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ABSTRACT

The Scots language has been historically marginalised in Scotland, arguably due to its lack of ‘capital’ (see Bailey, 1987 and Bourdieu, 1986). The European Union, under the Charter for Minority Languages, recognised Scots as a minority language in 2000 and the UK Government ratified Scots as such in 2001, yet Scots is still often perceived as ‘bad English’ or positioned within the invented romantic ‘tartanry’ of Scotland’s heritage (Matheson and Matheson, 2000). Scottish institutions such as the education system have traditionally ‘othered’ the Scots language and its speakers (Bailey, 1987). This has potentially generated barriers for learning and compromised Scots-speaking children’s notions of self-worth, agency and identity.

The following thesis explores Scottish secondary school student and teacher attitudes towards the place of Scots language in the Scottish classroom. The study also considers how and why such attitudes have emerged and endure. Moreover implications and recommendations for the inclusion of Scots in Scottish schools are considered.
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CHAPTER 1: Introduction

1.1. Focus

‘What’s wrong with your face, Docherty?’

‘Skint ma nose, sur.’

‘How?’

‘Ah fell an’ bumped ma heid in the sheuch, sur.’

‘I beg your pardon?’

‘Ah fell an’ bumped ma heid in the sheuch, sur.’

‘I beg your pardon?’

In the pause Conn understands the nature of the choice,
tremblingly, compulsively, makes it.

‘Ah fell an’ bumped ma heid in the sheuch, sur.’

The blow is instant (McIlvanney, 2007: p114).

This scene from McIlvanney’s (2007) Docherty helps to epitomise the historical marginalisation of the Scots language in the Scottish classroom (see Bailey, 1987). The main premise of this thesis posits that the marginalisation of Scots creates barriers for learning and can compromise children’s notions of self-worth, agency and identity.¹ Links surrounding the status of Scots and its place in both Scottish society and Scotland’s classrooms are explored throughout this thesis.

Specifically, I am concerned with examining children and teachers’ attitudes to Scots and the place of Scots in the classroom. Arguably such topics are often connected to the effects of historically marginalising Scots in Scottish schools (see Bailey, 1987).

¹ See Bailey, 1987 and Matheson and Matheson, 2000 for example.
The marginalisation of Scots in turn, I argue, is habitually due to its lack of ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) in many powerful institutional and bourgeois or traditionally middle-class Scottish contexts, such as the education system (see Bailey, 1987).

Although intimated in much of the literature in the field of Scots (See Matheson and Matheson (2000), McClure (2009) and McPake and Arthur (2006) for example), links between the marginalisation of Scots and the lower socio-economic background of many of its speakers are rarely openly addressed. Such arguable prejudice can be regarded as an uncomfortable and guarded legacy of a duplicitous Scotland (see Hassan, 2013). It is perhaps symptomatic of the complex, hypocritical and often paradoxical nature of the country at large (McLaren, 1956).

This arguably complicated national persona is epitomised for example in the Edinburgh based literary character Jean Brodie\(^2\) and indeed, with the Edinburgh writer Louis Stevenson’s creation, Jekyll and Hyde.\(^3\) These characters are synonymous with Louis Stevenson’s Edinburgh, the Edinburgh of ‘two faces’, the new and old towns, the ‘respectable and conventional’, the ‘shady characters and underhanded dealings’ (famousauthors, Web).\(^4\) It is of little surprise then that the 18\(^{th}\) century elocution movement to eradicate the Scots of their ‘scotticisms’ began in Edinburgh, where apparently refined English, not a supposedly crude Scots, was the acceptable code of the time (see Bailey, 1987).

---

\(^2\) See Muriel Spark (1961) *The Prime of Miss Jean Brodie* (Macmillan)

\(^3\) See Robert Louis Stevenson (1886) *Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* (Longmans, Green and Co.) and also Trevor-Roper (2008) for a discussion on the creation of Scottish myth.

\(^4\) See http://www.famousauthors.org/robert-louis-stevenson
Scotland’s duplicitous persona (see McLaren, 1956) can also be linked to what appears to be the Scottish belief in an egalitarian educational system in Scotland (see Anderson, 2008). The ‘lad o pairts’ ideal,\(^5\) which is generally upheld and revered, is an example of this (see Anderson, 2008). Yet despite this ideal, the marginalisation of the often lower socio-economic Scots speaker in the classroom has largely been sustained (see Bailey, 1987). The ‘lad o pairts’ was a, “boy of modest social origins from a rural or small-town background” (ibid.: p205), who was provided the chance to scale, “the educational ladder to such professions as the ministry, schoolteaching or the civil service” (ibid.: p205). This belief, as Anderson (2008) argues, does not so much suggest a ‘classless society’ in Scotland but rather a ‘meritocracy’, where talent is valued above class. Nevertheless, the Scottish education system has developed a reputation for, “a wider tradition of social egalitarianism” (McCrone, 2008: p226), which the ‘lad o pairts’ has arguably helped to fuel (ibid.) but unfortunately the marginalisation of the lower socio-economic Scots appears to prevail (see Bailey, 1987 and Matheson and Matheson, 2000).

One must question overall then, how egalitarian the Scottish education system is when, despite recent developments in educational policy and research in the field which supports Scots,\(^6\) many Scottish schools still struggle with creating inclusive policy that acknowledges and supports Scots-speaking children in their classrooms (see Matheson and Matheson, 2000). As Trevor-Roper (2008) posits: “myth, in Scotland, is never driven out by reality, or by reason, but lingers on until another myth has been discovered, or elaborated, to replace it” (pxx); therefore the notion of

---

\(^5\) See http://www.theguardian.com/education/2002/nov/21/highereducation.tuitionfees (Accessed 2 / 1 / 2014) for an interesting article on tuition fees in Scotland compared to those in England and the ‘lad o pairts’ ideal in the Scottish education system.

an egalitarian Scottish education system seems unconvincing until all children are actively included in the Scottish classroom, regardless of their lingua franca.

To continue, the research that informs this thesis originates from case studies I conducted from March to May in 2010, with two west lowland Scottish secondary schools. The research was funded by the Beacon North East, a subsidiary of the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement.78

I largely rely throughout the thesis on the qualitative data collected therein. I draw too on findings from both a recent Scottish Government funded public attitudinal review of the Scots language (Tns-bmrb, 2010b) and results from the 2010 National Survey of Teacher Attitudes to Scots Language in Curriculum for Excellence (Cross Party Group on the Scots Language, Web).9 A comparable piece of research by Shoba (2010), a case study concerned with implementing Scots in a Scottish classroom, is also referred to. To add, I provide a context for the place of Scots in Scotland by considering the ‘European Union Minority Language Committee’ reports on Scots (on-going from 2002), a recent Scottish Government Scots language audit (2009) and results from the recent Scottish census question on Scots (2011).

The following chapters highlight emerging themes from the school data I collected. Such themes include a ‘schizoglossic’ (Haugen, 1972) mind-set in Scots speakers,10 an insecurity in their own tongue, and issues surrounding the ‘social’ and ‘cultural capital’ (see Bourdieu, 1986) of Scots. These themes are generally unique to my own

---

7 See beacon North East Web, at: http://www.ncl.ac.uk/about/values/partnerships/city/beacon/
8 See http://www.ncl.ac.uk/about/values/partnerships/city/beacon/
9 http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/msps/50090.aspx
10 ‘Schizoglossia’ (Haugen, 1972): an unsecurity in one’s language.
work; indeed, I deliberately highlight them to depict what is perhaps ‘common knowledge’ in Scotland but which is rarely spoken of or questioned: the duplicitous status of Scots, at least in the minds of the Scottish (see Tns-bmrb, 2010b). To add, the ostracism of the Scots language, often by the Scottish education system, has been endemic and pervasive (see Bailey, 1987); I argue that the links between the ‘cultural’ and ‘social capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) of Scots and its marginalisation are intrinsic to the creation of this phenomenon. From my ‘insider’s’ perspective as a Scot, the links between the Scots language and ‘capital’ are generally concealed but ubiquitous in Scotland. They are also largely evaded, indeed are a gap, in the field. Thus, in order to further appreciate the ambiguity surrounding Scots and its marginalisation, I define the language as consisting of ‘modern’ and ‘heritage’ codes. ‘Modern’ Scots I argue is frequently associated with working or under-class Scottish comedy characters such as Rab C. Nesbitt for example; what I term ‘heritage’ Scots is considered as a historical language seen in the poetry of Burns for example, an artefact associated with the romanticism of Scotland’s ‘tartan’ heritage and often used to effect by the Scottish middle-classes (see Shoba, 2010).

My work overtly recognises, acknowledges and problematizes issues surrounding the Scots language; in doing so it adds to the field of Scots. I argue that these emerging issues go some way to explaining the marginalisation of the Scots language and the continuation of its negative entrenchment in Scotland. My concluding chapters explore the ramifications of including Scots in today’s Scottish schools and the possible challenges, benefits and ultimate caveats teachers, children and their communities may face in doing so.
1.2. Rationale and Aim

The Scots language and its differing codes have an impressive history and literature, which can be traced back to the 5th century Anglo-Saxon invasions (Kay, 2006; McClure, 2009). The language is recognised by the Council of Europe as a minority language and was ratified as such in 2001 by the UK Government. Scotland’s recent census results indicate that 30% of citizens speak Scots in Scotland today (National Records of Scotland, 2011). The new Curriculum for Excellence now includes Scots and the Scottish Government’s Education Scotland has recently appointed Scots Language Co-ordinators to help implement Scots in schools. Indeed, I recently met with the Co-ordinators to disseminate my findings.

Although the above examples are encouraging, before further initiatives regarding the implementation of Scots in Scottish schools are realised, it is firstly important that issues surrounding Scots are fully understood. Only by problematizing entrenched notions regarding Scots can we begin to acknowledge and understand in depth the issues surrounding the language. In doing so, we will be well positioned to effectively address such issues.

The rationale that underpins my research project and thesis are my interests in language, power, ‘social’ and ‘cultural capital’ and identity. Bourdieu’s (1986) work on ‘capital’, Foucault’s (1990a for example) notions of power and Jung’s (1959) idea of the ‘collective unconscious’ combine to create a theoretical backdrop to my work. I also draw from psychoanalytical theory at points (see Lacan, 1988 for example) to further support my discussion. Although these theorists are perhaps awkward

---

11 Council of Europe: European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/minlang/default_en.asp
bedfellows so to speak, my discussion throughout this thesis will highlight why their work nevertheless has played an important part in underpinning the analysis and outcomes of my results.

The overarching aim of the research project, as introduced above, is to explore children and teachers’ attitudes to Scots and the role of Scots in the classroom. I also examine the effects of historically marginalising Scots in the Scottish classroom and hence, the ramifications of including Scots in today’s Scottish schools. In addition the research identifies implications and caveats, and also creates recommendations, for the inclusion of Scots in the Scottish classroom.

I approach the study from an ontological position in constructionism and epistemological position in interpretivism (see Berger and Luckman, 1984, Bryman, 2004, Garfinkel, 1984 and Lyotard, 1984 for example). I seek to understand participants’ subjective experiences and perceptions; I assume both my data and interpretation of same to be privy to social constructs. As such, it is essential that I apply epistemological reflexivity throughout my thesis to ensure transparency and rigour (see Bourdieu and Waquant, 1992 and Guilleman and Gillam, 2004).

1.3. A Brief Outline of Context

What I term ‘modern’ Scots is considered within much of its speech community and beyond as a form of ‘slang’ (See Azripe and McGonigal, 2007, Lo Bianco, 2001, McPake and Arthur, 2006 and Macafee, 1994 for example). Matheson and Matheson (2000) state that: “Scots consider their language as slang, or in other words ‘bad English’” (p213); indeed McPake and Arthur (2006) suggest that Scots is considered,
“a ‘corruption’ of English” (p157). In contrast Hodgart (1997) posits that, “‘guid’ Scots wis whit their grannie spoke, aye in the past, aye somewhaur else” (p388).

Scots can also often be regarded as a language belonging to the invented romantic ‘tartanry’ of Scotland’s heritage (McCrone et al., 1999; McPake and McArthur, 2006); this code of Scots I term ‘heritage’ Scots.

Arguably, Scottish institutions such as the education system have helped to position Scots speakers as the ‘other’ (see Said’s 1979 seminal text regarding the notion of establishing ‘the other’), where speakers have been ‘colonised’ (O’Regan, 2006; see Matheson and Matheson, 2000) by an Anglicised code (Williamson, 1982a, 1982b).

Such a language could be regarded as Scottish Standard English, for example Standard English with an occasional Scots word and Scottish accent. Bailey (1987) explains that during the eighteenth century: “The language chosen for emulation by parents seeking education for their children came more and more to be that associated with the prestige dialect of London” (p132). He adds: “Schools attempted to eradicate – the Scots vernacular” (p132). Indeed, Bailey (1987) suggests that it is only lately that Scots has been reconsidered as a language for the Scottish classroom.

Positioning Scots as the ‘other’ has aided the formation of a Scottish ‘schizoglossia’ (see Haugen, 1972): an insecurity in the use of Scots by its speakers. Macafee (2000) suggests that Scots-speakers’ are largely ignorant of their own tongue. However, Scots speakers’ lack of confidence in the employment of Scots in some settings, such as school, is contrasted with the frequent employment of Scots in less formal contexts such as the home and street (see Tns-bmr, 2010b). It is reasonable to suggest that

---

13 Translation: good Scots was what their grandmother spoke, always in the past, always somewhere else.
the Scots language is associated with community, notions of identity and culture (see Hornberger, 2008); it is the “soul” and “mental individuality” (Westermann, cited in Whitehead, 1995: p4) of its interlocutors; this is evident when we consider participant B’s comments for example, when I analyse the pilot study results in chapter 4. What I term ‘heritage’ Scots has a prominent position in Scotland’s literature and culture. Scots has a long literary pedigree from Barbour’s *Bruce* and Blin Harry’s *Wallace* in the 14th century, and in the work of the Makars of the 15th/16th centuries, to Burns of the 18th century and MacDiarmid in the 20th century. More modern writers such as Tom Leonard continue the tradition. In addition, ‘modern’ Scots is used to effect by Scottish comedians such as the controversial Frankie Boyle and Billy Connolly or Kevin Bridges. Scottish comedy series such as ‘Chewin’ the Fat’ or ‘Rab C. Nesbitt’ also include characters that employ ‘modern’ Scots, although as intimated earlier, often the Scots-speaking characters or the Scots they promote is regarded as comedic and lacking in ‘cultural’ or ‘social capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986).

As a result of intervention from the Scottish education system for example, what might be considered the ‘collective unconscious’ (Jung, 1959), the mind-set, of the marginalised Scots-speaker, which I posit Scots helps to embody and express, has arguably become compromised. The speaker is fragmented, as Matheson and Matheson (2000) suggest, accommodating the, “schizophrenic effect of thinking and speaking in one language while writing in another” (p213). This has arguably resulted in a ‘schizoglossia’ (see Haugen, 1972), an insecurity amongst the Scots-speaking community. As such, the apparent colonisation of the Scots language has resulted in ‘modern’ Scots speakers arguably struggling to gain ‘social’ and ‘cultural capital’ in many formal contexts, such as the church or school (see Matheson and
Matheson, 2000 and Bourdieu, 1986). Inversely the use of ‘modern’ Scots in certain informal contexts, for example in the home or street, appears to be antithetical in providing the speaker with significant ‘social capital’ (see Bourdieu, 1986) and agency. In addition, ‘heritage’ Scots is often employed in a tokenistic fashion to accrue ‘cultural capital’ (ibid.), particularly in the Scottish education system (Shoba, 2010).

1.4. Key Research Questions

My key questions support my aims by problematizing the role and status of Scots, particularly in Scottish schools. My questions also examine links between the Scots language and notions of identity, ‘cultural’ and ‘social capital’ (see Bourdieu, 1986). This enables me to acknowledge and understand some of the current issues surrounding the language, as discussed above. In turn I am then able to identify the implications and caveats, and make recommendations, for the implementation of Scots in Scottish classrooms.

Therefore, the five key questions I have set out to address in the research are:

1. a) What attitudes do students and staff of the two case study schools have with regards the status of Scots and b) its place in Scottish schools;

2. What links, if any, do participants make between the use of Scots, ‘capital’ and identity;

3. a) How and why have these attitudes emerged and b) why do they perhaps remain;
4. What recommendations, if any, do participants have regarding the provision of Scots in the Scottish classroom;

5. What possible challenges, benefits and caveats are staff and students privy to in implementing Scots in the classroom

1.5. Style

I provide here a brief synopsis of the approach and presentation of the following chapters.

Approach

With regards writing style, I often adopt what I term a reflexive narrative approach, which draws from the convention of critical autobiographical writing (see Riley and Hawe, 2005 for example). As Sikes and Gale (2006) discuss, recently there has occurred an, ‘auto/biographical turn’ in the social sciences, where the post-modern is favoured and is as a reaction and rejection of ‘grand narratives’ or universal truths. A reflexive narrative approach is the use of ‘little stories’ (Lyotard cited in Hammer, 1998: p137) rather than ‘grand narratives’. Sikes and Gale (2006) suggest this approach enables researchers to both create and employ narrative as a means to specifically explain their research ‘story’, rather than relying on an overarching theory to appreciate the chosen phenomenon.\(^{14}\) Thus, I occasionally incorporate the ‘little stories’ of my participants and, reflexively, ‘stories’ from my own perspective, in order to supplement the evidence I provide.

\(^{14}\) See also Campbell 1988; Mishler 1999; Wortham 2001.
To expand, the reflexive narrative approach is normally associated with qualitative research, where ‘stories’ are often told therein. Lyotard (1989) distinguishes between the ‘grand narrative’ and ‘little stories’, where the latter, “posit[s] a more local, as opposed to a more civic identity” (Lyotard cited in Hammer, 1998: p137). Therefore a reflexive narrative approach is pertinent to my work, as my participants provide largely qualitative data through their own experiences, their ‘stories’. To add to this is my own position in the research; I am a ‘local’: a Scottish speaker of Scots and also, at one time, a Scottish teacher. Therefore, I am an ethnographer or ‘insider’, in the phenomenon I study. Now, as a teacher educator and early career researcher, and being located in England, I also have the luxury of being an, ‘outsider’ to the phenomenon.

These positions enable me to provide further reflective and reflexive perspectives (see Guilleman and Gillam, 2004 for example); they allow me to explore both ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ ‘stories’. Fox and Allan (2014) suggest that as a doctoral student and early career researcher, my ‘unbecoming and becoming’ from, in my case, teacher towards fully fledged researcher, have potentially involved a ‘dialogic’, “reflexive ‘trip’ ” (ibid.:p101) between my supervisor and myself. I am grateful that this has been the case, where our discussions have continually sparked in me further reflexive thinking and as such a continual repositioning of my work. I am also aware however that there has been a ‘dynamic’ reflexivity, an ‘unbecoming and becoming’, between my understanding of my own personal and professional ‘Scottish history’ and those of my participants and the Scottish culture I am still included within. In reflecting on my own and my participants’ ‘stories’, there has occurred an intertwining of ‘stories’, which has allowed me to continually and reflexively frame and reframe the
phenomenon I study, my position within the research and even my place as a Scot as part of and beyond Scotland and its culture. In turn, this process has enabled me to appreciate and discuss the phenomenon I study in a more insightful manner.

To add, my deliberate and blatant attempt to adopt a ‘local’ approach to my work is in keeping with a narrative approach. Scotland is a peculiar country; as said it is a nation of contradictions. McLaren (1956) states that the Scots are: “about as confusing a collection of opposites as you are likely to meet anywhere in the world. They have more internal differences of character and opinion than almost any other nation” (p8). Although I allude to other minority languages in my work, I persistently return to the distinctive setting and peculiar situation of Scots and Scotland (see McLaren, 1956). There is much to compare in the struggles of other minority languages as they fight, like Scots, to be heard amongst their contextual lingua franca. However, as ethnographers situate themselves in and amongst a phenomenon in order to appreciate it, so I too situate myself in the particular phenomenon of the Scots language in Scotland.

I also draw from a wider bank of ‘stories’ in this thesis, in order to elaborate on my analysis and to provide contextual meaning. I refer not only to the ‘stories’ of my participants and my own ‘stories’ but also, as can be seen above, from those of Scottish Literature and more generally Scottish culture. Therefore I may refer to the Scottish writers Muriel Spark or Neil Gunn or the Scottish comedian Kevin Bridges or even the television anti-hero Rab C. Nesbitt for example, as additions to the participant ‘stories’ I am exploring. Craig (2011) also adopts this approach to effect in her engaging text: The Scots’ Crisis of Confidence.
My academic background allows these comparisons, as it lies in literature, and in particular, Scottish Literature and Scottish Studies. This provides me with the advantage of being able to analyse my data whilst drawing from the wider context of the Scottish condition. Therefore my work is interdisciplinary and hence I can offer my reader the opportunity to appreciate my analysis within a broader and richer setting in Scots, Education and Sociolinguistics and more widely Scottish Literature and Scottish Studies.

I would like to make clear though that I do not present my use of ‘narrative’ as evidence per se, rather the ‘stories’ I employ simply provide my discussion with further depth and contextual relevance. Indeed, I adopt thematic and content analysis to examine the bulk of data collected. This said these cultural ‘stories’ and their motifs, which interweave themselves between the data, are essential as they whisper of the broader duplicitous ‘collective unconscious’ of the Scottish nation and hence, perhaps help to shed light on some of the peculiarities of the Scottish condition.

**Style**

Although I adhere to the Harvard system of referencing throughout, I footnote related points or references in order to avoid disrupting the flow of each section and chapter. In addition, I utilise the figures [ ] to indicate that I have included my own words in a quote or I employ … to display that I have left a section or word out of a quote. On occasion I add italics and / or bold too, to emphasise a point, a section of a quote, sections of data or an emerging theme in the data. I also periodically reference from
web sites; the reader will find the full site addresses either in footnotes and/or within the references pages.

1.6. Overview

In chapter 1 the reader is provided with an introduction to the thesis. Here I explain the rationale and context of my research. I also outline my aims and key research questions and offer an overview of the rest of the thesis.

In chapter 2 I present a literature review, which firstly considers recent policy developments and research in the field of Scots. I also explore issues surrounding Scots, Scots, language ecology and language rights issues, Scots as a language, its history and literature and bilingualism within the context of the Scots in Scottish schools. I provide the context of Scots after I discuss Scots in policy and practice in Scotland, as I wish the reader to appreciate the current status of the language, without being biased by its previous standing in history and literature. Overall the first two chapters afford the reader with a foundation with which to appreciate the following chapters of the thesis.

Chapter 3 is concerned with the methodology of the research. It outlines my ontological and epistemological position and approach respectively and discusses the methodological choices of my work, including its design, strategy and methods. Chapter 3 also addresses my position within the research and my ethical considerations.
Chapter 4 presents my research findings. I also include the discussion of my findings in this chapter, as I wish my analysis to have clear links to the data sets. Chapter 4 is split into three parts in order to allow me scope to analyse and examine each data set in detail and also to enable me to refer back and forward as and when needed. Part 1 considers data from a pilot study I conducted with participants privy to the Scottish education system during the 1940s to 50s. The pilot study is particularly interesting, as it allows me to consider, through thematic analysis (see Ryan and Bernard, 2003), the status and place of Scots in Scottish schools and communities then and now. The data adds a diachronic element to the study. This is useful in helping the reader to appreciate the enduring issues surrounding Scots.

Part 2 of chapter 4 is concerned with data collected from participant staff focus groups. The two groups, one in each case study school, answered semi-structured interview questions regarding Scots and its place in schools. These questions were clearly related to my key research questions above. In part 2 I provide an initial content analysis of the data. Similar to part 1 of chapter 4, I also conduct a thematic analysis (ibid.), which reveals some interesting recurring themes.

Part 3 of chapter four considers the qualitative and quantitative data of my student questionnaires. I offer both a thematic (see Ryan and Bernard, 2003) and a descriptive statistical analysis of the data. I begin to link my results to the analysis of the data from the pilot study and staff focus groups.

Chapter 5 provides my conclusions, incorporating the limitations of the research project and implications and recommendations for school practitioners and
educational policy makers alike. Here I bring together my study of the field and the analysis of my data sets, in order to answer the key questions I set myself. I also reflexively pause at this point to consider the research process and my development from teacher to teacher educator to researcher, as a result of my journey in researching Scots in schools.
CHAPTER 2: Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

In this chapter I provide an overview of the place of the Scots language in Scotland. I firstly base this on the United Kingdom’s minority languages Committee of Expert reports.\(^{15}\) I then consider results from the Scottish Government funded audit of Scots language (Scottish Government 2, Web),\(^{16}\) the Scots question in the 2011 Scottish census and a public attitudinal review of the Scots language (Tns-bmr, 2010b). I also explore the 2010 National Survey of Teacher Attitudes to Scots Language in Curriculum for Excellence (Cross Party Group on the Scots Language, Web); the Curriculum for Excellence (Scottish Executive, 2004) is the most recent curriculum in Scottish schools, having been implemented in August 2010. In addition I refer to Shoba’s (2010) case study, which explores the implementation of Scots in a Scottish classroom. I examine too issues surrounding the definition and status of Scots as a language and its place within language ecology and language rights debates and I provide Scots a context, by considering its history and literature. I also examine a bilingual approach to implementing Scots language in schools.

2.2. Scots and the European Charter for Minority Languages

Scots is often regarded as a form of ‘bad English’ (see Matheson and Matheson, 2000), although it is recognized as a language in its own right;\(^{17}\) The European Union, under the Charter for Minority Languages, recognised Scots as a minority

---

\(^{15}\) Council of Europe: European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, Web at: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/minlang/default_en.asp  
\(^{17}\) See also sections 2.7 and 2.9 below.
language in 2000 and the UK Government also ratified Scots as such in 2001 (Web), as part of their commitment to honour the Charter.

The Charter defines a minority language as being:

- traditionally used within a given territory of a state by nationals of that state who form a group numerically smaller than the rest of the state’s population; they are different from the official language(s) of that state, and they include neither dialects of the official language(s) of the state nor the languages of migrants (ibid.).

The 2011 Scottish census results demonstrate that a minority of the Scottish population, 30%, speak Scots (National Records of Scotland, 2011); in the field, Scots is not considered a dialect of English or a language of modern day migrants (see Azripe and McGonigal, 2007, McClure, 2009 and Matheson and Matheson, 2000 for example). Scots is normally spoken to the south, central, east and north east of Scotland and is also employed on the islands of Orkney and Shetland. According to the Scots Language Centre (Web), there are four main codes of Scots: Insular, Northern, Central and Southern, which were determined during the 1870s by Murray (1870-72, 1873) (ibid.). Fig. 2.1., courtesy of the Scots Language Centre, is a map of the Scots speaking areas of Scotland. Scots is spoken in the darker blue sections. The lighter blue sections are the Gàidhealtachd and Eilean Siar; Eilean Siar is where most Gàidhlig speakers in Scotland reside (Scotlandcensus, Web).

My case study results

---

19 See Scots Language Centre, Web at: http://www.scotslanguage.com/
were collected in the South Central area of Scotland (see Fig. 2.1.).

Fig. 2.1. ‘Scots speakers by region’

Some examples of Scots, as indicated in Fig. 2.1., include South Central or Gallowa:

“Forbye thae, there’s lots o’ ither names gaun, joost like whut ye’ll fin a’ ower Scotlan” (Scots Language Centre, Web) (this translates as: ‘Besides all that, there are lots of other names in circulation, similar to those you will find all over Scotland’)

---

and West Central: “An’ roun’ your lean haffets, ance sonsy and fair, / Hings, tautit an’
tousie, your bonny broun hair” (ibid.) (translated as: ‘And round your lean cheeks,
once attractive and fair, / Hangs, tangled and tousled your beautiful brown hair’).
Also, an example of Southern Scots is: “For he had left nae gear to steal, / Except sax
sheep upon a lee’” (ibid.) (translation: ‘For he had left no equipment to steal, / Except
six sheep upon a sheltered field’). An illustration of Northern Scots or the Doric is:
“The auld barn, biggit fur horse-feed an harness, hid cheenged frae shelts tae deep
litter, a crowdit, flechy, kecklin, scrattin squatter o hens” (ibid.) (translated as: ‘The
old barn, big for horsefeed and harnesses, had changed from animals to deep litter, a
crowded, flea-ridden, cackling, scratching, spluttering of hens’). An example of
Insular Scots or Orkney is: “I telt’im at aince ‘at I hed been sae lang awa fae hame ‘at
feinty bit o’ me minded (ibid.) (translation: ‘I told him at once that I had been so long
away from home that a faint bit of me remembered’). Further examples of Scots can
be found on the Scots Language Centre website.24 The examples provided here help
to demonstrate that Scots differs from Scots-speaking region to region in Scotland by
means of lexis, syntax and when spoken, phonology. Indeed, the reader is advised to
visit the Scots Language Website and listen to the differing examples of Scots
available there, in order to appreciate further the differences between these regional
codes. We understand from above then, that Scots is not simply a generic language in
Scotland but is differentiated into distinct codes according to region.

A minority language, according to the European Charter requires, “the adoption of
protective and promotional measures” (European Charter for Regional or Minority

Committees of independent experts, who aim to support and monitor the ‘protection and promotion’ of minority languages on behalf of the Charter are created, “from ‘a list of individuals of the highest integrity and recognised competence in the matters dealt with in the Charter’ ” (ibid). As a point of reference, in September 2009 the Committee of Experts for Scots consisted of Mr Emyr Lewis from Wales, Mr Sigve Gramstad from Norway, Mrs Vesna Crniæ-Grotiæ from Croatia and Ms Simone Klinge from the Charter Secretariat.26

The European Union Minority Language Committee’s involvement in supporting the Scots language in Scotland has been significant in encouraging the development of Scots policy and practice in Scottish schools. This is evidenced in the United Kingdom EU Minority Language Committee recommendatory and monitoring reports, four sets in total; they offer an account of the recent and current context of Scots in Scotland. I provide a summary of these reports below, in order to offer the reader a useful foundation and context to the rest of my discussion in chapter 2.

The Council of Europe Initial Periodical Report, 2002 stated that, “Scots is on a linguistic continuum with English” (p7), suggesting that Scots is a, “Halbsprache or half-language” (Görlach, 1998: p13) between Scots and English. This appears to contradict their definition of a minority language. However, the first report of the Committee of Experts (2004) elaborated on this statement with: “The proximity of Scots to English has made it difficult for the language to receive official recognition as a separate language in the UK” (p7). The 2004 report also indicated that, “There is

---

25 Council of Europe: European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, Web at: http://www.conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ChercheSig.asp?NT=148&CM=8&DF=&CL=ENG
26 See Scots Language Centre, Web at: http://www.scotslanguage.com/
no official policy for Scots” (ibid.: p10); indeed, only recently has the New Curriculum for Excellence (Scottish Executive, 2004) for Scottish schools in Scotland notably acknowledged Scots in its recommendations. Therefore the ‘protection and promotion’ of Scots has been difficult.

Comments from the second report of the Committee of Experts (2007) revealed there were still, “no official figures of the number of Scots-speakers” (ibid.: p6); this was obviously before the recent census in 2011 where a Scots question was asked therein and 30% indicated that they spoke Scots. The Experts also stated that, “[t]his seems to be linked with a low awareness of the speakers themselves of the existence of Scots as a distinct language” (ibid.: p6), a point Macafee (2000) raises in her own research. The second Committee of Experts report (2007) also stated that Scots speakers were not generally literate in the language, there being “no single standard written form of Scots” (ibid.: p13). The report recommended that ‘language corpus planning’ was extremely important to establish a canon of Scots; this in turn would help to support Scots in schools (ibid.). Indeed, “the teaching of Scots to teaching in Scots” (ibid.: p13), the report suggested, would encourage teachers to ‘accept’ Scots in the classroom (ibid.). However the report indicated that numbers of Scots speakers needed to be established, before a policy on ‘protecting and promoting’ Scots could be developed (ibid.). The Experts commented at this time that: “The situation of the Scots language in Scotland however, remains unsatisfactory” (ibid.: p8), largely due to the issues surrounding the language that they raised as above.
Scotland welcomed a new government in May 2007, with most MSPs, 47, belonging to the Scottish Nationalist Party.\footnote{27 See http://www.scotland.gov.uk/About/Government/sgprevious/2007-2011} The new Government pledged to, “[p]romote an increased awareness of Scots and its literature” (Scottish Government 2: p1) and, “include introducing a question on Scots in the census” (ibid.: p1). Following this, the Charter’s third periodical report for the UK (2009) noted that the Scotland’s new Curriculum for Excellence acknowledged that: “‘Scotland has a rich diversity of language, including Scots’” (ibid.: p23). The report also acknowledged the Curriculum’s statement: “‘languages, dialects and literature of Scotland provide a rich and valuable resource for children and young people to learn about Scotland’s culture, identity and language’” (ibid.: p55). However, the third periodical report for the UK (2009) recognised that there was still a need to enhance the standing of Scots in Scotland (ibid.: p45).

In their 2010 report the Committee of Experts stated, “Scots benefits from an increased degree of public recognition and respect” (p9). However, the Experts stated that the Scottish Government had still not produced a language policy for Scots, as part of the National Languages Strategy (ibid.). The Experts also noted that, “the provision of Scots in education is stronger at primary school and higher education level, and weaker at secondary school and further education level” (ibid.: p15).

The Fourth Periodical Report (2013) noted that a Scots question was included in the 2011 census. The Scottish population were asked whether they could ‘understand’, ‘speak’, ‘read’ and/or ‘write’ in English, Scottish Gaelic and/or Scots (ibid.). The report also stated that the Scottish Government funded Scots Language Centre had
created a web site to help support the Scottish public in answering the above census question (ibid.). The results from the census are included below. The fourth periodical report (2013) stated too that, “[d]uring the next monitoring cycle the Scottish Government will develop plans for the introduction of Scottish Studies” (ibid.: p5) in schools, incorporating Scots language as a strand therein (ibid.).

The Fourth Periodical Report (2013) also commented on Government funded attitudinal research of the Scots language in Scotland, which I discuss below; the results demonstrated the significant role Scots plays in modern Scottish life (ibid.). The report also noted that a Scots Language Ministerial Working Group, chaired by (Mr) J. Derrick McClure, had made various recommendations for the support of Scots language including: the creation of a language policy for Scots; increased funding for organisations such as the Scots Language Centre and Scottish Language Dictionaries (Scottish Government 1, Web) and the introduction of Scots Co-ordinators to oversee the implementation of Scots in schools.

As a result of the periodical and Expert reports, the Scottish Government agreed to create a Scots language policy and provide funding for Scots. It also encouraged the production of ‘Studying Scotland’ and Scots continuing professional development resources for teachers via Glow, the online Scottish school resource bank. Both of these are new resources for teachers concerned with Scotland and its languages; they can be viewed via the links in footnotes below. The Scottish Language Dictionaries

28 www.ayecan.com
29 The Tns-brmb (2010b) study.
30 http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2011/03/18094509/2
31 http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/studyingscotland/about/what.asp ; see also Education Scotland in references.
32 http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/usingglowandict/glow/whatisp ; see also Education Scotland in references.
also produced CPD resources for teachers and appointed an Education Outreach Officer; again resources can be viewed via the footnote below.\(^3^3\)

As documented by the periodical and Expert reports, there has been a slow shift in Scotland towards supporting Scots in Scottish schools and in Scotland at large. However, from my own research it is apparent that there is some way to go, not only in fully incorporating and supporting Scots in schools but also in educating Scots and non-Scots speakers alike in the Scots language and its status as a language. I discuss this more fully below and in the analysis of my results in chapter 4.

### 2.3. Audit of Current Scots Language Provision

Here I provide a brief summary of the 2009 Scottish Government’s\(^3^4\) commissioned audit of Scots language provision in Scotland. The audit considered a ‘snapshot’ of Scots provision and, in doing so, offered a broad representation of the place of Scots in Scotland at this time.

As outlined by the Council of Europe European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, ‘seven categories of public life’ (CoE ECRML) were examined for Scots provision: “Education; Judicial Authorities; Administrative Authorities and Public Services; Media; Cultural Activities and Facilities; Economic and Social Life; and Trans-Frontier Exchanges” (Scottish Government 2, Web\(^3^5\): Executive Summary).

The audit adopted a case study method (Scottish Government 2, Web\(^3^6\): Audit) and

---

\(^3^3\) [http://www.scotsdictionaries.org.uk](http://www.scotsdictionaries.org.uk)

\(^3^4\) NB: Scottish Government of 2007.


the design incorporated a ‘snowball sampling frame’, in order to recruit participants from wider target communities (ibid.).

The strategy of the audit involved mixed methods, where both quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection, such as interviews and ‘documentary analysis’, were employed (ibid.). It appears that the quantitative data was displayed via a basic descriptive statistical method, where instances of Scots provision were recorded within the ‘category of public life’ they related to (ibid.). With regards qualitative data, the audit provided examples from interviews; however, no formal means of qualitative data analysis, such as content or discourse analysis, was apparent in the document. Some thematic analysis of interviews was presented; nevertheless section four simply appeared to offer a discussion based around the qualitative data collected. Thus, as the analysis of data seemed to be indicative only, I briefly consider the main points, as raised in the report.

The leading instances of provision for Scots, according to the report’s quantitative data, lay in ‘Education’, with ‘Cultural Activities and Facilities’ and ‘Media’ being the next leading categories (ibid.). The report stated that, “language provision is distributed very unevenly through the CoE ECRML’s seven categories of public life” (ibid.: p17), although it did acknowledge that some provision crossed boundaries between categories (ibid.). The main provider of resources, information, research etc. on Scots was the Scots Language Dictionaries, closely followed by the Scots Language Centre and the Elphinstone Institute in Aberdeen University (ibid.). Most instances of provision were offered online; ‘printed materials’, ‘educational’ and ‘in person’ ‘forms of provision’ followed (ibid.). The main ‘areas of provision’ were
‘Scotland-wide’ and then ‘world-wide’ (ibid.). Specifically and subsequent to these, Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeenshire were the next highest instances of provision ‘by area’ for Scots (ibid.).

Qualitative data analysis by means of what appears to be thematic analysis, suggested that the main themes to arise from the data included the status of Scots as a ‘living language’ (ibid.). To add, Scots appeared to occupy a ‘centrality’ to ‘a sense of identity’ in Scotland and the language was clearly ‘important’ to the Scottish people (ibid.). The audit uncovered, by means of both qualitative and quantitative data analysis, that, “the categories of Judicial Authorities and Administrative Authorities and Public Services, [was] where almost no provision was found” (ibid.: p37) for Scots. In addition, discussions regarding, “Scots language as an asset for economic development” (ibid.: p37), the audit suggested, were absent. The audit however linked Scots with having ‘social capital’ regarding ‘economic development’ in ‘tourism’ and other ‘cultural activities’; the audit then compared this to similar developments with Irish and Gàidhlig (ibid.), where for example Irish, “language and cultural practices underpin a growing tourism and music / literature economy which caters to an international market. The economic impact on the host towns of the Gaelic Mod is an example of this” (ibid.:p37).

The audit also suggested that, “[t]he Scottish Government could consider how awareness [of Scots] may be raised within the Scottish judicial system” (ibid.: p43); it proposed too that, ‘the profile of Scots language provision at local authority level may be developed or increased” (ibid.: p43). The audit suggested the same for ‘national bodies or authorities’ (ibid.). It also proposed that Scots could be better provided for
through Media and should continue to be incorporated in the cultural activities of Scotland (ibid.). The audit suggested too that the Scots language should be promoted and supported by the Scottish Government and its local authorities worldwide, to aid the status of the language and add to the appeal of Scotland for international visitors (ibid.).

Pertinent to my research, the audit advised, as did the European Union Reports above, that provision for the Scots language in Education was ‘uneven’, it being reliant on individual teachers and appearing more prevalent in primary than secondary schools in Scotland (ibid.). As part of my initial research, I held several telephone conversations with Matthew Fitt, a Scottish poet, novelist and co-founder of Itchy Coo, an imprint that translates or adapts into Scots / publishes for children well known texts such as *Asterix* and *The Gruffalo*. Matthew found from his own experience and research working with schools and children, that primary schools were much more accommodating than secondary schools in Scotland regarding the inclusion of Scots in the classroom. This, and similar accounts in the European Union reports above and here with the Scots audit, played a significant part in my decision to approach secondary rather than primary schools in Scotland to conduct my research; I believed I would uncover much more revealing data with regards participant attitudes towards Scots in the classroom, if there appeared to be some resistance already within the secondary school context regarding implementing Scots into secondary classrooms.

