



Scottish classroom voices: a case study of teaching and learning Scots

Jo Arthur Shoba

To cite this article: Jo Arthur Shoba (2010) Scottish classroom voices: a case study of teaching and learning Scots, Language and Education, 24:5, 385-400, DOI: [10.1080/09500781003695559](https://doi.org/10.1080/09500781003695559)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500781003695559>



Published online: 29 Apr 2010.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 628



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

Scottish classroom voices: a case study of teaching and learning Scots

Jo Arthur Shoba*

Department of English and History, Edge Hill University, St Helens Road, Ormskirk L39 4QP, UK

(Received 5 October 2009; final version received 9 February 2010)

Research in multilingual classrooms demonstrates education as a key site within which social and linguistic values are shaped. This study extends such research by investigating language use in a Scottish primary classroom. Scots is widely spoken throughout Scotland, figuring in a 2003 Scottish Parliament report as one of two indigenous heritage languages, alongside Gaelic. However, the historical repression of Scots and its linguistic relatedness to English have led to its being widely regarded as a non-standard dialect rather than a language, in fact as ‘bad English’. Scottish English, rather than Scots, is the officially sanctioned language of education in Scotland. This study focuses on talk amongst schoolchildren during lessons in which written Scots texts were discussed. Triangulation with interview data served to relate the patterning of linguistic choices observed to the social meanings which participants attach to their language choices. The findings indicate challenges faced by teachers and learners in identifying which Scots forms – their own usage or those found in written texts – will be validated through classroom use. They also reveal the constraining effects on such classroom initiatives of the wider context of Scottish language norms and values.

Keywords: classroom dialogue; heritage languages; pedagogy; Scots

Introduction

‘I didn’t know about old Scots . . . even though I talked

some of the words I thought that was in English’

(schoolchild, aged 10)

There are many examples, throughout the world and throughout history, of the imposition of prestige languages through education. One thinks, for example, of Ngũgĩ wa Thiongo’s (1986) moving account of his childhood experiences of schooling through English in rural Kenya. Lack of affirmation of children’s home language, and a resulting loss – of both language and cultural identity – lead all too often, in Lambert’s (e.g. 1980) terms, to ‘subtractive’ rather than ‘additive’ bilingualism. It is therefore helpful that a body of research is emerging which focuses in some detail on the classroom processes implicated in the interactional accomplishment of social and linguistic hierarchy. For example, in the contexts of Hong Kong and Sri Lanka respectively, Lin (2001) and Canagarajah (1999) have examined the teaching of English, both studies demonstrating the value-laden nature of the bilingual language practices which characterise classroom interaction in these settings. (For a range of further studies, see Heller and Martin-Jones’ 2001 edited collection.)

*Email: shobajo@edgehill.ac.uk

Approaching the case of Scots from this perspective is revealing; because of its linguistic relatedness to the prestige variety, Scottish English, it is also quite complex.

The origins of both Scots and English can be traced back to the Anglo-Saxon invasions of Britain in the fifth century. Spreading north and west from Northumbria, by the eleventh century Scots – then known as Inglis, and only later as Scottis – was the everyday language of lowland Scotland and had replaced Gaelic as the language of the Scottish court. The fifteenth century marked a ‘golden age’ of Scots literature, following which the language entered a prolonged period of decline, related to developments in education and in literacy which are outlined in the following section of this paper. Görlach (1998, 13) describes this subsequent history of Scots as one of ‘dithering between independent language status and that of a set of de facto dialects of English’, terming contemporary Scots ‘a *Halbsprache* or half-language’.

Contemporary Scots exists as a relatively unfocused variety – variable rather than standardised – so that usage has been conceptualised as a stylistic continuum along which speakers ‘styledrift’ (Aitken 1982). Moreover, this stylistic continuum is not static over time but continues to shrink, with the Scots pole being drawn towards the English pole. This helps to explain uncertainty in the minds of Scots speakers over the identification of their language: as Macafee (2000, 5) puts it in discussing attempts to survey Scots speakers, Scots is ‘not well-defined in the public mind’. Indeed, the term ‘Scots’ to define contemporary usage is not in common currency. This confusion is echoed in the statement of the 10-year-old Scots speaker which heads this section, as is the fact that Scottish schoolchildren in general have ‘negligible knowledge of the history of Scots’ (Menzies 1991, cited in Corbett 2003, 266), being exposed instead to the widespread perception of Scots as a non-standard dialect of English (Lo Bianco 2001). The twentieth-century Scots literary revival rested not on contemporary usage but on Lallans, a reinvention of Scots which, as McClure (1995, 23) points out, is ‘nobody’s native speech’. Indeed, the best known of the Lallans poets, Hugh MacDiarmid, described contemporary spoken Scots as ‘decayed and corrupt forms . . . plebeian and illiterate usage’ (cited in Milton 1997, 197). 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. The internalisation by Scots speakers of this viewpoint – the notion that they do not speak ‘properly’ – is succinctly captured by Tom Leonard in the title of his poem ‘Ma Language Is Disgraceful’ (1984).

Variability is of course a feature of all language use; indeed, Makoni and Pennycook (2006) argue that all languages are, in reality, creoles. In the case of Scots, there are particular difficulties in classifying features as on the one hand Scots or on the other English. For example, the word ‘wa’ (discussed later in this paper) can be taken as either a Scots lexical item or a Scots pronunciation of the English lexical item ‘wall’. Nevertheless, there are certain undoubtedly Scots usages, among them many which are viewed as ‘shibboleths’ (Miller 1993). For example, in the study reported here, children were heard to tag statements with the particle ‘ken’, the equivalent of standard English ‘(you) know’. They also used the second person plural pronoun ‘yous’, a feature not unique to Scots but found in many varieties of English, alongside the standard English ‘you’; while past participles such as ‘I’ve *went*’ occurred alongside the standard English ‘gone’. Pronunciation was also variable, with occurrence of both [θ] and [h] as the initial sound of ‘thing’ or ‘think’.

