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On the outside, looking in: Learning community languages and Scotland’s 1+2 Language Strategy.

Abstract
The Scottish Government's ambitious 1+2 Language Strategy has refocused attention on language education policy (LEP) and the provision for learning additional languages in Scottish schools. However, the maintenance of community languages\(^1\) continues to be the responsibility of minoritised parents and their complementary schools\(^2\). This article reports on a national survey of complementary school providers in order to gain insights into their perspectives of community language learning during the implementation of the 1+2 Language Strategy. Data is analysed using a Critical Language Policy (CLP) lens and reveals a complex picture of provision for teaching and learning community languages, outside of mainstream schools, and an untapped resource for language planning and valuing the linguistic diversity of Scotland. The article concludes with a discussion to inform future developments of the 1+2 Language Strategy, among which is greater engagement with language communities and a more nuanced planning approach to language learning for contemporary societies.
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Introduction
Language education policy (LEP) manifests itself through a variety of language choices including the official language(s) of instruction, the choice of additional foreign languages to study and when to start teaching additional foreign languages. In 2012 the Scottish Government introduced a 1+2 Language Strategy to align with the European Union’s (EU) goal that all European citizens should master two languages in addition to their ‘mother tongue’ in order to promote mobility and intercultural understanding (Scottish Government, 2012). In practice this means every primary school child will start learning a second language (L2) in the first year of primary school (4-5 years of age) and a third language (L3) at the latest by Primary 5 stage (8-9 years of age), which they'll continue until the end of Secondary year 3 (13-14 years of age).

The 1+2 Strategy report does not stipulate which language should be studied for L2 or L3. Therefore, these additional language planning choices, contained within the strategy, are ideological in nature and consequently schools become significant spaces for the interpretation - and possible misappropriation - of declared language policies (Shohomy, 2006; Liddicoat & Taylor-Leech, 2015). Similarly, critical language policy (CLP) acknowledges that the interests and beliefs about languages become normalised by dominant society leading to the perpetuation of unequal power relationships between majority and minority language communities. This systemic privileging of certain languages, thereby, pushes community language education to the margins (Tollefson, 2006; Liddicoat & Curnow, 2014).

Another tenet of CLP, as a conceptual tool, is understanding the diversity and complexity of language practices in multilingual societies, local communities developing their own language policies and practices, and providing counter-narratives from those in the minority. Recent contributions to this debate have explored young people’s and teachers’ lived experiences of complementary schooling but

\(^{1}\) Various terms are used to describe the languages of minority groups. In the United States (US) and Canada, the term ‘heritage’ language is commonly used, whereas in the United Kingdom (UK) and Australia, the most widely used term is ‘community’ language and for consistency that is the term adopted for this article.

\(^{2}\) The term ‘complementary’ school (also referred to as ‘supplementary’ or ‘community language’ school) is used here to describe community-initiated schools which operate mainly at the weekend.
frequently these insights are from the position of one school and one language (Walters, 2014; Reath Warren, 2017; Huang, 2018; Tigert, 2019; Nordstrom, 2019).

The aim of this article is to advance this expanding body of knowledge that gives voice to marginalised communities by drawing on data from a ground-breaking national survey of complementary school providers. In this way insights can be gained from the perspectives of a diverse range of language communities in order to engage critically with over-riding discourses during the implementation of the Scottish Government’s flagship 1+ 2 Language Strategy.

The article begins by situating the research in the context of LEP in Scotland before examining minority language communities and the complementary school phenomena. This is followed by an explanation of the research methodology and presentation of the key findings using a CLP assessment. The final section discusses aspects of the 1+2 Language Strategy which could be developed and strategies for achieving this.

Language Education Policy in Scotland

Scotland is an interesting site for the study of language education policies as constitutional change and the devolution settlement in 1999 (and further devolution of powers in 2016 in the aftermath of the independence referendum in 2014) has promoted a greater sense of a Scottish identity and given rise to new policy directions to revitalise regional languages such as Gaelic (Robertson, 2018), Scots (McDermott, 2019) and British Sign Language (BSL) (Lawson et al. 2019). What is more, data from the 2016 ScotCen’s Scottish Social Attitudes (SSA) survey revealed that 89% of the Scottish public think that learning another language at school, from the age of 5, is important (Doyle, 2018).

Similar to the wider UK, Scotland has experienced a general decline in the number of young people in schools studying modern foreign languages (MFL) (MacFarlane et al. 2018). Against this backdrop, the Scottish Government remains unique in the UK for introducing a 1+2 Language Strategy, in 2012. This aligns with the EU’s goal that all European citizens should master two languages in addition to their ‘mother tongue’ in order to promote mobility and intercultural understanding. This attempt to radically reform national language planning, and to create the conditions to nurture multilingual and pluriliterate citizens, is expected to be implemented by 2021.

There are two recommendations within 1+2 Language Strategy that are key to this article:

Recommendation 2. … that local authorities and schools … can determine which additional languages to offer. As part of this strategy, consideration should be given to teaching modern European Languages, languages of the strong economies of the future, Gaelic and community languages of pupils in schools (authors’ emphasis in italics).