---

The audit concluded by stating that the ‘de-stigmatisation’ of the Scots language was one of the main aims of providers of Scots in Scotland (ibid.). The overall recommendation from the audit, “suggest[ed] that the Scots language needs its own unique solutions, driven by its historical context within which the language has existed” (ibid.: p40). Specifically the audit proposed that in education, the Scottish Government could build upon provision already in situ, explore opportunities to provide continuous professional development in Scots for teachers and instruct additional research in Scots (ibid.).

2.4 Scottish Census Results for the Scots Question

The 2011 Scottish census included for the first time a question on the Scots language. As discussed above, the question asked if citizens, “can understand, speak, read and / or write Scots” (Aye Can, Web)\(^38\). The Scots Language Centre created a website called ‘Aye Can’ to support the public in answering this question; citizens were encouraged to utilise a link that was provided to the ‘Aye Can’ website from the census question. As Macafee (2000) suggests, Scots speakers tend to have little mindfulness of their own tongue; therefore the Scots Language Centre endeavoured to support them in deciding what language they did speak.

The results were released in September 2013 (National Records of Scotland, 2011). The report did not go into great detail regarding the results for Scots, however it did state that, “the proportion of the population aged 3 and over in Scotland who reported they could speak, read, write or understand Scots was 38 per cent (1.9 million)” (p27). The report added, “For Scotland as a whole, 30 per cent (1.5 million) of the

\(^{38}\) Aye Can, Web at: http://www.ayecan.com/
population aged 3 or over indicated that they were able to speak Scots” (ibid.). The report also noted that those areas in Scotland where Scots was spoken the most were the Shetland Isles and Aberdeenshire, both scoring 49%, followed by Moray and the Orkney Islands with 45 and 41% respectively (ibid.). The areas that spoke Scots the least were Eilean Siar (7%), Edinburgh (21%), Highland and Argyll & Bute (both 22%) (ibid.).

The report however intimated that the results should be ‘qualified’ (ibid.). It stated: “The question on languages skills in the census questionnaire was relatively poorly answered” (ibid.); there was a suggestion that as, “a significant number of respondents provided information on their skills in Scots but did not indicate any corresponding abilities in relation to English” (ibid.), this might indicate that, “they considered Scots and English as inter-changeable” (ibid.). To add, the report also suggested that research prior to the census proposed that the public was unsure as to what Scots is and therefore, this could have produced “inconsistencies in the data collected” (ibid.) for the 2011 Scots language census question.

Such qualifications were unexpected. Indeed The Missing (2013), an article in Bella Caledonia, an online Scottish magazine, voiced concern regarding the brevity of the census report on Scots and qualifications made therein. The article was written by Michael Hance, Director of the Scots Language Centre, in response to Gerry Hassan’s (2013) article in a separate online magazine, Scottish Review: Scotland's Comforting Stories and the Missing Voices of Public Life. Both Hance and Hassan are active members in the field of Scots and/or the broader political arena in Scotland.
Unfortunately Hassan and Hance’s articles have no page numbers but can be accessed at the links below.  

Hance states that the National Records for Scotland (NRS), the overarching agency accountable for the 2011 census, shed, “doubt on the validity of their figures” in its census report on Scots language. He suggests that they are, “implying that those saying they spoke Scots hadn’t understood the question”. He also stated that the NRS, “undermined a respected and methodologically sound survey carried out by its own staff” and, “brought into question the agency’s ability to collect data effectively by suggesting that questions which it had developed and tested had been misunderstood by respondents”. The article surmised that the report’s author had, “linguistic prejudices [that were] so strong that they outweighed what otherwise one would assume would be the natural desire to present the NRS as an institution with a pedigree of successful research into the prevalence of Scots language speakers in the general population”. The article also highlighted that as the press releases for the NRS’s census report did not support the results for Scots, the media failed to notice these results and therefore, they were overlooked or misrepresented in the press. As such, the article suggests that the NRS report, “has quietly given Scots speakers and the wider community a message … ignore the responses to the census, they don’t prove anything, the people who said they were speakers are not to be trusted … Scots is just English, it doesn’t exist”. The article adds that this is, “an established pattern … state and its agencies pretend Scots doesn’t exist”.

The Scots Haunbuik supports Hance’s comments. It is an online page for issues surrounding the Scots language; unfortunately, like Bella Caledonia, it has no page numbers but a link is provided below.\textsuperscript{41} The article \textit{Missing, Presumed Deid} [Dead] in The Scots Haunbuik states, “systematic silencing of Scots voices [is] … a form of soft oppression, a form of oppression that the middle class Scottish establishment (here represented by the hapless NRS) can make with a clear conscious”. The article qualifies its comment with reference to Hassan’s comment: “‘\textit{a long Scots tradition of middle class society presenting a caricatured version of the working class}’”. The Scots Haunbuik adds, “A caricatured class, a caricatured culture, a caricatured tongue; all forms of control”.

Both Hance and The Scots Handbook’s comments are persuasive, particularly in light of the European Union Committee of Expert reports, which state that the situation in Scotland is ‘unsatisfactory’. From my own research, it seems that associations are often drawn in Scotland between the use of Scots and the social class of its speaker (see section 2.7.). Arguably, the marginalization of the code can be linked with the marginalization of the working or under classes in Scotland and I go on to discuss this in chapter 4 in my analysis of the pilot study data and in particular in section 2.7. below, when I consider the portrayal of ‘Neds’ and their code of Scots in the Scottish media. Indeed, negative class associations are perhaps one of the reasons for the ‘stigmatisation’ of Scots, as alluded to in the 2009 Scots audit, as above.

2.5. Public Attitudinal Review of the Scots Language, 2010

The Scottish Government funded a public attitudinal review of the Scots language in 2009 to, “help inform policy development for Scots” (Tns-bmrb, 2010b: p1). The study adopted a cross-sectional survey research design and a mixed methods research strategy to collect its data. Interviewers employed a computer assisted personal interviewing technique (CAPI) to gain data (Tns-brmb, 2010b), where participants answered questions via a computer but the interviewer was also present to help guide the participant. The sample of approximately 1000 Scottish participants was, “representative of the adult population (aged 16+) in terms of sex, age, employment status and socio-economic group” (p1).

The main findings revealed that the Scots language was reported to be spoken by 85% of participants, with 43% of these indicating that they spoke it “a lot / fairly often” (ibid.). Those who stated that they spoke Scots indicated that they did so, “when socialising with friends (69%) or at home with the family (63%)” (ibid.). The main reason supplied for being a non-Scots speaker was, “‘I am not Scottish!’” (ibid.).

Despite these results, 64% of participants concurred with, “I don’t really think of Scots as a language – it’s more just a way of speaking” (Tns-brmb, 2010b: p2). 29% however disagreed with this, suggesting that they did regard Scots as a language. This figure of 29% is interesting, as it echoes the 30% of citizens in the Scots census results, as above, that indicated that they spoke Scots. A lack of awareness of the Scots tongue may lead participants to consider Scots as simply ‘a way of speaking’ and not a language they actually use (see Macafee, 2000). Indeed, from the Tns-brmb

42 See Sainsbury et al. http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU3.html for a further discussion on CAPI.
(2010b) study 67%, “agree[d], ‘I probably do use Scots, but am not really aware of it’” (p2).

To continue, the Tns-brmb (2010b) results demonstrated that, “half indicated they ever read in the Scots language and around a third ever use Scots when writing” and, “those who do tend to read / write in Scots tend to do so only occasionally or rarely” (p1). The study also revealed that 63% of participants did not agree with the statement that Scots: “‘doesn’t sound nice – it’s slang’” (p2). However 26% did concur with this statement, suggesting, “that some have negative perceptions of Scots as a language” (ibid.). In addition, 67% of participants in the study thought that, “it is as important that Scots is used in Scotland these days” (ibid.), although 31% believed it was not. Some of the reasons provided by participants as to why Scots was not ‘important’ included problems deciphering the language, as they believed it was antiquated or “inferior to English” (ibid.). However, “there is widespread recognition of the role of Scots in the history, culture and local identities of Scotland” (ibid.). This said, 62% believed that, “Scots is not relevant to the modern Scotland of today” (p3). Contrary to this, 63 and 69% respectively of participants from the Tns-brmb (2010b) study stated that they used Scots ‘when socialising with friends (69%) … or at home with the family (63%)’.

The study also asked participants their opinions regarding the role of the Scots language in Education. 73% agreed that, “learning Scots can contribute to a sense of national cultural identity” however, only 56% believed that, “learning Scots has educational benefits for school children” (p3). To add, “just over half are in support of teaching Scots in schools” (ibid.) yet 29% do not agree with Scots being taught.
64% believe, “children in Scotland should be encouraged to speak Scots” (ibid.) nonetheless, 31% disagree.

It seems therefore that the Tns-brmb (2010b) survey raised some conflicting results. By way of explanation, I argue that in Scots studies such as the Tns-brmb (2010b) survey, participants differentiate between what they regard as the Scots of Robert Burns’ time / the Older Scots period or what I term ‘heritage’ Scots, with Hassan’s ‘caricatured version of the working class’ Scots, what I refer to as ‘modern Scots’, that is often considered as ‘slang’ and ‘inferior to English’ (see Matheson and Matheson, 2000).

It is unlikely that participants are actually completely aware of such differences in Scots, in all probability due to them having little mindfulness of the Scots tongue (see Macafee, 2000). Indeed, many Scots speakers may only have a tacit knowledge of their Scots code. However, I suggest that even tacitly some participants perceive Scots as ‘modern’ and others consider it as a ‘heritage’ code. For example, I propose that 67% of participants in the Tns-brmb (2010b) study were referring to ‘heritage’ Scots when they described it as, “being old-fashioned” (p2). Indeed, when there was, “an overall consensus that Scots has an important role in terms of the identity, culture and heritage of Scotland” (Tns-brmb, 2010b: p2), I suggest that participants were also referring to ‘heritage’ Scots here.

‘Modern Scots’ is not the language of the Scottish institution (see Scottish Government 2, Web43: Audit); it is a Scots used, ‘when socialising with friends … or

at home with the family’ (Tns-brmb, 2010b). It is the Scots of ‘a caricatured class, a caricatured culture, a caricatured tongue’ (Scots Haunbuik, Web)\textsuperscript{44} and as stated, I discuss such codes of Scots in section 2.7. below. I suggest, ‘modern’ Scots is for its ‘in-group’ speakers (see Tajfel, 1982) and as I propose throughout this thesis, these speakers and their tongue are often marginalised due to issues of socio-economic status and a lack of ‘cultural capital’ (see Bourdieu, 1986). It appears that few participants in the Tns-brmb (2010b) study understand however, that ‘heritage’ Scots is the precursor to ‘modern’ Scots (see Macafee, 1994 for example). ‘Heritage’ Scots, such as the poetry of Robert Burns, is, “highly valued as part of their heritage, perhaps most of all by the middle classes” (Shoba, 2010: 390), a different ‘in-group’ (see Tajfel, 1982). Yet it is, “also a language of the past, linked to a material world far removed from modern Scotland” (Shoba, 2010: p390). Indeed, ‘heritage’ Scots is plainly the basis for the pedigree and standing of ‘modern’ Scots as a language in its own right (see Kay, 2006). Again we are reminded of results from the audit of Scots language provision (2009), where a need for further education in the Scots language is required, particularly in Scottish schools. However future research into the differing codes of Scots beyond the regional, in view of issues raised in this thesis such as a class-based stratification of the Scots language (see Macaulay, 1978) and linguistic prejudices therein, would be invaluable in progressing the field of Scots and Scots in education, particularly as it is an apposite stance not often adopted in the field.

\subsection*{2.6. Report of Teacher Attitudes to Scots Language}

Several research studies in the field of Scots language have sought to establish how many Scots speakers there are in Scotland, where Scots is spoken and / or what the

\textsuperscript{44} See article Missing, Presumed Deid, Web at: http://scotshaunbuik.co.uk/wp/
role of Scots is in Scottish education (see Craig, 08/09; Fitt, 2009; Murdoch, 1995; Mate, 1996, Shoba, 2010, The Coulter PS Report, 2004 and Cuddy Brae, 2006/07). The 2010 National Survey of Teacher Attitudes to Scots Language in Curriculum for Excellence45 invited educationalists from across local authorities in Scotland to take part in an attitudinal survey regarding the teaching of Scots language in schools. The National Survey collected data from the April to October of 2010. The research design was similar to the Tns-brmb (2010b) study in being cross-sectional. The survey adopted a mixed methods research strategy, employing a questionnaire with closed and open questions. 206 participants completed the questionnaire; 141 responses originated from the Early Years and Primary division, 55 came from the Secondary division and 10 from Initial Teacher Education lecturers. A recognisable issue throughout the field, discussed in more detail below, is the willingness of primary, in contrast to many secondary schools in Scotland, to embrace the implementation of Scots in schools and this is perhaps reflected in the response rates above.

To continue, the National Survey (2010) first asked participants, “To what extent are you a Scots speaker?” (2010: p6). Results suggested that nearly half of participants believed that they utilised Scots in everyday life (47%) (ibid.). This is broadly comparable to the 43% of participants in the Tns-brmb (2010b) study who stated that they employed Scots ‘a lot / fairly often’. The results are slightly higher than the 30% of citizens in the Scots census, who indicated that they spoke Scots.

Participants in the National Survey (2010) were asked in question 2 of the questionnaire how much they ‘valued’ Scots. 82% of participants stated, “that it was an important feature of Scottish culture” (2010: p7) and 46%, “believed it [Scots] to be part of modern Scottish identity” (ibid.). 33% of primary teachers and 38% of secondary teachers were, “insecure” (2010: p8) when asked what their, “knowledge of the history and literature of the Scots language” (ibid.) was in question 3. However when asked in question 4, “What place should Scots have in Curriculum for Excellence” (2010: p9), 69% of participants, “believed that Scots should be used across learning” (ibid.). Some participants were concerned with how Scots language would be assessed in classrooms. In answer to question 5, “Are there any benefits to teaching Scots in schools?” (National Survey, 2010: p10), all participants felt that Scots, “added to the school experience for children” (ibid.). Interestingly, when asked in question 6, “Are you confident teaching Scots?” (ibid.: p11), primary teachers (64%) were more confident in teaching Scots than secondary teachers (44%). This echoes points raised earlier in 2.3. regarding the European Union Minority Language Reports on Scots and Matthew Fitt’s observations, where it was suggested, respectively, that Scots provision was ‘uneven’ and that primary school teachers tended to be more accepting of Scots in their classrooms than secondary school teachers.

The National Survey (2010) results are reminiscent of findings from the Tns-brmb (2010b) study where, ‘there is widespread recognition of the role of Scots in the history, culture and local identities of Scotland’. The National Survey (2010) participants were generally positive regarding the role of Scots in Scottish schools. It is unclear though how these participants defined Scots; unfortunately they were not
asked. It is possible that some were referring to what I term ‘heritage’ Scots in many of their responses, as 43% believed it, “to have emotional and / or historical value” (2010: p7).

Overall the results from the 2010 National Survey of Teacher Attitudes to Scots Language indicated that, “a broad range of high quality Scots language CPD training” (p2) for those in the education sector was needed. Also, “contemporary, accessible and relevant Scots language resources including on-line materials was needed” (ibid.) too. Moreover, “visibility supporting the Scots language in Curriculum for Excellence at all levels” (ibid.) was required. These outcomes are not dissimilar to some of the recommendations made by the European Committee of Experts and those contained within the 2009 Audit of Current Scots Language Provision, as discussed in sections 2.2. and 2.3. above; the recommendations suggest that many Scottish teachers feel ill-prepared for the implementation of Scots in their schools.

To add, as discussed earlier, some participants involved in the 2010 National Survey demonstrated a lack of understanding and appreciation of the Scots language and this serves to complicate results, in that it is not always clear what they believed Scots to be (see Macafee, 2000); similar results were apparent in the Tns-bmrb (2010) study for example. As such, I propose recognising the differing types of Scots in a framework of ‘heritage’ and ‘modern’ Scots, in order to provide some clarity to my results and to allow for deeper analysis within the field of Scots language in education; in doing so, I aim for such issues as the ‘stigmatization’ of Scots to be appreciated more fully.
2.7. The Problem with Scots

A significant amount of research in the field of Scots language, particularly at the micro linguistic level, suggests that Scots exists on a, “continuum between Scots and Scottish Standard English” (Macafee, 1997: p514). A problem in the field of Scots language is that there is little research that investigates and defines Scots as a modern living language in its own right. An example of Scots, with its translation into English, demonstrates that the two languages are quite different:

Ae muckle drawback is the ongaun ‘image’ o Scots as jist for daft-like blethers atween famlie an freens an the orra lauch on the telly or radio. Aw sic ‘wee leids’ has thon kin o problem whaur the’r a poerfu official language – here English is ‘sairious’ an Scots jist isna (Bella Caledonia, Web)

A large drawback is the ongoing ‘image’ of Scots as being just for lighthearted chat amongst family and friends and the occasional laugh on the telly or radio. All such ‘small languages’ have that kind of problem where there is a powerful official language – here English is ‘serious’ and Scots just is not (my translation).

However, the field of Scots language recognises that Scots is either frequently considered ‘slang’ (see Matheson and Matheson, 2000) or deriving from the literary heritage of Older Scots; the latter is often contained within Scottish Standard English and valued in the Scottish education system (see Shoba, 2010). As such, Scots ‘slang’ normally has less value and status than Older Scots / Scottish Standard English in Scotland (see Shoba, 2010). Indeed, results from the National Survey (2010) are intriguing; most teachers were in favour of Scots in the classroom but were they referring to ‘heritage’ Scots, as Shoba’s (2010) results would suggest?

---

46 See also Corbett et al. (2003) for example.
47 See Bella Caledonia, Web at: http://bellacaledonia.org.uk/2013/05/28/speakin-oot-for-scots/
Seminal work by formal linguists Labov (1966) and Trudgill (1974) stratified differing language codes and their use by interlocutors from various socio-economic contexts in New York and Norwich respectively. Scholars of the Scots language have completed similar studies, for example in Glasgow (see Macaulay, 1973). However, I have not discovered a scholar in the field of Scots who has adopted Bourdieu’s (1986) ‘forms of capital’ to determine differing varieties of Scots based on their apparent ‘social’ and ‘cultural’ value or ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986). Indeed, the two codes, ‘heritage’ and ‘modern’ Scots, can be understood by their attributed ‘social’ and ‘cultural capital’ in Scottish society.⁴⁸

Therefore, this suggests a research gap in the field; there is a need for the differing varieties of Scots to be explored according to their apparent ‘capital’, in order that we can appreciate and challenge such classifications for reasons of social justice and inclusion. I would like to implement this approach in my thesis; I adopt Bourdieu’s (1986) ‘cultural’ and / or ‘social capital’ to examine the Scots language; this allows for a deep and subtle ‘deconstructive’ (Derrida, 1967) analysis of the differing varieties of Scots and the manner in which they are perceived in Scottish society.

‘Cultural’ and ‘social capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) could be applied to both ‘heritage’ and ‘modern’ Scots, even though I tend to relate ‘cultural’ to the former and ‘social’ to the latter. Bourdieu’s (1986) theory of ‘capital’ obviously applies to a wide range of situations and contexts; Bourdieu (1986) presents a notion of ‘cultural capital’ and one’s embodied ‘habitus’ and ‘hexis’ therein (Crossley, 2005). For Bourdieu our

---

⁴⁸ See Ebonics (Smith, 1997) and Maori (Boyce, 1992) as examples of research into minority language with arguably historically compromised ‘capital’.
‘habitus’ is our, “range of complex and intelligent behavioural dispositions, moral sentiments, acquired competences and forms of practical understanding and reasoning” (ibid.: p104). It is that which is tacitly learned and moulded within us from birth by our society and context (ibid.). ‘Hexis’, suggests Bourdieu, can be understood as our ‘habitus’ represented through our bodies (Jenkins, 1992). Indeed, “[f]or Bourdieu, the body is a mnemonic device” (ibid.: p75), demonstrating our ‘cultural capital’. ‘Cultural capital’ is our exploitation of our ‘habitus’, perhaps by means of our ‘hexis’, to gain advantage in some manner (Crossley, 2005).

Therefore, it is possible for ‘modern’ Scots speakers to have ‘cultural capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) too, where their code offers a linguistic manifestation of some of the valued cultural practices common to their own social group. Likewise the employment of both codes can achieve ‘social capital’ (ibid.) in their respective contexts, as each arguably allows ease of access to the various social networks they are aligned with; I provide examples below to demonstrate this phenomenon and its distinctions.

The key is in the context however; Bourdieu (1997) suggests, ‘the power of instituting’, ‘to impose recognition’ on such activities as academic learning for example, creates ‘cultural capital’. Thus, the Scottish education system, a formal institution of Scotland, arguably has ‘cultural capital’ (see Bailey, 1987). ‘Heritage’ Scots then, is utilised in the Scottish education system (see Shoba, 2010) by means of Robert Burns’ work for example; therefore the code is obviously imbued with a form of ‘cultural capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986), which tends to be associated with the Scottish education system and being educated (see Shoba, 2010). As we know, the Scottish
education system values ‘heritage’ Scots and has historically rejected ‘modern’ Scots (see Bailey, 1987 and Shoba, 2010); it is reasonable to suggest therefore that ‘modern’ Scots does not own such ‘capital’ in the context of the Scottish classroom, as it is generally not accepted in Scottish schools (see Bailey, 1987). I therefore posit that one of the problems with Scots is that ‘modern’ Scots has little if any ‘cultural capital’ in the Scottish education system, whereas ‘heritage’ Scots has significant ‘cultural capital’ in and beyond schools and perhaps the wider institutions of Scotland (see Shoba, 2010).

To continue, scholars tend to refer to three codes in the field of Scots language: ‘Scots’, often considered ‘slang’ and associated with the Scottish working classes (see Matheson and Matheson, 2000), ‘Older Scots’, an outdated literary version, or ‘Scottish Standard English’, normally a hybrid of the phonological and lexical elements of Scots, Older Scots and English and usually employed by the Scottish middle classes (see Shoba, 2010). I would argue that the differing codes of Scots the Scots Language Centre present: Insular, Northern, Central and Southern, are aligned more to my ‘modern Scots’ code, as they are spoken, “in people's homes, in the streets, and in the everyday life of communities” (Web)49. Intrinsic within these (spoken and literary) varieties of ‘Scots’, ‘Older Scots’ and ‘Scottish Standard English’ are lexical and phonological differences. Even more significant perhaps are the varying degrees of ‘capital’ that are attributed, internalised (‘hexis’) and demonstrated (‘habitus’) by the speakers of these varieties (see Shoba, 2010).

---

49 Scots Language Centre, Web at: http://www.scotslanguage.com/
'Heritage’ rather than ‘modern’ Scots is arguably a code of language generally employed when appropriate by the Scottish bourgeoisie, either when using literary references to ‘Older Scots’ and / or when contained within the employment of Scottish Standard English (see Shoba, 2010). ‘Heritage’ Scots can often be employed in a tokenistic manner by the middle-classes in Scotland in order to draw allusions to a ‘capitalised’ Scottish heritage, whilst distancing one’s self from more ‘vulgar’ ‘modern’ Scots and the lack of ‘capital’ it represents (see Matheson and Matheson, 2000, McCrone et al., 1999 and Shoba, 2010).

A close example to this ‘heritage’ Scots is discussed and demonstrated by the Scottish comedian Kevin Bridges during a show at Glasgow’s Scottish Exhibition and Conference Centre (see Fig. 2.1.1. below). I believe it is appropriate to refer to Kevin here, as he has a strong Scottish following, having, “sell out shows culminating in a night at the 10,000 seat Glasgow SECC” (Comedy Central, Web); this suggests that his material is appreciated and understood by Scottish audiences.

Fig. 2.2. Kevin Bridges: ‘New Accent’ sketch (Youtube – see footnote 50)

50 Kevin Bridges, ‘New Accent’, Web at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0ouk_XEU-mw
51 See http://www.comedycentral.co.uk/comedians/kevin-bridges/#bio
In Kevin’s ‘New Accent’ sketch he acknowledges the existence of an arguably contrived variety of Scots used by some West End Glasgow interlocutors. The West End of Glasgow is known to be a middle-class area of the city; it hosts Glasgow University and many wealthy leafy streets. Kevin calls the variety of Scots he refers to the ‘new homogenised Scottish’. Kevin’s own variety or code of Scots is a form that I would term ‘modern Scots’. Kevin was raised in a council house in Clydebank, Glasgow; the area is generally not renowned as being wealthy and is therefore a contrast to the West End.

Although Kevin’s ‘new homogenised Scottish’ does not provide the reader with the ‘heritage’ lexis I refer to, it does offer a reasonably convincing example of the phonological devices adopted by many speakers of ‘heritage’ Scots, at least in this geographical and socio-economic context. For example, Kevin impersonates these young West End Glasgow interlocutors with, “what’s yur chaat”, “wasn’t Fraser’s baantar to-ally baangin” and, “top chaat, top banter”. He places an emphasis on the vowel sounds, elongating and exaggerating them as he hears them spoken by said interlocuters. He then juxtaposes his impression with his own ‘modern’ Scots: “Thats the wey they fuckin tok; thats the kinda freaks ah live beside these days”. The phonology of his sentence is short and choppy, a direct comparison to the languid speech of the West End interlocutors.

The audience laugh at Kevin’s impression and the contrast of this variety of Glasgow Scots with his own Glasgow speech. The implication is that the West End interlocutors adopt a contrived middle-class variety of Scots, what I would term a

52 See Daily Record, 20th July, 2013, Web at: http://www.dail-record.co.uk
form of ‘heritage’ Scots. This is compared to what he regards as the ‘normal’, ‘non-freakish’ working-class variety that he employs and promotes, i.e. ‘modern’ Scots.

The inference is that Kevin’s code of Scots is not manufactured like that of the West End interlocutors; rather his code is perhaps seen as more honest, sincere. Indeed, similarities can be drawn here with the employment of Scottish workers with a Scottish accent in call centres, as employers apparently, “trade heavily on the positive connotations of a Scottish accent, such as friendliness, sincerity and reliability” (Cameron, 2006:p183).

Viewer comments below the ‘youtube’ clip of Kevin state however that Kevin:

“doesn’t seem to realise it but i reckon he's heard us highlanders (a lot of whom live in the west end..) - the accent he's doing isn't really 'homogenised' glasgow, it's a straight highland accent. it's spot on though”. They also comment, “mm new accents is that the poshy people that have good jobs in glasgow or people that live their and have picked the lingo / dilect up”. Further more one states, “you may have shitty genetics Kevin Bridges but you are a fake ned like so many others”.

These comments are interesting; there are similarities in the Scottish Highland drawl and the elongated vowel sound of what I term ‘heritage’ Scots, which I discuss below in more detail when considering characters from the popular Scottish television programme ‘Chewin the Fat’. Historically, the Highlands of Scotland have been imbued with ‘cultural capital’, being romanticized as the mystical land of the ‘noble savage’ and the playground of the southern English elite for hunting, shooting and

---

fishing (see McCrone et al., 1999). It is possible that a Highland hybrid ‘heritage’ Scots may have been adopted by, ‘the poshy people that have good jobs in glasgow’, to demonstrate middle-class ‘cultural’ and ‘social capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986).

What is particularly significant from these ‘Youtbe’ quotes however is the comment, ‘you may have shitty genetics Kevin Bridges but you are a fake ned like so many others’. This remark suggests that Kevin’s ‘modern’ Scots code is, as with ‘homogenised Scottish’, ‘fake’ or contrived. Kevin’s ‘modern’ Scots is perhaps not the code that the viewer thinks ‘Neds’ would use; perhaps Kevin’s code is not quite ‘Neddish’, or what might be perceived as Scottish ‘slang’, enough.

Ned is the name given to certain working or more often under-class Glaswegians (see Jones, 2012). It is similar in meaning to the term Chav (see Jones, 2012). Ned stands for ‘non-educated delinquent’ and Neds are generally associated with crime and anti-social behavior. Indeed, viewers’ comments suggest that speaking certain forms of ‘modern’ Scots means one has ‘shitty genetics’ and is a Ned. One viewer states, “Ned’s give a bad reputation to Glasgow, why the fuck would he want to be one?”.

Certainly if we compare Kevin’s speech with the Neds in the Scottish television series ‘Chewin the Fat’ (see Fig. 2.3. below), his code is more easily discernible to the Scottish Standard English ear. However, phonologically Kevin’s code is still clearly a form of ‘modern’ Scots, in this case Glasgow Scots, as he demonstrates many of the phonological devices employed in Glaswegian, such as the glottal stop. However, it would seem that even within my own suggested varieties of Scots, ‘heritage’ and

---

54 See http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2013/aug/10/scotland-land-rights
‘modern’ Scots, there are differences.

The popular Scottish television comedy series ‘Chewin the Fat’ incorporates Ned characters to effect in some sketches. In 2001, at the height of the programme’s success, there were 1.3 million viewers of ‘Chewin the Fat’, a 70% section of the Scottish audience.\(^{55}\) This suggests that the Neds and their type of ‘modern’ Scots speech, was a form of sardonic amusement to the wider Scottish public. In Fig 2.4. below we see an example of spoof news reports employed in the show, where the newsreader speaks Scottish Standard English and the Ned, Rab McGlinchy, in a superimposed box in the corner of the screen, ‘interprets for the Neds’.\(^{56}\) The inference is that the ‘modern’ Scots of the Neds is so different from the ‘heritage’ Scots / Scottish Standard English of the newsreader that it needs interpreted. The joke though is that the newsreader shows no reaction to Rab’s speech and interpretations; dramatic irony is employed here in a sense, as the Scottish audience knows that normally Neds would not be acknowledged, accepted, included and catered for in this manner within Scottish society (see Jones, 2012 and his discussion of the under-classes of Britain).

The BBC devotes a web page to the ‘Chewin the Fat’ Neds,\(^{57}\) where one can listen to Neds speaking and learn their language, learn Ned recipes too and find out one’s Ned name. It is clear that the Neds and their speech are ‘othered’ by the writers and producers of ‘Chewin the Fat’. Jones (2012) discusses the demonization of the working and under-classes in his book ‘Chavs’; ‘Chewin the Fat’ helps to perpetuate

\(^{55}\) See http://www.heraldscotland.com/sport/spl/aberdeen/they-re-no-gonnae-dae-that-ony-mair-chewin-the-fat-team-decide-to-call-it-a-day-1.123043

\(^{56}\) See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a8Sdyh1ZVxE

\(^{57}\) See http://www.bbc.co.uk/scotland/tv/chewinthefat/neds/index.shtml
this activity in its damaging definition and portrayal of Neds and their speech. These caricatures of the working or under-classes, as Hassan (2013) discusses, are openly exploited in Scotland; such caricatures go some way to confirming and explaining the lack of ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) their speech, a form of ‘modern’ Scots, often appears to have in many contexts within Scotland, including the education system (see Shoba, 2010).

Therefore, it is clear from the original ‘youtube’ comments in response to Kevin’s sketch on ‘homogenised Scottish’ that Kevin’s ‘modern’ Scots is associated with
Neds, whether it is a ‘fake’ representation or not. There is also a hint of ‘in-group’ (see Tajfel, 1982) status with regards ‘modern’ Scots and being a Ned. The viewer suggests that Kevin’s code is ‘fake’ and that many try to adopt the status of ‘Ned’ but fail, in their attempts to gain social status in their particular context. Within this is the implication that the varying forms of ‘modern’ Scots and all they represent have just as much ‘in-group’ (see Tajfel, 1982) status as ‘heritage’ Scots or Scottish Standard English in their differing speech communities. Indeed, Kevin implies that his Scots is ‘normal’ compared to the ‘homogenised Scottish’ he discusses.

Incidentally, Kevin also chooses names such as Callum and Fraser for those West End interlocutors he impersonates in his ‘New Accent’ sketch; these are compared to characters he introduces in a separate sketch such as ‘Wee Mental Davie’, whom he terms as one of the ‘real people’ of Glasgow. Wee Mental Davie is: “apprentice joiner, father of six”, used on a billboard as a ‘real’ advertisement of Glasgow and described as standing with his six children, who are, “all tucked in to the one track suit … a La Coste tracksuit, only the best for these kids; they’re all dressed up for their Grannie’s thirtieth”. The audience laughs at the image and social implications of the scene Kevin paints; they also laugh as they are aware that such names as Callum and Fraser and Wee Mental Davie (and Rab McGlinchy!), at least in Glasgow, are considered either middle-class or working-class / under-class, ‘Neddish’, respectively. Kevin’s overall point then, in his ‘New Accent’ sketch, is that there is a clash between a form of middle-class or what I term ‘heritage’ Scots speech and his more working-class or what I name ‘modern’ Scots; this clash he implies, is to do with class and ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986).

The characters James and Gary, The Banter Boys, demonstrate a pertinent example of ‘heritage’ Scots, combined with Scottish Standard English. Again these characters originate from the popular Scottish television series ‘Chewin the Fat’ (see Fig. 2.4. below) and most likely are a spoof of the equally comedic 1980s television show Victor and Barry, the ‘Kelvinside men’. Once more I utilise an example from ‘Chewin the Fat’, as in this instance it expertly highlights a technique often used by ‘heritage’ Scots speakers (see Macafee, 1983), where interlocutors’ consciously use ‘heritage’ Scots in order to suggest their bourgeoisie positioning.

Fig 2.5. Gary and James, the Banter Boys, ‘Chewin the Fat’ (Youtube – see footnote 59+60)

The characters James and Gary in this sketch (Fig 2.5. and footnote 41) use some ‘heritage’ lexis such as “Scotia’, ‘the noo’ and ‘doon’ for example, which indicates their own ‘capitalised’ ‘heritage’ code and supposed middle-class roots (see Bourdieu, 1986; Shoba, 2010). Their phonology is that of the Scottish Standard English Kelvinside code, a recognised middle-class form of Glaswegian, which, similar to

---

59 Chewin the Fat, The Banter boys, Web at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7T5K1HxEBCU
60 See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-t04qzYLzoc
61 ‘Scotland’, ‘the now’ and ‘down’.
Kevin’s ‘homogenised Scottish’, places emphasis on vowel sounds; I provide examples below. Indeed, “it is a source of humour in the media, especially when the speaker is also portrayed as lapsing into localised speech” (Macafee, 1983: p32). Its sister code, Morningside in Edinburgh, has similar peculiarities (ibid.).

The Banter Boys refer to Rennie Mackintosh and the love poetry of ‘Robbie Burns’, almost clichéd references to Scottish culture, which help to compound their educationally ‘capitalised’ middle-class image (see Shoba, 2010). What is particularly interesting in this clip however is the characters’ fascination with ‘modern Scots’. Indeed, they attempt to code switch to Glasgow ‘modern’ Scots by using such phrases as ‘head the ball’, ‘the barrows’ and ‘murder policeman’, pronounced in ‘modern’ Glaswegian Scots as: ‘heid the baw’, ‘the barras’ and ‘murder polis’. Their inaccurate use of ‘modern’ Glaswegian Scots merely perpetuates their ‘capitalised’ middle-class, Kelvinside code and roots.62 What is also obvious and compelling is The Banter Boys’ sheer delight in ‘modern’ Scots; indeed, their attempts to employ the code suggests a desire to be part of the ‘in-group’ (see Tajfel, 1982) ‘modern’ Scots speech community in Glasgow, a group that I mention above when discussing Kevin Bridge’s sketch.

The writers parody James and Gary further by employing dramatic irony to challenge their supposed ‘cultural’ and linguistic ‘capital’ (see Bourdieu, 1986). The characters lapse in their ‘heritage’ code by using words such as: ‘wan’, ‘hoose’ and ‘cannae’,63 lexis normally associated with less ‘capitalised’ ‘modern’ Scots.64 This is common with the Kelvinside interlocutor, as Macafee (1983) discusses. The audience is aware

62 A generally affluent area of Glasgow.
63 One, house and cannot.
64 See chapter 4, part 1, pilot study results.
of this lapse but the characters appear oblivious. Thus, the implication is that the characters adopt their ‘heritage’ Scots code as an allusion to their apparent middle-class status and the ‘capital’ associated with such positioning; indeed, their lapses into ‘modern’ Scots perhaps betray more working-class roots. Once more, just as the viewer from Kevin Bridge’s sketch above suggests, there is a sense of ‘fakery’ in the employment of, here, ‘heritage’ Scots. Perhaps James and Gary vicariously adopt ‘modern’ or ‘heritage’ Scots, as many Glasgow interlocutors often do, in an attempt to gain ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) and allow them access within Glasgow to certain speech communities.

We have established that ‘modern Scots’ has many codes. One of the most recognised ‘modern’ Scots codes that perhaps many ‘heritage Scots’ speakers attempt to distance themselves from (apart from James and Garry!) is indeed Glaswegian. This is a code of Scots unfortunately immortalised by such anti-heroes as Rab C. Nesbitt for example (see Fig. 2.5. below) and the ‘Chewin the Fat’ Neds.

---

65 See the Scots Language Centre, Web at: http://www.scotslanguage.com/
Fig. 2.6. Rab C. Nesbitt

Rab C., like the Neds, is generally an unpleasant character, imbued with all the stereotyping of supposed under-class Britain (see Jones, 2012). The British Comedy Guide describes him as, “a cantankerous loud mouthed drunk who rages at anything that moves”, a “self-styled ‘street philosopher’ … in a state of serial unemployment” (Web). In some ways he is similar to the under-class Frank Gallagher from the television series ‘Shameless’, who explains that the under-class are needed to provide the middle-class their status and a focus for, “grinding your axes!” (Tvtropes, Web). Like Frank, Rab helps to embody and compound the lack of ‘cultural capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) his speech is associated with (see Matheson and Matheson, 2000). Yet, as we have seen with the ‘Chewin the Fat’ Neds, the Scottish public appear to relish his apparently contentious speech. Indeed, in October 2011, the new series of Rab C. Nesbitt drew 1.99 million viewers, not just in Scotland but nationally (Broadcast Now, Web). Perhaps Rab provides the Scottish public with a focus, ‘an axe to grind’.

67 Courtesy of The Independent, www.independent.co.uk / Google images.
68 See Jones’ 2012 book ‘Chavs’ for a discussion on the marginalization of the working classes.
69 See http://www.comedy.co.uk/guide/tv/rab_c_nesbitt/characters/
70 See http://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Series/Shameless
71 See http://m.broadcastnow.co.uk/5033024.article
As can be seen from the ‘Youtube’ clip (footnote no. 48), the lexis and phonology Rab employs is nearer to the Neds’ ‘modern’ Scots in ‘Chewin the Fat’, than that of, say, Kevin Bridges’ ‘modern’ Scots. As discussed above, we know that even ‘modern’ Glaswegian Scots has different varieties. For example, Rab employs such words as ‘simmet’ (vest), ‘weans’ (children) and ‘joab’ (job) in the clip, words which are recognisably working or under-class ‘modern’ Glaswegian Scots and arguably rarely found in the lexis of ‘heritage’ Scots speakers. Rab C.’s representation of the code further adds to its lack of ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986), when we compare it to James and Garry’s ‘capitalised’ (Bourdieu, 1986) ‘heritage’ Scots and / or the Scottish Standard English of Rab McGinchy’s news reader for example. This said, Rab C. Nesbitt’s code of ‘modern’ Scots, as discussed above with regards the Neds for example, seems to provide ‘in-group’ (Tajfel, 1982) status to many who employ it; indeed arguably the code affords its speakers ‘covert prestige’. LePage and Tabouret-Keller (1985) explain this phenomenon further: “With every speech act all individuals perform, to a greater or less extent, an 'act of identity', revealing through their personal use of language their sense of social and ethnic solidarity or difference” (back cover).