Bakhtin’s concept of heteroglossia (1981) is apposite in the case of Scots in that it emphasises not only the hybridity of language – of all language, in fact – but also the dialogic relationship between utterances, i.e. language in use. Words, for example, carry with them social and cultural echoes – ‘dialogic reverberations’ (Bakhtin 1986, 94) of their social history – and these are constantly added to, so that our speech embodies ‘varying

degrees of otherness and varying degrees of our-own-ness' (Bakhtin 1986, 89). The speaker is thus at risk of experiencing, 'intra-individual conflict among the voices internalised from a heteroglossic and stratified society' (Cazden 1989, 122). The concept of voicing, applied to the speech of participants in this study, offers insights into their stances towards Scots and its place in their repertoire. Within the prescriptive context of education, it also demonstrates the tension which exists between constraint and choice in language use.

In the following sections of this paper, the study is further contextualised in relation to Scottish education, and its design and method are described. The three main sections are then devoted to presenting and discussing data.

Educational context

Historical accounts (e.g. Corbett, McClure, and Stuart-Smith 2003; McPake and Arthur 2006) of the decline of Scots as a national language over the centuries, and the concomitant encroachment on Scots of English, highlight firstly the early and continuing impact on Scots of the coming of literacy to Scotland in English, the language of authoritative texts such as the King James Bible (1611). Secondly, again over centuries, English was legitimated as the language of education: schools pursued a policy of 'discouraging, or attempting to outlaw, spoken Scots from the schools' (Williamson 1982, 81), thus effectively acting as agents of Anglicisation. Within the linguistic economy of Scotland, Scots and English have therefore not developed on any basis of sociolinguistic equality. The relationship between the two is not one of complementarity, as, for example, in the case of the Norwegian varieties Bokmål and Nynorsk (Baker and Prys Jones 1998), but one of hierarchy. (See Kay 1998 for discussion of further examples of parallels to the Scots–English linguistic duality.)

In contemporary Scotland, negative and sometimes hostile attitudes towards contemporary Scots exist alongside associations of Scots with cultural heritage and therefore with national pride. The place of Scots in Scottish education is largely limited to the study of some of the classics of Scots literature, principally the work of Robert Burns, whose birth is ritually celebrated in schools each year. Meanwhile, Scots as spoken in present-day Scotland is allowed the most marginal of roles in the *English* language curriculum. The 5–14 Guidelines for the English Language published in 1991 (<http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/5to14/guidelines/englishlanguage.asp>), acknowledge that 'the speech of Scottish people is often distinctive'. Schools are to foster 'an awareness of the diversity of accents, dialects and languages in Scotland', but, as in the Kingman Report (Department of Education and Science 1988), which formed the basis for the national curriculum for English in England and Wales, the emphasis in the Scottish Guidelines is on the need for a standard variety, 'which enables communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries'. The standard referred to is English, while a single reference to Scots by name is made in the document, in order to make the point that there is 'no standard form of Scots'. To 'help pupils' deal with this 'sensitive area', it is proposed that terms such as 'accent' and 'dialect' should be explained and discussion encouraged.

There are some indications of reassessment of Scots in the new political context created by devolution of political powers in 1997 from Westminster to a Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh, the first such institution since the Act of Union in 1707. For example, prominence is given to Scots in the National Cultural Strategy for Scotland (Scottish Executive 2000). Significantly, Scots is portrayed here as a 'living language', and some attention is given to how its use can be promoted. This is at odds with the role of schools in reinforcing a view of Scots as 'only appropriate for affectively powerful but instrumentally limited arenas' (Corbett 2003, 252); it challenges a 'heritage' view of Scots, described by Hodgart

(1997, 86) as, ‘the auld myth that “guid” Scots wis whit their grannie spoke, aye in the past, aye somewhaur else’. It remains to be seen whether the devolved political status of Scotland will, over time, alleviate the linguistic insecurity of many Scots speakers, enabling a ‘normalisation’ of Scots use across different spheres of public life. (See Baker and Prys Jones 1998 on this approach to the promotion of Catalan.) The effect, on the other hand, might be to obviate the perceived need to signal national distinctiveness through language.

An association exists in the minds of many, between the promotion of Scots and Scottish nationalism. Thus, many teachers are suspicious of advancing in their classrooms a political agenda which they do not necessarily endorse (Gibson and Gifford 1997). However, there is anecdotal evidence that attitudes in schools and classrooms have become more relaxed, and teachers wishing to promote Scots in the classroom have interpreted the curriculum guidelines as permitting them to do so. *The Kist/A'Chiste*, an anthology of Scots and Gaelic texts and audio tapes for primary schools (Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum 1996), has been widely used in primary schools (though it is now out of print). There are also a number of engaging accounts of teachers encouraging their school pupils (mainly primary) to draw on their existing knowledge of the language and become active and enthusiastic speakers and writers (e.g. Fitt 1998). However, there appears to have been no systematic research on the impact of these developments (Corbett 2003; Mercator-Education 2002). For example, there is little evidence of the extent to which classroom initiatives raise awareness among pupils (and teachers) of their own language use and, more broadly, of language values across modern Scottish society. It is within this context that the present study, as described in the following section, was designed and conducted.