3 Scotland does have other language communities such as Gaelic, Scots and BSL, but for the purpose of this article examining complementary schools, community language refers to those minority languages not traditionally associated with Scotland.
Recommendation 33. … further development of the links involving cultural organisations, local authorities, language communities and schools (authors’ emphasis in italics).

The text above indicates a commitment to offer a wide menu of languages supported by greater engagement with language communities. However, Shohamy (2006: 52) believes in critically interrogating LEP more, as this type of discourse (in the recommendations above) only provides ‘declarations and intentions’. Of note, educational policy in Scotland is rarely enshrined in legislation but ‘is much more commonly advisory or hortatory rather than imperative’ (Gillies, 2018: 87). In the case of the 1+2 Strategy, the role of local education authorities is paramount, as the thirty-two councils have been entrusted with decentralised funding to execute the recommendations alongside delegated language planning and decision-making. This leaves the Strategy open to local policy creation and a review of progress in implementing the 1+2 Language Strategy, conducted by Christie et al. (2016), found that French and Spanish remain the most popular L2 languages (mentioned within local authority strategies).

The field of CLP is characterized by debates about the very nature of the labels ascribed to both languages and learners in policy documents which can have intended and unintended consequences (Johnson, 2011). A challenge for local authorities in applying the 1+2 approach is the questionable use of the term ‘mother tongue’ used throughout the Strategy. For the majority of children mother tongue is likely to be English but for others it may be a home language other than English. When starting school these children will faced with the dual task of learning English as the language of instruction and an additional language, which is unlikely to be their stronger first language. Furthermore, languages cannot be neatly divided into community languages and modern languages. For example, German is a community language for some children who have German-speaking parents. Similarly, Gaelic and Mandarin can be modern languages for children from English speaking families who have the opportunity to learn these languages from scratch, as part of the 1+2 Strategy. For a more nuanced discussion about different learner scenarios and children’s engagement with languages in Scottish schools see McColl (2011).

The 1+2 Language Strategy does not instruct schools which language should be taught for L2 or L3. There are, however, more restrictions on the choice of L2 since it must be a language which children can continue to study at secondary school to the level of a National Qualification. This caveat discounts the majority of community languages with the exception of Urdu and Chinese. Of significance, attempts by the Polish community to lobby for Polish as an examination subject at National 4 and 5 and Higher level have been continuously rebuffed by the Scottish Government.

For L3 however, there are no such restrictions in terms of continuity into the secondary school which gives schools scope to deliver a language which suits their local circumstances and allows them to capitalise on available resources. For example, a number of primary schools have experimented with support from native speakers, such as enlisting overseas students from local Universities, to teach Mandarin on a voluntary basis.
Although the review of progress in implementing the 1+2 Language Strategy, (Christie et al. 2016), found a more diverse range of languages under consideration for L3 (such as BSL, Gaelic, Scots, Polish and Arabic), the most popular proved to be Spanish, German and French. It may be argued that it is not realistic to expect that all primary teachers be trained to deliver an in-depth experience of two languages, particularly at this stage in the development of the policy.

That said, the discourse surrounding the attachment to a limited number of Western European languages relies on historical, geographical and economic arguments. The latter views certain languages as desirable commodities that have market value (Block, 2014), whereas, the community languages used daily in homes across Scotland are perceived as lacking economic value and commodification status. In fact, community language maintenance is frequently viewed as the sole responsibility of the language communities themselves rather than mainstream schools (Weekly, 2020).

Regrettably, the commodification argument, habitually played out in political arenas and the media, clouds the overwhelming body of empirical research evidence of the social and cognitive benefits of additional language learning (regardless of the language learnt) - including more developed creativity skills, enhanced analytical abilities, improved memory, a strong foundation for learning additional languages and a greater appreciation of cultural diversity (Woll & Li Wei, 2019).

The promotion of languages within the scope of 1+2 Language Strategy is also determined by changing ideologies mediated through political and commercial factors. The Scottish Government Strategy explicitly states that ‘account should be taken of…languages of the strong economies of the future’ (Scottish Government 2012: 14). This can be illustrated by an era of educational collaboration between China and Scotland and the creation of 44 Confucius hubs in schools across the whole of Scotland. This is not too dissimilar to the promotion of Japanese in the 1990s. According to Pérez-Milans (2015) the rise of Chinese as a MFL offers schools an opportunity to construct a discourse of mobility and employability linked with the learning of a ‘global’ language. At the same time tensions exist because of a mismatch in teaching styles and an emphasis on language awareness rather than language learning. Furthermore, scant attention has been paid to the promotion of Chinese among the Cantonese and Hakka speaking Chinese diaspora in Scotland (Hancock, 2014).

**Language Communities in Scotland**

The 1+2 Language Strategy recommends that links should be developed involving local authorities, language communities and schools to benefit from native speakers whose skills can be deployed to support the work of teachers. Scotland’s language communities are heterogeneous in nature as a consequence of both historical migratory flows and more intensified contemporary transnational mobility. For nearly half a century, the linguistic demography of Scotland has been shaped by large settled communities of former commonwealth citizens including Urdu and Punjabi speakers from Pakistan and Cantonese and Hakka speakers from Hong Kong. More recently, the territorial enlargement of the European Union (EU) in 2004, 2007 and 2013 brought 13 new countries into the
Union, presenting opportunities for transnationalism and an entitlement to the free movement of labour. These relatively recent language communities come from countries such as Poland, Romania, Lithuania, Latvia and Hungary.