My discussion drawn from icons of Scottish popular culture suggests that ‘heritage’ Scots and / or Scottish Standard English speakers may very well scorn ‘modern’ Scots speakers and vice versa. There also appears to be ‘in-group’ (see Tajfel, 1982) status in using ‘heritage’ Scots. However, there is ‘in-group’ (ibid.) status too in adopting ‘modern’ Scots and even what might be regarded as under-class ‘modern’ Scots or ‘Ned speak’. It is clear that class, and its associated ‘cultural’ and ‘social’ capital (Bourdieu, 1986), plays a large factor in the perceptions of differing Scots codes.
Indeed, ‘chav-bashing’, or rather ‘Ned-bashing’, such as we see above with the portrayal of the Neds or Rab C., does little to improve the status of ‘modern’ Scots speakers. Jones (2012) “argues that class hatred is the last acceptable prejudice” (The Guardian, Web)\(^{72}\) and indeed Hanley states that, “a great deal of chav-bashing goes on within working-class neighbourhoods, partly because of the age-old divide between those who aim for ‘respectability’ and those who disdain it” (ibid.).

The problem with Scots is that it is notoriously difficult to research; as can be seen from some of the results from recent Scots studies above, its own speakers are not often aware that they are speaking a form of Scots or, indeed, that Scots exists at all as a separate language from English (Macafee, 2000). Macafee (2000) and Mate (1996) suggest that when researching Scots there exists, “genuine problems of validity, arising from the beliefs of speakers in some parts of the country about their speech” (Mate, 1996: p2). I argue that the main reason for such insecurity in Scots speakers, particularly ‘modern’ Scots speakers, is the lack of ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) their code has in Scotland; as we know, Scots is often simply labelled as English ‘slang’ (see Matheson and Matheson, 2000). As such, analysing and interpreting results can often be problematic for the researcher. However, many participants’ responses in the studies mentioned above suggest that Scots is spoken in some form in Scotland today. Indeed, one can argue from these various surveys that Scots is spoken by more than 30% of the Scottish public.\(^{73}\) Therefore, due to such initiatives as the Scots question in the 2011 Scottish census, although there are issues of ‘validity’ and ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) surrounding the study of Scots, awareness of Scots is growing.

\(^{73}\) See National records of Scotland 2011 census results for example.
2.8. Scots and Language Ecology

Language ecology theory argues that minority languages exist, intertwined in an almost physical biological sense (see Maffi, 2001; Murdoch, 2001), within a framework of, “employment, religion, government, cultural life, media” (Hornberger, 2008: p1). This implies that, metaphorically, languages are ‘alive’ and as such it is reasonable to suggest that all languages, including minority languages or the language communities who utilise them, have rights. For example, the language of Scots should now have the right to be included in the classroom, as the Curriculum for Excellence intimates.

To continue, the notion of language rights is linked with social justice (see Madoc-Jones & Buchanan, 2004); the creation of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (Council of Europe, Web), which we know recognises Scots as a minority language, is an apposite example of this association. If the maintenance of diversity is also a fundamental element of social justice, then sustaining indigenous minority languages, and the collective voice and identity these languages arguably symbolise, is subsequently reasonable (Edwards, 2010; Hornberger, 2008).

As said, language ecology likens itself to biological ecology (see Haugen, 1972); the preservation of endangered species is an aspect of the latter. Therefore Scots and perhaps more so ‘modern’ Scots in particular, being arguably endangered in the minds of its own speakers, (see Macafee, 2000 and Mühlhäusler, 2003) has, it is reasonable

75 See Freeland and Patrick, 2004; Haarmann, 1986; Haugen, 1972; Kymlicka and Patten, 2003 and Nettle and Romaine, 2000 for a more in-depth discussion on same.
76 See http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/minlang/default_en.asp
77 See Edwards, 2010; Maffi, 2001; Murdoch, 2001; Pateman, 1987
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to suggest, a ‘right’ to preservation. To preserve the language though, would be to suggest that it is ‘dying’; however from results above it seems that Scots is instead simply marginalised, especially within the minds of its own speakers. Therefore, within the context of language ecology theory I would suggest that Scots should, as an alternative, be recognised and included within Scottish society.

An indigenous language is a ‘verbal botany’ (Nettle and Romaine, 2000) that, as Crystal (2000) suggests, contains the cultural, political and historical framework of a group. Indigenous minority languages are arguably the codes with which communities and their members construct and express their historically and culturally positioned experiences and emotions (see Pattanayak, 1998). Thus, to continue to marginalise ‘modern’ Scots would be to perpetuate the exclusion of the experiences and emotions of its speakers; we see an apt example of this in my opening quote with Conn and his teacher (McIlvanney, 2007).

From a Jungian (1959) perspective, indigenous minority languages could be regarded as the vehicle with which to express a group’s ‘collective unconscious’. The latter is arguably encapsulated and demonstrated through the manifestation of the cultural and historical constructs, the interrelated ecologies, of the group. Therefore, a group’s ‘collective unconscious’ could be enacted, for example, through speech, ballads and even literature.

---

I suggest that the language of Scots is a pertinent vehicle for the expression of a Scottish ‘collective unconscious’. The Scottish novelists Neil Gunn and Lewis Grassic Gibbon demonstrate such a notion in their writing, by echoing the rhythms of Gaelic and Doric, “the device of almost supernatural experience or ‘race memories’ of ancient time ... [and] symbolic structure” (Gifford, Dunningham and MacGillivray, 2002: p672). Thus, Gunn’s ‘long-gaze’, “is a view of Scotland entire ... [its] collective unconscious” (Ibid: p675). Indeed, as Gifford (2004) states, there is within Scottish literature, “the Jungian concept of the ‘collective unconscious’ producing in its protagonists co-existing moments of ancient time with time present” (p19). A carrier for this notion of a ‘collective unconscious’, an ‘ancient’ and ‘present’ time so important to the culture of Scotland, is the Scots language.

If the marginalisation of Scots persists, then the, “soul and ... mental individuality” (Westermann, cited in Whitehead, 1995: p4), the ‘collective unconscious’, of the Scots speaker may become lost.

2.9. Scots as a Language

Although I discuss this to an extent in 2.7. above, it is valuable at this juncture to consider what human language is and thus, appreciate in more depth Scots as a language. Human language can exist in many forms, such as for example the spoken and written word and non-verbal signs and symbols; we can also produce language for different purposes, such as the creation of computer languages for instance.

---

80 Scots code of Aberdeenshire.
To elaborate, languages can be regarded as structured, a subject in itself, or be understood as an expression of that structure, a way of speaking, such as with, say, Spanish, German or French; indeed, language is a symbolic system (Graddol, Chesire and Swann, 1987 and Saussure, 1983). Languages can be classified typologically, with particular and often grouped structures such as phonemes, lexical items and syntactical arrangements (Thomas and Wareing, 1999). Languages can also be arranged genealogically according to their relational historical associations (Graddol, Chesire and Swann, 1987). Arguably, languages carry memetic signs that embed cultural meaning (see Dawkins, 1976). To add, languages may demonstrate a speaker’s identity (see Joseph, 2004; Benwell and Stokoe, 2006) and culture, the former of which is often intertwined politically and socially with language status and language employed as a discourse of power (see Giglioli, 1972; Graddol, Chesire and Swann, 1987; Thomas and Wareing, 1999). This is clearly seen in Scots, where both ‘modern’ and ‘heritage’ Scots imply a speaker’s status; indeed, ‘heritage’ Scots is often utilised within the discourse of power of the Scottish education system (see Shoba, 2010).

Power or a lack of power can be determined, enacted and/or claimed through the use of a particular language, which positions ‘actors’ within discourse as being powerful or even deficient in power. As Foucault states, “power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategic situation in a particular society” (1990a: p93). We can see in my introduction, Conn and his teacher strategically positioning themselves according to the code of Scots language they adopt (McIlvanney, 2007).

---

Human language then can be a spoken or written activity and can be considered structurally, for example by incorporating Saussure’s (1916) linguistic ‘two-side model of signs’; this consists of the ‘signified’ or the sign, a word for example, and the ‘signifier’, the meaning imbued to the sign, the word. Language can also be regarded as existing in symbols with semiotic purposes and more largely within communicative practices per se, such as with the use of gestures for instance.

However, approaching the study of Scots language, by linking social functions and language, in many ways Scots is more than, say, Saussure’s (1916) structuralist notion of a language; Scots, like many other languages, can be considered post-structurally, it being constructed and embedded with social and political connotations (see Foucault, 1990a). To employ a pertinent metaphor, in comparing the notion of a language with the concept of a nation, we notice numerous similarities. Anderson (2006) posits nationalism as being an, “imagined political community” (p.6), persisting through the symbols, or mnemonics, of said nation and the rhetoric of politicians (Billig, 1995). In the same way a language, Scots for example, is more than its phonemes, lexical items and syntactical arrangements (Thomas and Wareing, 1999), it is considered as, indeed often employed to express, social and political nuance and connotation. Indeed, the rhetoric of Alex Salmond provides a clear example of this when, for example, he appealed to the ‘folk’ of Scotland by employing their code of ‘modern’ Scots at The Scottish Independence Rally, 2013.

---

82 See also Saussure, 1983.
83 See Bakhtin, 1981; Eco, 1976; Peirce, 1931-58 for example.
84 See Morris et al., 1979 for example with regards communication through gestures.
85 See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vfvtgERr02Y
I realise as researcher then that it is important to recognise Scots as a language entrenched in social and political binds; ‘modern’ Scots is often considered as being a form of ‘slang’, spoken by the Scottish proletariat, for example, whereas ‘heritage’ Scots is frequently adopted by the Scottish bourgeoisie (Shoba, 2010), a code positioned within and reduced to the invented romantic ‘tartanry’ of Scotland’s heritage (McCrone et al., 1999; McPake and McArthur, 2006). It is imperative that I challenge such notions. As a Scots speaker and a once student and teacher within the Scottish education system, I am intrinsically linked and privy to the social and political entrenchment of the Scots language. However in confronting such perceptions, I am liberated to explore the intricacies of Scots in and beyond its compromised positioning. Thus, I enable myself as researcher to achieve some form of critical distance (see Duchene and Heller, 2007; Ladefoged, 1992) from my axiological or emic perspectives and to explore the discourses of power (see Fairclough, 1989, 2003) surrounding Scots in an epistemologically reflexive manner.

2.10. The Context of Scots

Origins of the Scots code can be traced back to the 5th century Germanic Anglo-Saxon invasions. The poem, ‘The Dream of the Rood’, inscribed on a cross at Ruthwell church in Dumfries and Galloway, is perhaps the earliest documentation of the Anglo-Saxon language in Scotland (Kay, 2006; McClure, 2009). The code was brought from Northumberland to Berwickshire during the 7th century. Yet, as a result of Alba’s King, Kenneth MacAplin, it remained for some time in the south east of what

---

is now known as Scotland. Gaidhlig was spoken in much of Scotland at this time
(Kay, 2006; McClure, 2009). However, from Malcolm III to David I’s reign the
Anglo-Saxon language grew in significance (McClure, 2009). As a result of the
introduction of burghs (Scottish for borough)\(^9\) and the Gaels’ need to trade with their
Anglo-Saxon neighbours, the Anglo-Saxon tongue, later known as Inglis,
strengthened. To add, the death of the Celt, Alexander III and the adoption of Inglis
by mainly Dutch, Scandinavian and Flemish immigrants, further increased the
practical value of Inglis (ibid.). In addition, due to political developments such as the
murder of King James I and Robert the Bruce granting Edinburgh a ‘Royal Burgh’
charter, the Scottish governing body was eventually relocated from the Gaidhlig
capital Perth to Inglis Edinburgh;\(^9\) James VI, having an interest in Inglis (later know
as Scots) (Jack, 1997), ensured Inglis was utilised in court and legal proceedings. By
the end of the Middle Ages, Gaidhlig was largely confined to the north of Scotland
(Miller \emph{et al.}, 2009).

From the 14\(^{th}\) century Inglis developed a literature recognised throughout Europe:
John Barbour wrote ‘The Brus’ and thereafter Andrew of Wyntoun and Blin Harry
penned ‘Oryginale Cronykil of Scotland’ and ‘The Wallace’ respectively. These were
canonical texts that helped to lay the foundations for Scottish literature. Gavin
Douglas, a Scots poet during the 15\(^{th}\) century, otherwise known as a ‘Makar’, helped
to distinguish Scots as separate from English; indeed, he provided it with the name
Scots. These writers created the early Scottish literary tradition (Kay, 2006; McClure,
2009).

\(^9\) See http://www.scots-online.org/dictionary/search_scots.asp
\(^9\) See also http://www.rampantscotland.com/know/blknow_cities.htm
Although I do not have space to discuss Scotland’s oral ballad tradition here, reciting ballads was an alternative but thriving activity for the Scottish illiterate ‘folk’; ballads would be told in homes and at gatherings for means of entertainment (see Buchan, 1997). As these tales were oral in nature, arguably the first literary representation of one can be traced only as far back as the 16th century, with the ‘The Complaynt of Scotland’; the ‘Complaynt’ was a reaction to the on-going Scottish / English tensions at this time (Lynch, 1997). The Scottish ballad tradition however, originated much later than the ‘Complaynt’ (see Buchan, 1997).

The implementation of the English Geneva Bible by Protestant Reformers in Scotland indicated the beginnings of the decline of Scots, as the language of religion was now English (McClure, 2009). To add, the introduction of the printing press by James VI, and its English norms, meant Scots was subject to English language conventions (ibid.). Scots, established in the Scottish court and influenced by many separate languages, such as Danish, Flemish and French, and indeed Gaidhlig and Latin (Kay, 2006), was now weakening. The union of the Scottish and English crowns in 1603 and parliaments in 1707 further damaged the standing of Scots, as English was now proposed as the lingua franca in Scotland (see Kay, 2006). Thereafter, during the enlightenment period the educated elite, particularly in Edinburgh, adopted English rather than Scots as their tongue (Bailey, 1987). Scottish schools also presented English as being the acceptable code and endeavoured to eradicate ‘scoticisms’ or Scots from their students’ speech (Bailey, 1987; McClure, 2009). As I discuss throughout this thesis, the English elocution movement of the eighteenth century in Scotland created the foundations for the continued marginalisation of Scots in the Scottish classroom, even until very recently.
Despite this, Scots has endured. Broadly speaking, from the early ‘Dream of the Rood’ to Scots in printed literature, as a result of the ‘Makars’, an Older Scots literary tradition was established; it became known as Middle Scots (Kay, 2006, McClure 2009). Ramsay, influenced by Watson, Ferguson and Burns of the 18th century, continued the Scots literary tradition into more modern times (Watson, 1993). MacDiarmid, during the 20th century, attempted a revival of Scots with his version of Lallans (lowland Scots) and wrote such poems as a ‘A Drunk Man Looks at a Thistle’ (ibid.). His work began The Scottish Renaissance. To add, many modern day Scottish writers by birth, such as Tom Leonard and Liz Niven, still write in differing forms of Scots.

Scots has a long history; it continues in today’s literature of Scotland and enduring modern day acknowledgements and reproductions of the ballad tradition. As research above suggest, Scots remains as a living code in Scotland, demonstrated both verbally by its speakers and in written and oral literature, the media and now recently as part of the Scottish curriculum.

2.11. Bilingualism and Education

Schools are often considered to be the vehicle with which to secure the revitalisation of a language (see Hornberger, 2008). Tabouret-Keller et al. (1997) and Akinnaso (1993) posit that students succeed better in school when they are taught in their indigenous language and that skills developed therein are transferable to learning a second language.

---

91 Such as Henryson, Dunbar, Lyndsay and Douglas during the 15th and 16th centuries.
92 See www.scottish-folk-music.com for example.
93 See the Tns-brmb (2010b) study for example.
Education has often been active in the marginalisation of indigenous minority languages and thus the exclusion of its speakers (see Hornberger, 2008 and Kamwangamalu, 2005); Scottish schools have been no different here (see Bailey, 1987 and Kay, 2006). However, schools also have the capacity to challenge the marginalisation of a language and facilitate the inclusion of these minority language speakers in the classroom. Encouraging bilingualism in school contexts is a complex matter though. In doing so schools may not only be attempting to address language marginalisation or reverse language shift (see Fishman, 1990, 1991) but also the revitalisation of a language that appears to have died.94

Despite results above, some research in the field of Scots still suggests that Scots is indeed a dying language (see Aitken, 1984). Gorlach (1998) names Scots, “a Halbsprache or half-language” (p13) and Hodgart, (1997) describes it as the, “mixed state o Scots and English” (p86) (see also McPake and Arthur, 2006, Corbett et al., 2003). If we agree with such scholars, language loss / death or even shift is of concern (see Crystal, 1997, Dorian, 2004, Fishman, 1990, 1991 and Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000), when one considers the notion that if a minority language dies, so might its speakers’ identity, culture and community (Hornberger, 2008), their, “soul” and “mental individuality” (Westermann, cited in Whitehead, 1995: p4).

Scots is spoken but not often recognised by its speakers. Therefore, even if Scots is simply marginalised, as results above suggest, the ‘soul’ and ‘mental individuality’ of the Scots speaker, their psyche, is potentially dislocated, in that their ‘soul’ speaks

---

94 See Lewis and Simon, 2009 for a discussion on Fishman’s GIDS scale, Ethnologue’s categories and UNESCOs scale with regards measuring language endangerment
Scots yet their mind speaks English. Such a Scottish ‘schizoglossic’ (Haugen, 1972) mind-set may prove problematic for Scottish schools when implementing and supporting Scots in the classroom. As Scots has been traditionally marginalised, often relegated to ‘slang’, in numerous contexts of Scottish life including education, many Scottish children may be unaware that they most likely speak Scots (see Bailey, 1987 and Matheson and Matheson, 2000).

Supporters for Scots, such as the Scots Language Centre and the Scots Online Dictionary, clearly disagree that Scots is suffering from some type of natural death (Mühlhäusler, 2003); they have worked to raise the profile of the code, rather than revitalise it. To add, recent scholarly activity regarding Scots also appears to be more concerned with embracing the language as it stands (See Glasgow University SWAP Project, Web). Such positive steps are encouraging for a bilingual programme in Scots within Scottish schools; however as said it is a complex issue and is certainly not a panacea for addressing the marginalisation of Scots. Indeed, the role of the Scottish education system in originally marginalising the code (see Bailey, 1987), and the resultant ‘schizoglossic’ (Haugen, 1972) effects on Scots speakers, must be carefully considered. A bilingual approach may also prove problematic until issues surrounding the ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) of Scots in its differing variations, is recognised and addressed.

It would be unwise to imagine that the body of power, the ‘force relation’, (Foucault, 1990a) that is the Scottish education system would be fully responsible for the marginalisation of Scots. Such a perspective of the current Scots language situation
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95 See Glasgow University SWAP Project: http://swap.nesc.gla.ac.uk/ and also Shoba, 2010
would disregard other ‘force relations’ within Scotland that work together or, indeed, oppose each other, from the micro to macro level, to ensure and perpetuate the differing power relations at work in the marginalisation of Scots. As Foucault (1990a) states, power is pervasive and the marginalisation of Scots is as a result of the Scottish education system, the educationalist, the community and even the speaker; sequentially, each actor therein is also influenced by a myriad of ‘force relations’ of their own context that has led them to often marginalise Scots. Even more so then, we are aware that a bilingual programme for Scots in Scottish schools is potentially challenging.

2.12. Summary

In this chapter I have presented policy developments and research in the field of Scots language. I have also explored some of the problems surrounding the definition and status of the code and its place within language ecology and language rights debates. To add, I have considered Scots as a language and examined Scots contextually, drawing upon its history and literature. I have examined too a bilingual approach to implementing Scots language in schools.

In the following chapter I outline my methodological position and approach and subsequent methods. I also consider my position within the research and my research ethics.
CHAPTER 3: Methodology

3.1. Introduction

In this chapter I outline the ontological position and epistemological approach I adopt in my research. My ontology and epistemology inform the methodological choices and chosen methods I employ. Subsequently I present the methodology of my study by discussing my research design, strategy and methods. I consider too my position within the study and the ethics of my research.

To add, within my research I reflexively consider the influence my role as researcher has within my work, in order to provide transparency and rigour throughout the study (see Guilleman and Gillam, 2004). In the field of social research the interconnection between the position of the researcher, their methodological choices and hence, the methods and data analysis they adopt is often neglected (see Mauthner and Doucet, 2003). The links between my research and myself as researcher are intrinsically connected: I am Scottish and have studied and taught in the Scottish education system for approximately 29 years. As such, I ensure that my work incorporates reflexive analysis (see Mauthner and Doucet, 2003).

I also write myself into the research at points. I adopt what I term a reflexive narrative approach, which here draws from the convention of critical autobiographical writing (see Riley and Hawe, 2005 for example).

3.2. Ontological position

Ontological positioning in social science research often originates from what might be referred to as the “nominalist-realist debate” (Cohen et al., 2011: p5), where social
reality is either considered to be separate to or indeed a product of the mind (Cohen, 2011). In educational research, the polarisation of such ontological positions was prevalent (see Nisbet, 2005).

To elaborate, educational research is a relatively new discipline, originating from separate disciplines such as Psychology and Medicine; hence, common to Psychology and Medicine, educational researchers often adopted the scientific method, normally an objectivist ontological position and positivist epistemological approach (see Nisbet, 2005). In Europe during the 1960s and 70s however, Education began to establish itself as separate to such disciplines as Psychology. During this period many researchers employed a constructionist ontological position and interpretivist approach (ibid.). This shift was from a deductive to an inductive paradigm (ibid.). Later in the 1990s the impact of Hargreaves (1996b), Tooley and Darby (1998) and Hillage et al.’s (1998) papers were pivotal in challenging educational research methodology (see also Fries, 2009, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004 and Sale et al., 2002). Their criticisms encouraged a differing approach in the education community; instead of polarizing the ontological and epistemological positions of educational research, a combination of weak or strong constructionist and objectivist stances were adopted, resulting in the use of mixed methods research (see Nisbet, 2005).96

Research in the field of Scots language largely employs formal linguistic analysis that considers such topics as phonology, lexis and orthography for example (see Meyerhoff, 2006 for a wider discussion on same). This scholarly activity arguably

demonstrates a more objectivist ontological position. However, some research papers employ sociolinguistics analysis at the macro level. Many of these studies are concerned with the status of Scots, its place in schools and its legitimacy as a language. Arguably a constructionist stance is often adopted therein, although objectivist positions are also acknowledged. I provide examples of such studies in the footnotes below.

As an educational researcher, with an interest in macro sociolinguistics, I adopt a strong constructionist stance, where I regard the nature of what I wish to study, the ontological concern of my research (Bryman, 2004; Cohen et al., 2011), to be, ‘concept-dependent’ (Sayer, 1997) and open to ‘force relations’ (Foucault, 1990a). There are many interpretations of social constructionism, which have become apparent following Berger and Luckmann’s (1984) seminal work, first printed in 1966 (Stam, 2001). The form of constructionism I choose to adopt, links to Durkheim’s (1965) notion of ‘social facts’, where many but not all things are created by means of words and social interaction (Crossley, 2005; Houston, 2001). I also adhere to the notion that ‘things’ created by society can also be de or re-constructed by that same society. Therefore I allow ‘concept-dependent’ ‘things’ the potential to change and
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97 See Everaert et al. (2010), Malmkjaer (2004) and Tomalin et al. (2006) for discussions on natural science linguistics enacted through structuralism, functionalism, generativism and historicism; see also Macafee (1983), Gorlach (1985), Robinson (1987) and Romaine (1975) for examples of formal linguistic studies of Scots.


develop by means of social agency (see Crosseley, 2005, Sayer, 1997 and Stam, 2001).\textsuperscript{100}

To situate my research more immediately in the field, I examine what I regard as constructed attitudes to Scots in the classroom. My ontological stance aligns most directly with the macro sociolinguistic work of Azripe and McGonigal (2007) and Matheson and Matheson (2000). For example, Azripe and McGonigal (2007) examine, “issues of identity, culture and citizenship within an exploration of imaginary textual worlds that relate significantly to children’s socio-linguistic reality” (p2). Therefore, arguably Azripe and McGonigal (2007) adopt a constructionist position, as they are interested in the children’s construction of ‘identity, culture and citizenship’.

I also posit that historical, political and social constructs influence perceptions of Scotland and Scots (see Matheson and Matheson, 2000);\textsuperscript{101} this is demonstrated through events and cultural expressions in and beyond Scotland. I consider associations, ‘if any, [that] participants make ... between the use of Scots and capital in Scotland’ (key research question 2); this is due to the significance ‘cultural’ and ‘social capital’ have in exploring how ‘capital’ beyond the economic is constructed in society and through its languages (see Bourdieu, 1986).

As a précis then, I adopt an ontological position in the field of Scots within strong constructionism and as such, my work aligns with a certain niche of research in said

\textsuperscript{100} See Archer (1995, 1996, 2000) for an interesting discussion regarding the tensions surrounding agency within post-structural debate and the need to acknowledge agency at ‘upwards, downwards and central conflation’ points.

\textsuperscript{101} See Bailey (1987), McPake and Arthur (2006) and Matheson and Matheson (2000) for example.
However, I also demonstrate a stance in weak objectivism, which posits that objects exist independently of ideas (Cohen et al., 2011). If necessary I can employ the latter to question, explore and explain the limitations of my constructionist position. This positioning is similar to the ontological stance of McPake and Arthur (2006).

To conclude, my methodological choices are influenced by my ontological position, as I am led to adopt a mixed methods approach, which draws upon both constructionist and objectivist positions. As discussed above, this is a practice common in the field of educational research and macro sociolinguistic research in the field of Scots.

3.3. Epistemological Approach

Epistemology is the manner in which one comes to appreciate what is to be studied (Newby, 2010). A range of epistemological approaches in educational research, largely deriving from either nominalist or realist ontological positions, or often a combination of same (Cohen et al., 2011; Hartas, 2010), is usual. A similar approach is apparent in the field of Scots language.

I regard my epistemological approach as dependent upon my ontological position (see Edwards, in preparation). My ontological position mostly adheres to constructionism;
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102 See Azripe and McGonigal (2007) and Matheson and Matheson (2000) as examples.
103 See Ngaha, Web for an example of mixed methods research in the field of language and education.
my epistemological approach largely aligns with an interpretivist paradigm (see Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998). These two stances are arguably compatible, as they consider the phenomenon to be studied as a construct (see Cohen et al., 2011). I therefore induce meaning from what I regard as my participants’ constructed perspectives regarding the Scots language (Cohen et al., 2011). Being epistemologically reflexive (see Nightingale and Cromby, 1999), I also consider my own etic and emic perspective and influence in the research; for example, as discussed in chapters 1 and 2, I discuss my position in the research and my reflexive approach therein (see Cohen et al., 2011, Finlay, 1998, Guilleman and Gillam and Koch and Harrington, 1998).

Broadly, by means of a phenomenological approach, I aim to understand the basic structures of my participant’s subjective meaning (see Barry, 1995, Cohen et al., 2011, Hartas, 2010 and Newby, 2010). I analyse my data by considering participants’ experiences and thoughts with regards Scots; in a sense I employ their ‘biodata’ too, their biographical ‘stories’, to help make sense of their responses (see Cohen et al., 2011). These are recounted largely by means of spoken discourse and derive from participants’ constructions of meaning and context, created through for example their own social class, gender and ethnic origin (see Cohen et al., 2011). Arguably I assume a post-phenomenological approach though, similar to post-structuralism, where the, “trans-subjective context of meaning [is] in need of permanent elucidation and interrogation” (Adams, 2007: p3). Post-structuralism posits that the social world at least is constructed, open to deconstruction (see Derrida, 1967). Therefore, my participants produce responses through their contexts but are still able to exercise
agency (see Archer, 1995, 1996, 2000 and O’Regan, 2006) and I am still enabled to deconstruct their answers.

I posit then that a post-structural epistemological approach is appropriate here. Scots and non-Scots speakers in Scotland, as chapter 2 discusses, have arguably embedded and complex multi-layered understandings, or arguably misunderstandings, of the Scots language (see Macafee, 2000). I appreciate that these notions surrounding the Scots language are constructs and hence, open to deconstruction (see Derrida, 1967). Therefore, I am able to interpret and establish outcomes from my data by adopting a post-structural epistemological approach (see Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

3.4. Methodology: Research Design, Strategy and Methods

As intimated in the introduction, my chosen research design is case study. A case study is a, “detailed description and analysis of an instance / phenomenon using multiple data collection methods” (Coles and McGrath, 2010: p189). Case studies, “can be based on any mix of quantitative and qualitative evidence” (Yin, 2003: p15) but are often qualitative and inductive in content and process (Bryman, 2004). The use of a case study design compliments my ontology and epistemology; I adopt an inductive process, involving mixed methods with a preference towards qualitative data analysis, as I discuss in more detail below.

I chose two schools as case studies in my research. The schools arguably lie on borders of sorts, A beside England and B near Ireland; the second border is obviously split with a ferry journey. The schools are situated within Dumfries and Galloway, school A in Annan and Eskdale and school B in Wigtownshire. Specifically they are
located in small towns surrounded by farmland and they comprise of no more than 11000 residents each (scrol, Web).\footnote{See: http://www.scrol.gov.uk/scrol/browser/profile.jsp?profile=Population&mainLevel=Locality&mainText=stranraer&mainTextExplicitMatch=false&compLevel=CountryProfile&compArea=Scotland&compText=&compTextExplicitMatch=null} School A had the highest roll (1098) of all secondary schools in Dumfries and Galloway in 2010, closely followed by School A with 989 students. In chapter 4, part 3, as part of my analysis, I provide more in depth information regarding the socio-economic background of each school and maps to indicate the areas they reside within.

A small and focussed context for my data collection was required, in order to enable participants to share in detail their perspectives on Scots language. Case study design was therefore appropriate, as it adopts an, ‘intensive approach’ whereby, “a researcher focuses on only one specific instance of the phenomenon to be studied, or only a handful of instances in order to study a phenomenon in depth” (Swanborn, 2010: p2). Similar approaches have been employed in the field of Scots language. Shoba’s (2010) research design is broadly comparable to my own; it was a “small scale study” (p388) adopting a ‘micro-ethnographic’ approach, which collected comparative observational and interview data. My case studies, school A and B each being a ‘case’, Yin (2003) would describe as “representative or typical case[s]” (p41), where, “the circumstances and conditions of an everyday or commonplace situation” (p41) are apparent. Indeed, my two chosen schools for my case studies were ‘typical’ of many modern comprehensive secondary schools in Scotland, with students coming from mixed socio-economic backgrounds. I discuss the context of each school in more detail in chapter 4, part 3.
The common caveat of adopting a case study approach is its ability to achieve external validity, generalizability or, indeed, when referring to a qualitative piece of research, transferability (Bryman, 2004). To add, reliability or in qualitative terms, dependability, is also a concern in employing a case study design (ibid.). For example, field surveys allow for generalizability, as they are often cross-sectional and therefore results can be generalized outside the object of study (see Cohen et al., 2011); however, outcomes for case studies are limited to the context of the study (Yin, 2003). As Yin (2003) suggests, surveys depend upon statistical generalizability, whereas case studies are dependent on analytical generalizability or transferability. As my case study schools are largely ‘typical’ of many secondary schools in Scotland, in that students come from mixed socio-economic backgrounds, it is reasonable to suggest that at least some transferability and dependability can be applied to my findings.

As I discuss below, throughout the collection of my three different data sets, I largely adopted a qualitative research strategy. I also collected quantitative data in order to triangulate my results and thus add to the internal validity or credibility of my findings.

In February 2008 I conducted a small pilot study, recruiting two participants using a snowball sampling technique. I held telephone semi-structured interviews with both participants; interview questions can be found in appendix A and a discussion of my results in chapter 4, part 1. I decided to conduct the pilot study in order to decipher whether there was much to be learned from the questions I had developed on Scots and Scots in education during the initial taught stages of my Doctorate. From the
pilot study results I realized there was indeed much to be gained from conducting my doctoral research on this topic.

It was difficult to locate participants in the Newcastle area who had experienced the Scottish education system and spoke Scots or were aware of the language. As such, for the pilot study I recruited participants from my family; they still live in a Lanarkshire village south of Glasgow where I grew up and had experienced the Scottish education system as children. Therefore, it was relatively quick and simple to obtain data, as I remain in regular contact with these family members. I ensured the participants were not biased in any way, as I did not discuss my own knowledge or opinions regarding the Scots language with them and repeatedly reassured them that they should simply provide their own opinions and not what they thought I wanted to hear. In doing this I aimed in particular to avoid the Hawthorne effect (see Jones, 1992). I secured one participant and they encouraged the second to take part. Participants here and throughout my study are provided pseudonyms to protect their anonymity.

I wished to collect participants’, “attitudes, beliefs, feelings or perceptions” (Coles and McGrath, 2010: p 103) regarding the Scots language. A semi-structured interview approach in the pilot study allowed me the flexibility to explore further with participants any interesting responses that arose. My participants provided me with extremely engaging data (see chapter 4, part 1). I subsequently collected extra data from these participants; I realized as my doctoral research progressed that there were additional questions I wanted to ask my participants, mostly in order to seek further clarity with regards their original responses. This secondary data was collected as and
when required or provided in an impromptu manner by participants; participants were always made aware that any subsequent responses they gave may be used in my research. I included this secondary data in my first set of interview notes or I simply wrote it straight into my thesis, as at times the secondary data was collected spontaneously during more general conversation with participants (see appendix A).

To analyse the pilot study qualitative responses, I utilised thematic analysis by searching for repetition in the data (see Ryan and Bernard, 2003). In adopting this process I adhered to Opler’s (1945) notion that themes link to, “manifestation[s] of expressions in data” (Ryan and Bernard, 2003: p86). Opler (1945) suggests that some themes are, “obvious and culturally agreed on, while others are subtler, symbolic, and even idiosyncratic” (ibid.: p87). He also posits that themes can be, ‘interrelated’ and are as important as their frequency, cross-cultural prevalence, value and contextual appropriateness (Ryan and Bernard, 2003). To add, the recognition of themes is also dependent on the researcher’s, “prior theoretical understanding of the phenomenon under study (an a priori approach)” (ibid.: p88). With this in mind, I searched for all identifiable themes in the pilot study, and throughout my subsequent qualitative data sets, that clearly demonstrated repetition, interrelated prevalence, value and contextual appropriateness, keeping in mind my reflexive position in the research too.

My main data sets were collected between March and May 2010 from two Dumfries and Galloway secondary schools (which I call school A and B as above). I conducted semi-structured interviews with one staff focus group in each school and recorded responses with a hand-held recording device. I also issued questionnaires to two secondary year 1 classes (which I termed my target classes), again one in each school.
The questionnaires were designed to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. The semi-structured interview questions and questionnaires can be found in appendix B. I discuss collection of these data sets in more detail below.

In addition I conducted semi-structured interviews with a small group of students from each target class, using a similar approach to my focus group interviews above. I also invited the parents / guardians of each target class into school A and B respectively to complete questionnaires and create focus groups; I aimed to conduct semi-structured interviews with these focus groups. Unfortunately, there were so few student and parent participants in these two data collection sessions, with little information arising from the data, that I decided not to include the results in my thesis. To add, I conducted semi-structured interviews with each target class teacher, again using a hand-held recorder; I asked them similar questions to those used in the staff focus groups. Results were interesting but unfortunately I do not have space to discuss them here.

Staff focus group participants’ were provided pseudonyms, according to their school and gender, to ensure anonymity and to allow their individual voices to be repeatedly recognized and ‘heard’ throughout the analysis of the interviews. The groups comprised of eight participants: three male teachers and one female teacher in School A and two male and two females, one administrator and three teachers, in school B. Including both teaching and non-teaching staff helped to provide a slightly wider staff perspective.
As with the pilot study I adopted a snowball sampling approach (Bryman, 2004) to recruit staff; living in Newcastle I was limited in the number of times I could visit the schools. In each school the principal teachers of the English departments initially acted as gatekeepers, wishing to know more about the study before allowing me access to their staff and students. Both however, after agreeing for their staff and students to take part in the study, volunteered an English teacher from their department; these members of staff subsequently became what I termed as my two target teachers, as I worked closely with them during the study.\textsuperscript{107} The two target teachers then encouraged other staff to take part in the respective focus groups.

I largely adapted and employed the student questionnaire closed questions to help create semi-structured interview questions for the staff focus groups (see appendix B); I conducted the staff focus groups after I collected student data. As with the pilot study, a semi-structured interview approach was suitable here, as again it gave me the flexibility to explore interesting responses. Utilizing the questions from the student questionnaires provided more internal validity / credibility to the study, by enabling me to compare results with the student participant responses (Bryman, 2004). The semi-structured questions included: ‘[d]o you think Scots [is] … a language in its own right?’ and, ‘how do you feel about … Scots throughout society [and] in the Curriculum for Excellence as well?’. Both focus groups discussed their views openly and in detail.

\textsuperscript{107} The gatekeepers were the principal teachers of English departments in each school. I approached them in January / February of 2010 to enlist their support and involvement with the project. The most suitable subject base to accommodate my project was English, as language studies are incorporated to an extent in English classrooms in Scotland. English teachers in Scottish schools, from my emic experience, usually have some kind of knowledge regarding Scots language and literature and therefore, I hoped they would be interested in the research project. Indeed I was proved correct.
I utilised content and thematic analysis (Ryan and Bernard, 2003) to quantitatively and qualitatively analyze the staff focus group data. To elaborate, in my content analysis I created an overview of the main emerging ‘categories’ (see Graneheim and Lundman, 2004). Adopting the same method as I utilized in the pilot study, the qualitative thematic analysis revealed themes that were raised and seen as significant by staff.

Conducting the content analysis, I adapted Graneheim and Lundman’s (2004) approach, annotating the interview transcriptions by determining the ‘meaning units’, “the constellations of words or statements that relate to the same central meaning” (ibid.:p106). I then annotated, coded and categorized the participant ‘meaning units’. Finally I grouped the categories into themes, using a similar approach to determine themes as outlined above when I thematically analyzed the pilot study interviews. Fig. 3.1. provides an example of my annotations and coding. Each underlined or circled section is a ‘meaning unit’. I made notes at the right hand side, which explored the ‘meaning units’ and I then condensed and codified them on a separate ‘coding and categorization’ page. Subsequently codes were placed on the left of the interview transcription. Fig. 3.2 is an example of how I condensed the ‘meaning units’, coded and categorized them and then arranged the categories into thematic groups. In Fig. 3.2. the reader can also see that I counted how many times each ‘meaning unit’ occurred; this informed the quantitative outcome of the content analysis by providing weighted categories (see chapter 4, part 2, Fig. 4.2.1. for a graphical representation of categories). As a result of my content analysis of the staff

108 See appendix B for annotated interviews and meaning units, condensed meaning units, codes, categories and themes.
focus group interviews, it became clear which categories were more important than others to participants.

Fig. 3.1. Extract from annotated and coded focus group interviews, school A
The reader will note that ‘meaning units’ are, “referred to as the manifest content” and the, “underlying meaning of the text, [is] referred as the latent content” (ibid., p106).

Thus, by placing ‘M’ or ‘L’ beside the codes on the interview transcriptions I indicated whether the ‘meaning units’ were ‘manifest’, evident, or ‘latent’, concealed. If I placed a question mark beside the ‘M’ or ‘L’ on either, this indicated that the ‘meaning unit’ was ambiguous, in that it was not clear whether the ‘unit’ was ‘manifest’ or ‘latent’. The annotated transcripts for each focus group interview can be found in appendix B.
As discussed above, I also collected qualitative and quantitative data, using questionnaires with open and closed questions, from two mixed ability secondary year 1 (S1) classes in school A and B. I chose this age range of children, 11-12 years old, as from my experience as an English teacher I felt they might be more engaged with the topic of Scots language and motivated to work with me than older classes might be; it often takes longer to develop a good working relationship with older children and young adults than S1 students. Therefore, as I could only visit the schools to collect data on two occasions due to work commitments, seeking S1 classes to take part in the study seemed the obvious choice. I was however provided funding for my research through Beacon North East and Newcastle University and so financially I was easily able to make these visits.

My target teachers taught S1 classes and so arranging to work with them was straightforward. Target teachers agreed to volunteer their students to take part in the study, although permission to participate was also asked of students themselves; their parents / guardians were asked too if the students could take part (see below in section 3.6. for more detail). Both target teachers in each school could provide me with background information on their classes, such as the attainment, social background and behavior of students, which was helpful.