The study

This paper reports on a small-scale study, focusing on one class in a primary school in Fife, on the east coast of the central Scottish lowlands. The school is situated on a large suburban housing estate, formerly council housing stock but now in mixed public and private ownership, in an area which has experienced industrial decline since the twentieth century. Fife was selected as the context of the research since it can be considered one of the heartlands of Scots, an area where ‘traditional dialects survived more or less unchanged until within living memory’ (McClure 2003, 220).

The class was in their last year of primary education, Primary 7, with pupils aged 10 to 11 years. All but a few had grown up in the area, and none were identified as speakers of languages other than Scots or English. The teacher – whom we will call Mrs Reid – was an experienced primary teacher and enthusiastic about the idea of teaching Scots, being a Scots speaker herself. She had, however, little prior experience of teaching the language. She devised a block of lessons, over several weeks, which was well received by the pupils and which engaged them in varied activities related to written and spoken Scots. For example, an older Scots speaker was invited into the classroom for storytelling, with opportunities for the children to ask questions and attempt some writing of their own in Scots as follow-up. A major focus of much of the work, as discussed in this paper, was on developing the children’s Scots vocabulary. More broadly, Mrs Reid identified her aims as heightening the children’s awareness of Scots and encouraging its use in the classroom.

A micro-ethnographic research approach was adopted, defined by Erikson (1976, cited in Hornberger 1995, 243) as a focus on ‘particular cultural scenes within key institutional settings’. Collection of observational data involved two visits to the school, and on each occasion a lesson lasting around an hour and a half was recorded. The lessons were videotaped, and on each occasion four children wore clip-on microphones during the group

activities. Observation was complemented by interviews with the teacher and with groups of pupils, so that triangulation of data threw light on the question of the relationship between observed classroom language practices and language attitudes expressed by participants. A final tranche of data was obtained from a whole-class session in which one of the researchers, herself a Scots speaker, presented extracts from the recorded data and invited discussion, with the aim of capturing further emic perspectives on the teaching and learning sequence.

Written punctuation has been added to transcribed data extracts throughout this paper, to make them more accessible to lay readers. Where features of Scots pronunciation are significant, these have been reproduced in the spelling. (Universally accepted spelling conventions for Scots do not, however, exist.) In addition, the following conventions are used:

... = an utterance trailing off

(*italics*) = non-verbal or paralinguistic information

[] = phonetic transcription

Participant names have been changed in order to protect anonymity.

Finding the words

‘I know that word – I’ve seen it!’

Among the activities devised by Mrs Reid for her pupils were several which focused on Scots lexical items. She expressed as one of her goals, ‘I hope they’re going to get an increased Scots vocabulary’, offering examples such as Scots ‘shoogle’ (in English, ‘shake’) and ‘dunt’ (‘push’). To this end, there were (light-hearted) word tests and wall displays, and each pupil compiled a personal Scots dictionary.

Mrs Reid’s perception was of loss – from her generation to that of her pupils – of Scots words. This process of lexical erosion has been documented in research, such as that of Macafee (1994, 1997), who points out that one of its consequences is that the linguistic focus of Scots is being progressively diminished: its degree of divergence from English – what Görlach (1998) terms ‘abstand’ – is reduced. In other words, the loss of lexis is significant in that it reduces the perception of Scots as a separate language. Moreover, Scottish schools have been instrumental in the relexification of Scots, i.e. the replacement of Scots words by English words, as is reflected in a comment by Scottish writer William McIlvanney that when he first went to school in the mid-twentieth century, learning, for example, that a ‘brace’ was now to be called a ‘mantelpiece’, ‘the whole house was redecorated with English words’ (cited in Macafee 1994, 245). The erosion of distinctively Scots vocabulary has proceeded apace in the subsequent decades. Nevertheless, Mrs Reid sees some opportunity for increasing her pupils’ awareness in this area, saying that she would like them to ‘see that there are acceptable alternatives to the English words and why ... why aren’t we using them?’

One advantage of focusing classroom activities on lexis is that it avoids some more contentious issues relating to Scots usage. In Scots grammar, for example, past participle forms such as ‘I’ve *took*’ or ‘he’s *went*’, are often misconstrued as bad English and strongly disapproved of. And Scots pronunciations such as the vowel in ‘hoose’ are commonly regarded as inappropriate for educated usage (although in an interview for this study, the teacher, Mrs Reid, gives ‘hoose’ and ‘doon’ as examples of usage by pupils she would not

correct). In contrast to both grammar and pronunciation, Scots vocabulary has traditionally been approved of – cherished even – across social classes. Miller (1998, 47) points out that ‘[j]udicious use of Broad Scots vocabulary is . . . permitted and even savoured’. Furthermore, there is some research evidence (Macauley 1977, as discussed in Macafee 2003) to show that ‘old Scots words’ are better known among the middle class rather than the working class in Scotland. All of this might seem at variance with McIlvanney’s experience – of linguistic re-education away from Scots – as described above. The key to understanding the apparent contradiction lies in the Scottish cultural tradition of celebrating Scots literary achievements of the past, primarily and often exclusively the poetry of Robert Burns (1759–1796). In reading, hearing and reciting these works in school, youngsters encounter a Scots which is not just socially sanctioned but highly valued as part of their heritage, perhaps most of all by the middle classes. However, it is also a language of the past, linked to a material world far removed from contemporary Scotland. (The pace of change was well illustrated in this study, to the class teacher’s and researchers’ surprise, when the children needed an explanation of ‘tea leaves’.) Much of the distinctive vocabulary of Scots is not part of modern everyday usage, and schoolchildren often have difficulty in understanding it. It is not *their* Scots, in any communicative sense. The extension of pupils’ Scots vocabulary is therefore likely to be seen as a ‘safe’ classroom language learning activity, uncontentious in that it reflects wider social values and educationally approved goals.