In addition to the above large-scale cross-border movements, political and economic volatility across the globe have seen the arrival of significant numbers of refugee and asylum-seeking families to Scotland. Most ‘New Scots’ originate from countries experiencing conflict (such as Afghanistan, Somalia and Zimbabwe) or persecution (such as the Roma in Eastern Europe and Kurds in Iraq). Clearly this demographic fluctuates depending on political developments. For example, as a result of the humanitarian crisis in Syria, over 3,000 Syrians refugees have arrived in Scotland since 2015, as part of the UK government’s Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme (VPRS).

The Scottish School Census 2018 (Scottish Government, 2019) identified 63,626 (9%) pupils who had a first language other than English. This proportion of children and young people learning English as an additional language (EAL) showed an increase of 90% from 2010 when the data was first recorded nationally (Scottish Government, 2019). Furthermore, the 2018 Pupil Census confirms that children and young people come from a variety of language backgrounds with 149 listed as ‘first’ languages compared to 136 different languages in 2010. In 2018 the top five community languages in order of pupil numbers were Polish, Urdu, Punjabi, Chinese (Mandarin and Cantonese) and Arabic.

The transnational factors and patterns outlined above have created ‘super-diverse’ (Vertovec, 2007) language communities in Scotland characterised by a dynamic interplay of variables among scattered, multiple geographical-origin, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified migrants. This kind of complexity provides an unmatched potential to tap into and promote the linguistic resources of school age children and young people as a part of the 1+2 Language Strategy.

**Complementary Schools**

The complementary school phenomena have grown out of decades of institutional structures and a system of ‘linguistic apartheid’ (Li Wei, 2006), where the learning of community languages is not legitimised in mainstream schools. It has, therefore, been left to the endeavours of concerned language communities to take action and set up schools themselves in the evenings and weekends in order to protect the vitality of their heritage languages, as it is integral to their identity and cultural practices (Hancock and Hancock, 2019). The creation of these pockets of micro language planning (Liddicoat & Taylor-Leech, 2015) can be theorised using Bourdieu’s (1990) notion of agency and the capacity of parents to act autonomously and make their own choices. Nwulu (2015:15) distinguishes three different motivational factors behind the establishment of this type of grassroots provision: conserving the linguistic and cultural heritage; compensating for underachievement and inadequate mainstream

---

4 Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovak Republic, Slovenia joined in 2004; Romania and Bulgaria joined in 2007 and Croatia joined in 2013.
provision and a *counter-cultural* dimension which seeks to challenge dominant societal discourses that perpetuate racism and discrimination. This latter element is particularly relevant in a Brexit world where everyday racism is on the increase.

Complementary schools are not divorced from criticism. Analysts such as Cummins (2000) caution against ‘romanticizing’ the learning of community languages when the languages are marginalized from mainstream education and relegated to a powerless position. García (2014) believes this state of affairs contributes to the silencing of society’s bilingualism. Part-time provision also means learners are unable to develop their first language skills to a sophisticated and academic level. As a result, learners tend to develop a skewed profile in oral language and literacy skills (Zhang, 2016). In addition, some scholars question the educational rigor of teaching and learning when pedagogical practices are perceived as ‘mundane’ and backward looking (Li Wei & Wu, 2010; Walters, 2011).

That said, the last decade has seen a wave of scholarly activity in a variety of locations across the globe acknowledging the crucial educational and social role of complementary schools, such as England (Creese & Blackledge, 2010), the United States (US) (Beaudrie et al, 2014), Canada (Aravossitas, 2014) and Australia (Nordstorm, 2016). By comparison, scant attention has been paid to the complementary school phenomena in Scotland, with the exceptions of Hancock (2012) and Bell (2013).

A number of contributors to the debate have pointed to complementary schools as opening up possibilities for authentic language practices and translanguageging where learners use their agency and employ all the languages at their disposal on their own terms to support learning (Creese and Blackledge, 2010; Hancock, 2012; Li Wei, 2014). This practiced language policy (Bonacina-Pugh 2012, 2017) shines a light on youth culture as learners’ contest and negotiate language norms and choices. Maylor et al. (2010) also argue that complementary schools help to reinforce English language learning, make children more effective communicators, and support problem-solving abilities and reading proficiency.

These weekend and evening schools serve a vital role in developing children’s social capital through participation in shared cultural activities and engaging with role models from similar backgrounds. These ‘separate spaces’ provide children and young people with safe havens to build resilience and explore complex questions of nuanced identity (re) construction and (re) invention as they navigate diasporic social, cultural and linguistic contexts (Francis, Archer & Mau, 2009 and Nwulu, 2015).

**Methodology**

The research design was informed by a CLP perspective and included four overlapping and interconnected phases. A first step in understanding the complexities of language policy is to explore the intersection of interests of the dominant and minority language groups. With this aim in mind, two half-day knowledge exchange seminars were organized at the University of Edinburgh in order to bring
together practitioners, local government staff and other stakeholders, for dialogue and engagement. For example, Local Authority English as an additional language support Services (EAL) were considered the first point of contact because of their advocacy role in schools and knowledge of learners’ and parents’ heritage backgrounds.