On the days I collected the data, school A’s class consisted of 10 male and 6 female students and school B’s class comprised of 13 male and 11 female students; there were 40 student participants altogether. As with both the pilot study and staff focus groups, when analysing the responses qualitatively, I employed a similar process of

109 See appendix C for student questionnaires.
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thematic analysis by searching for repetition in the data (see Ryan and Bernard, 2003).

I also considered the quantitative data arising from the questionnaires by using descriptive statistical analysis, in the sense that I simply collated and represented raw numerical results in graph form. However, my data collection and analysis was mostly concerned with the qualitative data I collected and so I did not draw inferential conclusions from my quantitative findings; this said I did make tentative conclusions regarding obvious comparisons and patterns between my quantitative findings and my other data sets (Cohen et. al., 2011).

3.5. Researcher’s Position

As discussed in chapters 1 and 2, I am mindful of my emic position within the study; I am a Scots speaker, a product of the Scottish education system and a once Scottish secondary schoolteacher. My emic position privileges me with being able to provide, “a deeper understanding of cultural relativism” (Saville-Troike, 2003: p4) within the research. My etic position as researcher aids my reflexive approach, enabling me to appreciate the data beyond my emic perspective and thus, beyond any cultural bias I may have. I write myself into the study, whilst adopting what I term a reflexive narrative approach (see Riley and Hawe, 2005), in order to provide transparency and reflexivity with regards the findings (see Saville-Troike, 2003); in doing so I support the confirmability of my findings (Bryman, 2004).
3.6. Ethics

I received full ethical approval for my research project from the Ethics Committee at Newcastle University in 2010. Throughout my research I have adhered to the British Educational Research Association (B.E.R.A.) Guidelines.¹¹¹ I paraphrased and employed these guidelines during the process of obtaining participant consent (see appendix D).

As part of the pilot study, before my first data collection session, I explained my research ethics to both participants via the telephone. Each participant verbally provided his or her consent to take part in the study. Before collecting my main data set, I provided schools with information leaflets about the project.¹¹² The leaflets contained my contact details; I made clear to schools that they were welcome to contact me if needed.

I then requested consent from participants to take part in the research. Firstly, I sent the head teachers or principal teachers of the two schools a consent letter.¹¹³ Once consent had been granted, I then asked for consent from the various individual participants, including a letter to the students’ parents / guardians;¹¹⁴ I verbally explained my ethics to participants from staff and student groups. I made participants aware that their data would be kept secure. Thankfully there were no objections from parents / guardians regarding their children taking part in the study. There were no objections from staff and students either. I was alert to any issues that may have arisen in the data collection sessions that could prove sensitive but no issues that

¹¹¹ BERA Guidelines (British Educational Research Association): http://www.bera.ac.uk
¹¹² See appendix D for the school and staff information leaflet.
¹¹³ See appendix D for the school consent letter.
¹¹⁴ See appendix D for parent / guardian consent letter.
caused contention arose. Although I had at that time recent clear Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks, I ensured that the research data was collected in the schools when staff were present or nearby. I made the schools aware of my recent clear CRB check.

I explained to participants that on completion, they would be provided with a summary of the research project. I will also make target teachers aware that the full write-up is available to them if needed. To add, if requested I will re-visit the schools to provide a verbal debrief to participants and interested parties.

To the best of my knowledge there were and are not any risks to participants. Hopefully schools benefited from the research project, as I taught their two S1 classes a lesson on Scots language and also provided a lesson to these students on how to begin a research project. I provided schools with free materials on Scots too, as a gesture of thanks.

3.7. Summary

In this chapter I have stated my research position. I have also offered justifications for my research focus and outlined the procedures I followed with regards data collection and analysis. In addition, I have considered ethical issues relevant to the study and have also made note of my own role as a Scot, in as much as I am inevitably both researcher and researched.
In chapter 4 I present the analysis of my results from the pilot study, staff focus groups and student questionnaires. I also provide a discussion on each set of results, which leads me to chapter 5 and my conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER 4: Data Analysis and Discussion

Part 1: Introduction and Analysis of the Pilot Study

4.1.a. Introduction

Chapter 4 is divided into three parts, a part for each data set I gathered and analyse. Part 1 of this chapter focuses on my pilot study. I include results from two retired participants from my home area, as discussed in chapter 3. Data from my main study, deriving from staff and student participants of two Dumfries and Galloway secondary schools, is then analysed in parts 2 and 3. Specifically, part 2 analyses the data collected from staff focus groups and part 3 analyses the quantitative and qualitative data gathered from student questionnaires.

4.2.a. Pilot Study

I carried out a small pilot study in February 2008, with two participants, who I name A and B; they are still living in my home village in Lanarkshire, south of Glasgow and experienced the Scottish education system as students between the 1940s and 50s. Collecting data on Scots from the 1940s-50s is useful, as it provides an element of diachronic analysis, when I compare it to data I collected in 2010 from my case study schools.

During the pilot study I asked participant A and B eight semi-structured interview questions including:

- What is your general opinion of Scots?
- How was using Scots at school viewed by the staff and pupils?
- What links, if any, do you think Scots has with Scottish identity?

(see Appendix A for all 8 questions).
I subsequently collected extra responses from these participants as discussed in chapter 3; I realized as my doctoral research progressed, and I further developed my understanding of Scots in the classroom, that there were supplementary questions I wished to ask my two participants regarding their original responses. This secondary data I simply wrote as question 9 on my first set of interview notes (see appendix A) or I included it directly into my thesis, as it was collected in an impromptu manner, due to circumstance. Data was collected via the telephone. I wrote notes and repeated these to participant A and B to ensure I had recorded their comments accurately. These are generally written in Standard English, although some Scottish words are included.

I give each participant’s response a code, which outlines where it can be found in the appendices, and which of the two participants has spoken it in response to what question. Therefore all responses are in Appendix A and so I write AA after each response I quote. The participants are defined as being either PA meaning participant A or PB meaning participant B; participant A and B’s responses are clearly outlined in the appendices. The participants’ responses relate to the particular questions I ask them and so the responses are also highlighted as relating to Qu1, which is question 1 or Qu2, which is question 2 and so on. Again these can be found in the appendices according to the participant they are associated with. As such, a response may have the following code: ‘AA, PB, Qu3’ for example, which is ‘appendix A, participant B, question 3’. If the responses were collected and inserted straight into my thesis, then my code is simply PA or PB and T for thesis. I avoided coding the answers in any more depth than this as, it being my pilot study, I simply wished to view the responses as they stood and allow themes to emerge from the data. I highlight phrases in bold in
this and later sections, where emerging themes from the data become apparent (Ryan and Bernard, 2003).

Mostly participants A and B, although referring to their own childhoods during the 40s-50s, provided similar responses to those of my participants from my case study schools. For example, from the pilot study themes emerge such as issues of ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) surrounding Scots and the existence of ‘in-group’ (Tajfel, 1982) Scots speakers. These themes are similar to those that become apparent throughout my subsequent data analysis in chapter 4, parts 2 to 3. Therefore the pilot study, even though it only included two participants, was an invaluable exercise, as it firstly introduced themes that sparked my interest in conducting my doctoral thesis in the subject of Scots in schools and also, enabled me to explore, replicate and develop these themes and uncover further themes in the later analysis of my main data sets.

As discussed in chapter 2, I am interested in the links between Scots and ‘cultural’ and ‘social capital’ (Bourdieu, 1984); therefore it is important before I discuss my analysis of the pilot study data, to outline the socio-economic backgrounds of both participants when they grew up in Glasgow, as their backgrounds are important in my analysis of their responses below. This information was collected recently from the participants: I asked them, ‘what was Barmulloch / Balornock’ or, ‘Govan and Easterhouse like’ (question 9), their respective childhood home areas. These areas offered participants different experiences, as I discuss below, and as such, it was important to collect this ‘biodata’, as the experiences they gained from their home areas potentially influenced their subsequent responses.
Participant A was raised in Barmulloch near Balornock, a working-class area of Glasgow. In the city of Glasgow however, it was regarded as a more sought after area than, say, Govan and the Gorbals (see Paice, Web).\textsuperscript{115} Participant A stated, verbatim, ‘Barmulloch was a new scheme to provide additional housing for Glasgow. Didn’t hear as much about Barmulloch as you did about Easterhouse, Castlemilk and Drumchapel, some of the other schemes’ (AA, PA, Qu9). She added, ‘It was a slightly nicer scheme … There was possibly more crime in the other areas … Springburn was near and was made up of tenements and factories with not many gardens’ (AA, PA, Qu9). Tenements were blocks of flats, often only consisting of one or two rooms, no bathroom and a toilet outside in the communal hallway or ‘close’. She continued, ‘Balornock’s new schemes were nicer than tenements, with front and back gardens’ and, ‘Barmulloch and Balornock houses had 2 or 3 bedrooms, a proper bathroom, a separate kitchen, living room and a bathroom in the house … it was a step up’ (AA, PA, Qu9).

Participant B was raised in Govan and then moved to the newly developed area of Easterhouse. Govan was historically recognised as an area of deprivation in Glasgow and Easterhouse quickly followed suit (see Paice, Web).\textsuperscript{116} Participant B stated of Govan:

\begin{quote}
It was just ordinary life; you didn’t know any better. On a Saturday night you’d see men coming out the pub, stripped to the waist, having a punch-up … Everybody worked but they weren’t
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{115} Paice, L., Web at: http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/cross_fac/iatl/ejournal/issues/volume1issue1/paice/ Overspill Policy and the Glasgow Slum Clearance Project: From one Nightmare to Another?

\textsuperscript{116} Paice, L., Web at: http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/cross_fac/iatl/ejournal/issues/volume1issue1/paice/ Overspill Policy and the Glasgow Slum Clearance Project: From one Nightmare to Another?
well paid … My family came from the old tenements where there were outside toilets in the close [communal hallway] and no bath … We were too busy working and putting food on the table in order to live (AA, PB, Qu9).

He described Easterhouse as, ‘a new scheme and at first it was not too bad but when the overspill from the tenements came it grew worse. It was a mix of people. Some were poor and some thought they were getting a leg-up’ (AA, PB, Qu9). He added, ‘There was a lot of gang culture in Easterhouse. It made people wary. They didn’t have any aspirations’ (AA, PB, Qu9).

4.3.a. Attitudes to Scots

Firstly I asked participants A and B what their general opinion of Scots was. I did not provide them with a definition of Scots, as I wished to discover how they might refer to it. I place in bold those responses or sections of same that appeared particularly significant.

In response to question 1, ‘What is your general opinion of Scots’, Participant A said that Scots is: ‘[o]ld fashioned. Out dated. I understand it but don’t use it very much; I see it as in the past. I am proud of it as my heritage. I don’t see a place for it in the modern world’ (AA, PA, Qu1). Participant B stated for question 1 that Scots is: ‘[q]uite a diverse language because there are quite a few different accents – Orkney they sing, Edinburgh they repeat themselves and in Glasgow it’s guttural’ (AA, PB, Qu1).
Participant A suggested that Scots is an ‘[o]ld fashioned’ language but one that she could ‘understand’. She was ‘proud’ of it as her ‘heritage’ but did not view Scots as a modern living language. This is a similar result to the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study where 62% of participants believed that, “Scots is not relevant to the modern Scotland of today” (p3). I regularly refer to the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study in part 1 of chapter 4, as there are similarities to be drawn between the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study’s results and my results from the pilot study.

When we compare participant A’s response to question 1 with participant B’s response to the same question, we realise that each perceived Scots quite differently. Participant B’s reference to Scots as ‘diverse’ and having ‘differing accents’ suggests that he has was referring to what I term ‘modern’ Scots, a language in use today. The Tns-bmrb (2010b) study echoes this when 85% of participants stated they spoke Scots. This directly contradicts the 62% of participants in the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study that believed Scots ‘is not relevant’ (p3). There is an inconsistency in my own two pilot study participants’ perceptions of Scots and also with the participants in the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study. This, I suggest, stems from whether they regarded Scots as ‘modern’ or ‘heritage’ Scots (see chapter 2). Indeed, if they considered Scots to be a ‘heritage’ code, then they would most likely perceive it as ‘old fashioned’ or ‘not relevant’ today but if they believed Scots to be a ‘modern’ code, then they may very well consider it as being current, ‘diverse’ and having ‘different accents’.

In February 2013 and March 2014 I returned to my original questions with the participants and discussed their answers with them in more detail. It was necessary to seek further clarification from participants at these two points, as supplementary
questions arose in my mind from analysing the pilot data during these periods. Participant A’s description of Scots, she confirmed, had originally been referring to Older Scots or a Scots directly after the Older Scots period (1375 to 1700) (see Jones, 1997a). She stated that she saw the code as ‘old Scots’, the ‘vocabulary of Robert Burns’, ‘rarely heard’ and she made no mention of ‘modern’ Scots. In contrast participant B explained that he had been specifically discussing Glaswegian in his original response, a code currently in use (see Macafee, 1994 and SLC, Web). He said that, ‘a lot of it’s slang … a distorted version of English’ and that, ‘people speak Glaswegian still every day’. Again similarities can be drawn with the Tns-brmb (2010b) study where 64% of participants did not see Scots, ‘as a language - it’s more just a way of speaking” (Tns-brmb, 2010b: p2).

As discussed in chapter 2, ‘modern’ Scots is often considered to be ‘vulgar’ (Matheson and Matheson, 2000), compared to ‘heritage’ Scots, which is a ‘capitalised’ (Bourdieu, 1986) language of the Scottish education system and the middle-classes in Scotland (see Shoba, 2010). Glaswegian is an apt example of ‘modern’ Scots; in chapter 2 I discuss how the ‘Chew in the Fat Neds use ‘modern’ Scots to effect. The idea that the many codes of Scots are corrupt forms of English, a notion traditionally proposed by the Scottish education system for example (see Bailey, 1987 and McPake and Arthur, 2006), makes it problematic for researchers to study Scots. This is apparent when participant A answered question 1 above and did not appear to understand that Scots is considered a modern language in its own right; instead she referred to a more antiquated, literary Scots, a ‘heritage’ Scots of the

---

117 See: http://www.scotslanguage.com
Scottish education system perhaps (see SLC, Web). As Macafee (2000) posits, it is difficult to research Scots due to the beliefs Scots speakers have of the language.

Macaulay (1991) argues that differences in perceptions of Scots are most likely due to a, “folk vs literary dimension rather than a Scots vs Standard English dimension” (p514). ‘Literary’ Scots, such as that from the Older Scots tradition and the work of the Makars for example (see chapter 2), has ‘cultural capital’ in the Scottish education system (see Bailey, 1987, Bourdieu, 1986 and Shoba, 2010); it is similar to my ‘heritage’ Scots. This is compared to ‘folk’ Scots, the language of the people, such as Glaswegian, my ‘modern’ Scots. Macaulay’s (1991) adds that Scots has, “distinctive narrative styles, as between middle-class and working-class speech” (Macafee, 1997: p514).

‘Heritage’ Scots is not only regarded as ‘capitalised’ (Bourdieu, 1986) but is also employed for reasons of ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) by the middle classes in Scotland (Shoba, 2010). Although participant A’s local council provided her ‘scheme’ of houses for the working classes, ‘Balornock’s new schemes were nicer than tenements, with front and back gardens … it was a step up’. Therefore, it is not surprising that participant A did not acknowledge ‘modern’ Glaswegian Scots but rather spoke of the ‘capitalised’ code of ‘heritage’ Scots in her answer to question 1. Indeed she stated, ‘People spoke more broad in Springburn’ (AA, PA, Qu9), her neighbouring area. She perceived Scots to be her ‘heritage’; Glaswegian ‘modern’ Scots in the ‘nicer’ scheme of Balornock may not have been as acceptable as it was in Govan or Easterhouse.

Participant B said that people in his home area, ‘didn’t have any aspirations’. He was
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118 Scots Language Centre, Web at: http://www.scotslanguage.com/
used to witnessing, ‘men coming out the pub, stripped to the waist, having a punch-up’. Therefore, it is not unexpected that he refers to ‘modern’ ‘guttural’ Glasgow Scots, the code of his community, even though it is a code that lacks ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986).

The initial results from the pilot study suggest that participants had varying and contradictory attitudes towards Scots. These attitudes may have been at least partly due to the participants’ differing socio-economic backgrounds and the forms of ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) ‘modern’ and ‘heritage’ Scots could offer them in their respective communities.

4.4.a. Selective Usage of Scots

I now consider participant A and B’s responses to questions 2 to 5. I bring these responses together, as they relate to one another and suggest that the two participants appeared to have gained similar experiences during their time in primary and secondary education in Scotland. In particular the responses indicate that the participants learned to be selective regarding when and where they used Scots. The questions I asked are as follows:

2) How was using Scots at school viewed by the staff and pupils?

3) Did you ever use Scots at school and if so, what were the results?

4) As a child where else might you have or have not used Scots and why?

5) As an adult where might you have or have not used Scots and why? (see Appendix A).
Participant A stated for question 2: ‘[d]idn’t use [Scots] in the classroom – it was just modern English you used’ (AA, PA, Qu2). However, she also said: ‘used it in the home, in clubs and organisations’ (AA, PA, Qu4) and, [a]s a child, ‘you were told, ‘Speak properly’ and properly meant the Queen’s English’ (AA, PA, Qu5). Immediately we notice a contradiction from her earlier response, where she said that she didn’t, ‘use it very much … I don’t see a place for it in the modern world’ (AA, PA, Qu1); here she stated that she used it in, ‘home, in clubs and organisations’, organisations being the Girl Guides, which she was a member of. This contradiction again echoes a similar inconsistency in the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study, where 85% of participants stated that they spoke Scots, whilst 62% believed Scots ‘is not relevant’ (p3). Similar to participant A though, the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study stated that those who spoke Scots indicated that they did so, “when socialising with friends (69%) or at home with the family (63%)” (p1).

Participant A perceived Scots as being, ‘the same words as everyone else, including some Scots words … and the same accent’ (PA, T). Arguably participant A was referring to the lexis of ‘heritage’ Scots when she stated, ‘some Scots words’. She said that, ‘we were unaware we were using Scots words (PA, T)’. This phenomenon is echoed in the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study where, “two thirds (67%) agree that their use of Scots is sub-conscious; that they are really not aware of speaking it” (p15).

Being ‘unaware’ of using Scots, it being a seemingly ‘sub-conscious’ linguistic act, helps to explain the issues Macafee (2000) suggests researchers face when
researching Scots; these issues are as a result of the ideas Scots speakers have of the language. For example, if Scots speakers are not aware of Scots, then they are unlikely to state they speak it and this can create confusing results. To add, if Scots does not exist in the minds of its speakers, then it is also likely to have little status as a language. This assumption is supported by the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study, where 64% of participants stated, “I don’t really think of Scots as a language – it’s more just a way of speaking” (Tns-brmb, 2010b: p2). This is despite 85% of these same participants stating that they spoke Scots (Tns-bmrb, 2010b). It is not surprising then that participant A offers contradictory responses regarding her use of Scots; such results are replicated within the field in the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study for example and discussed by Macafee (2000).

Participant B said in answer to question 2, ‘[y]ou spoke polite English. You didn’t speak like the way you spoke outside of school. You were told to speak properly’ (AA, PB, Qu2). He also responded to question 3 with, ‘No I was always polite’ (AA, PB, Qu3). With regards question 4 he stated: ‘In the church I would have to speak properly’ (AA, PB, Qu4) and in response to question 5 he said, ‘I wouldn’t use it at work – just with colleagues but not in a board room - I would speak politely’ (AA, PB, Qu5). He said too: ‘[u]sed my native tongue when I was in the house’ (AA, PB, Qu4) and, ‘outside of school ... in the street’ (PB, T).

Participant B was similar to A when he stated that he used Scots ‘in the house’ and, ‘in the street’. Again similar to participant A, he was also told to ‘speak properly’. As an adult he would avoid using Scots in more formal settings such as the ‘boardroom’ at work. Unlike participant A however, there did not appear to be a
contradictory element to participant B’s answers here and in response to question 1 above; he acknowledged that he spoke Scots, though he did indicate that he was selective in the way that he used it. Indeed, participant B was clearer regarding when he used Scots than participant A and referred to the code as his ‘native tongue’, his first language: Glaswegian. The participants’ selective employment of the code is also echoed in the findings from the Tns-bmrb (2010b) survey, where participants indicated where they would mostly use Scots, “at home with the family” (p13) or “when socialising with friends” (p13).

It appears then that participants A and B avoided employing Scots in more formal places that held some prestige such as the school, church or some contexts in the workplace. This suggests that Scots had little status or ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) in such places but was acceptable predominantly in social settings, such as the ‘home’, ‘street’ or in local ‘organisations’. A study to consider bidialectalism in Scots is currently underway at Glasgow University. It aims to begin to understand the different codes Scots interlocutors employ when in various social contexts. The data will be collected from participants in the North East of Scotland. The results will prove to be an interesting comparison to similar themes raised here.119

Participants A and B were not encouraged to employ Scots in formal settings, as it was not ‘polite’ or ‘proper’; indeed, to ‘[s]peak properly’, ‘meant the Queen’s English’, presumably Standard English. Being ‘proper’ was also to be: ‘brought up properly - to speak nicely, dress nicely, keep a clean home, have manners’ (PA, T). Participant A added, ‘[y]ou knew to speak properly at school because you were

119 See: http://www.gla.ac.uk/news/headline_277269_en.html
taught to at home and the teacher spoke properly so you just did’ (PA, T).

Participant B responded similarly with, ‘I was told to speak properly when in the situation [school, church] by my family’ (PA, T). As Fairclough (1989) suggests, employing standard English or aspiring to, “was regarded as correct English, and other social dialects were stigmatized in terms which indirectly reflected on the lifestyles, morality and so forth of their speakers” (p57). This echoes participant A’s comment when she stated that being ‘proper’ was to be ‘brought up properly - to speak nicely, dress nicely, keep a clean home, have manners’.

Near the conclusion of the medieval period, a form of Standard English became more widespread as a result of the developing power of the merchants in London. The merchants spoke an East Midland dialect, a precursor to Standard English, and the code gradually became linked to institutions of power and status (see Fairclough, 1989). Institutions colonised by Standard English, such as the Scottish education system for example, ensured the rise of the bourgeoisie to the detriment of the working class, as the bourgeoisie spoke Standard English, the language that arguably allowed them passage in such contexts (see Fairclough, 1989).

Therefore, to ‘speak properly’ was aspirational; it potentially helped to better one’s social standing and arguably this is what participant A was taught by her family and school. Participant B was also ‘told to speak properly’ but only ‘when in the situation [school, church] by my family’. There is a suggestion then that participant A was told to ‘speak properly’ because it was an indicator that she was ‘brought up properly’ and therefore that she had some ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986). Indeed she stated, ‘Adults thought the only way to gain status was to go against your heritage and speak the
Queen’s English’ (AA, PA, Qu5). For participant B, ‘speaking properly’ was to do with code switching to ‘fit in’, to show respect perhaps to schoolteachers and ministers.

McPake and Arthur (2006) state, “[u]niversalisation of schooling in Scotland … ensured the spread of English throughout Scotland … By the 20th century, the legitimisation of English as the language of the education system had been fully achieved” (p158). It is no surprise then that participant A and B learned to be selective when and if they utilised Scots. However Scottish children were not simply taught to code-switch from Scots to English according to their situation, rather families and schools often wished to entirely eradicate them of their Scottish tongue. As participant A stated, ‘it was drummed out of us’ (AA, PA, Qu5).

Such attitudes can be traced to the 18th century in Scotland where many influential Scotsmen, such as Adam Smith the philosopher and economist, viewed Scots as a, “barbaric relic of a backward society” (Jones, 1995: p1). They strove for an, “English Academy where the linguistic rectitude of ‘correct’ English would be maintained” (ibid.: p2). Indeed, “there was an extensive importation of schoolmasters and grammar teachers into a multitude of language schools in Edinburgh” (ibid.: p2), in order to rid the Scottish children of their ‘scotticisms’. As Jones (1995) suggests, there was a, “pronounced Scotophobia” (p2) during this period, that may had links to the Jacobite Rising and the Bute Controversy in 1762, where the Scottish Earl of Bute replaced the Duke of Newcastle as first Lord of Treasury and then Prime Minister. The country was suspicious of Bute’s friendship with King George III and this did not help to improve English / Scottish relations at that time (Jones, 1995, Spector, 1992).
It is reasonable to suggest therefore that an 18th century legacy of ‘Scotophobia’ and the desire by an Anglo-centric elite to rid schoolchildren of their ‘scotticisms’ was still influencing the Scottish education system when participant A and B were at school. Therefore, it is not surprising when participant A stated that she did not ‘use it very much’, ‘it’ being Scots. This said the enduring nature of Scots is extraordinary when we consider the campaign to eradicate it. Participant A and B still spoke Scots as children but learned that Scots was to be used selectively; indeed arguably participant A learned to avoid speaking Scots, as this provided her with ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986). However, as participant B stated, Scots remained his ‘native tongue’ and was used in ‘the house’ and, ‘outside of school ... in the street’; ‘In the church’ and school though he, ‘would have to speak properly’.

4.5.a. Links between Scots Usage and Socio-economic Background

Earlier I stated that participant A’s socio-economic background was considered in Glasgow more affluent than participant B’s, due to the area she lived in (see Paice, Web). I argue here that this was reflected in the differing codes of ‘modern’ Scots both participants adopted; these differing codes provided them with ‘capital’ and / or ‘in-group’ (Tajfel, 1982) status in their varying contexts.

Macaulay’s (1977) study of ‘consistency and variation in Glaswegian English’ suggested that the stratification of certain “phonological variables” (p13), including the use of a glottal stop, indicated in Glasgow one’s socio-economic status; the use

---

120 Paice, L., Web at: http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/cross_fac/iatl/ejournal/issues/volume1issue1/paice/ Overspill Policy and the Glasgow Slum Clearance Project: From one Nightmare to Another?
121 For example ‘situation’ often pronounced ‘si (glottal stop)– u – a – tion’ in Glasgow.
of the glottal stop in his study suggested a lower socio-economic status. Participant B uses a glottal stop with words such as ‘situation’, pronounced by participant B as ‘si’u’a’tion’. I have never heard participant A use a glottal stop. This compares similarly to Macaulay’s (1977) findings in that participant B originated from a lower social-economic background in Glasgow than participant A.

Participant A stated, ‘There’s your Kelvinside accent – that’s posh, there’s ordinary Glasgow that speak like me and broad Glasgow, that’s not posh’ (PA, T). In chapter 2 I provide examples of the ‘posh’ Kelvinside accent with James and Garry and ‘broad’ Glasgow with the ‘Chewin the fat’ Neds. Participant B would use ‘broad’ or ‘modern’ Glaswegian, ‘in the street’. As discussed in chapter 2 however, there are differing degrees of ‘broad’ or ‘modern’ Glasgow, from Kevin Bridges’ ‘modern’ Scots code to the ‘Ned’s’ extreme version of the same ‘modern’ Scots. A scene from the popular Scottish comedy series ‘Still Game’ gives an example of the apparent indecipherability of ‘Ned’ Glaswegian. The main characters are stuck in a lift. Eventually some ‘Neds’ see them through the space open between the top of the lift and the floor and demand £10.00 before they will help them. The main characters give them the money, whereupon one ‘Ned’ states: ‘feechies’. The characters in the lift are confused. Eventually the ‘Ned’ translates the word into ‘modern’ Scots: ‘A tenner frae each o youse’ (ten pounds from each of you).122 As said, knowing participant B well, I would regard his use of ‘modern’ Scots as closer to Kevin Bridge’s code than the code of the ‘Neds’.

122 Still Game, Web at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bR9O_DOCHf8
In contrast to participant B, Participant A stated that her family was concerned with how they were, ‘heard by your neighbours’ (PA, T) and so she would speak what she described as ‘ordinary Glasgow’ or she would ‘speak properly’, which could be considered Scottish Standard English. ‘Ordinary Glasgow’ is not ‘broad’ or ‘Ned’ Glasgow; it is a ‘modern’ Glaswegian Scots comparable to, say, the Scottish television presenter Lorraine Kelly; although Lorraine originates from the Gorbals (inner city Glasgow) and then East Kilbride (a new town on the outskirts of Glasgow), her use of Scots is similar to participant A.¹²³

To continue, participant A described an occasion when she was playing outdoors and a child challenged her speech with: ‘why do you say ‘my younger brother’ and not ‘my wee brother’ like everyone else?’ (PA, T). Participant A appeared to distance herself from some of her community in speaking a different code of Scots to them, perhaps Scottish Standard English. Indeed, she stated that, ‘[t]he family across the street would use slang; they would be looked down upon’ (AA, PA, Qu5). Here ‘slang’ refers to ‘broad’ or ‘modern’ Scots; by using the words ‘they would be’, it is possible that this family was ‘looked down upon’ by a number of other families; inferentially then, some people who lived alongside participant A may have also avoided speaking ‘broad Glaswegian’, for reasons of ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986), or as participant A suggests, ‘status’. Again however we notice contradictions in participant A’s perception of her use of Scots; she stated she spoke Scots in social settings and she used ‘ordinary Glasgow’ but she also stated that she spoke ‘properly’, as the child above highlighted. As said participant B was clear regarding when and how he spoke Scots.

¹²³ See Lorraine Kelly on The Graham Norton Show at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_MOQ2_vKrjw
Knowing participant A well too, I recognize that she code-switches from an ‘ordinary Glasgow’ or ‘modern’ Glasgow, loosely similar to that used by Kevin Bridges, to Scottish Standard English: English with a Scottish accent and some Scots words, similar to my ‘heritage’ Scots. She can also switch to what one might term north Glasgow, a softer Glaswegian that incorporates many Glaswegian words that participant B might employ; it is dissimilar to the code participant B or Kevin Bridges use though, being less ‘short and choppy’ and more gentle in delivery. With participant B, I have not noticed him code-switching from say ‘broad’ Glaswegian to Scottish Standard English, apart from when he has to present in a more formal setting, such as at a funeral for example. In this context he will attempt to adopt Scottish Standard English but he is not entirely successful, as his ‘broad’ or ‘modern’ Glasgow code will filter through, indicating the ‘modern’ code of Glaswegian Scots he habitually uses; indeed, it does not sound ‘natural’ for participant B to use Scottish Standard English.

Participant A and B clearly speak differing codes of Glaswegian, as above, according to where they grew up in the city of Glasgow. However participant A is more adept at code-switching according to her context; she describes how she learned and often adopted a form of Scottish Standard English, and to an extent ‘heritage’ Scots, for reasons of ‘status’ or ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986). Participant B though, tends to stay true to his ‘modern’ ‘broad’ Glaswegian in most settings, although he can attempt Scottish Standard English in some more formal contexts. It is possible that participant B, being taught he had to ‘speak properly’ in certain settings, adopted this approach in a functional manner, in that it helped him to adhere to the formality of the occasion. Participant A however, seemed to switch her choice of Scots code to obtain
‘status’ or ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986). It appears that both participants still generally continue to employ their use of Scots in a similar fashion today.

During my data collection periods of the pilot study, participant B referred to Glaswegian as ‘guttural’ (AA, PB, Qu1); he said that it is not, ‘polite English … pronouncing your ts, pronouncing every word properly’ (PB, T). Participant A stated, ‘[m]y family would have looked down on people who spoke broad Glasgow’ (PA, T). As discussed, participant B tended to stay true to his code of ‘broad Glasgow’ (see Macaulay, 1977) and this acted as an indicator of his lower social-economic status; participant A however displayed a ‘schizoglossic’ (Haugen, 1972) mind-set, an insecurity and disparity in the Scots codes she adopted. Despite being encouraged to speak the ‘Queen’s English’ and therefore help to perpetuate a form of ‘linguicide’ for Scots in Scotland (see Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson, 1999), she spoke Scots in, ‘the home, in clubs and organisations’.

It appears that unlike participant B, participant A was provided with mixed messages from her family regarding the use of Glaswegian and general Scots words:

‘[S]cunnered’\textsuperscript{124} was okay but ‘scunnert’ wasn’t – ‘footerin’\textsuperscript{125} instead of ‘footering’ was okay though’ (PA, T). As Macaulay (1977) indicates, the use of the glottal stop in Glaswegian was an indicator of lower socio-economic status and therefore it is of no surprise, when we consider that participant A was told to ’speak properly by her family, that she was generally discouraged from using it. In some instances missing letters did appear to be acceptable in participant A’s family, although with the word

\textsuperscript{124} “aversion, disgust or loathing”, Scots Online Dictionary, http://www.scots-online.org/dictionary/search_scots.asp
\textsuperscript{125} “fiddle, nuisance”, Scots Tongue, http://www.cs.stir.ac.uk/~kjt/general/scots.html
'footering’, it is more likely to be written as ‘footerin’ in Glaswegian or ‘modern’ Scots anyway.

Participant A also stated when employing Scots, or what I term ‘heritage’ Scots, that she, ‘pa[id] a kind of homage to your heritage by using words or phrases that have survived … [y]ou selectively use it but in an unconscious way’ (AA, PA, Qu3).126
Again we are reminded of earlier data where participant A said that, ‘we were unaware we were using Scots words (PA, T)’ and when “two thirds (67%)” of the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study, “agree[d] that their use of Scots is sub-conscious; that they are really not aware of speaking it” (p15).

Interestingly when I repeatedly asked participant A to define Scots in layman terms she struggled. She often resorted to descriptions of Older Scots such as ‘awa’ for ‘away’ or ‘hoose’ for ‘house’ (AA, PA, Qu8). These are not words she would normally use; indeed, they are more likely to be found in the poetry of Robert Burns. I did not define for the pilot participants the differing codes of Scots the Scot Language Centre outlines, such as Northern or Central Scots for example.127 Yet ironically participant A unconsciously employed many words and phrases of ‘broad’ ‘modern’ Glaswegian Scots vocabulary when she was being interviewed. Once more we are reminded of earlier data where participant A was ‘unaware’ she was speaking Scots and where the Tns-bmrb participants thought, “that [their] use of Scots [was] sub-conscious” (2010b: p15).

126 Some words or phrases participant A may have been referring to are ‘ben the room’ (go to the other room or in the other room), ‘kitchen’ (a breakfast of sausage, egg, dumpling, fried bread etc), ‘steareage will do’ (to use ones hands to pass food) and ‘hansell’ (to place silver in a gift such as a purse or money box) for example.
127 See http://www.scotslanguage.com
During the interview participant A regularly used ‘ye’ for ‘you’, ‘yin’ for ‘one’, ‘a’ for ‘I’, ‘wurnae’ for ‘weren’t’, ‘aw’ for ‘all’, ‘am’ for ‘I am’ and ‘ma’ for ‘my’, words and phrases commonly heard in many parts of Scotland. Indeed, these are all examples of Scots according to the Scots Online Dictionary, the latter of which is a valid source in the field of Scots.\(^{128}\) When I asked participant A about her use of Glaswegian, she stated that it was participant B who had influenced her speech, as she had been married to him since she was a young woman. Thus participant A was inferring that participant B’s code of Glaswegian Scots was not her code and therefore not indicative of her socio-economic status. As such, she was implying that her ‘natural’ code of ‘modern’ ‘ordinary’ and not ‘broad’ Glaswegian Scots highlighted her higher economic status compared to participant B (see Macaulay, 1977). I did not know participant A before she was married and so it is difficult to ascertain whether she has been influenced by participant B’s ‘broad’ code or not, however it may be the case that participant A has always spoken in this way but is also ‘unaware’ of this aspect of her Scots code. Macafee’s (2000) caveat to researchers, where she warns of the difficulties of researching Scots due to the perceptions of its speakers, is again pertinent here.

Participant A went on to state that people who spoke ‘broad’ ‘modern’ Glasgow were, ‘‘awful broad’, ‘she’s awful common’ – common is poorly spoken, tarty dressed or poorly dressed – what modern people would call a chav’ (PA, T). She also said, ‘[a]dults thought the only way to gain status was to go against your heritage and speak the Queen’s English’ (AA, PA, Qu5) and this was done to avoid being ‘common’. However, despite adopting the ‘Queen’s English’, participant A

\(^{128}\) See http://www.scots-online.org/dictionary/
continued to use Glaswegian in interviews with myself, demonstrating her misperceptions with regards the Scots code she employed.

Participant A stated too, ‘[o]n television they had a, ‘toffee ball in their mouth’ (PA, T). Places of institutional authority also included the media in Scotland, where ‘[P]olite English’, Scottish Standard English or ‘heritage’ Scots was employed. Therefore, to employ Standard English or Scottish Standard English was to arguably associate oneself with power and align with, “the dominance of the capitalist class and the subordination of the working class” (Fairclough, 1989: p57).

In contrast, participant B lived within an environment of relative deprivation; as he discusses above, they were ‘too busy working and putting food on the table’ (AA, PB, Qu9). He was more concerned with employing his ‘native tongue’, Glaswegian, in order to, ‘integrate in the social group’ of his local environment in Govan and Easterhouse. He did not consistently distance himself from his code of Scots and the socio-economic status it denoted, as participant A and her family did. He stated, ‘only put on the airs when we were in school or if I was at a board meeting – if I spoke polite in the street they would say ‘why are you speaking like that?’ ’ (PB, T).

For participant B, to alienate himself from his ‘broad’ ‘modern’ Glaswegian Scots code, ‘to put on the airs’, would have been to isolate himself from his community. The notion of community and collectiveness in Scotland is strong; Kellas states there has been, “a steady growth to the position today in which national consciousness is to be found throughout Scottish society” (p119). Tonnis’ (1887) Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft is therefore pertinent here. In a deprived area neighbours might have
found it necessary to support each other more. *Gemeinschaft* or ‘community’ describes the individual’s integration and responsibility within a community. *Gesellschaft* or ‘society’ however refers to the individual and their particular concerns that come above their ‘community’. Durkheim’ (1893) *Division of Labour* developed Tonnies’ work towards notions of mechanical and organic solidarity.¹²⁹ Therefore, to act as if in a *Gesellschaft* would have been a poor tactic for participant B. He would have been rejecting the working-class community and Scottish collectiveness that he most probably relied upon. Conn, our protagonist in the opening chapter to this thesis, also resists betraying his working-class community by staying true to his ‘broad’ Glaswegian code, despite his teacher’s imminent chastisement. For participant B then, just like Conn, it was fruitful to seek covert prestige in his ‘guttural’ code and thus, acceptance by his community.

To continue, in contrast participant A, living in a more prosperous neighbourhood, may have competed with her neighbours to help distance herself from her working-class background and demonstrate her increasing social status. As participant A stated: ‘[t]he family across the street would use slang; they would be looked down upon’. Participant A still wished to allude to her ‘Scottishness’ however, a need to acknowledge a Scottish collectiveness perhaps. She did so by, ‘pay[ing] a kind of homage to your heritage by using [Scottish] words or phrases that have survived’ (AA, PA, Qu2); these words were ‘heritage’ Scots, which held status in the Scottish education system. Therefore participant A could remain a member of the Scottish collective by employing ‘heritage’ Scots, however she managed to elude being, ‘looked down upon’, as she also avoided using ‘broad’ ‘modern’ Glaswegian. Indeed,

we can appreciate from Trudgill’s (1974) study of language differentiation in Norwich that it is more common for women to align to a code of speech that has overt prestige, rather than men. Therefore, it is not surprising that participant A avoided ‘broad’ Glaswegian.

Generally, participant B did and appears to still have a more secure relationship with his ‘native tongue’ than participant A. Again this concurs with Trudgill’s (1974) research. Although participant B complied to the institutional demand for Standard English, he also recognised that Scots had covert prestige (see Labov, 1966 for example) or ‘insider’ ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) in his own context. Participant B stated that it is, ‘shorthand for people’s feelings’ (AA, PB, Qu6) and was, ‘the language people spoke in the street’ (PB, T). Therefore it had agency in his speech community (see Foucault, 1980, 1981).

As I mention above, Macaulay’s (1977) work, and indeed Macaulay and Trevelyan (1973)’s study, are relevant to the pilot study data. I discuss this study in depth here, rather than within my literature review in chapter 2, as Macaulay’s (1977) work is particularly relatable to my pilot study and the Glaswegian Scots my two pilot study participants employ. Therefore by including a short discussion of Macaulay’s (1977) work in this section, I allow the reader to immediately appreciate the comparisons I draw between my own data and Macaulay’s (1977).