Interesting discussions took place among pupils during one activity which Mrs Reid devised around Scots vocabulary. It involved the pupils taking a published list of Scots words as a starting point but relating the words to their own experience and usage, thus creating opportunities for exploratory discussion and the developing of metalinguistic awareness. The pupils’ task was to categorise the words, marking any they recognised with either one tick for ‘I know that word’ or two ticks for ‘I use that word’. They would then select four words from each of the two lists they had made and devise a board game into which their eight words would be incorporated. The original list (<http://www.cs.stir.ac.uk/~kjt/general/scots.html>) of ‘sample Scottish words’ and English equivalents, headed ‘Scots Tongue’, was some 10 pages long and had been discovered on the Internet by one of the pupils. In adopting it for the purposes of this activity, Mrs Reid was able to respond to the interest and initiative shown by her pupil. However, the choice is also an illustration of scarcity of resources (see discussion above) in schools for teachers working on Scots, in this case the difficulty of providing a concise word list which is authoritative and uncontroversial. The list is the work of a Scots enthusiast rather than a scholar, and contains some idiosyncratic items, such several referring to beer: ‘Tartan’ and ‘Special’ are both intended as nouns and each is glossed as ‘a commercial beer’, presumably from the brand names. These words are also likely to pose a challenge to pupils’ (and perhaps many adults’) knowledge of beer and beer-related vocabulary! Their status as Scots is also likely to be contested by many, though others might cite Glasgow poet Tom Leonard’s lines ‘ahv drank thi speshlz that wurrin thi frij’ (cited in Milton 1997, 198).

It was noticeable around the class that some pupils engaged with the word list activity more fully and enthusiastically than others. The data extracts discussed in the remainder of this section are taken from talk between two boys, Stuart and Luke, who gave the task their sustained attention. While they did so, the two girls in their group, Nina and Alison, had already moved on to talk about the design of their board game – choices of colours, size and so on. (Nina and Alison’s roles are further discussed in the next section of this paper.) In the following extracts, the two boys are trying to ‘situate’ words from the Scots vocabulary list, taking the approach of trying words out in phrases or sentences.

Extract 1.

Stuart: 'Blether'. I know that word. I've seen it! 'Stop bletherin!'

The boys recognise 'blether', meaning 'chat', and Stuart can come up with an example of how it is used in context. However, in the next extract the word 'blae', meaning 'blue', is unfamiliar.

Extract 2.

Note that :: in Stuart's second turn indicates elongation of the vowel.

Stuart: Em 'blae' for 'blue'. Do you say 'blae'? Like 'My ...' 'Rangers have a blae blue (*laughs*) away strip'. That's kindae weird, eh?

Luke: Like 'I've got a blae top on'.

Stuart: Aye. 'I've got a blae:: top on'.

The boys try the word 'blae' out first of all in a sentence which is otherwise entirely English, describing the Glasgow Rangers' football strip: 'Rangers have a blae away strip'. It doesn't feel right – in fact they agree that it's 'kindae weird'. In their second attempt to find a context of use for the unfamiliar 'blae', they draw attention to the vowel – which is the point of difference from the English cognate 'blue' – by elongating it. This might be seen as a device for 'voicing' the unfamiliarity of the word itself – its 'distance' from their usage; to put it another way, they are *reporting* use of the word, as indeed they did in the case of 'blether', but the way in which they do so provides evidence of Bakhtin's point that 'there are no 'neutral' words and forms – words and forms that can belong to 'no one' (1981, 293). Both boys also noticeably standardise the other elements of the sentence (I've got a ... top on) towards English rather than Scots pronunciation, enunciating [a] and the final consonant of 'got' in an exaggeratedly careful way and thus mimicking a 'posh' accent (associated, for example, with the Edinburgh district of Morningside). This styleshifting, in the context of the laughter which pervades the exchange, may therefore be seen as signalling the boys' awareness of caricatures associated with Scots: they are mocking the Scots speaker trying her/his best to sound refined and educated but giving herself/himself away with the non-standard 'blae'. In other words, they are voicing wider social attitudes, which may or may not be their own but which are acting powerfully upon them in their developing sense of self and identity. As Maybin (2006, 4) has argued in her study of children's use of reported dialogue and of anecdote in another context, Stuart and Luke are 'taking on culturally authorized evaluative perspectives and judgements about how to be in and act on the world'. Further examples of the indexing through voice of identities and stances occur in the following extract, where the word under discussion is 'aff' (English 'off').

Extract 3.

Stuart: 'Aff'. 'Get aff that wa'.

Luke: Aye, I say that.

Stuart: (*laughs*) Or 'get aff that ... get aff that deek [dik]!'

Luke: 'Get aff the wa'.

Stuart: Or 'get aff the duke [djuk]!'

Luke: (*in menacing tone*) 'Get aff that duke [djuk]!' (*laughter*) 'Duke [djuk]?'

Stuart: Aye.

Luke: 'Dyke [dΛɪk]. Get aff that dyke'.

Where Luke says 'Get aff that dyke!' in a gruff, menacing tone, he uses Scots pronunciation features throughout – glottal stops in both 'get' and 'that'. Again, this may reveal stereotypes of roughness, i.e. lack of social refinement, associated with use of Scots.