Second, the networks from the seminars were supplemented by a desk-based Internet search to pinpoint schools that may have been missed. This snowballing sampling method was employed because previous research identified several challenges when reaching out to marginalized communities in Scotland when schools are often only known by the communities themselves (McPake, 2006). The sample was built up in an incremental way until it was deemed that data generated would be as representative as far as possible of the diverse language communities.

The mapping exercise identified 62 complementary schools or classes making provision for 18 different heritage languages after school hours or at the weekend: Polish, Cantonese, Mandarin, Arabic, Urdu, Punjabi, Hebrew, Hindi, Russian, Greek, Japanese, Farsi, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian and Dutch (see Table 1). All of the schools were located in the major cities of Scotland (Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen and Dundee and Inverness). The vast majority of the schools (84%) were in the central belt which includes Glasgow and Edinburgh.

The number of complementary schools may appear low but it seems likely that there were other community language schools and centres which we failed to identify either via the knowledge exchange sessions or through internet searches. The diversity and precariousness of the sector means some schools move in and out of existence because of lack of suitable teachers and sustainable funding. Also, some organisations are just a small group of parents and children meeting in community premises or private houses and therefore not officially identified as community language schools. Furthermore, it is sometimes difficult to identify if a faith setting, such as a Gurdwaras or Synagogues, provides language as well as religious teaching.

**Table 1: Languages taught in complementary schools (n=62)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin/Cantonese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Attendees at the seminars included representatives from Scottish Government, Education Scotland, the Polish Consulate, Scotland’s National Centre for Languages (SCILT), academics, practitioners (mainstream and complementary schools), local authority staff from across Scotland (Stirling Council, Highland Council, Dumfries and Galloway Council, City of Edinburgh, Scottish Borders), NGOs and students.
Third, the questionnaire was distributed through Bristol Online Survey (BOS) to capture the viewpoints and experiences of complementary schools. This web-based survey tool provides a variety of question types and complex data flows can be built up by the use of filter questions. BOS has the benefit of allowing participants to edit and make changes and the use of set questions supports reliability.

The questionnaire was composed of four sections. The first section collected information about the school, including the date it was established, the accommodation used, number of teachers (including parent- and student-teachers), and financial support. The second section focused on pupils at the school, asking for the number of pupils, age range, size and organization of classes, and whether pupils came from bilingual or English-speaking homes. The questionnaire then turned to the ways in which the school supported the 1+2 Strategy. Finally, a set of questions asked about assessment in the school, including details of homework, tests and reporting assessment to parents. A pilot of the questionnaire was sent to three teachers at separate complementary schools to gain feedback on the design and make adjustments.

The questionnaire was sent to 62 complementary schools identified in the audit and received 21 responses (a 33% response rate); this is above response rates for nationally distributed surveys (Salah & Bista, 2017) (see Table 2). All of the schools were located in Glasgow or Edinburgh with the exception of three Polish Schools found in the Scottish Borders, Inverness and Aberdeen.

Table 2: Questionnaire Responses (n=21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin/Cantonese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the fourth phase, several respondents to the online questionnaire indicated they would be willing to
provide further information about their complementary school. As such a number of follow-up telephone and face-to-face semi-structured interviews were set up to encourage counter narratives as it allowed representatives of language communities a voice to contest issues. However, a danger of this approach is it positions marginalised groups as the ‘other’. That said, semi-structured interviews do offer a potentially richer response into alternative perspectives, by giving the interviewer a chance to probe and explore the themes in more depth and to gain a more illuminating understanding of the issues.

Different themes emerged from the data gathered from the questionnaires and interviews including commonalities and differences. These themes were then categorised in relation to aspects of CLP to help explain the complementary school phenomena and to acknowledge the interests and perspectives of language communities in Scotland. That is to say, interpretive understanding was achieved through thematic analysis which surfaced both inductively from the data itself and deductively from a CLP perspective.

**Findings**

This section draws on findings from the national audit of complementary schools in Scotland but for the purpose of this article it concentrates on data related to three key themes from a CLP standpoint: diversity of languages and provision; diversity of learners and curriculum activities; and counter narratives associated with the 1+2 Language Strategy.

**Diversity of languages and provision**

The schools varied widely in size; the largest was a Chinese school with over 1,000 pupils, while other schools only had around 20-30 pupils. In general, there was a strong network of Chinese and Polish schools reflecting the demographics of Scotland. Many of the eighteen Polish Saturday schools had been established since the accession of Poland to the European Union (EU) in 2004, with one founded as recently as February 2016.

The majority of Chinese schools were well established, with several active since the early 1970s, but new schools continue to be set up including one in 2016. One Japanese complementary school had been operating since the early 1980s, and a Greek school had been functioning for over 50 years. The majority of other European language complementary schools were set up in the last 10 to 15 years.