Macaulay (1977) conducted a Labovian-type study of the stratification of language in Glasgow (see Fig. 4.1.1. below and also Macafee, 1983). Macaulay (1977) found that
class IV participants: “semi-skilled and unskilled manual” (Macafee, 1983: p13), utilised the linguistic variants the study chose to focus on, such as the use of a glottal stop, far more than class I participants: “professional and managerial” (Macafee, 1983: p13). Macaulay (1978) believed this was indication enough of a, “relatively stable, socially stratified speech community” (p139) at that time.

Further Labovian-type studies of Glasgow would help to confirm the reliability of Macaulay’s findings (see Milroy, 1980 and Romaine, 1980). Nevertheless, Macaulay’s research also discovered that females utilised such phonological variants less than males. In class II, “white-collar, intermediate non-manual” (Macafee, 1983: p 13), little use of the glottal stop was most prevalent. Females scored nearer to class I above in their use of the variants, and males were closer to class III below, “skilled manual” (Macafee, 1983: p13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>III/IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4.1.1. Macaulay’s (1977) Glasgow Study Results: raw figures (reproduced from Macafee, 1983)

Interestingly participant A worked as a secretary (class II) and participant B was an electrical and mechanical engineer (class III) (see Macaulay, 1977). The outcomes of the pilot study, with regards the differing codes participant A and B employed, echoes Macaulay’s (1977) results. As we know participant A generally adopted Scottish

---

The origins of the classifications are not clear but seem to have been drawn from governmental references to social stratification at that time.

---
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Standard English, ‘heritage’ Scots or even ‘ordinary’ Glaswegian. Participant B mostly utilised the Scots code of his working-class speech community: ‘broad’ ‘modern’ Glaswegian.

Therefore, if we consider the data above and also Macaulay’s (1997) research, it is reasonable to suggest that the participants’ speech appeared stratified according to their socio-economic status in Glasgow during the 1940-50s. It also clear that participant A and B chose to utilise differing codes of Scots in particular settings; participant A arguably chose her more formal code of Scots, or ‘heritage’ Scots, in order to gain status. Participant B avoided using his ‘broad’ Scots code in the ‘board room’ but chose to use it ‘in the street’ to ‘fit in’ to his community.

4.6.a. Links between Scots Usage, Gender and Religion

For participant A, employing ‘broad’ ‘modern’ Glaswegian not only risked being considered as lower-class, ‘common’, but also perhaps morally suspect, if we consider Gordon’s, (1997) study. Gordon (1997) suggests that middle-class women deliberately utilise a prestigious code to avoid moral stigma. She posits that women who employ a less prestigious code are often considered to be sexually promiscuous. Gordon supports her hypothesis with an attitudinal empirical study of private school children’s attitudes to three differing codes of speech in New Zealand. The codes were labelled as: “cultivated, general and broad” (p52) and were all spoken by females. The woman who spoke ‘broad[ly]’ was considered to have, “the lowest intelligence, the lowest family income, and [be] the most likely to smoke and be promiscuous” (p60). Her code was an indicator of low social status (Gordon, 1997). Gordon (1997) also supported her hypothesis by exploring the phenomenon that
language itself is gendered. As discussed above, scholars such as Trudgill (1972, 1974, 1983) have also documented that women within class-based societies often employ the prestige or standard forms of a code to gain status (Gordon, 1997). Participant A explained that when in her teens and twenties, sexual promiscuity was considered to be shameful. She paralleled Gordon’s (1997) study by stating, ‘common is poorly spoken, tarty dressed or poorly dressed’.

In addition, there were political associations in adopting certain codes of Glaswegian. The tensions between Catholics and Protestants in the west coast of Scotland are well documented. Being Catholic or Protestant often includes adopting inherent identities, categorised by Celtic and Rangers football team colours, where in Glasgow one lives and so on. The association of Catholic people with low socio-economic status in the west coast of Scotland is historical and was clearly divisively advantageous for many Protestants. Both participant A and B are Protestant.

Presenting my data at the Scottish Educational Research Association conference a few years ago, a member of the audience suggested that my work could be regarded as covertly anti-Catholic. In Ireland, Scots is associated with Protestantism (see Craith, 2001) and from the member of the audience’s description, this Irish Scots (Ulster Scots or Ullans) was immersed in heritage, Robert Burns and so on, again associated with Protestantism. If similar differences between the Catholic and Protestant Scots codes existed when participant A and B were growing up in Glasgow, employing not

---

131 See Meyerhoff, 2006 and Thomas and Wareing, 1999 for further discussions on this topic.
132 The polemics surrounding this debate are many and complex (see Cameron and Coates, 1989; Chambers, 1992 and Gal, 1978). As such Trudgill (1983) later adapted his stance to include newer explanations for women’s use of overtly prestigious codes of speech (Gordon, 1997).
only a working-class code but one associated with Catholics may have caused participant A further difficulties, such as conflict within her own Protestant community. Although Macafee (1983) states that Macauley’s (1977) research “produced no evidence of differentiation between the speech of Catholics … and Protestants” (p14), it would be an area worthy of further study, as it may add to the field of Scots and Irish studies; unfortunately however it is beyond the boundaries of this thesis.\

4.7.a. Scots and Scottish Identity

When asked about Scots and Scottish identity, participant A stated the following:

‘Scots is linked up with the country, the scenery, the courtesy, the culture’ (AA, PA, Qu6), ‘[i]t’s important to me because it’s my language … It’s part of my pride that I’m Scottish … I know Scots is my language’ (AA, PA, Qu8) and, ‘I am proud of it as my heritage’ (AA, PA, Qu1). She also said: ‘if you’re from Scotland you speak Scottish and that’s your identity – the language epitomises everything about you’ (AA, T). Participant B stated: ‘I think the language is a shorthand for people’s feelings – they are very descriptive words – they sound like what they mean’ (AA, PB, Qu6) and, ‘Scots language is important to your identity … it’s important to being Scottish’ (PB, T).

Participant A suggested that Scots is a language of ‘heritage’. She linked its ‘heritage’ to her Scottish identity. The Tns-bmr (2010b) survey echoes this theme where 88% of its participants agreed that Scots, “plays an important part in our history and heritage” (p22). Participant A also stated: ‘I know Scots is my language’.

135 The case of Northern Ireland is a useful comparison (see Craith, 2001 and also Chris Gilligan: http://westscotland.academia.edu/ChrisGilligan for writings on the Northern Irish situation).
We understand from above that when participant A referred to Scots as being her ‘heritage’, it seems that she was discussing Older Scots (see Jones, 1997a) as being what she regarded as Scots and not a modern Scots code. Participant A said that this ‘heritage’ code, ‘is linked up with the country, the scenery, the courtesy, the culture’ (AA, PA, Qu6); she added, ‘you speak Scottish and that’s your identity’ and, ‘it epitomises everything about you’. 86% of Tns-bmrb (2010b) participants also indicated that, “Scots is a valuable part of our culture and identity” (p22). Although hesitant of its language status, participant A was definite and ‘proud’ of the intrinsic role Scots language plays as part of her Scottish identity.

For participant A, viewing the Scots language as a ‘heritage’ code not only provides it with status, for example in the context of the Scottish education system (see Shoba, 2010), but also romanticises the language, which again gives it an appeal. Scotland is generally regarded to be, before its ‘lowland urbanisation and industrialisation’ (McCrone et al., 1999: p56), a place of myth, legend and romanticism. As discussed in chapter 2, the Highlands of Scotland have historically been instilled with ‘cultural capital’, a romanticized land of the ‘noble savage’ and the playground of the southern English elite (see McCrone et al., 1999). A romantic image of Scotland past, and particularly Highland Scotland, “provided a ready made identity for lowland Scotland … under the influence of the Romantic movement, the Highlands offered something distinctive and exotic” (ibid.:p56). Participant A stated Scots is, ‘Old fashioned. Out dated’ (AA, PA, Qu1), a ‘heritage’ code therefore that is also, ‘linked up with the country, the scenery, the courtesy, the culture’. Participant A places the Scots code in the past with the romanticised ‘scenery’ and ‘culture’ of Scotland (see McCrone et al.,

136 See http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2013/aug/10/scotland-land-rights
1999) and consequently she imbues it, and therefore by proxy herself, with ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986).

Participant B stated that Scots is, ‘important to being Scottish’. Again the Tns-bmrb (2010b) parallels these comments when 81% of participants agreed that, “Scots is an important aspect of our identity in my part of Scotland” (p22). Participant B also said that the, ‘language is a shorthand for people’s feelings – they are very descriptive words – they sound like what they mean’. McClure (2009) states that Scots, “is an expressive medium of remarkable potential” (p61) and, “a mark of distinctive identity of the Scottish people” (p69). Mackay Brown (1972) exemplifies in his novel *Greenvoe* participant B’s suggestion that Scots has the capacity to express the Scottish experience:

> A simply lovely morning’, announced Miss Fortin Bell. ‘She’s coming. That must be her now.’ She spoke as if she was shouting into a gale. (The islanders could never understand why the gentry spoke in such heroic voices – their own was slow and wondering, like water lapping among stones.) (p15).

Although the two participants in the pilot study differ in perceptions of Scots, they appear to agree on the importance of Scots as a valuable part of their identity. Participant A stated, ‘if you’re from Scotland you speak Scottish and that’s your identity’ (AA, T). Participant B said, ‘Scots language is important to your identity … it’s important to being Scottish’ (PB, T). The dichotomy in the pilot study participant responses regarding the ambiguous status of Scots and yet its important role in Scottish identity is again paralleled in the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study. When asked, “[h]ow often / much, if at all, do you yourself speak Scots” (p8), only 20% stated “[a] lot” (p8). However, when asked if “Scots is a valuable part of [their] culture and identity” (p22), 86% of participants agreed.
4.8.a. Summary

Many questions surrounding Scots in Scotland and in Scottish schools were raised whilst conducting this pilot study. The research offered emerging themes with the potential for further examination in my main data sets. The central themes raised here included the selective use of Scots according to the socio-economic context and ‘capital’ of the speaker and also links between Scots usage and the context of the speaker.

In the following chapter I analyse results from the staff focus group interviews, deriving from school A and B, firstly by conducting a content analysis of the results and following this, a thematic analysis of same.
CHAPTER 4: Data Analysis and Discussion

Part 2: Main Data Analysis - Staff Focus Groups

4.1.b. Introduction

In this section I present a content analysis of the staff focus group interviews in school A and B. As discussed in detail in chapter 3, I create a quantified overview of the main emerging ‘categories’ (see Graneheim and Lundman, 2004). Similar to the pilot study, I also provide a qualitative thematic analysis of the staff focus group data, identifying repeated themes therein (Ryan and Bernard, 2003). In adopting different analytical approaches, I demonstrate the broad range of themes raised by staff. To add, I draw from the pilot study data analysis in part 1 of this chapter, the 2010 National Survey of Teacher Attitudes to Scots Language in Curriculum for Excellence, the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study and Shoba’s (2010) work as relevant comparisons to my staff focus group data analysis.

4.2.b. Content Analysis of Data

As discussed in chapter 3, there were 4 staff in each focus group and there were two groups altogether, one group in school A and one in school B. The questions I asked staff in their focus groups were semi-structured. I knew I wanted to gather from staff their thoughts on the status of Scots, its place in schools and the implications of this. These related to my key research questions (see chapter 1 introduction). I left the delivery of my interview questions relatively open, as this enabled me to pitch my questions in a manner that was appropriate to each focus group in school A and B. In school A I asked:

- ‘Do you think Scots exists, do you think it’s a language in its own right?’
• ‘[H]ow do you feel about … Scots throughout society [and] in the Curriculum for Excellence as well?’

• ‘[T]here’s not a standard [in Scots], so one spelling could be different to another spelling so … there’s implications [for schools]… what [do] the rest of you think?’

In school B I asked:

• ‘[D]o you think Scots is a language in its own right?’

• ‘[t]he Scottish Government are trying to promote the use of Scots in institution like the institution of Education and are aiming to promote it in schools. So what are your thoughts on that?

• ‘So it’s the implications for schools. Just wondered what your thoughts would be ‘?137

My questions differed slightly from school A to B, as I pitched them according to the atmosphere of the group and their apparent openness to discuss such issues. School A’s focus group appeared quite serious regarding the meeting and so my questions were very straightforward and factual. Focus group A was more relaxed and jovial when they gathered for the meeting and so my questions were perhaps more informal, in fitting with the mood. The discussions with both focus groups were productive and so I did not need to ask many further questions to prompt interesting responses.

As discussed in chapter 3, I firstly conducted a content analysis of my staff focus group data. The pie chart in Fig. 4.2.1. illustrates the weightings of the different categories that arose from my content analysis. In chapter 3 I explained that, ‘meaning units’ are, ‘the constellations of words or statements that relate to the same

137 See appendix B for staff focus group semi-structured interviews.
central meaning” (Graneheim and Lundman’s, 2004: p106). I counted how many times each ‘meaning unit’ was repeated in the data; I then coded, condensed and grouped the ‘meaning units’ with similar content to create ‘categories’ (see Graneheim and Lundman, 2004) and gave an overall classification for each category. The ‘categories’ (ibid.) helped to produce the themes, which have emerged through my thematic analysis of the data sets.  

![Content analysis of staff focus group semi-structured interview responses (categories), Schools A and B](image)

Fig. 4.2.1. Content analysis of staff focus group semi-structured interview responses, Schools A and B

---

138 See appendix B for a table of the collated codes, categories and themes from staff focus groups.
I discuss the overarching themes from the staff interviews in more detail below. Here however I briefly consider those initial content analysis categories that emerged from the data from both school A and B and which received the highest scores of ‘meaning units’ (indicated numerically in Fig. 4.2.1); in doing so I examine some of the actual ‘meaning units’, the verbatim quotes from staff, which created these categories (these are considered in more detail below in my qualitative analysis of staff responses). As can be seen in Fig. 4.2.1, the top four categories are: ‘Issues and conflicts surrounding teachers / English teachers implementing Scots in L1, Standard English speaking classrooms’, ‘Status of Scots’, ‘Scots lexis and syntax’ and ‘Defining language’.

In Fig. 4.2.1, we can see that 23 ‘meaning units’ were created from participant responses that formed the category: ‘Issues and conflicts surrounding teachers / English teachers implementing Scots in L1, Standard English speaking classrooms’. I include interesting ‘meaning units’ from this category below. Staff did not appear to realise my distinction of ‘heritage’ and ‘modern’ Scots, and this is not surprising for reasons discussed in previous chapters, such as the lack of knowledge Scots speakers and non-speakers alike possess regarding the Scots language; thus I refer to staff responses as being in relation to Scots per se, unless stated otherwise. Again we are reminded of Macafee’s (2000) caveat that Scots and its differing codes are largely unrecognised and misunderstood in Scotland. I ‘anonymise’ participants by indicating their sex and school (school A or B = a or b respectively) only. Again, as with data in part 4.1., I highlight in bold the most engaging or revealing sections of each ‘meaning unit’: 
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• a lot of people, sort of, in education are **uncomfortable with**

  **giving the language that status** – that its okay to use it in the
  formal essay *(male 3a)*

• But it’s also very important that pupils know about **appropriacy**
  *(female 3b)*

• people would have to learn English … **Standard English as a**
  **foreign language** *(male 2a)*

• but certainly **we would have to re-educate ourselves partly**
  *(male 2a)*

It seems that staff were ‘uncomfortable’ in providing Scots with ‘status’ similar to that of, say, Standard English. These comments resonate with our understanding that the Scottish education system did much to eradicate Scots from its classrooms, believing that Scots was a ‘corrupt’ form of Standard English (see Bailey, 1987 or Matheson and Matheson, 2000 for example). Participant A from the pilot study echoed this with her comment: ‘[d]idn’t use [Scots] in the classroom – it was just modern English you used’ *(AA, PA, Qu2)*. Arguably, as a result of this legacy, it is of little surprise that staff was concerned with the ‘appropriacy’ of Scots in schools. Staff responses here suggest that they did not regard Scots as a prestige code.

To add, from these qualitative responses it appears that staff thought Scots might be implemented in schools as an L1, as they believed that they may have to teach Standard English ‘as a foreign language’. As such, staff thought they needed to be ‘re-educated’. This echoes results in the 2010 *National Survey of Teacher Attitudes to Scots Language in Curriculum for Excellence*, where 33% of primary teachers and 38% of secondary teachers were, “insecure” *(2010: p8)* when asked about their,
“knowledge of the history and literature of the Scots language” (ibid.). Indeed, from this survey one of the key recommendations was, “providing and coordinating a broad range of high quality Scots language CPD training” (ibid.: p2) for teachers.

Staff also provided ‘meaning units’ for the category: ‘Issues and conflicts surrounding teachers / English teachers implementing Scots in L1, Standard English speaking classrooms’ that included:

- perhaps **only** [teaching Scots] **with those who are more able to cope with a variety of languages** (male 1a)

- **It’s often who we would see as less able are actually able to ..**
  
  we saw it today when we did a [Scots] translation exercise and **one of the less able in the class got it straight off** (male 3a)

These comments suggest that staff differed in their opinions of which children would benefit from Scots. Some thought ‘more able’ children would ‘cope’ with Scots, whereas other staff believed the ‘less able’ would excel in the code. 53% respondents of the 2010 National Survey believed Scots, “engaged and motivated children” (p10) and 46% felt it would, “produce confident individuals and responsible citizens” (ibid.); however all, “respondents clearly indicated that that they felt Scots added to the school experience for children” (ibid.). From these focus group staff responses and results from the 2010 National Survey above, it seems that my staff focus groups were generally open to the idea of Scots in schools but they obviously had some reservations, whereas the 2010 National Survey respondents were perhaps more positive regarding Scots in schools.
Lastly, female 3b included the following ‘meaning unit’ for this category: I think it’s very important to teach Scots, because it’s part of the history and culture of Scotland (female 3b). From this it seems that some staff thought Scots was an ‘important’ ‘part of the history and culture of Scotland’ and this echoes results from the pilot study where, for example, participant A stated that Scots is: ‘linked up with the country, the scenery, the courtesy, the culture’ (AA, PA, Qu6). The Tns-bmrub (2010b) survey also repeats this theme, as 88% of its participants agreed that Scots, “plays an important part in our history and heritage” (p22).

Staff were specifically concerned with the ‘status of Scots’ (see Fig. 4.2.1.). Although this was raised within the meaning units for category: ‘issues and conflicts surrounding teachers / English teachers implementing Scots in L1, Standard English speaking classrooms’, enough ‘meaning units’ (18) arose on this topic to enable me to create a separate category: ‘Status of Scots’ (SS). Staff also produced sufficient ‘meaning units’ to allow me to create the categories: ‘Scots lexis and syntax’ (SLS) and ‘Defining language’ (DL) in equal proportions (12 ‘meaning units’ raised for each). I explore some of the ‘meaning units’ raised for these three categories here. I bring examples of ‘meaning units’ from each of these categories together, as they relate to one another:

- we are always aware that we’re using specifically Scots words (male 2a)

- here we’ve got just the odd sort of dialect word, like you say ‘Aye’ and ‘You ken’ (female 3b)
There appeared to be some disagreement amongst staff regarding whether Scots words were used to any extent or not. Certain staff employed ‘specifically Scots words’, such as ‘aye’ (yes) and ‘ken’ (know), whereas others said they utilised the ‘odd sort of dialect word’, which were, ironically, most likely to have also been Scots. This result could have been region specific; in chapter 2 Fig. 2.1. ‘Scots speakers by region’ outlines the differing codes of Scots employed throughout Scotland. It is possible however that the participants did use Scots, whether they thought it to be a dialect of Standard English or not, but were oblivious of this. Indeed, that staff considered ‘specifically Scots words’ to be different from a ‘dialect’ word suggests that they were unaware what Scots is. This is a convincing analysis particularly when we consider Macafee’s (2000) caveat that many Scots speakers are ignorant of their own tongue. As participant A from the pilot study stated, ‘[y]ou selectively use it but in an unconscious way’ (AA, PA, Qu3). To add, “two thirds (67%)” of the Tns-bmr (2010b) study, “agree[d] that their use of Scots is sub-conscious; that they are really not aware of speaking it” (p15). Indeed, staff were very unsure of what Scots was: ‘[i]s there a Scots language?’; one quite rightly pointed out that it ‘depends how you define a language’.  

- Are we talking about a…a distinct separate language, or…? Is it several variants (Laughter)? Is there a Scots language? (male 2a)
- it depends how you define a language (female 3b)
- It’s just different accents that we hear at the minute, not the traditional (male 1b)
To summarise, I have briefly considered some of the ‘meaning units’ from the top content analysis categories: ‘Issues and conflicts surrounding teachers / English teachers implementing Scots in L1, Standard English speaking classrooms’, ‘Status of Scots’, ‘Scots lexis and syntax’ and ‘Defining language’ (see Fig. 4.2.1. above). The following sections consider the content analysis results in further detail; they identify the main emerging themes that arise from the qualitative data originating from said categories.

4.3.b. Theme - The Status of Scots

Various themes become apparent in the participants’ responses to the staff focus group interview questions, when the data is thematically analyzed beyond an initial content analysis (see Fig. 4.2.1.). It is clear that said themes relate to the categories that emerged from the content analysis above. Below I highlight particular phrases in bold, as they go towards creating repeated themes that emerge from the data. The status of Scots as a language is not only a category in the content analysis of the staff focus group data but is also a reoccurring theme in the staff data that I firstly wish to consider.

My initial questions to both focus groups were: ‘Do you think Scots exists, do you think it’s a language in its own right’ (school A) / ‘[D]o you think Scots is a language in its own right?’ (school B). This question aimed to discover participants’ attitudes regarding Scots as a language. In school A female 2a, a Teacher of English, responded to my question with: ‘I think very much so. I think it’s alive in the playground, it’s alive in the classroom’. However, her colleagues were more hesitant; they questioned what Scots was. Male 2a, a foreign languages teacher, said:
‘Are we talking about a … a distinct separate language, or a variant of the language, or …? Is it several variants (Laughter)? Is there a Scots language?’ and, ‘Even though vocabulary might be different in parts and we are always aware that we’re using specifically Scots words, does it necessarily still make it a different language?’ Female 2a’s response was certainly unlike her colleagues’, however being an English teacher, she may have been more aware of Scots as a language than the other staff participants. Indeed, her colleagues’ responses were not surprising when Macafee (2000) suggests that the majority of people in Scotland are uninformed regarding the Scots language.

In school B a comparable sense of ambivalence arose in response to my first question. Indeed, staff began to define the code themselves. Male 1b, a Teacher of Geography and originally from Yorkshire, stated: ‘What are we classing as being Scots? Because I’m not exactly sure of what that is’. Female 2b, an administrative assistant, said: ‘Proper Scottish or just the accents … I think it’s just an accent’ and male 1b replied with: ‘Yes, I’d agree with that. It’s just different accents what we hear at the minute, not the traditional’. Unlike female 2a, Male 2b, another Teacher of English, commented: ‘I think it’s gotten too diluted’. Female 2b stated: ‘True Scots is a bit of Robbie Burns’.

As the above data demonstrates, there was some uncertainty regarding the status and definition of Scots as a language. Bar male 1b, all staff are Scottish, yet they struggled to define the status of Scots as a language. This resonates with some of the contradictory pilot study responses I discuss in part 1 of chapter 4. For example participant A from the pilot study stated that Scots is ‘[o]ld fashioned. Out dated’
(AA, PA, Qu1) but yet she, ‘used it in the home, in clubs and organisations’ (AA, PA, Qu4). A similar inconsistency is found in the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study, where 85% of participants stated that they spoke Scots, whilst 62% believed Scots ‘is not relevant’ (ibid.).

Staff focus group participants attempted to define Scots as being ‘diluted’, an ‘accent’ and it was clear that some did not wish to give it language status: ‘specifically Scots words, does it necessarily still make it a different language?’. Yet these same teachers believed that, ‘true Scots’ exists as a Scots of ‘heritage’, as they stated that, ‘[t]rue Scots is a bit of Robbie Burns’. As such, it appears from responses that participant staff generally believed ‘modern’ Scots did not hold much status as a language and did not have a great deal of ‘capital’, at least ‘cultural capital’, in the classroom (see Bourdieu, 1986). This is particularly clear when we also consider responses above where teachers were, ‘uncomfortable with giving the language that status’ and were concerned with its, ‘appropriacy’ in the classroom. However, staff’s answers also implied that ‘heritage’ Scots did have status as a language, as it was, ‘[p]roper Scottish’.

Therefore, despite the The European Union Charter for Minority Languages, recognising Scots as a minority language in 2000 and regardless of all the European Union Minority Language Committee’s involvement in encouraging the development of Scots policy and practice in Scottish schools, in 2010 my focus group staff participants were still unsure of the existence of Scots and what its definition actually was. A ‘heritage’ rather than ‘modern’ notion of Scots prevailed in staff’s minds: ‘[t]rue Scots is a bit of Robbie Burns’ and ‘modern’ Scots was simply an ‘accent’,
although arguably they were not completely aware of the distinction between ‘modern’ and ‘heritage’ Scots (see Macafee, 2000). Again we are reminded of the legacy of marginalization that Scots has endured from the 18th century onwards, particularly in Scottish schools (see Bailey, 1987), a legacy that seems to prevail in the Scottish classroom if we consider staff’s responses here.

As we know from the pilot study, ‘heritage’ Scots has ‘cultural capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986). For staff focus groups in school A and B, ‘heritage’ Scots could very well be regarded as, “highly valued as part of their heritage, perhaps most of all by the middle classes” (Shoba, 2010: 390). Indeed, participant A from the pilot study linked her Scottish identity to ‘heritage’ Scots and 88% of participants from the Tns-bmr (2010b) survey echoed this theme when they agreed that Scots, “plays an important part in our history and heritage” (p22). For participant A, viewing the Scots language as a ‘heritage’ code provided it with status and the romance of Scotland past. Perhaps for many staff in school A and B focus groups Scots is, “also a language of the past, linked to a material world far removed from modern Scotland” (Shoba, 2010: p390). Unfortunately staff participants from school A and B did not seem to appreciate that ‘heritage’ Scots, although it has ‘capital’, is the foundation for the pedigree and standing of ‘modern’ Scots as a language in its own right (see Kay, 2006). Once more we are aware that such attitudes regarding the status of Scots link to notions of ‘modern’ Scots being ‘vulgar’ and lacking in ‘capital’ (see Matheson and Matheson, 2000 and Shoba, 2010); again this is arguably resulting from the 18th century legacy to eradicate ‘scotticisms’ from Scottish classrooms (see Bailey, 1987).
4.4.b. Theme - Scots and ‘Capital’

A second theme that also emerges from the staff focus group data is the link between Scots and ‘capital’ (see Bourdieu, 1986). In this brief section I wish to explore this theme; it relates to some of the issues raised in section 4.3.b. above.

Female 2a stated of modern Scots: ‘I think it’s alive in the playground, it’s alive in the classroom’. Yet her colleagues did not support her appreciation of ‘modern’ Scots. This is arguably because learning ‘heritage’ Scots in the classroom rather than the ‘modern’ Scots of the playground would be, “uncontroversial in that it reflects wider social values and educationally approved goals” (Shoba, 2010: p390).

Shoba’s (2010) suggests that, “the key to understanding this ‘schizoglossic’ (Haugen. 1972) contradiction lies in the Scottish cultural tradition of celebrating Scots literary achievements of the past, primarily and often exclusively the poetry of Robert Burns” (p390). Indeed, the Scottish ‘slang’, the apparent ‘diluted’ (male 2b) Scots of today’s classrooms, for example ‘aw’, ‘am’ and ‘ma’ (all, I am, my) of the west of Scotland, spoken by for example participant A in the pilot study, are arguably illustrations of ‘modern’ Scots but they tend to be mistaken for “bad English” (Shoba, 2010: p389 and see McClure 1988). Indeed as we know, staff participants in schools A and B did not recognise what Scots actually is: ‘[i]s there a Scots language?’. They did not recognize ‘diluted’ Scots, i.e. ‘modern’ Scots to be a language.

It seems that other forms of Scots lexis however, such as ‘shoogle’ (to shake), ‘droukit’ (soaked), ‘trauchelt’ (exhausted and weary) and ‘scunnered’ (sickened) or
male 3a suggestions of: ‘tattie’ (potato) and ‘wee’ (small) (male 3a),\textsuperscript{139} or even the vocabulary of Robert Burns for example is, “approved of – cherished even – across social classes” (Shoba, 2010: p390); interestingly though the, “‘old Scots words’ are better known among the middle classes” (ibid.: p390 and see also Macaulay, 1977 and Macafee, 2003).

In acknowledging ‘heritage’ Scots but questioning ‘modern’ Scots, arguably some members of the staff focus group unwittingly linked Scots with social class (see Macaulay, 1977). This is clear when they discussed issues such as the ‘appropriacy’ (female 3b) of ‘modern’ Scots for example or only acknowledged Scots as being ‘[p]roper Scottish’, i.e., the ‘heritage’ Scots of the middle-classes in Scotland (Shoba, 2010). Participant A from the pilot study also demonstrated her appreciation of Scots as an indicator of social class when she stated, ‘[a]dults thought the only way to gain status was to go against your heritage and speak the Queen’s English’ (AA, PA, Qu5). Likewise, in the Tns-bmrb (2010b) survey, “some have negative perceptions of Scots as a language” (p2). 31% believed it was not “important that Scots is used in Scotland these days” (ibid.) because it was thought to be antiquated or “inferior to English” (ibid.).

We know from Macaulay’s (1977) work that there appears to be a link between Scots and social-class. We have seen from my pilot study and such surveys as the Tns-bmrb (2010b) that participants indirectly highlight this in their acknowledgement of ‘heritage’ Scots and their rejection of ‘modern’ Scots. I suggest that many of the staff in the focus groups from school A and B were reticent regarding Scots in the

\textsuperscript{139} See The Scots Online Dictionary at: http://www.scots-online.org/dictionary/search_scots.asp
classroom due to the link between Scots and social class. Only female 2a transcended such an unfortunate connection by acknowledging its modern day existence ‘in the playground … in the classroom’.

4.5.b. The Marginalisation of Scots in the Scottish Classroom

A third theme that emerges from the staff focus group data is the marginalisation of Scots in the Scottish classroom. I asked school A participants, ‘how do you feel about … Scots throughout society [and] in the Curriculum for Excellence as well?’ and ‘there’s not a standard [in Scots] … there’s implications … what [do] the rest of you think?’ and school B participants, ‘the Scottish Government are trying to promote the use of Scots in institution like the institution of Education and are aiming to promote it in schools. So what are your thoughts on that?’ and, ‘it’s the implications for schools … what your thoughts would be?’ (see appendix B). As we know from above, participants questioned the status of Scots but they were hesitant when discussing the place of Scots in the Scottish classroom. The reasons for this I suggest are linked to, historically (see Jones, 1995), the marginalisation of Scots in the classroom and are therefore worth considering separately here.

Some participants did not seem to have in depth knowledge of Scots: ‘[w]hat are we classing as being Scots? Because I’m not exactly sure of what that is’ (male 1b). Again we are reminded of a common thread that has run throughout much of my analysis so far in chapter 4, where some participants are unsure of what Scots actually is; participant A from the pilot study for example considered it as Older Scots, whereas participant B thought of Scots as being ‘slang’. Scots is spoken but not often recognised by its speakers (Macafee, 2000). Once more we can explain this
phenomenon as arguably being the result of the eradication of the Scots language from Scottish classrooms from the 18th century onwards (see Bailey, 1987). Consequently and historically many Scottish children have been told to ‘speak properly and properly meant the Queen’s English’ (AA, PA, Qu5). Therefore, the ‘soul’ and ‘mental individuality’ of the Scots speaker, their psyche, is potentially dislocated, as their ‘soul’ speaks Scots but their mind speaks English (Westermann, cited in Whitehead, 1995: p4). As such, many Scottish people remain ignorant of Scots as a language in its own right; indeed, 64% of Tns-bmrb participants did not see Scots, ‘as a language - it’s more just a way of speaking’ (2010b: p2).

Although female 2a stated that modern Scots was, ‘alive in the playground’, her caveat was that, ‘as soon as you then start to teach it suddenly becomes a totally different story’. Female 2a highlighted here a clear lack of recognition for Scots in the Scottish classroom. She stated: ‘I think as English teachers it’s because the norm is that you have to accept Standard English and that anything other than that is wrong’. Once more we are reminded of the 18th century, “highly organised and influential group of grammarians and linguistic commentators” (Jones, 1995: p1), who aimed to eradicate, “the Scotch method of pronouncing English” (ibid.); it was considered, “a barbaric relic of a backward society and, as such, to be supressed in much the same way as was Erse” (ibid.). Perhaps then what female 2a is describing is the ‘accepted’ modern results of a historical linguistic colonisation of Scots in Scotland and not only for reasons of taste but class too.

As Shoba (2010) suggests, Scottish schools and the middle-classes associate themselves with ‘heritage’ Scots, it having ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) in these
contexts. However, ‘modern’ Scots is ‘barbaric’, ‘Ned speak’, ‘wrong’, something to be scorned and ridiculed, as seen for example in the case of ‘Chewin the Fat’s’ ‘Rab McGlinchy’ (see chapter 2). There is very little place for it in the Scottish classroom. Indeed, male 3a stated when discussing children’s use of Scots in their work:

‘[i]t's always been interesting to me though how we’re allowed to give credit for using non-Standard English ‘for effect’ … a comic effect or a lower-class character or something like that that’s going to use Scots, and that reflects on the status of Scots as a language’.

It seems that ‘modern’ Scots in the Scottish classroom is only acceptable if used for ‘effect’, when utilised to create humour or indicate class. Female 3b also said, ‘it’s also very important that pupils know about appropriacy. So they’ve got standard English that they use in an appropriate situation and they can just switch register’. She compounded the marginalisation of Scots by providing it with little status here; it is not ‘appropriate’, not the ‘norm’, ‘wrong’, only worthwhile if caricaturing the working-class Scot but the ‘norm’ is Standard English and this is preferable.

Male 2a stated of the inclusion of Scots in the classroom, ‘[w]ell I can see the aims and it’s partly laudable, but I personally feel a bit uncomfortable about it’. From female 2a’s comments we can infer that Scot’s lack of status, it’s association with the working-classes, most probably made Male 2a feel ‘uncomfortable’. He continued with, ‘[w]e have got used to the standard language [English] being the language of education … [Scots] would certainly, you know, be a variant of English perhaps, but certainly we would have to re-educate ourselves partly’. Male 2a echoed female 2a’s point that Standard English has been ‘accepted’ in the classroom rather than Scots, by
stating that Scottish teachers have ‘got used to’ it. Unfortunately it seems that Scots has been supplanted, colonised, by Standard English (see Jones, 1995), resulting historically from those ‘grammarians and linguistic commentator’s’ need to emulate the “giddy heights of London Society” (Jones, 1995: p1). Like female 3b, male 2a also marginalised Scots by stating that it is not ‘the language of education’ and he challenged its status as a language in its own right as he considered it to be a ‘variant of English’.

It is also possible that introducing Scots into the Scottish classroom challenges ‘the language of education’ by repositioning the power and agency of the ‘in-group’ Scots speaking students who speak Scots in the ‘playground’ (female 2a) and the ‘out-group’, largely Standard English speaking educationalists (see Bailey, 1987 and Tajfel, 1982) who speak Standard English in the classroom; I discuss this idea in more detail in part 3 of chapter 4. Therefore, it is not surprising that the participant teachers were hesitant in their comments regarding teaching Scots.

Clearly excluding modern Scots, and hence its speakers, from the classroom is not inclusive practice (see Otsuji and Pennycook, 2011). However, some participant teachers did indicate that teaching Scots would not prepare students for the ‘outside’ world where, ‘outside Scotland they’ll be told ‘No that’s wrong’ ‘(male 3a). Sandred’s (1983) study raised similar concerns via data analysed from teacher participants in Edinburgh. Therefore, in order to successfully implement modern and not just ‘heritage’ Scots in the classroom, there is a requirement for the ‘re-education’ (male 2a) of teachers. Indeed, The National Survey of Teacher Attitudes (2010) suggests that teachers should be provided continuing professional development
opportunities for teaching Scots. As male 3a stated however, there needs to be, ‘a wider change in society’ before Scots is accepted in schools and beyond.

To conclude, for some of the staff focus group participants, Scots is a language for ‘comedians’ and the working-classes, such as Rab C. Nesbitt (see McCrone et al., 1999). The thought of teaching Scots made at least one staff participant feel ‘uncomfortable’; it was ‘wrong’ and thus, clearly not regarded as, ‘the language of education’. As discussed in chapter 2, a belief in a mythical egalitarian educational system in Scotland, the ‘lad o’ pairts’ ideal, is generally upheld and revered. Yet, the marginalisation of the lower socio-economic Scots speaker in the classroom, the modern day lad o’ pairts, remains until ‘modern’ Scots speakers are recognised and included in the Scottish classroom (see Bailey, 1987).

4.6.b. More Practical Concerns

In response to my questions: ‘‘there’s not a standard [in Scots], so one spelling could be different to another spelling so … there’s implications [for schools]… what [do] the rest of you think?’ (school A) and, ‘[s]o it’s the implications for schools. Just wondered what your thoughts would be?’, participants were also concerned with the practicalities of implementing Scots in their classrooms. This is reflected in the main content analysis category: ‘Issues and conflicts surrounding teachers / English teachers implementing Scots in L1, Standard English speaking classrooms’ in Fig. 4.2.1. above.

Female 2a stated: ‘if you’re marking any piece of work if you use the word ‘yin’

140 See http://www.theguardian.com/education/2002/nov/21/highereducation.tuitionfees for an interesting article on tuition fees in Scotland compared to those in England and the ‘lad o’ pairts’ myth of the Scottish education system.
you can’t acknowledge that as being okay … that’s where there’s conflict’ and, ‘[i]ts how we can teach it and how we can accept it in the written form … how you recognise all the different variants and dialects within that, and how you actually then standardise … that’ (female 2a). Female 2a’s comments echoed recommendations from The National Survey of Teacher Attitudes (2010). The survey suggests that teachers should be provided continuing professional development opportunities for teaching Scots and there should be “dictionaries and wordlists” (p20). Indeed, comments from the second European Minority Languages Committee of Experts report (2007) also suggested that as there was, “no single standard written form of Scots” (p13), ‘language corpus planning’ was extremely important to establish a canon of Scots; this in turn would help to support Scots in schools (ibid.).

Male 2a suggested that, ‘there’s more than one Scots way of speaking and it needs to define what a language is in the first place before you can really say’. In advance of this however, a standardisation of Scots would be required to take place. Female 2a stated, ‘it’s how we measure and assess literacy … now they’ve pulled the literacy of it back into the English domain it then puts that pressure on accepting the standard form and giving that greater value’; by this female 2a meant that the assessment of literacy is once again the English teacher’s responsibility in Scotland. Therefore it is necessary for a standardised form of Scots to be fully endorsed, in order that teachers can provide it with ‘greater value’ and consistently assess its use in the classroom.

The Scottish Education system’s campaign to rid its students of ‘Scotticisms’ since the 18th century (see Bailey, 1987) has been pervasive. Focus group staff participants’ marginalising attitudes towards Scots in the classroom and comments
such as Standard English being, ‘the language of education’ do not bode well for Scots. The notion that Scots is ‘wrong’ (male 3a), is deeply embedded in the psyche of the Scottish people, when we consider for example the incongruous results from the pilot study, the Tns-bmrb (2010b) survey and Shoba’s (2010) research (see also McClure, 2009).