Stuart readily supplies a context of use for the word under discussion ‘aff’, and in so doing he uses the noun ‘wa’, which is the Scots equivalent of the English ‘wall’. It does not appear on the list of words under discussion, however, while ‘aff’, which also has a close English cognate, does. Moreover, Stuart seems dissatisfied with the word ‘wa’ and casts about for a – more Scots? – substitute, noticing that a little further on down the list that word ‘dyke’ occurs, with its English meaning given as ‘wall’. However, it is clear that ‘dyke’ is not part of Stuart’s productive vocabulary, since he seems confused about its pronunciation. This leads to some fun for both boys, as they try out possibilities, before Luke settles the matter with the correct pronunciation. Further examples of confusion over usage arose, including an inconclusive discussion of the Scots words ‘ane’ and ‘wan’, both of which appeared in the word list as meaning ‘one’, but which the boys related to a homophone of ‘ane’ they were familiar with: ‘ain’, meaning ‘own’. All of this reveals an unintended implication of the exercise the boys are engaged in, focusing as it does on a list of words presented to them as Scots: namely that their own usage is *not* Scots.

Interviews towards the end of these lessons on Scots offered evidence of increased language awareness on the part of pupils, with their own language usage no longer either undefined or negatively defined. As one pupil put it: ‘Like a lot of us used to think like Scots was just like slang’. Clearly, however, one of the difficulties facing teachers in devising classroom activities for teaching and learning about Scots lies in a tension between a goal of Scots language extension or development – and the materials which are available for this – and one of affirming the Scots which is spoken by pupils.

Talking like a teacher

‘jaggy scissors’

While Stuart and Luke have been searching for words to use in the game, Nina and Alison have been engaged in decisions about design: their focus has been on the appearance of the game – what size the board and the cards should be, what colours should be used and how they should be decorated. This aspect of the task gave considerable scope for artistic embellishment on the part of the pupils. Interestingly, there was much reliance on Scottish stereotypes and touristic imagery: tartan was much in evidence, and the national colours – blue for Scotland and red for England – were linked to Scots and English respectively. The game devised by our group was named ‘Follow Nessie’. Stuart commented, ‘Know what I like about it? It’s the haggis and the wee moat and the Loch Ness Monster’s got a hat on’.

Nina was very much in charge of the production of the game. She is a highly organised girl who appears to have thought through the whole process in advance and whose main focus in the course of the lesson is to ensure that her ‘vision’ of the game is realised. The others in the group (known as Charlie’s Angels) are used to working with her: they expect her to be the leader, allocating tasks, and they regularly check that they are doing what she wants. She acts in an authoritative way and expects compliance with her instructions; the others in the group accept, perhaps even welcome, the fact that she takes on this directive, teacher-like role. Alison, too, at times takes on a quasi-supervisory attitude towards the boys. However, in the following extract, she has been sent by Nina to another table to collect the ‘jaggy scissors’ from Katherine, a pupil in a neighbouring group, so that the cards for the game can be cut out with decorative edges.

Extract 4.

(= indicates latched speech, i.e. no pause between utterances by different speakers)

Alison: (*talking to children in the neighbouring group*) Are you finished with the jaggy scissors?=
 Nina: = the pinking shears. Cause we're needing them. How long will you be? Would you bring them over to Charlie's Angels when you're finished? Katherine?

Nina, overhearing Alison, supplies a ready – apparently automatic – correction of 'jaggy scissors' to the appropriate specialised and standard English expression 'pinking shears'. ('Jaggy' or 'jaggie' as Scots usage is confirmed by, for example, its appearance in the *Pocket Scots Dictionary*.) This can be seen as part of the teacherly role Nina has assumed, akin to Mercer's (1995) view of the teacher as a 'discourse guide', helping learners to 'go back and forth across the bridge from "everyday discourse" into "educated discourse"' (1995, 83–4). In this role, compared with the usage of the other children in the group, Nina uses a relatively formal standardised Scottish English throughout the activity; to put it another way, she sounds like her teacher. This is not to say that Nina's usage did not vary. For example, she occasionally used the marked plural pronoun 'yous' when addressing the others in the group. This was perhaps an instance of communicative gain – being able to specify that more than one person is being addressed – outweighing the wider social opprobrium which might be attached to the usage. In general, however, Nina's usage was less variable than that of the others in her group, particularly that of the two boys, whose speech range in the classroom context is noticeably closer to the Scots pole of the stylistic continuum between Scots and Scottish English.

Nina's role is also critical in terms of what is absent from the transcript. She appeared completely uninterested in the Scots 'agenda', never once making mention of this. Given her dominant position in the group, her lack of interest seems likely to have limited the extent to which the group as a whole engaged with this aspect of the lesson. For example, the boys had moved to another table to discuss the Scots words, and when they returned to their own table, they were expected to become involved with the production of the board and cards. Stuart was clearly uninterested in this aspect of the activity and sought other options: first he wrote out the rules of the game, and then very tentatively he proposed writing them in Scots.

Extract 5.

Stuart: (*to himself, referring to the rules book*) We should have done it in Scots actually.

Nina: (*to Luke, about the cards*) Would it not be better to have Scots in that because that's more like blue?

Luke: Yeah, right.

Nina: Or whatever.

Alison: Ah think Scots do the answers.

Stuart: (*more loudly, to Nina*) Oh no, we could have done it in Scots, the rules book. Do you think that would be a wee bit . . . ?

Nina: (*to Alison*) So you're to have the . . .

Stuart: (*to Nina*) Do you think that would be a bit much?

Nina: (*to Alison*) You are going to take the Scots or the English?

Alison: Aye, the . . .

Stuart: Nina, should I do, should I do, should ah do, shall I do this in Scots?