Some sites of worship did not have formal language lessons but provided opportunities for learning languages and literacies through other activities. For example, a Hindu temple had Carnatic music classes where the children learnt vocabulary and a variety of scripts (Tamil, Telugu/Kannada and Malayalam) to support the understanding of the system of classical music commonly associated with southern India, as well as Sri Lanka.
The internet trawl highlighted the heterogeneous nature of minority communities in Scotland with a range of Chinese, Polish and Arabic schools serving the different needs of the super-diverse communities. For instance, Edinburgh alone hosts five distinct Chinese schools: two schools for Cantonese and Hakka-speaking children with heritage ties to Hong Kong with Mandarin and Cantonese classes; one small school for Cantonese and Hakka-speaking children with heritage ties to Hong Kong and located at the True Jesus Church; and one school with a 24-year history with provision for Mandarin-speakers from mainland China and affiliated to the Chinese Consulate. Finally, a new school set up by professionals for Mandarin-speakers incorporating diverse teaching methods and encouraging non-native speakers.

Arabic is the primary language of education and discourse in numerous countries across the Middle East and North Africa. Arabic also functions as the language of Islam for Muslims across the globe with Arabic taught in mosques for the recitation of the Qur’an. Not surprisingly, the internet scan revealed a diverse range of provision for the teaching of Arabic within Edinburgh: after school classes at the Mosque teaching Arabic alongside the study of the Qur’an; a Libyan school, supported by the Libyan Embassy in London, teaching a condensed curriculum programme to support children and young people to maintain their heritage language and curriculum knowledge before returning home; Arabic Saturday school open to all nationalities with a focus on learning Arabic, without religious texts, and acting as an examination centre; and single-community classes organised by Sudanese families in community centres once or twice a week.

Some schools also arranged classes around different language varieties. For example, a Greek school had an additional Ancient Greek class. Some classes in the larger Chinese schools were differentiated for Cantonese and Mandarin instruction and for adult speakers from non-Chinese homes.

Funding for schools came from a mix and variety of sources. Over half (67%) of the schools were funded through student fees, and over a third (38%) received financial support from embassies or consulates. Less than a third (29%) of the schools received some funding from the local authority (such as paying some teachers’ salaries) and support in kind, such as rent-free premises. Two schools turned to other sources of funding. One school teaching a European language received a home government grant for the promotion of language learning abroad and a Chinese school received a donation from an overseas charity. In other situations, schools were entirely self-funded and relied on volunteer teachers and board members with annual fees collected from parents to cover the cost of the rental of premises. A number of the participants mentioned the closure of complementary schools associated with their language communities as an era of budgetary austerity has made financial support from Scottish local authorities and home governments more difficult to source.

*Diverse learners and curriculum activities*
The audit revealed a diverse range of learners attending complementary schools in terms of socio-linguistic profiles and migration histories. The vast majority of the pupils at Polish and Chinese schools came from homes where both parents speak the community language. However, the well-established Chinese schools were more tailored for second or third generation speakers where mainstream schooling and social networking has privileged English as a source of qualifications and upward social mobility. Whereas, the more recent Polish schools cater for more transnational migrants and new arrivals where language maintenance is sometimes motivated by faith ceremonies and communication with grandparents in the heritage country.

In a Punjabi school 100% of the pupils came from Punjabi speaking families, whereas in the smaller schools making provision for European languages, the percentage of mixed race homes was significantly higher. For example, schools making provision for Portuguese (80%), French (70%), German (60%) and Greek (45%). The highest percentage belonged to a Japanese School where 74% of the pupils were mixed race. Schools with the highest percentage of pupils from families where the heritage language was not spoken included a Greek school (5%) and a French school (5%). These varied pupils’ language profiles, outlined above, means teachers have to respond to and adjust their pedagogies to the diverse language needs of learners in their classrooms. It is, therefore, not surprising that the main area identified by schools for teachers’ professional learning in the survey (80%) is greater knowledge of ‘differentiation’.

The schools were asked to give details of the curriculum materials that they employed. Some schools said they had to rely on textbooks used in mainstream schools in their heritage country, as the following show:

Japanese textbooks used in Japanese mainstream schools.

Lerndrachen materials primarily designed for school students in Germany, Austria and Switzerland.

Some schools sourced texts which were designed specifically for foreign language learners or for learners in diasporic communities:

Books are shipped from Cyprus and Greece. They are specifically developed for children learning Greek as a foreign language.

Falas Português? This is the main textbook and, yes, we do buy it in Portugal. It is written for children learning abroad. It comes with an exercise book and a CD.

---

6 Mixed race is a contested term but preferred to bicultural to illustrate the complexity and diversity of an individual’s cultural heritage.

7 Active learning and classroom management were also considered as priorities for teachers’ professional learning in the survey.
Whereas other schools used a mixture of resources to meet the needs of the learners with different proficiency levels:

The textbooks are a combination...based on the needs of the class. We order books from the Greek embassy, we buy the ones used in mainstream schools from Greece and we also use resources targeted [at the] Greeks of diaspora.

We buy school books from Poland, some of which are used in mainstream education there. Some are written for children living abroad.

One Arabic school adopted a trial and error approach:

We have tried different materials over the last 10 years, some brought from overseas from specialized bookshops and some others taught in mainstream schools. We did struggle sometimes in finding the right materials. But now we rely on books based on GCSE courses.