Scottish schools are now required, albeit in a tokenistic manner (see Scottish Executive, 2004), to re-introduce Scots in the classroom, a point that not all of my staff participants seemed to be aware of. Schools’ role in the marginalisation of Scots may have inadvertently supplied the code and its speakers with ‘covert prestige’. Thus the re-implementation of Scots in the classroom may prove difficult. Many of the participants I worked with in school A and B employed modern Scots to demonstrate their alliance and cohesion to ‘in-group’ (Tajfel, 1982) child Scots speakers.¹⁴¹ When I implemented a ‘Scots to English’ translation activity with secondary 1 (11-12yrs) participant students in school A, during my data collection phase in 2010:

I got the impression that the kids were rejecting the language I was asking them to translate [Scots]. My supervisor had mentioned that perhaps they did speak Scots but that it was so much of their power and identity that they weren’t about to allow a more imposing power, i.e. the education system [which I represented at that point], to dictate what it should be … they might simply use it as a gateway with gatekeepers … to their

¹⁴¹ See chapter 4, part 1 and 3.
community and they were not about to let said powers ‘in’

(Journal, 2nd April, 2010).

Indeed, when the class finished the lesson and were speaking amongst themselves, the target teacher and I could clearly hear them speaking a modern code of Scots (discussion with target teacher, 2nd April, 2010).

This said some students with challenging behaviour were positively engaged in demonstrating their knowledge of Scots, when Scots work was implemented in their classrooms. Interestingly many of these students were boys:

One boy at the front was doing well with the starter [activity] –
I imagined he could be quite challenging and the teacher confirmed this later. However, he was engaged with the task … one boy in particular who, again, seemed to have the potential to be challenging, was coming up with some interesting suggestions … all the boys who I had noticed to be engaged and coming up with good suggestions, also appeared to be pleased with the praise they received and genuinely looked proud, motivated and / or positive about their success

(Journal, 12th April, 2010).

These are issues I investigate further in the next part of chapter 4. However, in answer to my questions to both school A and B staff focus group participants, regarding the implementation of Scots in their classrooms, concerns were raised amongst the participants regarding whether there was a canon of Scots, how Scots would be standardised and how might it be assessed.
4.7.b. Summary

Scottish teachers may face many issues in implementing Scots in their classrooms. The focus group staff participants were uncertain with regards the code, its lexis and syntax, its definition and status (see Fig.4.2.1.). Indeed, some actively marginalized Scots and stated they would feel ‘uncomfortable’ in teaching it. To add, when I taught Scots to school A and B students during my data collection phase in 2010, some students rejected Scots in the classroom, preferring to remain loyal perhaps to its covert status and all this represents. Others engaged with Scots lessons and their challenging behavior decreased.

Regarding Scottish children as potentially bilingual may be the appropriate pedagogical and political response to these issues (see Lo Bianco, 2001). There is a requirement for Scots language policy to support bilingualism in not only the education system but also the varied contexts of Scottish life. However, it is essential for policy makers to consider the duplicitous status of Scots in the minds of its speakers and its compromised power and ‘capital’ (see Bourdieu, 1986), if the implementation of a bilingual programme for Scots in Scottish schools is to take place. Indeed, we may wish to consider more global examples of bilingual programmes in schools before we enter into our own in Scotland (see R. Benton, 1979, 1981; N. Benton, 1987; Boyce, 1992; Chrisp, 1979a; Hohepa, 2000; Ngaha, Web for the case of the Maori language and Sachdev, 1995 regarding the Aboriginal peoples in Canada).

Therefore there are many challenges ahead before Scots has a positive and secure place in Scottish schools and Scotland more widely, particularly when we consider some of the concerns raised in the 2010 Council of Europe Committee of Experts report,¹⁴³ where recommendations for the implementation of Scots had not been successfully addressed in Scotland. In the following part of chapter 4 I analyse the quantitative data collected from school A and B’s participant students.

CHAPTER 4: Data Analysis and Discussion

Part 3: Main Data Analysis: Student Questionnaires

4.1.c. Introduction

In this following chapter 4 I consider the quantitative and qualitative data I collected from the participant students of school A and B via questionnaires, the latter of which included both open and closed questions. Firstly however, as I draw links between my student participant results and the students’ socio-economic contexts, I provide the reader with contextual and socio-economic information regarding each school.

4.2.c. Contextual and Socio-economic Information for School A and B

The case study schools, A and B, are situated on borders, A beside England and B near Ireland; the second border as such could be regarded as being created by the North Atlantic Ocean. Both schools are located in the two largest towns in Dumfries and Galloway, bar Dumfries itself. Dumfries and Galloway has a population of 148000; Dumfries town has 31,600 residents and the two towns of my case study schools comprise of no more than 11000 residents each (scrol, Web),\(^1\) with 8,300 residents in school A’s town and 10,800 residents in school B’s town (D+G online, Web).\(^2\) Both towns are surrounded by farmland. School A had the highest roll (1098) of all secondary schools in Dumfries and Galloway in 2010, closely followed by School A with 989 students (scrol, Web).

School A’s town was originally a market town, which used waterpower to mill grain and spin cotton; lying on a port, it also has a history of shipbuilding. Today many

---


\(^2\) See http://www.dumfries-and-galloway.co.uk/facts/info.htm
residents in the town are employed at a nearby engineering works, a nuclear power station or two substantial food-processing factories (Annan online, Web).\textsuperscript{146} Figures for 2010, when I collected my data, report that 28\% of residents work in manufacturing and 25\% in process, plant and machine operatives. Only 5\% work in professional occupations (Annan Regeneration, Web).\textsuperscript{147} In 2010 there were low crime rates and unemployment and house prices were also low; in this year Dumfries and Galloway Council had designed a plan to foster regeneration in the town (ibid.). The town has a pipe band, a museum, The Solway Robert Burns society and a local rugby and football club, among other societies.

School B’s town is regarded as an old settlement, with a castle that dates back to the 16\textsuperscript{th} century. During the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} centuries, like school A’s town, it hosted a shipbuilding industry and was an established port (D+G online, Web). Today the town has a busy port, with ferries travelling to Belfast. There is a thriving tourist industry, with hotels, bed and breakfast accommodation and caravan and camping sites (ibid.). There is also a golf course used for championships, a curling rink and a local football club. The Galloway Games are held in the town too, where Highland Games are conducted, including music, dancing and tests of strength (ibid.). In addition the town hosts agricultural and horticultural events (ibid.). With regards crime, in 2010 school B’s town, “significantly exceeds the Dumfries and Galloway average on all the measures of alcohol provision and alcohol related harm” (The Galloway Gazette, 10\textsuperscript{th} June 2010, Web).\textsuperscript{148} In the same year there were also concerns of attempted murder, abduction and drug offences including drug dealing in

\textsuperscript{146} See http://www.annan.org.uk/links/index.html
\textsuperscript{147} See http://www.annan.org.uk/downloads/annan_masterplan_report_part1.pdf
\textsuperscript{148} See http://www.gallowaygazette.co.uk/news/local-headlines/alcohol-over-provision-survey-points-to-stranraer-central-1-2961131
the town (BBC News, Web).\textsuperscript{149} House prices in school B’s town have been below the national average in the last five years (Zoopla, Web).\textsuperscript{150}

Deprivation is lower in Dumfries and Galloway compared to a broad range of urban regions in Scotland (Allan, Hunter-Rowe and Houliston, 2010). Dumfries and Galloway is largely rural. In 2010, 9\% of school A students and 13\% of school B students were entitled to free school meals (FSM), compared to the average for the region (secondary school sector) at 10\% and the wider secondary school sector in Scotland at 14\% (Scottish Government 4, Web).\textsuperscript{151}

Dumfries and Galloway has only a 1.5\% share of the most deprived areas in Scotland, compared to Glasgow City, which has 26.8\%.\textsuperscript{152} (Allan, Hunter-Rowe and Houliston, 2010). School A can be considered as having a catchment area that is slightly more affluent than school B’s; school B’s catchment is similar in socio-economic terms to the national average but below the regional average. Both schools are situated in relatively more affluent contexts than some schools in, say, Glasgow City.

Registration entitlement for free school meals is often employed as a measurement of the socio-economic status (SES) of a school student population. Eligibility for free meals is dependent on various factors including applicants receiving Income Support, Income-based Job Seeker’s Allowance or having capital no more than £16000 (at

\textsuperscript{149} See http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-south-scotland-12577658
\textsuperscript{150} See http://www.zoopla.co.uk
\textsuperscript{151} See http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/School-Education/schmeals2010
Allan, et al. (2010) acknowledges that data referring to either individuals or geography alone can be limiting, as this does not provide a wider ‘picture’ of the phenomenon; Hobbs and Vignoles (2007) also question the validity of FSM status in measuring the SES of a school population. However the FSM data referring to school A and B does loosely map on to the findings from Allan, et al.’s (2010) analysis of deprivation in Dumfries and Galloway, as below. To add, as my research adopts a case study design, my results are therefore planned to be specific to limited groups. Therefore FSM is an acceptable indicator to draw on here.

This said, Allan, et al.’s (2010) consideration of deprivation in Dumfries and Galloway, by analysing the Scottish Government Social Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) 2009 data, is even more detailed than data arising from FSM surveys. It incorporates both individual and geographical data, which is important when considering Dumfries and Galloway and its both rural and town populations, and includes individual information that is more in depth than the FSM data. The study encompasses information regarding levels of crime, education, health, housing, access, income and employment. It also includes tax credit data, which the previous SIMD 2006 did not utilise. Therefore, I largely draw from Allan, et al.’s (2010) analysis to further inform my discussion below.

Allan, et al. (2010) geographically split the 2009 SIMD data from the most to least deprived areas. School A lies within Annandale and Eskdale. This region has few
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153 See http://www.adviceguide.org.uk/scotland/benefits_s/benefits_help_if_on_a_low_income_s/help_for_people_on_a_low_income_-_income_support.htm#h_help_for_people_on_a_low_income

154 See http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Education/Schools/HLivi/schoolmeals
deprived quintiles, a quintile being a measurement of deprivation here, and school A resides within one of the least deprived quintiles of the region (see Fig. 4.3.1):
From Allan et al.’s (2010) data, school A is located in a considerably less deprived area than school B. These results correlate with the FSM results for each school above, where school A has 4% less FSMs than school B and where school B has 3% more FSMs than the region of Dumfries and Galloway at large.

4.3.c. Quantitative and Qualitative Results

In April 2010 I visited schools A and B to collect student data. I gave the students in each school the paper questionnaire (I analyse the results of here) before I taught them a lesson on Scots. There were three closed questions in the students’ questionnaires, with question 3 having two sections. The questions were:

---

155 See appendix C for student questionnaire.
1. Do you think you speak Scots, Standard English, a different language or a mixture of Scots and English?
2. Do you think Scots is a language in its own right (yes, no, maybe)?
3a. Do you think Scots should be used in the classroom by students and / or teachers (yes, no, maybe)?
3b. Do you think Scots language and literature lessons should be taught in school (yes / no for each)?

Following each closed question I asked the students to write a qualitative answer to the same question: ‘Can you give reasons for your choice above / choices?’. I sought both quantitative and qualitative data, in order to gain a more in depth representation of the students’ opinions on Scots. The reader will note that the questionnaire also includes questions on Northumbrian; these were incorporated into the questionnaire as I was running a parallel study in Northumberland schools at that time. However, for my thesis I obviously focus on the answers for Scots that the children supplied.

I deliberately refrained from providing the student participants with any information on the differing codes of Scots before they started the questionnaires. I simply asked them to complete the questionnaires to the best of their ability. As far as was possible I wanted to gather their opinion regarding the language they spoke, Scots or otherwise, without me influencing their results by telling them anything about Scots. Some students in school A did ask for further guidance on Scots as they worked on the questionnaires. In my learning journal I kept during the data collection phase from March to May 2010, I wrote: “the kids continued to look unsure and were easily distracted” (Learning Journal, 12th April, 2010, School A) and, “the kids did take a while to do the questionnaire but not as long as it took the ‘school A’ kids’ (Learning
Journal, 13th April, 2010, School B). This was perhaps because, unlike school B, school A students had received no input on Scots from their teacher prior to my visit and therefore, may have been less sure regarding my questions on Scots.

I analyse the data, quantitatively and qualitatively, for each question in the sections below. For the quantitative data I collate in graph form descriptive statistics of the results; I analyse the qualitative responses by searching for repeated themes in the data, as I have done previously in part 1 and 2 of this chapter (see Ryan and Bernard, 2003). I reflect on possible links between the results and the socio-economic context of each school and I also indicate participants’ gender and the school they attend by stating ‘Boy 1a’ or ‘Girl 2b’ for example. I split the data into male and female responses, as this provides interesting comparisons. I highlight in bold phrases in the qualitative data that help to create emerging themes. Lastly I write student responses verbatim to ensure authenticity of participant ‘voice’.

4.4.c. Results for Question 1

Firstly I consider the quantitative results for question one: ‘Do you think you speak Scots, Standard English or a mixture of Scots and English’ (see Fig. 4.3 3.). To remind the reader, on the days I collected the data, school A’s class consisted of 10 male and 6 female students and school B’s class comprised of 13 male and 11 female students; there were 40 student participants altogether.
Bearing in mind the larger numbers in school B, these results are interesting when one considers the socio-economic background of each school. To reiterate, school A is located in a less deprived area than school B (see Figs. 4.3.1. and 2.). School B students, and in particular the boys, specified that they employed Scots to a greater degree than school A students. In contrast many school A students, again in particular the boys, reported that they use Standard English. It appears that the use of Scots could be considered as loosely stratified according to the socio-economic background of each school’s intake. Interestingly 67% of school A and 73% of school B girls favoured a mixture of Scots and English (Scottish Standard English) in their quantitative answers. Combined, 43% of boys from both schools used Scots and a mixture of Scots and English equally, whereas 47% and 70% of girls from both schools used Scots and a mixture of Scots and English respectively. Overall 18 students stated that they used Scots, compared to 13 and 22 students who indicated...
that they used Standard English and a mixture of Standard English and Scots respectively.

I now analyze a number of student qualitative responses for question 1; I draw on the quantitative results to support my discussion. Those students who only spoke Scots largely originated from school B. The 6 students who spoke Standard English alone came from school A. 8 out of the 10 Scots speakers provided the following qualitative responses for their use of Scots; note I highlight parts of their responses in bold, as these support the emerging themes I uncover in the data:

- Because I was born in Scotland (Boy 1a)
- because I was brout up with it (Boy 1b)
- I am Scottish (Boy 2b)
- because I was born in dumfries (Boy 3b)
- My reason is that I talk Scottish slang (Boy 4b)
- Because I am Scottish! (Girl 1b)
- because I have lived in Scotland all my life and I say stuff like ken and doon toon ect (Girl 2b)
- because I was born in Scotland (Girl 3b)

One can see a repeated theme where different students independently employed their nationality or speech community as an explanation for their use of code; for example Boy 1a stated; ‘born in Scotland’ and Boy 2b stated, ‘I am Scottish’. Boy 4b’s use of the phrase ‘Scottish slang’ is also interesting; this boy indicated on the questionnaire that he spoke Scots but in his qualitative answer his ‘reason’ for this was because, ‘I talk Scottish slang’. Participant B in the pilot study also referred to Scots as ‘slang’ and in the Tns-bmr (2010b) survey, 64% of participants did not see Scots, ‘as a
language - it’s more just a way of speaking” (Tns-brmb, 2010b: p2). There are parallels in these differing data sets, which once again suggest that some participants from these different studies did not regard Scots as a language but more ‘a way of speaking’ or ‘slang’.

Those student participants who said they spoke only Standard English also explained this by describing their or their family’s nationality:

- Because I am aridganerily from England (Boy 8a)
- My family and my cousins are all English (Boy 2a)
- Because my mum and dad are from England (Girl 6a)
- Because I speak really different from everyone here because I come from Cambridge (Boy 3a)

Participants’ explanation that their language code was due to their nationality or speech community, echoes results from part 1 of chapter 4, where the female participant in the pilot study, participant A, stated, ‘you [as in one] speak Scottish and that’s your identity’. Participant A said that this ‘heritage’ code, ‘is linked up with the country, the scenery, the courtesy, the culture’ (AA, PA, Qu6); she added, ‘you speak Scottish and that’s your identity’ and, ‘it epitomises everything about you’. 86% of Tns-brmb (2010b) participants also indicated that, “Scots is a valuable part of our culture and identity” (p22). It is reasonable to suggest that some student participants also associated their use of Scots or Standard English not only with their nationality but their national identity too. Indeed, Girl 1b’s exclamation mark: ‘Because I am Scottish!’ implies that the connection is obvious.
From the questionnaires it is interesting that many more students in school B than A stated that they spoke Scots only. It is also noticeable that 6 students in school A indicated that they spoke only Standard English. No student in school B claimed they spoke Standard English on its own. To revisit Allan et al.’s (2010) work, school A is positioned within quintile 4, the least deprived of quintiles in Annandale and Eskdale (see Fig. 4.3.1.). However school B is located in quintile 2, the most socio-economically deprived of all quintiles in Wigtonshire (see Fig. 4.3.2.). Tentative links regarding social-economic status and the use of Scots can be drawn again here, as the participants who claimed to speak modern Scots alone, largely originated from, compared to school A, the lower socio-economic catchment area of school B.

As indicated in the quantitative questionnaire data in Fig. 4.3.3., most of school A’s female participant students spoke Standard English; the next code favoured by the girls in school A was Scottish Standard English. Female participant students in school B largely spoke Scottish Standard English; the largest female participant group in school B thereafter spoke Scots. These outcomes correspond with part 1 and 2 of chapter 4, where identifiable Scots speakers in my different data sets tended to be linked to lower socio-economic contexts (see Macaulay, 1977); to reiterate, school B is located in a lower socio-economic area than school A. To elaborate, participant A from the pilot study came from a slightly more socio-economically stable area than participant B; both participants’ backgrounds were not affluent however but participant A strove to speak Scottish Standard English, whereas participant B spoke ‘modern’ Glaswegian Scots. The boys’ results from the student questionnaires here largely parallel the girls’. In school A the boys favoured Standard English and then
Scottish Standard English, whereas the boys in school B preferred Scots, closely followed by Scottish Standard English.

As said, Scots is often associated with lower socio-economic groups, whereas Scottish Standard English is usually recognised as the code of the middle classes in Scotland (See Shoba, 2010). However, despite it being clear that many of my female participants adhered to codes with prestige, some results from the female students in school B challenge this; 6 female participants in school B spoke Scots compared to only 2 in school A. School B being located in a lower socio-economic area than school A (Allan, *et al.*, 2010) suggests that, for the school B girls, aligning with the code of the community was more important than any need to adopt a prestige code.

Scots also arguably provides a certain identity, as participant data above and in part 1 and 2 of this chapter suggest: differing examples of the code are associated with differing community ‘in-groups’ (see Tajfel, 1982) and more broadly with being Scottish. Thus using modern Scots may have been extremely significant to the girls. For example, the Doric is associated with Aberdeen, Glaswegian with Glasgow and so on but when employed, any of the differing codes that comprise Scots, most likely suggest that one is Scottish (see Kay, 2006). It is difficult to describe what it is to be Scottish, as much of it is wound up in myth and cultural practice (McCrone *et al.*, 1999 and Trevor-Roper, 2008) but as participant A in the pilot study stated: ‘[y]our identity as a Scot is linked up with the country, the scenery, the courtesy, the culture’.

Girl 4b stated as her reason for choosing Scots and a mixture of Scots and English: ‘*because I live in scotland*’. Scots possibly offered some of the girls in school B
‘covert prestige’ in a working-class environment, a different type of status to the linguistic prestige code that participant A in the pilot study sought; we see this phenomenon too with participant B in part 1 of this chapter. However, using Scots most likely connected these girls to their national identity. This is again another repeated theme found in parts 1 and 2 of chapter 4 and the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study, where 86% of participants stated: “Scots is a valuable part of our culture and identity” (p22).

Qualitative responses to question 1 from those who reported they were monolingual Standard English speakers included Boy 4a’s comment: ‘**there is no difference between them**’; as said, he was asked in number 1 of the questionnaire if he spoke Scots, Standard English or a mixture of both. By ‘no difference’ Boy 4a was most probably implying that Scots and Standard English sounded the same; it was unlikely he would have been able to differentiate between the language codes in written form, there still generally being little ‘modern’ examples of Scots used in Scottish secondary schools. However, we know that there are clear differences between Scots and Standard English (see Matheson and Matheson, 2000 and Murison, 1977); I draw on an example I provide in chapter 2 to reiterate this point:

> Ae muckle drawback is the ongaun ‘image’ o Scots as jist for daft-like blethers atween famlie an freens an the orra lauch on the telly or radio. Aw sic ‘wee leids’ has thon kin o problem whaur the’r a poerfu official language – here English is ‘sairious’ an Scots jist isna (Bella Caledonia, Web)

A large drawback is the ongoing ‘image’ of Scots as being just for lighthearted chat amongst family and friends and the occasional laugh on the telly or radio. All such ‘small languages’ have that kind of problem where there is a powerful official language – here English is ‘serious’ and Scots just is not (my translation).
Particular differences between the Scots and English versions here include the words ‘muckle’ [big], ‘blethers’ [foolish talk] and ‘sic’ [such]. Boy 4a’s class demonstrated differences between Scots and Standard English when some of them spoke Scots beyond the range of the teacher (Observations made with class teacher, school A, April 2010). Indeed, students may not have wished to speak Scots in front of their teacher and myself, as they understood it was ‘not the language of education’ (staff focus group, male 2a) and therefore, not accepted in the classroom (see Bailey, 1987). Therefore it is reasonable to suggest that Boy 4a held an uncertain notion of Scots, as he believed that Scots was no different from English, yet evidence to the contrary surrounded him in his classroom.

To add, Girl 1a stated that she spoke Standard English as, ‘Robert Burns was Scottish and I don’t speak like him’. This student did not understand what ‘modern’ Scots is; she presumed Scots to be a ‘heritage’ and not contemporary code. Boy 4a and Girl 1a’s comments can be linked to part 2 of chapter 4 where staff focus group participants questioned the status of ‘modern’ Scots when, for example, they asked, ‘[i]s there a Scots language?’ (male 2a). To add, the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study provided similar results, as 62% of participants believed that, “Scots is not relevant to the modern Scotland of today” (p3). As Macafee (2000) suggests, there are, “genuine problems of validity, arising from the beliefs of speakers in some parts of the country about their speech” (p2).

We know from the qualitative results from question 1 in the student questionnaire that the students’ most favoured code overall was a mixture of Scots and English (Scottish
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156 See http://www.scots-online.org/dictionary/search_scots.asp
Standard English), a code with some status in Scotland, as discussed in chapter 2. In school A 8 students and 14 students in school B spoke the code: this is 55% of all student participants. Corbett et al.’s (2003) notion of Scots and English being on a linguistic sliding scale between the two codes is persuasive here; McPake and Arthur (2006) report that they describe it as a, “stylistic continuum between Scots and standardised Scottish English” (p159). By a ‘continuum’ Corbett et al. suggest that Scots is Standard English with a Scottish accent and occasional ‘heritage’ Scottish word. However in school A, although numerous students indicated that their favoured code was a ‘mixture of Scots and English, in practice this was not necessarily the case.

As discussed earlier, when the students were packing up at the end of the lesson, where I provided them with the questionnaire, many freely spoke a modern form of Scots, not Scottish Standard English, beyond audible range of the teacher (Observations made with class teacher, school A, April 2010). It appears from this that although my questionnaire results suggest students largely spoke Scottish Standard English, their behaviour in groups beyond the authoritarian gaze of the teacher was to speak Scots. Indeed, female 2a from the staff focus group acknowledged that Scots is, ‘alive in the playground’. Therefore it seems that some student participants were arguably bilingual in Scots and Standard English. However we are reminded of participant B’s comments in the pilot study data where he said: ‘[u]sed my native tongue when I was in the house’ (AA, PB, Qu4) and, ‘outside of school ... in the street’ (PB, T). Indeed, results from the Tns-bmrb (2010b) survey suggested that participants mostly used Scots, “at home with the family” (p13) or “when socialising with friends” (p13). Avoiding using Scots in front of the teacher
then, was perhaps a given with some school A participants at least; avoiding using Scots in formal settings in Scotland is a recurring theme throughout my data sets and some research in the field (see Matheson and Matheson, 2000 and Shoba, 2010).

From question 1 qualitative questionnaire data Boy 5a and Girl 9b also suggested that they were bilingual, when they stated that they, ‘speak both scots and standard English’ (Boy 5a) and, ‘SPEAk ENGlish sometimes and scottish other times but mostly english’ (Girl 9b). Such answers are reminiscent of those points raised above, where the students spoke Scots amongst themselves but Scottish Standard English during lessons; these results are also similar to participant B’s comment when he stated in the pilot study that he spoke English in the ‘church’ but Scots on the ‘street’. Matheson and Matheson (2000), referring to Shepperson (1986), suggest that the Scottish have been, “multilingual since the dawn of time” (p211). Lo Bianco (2001) posits that Scots being a distinct language from English, should be treated as such in Scottish schools.

Although many students in schools A and B were able to recognise Scots as a distinct code and may even have been bilingual, the marginalised position of Scots in the Scottish education system (Bailey, 1987) was arguably “internalised” (Shoba, 2010: p394) by these students, as they knew to speak Scots beyond audible range of the teacher. The amalgamation of Scots and Standard English, Scottish Standard English, was clearly regarded as the acceptable code of classroom interaction, in particular by the girls in schools A and B.
To summarise, some students ticked on the questionnaire ‘Scots’ or ‘Standard English’ or even both of these boxes; others ticked a ‘mixture of Scots and English’. Some students perhaps thought themselves to be bilingual (indicated by them ticking both the ‘Scots’ and ‘Standard English’ boxes or the ‘mixture of Scots and English’ box alone); however others may have believed they were simply Scottish Standard English speakers (indicated by them only ticking the ‘Scottish Standard English’ box). To add, other student participants ticked these boxes because Scottish Standard English or the use of Scots and English helped them to demonstrate their nationality. However as said the participants obviously provided ambiguous responses at points, when one also considers my observations in school A of students code switching beyond the audible range of the teacher.

4.5.c. Results for Question 2

I now consider the quantitative and qualitative responses from the second question in the student questionnaire: ‘Do you think Scots is a language in its own right?’ (see Fig. 4.3.4.):
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Fig. 4.3.4. Quantitative results for question 2 of student questionnaire
The students in school B remained, from question 1 onwards, generally more supportive in their responses regarding Scots than school A students; for example in question 2, 11 boys and 9 girls from school B thought Scot was a language in its own right, compared to only 6 boys and 3 girls in School A who believed the same. It is interesting that school B students, from a less affluent area than school A students, were much more supportive of Scots than school A students. Again this could suggest a link between the stratification of ‘modern’ Scots and the socio-economic context of its speakers. Indeed Shoba (2010) states, “Scots has survived into the present day largely in the speech of the urban working class, and it is this association which finally seals its social unacceptability” (p386). Participant A’s comment in the pilot study supports this idea; she stated when discussing ‘modern’ Scots, or what she regarded to be ‘slang’, that: ‘[t]he family across the street would use slang; they would be looked down upon’ (AA, PA, Qu5).

Many of the students in school A who ticked the ‘yes’ box for Scots being ‘a language in its own right’, also provided insightful comments regarding the code; the boys in particular tended to offer qualitative responses that supported Scots. I provide examples of a range of qualitative responses for question 2 below; I group these responses together according to their content and also highlight certain phrases therein to indicate emerging themes in the data. The data is written verbatim, as with previous student qualitative responses above:

- Scots – is a language in its self (Girl 1a)
- Scots is a language because it’s a country (Boy 9a)
- every language should have a right (Boy 10a)
• I think that **Scottish people should be able to use their own language** (Boy 5a)

• **because I speek Scottish** (Boy 1a),

Some students here stated that Scots simply *has* language status and should therefore also have rights; for example Girl 1a stated that Scots is, ‘a language in itself’ and Boy 10a said, ‘every language should have a right’. These are interesting comments when one considers the wider language rights paradigm (see Kloss, 1967 and May, 2005). Other students suggested that Scots is a language because Scotland is ‘a country’ (Boy 9a) and therefore, ‘Scottish people should be able to use their own language’ (Boy 5a). Boy 1a’s reason for Scots being a language was simply: ‘because I speek Scottish’.

School B students provided even more in depth qualitative responses regarding Scots for question 2. As with school A, most of the students who offered such responses also ticked ‘yes’ for Scots being ‘a language in its own right’. As Fig. 4.3.4. suggests, many of the responses which supported Scots as a language in its own right came from boys. Similar themes were repeated in this data set to those found in school A above:

• Yes because **people speak that language and people have rights** (Boy 12b)

• **Every country has a right of their own language** (Boy 9b)

• Yes because **every person should be aloud to speak there own language** (Boy 10b)

• **Anyone can talk whatever language dialect or slang they want** (Boy 4b)

As with school A’s responses to this question, language rights issues were raised as a theme here: ‘people speak that language and people have rights’ (Boy 12b) and,
‘Every country has a right of their own language’ (Boy 9b); as with Boy 9a, Boy 9b connected the status of a language to its country. Boy 4b’s comment is interesting too, as he used the words ‘dialect’ and ‘slang’. It suggests that he was still not entirely sure of the status of Scots, even though he ticked ‘yes’ for Scots being a ‘language in its own right’. Like school A’s Boy 1a, Girl 7b in school B simply responded to question 2 with, ‘because we speak scots’, as her reason for Scots being a language. A second girl echoed this with: ‘Because most people were we live speak Scotish and only a small amount speak english’ (Girl 2b). Girl 2b’s response reminds us that school B being located in a less affluent socio-economic context than school A, again suggests a link between the stratification of modern Scots and the socio-economic context of its speakers.

School B students also raised a different theme from students in school A for question 2. They suggested that Scots is a language in its own right because it appears dissimilar from English:

- The words in scottish are different from english (Boy 2b)
- There are certain words in Scottish … that have no meaning in the English language (Girl 5b)
- because scots is a different sound form the rest (Girl 4b)
- Because they speek different from english people (Boy 6b)

Boy 2b highlighted the lexical differences between Scots and English: ‘words in scottish are different from english’ and Girl 5b explained this further with, ‘certain words in Scottish … have no meaning in the English language’. Girl 4b also emphasized the phonological differences between Scots and English: ‘scots is a different sound form the rest’. Boy 6b, despite ticking ‘a mixture of Scots and
English’ for question 1, said, ‘Because they speek different from english people’ for question 2. Although there are discrepancies between this student’s answers for questions 1 and 2, he referred to Scots speakers as ‘they’. From this it seems that he did not include himself in this group; this might explain the anomalies in his results, as perhaps he did not see himself as a Scots speaker but thought the language still existed. These responses echo Kloss’ (1967) idea of a language being so because it is an ‘abstand’ code, there being noticeable linguistic differences between it and the recognised standard code of its context. Therefore, some of the school B students argued that Scots was a language in its own right because it was different from English.

To summarise, there were three main recurring themes arising from the qualitative responses from the open section of question 2. Students suggested that people have rights to be able to speak the language they choose. They also thought that Scots is a language because it comes from the country of Scotland and has different words from the English language, reasonable suggestions perhaps. Other students simply stated that Scots was a language because they spoke it.

It is interesting that school B students provided more in depth and supportive responses of Scots than school A’s students. It is also noteworthy that many of the overall responses came from boys, as we know that males appear less concerned with employing prestige codes than females do (see Meyerhoff, 2006) and so the male students may not have been worried about supporting a lower prestige ‘modern’ Scots. To add, the boys’ comments were generally concerned with language rights, whereas the girls’ responses were focussed on the language itself and in particular its
lexis. In addition it is noteworthy that it was school B students who also recognised that Scots was distinct from English. We know the school B students were more supportive of Scots than school A students in their questionnaire answers and therefore, it is possible that they understood Scots in more detail than school A students; they may also have received more instruction from their teacher on Scots than school A students had.

To continue, it is clear from Fig. 4.3.4. that not many students provided a ‘no’ or ‘maybe’ quantitative answer to question 2. Indeed, few of these students gave answers of any depth for the qualitative section of this question. For example, Boy 4a stated, ‘I don’t know any differencys between Scots and English’ and Girl 2a commented: ‘I don’t actually now’. Another student in school B said, ‘I Don’t know really’ (Boy 1b). Therefore, a number of students in both schools simply did not appear to understand what Scots is.

However, students in school A who ticked ‘maybe’ for Scots being ‘a language in its own right’ in question 2 made interesting comments. Boy 7a said, ‘because I think That It’s a bit oF both’ and Boy 8a commented, ‘I speek mostly english but a tiny bit scottish’. Girl 4a ticked ‘yes’ for Scots being a language in its own right and commented, ‘People who talk this language say so’; she presumably meant that Scots speakers told her that Scots is a language. As expected however, Girl 4a had ticked ‘a mixture of Scots and English’ for the quantitative section of question 1, therefore even though for Girl 4a she had been told Scots was a language, she obviously still believed it was a mixture of Scots and English. As with Boy 8a, Boy 7a had also ticked ‘Standard English’ for question 1, although Boy 7a had ticked ‘a
mixture of Scots and English’ too. In their qualitative answers for question 2 both Boy 7 and 8a indicated that they spoke a form of Scottish Standard English, even though Boy 8a stated that he was ‘aridgamerily from england’. This suggests that ‘modern’ Scots was available to Boy 8a if he was able to have learned it. Girl 4a supported Scots in her question 2 qualitative answer but used the word ‘People’, thus distancing herself from the pool of Scots speakers around her. Amongst other student participants, these students remained consistent in their perception of Scots from question 1, in that they believed Scots to be a mixture of Scots and English: Scottish Standard English.

However, some students in school A stated that they spoke Standard English or a mixture of Scots and English in question 1 but then went on to indicate in question 2 that they believed Scots is a language. Indeed many of their responses to question 2, as above, were supportive of Scots. It is quite possible that these students could have spoken Scottish Standard English but supported Scots too. However it is also possible that they actually spoke a form of ‘modern’ Scots but were unaware of this or failed to recognise it as a language. Such an idea is not unfeasible, as I heard many of school A’s students using Scots at the end of the lesson (Observations made with class teacher, school A, April 2010). It would have been interesting if these four boys and three girls had explained what they considered to be Scots.

To conclude, from the questionnaire results for question 2 certain students did not understand what Scots is. Others were clear that they spoke Scottish Standard English but yet supported Scots. However some of these students may also have spoken ‘modern’ Scots but were simply not aware of this. Another small group of
students said that they spoke Scots in question 1 but then did not say that it was a language in its own right in question 2. Their qualitative answers for question 2 suggested that they did not entirely understand what modern Scots is.

4.6.c. Results for Question 3a and 3b

Below I display the results for question 3a: ‘Do you think Scots should be used in the classroom by students and / or teachers?’ and 3b: ‘Do you think Scots language and literature lessons should be taught in school?’ . Not all students answered question 3a. I include two graphs below for each school’s results, in order to clearly display all the answers provided.
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Fig. 4.3.5. Quantitative results for question 3a; school A, male and female
In school A one noticeable outcome is that the students demonstrated less support for teachers using Scots in the classroom than themselves. In school B the students were more positive regarding students speaking Scots in the classroom compared to school A’s responses. They were also more supportive of teachers using Scots in the classroom than school A students were. However similar to school A, results were higher for themselves adopting the code in school, rather than the teachers. Both sets of school participants had similar scores for teachers ‘maybe’ using Scots in school.

Fig. 4.3.6. displays the results from school A and B for question 3b: ‘Do you think Scots language and literature lessons should be taught in school?’. Some students in school B did not answer the questions, similar to some school A students in question 3a above:
In school A all of the girls and half of the boys wanted Scots language lessons in school. The boys were slightly more positive regarding Scots literature lessons than the girls but both groups generally supported the idea. In school B many of the boys and girls were positive regarding Scots language lessons. In particular the school B boys were 35% more supportive than the boys in school A. From the results above, the boys in school B were consistently more positive regarding Scots than school A’s boys. This concurs with results in chapter 4, part 1 for Scots-speaking participant B, who was male and from a relatively deprived background; to reiterate, school B was located in a less affluent area than school A. This said, both the boys and girls in school B were as similarly positive about Scots literature lessons as school A’s participants, taking into account the differences in number between the two groups. Indeed, school A boys were more interested in Scots literature than language lessons. Perhaps Scots literature was more familiar to the boys and held more ‘capital’
(Bourdieu, 1986) for them in school A than Scots language did, as Scots literature has a recognised tradition and heritage in Scotland (see Kay, 2006).

I now consider students’ qualitative responses to question 3a. Following this I analyse student qualitative answers to question 3b. School A’s student quantitative answers for question 3a indicated that they were not overly positive regarding students employing Scots in the classroom (see Fig. 4.3.5.). They were even less keen on teachers utilising the code (see Fig. 4.3.5.). In particular the boys were the least supportive of both students and teachers employing Scots in the classroom. Comments for school A boys included:

- because **we don't need to learn an acsent** ar work (Boy 9a)
- because **some people might not like it** (Boy 8a)
- **There would be too many languages and it would get confusion** (Boy 4a)
- Because **they should not be forced to speak differently** (Boy 3a)

Boy 9a’s response where he called Scots an, ‘acsent’ (accent), echoes repeated themes throughout this chapter, where some participants did not consider Scots to be a language. He also saw no place for Scots ‘ar work’ (at work), or in other formal situations. Participant B in the pilot study also stated that he would not use Scots in formal contexts such as the ‘board room’ and in the Tns-bmr (2010b) study participants stated that they used Scots, “when socialising with friends (69%) or at home with the family (63%)” (p1). To add, Boy 4a was unaware that Scots was already spoken in his classroom. He appeared to believe that it would be an additional code utilised in school and ‘it would get confusion’. Boy 3a echoed this by
suggesting that speaking Scots was ‘to speak differently’ and Boy 8a suggested that, ‘people might not like it’. As Shoba (2010) posits, there is a, “lack of social refinement, associated with the use of Scots” (p391) and Boy 8a may have been referring to this when he thought that others might not appreciate its employment in the classroom.

Several students in school A were positive regarding Scots in the classroom. Girl 1a stated: ‘Scots should be used in the class because if your Scottish you might not know English’. Her response echoes students’ qualitative responses to question 1, where they indicated that they might be monolingual. To add, Boy 6a said, ‘I think pupils and teachers should be able to speak their regional language’. It is interesting that this student not only attributes the status of ‘language’ to Scots but he also recognises its regional varieties.

Overall however, school A students were not particularly positive regarding the employment of Scots by either students or teachers. Perhaps links can be drawn between the socio-economic context of school A, the lack of status ‘modern’ Scots seems to have (see chapter 2) and school A students’ general lack of support for Scots. To add, as suggested by participant B of the pilot study and as highlighted within the Tns-bmrb (2010b) survey, Scots does not appear to have a place in the formal settings of Scottish life and as said, children, ‘[internalise] these messages and transmit them to others” (Shoba, 2010: p394). Therefore, school A’s lack of support for Scots in the classroom is not entirely surprising. In addition, it is interesting that there appears a slight anomaly in school A where it was the boys, rather than the girls, who were much less in favour of Scots. This challenges trends suggested by
Trudgill (1974) and Wagner (2012) for example, who posited that girls often align with the prestige code, i.e. normally Standard English or Scottish Standard English in Scottish schools it would seem (Bailey, 1987). As such, we would have expected the girls in particular to object more to Scots in the classroom but this was not the case.

School B’s qualitative student responses to question 3a: ‘Do you think Scots should be used in the classroom by students and / or teachers?’ were more positive. Both the boys and girls were generally supportive of students utilising Scots in the classroom. However, they were less positive regarding teachers employing Scots, although more supportive than school A. Interestingly it was largely the boys who advocated teachers using Scots rather than the girls in school B. This reminds us of Shoba’s (2010) case study of Scots in the classroom, where her participant, Nina, when given an authoritative role in her group, instead of using Scots adopted a code that, “sounds like her teacher” (p.393). Indeed, Trudgill (1974) and Wagner’s (2012) research, where girls often align with the prestige code, is applicable here.