Alison: What the rules book? It might be a bit hard but you could give it a go. (*long pause*)

Nina: Nah, don't; just leave it like that. That's good.

Stuart: Right.

Stuart's suggestion – which would involve communicative use of written Scots – is at first ignored by Nina. While Alison engages with the suggestion to the extent of wondering how difficult it would be, Nina's is the final decision: a veto which implicitly endorses Stuart's worry that rules in Scots would be 'a bit much'. Nina's avoidance and indeed active suppression of further discussion of Scots has the effect of countering her teacher's wish to extend and legitimise the use of Scots in the classroom, instead reinforcing the earlier linguistic order. It is therefore clear that messages about legitimate language come not only from the teacher but also from children in the class who have internalised these messages and transmit them to others. Nina's 'message' to the group is that with Scots, appearances are more important than substantive engagement with the challenges the language presents, and in communicating this, she reflects a well-established perspective on the function of Scots in Scotland as being decorative, but not to be taken seriously.

From prohibition to promotion: how far can we go?

‘an ah believe ye dinnae gie them a row for sayin ‘aye’?’

(and I believe you don't tell them off for saying ‘aye’?)

Whereas the extension of pupils' vocabulary might be seen as a 'safe', i.e. socially sanctioned language learning activity – amounting, however unintentionally, to what Hodgart and Macleod (1996, 29) describe as an 'artificial exercise in nostalgia' – communicative classroom use of Scots has long been seen as an undesirable disruption of sociolinguistic norms. Williamson (1982) traces back to the 1872 Education Act the institutionalising through public schooling of 'attitudes to Scots and English already long held by educated and middle class Scots' (1982, 67), going on to cite the recommendation of the 1946 Report on Primary Education, implicitly underpinned by notions of linguistic deficit which are still common in the present day (Gibson and Gifford 1997), that schools should 'wage a planned and unrelenting campaign' against 'unlovely forms of speech masquerading as Scots' (Williamson 1982, 72). Anecdotal evidence is available (cf. Miller 1993) from past generations of schoolchildren, among them some who went on to join the ranks of the teaching profession, of the Scots they brought to school from their homes being denigrated as debased or degenerate vernacular speech forms, as 'a dialect of the gutter' (Williamson 1982, 73).

The present-day attitudinal climate is more enlightened, in the context of child-centredness as the prevailing educational rhetoric. However, from this study, it is clear that the ambivalence towards Scots expressed at the level of policy in the Scottish Office Education Department's Curriculum Guidelines (1991), as cited above, is also present at the level of implementation in school processes. Gibson and Gifford (1997) point out that teachers, who are among those who have gained most from accommodation towards dominant linguistic forms, have not been given the necessary support for critical reflection on the Scottish linguistic order and on the role of schools in maintaining it. They may therefore continue to see Scots as an obstacle to their charges' educational success and upward social mobility. The result is that they hold 'divided and dissonant views' towards their pupils' speech (Gibson and Gifford 1997, 147). Such diversity of views was reflected in informal staffroom conversations between the researchers and members of staff in the present study.

Given the central place of standardised English in Scottish schools, and its role in educational and professional advancement, teachers may also feel concerned over possibly

'hostile' parental reaction to their inclusion of Scots in their classroom teaching (Niven 1998, 67). Parents who themselves speak Scots in their daily lives may not necessarily agree that it should be encouraged – or even tolerated – in a school context. In the case of the present study, parents had given formal permission for their children's participation, but were not always sure what the lessons might entail. Mrs Reid reports as follows a conversation she had with one parent:

Extract 6.

Teacher: She was sayin, 'An ah believe ye dinnae gie them a row for sayin "aye"? Ah'm sorry it's me he gets it fae. Ah'm terrible. Ah'm always saying "aye" and ah'm always "doon here" an oh ah'm terrible'.

As grateful as this mother perhaps was that her son's teacher did not come down hard on him for Scots usages – and specifically for saying 'aye' – she clearly also felt guilty that she was providing a poor model for him in terms of acceptable classroom language. By reproducing the mother's words in their original Scots, Mrs Reid demonstrates her understanding of a shared evaluative framework in which contemporary Scots is a matter of some embarrassment, associated with what Niven has described as the 'Scottish cringe' (1998, 57).

Despite her willingness to challenge dominant linguistic values, Mrs Reid herself was not immune to their assimilative power: informally – and somewhat ruefully – she admitted that one prejudice she had internalised was in regard to use of 'glottal stops', which she could not bring herself to see as acceptable. Also, although she was working with the full approval of her school, and with explicit parental permission, she was keenly aware of limitations on what she could hope to achieve. This may explain the tentativeness with which she expressed one of her goals: 'I want them [i.e. her pupils] to know that it's not unacceptable to use Scots'. The double negative – *not unacceptable*, as opposed to *acceptable* – lends ambivalence to the statement, suggesting perhaps permission but not necessarily encouragement to use Scots. Moreover, Mrs Reid's own language use, while incorporating some distinctively Scots vocabulary, continued to provide her pupils with a model of standardised Scottish English as the language of the classroom. This may well have reflected some 'observer effect' of the research, but it also illustrates the difficulty faced by any Scottish teacher who attempts 'tae sclim ower the high wa o their ain linguistic condeetionin' (Hodgart 1997, 87), i.e. to conquer the linguistic conditioning to which they themselves have been exposed throughout their lives. As Macafee (1997, 536) points out, this conditioning makes it, 'difficult, even for those very strongly motivated, to use Scots naturally and spontaneously in unfamiliar registers, for instance public speaking or academic lectures'. Similar constraints were felt by one of the researchers who is a Scots speaker, but who struggled with self-consciousness in trying to use it fluently in the classroom, particularly when in the traditional teacher role of addressing the class as a whole.