A number of Chinese schools had to make provision for different language varieties taught in the school as the following suggests:

For Mandarin class, we order Zhōngwén [中文] textbooks and exercises book compiled by the Chinese Language College of Jinan University for Overseas Chinese and their children from UK Association for the Promotion Chinese Education. We also have pinyin book and exercise for Mandarin class. For adult non-native speaker class, we use HSK textbooks. For Cantonese classes, we use from UKFCS.8

Two schools, of Russian and Greek, noted that many teachers use material from the Internet which is becoming increasingly more available. Furthermore, the children also use websites and apps privately to support their learning. Almost all (80%) of the schools mentioned wanting access to more technology such as smart-boards, laptops, projectors and tablets to support teaching and learning. Some schools commented on the challenges of accessing technology when using mainstream school premises:

Our teachers are always keen to implement new technologies and resources but we do not have access to the tech systems available at [School] so sadly we are not in a position to make such use in the classroom.

We are seen as Council employees yet we do not have passwords for the computers to help with teaching in the classroom.

8 United Kingdom Federation of Chinese Schools (UKFCS) is a charity that aims to promote, through its member schools, Chinese language education and Chinese culture. Let's Learn Chinese is a new series of textbooks designed to meet the needs of children learning Chinese as a second or foreign language.
The curriculum activities are interpreted by an eclectic array of individual teachers working in complementary schools. These actors include registered teachers trained in Scotland, teachers who are qualified outside the UK, visiting international students, and unqualified volunteer parents. Written feedback showed that there was often a mismatch in teaching styles between the teachers who were educated in their heritage country and the pupils who attend schools in Scotland, as the comment below illustrates:

The teaching style in Greece is drastically different to the one here and it clashes what the kids are used to do at Scottish school. For example, minimum homework in Scottish schools versus a lot of homework and learning texts by heart in Greek schools. We follow the Greek teaching style and this can be proved challenging.

Two schools, of Polish and Russian, expanded on the challenges of the curriculum:

The biggest challenge comes from the parents’ expectations that quite often expect for the teachers to complete full-time school hours learning in a two-hour weekly lesson.

There is a demand from many parents to follow as closely as possible the age-appropriate curriculum for mainstream schools in Russian-speaking countries, which obviously isn't really feasible.

Counter narratives associated with the 1+2 Language Strategy

Many complementary schools indicated that they were outward-facing and looking for opportunities to share cultural experiences with wider society, that they encouraged ‘non-native’ speakers to attend, and were also keen to connect better with local authorities and mainstream schools to support the 1+2 Language Strategy.

The schools were asked how they thought their school supported the Scottish Government’s 1+2 Language Strategy and responses indicated varying degrees of awareness and interest:

We don't. We follow the curriculum as indicated by the Greek Ministry of Education.

We do not have a policy on this. We used to offer classes especially preparing pupils for SQA qualifications in Russian, and then, after the SQA Russian qualifications were dropped, for Russian A-Levels. Currently this is not being run due to lack of teachers prepared to take this on, but there is persistent parent interest.

The questionnaire collected information on whether schools had meetings with the Local Authority about the 1+2 Language Strategy; 16 of the 21 (76%) total responses indicated they had not had not been contacted by the Local Authority, nor were they aware of who they should approach to arrange a meeting. Only one school (of Punjabi) said they had meetings ‘quite often’.
Of the five schools that did have meetings with their Local Authority regarding the 1+2 Language Strategy, three indicated that these were either not frequent or that they were not particularly productive:

Yes, at least once a year. Sadly, we don't see that there is any informed progress or any lessons learned from these meetings.

Yes, but unfortunately not very productive.

We had one meeting with [the Service] but it has not lead to any real action.

The questionnaire asked if any of the complementary schools have links with mainstream schools to offer activities in Heritage Language learning; 19 of the 21 (90%) responses indicated that they did not have links with local mainstream schools. However, of these 19 schools, several indicated that this was something they were seeking to develop as the following responses indicate:

We work closely with both the schools where we provide our classes and in the future we consider organising sessions for pupils who are not heritage speakers of Polish.

We are working in this direction and would like to have support in doing so.

Two schools confirmed that they had links with mainstream schools:

Yes, some staff have a chance to offer taster Polish classes or participate in language days.

The Masjid teaches Arabic. The Saturday classes are with [ ], who is Moroccan and also teaching French as part of 1+2 as a parent helper in one of the primaries.

One complementary school had contacted a local authority to offer Japanese teaching as part of the 1+2 Language Strategy but the local authority responded that their support was not required because of their policy of teaching Mandarin.

One Chinese school had already reflected on the challenges of the availability of teachers to support the 1+2 strategy in mainstream schools. The school was willing to support the training of teachers by offering Mandarin lessons available online:

To offer non-Chinese speaking language teachers online Mandarin lessons and teaching platform designed by qualified native Chinese speaking teachers to enable any schools to provide Mandarin teaching to pupils. This would solve the problems of lacking of funding or qualified Chinese-speaking teachers at schools. Ultimately this project aims to empower more schools to offer Mandarin teaching and support 1+2 policy.
One area where complementary schools can support the implementation of the 1+2 Language Strategy is to prepare learners with their progression to national awards and qualifications. The survey revealed complementary schools are keen to enter their students for Scottish Qualification Authority (SQA) examinations but National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher Chinese and Urdu are the only Scottish awards available.