It seems therefore, that despite some of the girls supporting Scots in school B, many of them may perhaps have still found it difficult to ignore the poor status Scots appears to possess (see Williamson, 1982b). We are also reminded of findings in chapter 4, part 2, where teachers were ‘uncomfortable’ using Scots; this message may have been transmitted to their classes and thus became apparent in student responses above. Indeed, students’ answers suggested that Standard English was generally regarded as the ‘language of education’, in their school at least. Shoba’s (2010) notion then of children ‘[internalising] messages’ regarding the use of Scots is once more applicable.
To continue, qualitative responses less supportive of Scots for question 3a from students in school B included:

- I think **students should be aloud to but I don’t know about teachers** (Girl 8b)
- It should be **used at the appropriate time** (Girl 7b)
- because **you need to be polite in school so no but that could mean changing your accent so you like to speak naturally so** yes (Girl 4b)
- I think **if you speak like that it is’nt your fault** (Girl 6b)
- because **people cant help it if they speak and there is no problem with it** (Boy 12b)

Some of these students appeared to refer implicitly to a silent authority, teachers perhaps, who permitted or prohibited them to employ Scots. For example, Girl 7b stated that Scots should be, ‘used at the appropriate time’. Indeed, Girl 8b’s use of the word ‘aloud’ or ‘allowed’ also inferred the existence of such a regulatory group. She also echoed comments from much of her female peer group when she excluded teachers from using Scots with, ‘don’t know about teachers’. Girl 7b’s phrase; ‘the appropriate time’ and Girl 4b’s notion of ‘need[ing] to be polite in school’ may very well have been ‘internalised’ messages from teachers or parents (Shoba, 2010). Indeed, these participants had clearly learned to appropriate value to the Scots code, as they inadvertently suggested that Scots is potentially ‘inappropriate’ or ‘impolite’ in certain situations, such as school. This said Girl 4b also talked about ‘speak[ing] naturally’ and not ‘changing your accent’. She contradicted herself regarding
whether Scots has a place in school or not. What is clear from her response though was the tension she experienced between meeting expectations in school by adopting a ‘polite’ code (Scottish Standard English perhaps) or remaining faithful to her ‘natural’ speech (Scots), most likely the code of her home and community beyond the classroom. This is similar to participant B in the pilot study, who had to remain faithful to his community but adopted Scottish Standard English when in the ‘board room’ for example. We also witness this with the character Conn, in the introduction of this thesis, when he has a confrontation with his teacher (McIlvanney, 2007). Indeed, these issues are common throughout chapter 4; unsurprisingly Girl 4b ticked ‘maybe’ for both students and teachers employing Scots in school.

Girl 6b and Boy 12b were more sympathetic of Scots but yet their answers again attributed value to the code. Girl 6b’s it ‘is’nt your fault’ and Boy 12b’s ‘cant help it’ regarding Scots speakers suggested that that there was ‘fault’ in employing Scots but that it could not be ‘helped’, that using such a ‘faulty’ code was unavoidable. Boy 12b then contradicted him self by stating that there was ‘no problem’ in using Scots. Several of the student participants here provide contradictory answers concerning Scots, which suggests that they were uncertain regarding the use of Scots.

Other participants in school B were more positive when answering question 3a regarding whether Scots should be used by students in their classroom:

- Because **people should have a choice of how they speak** (Boy 7b)
- They **can talk in whatever dialect they Want** (Boy 4b)
- So that **people can speak different accents** (Girl 2b)
These students responses were reminiscent of the wider language rights paradigm (see May, 2005). For example, ‘people should have a choice’, ‘[t]hey can talk in whatever dialect they Want’ and ‘it is our rite’ suggest that they believed that students in school should not be censored in their code choices but have the freedom to speak how they chose. There was also a sense of inclusion in their responses with, ‘people can speak different accents’. This said it was clear that Scots was not fully understood by these students, as it was referred to as a ‘dialect’ and ‘accent’. Once more we uncover a theme of ambivalence in participants surrounding the status of Scots.

Other students stated:

- **Students should not have to talk any different than they do at home** (Boy 2b)
- **Students need to talk how they feel** (Boy 5b)

These answers echo participant B’s responses in the pilot study. He stated that Scots is, ‘shorthand for people’s feelings’ and was, ‘the language people spoke in the street’. The students here link Scots to ‘home’ and how they ‘feel’. Again we are reminded of the pilot study participants’ experiences in school and the tension and dislocation from their language and all it represents that Scots speakers experience when they are required to adopt a standardised code in school.

In answer to question 3a, Girl 3b stated that students should use Scots in the classroom: ‘because students are cooler’, than presumably teachers. This response suggests that there is an, ‘in-group’ of Scots speaking students who may reject the notion of ‘out-group’ (see Tajfel, 1982) educationalists speaking Scots. With Girl 3b,
perhaps Scottish Standard English or Standard English, often endorsed by the Scottish education system (see Bailey, 1987), were not regarded as ‘cool’. A linguistic repositioning of both students and educationalists will be required if Scots is to be incorporated into the Scottish classroom. As such this will enable a necessary dissolution of linguistic barriers of power with regards Scots and Standard English (see Foucault, 1981, 1982).

Worryingly one student in school B, Boy 9b, stated: ‘Cause if you go to Scottish schools you should all speak Scottish like no foraners’. There is a rather negative nationalistic implication from this comment. Indeed, when implementing Scots in schools, one must be aware of the mnemonics associated with nationalism and the language practices therein. As Shoba (2010) comments regarding his participants, “there was much reliance on Scottish stereotypes and touristic imagery” (p392).

Indeed, the production of Scotland as a brand and its resulting mnemonics is arguably as entrenched within the psyche of many Scottish people, as it is within the ‘foran’ mind. Subsequently such mnemonics are useful tools with which to exploit notions of nationalism (see Billig, 1995) and teachers should be wary.

To continue, Boy 11b states: ‘Students & teachers should learn’. Again this is a positive response but this student, similar to some of his peers, demonstrates his lack of appreciation of the Scots code. Indeed, it is likely that many of his peers, and no doubt teachers, speak ‘modern’ Scots. However, it may be the case then that this student considers the code to be a form of ‘heritage’ Scots such as Burns. Therefore, when implementing Scots in Scottish schools, teachers and policy makers will be required to define the different codes of Scots they are referring to and in particular
endorse ‘modern’ Scots, thus providing it with ‘capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986) and legitimacy. This said comments raised above regarding a repositioning of power between the ‘cool’ ‘in-group’ Scots speaking students and the ‘out-group’ (Tajfel, 1982) Scots Standard English or Standard English speaking educationalists, may cause difficulties during this process. To add, educationalists will need a recognised national data bank of Scots, such as the Scots online dictionary for example, in order to decipher, authenticate and implement the differing ‘modern’ codes of Scots.

To summarise, as discussed school B students were more positive regarding the employment of Scots than school A. This result, like that for school A’s responses to question 3a, is not surprising when we return to links drawn above between the socio-economic context of school B and its participants’ general support for Scots. In addition, it is interesting that it was the boys, rather than the girls, who were more in favour of teachers employing Scots. This supports trends suggested by Trudgill (1974) and Wagner (2012) for example, who posited that girls normally associate with the prestige code, i.e. often Standard English and Scottish Standard English in Scottish schools (Bailey, 1987). However, what is particularly interesting from school B’s results are the political and nationalistic stances adopted by some students and the links students made between Scots, ‘home’ and ‘feelings’. It seems that Scots is an emotive subject for many ‘in-group’, historically marginalised Scots speaking participants (see Bailey, 1987 and Tajfel, 1982); ‘out-group’ (Tajfel, 1982) teachers may do well to be aware of the tensions such associations might create in their classrooms.
I now consider responses from school A for question 3b. There is a clear difference between the girls’ and boys’ preferences for this question. All of the girls wanted Scots language lessons compared to only half of the boys, whereas similar numbers of both boys and girls wished for Scots literature lessons. Most of their qualitative answers however, refer to Scots language.

Some qualitative responses included the following:

- I suppose **it would be fun to learn it** (Girl 5a)
- **I don’t think everyone wants to know the full language** (Boy 6a)

Such answers exemplify the split between the girls’ and boys’ feelings in school A regarding learning the Scots language; Girl 5a was interested in Scots: ‘it would be fun to learn it’, but Boy 6a was not as enthusiastic: ‘I don’t think everyone wants to know the full language’. To add, both participants did not appear to consider themselves Scots speakers or perhaps ‘full’ speakers, as they intimated that Scots, or at least some of it, had to be learned. It is possible however that the students were not entirely sure of what Scots is. Girl 5a stated earlier in her questionnaire that she was Scottish but had adopted some English words from her friend. Boy 6a commented that he wanted ‘**people to know that [he was] Scottish’ but that he liked ‘the english language**’. This would suggest that both students spoke a form of Scottish Standard English and in fact, each had ticked ‘a mixture of Scots and English’ for question 1’s closed question.

Indeed, when Boy 6a commented that not ‘everyone wants to know the full language’, he may have been referring to ‘heritage’ Scots; full ‘modern’ Scots was
readily available to him in his classroom, whether he recognized it and employed it or not. To add, Girl 5a might also have perceived Scots to be a ‘heritage’ code, as she thought she would have ‘to learn it’, despite being immersed in ‘modern’ Scots like Boy 6a. Boy 2a summed up these confusions by stating: ‘I know what scots is but I can’t speak it, or understand it’. His comment strongly suggests that some students in the study did not recognize ‘modern’ Scots as a language and instead believed Scots to be a ‘heritage’ code.

Similar to participants above, Boy 8a stated in response to question 3b: ‘[b]ecause most people speak englishy – scottish’, a hybrid such as Scottish Standard English perhaps. It is possible that as these students were privy to ‘modern’ Scots in their classroom, they most probably employed it and thus, actually code switched from ‘modern’ Scots to Scottish Standard English when applicable. This could have occurred when they were with certain friends for example or when addressing the teacher.

Significant research is required to ascertain the different codes that students do employ, before more in-depth conclusions can be drawn in the field regarding the range of codes in existence within Scottish schools and the wider community. Prior to this however, the ‘modern’ Scots code needs to be defined and legitimized amongst and out with its speaker community as being separate from more ‘heritage’ Scots codes (see Aitken et al., 2001). Only then can an exploration of the types of Scots actively utilized by students be successfully instigated and therefore catered for in the classroom. Indeed this is necessary, as relying on students’ own current perceptions of the code they employ or simply deducing their code therein is tenuous. As Macafee
(2000) indicates, notions of Scots amongst participants hinder the validity of data in the field. Thus, it is difficult to conclude from students’ answers, when asked if they wished Scots language and literature in school, whether they knew what Scots is and which type of Scots they were referring to.

To continue, other students stated:

- **Scots language should be taught in classes** because if your
  Scottish you might not know the language, and it gives you a
  chance to know your culture (Girl 1a)

- **Scottish people should be able to learn about their heritage**
  and the country they live in (Boy 5a)

These responses complement answers directly above, as they again highlight the notion that many of the students in school A regarded Scots as a ‘heritage’ code. ‘Modern’ Scots was freely employed in these students’ classroom, yet both participants related Scots to the words ‘culture’ and ‘heritage’. It seems evident that they considered Scots to mean not the class code but a ‘heritage’ Scots. Again it is clear that the ‘modern’ Scots code needs to be defined and legitimized as distinct from more ‘heritage’ codes (see Aitken *et al.*, 2001). It is unlikely that the students could have provided a clear response with regards ‘modern’ Scots when they did not seem to be aware that it is arguably a distinct code in itself.

To add, it is interesting that these students associated Scots with ‘culture’ and ‘heritage’. Such responses are similar to those made by, for example, participant A in the pilot study and female 3b in the staff focus groups. Once more it is clear that many participants do not see, ‘a place for [Scots] in the modern world’ (participant A.
pilot study). Instead Scots is often viewed as from, ‘the past’ (ibid.), the language of ‘Robbie Burns’ (female 2b, staff focus group).

Several students highlighted links between Scots, Scotland and nationality / national identity; this is reminiscent of similar comparisons drawn earlier in student responses to question 1 in particular:

- Because we live in Scotland and it is important (Girl 4a)
- Because we are Scottish and we should be taught it (Boy 1a)

These participants also challenged the historically marginalised status of Scots in Scottish schools by employing the phrases: ‘it is important’ and, ‘we should be taught it’ (see Bailey, 1987). Their responses again resonate with the wider language rights paradigm (see May, 2005).

To conclude, we know there is a clear difference between school A’s male and female responses regarding Scots language for question 3b and some of the qualitative answers emphasize this. However, there is little explanation in the answers regarding why both groups were supportive of Scots literature lessons. One can only surmise that Scots literature has more ‘capital’ (see Bourdieu, 1986) than Scots language; Scots literature has a heritage and tradition (see Kay, 2006). Much of the literature in school is often derived from ‘heritage’ texts, such as Burns and hence, is provided with some legitimacy. This said there are many modern Scottish texts, such as those by Iain Banks or A. L. Kennedy for example, that are taught in Scottish schools but unfortunately such texts are often written in English. In addition though, Scots literature might also have appeared more familiar to the students, as the reading of Scottish literature is encouraged in Scottish secondary schools. Thus, the students
may have been more confident in supporting Scots literature than language in their answers, as it was recognizable to them.

Other topics that arose from school A student responses to question 3b included students’ confusion regarding the code they spoke. It was unclear whether some students spoke Scottish Standard English, ‘modern’ Scots or in fact code-switched between Scots and a form of Standard English. Again, as with earlier sections, we are aware of these students’ uncertainty regarding the ‘modern’ Scots code; they did not appear to be conscious of the code being utilized in their classroom or indeed the possibility that they adopted it themselves. As outlined above, these students may simply have considered Scots as being a ‘heritage’ language. A small group of students did regard learning Scots as ‘important’, for reasons of nationality and national identity, but again they viewed it as a language to be acquired, not one that they may have already spoken.

Once more we can also return to links drawn above between the socio-economic context of school A and its participants’ general lack of support for the Scots language. Their overall support of Scots literature simply reinforces the suggestion that the compromised status of ‘modern’ Scots influenced some school A students’ responses.

I now consider responses from school B for question 3b: ‘Do you think Scots language and literature lessons should be taught in school’. We know that, compared to the boys in school A, boys in school B were much more supportive of Scots language lessons; conversely, the girls were not quite as positive as their counterparts
in school A (see Fig. 4.3.7.). Again links can be drawn between the lack of status Scots appears to have and female participants' reluctance to adopt the code. Similarities can also be made between results here and some school B responses for question 3a, where several girls supported Scots for reasons of belonging and identity, yet many of them still appeared to find it challenging to disregard the lack of status associated with Scots.

Both boys and girls however, were as similarly positive as school A students regarding Scots literature lessons, although as with school A responses, many of their qualitative answers appear to relate only to Scots language. School B’s responses were largely similar to school A’s for this question, although there were less qualitative responses, particularly from the boys. This said there was more of a sense of activism in the school B answers compared to school A. School B responses, verbatim as above, include the following:

- because **they try to teach us english and not Scottish** (Girl 7b)
- You **should be taught about the words used in your own area**
  (Girl 5b)
- because **it should be taught because it's the country we live in**
  (Girl 3b)
- **Not enough lessons are taught in the Scottish language** (Boy 2b)

Once more we find that students confronted issues surrounding the marginalisation of Scots in Scottish schools (see Bailey, 1987). Girl 7b’s answer implies that the students should be taught Scots: ‘they try to teach us english and not Scottish’. Her use of the word ‘try’ is interesting, as it suggests that attempts to teach students English had not
been entirely successful. She also uses the word ‘they’ and ‘us’, suggesting a linguistic ‘in-group’ and ‘out-group’ in the Scottish classroom (Tajfel, 1982). Girl 5b and 3b, similar to Girl 4a and Boy 1a above, employed their nationality and geographical context to justify their support for Scots: ‘it’s the country we live in’. Boy 2b simply suggested that more Scots language lessons needed to be implemented in class: ‘Not enough lessons’. As with some of school A’s responses for this question, several of school B student answers echoed the broader language rights paradigm (see May, 2005).

To continue, like Boy 5a, other students in school B were supportive of Scots language lessons, due to the ‘heritage’ aspects of the code:

- becase it is our history and heritage (Boy 1b)
- it would be interesting and you would maybe understand Burns’ poem (Girl 8b)

These responses are similar to some of the student answers in school A directly above, where Scots was regarded as a ‘heritage’ code. Indeed, Girl 8b presumed that Scots language and literature lessons would involve studying Burns and ‘maybe understand[ing]’ the bard. Once more, it is apparent that the ‘modern’ Scots code needs to be recognized and promoted as a language separate from ‘heritage’ Scots (see Aitken et al., 2001). School B students, as with school A’s students, did not appear to regard Scots as a distinct ‘modern’ code.

Less positive responses from school B for question 3b included:

- no cause it isnt really appropriate cause you know how to speak (Girl 4b)
• **I just don’t like literature** (Boy 4b)

Girl 4b’s answer is ambiguous. She may have intended to suggest that Scots is not ‘appropriate’ and that we ‘know how to speak’, i.e. we should speak English. However she might also have been suggesting that we ‘know how to speak’ Scots and thus, Scots lessons would not be needed. The rest of her questionnaire answers do not provide further clarification, as they are as contradictory as her response here. In contrast Boy 4b’s answer is clear: his reason for ticking ‘no’ for Scots literature is because he does not ‘like literature’. This said he ticks ‘yes’ for Scots language in the classroom and is supportive in his overall questionnaire regarding Scots language.

In summary, school B students were slightly more supportive of Scots language than Scots literature, yet similarly positive to school A students regarding Scots literature. There is little explanation for why both school groups were supportive of Scots literature lessons. However as discussed above, perhaps Scots literature had status, ‘capital’ (see Bourdieu, 1986), and was familiar to the students. Again as with responses from school A students for question 3b, some school B students appeared unsure of what Scots actually is. Many did not seem to consider Scots as being anything other than a ‘heritage’ language. However several students adopted an activist stance with regards the code and employed their nationality as the reason for supporting Scots in the classroom. Links between the socio-economic context of school B and its participants’ support for the Scots language can be drawn. However it is clear that not many of the students appeared to appreciate Scots as a ‘modern’ language.
4.7.c. Summary

There are many recurring themes that arise from the results of this study overall: pilot study and school participants repeatedly questioned the status of Scots and the marginalisation of ‘modern’ Scots was also an evident theme therein. To add, other themes in the data that were apparent included links between the use of ‘modern’ Scots and one’s socio-economic status and associations between ‘modern’ Scots and notions of community. Also, themes concerned with Scots and national identity and ‘heritage’ Scots, status and culture were evident too.

In addition, it is worth noting that participant staff demonstrated particular concerns with regards implementing Scots in the classroom, as discussed in part 2 of chapter 4. For example, they believed they would need educated in the code in order to teach it and they were worried about which students, according to their academic levels, should be taught Scots. However some staff thought Scots did have an important place in the classroom, due to its historical and cultural significance.

In the following chapter I conclude this thesis by considering how my results compare to my original key questions. I also consider the limitations of my study and discuss the implications of my research for educationalists and policy makers alike. I offer recommendations for both groups too, regarding the successful implementation of Scots in schools.
CHAPTER 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Introduction

I conclude this thesis by comparing the results from my different data sets with my original key questions; I include brief but pertinent pieces of data here for illustrative purposes only. In comparing my results to my key questions, I aim to provide the reader with a sense of coherence regarding how the overall findings of my study go towards answering these questions. I present both the implications of the research and recommendations too for policy makers and educationalists. I also consider the limitations of the study. In addition I provide reflections on the research process itself and lastly I offer my final conclusions.

5.2. Key Questions and Conclusions

Throughout chapter 4 I highlighted for the reader the emerging themes from my data sets. I would now like to compare these themes to my key questions, in order to provide a sense of completion to the study:

Key question 1a and b:

- a) What attitudes do students and staff of the two case study schools have with regards the status of Scots and b) its place in Scottish schools

It became clear that many participants were unsure and confused as to the definition of Scots: ‘Is it several variants? Is there a Scots language?’ (male 2a). These results were echoed in the Tns-bmrbb (2010b) study, where 85% of participants stated they spoke Scots but 64% did not see Scots, ‘as a language - it’s more just a way of speaking’” (2010b: p2). Macafee (2000) also warned that participants’ lack of understanding of Scots was a recurring problem when researching the language.
Participants also asked many questions regarding the status, the ‘capital’, of Scots: ‘we’re using specifically Scots words, does it necessarily still make it a different language?’ (male 2a). Some participants felt that Scots speakers had rights and that the code should be actively recognised: ‘because it is our rite’ (Boy 10b). However, there was some ambivalence amongst participants regarding the place of Scots in Scottish schools: ‘as soon as you then start to teach it suddenly becomes a totally different story’ (Female 2a); yet, Scots was recognised as part of the history and culture of Scotland: ‘is linked up with the country, the scenery, the courtesy, the culture’ (AA, PA, Qu6); it was even considered an element of national identity: ‘Scots language is important to your identity … it’s important to being Scottish’ (PB, T). This is again similar to results in the Tns-bmrb (2010b) study where 88% of participants agreed that Scots, “plays an important part in our history and heritage” (p22). Although there was some support for Scots in the classroom, particularly from school B students, various participants continued to marginalise the place of Scots in schools, as it was considered not ‘appropriate’ (female 3b) as, for example, ‘some people might not like it’ (Boy 8a).

Key question 2:

- What links, if any, do participants make between the use of Scots, ‘capital’ and identity

As discussed above, participants regularly made reference to Scots as being an important element of their Scottish identity and culture but many participants struggled with the lack of ‘social’ and ‘cultural capital’ (see Bourdieu, 1986) they believed Scots speakers possessed: ‘[t]he family across the street would use slang; they would be looked down upon’ (AA, PA, Qu5). Much of this may have been as a
result of links made between the use of ‘modern’ Scots and the socio-economic contexts of its speakers (see Shoba, 2010). As participant B, a ‘modern’ Glaswegian Scots speaker stated, his family was, ‘busy working and putting food on the table’ (AA, PB, Qu9). It also seems that Scots speakers had little agency in, for example, school: ‘[y]ou spoke polite English. You didn’t speak like the way you spoke outside of school. You were told to speak properly’ (AA, PB, Qu2). Therefore, it emerged from the data that Scots possibly had covert prestige with students and became a marker for student ‘in-group’ status; for example Girl 3b said that students should use Scots in school, ‘because students are cooler’ than teachers; indeed, whilst working with students in school A, many students freely spoke a ‘modern’ form of Scots, not Scottish Standard English, beyond audible range of the teacher (Observations made with class teacher, school A, April 2010). It also became obvious from the data that many participant Scots speakers were bilingual in modern Scots and Scottish Standard English, knowing where and when to code switch between the two: ‘[u]sed my native tongue when I was in the house’ (AA, PB, Qu4) and, ‘outside of school ... in the street’ (PB, T) and also: ‘speak both scots and standard english’ (Boy 5a) and, ‘SPEAk ENGlish sometimes and scottish other times but mostly english’ (Girl 9b).

Key question 3:

- How and why have these attitudes emerged and b) why do they perhaps remain

It was reasonably consistent throughout the data sets that modern Scots was often considered as ‘slang’ and not ‘polite’; Girl 4b said of the use of Scots in school: ‘because you need to be polite in school so no’. Teachers and family often passed on these views to students and adult participants in childhood and the expectation that
‘proper’ codes of speech, such as Scottish Standard English, would be employed by participants thereafter were perpetuated: ‘[y]ou spoke polite English. You didn’t speak like the way you spoke outside of school. You were told to speak properly’ (AA, PB, Qu2). Chapter 2 explores in some depth some of the historical events that led to the de-valuing and marginalisation of Scots, particularly in Scottish schools (see Bailey, 1987); the eighteenth century elocution movement to eradicate ‘scotticisms’ in Scottish speech was just such an event (see Jones, 2005). It seems that negative attitudes towards Scots language still prevailed in some of my participants: ‘But it’s also very important that pupils know about appropriacy’ (female 3b). However, a contradiction lies in the value that was given by some participants to what I term ‘heritage’ Scots. This code of Scots is not marginalised in Scottish schools, perhaps due to its links with the culture of Scotland and even associations to national identity: ‘True Scots is a bit of Robbie Burns’ (Female 2b). As Shoba (2010) states, this is, “a Scots which is not just socially sanctioned but highly valued as part of their heritage, perhaps most of all by the middle classes” (p390).

Key question 4:

• What recommendations, if any, do participants have regarding the provision of Scots in the Scottish classroom

It was mostly staff participants who made recommendations regarding the implementation of Scots in the Scottish classroom; for example they stated: ‘we would have to re-educate ourselves partly’ (male 2a) and, ‘[i]ts how we can teach it and how we can accept it in the written form … how you recognise all the different variants and dialects within that, and how you actually then standardise … that’ (female 2a).

Similar concerns regarding a requirement for continuing professional development in
Scots and more Scots resources for teachers were raised by educationalists in the *The National Survey of Teacher Attitudes* (2010). Staff in my study did think that Scots has a place in school, again for reasons of culture and heritage, but they were concerned with its status, its ‘capital’, and how this would impact on the standing of the English language that is accepted and routinely employed in Scottish schools: ‘a lot of people, sort of, in education are uncomfortable with giving the language that status – that its okay to use it in the formal essay’ (male 3a). They were also worried about the impact Scots lessons might have on less able children: ‘perhaps only [teaching Scots] with those who are more able to cope with a variety of languages’ (male 1a).

Key question 5:

- What possible challenges, benefits and caveats are staff and students privy to in implementing Scots in the classroom

From the data analysis it was obvious that many students and teachers were not overly comfortable with the thought of modern Scots in schools: ‘uncomfortable with giving the language that status’ (male 3a). However, it was even more obvious that students were happier with themselves, rather than teachers, employing Scots in class: ‘I think students should be aloud to but I don’t know about teachers’ (Girl 8b). Again the reasons for this might lie in Scots acting as an indicator of belonging not only to student ‘in-groups’ (see Tajfel, 1982) but also lower socio-economic groups, neither of which teachers are often associated with. Therefore, a great deal of consideration is required by educationalists and education policy makers with regards how the implementation of Scots might relocate the power bases of student and teachers in the Scottish classroom and what the impact of this might be. Nonetheless, it seems that
more disengaged children excelled when introduced to Scots: ‘one of the less able in the class got it straight off’ (male 3a); they understood the code and their behaviour was less off-task – suffice to say they gained status and confidence as Scots speakers in Scots lessons; this is at least one good reason to support the production of sound policy for the implementation of Scots in Scottish schools.

As such, my recommendations for policy makers are important. As discussed in chapter 2, the idea of language rights is linked with social justice (see Madoc-Jones & Buchanan, 2004); indeed some student participants indicated that Scots and its speakers have rights. Maintaining diversity is also a fundamental element of social justice and therefore sustaining indigenous minority languages, and the collective voice and identity these languages arguably symbolise, is crucial (Edwards, 2010; Hornberger, 2008).

As outlined in my learning journal (12th April, 2010), I taught Scots to both classes in school A and B during my data collection phase. Some students, mostly boys, who displayed disengaged behaviour were positively engaged in demonstrating their knowledge of Scots. As discussed above, engaging challenging children by employing Scots in the Scottish classroom is potentially effective educational policy and practice. However, acknowledging and including Scots speaking children in schools is also a matter of social justice, diversity and inclusion, as it enables all Scots speaking children and their collective voice and identity, regardless of social class or culture, to be heard in school.
Informed policy to support the implementation of Scots in Scottish schools being therefore a matter of social justice, would aim to encourage inclusive practice in schools, by supporting the maintenance and inclusion of the diverse and often collective voice of the Scots speaker and their differing socio-economic contexts; this is arguably a just and fair approach that Scottish schools and their students would no doubt benefit from. As I also highlight in the first paragraph of this thesis, effective policy for Scots in Scottish schools is imperative in order to support the self-worth, agency and identity of Scots speaking children; if such policy encouraged positive and inclusive practice, enabling even a small group of children to feel ‘proud, motivated’, then it would be worthwhile.

Perhaps the best approach to implementing Scots in schools then would be to adopt a bilingual model, thus considering Scottish children as potentially fluent in both ‘modern’ Scots and Scottish Standard English (see Lo Bianco, 2001). In doing so the code and the speaker would hopefully avoid potential marginalisation in class and the differing codes of Scots, ‘modern’ and ‘heritage’, could both be provided the status they deserve.

It is important to note however, that some links between nationalism and Scots were raised in the data. It is evident that a sense of nationalism that excludes children of race, culture and / or nationality beyond the Scottish experience is inappropriate and has no place in the Scottish classroom. However, perhaps the more negative nationalist connotations occasionally associated with the Scots language and indeed, being Scottish per se, is an issue worthy of further investigation by teachers; indeed, this is particularly pertinent in light of the current political climate in Scotland and on-
going plans by the Scottish Government to implement Scottish Studies as a subject in Scottish classrooms (discussions with Scottish Government, June 2013). Teachers would therefore be advised to be aware of said links between language and identity and be willing to explore with their students the manner in which language and its associations with particular identities can be both inclusive and exclusive. Indeed, by exploring the positive aspects of difference through language, teachers will also be examining the broader theme of diversity in their classrooms.

One must note however, that unless Scots has the support of the broader community in Scotland too, its people, institutions and so on, then implementing Scots in schools will lose its impact and momentum when the child leaves the confines of the school yard. Indeed, male 3a stated, there needs to be, ‘a wider change in society’ before Scots is accepted in schools and beyond. However, if ‘modern’ Scots is recognised as a language in its own right in Scotland’s wider communities, then Scots and its speakers will hopefully face a brighter and more inclusive future in Scotland.

5.3. Limitations and Reflections on the Research Process

I have learned a tremendous amount from conducting my Doctoral research study and writing up the results. I have learned in particular from the methods I chose, which actually in practice manifested differently from how I had imagined. They were aptly suited to uncovering the data I required however, when I planned the study, I had a limited concept of how much data would be appropriate. As such, I probably collected enough data for three to four Doctoral theses! This said my rich data bank allowed and taught me how to pick and choose appropriate data to assemble a ‘story’ that would address the research phenomenon in question.
I also learned how to successfully produce data collection methods that provided the information I needed to answer my key questions. For example, I now realise that trying to be economical in my student questionnaire and including more than one question in each section to save paper and time, served to complicate my participants’ understanding of the questions. Thankfully, including an open question after each closed question provided further clarity to the results.

To continue, as part of my position at Durham University and previous to this at Newcastle University, I aim to interact with colleagues and students in a professional and effective manner. Therefore, I was not overly worried about conducting semi-structured interviews for the first time with school staff. However, what was unexpected but perhaps not surprising in my new role as researcher, was finding it necessary to develop a wider perspective from once teacher, now teacher educator to researcher.

For example, perhaps part of the reason I was economical with the questionnaires was because I was used to adopting this approach as a teacher in schools; being cost-effective with school resources such as paper was a must. I soon realised however that for the purposes of research I had to think in a different way. My key questions and the data I wished to collect to answer them had to be paramount in my mind when constructing the questionnaires; indeed how economically the questionnaires could be assembled and how efficiently they could be completed by students were perhaps not as important as making the questions unambiguous to these students.
To add, as said although I was not overly worried about conducting interviews, I realised that I had to adopt a different approach as a researcher than a university tutor or schoolteacher. I firstly had to negotiate gatekeepers; I had to forge links with staff and participants and then secure data collection periods. Being the lead and only researcher for the project, I was in a leadership role as I am in the classroom but I had to accept that I could not always lead negotiations or expect reciprocal behaviours. I learned that although the research project was upmost in my priorities, it was not necessarily top of participant or collaborating colleagues’ priority list. Thus, I learned to appreciate any progress I made in liaising with schools and collecting data and I found ways to encourage further progress, recognising when I had probably gained and given as much as I could. Although, these more subtle skills were not overly difficult to grasp, the process did help me to realise some of the differences between my teaching role and the job of a researcher.

I also learned that certain approaches might not always suit my aims. For example, I originally wished to conduct a co-participative study, by involving the students in the research. Although I did do this and it was successful to a certain extent, I realised that I would need to be flexible and not focus on writing about this part of my work, as the process was difficult to implement and maintain, did not yield particularly rich results and detracted from the central focus of my study. However, some approaches I chose in my research were very valuable; for example, I learned about the worth of conducting a pilot study. My pilot study provided me with emerging themes that inspired me to conduct my main research project. I was therefore able to take these themes forward and investigate them further as part of said project and the write up of this thesis.
It is worth mentioning here that I presented on my work at various conferences during the period of my Doctoral studies; these included conferences with my funder, Beacon North East, the Scottish and British Educational Research Associations, the National Association for the Teaching of English (NATE), in-house presentations with Newcastle University and Durham University for NATE and more recently a conference with the Forum for Research on the Languages of Scotland and Ulster at Aberdeen University. I also very recently disseminated my findings to colleagues in Education Scotland, specifically the newly appointed Scots Co-ordinators, who were interested in my work. To add, I held several telephone conversations with Michael Hance, Director of the Scots Language Centre, and Matthew Fitt, the co-founder of Itchy Coo publishing company, during the period of my Doctoral study. The process of preparing for these presentations and receiving comments from colleagues on my work at these events, and during telephone conversations with Michael Hance and Matthew Fitt, helped me to reflexively consider the successes and limitations of my on-going research and write-up. Therefore this aided me further in developing the skills and knowledge I needed to become a successful researcher and in my chosen field of Scots language in Education.

It is fair to say that I have learned many things about conducting a research project over the last six years, too much to outline here unfortunately. As such, I feel equipped to confidently approach my next research project and continue to develop in my career as a researcher, whilst still also learning from the process of research itself.
5.4. Conclusion

Scots language is no doubt fascinating, yet, there are very many contradictions wound up in the use of Scots, as there are in many aspects of Scottish culture. Scots language embodies the complex and duplicitous character that is Scotland. Just as Deacon Brodie, town councillor by day and burglar by night, is the personification of the two faces of Edinburgh, the old and the new, the dark and the light, so too does Scots embody the complex and often conflicting nature of Scotland and its people. Therefore, drawing on these complexities, the distinctions I make in this thesis between ‘modern’ and ‘heritage’ Scots and the marginalisation of the Scots speaker and their often low socio-economic status, I hope add to the contentious yet valuable field of Scots language.

I see it fitting then, to end this thesis with a piece of ‘modern’ Scots that best illustrates the aims of this research; having translated all previous examples of Scots in this thesis, I hope the reader will be in some way equipped to read this extract and understand same. I finish with a response in my own regional tongue:157

Aften fowk dinna ken whit they’ve got till it’s awa, but the guid thing is Scots isna ‘awa’. It’s aye aw aboot us, mibbies a bit wabbit at times, but Scots is a rael story o thrawn survival. It’ll anelie dwine awa tae naething gin we lat it. We need tae gie it a bittie mair love an respeck…

Somewey acause it’s ‘jist Scots’ we’ve kin o no taken muckle tent o its importance in oor culture. Generations o bairns has been brocht up uneducate in their ain mither tongue. It’s no richt. A muckle opportunity in scuils tae help oor bairns be ‘bilinguals’ is jist tint…

Nooadays they mebbe dinna tawse the bairns or sen thaim tae “speech class” but “respecting the language a child brings to school” doesnae for normal rax tae lairnin thaim hoo tae read and

---

write in it. The punitive stuff has been tynt, but in monie weys the policy steys the same. Scots is no tae hae visability, and is no tae be a language we lairn wir bairns in onie kinna systematic wey. Auld auld-farrant attitudes is hard tae chynge. As ae speaker pit it: “Scots [...] needs upbiggit an emancipatit, an that the Scottish estabishment is agin that.” Sae whit can we dae? (Bella Caledonia, Web).\(^{158}\)

Nn ah says thut wur gonnie huv tae keep oan fightin fur the weans that speak the Scots leid in thon clessrooms, cuz its their tongue, their folk, their hame; aye, n whit a rair tongue it is anaw.

\(^{158}\) Bella Caledonia, Web at: http://bellacaledonia.org.uk/2013/05/28/speakin-oot-for-scots/
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Scots in the classroom interview
Feb 08

Telephone interview

1) What is your general opinion of Scots?
2) How was using Scots at school viewed by the staff and pupils?
3) Did you ever use Scots at school and if so, what were the results?
4) As a child where else might you have or have not used Scots and why?
5) As an adult where might you have or have not used Scots and why?
6) What links, if any, do you think Scots has do with Scottish identity?
7) What Scots do you use - can you pinpoint the words or phrases that you think are Scots and which you may use regularly?
8) What Scottish words do you know of but don’t use? Why do you not use them?

1) Old fashioned. Out dated. I understand it but don’t use it very much. I see it as as in the past. I am proud of it as my heritage. I don’t see a place for it in the modern world.

2) Never discussed. Nobody used it. Didn’t use it in the classroom - it was just modern English you used. Some words of the Scots language have continued down through the generations and are incorporated into everyday language. They’ll come out in a sentence or paragraph. Without the person realising, they pay a kind of homage to your heritage by using words or phrases that have survived. You’re not conscious of it. If I was speaking to someone who couldn’t speak Scots then I wouldn’t use those words, as I wouldn’t instinctively know they wouldn’t understand. You selectively use it but it’s unconscious.

---

P.B.
8. I don't ever remember using it at school at all. I don't remember being taught Burns or anything to do with Scots just Robert the Bruce. They did insist on us learning Scottish country dancing.

4. Used it in the home, in clubs and organisations — only a dribble of words. As a child I wouldn't have used Scots words only as an adult. I don't recall using children the Scots language as such, only older.

5. As a child you were told, “speak properly” and properly meant — the Queen's English. But adults contradicted themselves as they spoke Scots words to each other.

I don't know how I know Scots words — I probably learned them from the adults. Adults thought the only way to gain status was to do against — your heritage and speak the Queen's English. I think it was drummed out of us. I said, "Are," my family would say, "speak properly." The family across the street would use I'd say, they would be
1) What is your general opinion of Scots?
2) How was using Scots at school viewed by the staff and pupils?
3) Did you ever use Scots at school and if so, what were the results?
4) As a child where else might you have or have not used Scots and why?
5) As an adult where might you have or have not used Scots and why?
6) What links, if any, do you think Scots has do with Scottish identity?
7) What Scots do you use – can you pinpoint the words or phrases that you think are Scots and which you may use regularly?
8) What Scottish words do you know of but don’t use? Why do you not use them?

5) Looked down upon.
6) I think it has got a lot to do with identity because you understand it.
   You just seemed to learn it. Your identity as a Scot is linked up
   with the country, the scenery, the country, the culture, has we
   like to be seen by others and
   by understanding some of the
   Scots language.

7) Gie-means very. Och! Humno-what’s an English
   Dibb. Ben the room – the bedroom through
   Aye. the room. Then translate to
   Sgruite – wooden spoon, if I’m talking about
   Someone who stirs things up. Sink – order.
   wee

P.B
Residential than council house. Rockefeller houses had 23 bedrooms.

Boys spoke more bravado. Rockefeller quarters were more

in Springfield. I was born in a room in a house

called ‘Rockefeller House’. The bedroom,

in Springfield, which was a

bedroom in the house.

It was a step-up.

My dad used to

climb up to a room in the

Rockefeller House.

Barnet was built

as a right proper

place.

It was a

step.

I don’t think it was

such a big deal.

I was part of the

gang, but I don’t

use it.

It’s an important part of me because History

3

was English.

What does it mean to you?
Scots in the classroom interview
Feb 08

1) What is your general opinion of Scots?
2) How was using Scots at school viewed by the staff and pupils?
3) Did you ever use Scots at school and if so, what were the results?
4) As a child where else might you have or have not used Scots and why?
5) As an adult where might you have or have not used Scots and why?
6) What links, if any, do you think Scots has do with Scottish identity?
7) What Scots do you use – can you pinpoint the words or phrases that you think are Scots and which you may use regularly?
8) What Scottish words do you know of but don’t use? Why do you not use them?

1) Quite a diverse language because there are quite a few different accents - thrown they sing, Edinburgh they repeat themselves - in Glasgow its quickish.
2) You spoke polite English. You didn’t speak like the way you spoke outside of school you were used to speak.
3) No I was always polite - you didn’t use many slang words unless you were learning Burns when you learnt what the words meant.
4) I used my native tongue when I was in the house, in the church I would have to speak properly.
5) I couldn’t use it at work - just with colleagues but not in a board room - I would speak politely.
6) I think the language is a shorthand for peoples feelings.
– they are very descriptive words – they sound like what they mean. Make shove or shoogle or giver – these words are descriptive words.

7) By the way

8) Don’t know.

9) What was Govan + Easterhouse like?