Mrs Reid felt able to claim some progress towards her goals: 'the acceptance and the attitude – I'm definitely *definitely* winning on that one'. As evidence she observed, 'I had noticed that [the children] were speaking a lot more Scots in the classroom – to each other, yes, and to me'. This raises the question of which forms and usages were being identified as Scots, given variability in modern usage and, of course, the close relatedness of Scots to English.

Again and again in the interview data (as, indeed, in Mrs Reid's conversation with one of the children's parents, as reported above), it is the word 'aye' which is offered as a marker of Scots – as opposed to English – speech, as in this extract:

Extract 7.

- Researcher: What about at school do you speak Scots at school?
 Pupil 1: A wee bit.
 Pupil 2: Yeah.
 Pupil 1: Like we go 'aye' an that.

These pupils were being asked specifically about the outcomes of their recent lessons on Scots. Their claim that they now feel free to use 'aye' is reinforced by their teacher's statement: 'I never correct a child if they say "aye"'. This is in contrast, however, to anecdotes throughout the interviews about the proscription of the word 'aye' in other classrooms. As one pupil saw it, '[L]ike, we get encouraged in this class to talk our own Scots language like when in Primary 6 and that we would get a row for saying "aye"'.

In discussing language use by pupils in classrooms in England, Cheshire and Edwards point out that there is little research on stigmatised non-standard forms and 'few hypotheses offered to explain why some variables are more salient than others' (1993, 93). 'Aye', however, represents a distinct token of Scots usage, easily identifiable regardless of its linguistic context. The pupils were quite aware that their current teacher is unusual in allowing them to say 'aye'. However, at this stage in their linguistic socialisation, and indeed in the construction of their identity, they struggle to hear the 'dialogical reverberations' (Bakhtin 1981) with which the usage is replete. They are therefore not necessarily sure why other teachers proscribe its use. Niven (1998, 60) reports Scots-speaking pupils as, 'sometimes genuinely baffled as to why a word like "ay" [*sic*] spoken with all politeness is rejected for the English equivalent "yes"'. One pupil in the present study speculated that teachers think it is 'rude' to say 'aye'. Given that positive politeness in Scottish working-class culture takes the form of linguistic accommodation towards Scottish English, 'aye', as a token of Scots speech, would seem to signal to teachers disrespect or even defiance on the part of pupils. The usage appears to present a challenge, however unwitting, to the linguistic order of the classroom and therefore to its upholder, the teacher herself. Teachers' reactions may further be connected to the association of contemporary Scots with stigmatised urban vernaculars, and to the quite widespread notion that what linguists consider to be Scots is in fact 'slang' (Macafee 1994).

The right to use 'aye' in place of 'yes' seems highly symbolic for many Scots (whether or not they view themselves as Scots speakers or use any other overtly Scots terms in their speech). Although the children and the teacher in this study make reference to the importance of the right or freedom to use 'aye' in the classroom, the recorded data show that its use was rare. The more common usage was not, however, 'yes', but 'yeah'. For example, the figures from a one-hour recording of two boys and two girls engaged in an activity of making games based on Scots words were as follows: 'aye' used seven times; 'yes' used six times; 'yeah' used 49 times. During a 30-minute interview, the usage of the teacher herself, perceived by her pupils to be a Scots speaker, was as follows: 'aye' used three times; 'yes' used 13 times; 'yeah' used 16 times. Clearly, the reality of usage by both the pupils and the teacher is that 'yeah' is much more common than either 'aye' or 'yes'. The use of 'aye' is therefore more symbolic than actual.

This small sample, from just one classroom, indicates a need for wider research to establish the relationship among the three usages. Do they, for example, form a stylistic continuum with 'yeah' – the preferred usage of the children – occupying middle ground between the two more clearly marked Scots and English poles? Given the relative informality of the recording situations in this classroom, is 'yeah' viewed as appropriate or inappropriate in more formal contexts? Cheshire and Edwards (1993, 39) discuss corrections by teachers

of pupils' speech in England, citing one child's response to their survey: 'Yes, like when I say *ye* they always correct me and say *yes*'. Do some teachers in Scotland, in some situations, also proscribe 'yeah'?

More broadly, there is a need for investigation of teacher attitudes towards Scots features of the pupils' speech (and indeed their understanding of such features as Scots or otherwise), as well as their classroom practice in relation to these features. Persistent corrections, it has been noted (Cheshire and Edwards 1993), may lead pupils to become reticent in oral work. Miller (1993, 104) further argues that 'immense hostility to school and education is engendered by . . . linguistic clashes in the classroom'. It is the resultant lack of linguistic self-esteem on the part of many young Scots speakers (Macafee 1994) which is referred to by Douglas Dunn, Professor of Poetry at St Andrews University, when he hopes for 'the advancement of education to the point at which my Scottish students would speak to me' (cited in Ascherson 2002, 135). As Corbett (2003, 272) points out, the need is for empirical evidence to establish whether or not 'greater knowledge of Scots and its linguistic heritage will increase pupils' linguistic self-esteem'.

If we accept use of 'aye' as an indication of the students in this study 'using more Scots', as claimed by their teacher, it is interesting to note in the data several examples of the use of 'aye' clustering around points where Scots vocabulary is being discussed, as in the following extract where two boys are looking, with one of the researchers, at an on-screen page from the *Electronic Scots School Dictionary*.

Extract 8.