None of the complementary schools in the survey were registered as an SQA examination centre. Only two complementary schools were able to conduct the controlled assessment units in talking and reading at their school as these Chinese tests can be moderated by a General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) registered teacher. However, the writing and listening elements of assessment have to take place in a school acting as an SQA examination centre. One respondent noted the difficulties if the complementary school did not have a GTCS registered teacher:

We had frequent monitoring and moderation from a GTCS registered Chinese teacher who worked in a Scottish school – this has always been a bit of a challenge to overcome and we have taken advice from SQA in the past.

Complementary schools not having access to a General Teaching Council (Scotland) (GTCS) registered teacher to help with the controlled assessments was compounded by the fact that languages such as Polish are not a subject area taught in Scottish Schools. Consequently, the GTCS does not have a registration category for the teachers of that language who have obtained their teaching qualifications in another country. In the absence of an SQA award, it relied on the actions of complementary schools and parents to look for opportunities for their young people to take examinations under the auspices of English examination boards.

There were some examples of effective partnerships between mainstream and complementary schools and one respondent noted the advantage of their complementary school being located in the same building as the mainstream school. In some circumstances the examinations were timetabled in addition to the students’ other subjects and the examination fee paid by the mainstream school. In another situation students applied as External Candidates in order to sit the examinations in another school.

However, during an interview one complementary school teacher talked about possible communication and organizational difficulties if the mainstream school was dealing with an English examination board rather than the familiar SQA.

One respondent mentioned that this was dependent on the goodwill of the mainstream school allowing the space and timetabling of the examination. Sometimes the complementary school paid the fees and

---

9 Examples of languages offered by English Boards include AQA (Bengali, Chinese, Modern Hebrew, Panjabi, Polish and Urdu), Edexcel (Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Modern Greek and Urdu), Oxford Cambridge and Royal Society of Arts (OCR) (Dutch, Gujarati, Persian, Portuguese and Turkish).
charged parents an administrative fee when presenting young people for examinations in mainstream schools. At least one complementary school mentioned that the only examination centre left to accept their students as external candidates was a small private school:

We have a dedicated teacher who prepares the students throughout the year and then their parents take them to [ ] in June, for their exams. We used to present them through some private schools in Glasgow, but they have all stopped the GCSE/GCE examinations in favour of the International Baccalaureate.

One school reported that the decision by SQA to axe Higher Russian after 2015 meant that parents had to take on the responsibility for organizing the examination for their son or daughter:

Since there is no SQA qualification in Russian, our only available qualifications are English ones. The arrangements here tend to be very ad hoc – historically it was up to the parents to arrange this; historically this has usually been done via the (most often private) school the child goes to.

The findings reveal a broad range of provision in terms of complementary schools in Scotland, and diverse language communities across the country. However, they also suggest that the current implementation of the 1+2 Language Strategy at a national and local level is not fully realising the potential of complementary schools to contribute to and enhance linguistic diversity in Scotland and fulfil the aims of the Strategy. The following Discussion will consider the implications of this in more detail.

**Discussion**

This article has taken a CPL lens to report on a more nuanced understanding of grassroots schooling exercised by language communities during the implementation of the Scottish Government’s 1+2 Language Strategy. It is acknowledged that the findings that emerged from the research are based on a small sample of questionnaire returns and interviews. As such the findings cannot be considered representative of all complementary schools in Scotland. That said, the sample covered a wide range of provision and language communities and provided an enriched national picture of the complementary school phenomena and a diverse provision for 18 languages.

The 2018 Schools Census shows 149 different languages spoken by pupils in Scottish schools (Scottish Government, 2019). Taking Gaelic, Scots and British Sign Language (BSL) out of the equation, this suggests no provision exists for the teaching and learning of many languages. Some of these languages have very small numbers of speakers, but notable omissions, in order of pupil numbers, are Romanian, Lithuanian Bengali and Latvian. The research also highlighted a lack of provision for asylum seekers and refugees.
The mixed landscape of provision requires a flexible approach to support the 1+2 Language Strategy and cater for the diverse needs, perspectives and aspirations of the community language learners and their communities. Ways of enhancing effective pedagogies include utilising technological advances and shared learning spaces (Coyle, 2018) to support geographically isolated community language learners in schools, such as the E-Sgoil\textsuperscript{10} initiative in the Western Isles of Scotland, complementary schools and mainstream schools working in partnership (Ramalingam & Griffith, 2015; Anderson, Chung & Macleroy, 2018), and mainstreaming community languages (McFarlane, Deerin & Payne, 2018). Refer to Hancock and Hancock (2018) for a detailed account of the benefits and limitations of these different models.

The overriding concern for complementary schools is language maintenance but local language planning is in a constant state of flux and influenced by different actors (Hogan-Brun, 2013). The survey revealed wide-ranging local practices constrained by inadequate and uneven funding, a pursuit of authentic teaching materials for an assortment of diasporic learners and new arrivals, a mismatch in pedagogical practices, and a lack of Scottish qualifications in community languages. That said, the danger of a CLP focus on decisions made in language communities is that analysis adopts a fragmentary perspective and is deprived of more high level interpretations of national policy which excludes community languages from mainstream schooling (Pennycook, 2010).