Govan – it was just ordinary life; you didn’t know any better. On a Saturday night you’d see men coming out of the pub, stripped to the waist, having a punch-up. Everybody worked but they weren’t well paid – low wages. We stayed in a 30s tenement. My family came from the old tenements. We were there with outside toilets. We were too busy working + putting food on the table in order to live.

Easterhouse was a new scheme – at first it was not too bad, but when the overspill from the tenements got worse, some were poor. Some people thought they were getting a leg-up.
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Staff focus group semi-structured interview questions, annotated transcripts and codes, categories and themes

Staff focus group semi-structured interview questions:
School A:

• ‘Do you think Scots exists, do you think it’s a language in its own right?’
• ‘[H]ow do you feel about … Scots throughout society [and] in the Curriculum for Excellence as well?’
• ‘[T]here’s not a standard [in Scots] … there’s implications … what [do] the rest of you think?’

School B:

• ‘[D]o you think Scots is a language in its own right?’
• ‘[T]he Scottish Government are trying to promote the use of Scots in institution like the institution of Education and are aiming to promote it in schools. So what are your thoughts on that?
• ‘[I]t’s the implications for schools … what your thoughts would be?’
Staff focus group annotated transcripts

START AUDIO

Interviewer: Okay. So 12th of April, teacher discussion on Scots language in the classroom. So if you could ...

Female 1: [?? 0:00:11].

Interviewer: Okay.

Male 1: [0:00:13].

Male 2: [0:00:15].

Male 3: [?? 0:00:16].

Interviewer: Okay. So if I ... if I just give you a question and see what you think about it? The first question we really asked the kids was “Do you think Scots exists, do you think it’s a language in its own right?” You know, what’s your ... what’s your opinions on that?
Female 1: I think very much so. I think it’s alive in the playground, it’s alive in the classroom, but as soon as you then start to teach it suddenly becomes a totally different story.

Male 2: Are we talking about a ... a distinct separate language, or a variant of the language, or ...? Is it several variants (Laughter)? Is there a Scots language?

Interviewer: Well I would argue ... my position is there’s a Scots language in its own right, but that’s not necessarily your opinion, so I mean it’s ... really what you think.

Male 3: [It’s like I said to the kids earlier 0:01:06] got completely separate words ... er, like the kids in class would said well ‘tattle’ is just potato but how do you get ‘wee’ from ‘small’? So if it’s got specifically its own words does that then make it a language?

Male 1: Well I mean there ... there are all kinds of crossovers like, for example, the word in Scotland for a large serving dish is an ‘ashet’ which comes from ooslette. And I mean that’s, in as much as kids know about these things at all, they ... they’re familiar with that, whereas obviously it gets you blank looks... gets you blank looks in England. But I mean there’s ... you know, there’s other examples as well particularly, you know, words like ... words like ‘bra’ meaning good, particularly ... I used to work in Dundee and that’s very much in use there, and that’s ... that is actually the Swedish word for good ... the sort of mainstream Swedish word for good.
And there's obviously the sort of cross-fertilization there with sort of fishing fleets and things.

Male 2: So I think there are various influences regarding the origins of vocabulary that may vary from region to region. But do they necessarily affect the whole of Scotland? I mean words such as 'kline' for example, that is specific to the north-east isn't it, and that comes from Scandinavian as well.

Even though the vocabulary might be different in parts and we are always aware that we're using specifically Scots words, does it necessarily still make it a different language? (Laughter)

Interviewer: Does it ... yes.

Male 2: And I think you need to look at the history, historical developments. The poetry of Burns, for example, is written in lowland Scots but was that intelligible to people from the north-east or the islands or ...? You know there are possibly more than ... there's more than one Scots way of speaking and it needs to define what a language is in the first place before you can really say ... (Laughter)

Interviewer: There's an argument that says that it is a language in its own right, it was in print in the 15th century and it was the union and [creation of the 0:03:57] parliaments that helped to dissolve it as a language. And it originates from Northumbrian, and it had influences from, you were talking about Flemish influences, Danish,
obviously it originates from Anglo-Saxon and French from the old alliance and so on. The ... now in the, as you probably know in the new Curriculum for Excellence it says "Scots is to be taught in schools, language and literature" and that clearly has an impact for you, perhaps more for English teachers, I don't know. Do ... how do you feel about that, that now the Scottish ministerial group are trying to promote Scots throughout Scottish society but in the Curriculum for Excellence as well? Do you think ... well tell me how you feel about it; because I don't need to do it, you do (Laughter).

Male 2: Well I can see the aims and it's partly laudable, but I personally feel a bit uncomfortable about it (Laughter). We have got used to the standard language as being the language of education and that you know, language goes back to ... to most likely the south-eastern dialect spoken in the south-east of England. It would certainly, you know, be a variant of English perhaps, but certainly we would have to re-educated ourselves partly (Laughter). Some people would have to learn that variant if they were going to teach it (Laughter).

Interviewer: You ... sorry, you had a different view?

Female I think as English teachers it's because the norm is that you have to accept Standard English and that anything other than that is wrong, and certainly if you're marking any piece of work if you use the word 'yin' you can't acknowledge that as being okay and that's where there's going to be a ... that's where there's conflict. It's how
we can teach it and how we can accept it as well in the written form. And if it has a parity then fine, but it's how you recognise all the different variants and dialects within that, and how you actually then standardise (Laughter) that.

Because we were discussing when we were teaching the wee ones...

... that they... they got very stressed about it in the class because they're so used to having Standard English and what I was trying to say to them was "There's not a standardised Scots language", you know, it's... there's a dictionary for Scots language that's got a few but there's not a standard... so one spelling could be different to another spelling so, you know, there's implications. I don't know what the rest of you think.

Male 3: It's like you're saying we've got used to Standard English but Standard English is essentially a written form of the language. It's not... Standard English isn't something that unless you're Oscar Wilde you speak. And it's like [Julian 07:20] said, it's giving it the [values 07:21] a good example, you know if they're using Scots words in their writing then you've got to acknowledge that, but then that's... that's got to be part of a wider change in society anyway.

Because they go outside Scotland they'll be told "No that's wrong, you've got to use the formal Standard English in these situations".

Female 1: It's how we measure and assess literacy then because that all then comes to bear in the final... the final marks where for your ability within... within Eng... and now that they've pulled the literacy of it
back into the English domain it then puts that pressure back on accepting the standard form and giving that greater value.

Male 3: It’s always been interesting to me though how we’re allowed to give credit for using non-Standard English ‘for effect’. And so it’s like you were saying earlier on it’s so [often 0:08:09] a comic effect or a lower-class character or something like that that’s going to use Scots, and that reflects on the status of Scots as a language. And I think a lot of people, sort of, in education are uncomfortable with giving the language that status—that it’s okay to use it in the formal essay.

Interviewer: The kids in the class today were certainly uncomfortable about it and really quite anxious about “Oh is this right, should I not, should I write this”. Do you have anything to add to that David?

Male 1: I think that a lot of the kids that we have, it takes them … you know, it takes them all their time, in a way, to … to acquire Standard En- ... Standard, if you like, English and I … that’s the … and that mainly is what they’re going to be needing for job applications and the like. And I’m aware this is, sort of, a rather paternalistic kind of thing to say but it’s … but I wonder if, for some of them, it’s not sort of … if you’re sort of formally teaching it as well I wonder if it’s not sort of introducing more complication than perhaps is helpful to some of them.

You know, and I take the point that, you know, that it’s a legitimate language and it’s … that it’s the way that a lot of people, you know.
Male 3: Strange really.

Interviewer: Yes. (Laughter).

Male 3: Well we saw it with one of the kids today. It’s often who we would see as the less able are actually able to ... we saw it today when we did a translation exercise and one of the less able in the class got it straight off. I think there’s a lot more ... they’re capable of lot more nuance in their own language, in a ... for ... language for application forms, things like that, the language that’s straightforward then yes the language is used. But if you look at the nuance of description, for example, the piece that you brought in about the birds [?? 0:10:52] about, they wouldn’t get that in Standard English, they wouldn’t be able to put that kind of nuance of movement and thought into language. I think that’s one place where Scots is really useful, it’s for that expression.

Interviewer: Onomatopoeic almost.

Male 3: Absolutely.
Male 2: Yes but I think that pupils still ... we still need to do our job which we have to educate pupils to be able to express themselves in Standard English, otherwise people would have to learn English ... Standard English as a foreign language (Laughter) in a way. We'd be separating ourselves from what's agreed in all English-speaking countries.

Interviewer: It's very political.

Male 2: There are variants ... variants of English that would become more and more unintelligible to other English speakers. I mean there are dialects in many other countries and, but those dialects are looked on as dialects, and a standard language is the one that's agreed on over a wide geographic area. I know about German for example, there are many different dialects of German, regional dialects, but there's one standard language, and although few people speak wholly the standard language they nevertheless need to be able to express themselves in that standard language.

Interviewer: I'll sum it up now because I'm conscious it's the end of your lunchtime, but does anyone want to add anything else at all? No? Okay (Laughter), well thank you very much. I really appreciate that, I'll get that all transcribed and then I'll write up on it. That's-

END AUDIO
START AUDIO

Female 1: Right, here we go. So it's Teacher's Baseline Discussion.

Okay. So my first question would be, do you think yourselves, do you think Scots is a language in its own right?

Female 2: Proper Scottish, or just the accents.

Female 1: Just what you think.

Female 2: The way we speak I think is just accent, so I think we are English at the end of the day.

Male 1: Yes, I'd agree with that. It's just different accents what we hear at the minute, not the traditional....

Female 2: True Scots is a bit of Robbie Burns, it's a bit of...
Male 2: Yes, I think that possibly is a language but I think it’s gotten too diluted now. I don’t think I’d find anybody who doesn’t just speak now a sort of Scottish accent on English.

Female 2: I think, aye, it’s a Scottish accent.

Female 3: I think it’s a really complicated question because it depends how you define a language. Like we were saying, it’s not just about accent but probably Scots itself I would say is a language, but not one that’s spoken now.

Male 1: What are we classing as being Scots? Because I’m not exactly clear of what that is.

Female 3: Exactly, exactly.

Male 1: - not being from these parts.

Male 2: I guess if you go back far enough and you read really old things, if you go back to Burns and even before, then the stuff that – it’s difficult to read. I don’t know.

Female 3: Because here we’ve got just the odd sort of dialect word, like you say ‘Aye’ and ‘You ken’, and these are just words that are mixed in
with English. Whereas a language would have a whole set of
grammar rules of its own and ... it might be related to English but –

Male 1: Is it Gaelic or Gallic? I can never remember which. Is that what we
are meaning with Scots?

Chorus: No.

Female 3: It's kind of Burns poetry, with a lot of those words we don't
recognise any more.

Female 2: Again, even with a Scottish accent, well the Scottish language,
there's quite a lot of different languages each place you go to, as
well. You find that with the Orkneys, aye? As a language as well
as the accent.

Male 2: It's difficult because if you go back and you say 'Look
Shakespeare's almost a different language because it's 400 years
old', then you would have to class something that's as different as
Scots as a language too. But I don't know if anybody - I think if it's
a language I don't think it's spoken any more. I think it has just ...
specially with radio and TV, everybody kind of speaks a much more
standardised English, with dialect words and accents thrown in.

Female 2: I would agree.
Female 1: So the new curriculum for excellence, which I’m sure you are all over the moon about (Laughter) has a part in it which includes Scots. You’ve probably seen it. Where basically we’ve got the Scottish government are trying to promote the use of Scots in institutions like the Institution of Education, and are aiming to promote it in schools. So, what are your thoughts on that?

Female 2: What are they aiming to promote? Is it the actual Scottish language or is it just the accent?

Female 1: Well they term it “Scots language”. So their remit would be to promote Scots, they simply say “Scots”, rarely see them saying “Scots lan guage” but “Scots”.

Female 2: But the writer, the Scottish like Bruce, or Robbie Burns is Scot, or...

Female 1: It’s very open. It’s very open to interpretation.

Female 3: Just encouraging more teaching of say the likes of Burns or poetry or literature that....

Female 2: That side of things, or ...
Female 1: I think it would be open to your interpretation. Some of the things that we ask the kids to do, where... do you think kids should be able to speak Scots in class. do you think teachers should speak Scots. do you think we should teach Scots. do you think we should teach Scots literature (which you probably do anyway)? So it's the implications for schools. Just wondered what your thoughts would be.

Female 2: I think that, in my time, and my children's time, it was you had to speak properly. You went to school and you said "Yes" and "No" and "Please" and "Thank you" politely. But I think that's kind of slipping away. Kids don't get into trouble any more for the way they speak. They get told... so they just say "Aye" and "No", "Aye, right Miss", "No Miss", whatever. As broad as they are. So again it's back to accents, isn't it? Rather than the actual Scottish language again.

Female 3: I think it's very important to teach Scots, because it's part of the history and culture of Scotland. But it's also very important that pupils know about appropriacy. So they've got standard English that they use in an appropriate situation and they can just switch register.

Female 2: Sounds good.

Female 3: Have you any thoughts as a Yorkshireman? (Laughter)
Male 2: I could go into my own dialect anyway, so you wouldn’t understand a word I’d say. No, I think it’s important that people from Scotland know about their history and where they’ve come from. Some of the place names I can’t pronounce and the kids tell me how to do it! So for outsiders and that, I think it would be quite difficult for me to teach that, not being from Scotland, but I think it would be important for them to learn about it.

Female 2: Because language is so tied up with identity as well.

Female 1: Does anybody want to add anything to that at all?

Male 1: I think that’s fair enough.

Female 2: No, I’m quite ...

Female 1: That’s it, that’s us done. Okay, thanks very much.

END AUDIO
Staff focus group semi-structured interviews
codes, categories and themes:

(see Graneheim and Lundman, 2004)

Staff Focus Group Interviews (teaching and non-teaching staff):
School A+B:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS SCHOOL A</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS SCHOOL B</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEMATIC / THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. what a language is in the first place before you can really say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. it depends how you define a language</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>General definition of a language</td>
<td>GDL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Whereas a language would have a whole set of grammar rules of its own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are we talking about a...a distinct separate language, or...? Is it several variants (Laughter)? Is there a Scots language?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. What are we classing as being Scots? Because I’m not exactly clear of what it is</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>General definition of Scots</td>
<td>GDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is it Gaelic or Gallic? I can never remember which. Is that what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defining language (DL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language, power, agency and social capital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
we are meaning with Scots?

1. True Scots is a bit of Robbie Burns
2. if you go back far enough and you read really old things, if you go back to Burns and even before, then the stuff that—it’s difficult to read. I don’t know
3. It’s kind of Burns poetry, with a lot of those words we don’t recognise anymore
4. but not one that’s spoken now
5. It’s difficult

6. General definition of Scots as a heritage language

GDSHL
because if you go back and say “Look Shakespeare’s almost a different language because it’s 400 years old”, then you would have to class something that’s as different as Scots as a language too.

But I don’t know if anybody I think if it’s a language I don’t think it’s spoken anymore

| TOTAL | 2 + 10 = 12 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. We have got used to the standard language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3. I think we are English at the end of the day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assumption regarding standard language in Scotland</td>
<td>ARSLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
everybody kind of speaks a much more standardised English, with dialect words and accents thrown in

1. language goes back to … to most likely the south-eastern dialect spoken in the south-east of England 1 Assumption regarding origins of standard language in Scotland AROSLS

1. We’d be separating ourselves from what’s agreed in all English-speaking countries 1 Assumption that Scots as L1 would separate Scotland from countries with Standard English as their L1 ASL1SSCSEL1

1. how you actually then standardise (Laughter) that 1 Standardising Scots SS

1. the way that a lot of people, you know, speak 1 Non-standardised Scots NSS

1. You know there’s implications 1 Implications for standardising Scots ISS

TOTAL 6 + 2 = 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. that’s got to be a wider change in society anyway 2</td>
<td>1. Proper Scottish, or just the accents 8</td>
<td>General status of Scots GSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. it’s a legitimate</td>
<td>2. The way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>we speak I think is just accent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>It’s just different accents that we hear at the minute, not the traditional. I think that possibly is a language but I think it’s gotten too diluted now. I don’t think I’d find anybody who doesn’t just speak now a sort of Scottish accent on English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I think, aye, it’s a Scottish accent. It’s not just about accent but probably Scots itself I would say is a language, these are just words mixed in with English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language, power, agency and social capital**

**Status of Scots (SS)**
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>So again it’s back to accents, isn’t it? Rather than the actual Scottish language again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I think that, in my time, and my children’s time, it was you had to speak properly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scots as lacking capital in certain contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLCCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>it’s alive in the playground, it’s alive in the classroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>General status of Scots in Scottish schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>it’s giving it the good example</td>
<td></td>
<td>GSSSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>to teach it suddenly becomes a totally different story</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Status of Scots in Scottish classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>if they’re using Scots words in their writing then you’ve got to acknowledge that</td>
<td></td>
<td>SSSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>if it’s got specifically its own words does that then make it a language?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lexical aspects of Scots and its status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>does it necessarily make it a different language?</td>
<td></td>
<td>LASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>a comic effect or a lower-class character</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students using Scots as a code that lacks capital in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SSCLCW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or something like that’s going to use Scots, and that reflects on the status of Scots as a language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS SCHOOL B</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. we are always aware that we’re using specifically Scots words
2. ‘tattie’ is just potato but how do you get ‘wee’ from ‘small’ (M – L?)
3. word in Scotland for a large serving dish is an ‘ashet’
4. words like ‘bra’ meaning good (M-L?)
5. words such as ‘kline’ [author’s note – may be ‘quine’] for example
6. Even though the vocabulary might be different in parts

1. got completely separate words (M-L?)
2. ‘tattie’ is just potato but how do you get ‘wee’ from ‘small’ (M – L?)
3. word in Scotland for a large serving dish is an ‘ashet’
4. words like ‘bra’ meaning good (M-L?)
5. words such as ‘kline’ [author’s note – may be ‘quine’] for example
6. Even though the vocabulary might be different in parts

1. that may vary from region to region. But do they necessarily affect the whole of Scotland
2. that is from the north-east isn’t it
3. gets you blank looks in England

1. Assumption Regarding Scots Speakers’ Knowledge of Lexical Aspects of Scots ARSSKLAS
2. Lack of knowledge regarding lexical aspects of Scots LKRLAS
3. Lack of confidence regarding lexical aspects of Scots LCRLAS
4. Comparison between lexical aspects of Scots CLASE

Scots lexis and syntax (SLS)
Language, power, agency and social capital; language, national identity and nationality
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### Similarities between the lexical and syntactical aspects of Scots and English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS SCHOOL A</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS SCHOOL B</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEME/THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I think that’s one place where Scots is really useful, its for that expression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. if you look at the nuance of description, for example, the piece that you brought in about the birds about, they wouldn’t get that in Standard English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. they wouldn’t be able to put that kind of nuance of movement and thought into language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Descriptive nuances of Scots compared to Standard English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS SCHOOL A</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS SCHOOL B</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEME/THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It would certainly, you know, be a variant of English perhaps</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Variant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. which comes from assiette
2. that is actually the Swedish word for good…the sort of mainstream Swedish word for good(M-L?)
3. And there’s obviously the sort of cross-fertilisation there with sort of fishing fleets and things(M-L?)
4. So I think there are various influences regarding the origins of vocabulary(M-L?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS SCHOOL A</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS SCHOOL B</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEMATIC / THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Again, even with a Scottish accent, well the Scottish language, there’s quite a lot of different languages each place you go to, as well. You find</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Differing codes and phonological aspects of Scots</td>
<td>DCPAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 6 + 1 = 7
<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that with the Orkneys, aye? As a language as well as the accent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>there are possibly more than…there’s more than one way of speaking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge regarding differing codes of Scots</td>
<td>LKRDCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>but was that intelligible to people from the north-east or the islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Questions regarding speaker intelligibility between codes</td>
<td>QRSIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>but its how you recognise all the different variants and dialects within that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of confidence regarding the lexical, syntactical and codal aspects of Scots</td>
<td>LCRLSCAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 + 1 = 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEANING UNITS</td>
<td>SCHOOL A</td>
<td></td>
<td>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</td>
<td></td>
<td>MEANING UNITS</td>
<td>SCHOOL B</td>
<td></td>
<td>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</td>
<td>CODES</td>
<td>CATEGORIES</td>
<td>THEMATIC / THEORETICAL CONTEXT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I mean there are dialects in many other countries and, but those dialects are looked on as dialects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>few people speak wholly the standard language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 + 0 = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lexical, syntactical, phonological and codal aspects of Scots (LSCAS) | Language, power, agency and social capital
1. need to be able to express themselves in that standard language
   - Assumption that speakers should be able to express themselves in standard language
   - ASES

1. a standard language is the one that’s agreed on over a wide geographic area
   - Country’s policy on L1
   - CPL

2. I know about German for example, there are many different dialects of German, regional dialects, but there’s one standard language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>SCHOOL B</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEMATIC / THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. they’ve pulled the literacy of it back into the English domain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR conception of policy on Scots in the New Curriculum for Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. it’s partly laudable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAP conception of policy on Scots in the New Curriculum for Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I personally feel a bit uncomfortable about it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LS conception of policy on Scots in the New Curriculum for Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What are they aiming to promote? Is it the actual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LR conception of policy on Scots in the New Curriculum for Excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 3 + 0 = 3

Language, power, agency and social capital; language, national identity and nationality
2. Scottish language or is it just the accent? Just encouraging more teaching of say the likes of Burns or poetry or literature

TOTAL 3 + 2 = 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS SCHOOL A</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS SCHOOL B</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. we still need to do our job which we have to educate pupils to be able to express themselves in Standard English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I think as English teachers it’s because the norm is that you have to accept Standard English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. anything other than that is wrong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. if you’re marking any piece of work if you use the word ‘yin’ you can’t acknowledge that as okay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. that’s where there’s conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Belief that teachers’ role is to teach students to express themselves in Standard English
Belief that English teachers in Scotland are required to expect Standard English from students
Belief that English teachers in Scotland can only accept Standard English from students
Conflict between English teachers in Scotland only accepting Standard English from students and
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. how we can accept it as well in the written form</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Comment regarding English teachers in Scotland accepting from students Scots in the written form</td>
<td>CRETSASSWF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. then puts that pressure back on accepting the standard form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. a lot of people, sort of, in education are uncomfortable with giving the language that status – that its okay to use it in the formal essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. people would have to learn English … Standard English as a foreign language (Laughter)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teaching Standard English as a L2</td>
<td>TSEL2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. as being the language of education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assumption regarding standard language of Scottish education</td>
<td>ARSLSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. but certainly we would have to re-educate ourselves partly (Laughter)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assumption regarding code teachers speak</td>
<td>ARCTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. how we can teach it</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comment on how teachers will teach Scots</td>
<td>CTTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. it needs to be done very carefully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. So for outsiders and that, I think it would be quite difficult for me to teach that,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comment that non-Scottish teachers may struggle to teach Scots</td>
<td>CNSTSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues and conflicts surrounding teachers / English teachers implementing Scots in L1 Standard English speaking classrooms (ICST/ETISL1SESC)

Language, power, agency and social capital; language, national identity and nationality
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Some people would have to learn that variant if they were going to teach it (Laughter)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comments on teachers learning Scots to teach it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so I wouldn’t say that it should be taught</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>but I think it would be important for them to learn about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perhaps only with those who are more able to cope with a variety of languages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher belief that Scots should only be taught to more able students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s often who we would see as less able are actually able to.. we saw it today when we did a translation exercise and one of the less able in the class got it straight off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comment regarding less able students excelling in Scots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they’re capable of a lot more nuance in their own language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students excelling in Scots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think it’s very important to teach Scots, because it’s part of the history and culture of Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comment regarding teachers teaching Scots, as they believe it’s a language of heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But it’s also very important that pupils</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher’s belief that Standard English rather than Scots is appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teacher's belief that students should be able to code switch to Standard English in appropriate situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEMATIC / THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. they've got standard English that they use in an appropriate situation and they can just switch register</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher’s belief that students should be able to code switch to Standard English in appropriate situations</td>
<td>TSCSEAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

| 18 | + | 5 | = | 23 |

### Negative student reactions to Scots lessons as opposed to English lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEMATIC / THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. they got very stressed about it in the class because they’re so used to having Standard English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negative student reactions to Scots lessons as opposed to English lessons</td>
<td>NSRSLEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

| 2 | + | 0 | = | 2 |

### Student challenges in having Scots lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEMATIC / THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. if you’re sort of formally teaching it as well I wonder if it’s not sort of introducing more complication than perhaps is helpful to some of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student challenges in having Scots lessons</td>
<td>SCSL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Familiarity with Standard English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEMATIC / THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. we've got used to Standard English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Familiarity with Standard English</td>
<td>FSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. You went 1 Standard English having SECSS
to school and you said “Yes” and “No” and “Please” and “Thanks you” politely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capital in Scottish schools</th>
<th></th>
<th>Issues surrounding Standard English in the classroom (ISSEC)</th>
<th>Language, power, agency and social capital; language, national identity and nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>But I think that’s kind of slipping away. Kids don’t get into trouble any more for the way they speak, so they just say “Aye” and “No”, “Aye, right Miss”, “No Miss”, whatever. As broad as they are</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard English lacking capital in Scottish schools</td>
<td>SELCSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|   | Standard English isn’t something that unless you’re Oscar Wilde you speak | 1 | Questions surrounding spoken form of Standard English | QRSFSE |
|   | What they’re going to be needing for job applications and the like (M-L?) | 2 | Requirement for Standard English outside of school | RSEOS |

Standard English is essentially a written form of the language (M-L?)

Standard English in written form

It’s not

Questions surrounding Standard English

Standard English isn’t something that unless you’re Oscar Wilde you speak

Questions regarding spoken form of Standard English

What they’re going to be needing for job applications and the like (M-L?)

Requirement for Standard English outside of school
Language for application forms, things like that, the language that’s straightforward then yes the language is used (M-L?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>SCHOOL B</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEMATIC / THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>how we measure and assess literacy then because that all then comes to bear in the final (M-L?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Questions surrounding how to measure and assess Scots literacy</td>
<td>QSMASL</td>
<td>Issues surrounding Scots in the English classroom (ISSEC)</td>
<td>Language, power, agency and social capital; language, national identity and nationality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving that greater value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comment regarding Scottish teachers imbuing status on a standard written form of Scots</td>
<td>CRSTISSWFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we’re allowed to give credit for using non-Standard English ‘for effect’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comment regarding teachers rewarding students for using Scots divisively in their work</td>
<td>CRTRSSDWH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL A</th>
<th>SCHOOL B</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED; SCHOOL B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th>NUMBER OF MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>SCHOOL B</th>
<th>CONDENSED MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>THEMATIC / THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I used to work in Dundee and that’s very much in use there</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Usage of Scots</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Scots speakers and usage (SSU)</td>
<td>Language, power, agency and social capital; language, national identity and nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the way that a lot of people, you know, speak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of Scots speakers</td>
<td>NSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL A TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED: SCHOOL A</th>
<th>UNITS SCHOOL B</th>
<th>TIMES SIMILAR MEANING UNITS ARE RAISED: SCHOOL B</th>
<th>MEANING UNITS</th>
<th>THEORETICAL CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Go outside Scotland they’ll be told “No that’s wrong, you’ve got to use the formal Standard English in these situations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negative views of Scots Outside Scotland</td>
<td>NVSOS</td>
<td>Miscellaneous comments (MC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It takes them all their time, in a way, to … to acquire Standard English … Standard, if you like, English (M-L?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student attainment</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Language, power, agency and social capital; language, national identity and nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The poetry of Burns, for example is written in lowland Scots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Knowledge regarding Burns poetry</td>
<td>KRBP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. it needs to define what a language is in the first place before you can really say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>References to undefined authority figures and decisions regarding Policy for Scots</td>
<td>RUAFDRPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. And I think you need to look at the history, historical developments (M-L?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>General history of Scots Language</td>
<td>GHSL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think it’s important that people from Scotland know about their history and where they’ve come from.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher belief that Scottish people should know about their heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Because language is so tied up with identity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Language and identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Student questionnaires

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
THE PLACE OF REGIONAL LANGUAGE IN SCHOOLS

The research project is funded by The Beacon Trust and hopes to learn about students and their community’s attitudes to regional language and its place in schools. The aim of the project is to create and put into action a scheme of work on regional language for the classroom, create recommendations for the Scottish Government / the QCDA regarding the place of regional language in the classroom and involve students and their community in the process of research. These aims will be achieved by gathering data from students (in S1 / Yr7 ), teachers and communities and involving students, teachers and parents / guardians in the research process. Four schools will be involved in the project: two in Northumberland and two in South West Scotland. Please feel free to contact the University Researcher, Miss Lowing, at any time:

Miss Lowing (K.A.Lowing@ncl.ac.uk) Newcastle University

A few details about yourself:

Town ____________________________

Gender : male ☐ female ☐

Ques. 1: Regional Language
Do you think you speak:

Scots.................................☐
Northumbrian....................☐
Standard English.............☐
A different language..☐

OR

A mixture of Scots and English............................☐
A mixture of Northumbrian and English..........[ ]
A mixture of Scots, Northumbrian and English..[ ]

Can you give reasons for your choice above?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Ques. 2: Regional Language Status
Do you think Scots or Northumbrian is a language in its own right (please tick the box appropriate to your area):
Scots: [ ] Yes.... [ ] No..... [ ] Maybe
Northumbrian: [ ] Yes.... [ ] No..... [ ] Maybe

Ques. 2 contd:
Can you give reasons for your choice above?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Ques. 3a Regional Language in the Classroom
Do you think Scots or Northumbrian should be used in the classroom by students and / or teachers?
By students: [ ] Yes.... [ ] No..... [ ] Maybe
By teachers: [ ] Yes.... [ ] No..... [ ] Maybe

Can you give reasons for your choices?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
**Ques. 3b Regional Language in the Classroom**

Do you think Scots or Northumbrian language and literature lessons should be taught in school (please tick the box appropriate to your area)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scots language literature</th>
<th>Scots Literature</th>
<th>Northumbrian language</th>
<th>Northumbrian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Can you give reasons for your choices?**

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________
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PUPIL BASELINE QUESTIONNAIRE
THE PLACE OF REGIONAL LANGUAGE IN SCHOOLS

The research project is funded by The Beacon Trust and hopes to learn about students and their community’s attitudes to regional language and its place in schools. The aim of the project is to create and put into action a scheme of work on regional language for the classroom, create recommendations for the Scottish Government / the QCDA regarding the place of regional language in the classroom and involve students and their community in the process of research. These aims will be achieved by gathering data from students (in S1 / Yr7), teachers and communities and involving students, teachers and parents / guardians in the research process. Four schools will be involved in the project: two in Northumberland and two in South West Scotland. Please feel free to contact the University Researcher, Miss Lowing, at any time:

Miss Lowing (K.A.Lowing@ncl.ac.uk) Newcastle University

A few:
School

Gender: male  female

Ques. 1: Regional Language
Do you think you speak:

Scots…………………………………
Northumbrian…………………
Standard English……………✓
A different language………

OR

A mixture of Scots and English……………
A mixture of Northumbrian and English…………
A mixture of Scots, Northumbrian and English.

Can you give reasons for your choice above?
Because sheriff banks was scottish and i don’t speak like him. Everyone says you speak english

Ques. 2: Regional Language Status
Do you think Scots or Northumbrian is a language in its own right (please tick the box appropriate to your area):

Scots: Yes…  Northumbrian: Yes
No…  No
Maybe

P. C31
Ques. 2 contd:
Can you give reasons for your choice above?
Scots is a language in to self, I don't know.

Ques. 3a Regional Language in the Classroom
Do you think Scots or Northumbrian should be used in the classroom by students and/or teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By students</th>
<th>By teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes..........</td>
<td>Yes........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No...........</td>
<td>No..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe......</td>
<td>Maybe......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you give reasons for your choices?
Scots should be used in the class because if your Scotland you might not know English.

Ques. 3b Regional Language in the Classroom
Do you think Scots or Northumbrian language and literature lessons should be taught in school (please tick the box appropriate to your area)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scots language</th>
<th>Scots Literature</th>
<th>Northumbrian language</th>
<th>Northumbrian Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you give reasons for your choices?
Scots language should be taught in classes because if your Scotland you might not know the language, so it gives you a chance to know your culture.
PUPIL BASELINE QUESTIONNAIRE
THE PLACE OF REGIONAL LANGUAGE IN SCHOOLS

The research project is funded by The Beacon Trust and hopes to learn about students and their community's attitudes to regional language and its place in schools. The aim of the project is to create and put into action a scheme of work on regional language for the classroom, create recommendations for the Scottish Government / the QCDA regarding the place of regional language in the classroom and involve students and their community in the process of research. These aims will be achieved by gathering data from students (in S1 / Yr 7 ), teachers and communities and involving students, teachers and parents / guardians in the research process. Four schools will be involved in the project: two in Northumberland and two in South West Scotland. Please feel free to contact the University Researcher, Miss Lowing, at any time:

Miss Lowing (K.A.Lowing@ncl.ac.uk) Newcastle University

A few of School

Gender: male □ female □

Ques. 1: Regional Language
Do you think you speak:
Scots□
Northumbrian□
Standard English□
A different language□
OR
A mixture of Scots and English□
A mixture of Northumbrian and English□
A mixture of Scots, Northumbrian and English□

Can you give reasons for your choice above?

I am SCOTTISH

Ques. 2: Regional Language Status
Do you think Scots or Northumbrian is a language in its own right (please tick the box appropriate to your area):
Scots: Yes□ No□ Maybe□
Northumbrian: Yes□ No□ Maybe□
Ques. 2 contd:
Can you give reasons for your choice above?

The words in Scottish are different from English.

Ques. 3a Regional Language in the Classroom
Do you think Scots or Northumbrian should be used in the classroom by students and/or teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By students:</th>
<th>By teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you give reasons for your choices?

Students should not have to talk any different than they do at home.

Ques. 3b Regional Language in the Classroom
Do you think Scots or Northumbrian language and literature lessons should be taught in school (please tick the box appropriate to your area)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scots Language</th>
<th>Scots Literature</th>
<th>Northumbrian Language</th>
<th>Northumbrian Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you give reasons for your choices?

Not enough lessons are taught in the Scottish language.
APPENDIX D

BERA Ethics, school and staff information leaflet, school consent letter and parent / guardian consent letter

BERA Ethics:

1. The participants understand that they are intrinsic to the research project;

2. The participants appreciate that they can refuse to take part at any time throughout the research project without issue;

3. I am mindful to ensure that the project does not provide advantage to any participants, in relation to others;

4. All participants and establishments referred to throughout the research and in the write-up are kept anonymous;

5. Participants must provide permission to the researcher to included them in the research project (ibid.).

BERA Guidelines (British Educational Research Association): http://www.bera.ac.uk
(Accessed 4/3/2014)
INFORMATION LEAFLET: Ane Instructioun for Bairnis to be Learnt in Northumbrian and Scottis: a co-constructive participatory study of Northumberland and Scots Language and Literature use for social inclusion and citizenship in the secondary classroom.

Context:

“What’s wrong with your face, Docherty?”

‘Ah fell an’ bumped ma heid in the sheuch, sur.’
The blow is instant” (McIlvanney, 1975: p114).

The research is a co-constructive participatory project (2010-11), concerned with the impact on social inclusion that incorporating regional Language and Literature in secondary classrooms may have. Participants from Northumbrian and Lowland Scottish schools and their local (speaking) community are working together to identify and negotiate where regional Language is addressed in the local school curriculum. Participants will also create with the researcher, for the Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency / Scottish Government, a model of recommendations for regional Language in the curriculum and a school pack of materials on regional Languages (diachronic) and Literature.

The foundations of the project are based on participatory research: students, staff and the wider community are working with the researcher to carry out the comparative project. The research is exploring the use or marginalisation of Northumbrian and Scots Language and Literature within classrooms of, in particular, English, and more generally Citizenship.

The participatory students, schools and local (speaking) community, with the researcher, are addressing local school policy on regional Language and the model for policy development in this area will also be created and presented to the QCDA / Scottish Government respectively for consideration. The pack of materials will be presented for publication and the audience for same will consist of UK secondary classroom English teachers and their students between the ages of eleven and thirteen. Teachers of Citizenship may also find the pack of use.

Approximate participants numbers: 4 secondary schools, 120 students, 40 teachers and 240 members of community including parents and non-teaching staff.

Participants will benefit from the research by working together to overcome barriers to engagement and thus, create positive change by addressing the place of regional Language in the local school curriculum. Specifically participants will benefit as follows:

II. Community and its children provided with voice regarding decisions that affect
them in their community by becoming actively involved with the research.

III. Schools / students and community encouraged to utilize project to identify barriers to engagement by addressing school policies on inclusion, Citizenship and regional Languages in the curriculum.

IV. Schools provided with a working model of participatory research, which they may employ in future school projects.

V. Schools / students UK wide have access to pack of materials that aims to encourage community involvement with schools by addressing policies as II above.

For further information contact: Karen A. Lowing on 0191 222 7593 / K.A.Lowing@ncl.ac.uk
Dear Colleague,

I wondered if you might be interested in being one of the four schools which will take part in the following research project (focus: year 7 / S1): as part of my work at Newcastle, I am researching the place of regional Language in the classroom. In particular I am interested in the sister languages of Northumberland and Scots and their use in English classrooms for inclusion and citizenship. Recently I secured funding from the Beacon Trust to carry out research in local and Scottish schools (see bid as attached).

I am happy to discuss the project further with you; my aim is to add to the curriculum at …….. school and develop a working model for pupil participatory research for school colleagues to utilise. To add, as part of the project, your school will also be involved in creating a unit of work on regional Language and will help to produce recommendations for the QCDA, Education Scotland regarding the role of Northumberland / Scots in Northumberland / Scottish classrooms. Just to add, the research project adheres To BERA ethics (http://www.bera.ac.uk/publications/guidelines/).

Once I have received confirmation from the two other schools and, hopefully, yourselves, I will draw up a timetable for the year long project, starting early this year, and forward same to you. You will be able to see from the bid how often I hope to visit the school, how staff, pupils and parents might be involved and so on.

I look forward to hearing your thoughts on attached and any questions yourself or colleagues may have.

All the best,

Karen Lowing

Degree Programme Director: MA Educational Research
Course Leader: English with Drama PGCE at M. Level
King George VI Building
Queen Victoria Road Newcastle-upon-Tyne
NE17RU

0191 222 7593 / 6390
PARENT / GUARDIAN CONSENT FORM

Dear Parent / Guardian,

I would like to ask for your consent for your child or child in your care to participate in a research project I will be carrying out at your child’s school from March 2010 until February 2011.

The research project will be created and conducted with students, their class teacher and myself and will provide students with the opportunity to produce a scheme of work on regional language. They may also be given the option to research this process and, to add, research the place of regional language in the classroom generally.

As the project is community wide, the students may be given the opportunity to be involved in meetings after school hours with adults (including parents / guardians and school staff) and I, to gather data and assist with the project. Students may also have some engaging home learning to complete throughout the period of the project. In addition, students might be asked to attend a meeting at the end of the project, at an agreed venue, to join in the experience of disseminating their findings to colleagues / peers from other schools involved in the project. Data collection from students will include questionnaires and audio interviews.

I hope that your child, by taking part, will not only learn about the language(s) of their region but also, discover how a research project is constructed. I anticipate that both these learning opportunities will enhance your child’s education and encourage them to feel confident in researching their own areas of interest in the future.

I adhere to the BERA guidelines regarding research ethics, summarised as follows:
BERA GUIDELINES (British Educational Research Association) http://www.bera.ac.uk:

- Participant aware they are part of research
- Participant aware that they can decline participation in research at any time without reprisal
- Research does not advantage participants(s) over others
- Participant / School remain anonymous
- Permission for participant to take part is sought from participant

Yours faithfully,
Karen A. Lowing
ITE PGCE at M. Level English with Drama Course Leader
Degree Programme Director: MA Educational Research
Newcastle University

*****************************************************************
***

PLEASE RETURN THE FOLLOWING TEAR-OFF SLIP TO YOUR CHILD’S CLASS TEACHER.

My name is:

My child’s name is:

Please tick the following:

Yes, I would like my child to take part in the research project carried out by Karen A. Lowing at my child’s school

No, I would not like my child to take part in the research project carried out by Karen A. Lowing at my child’s school