One significant challenge to the implementation of the 1+2 Language Strategy is the insufficient supply of professionally trained and qualified teachers for all languages (Crichton, 2018) but in particular the structural barriers complementary school teachers face in obtaining qualified status (Minty et al. 2008). One solution is to draw on the idea of the Confucius classroom hubs, which deploys teachers on a peripatetic basis to cluster schools and promotes the sharing of ideas and resources to stimulate the learning and teaching of Chinese. The Hub concept can be extended to other languages and include partner schools in a country that speaks the community language, professional learning opportunities, and the use of GTCS standards for exchange teachers. Victoria State Government in Australia also provides advice to community language schools with exemplars of running a language programme, language teaching resources and languages professional learning\textsuperscript{11}.

CLP has also been critiqued ‘for being too deterministic and underestimating the power of human agency’ (Johnson, 2010: 62). The idea that minority language communities start out from different power positions compared to dominant social groups, and yet can exercise agency at the same time, in

\textsuperscript{10} E-Sgoil is funded by the Scottish Government and Bòrd na Gàidhlig. In 2018 the Scottish Government published its Digital Learning and Teaching Strategy for Scotland Enhancing Learning and Teaching Through The Use Of Digital Technology. \url{http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0050/00505855.pdf}

\textsuperscript{11} Victoria State Government in Australia also provides advice to community language schools: \url{https://www.education.vic.gov.au/school/teachers/teachingresources/discipline/languages/Pages/clsschools.aspx}
the face of the 1+2 Language Strategy, needs interrogating more. Some scholars have referred to this phenomenon as ‘ambiguous agency’ (Bordonaru and Payne, 2012) where interpretations of agency and how it is achieved continue to be wide-ranging rather than assumed to be inherently positive and desired by all language communities. For example, two schools indicated that they valued their independence and a number of questionnaires were returned by Madrasses¹², who responded that they did not think that the 1+2 Language Strategy was relevant to them.

The reasons behind this stance for self-determination may be complex but it is not surprising as language communities have had to establish their own complementary schools to protect their languages, literacies and cultural traditions in order to resist monolingual school practices. Moreover, provision includes faith-based classes such as the teaching and learning of religious scripts in Gurdwaras and Mosques where practices are not well understood outside their own communities. Furthermore, there is a lack of evidence of the impact of language tuition on children and young people in faith-based classes (Cherti and Bradley, 2011).

Therefore, focusing on human agency is no longer enough and greater emphasis needs to be placed on the heterogeneous nature of language communities and the intricacies, ambiguities, tensions and contradictions of identifications of language learners and their lived experiences (Glasgow & Bouchard, 2019). Taking this standpoint alongside a perception of agency as ‘potential’ (Ratner, 2000), and fluctuating rather than static, will assist scholars, policymakers, and practitioners to engage more critically with CLP.

The Scottish Government’s drive for a devolved funding model to local authorities was determined by an acknowledgement of the varied demographics and educational provision across the country but a corollary of this political intention is a lack of ‘a systematic overarching national framework for development’ (Crichton, 2018: 344). Therefore, the enforcement mechanism of the declared language strategy is quite soft and open to varied interpretations and local variations.

As such power relationships go beyond decisions about the narrow choice of additional languages taught in mainstream schools but also include judgements about which language community voices are heard and which are being silenced. It is clear that some attempts were made by local authorities to make links with complementary schools but responses indicated that where meetings did occur, they were perceived as tokenistic and unproductive rather than educationally driven.

To have sustainable impact, one-off consultations with complementary schools need to be replaced by constructive and reciprocal processes with discernible actions to support community language learning. This engagement needs to be conducted in the spirit of respectful dialogue and learning from each other. Where conflicting agendas exist, these debates can be used as a stimulus for reflection and risk-

¹² The Arabic word madrassa (plural: madaris) generally has two meanings: in its more common literal and colloquial usage, it simply means ‘school’, but increasingly it has become the term used to describe an educational institution offering instruction in Islamic subjects including the Qur’an.
taking. According to Tisdell (2013: 23) transformation can be unsettling, tense, and uncomfortable but ‘perhaps more unsettling is needed.’

**Conclusion**

This article contributes to critical studies interrogating existing national language policy by investigating community language provision in Scotland in the context of the implementation of the 1+2 Language Strategy. It has taken a CLP perspective to support understandings of how community language learning is framed by ‘official’ and ‘counter’ narratives but remains at the fringes of the Language Strategy. It argues that there is a need to build on the Language Strategy by acknowledging the increasing number of children and young people in Scottish schools who are learning community languages and literacies in the evenings and weekends. This requires revisiting the commitment contained within the Language Strategy to further develop links involving language communities in Scotland. The article makes a case for greater dialogue between the different actors at the intersection of macro and micro language planning in order develop a more nuanced approach to teaching and learning community languages. In this way Scotland can take advantage of the pre-existing linguistic resources of many of its citizens to safeguard a global outlook in the shadow of Brexit and post-Covid-19 world.
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