- Researcher: What about, what do you call a potato?
 Pupil 1: Tattie.
 Pupil 2: Aye, tattie.
 Researcher: Right, let's try it (*typing*) Will that do for the spelling? Yeah. Oh well (*reading from the screen*) also spelled tawtie. What one do you say? Do you say 'tattie' or 'tawtie'?
 Pupil 1: Tawtie.
 Researcher: Tawtie.
 Pupil 1: Tawtie. Aye.

This is intriguing data, calling for further research into the effect on learners' usage of engaging, in their classroom activities, with written Scots language texts.

Concluding remarks

The children who participated in this study talked thoughtfully about their learning and expressed great enthusiasm for the activities they had been engaged in. The teacher too, as her remarks above show, felt that much had been achieved, in terms of the children's knowledge of Scots as well as their understanding of its origins and contemporary status. Having volunteered for the project, Mrs Reid was, however, keenly aware that she was alone in following a programme of work which was not part of the mainstream and was not being replicated in other classes. In that sense, she was pushing boundaries, putting herself in a professionally and possibly personally uncomfortable position, particularly when sanctioning what other teachers in the same school might seek to eliminate from the children's speech. While the curriculum guidelines at national level are flexible, allowing the development of classroom projects on Scots, they also offer little firm and overt support, leading Mrs Reid to describe them on one occasion as offering 'beads to the natives'. Thus, her experience clearly illustrates the fact that in terms of classroom use of Scots, we are

still 'in the phase of the enthusiasts' (Gibson and Gifford 1997, 151), as opposed to experiencing the 'integrated approach to Scottish language and culture' which Mrs Reid wanted to see.

At the national level, following on from political devolution and the 1997 establishment of a Scottish Parliament, there is an opportunity for some rethinking of Scottish identities, for a more mature engagement with the dialectic of the local and the global (Giddens 1991). One possibility is a move in the direction of cultural and linguistic 'nationism' (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985, 235), the ushering in of an era characterised by centripetal social and cultural forces (Bakhtin 1981) which exert pressure towards conformity with a single Scottish identity. However, there are signs that a more pluralistic approach to nation-building is being advocated. For example, a report on the role of Scotland's languages in educational and cultural policy (Education, Culture and Sports Committee 2003) proposes an inclusive language policy, listing Gaelic and Scots as heritage languages of Scotland, alongside minority and community languages such as Urdu and Chinese. This could entail some changes in Scotland's 'linguistic market-place' (Bourdieu 1977), including a re-evaluation of contemporary Scots. The 2003 report gives little attention to the place of Scots in education, merely stating as the sixth of its 13 Principles for the Scots Language that 'Scots should be an essential part of the educational curriculum in Scotland at all levels'. However, seeds of change can be seen in the Parliamentary Cross Party Group on the Scots language, which has been sitting since 2007 and which has more recently (2009) convened a subcommittee with a brief to consider the place of Scots in education (<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/msp/crossPartyGroups/groups/cpg-scots.htm>).

From the present study, it is clear that further research on Scots in education is needed, and that research into classroom processes should form a crucial aspect of that research agenda. This would entail 'sociolinguistically informed approaches to ethnographic research in schools', leading to, 'perspectives and methodologies which allow us to not only understand what's going on, but also imagine and implement change' (Hornberger 1995, 245). The outcomes of teaching and learning about Scots are also not to be taken for granted, although commentators such as Hodgart (1997, 1998) would argue that such provision for Scots speakers is an equal opportunities issue. Having begun this paper by characterising contemporary language usage in Scotland as heteroglossic, it is apt to return to note Bakhtin's broad philosophical point that languages have associated with them contradictory 'ideological systems and approaches to the world' (Bakhtin 1981, 296). Empowerment is therefore only possible through heteroglossia *with awareness* (see Cazden 1989), and this has been lacking as an educational goal in Scottish schools. The present-day ambivalence and confusion surrounding Scots can only be tackled by means of what Kearney (2003, 111) describes as 'a courageous and critical dialogue with our own heritage'.

Acknowledgement

The project on which this paper is based was devised jointly with Joanna McPake of Strathclyde University, who also provided insights for the interpretation of the data.

References

- Aitken, A.J. 1982. Bad Scots: Some superstitions about Scots speech. *Scottish Language* 1: 30–44.
- Ascherson, N. 2002. *Stone voices: The search for Scotland*. London: Granta Books.
- Baker, C., and S. Prys Jones. 1998. *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

- Bakhtin, M.M. 1986. *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information* 6, no. 6: 645–68.
- Canagarajah, A.S. 1999. *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cazden, C.B. 1989. Contributions of the Bakhtin circle to ‘communicative competence’. *Applied Linguistics* 10, no. 2: 116–27.
- Cheshire, J., and V. Edwards. 1993. Sociolinguistics in the classroom. In *Real English. The grammar of English dialects in the British Isles*, ed. J. Milroy and L. Milroy, 34–52. London: Longman.
- Corbett, J. 2003. Language planning and modern Scots. In *The Edinburgh companion to Scots*, ed. J. Corbett, J.D. McClure and J. Stuart-Smith, 251–72. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Corbett, J., J.D. McClure, and J. Stuart-Smith. 2003. A brief history of Scots. In *The Edinburgh companion to Scots*, ed. J. Corbett, J.D. McClure, and J. Stuart-Smith, 1–16. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Department of Education and Science. 1988. *Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the teaching of the English language* (The Kingman Report). London: HMSO.
- Education, Culture and Sports Committee. 2003. *Report on Inquiry into the role of educational and cultural policy in upholding and bringing out Gaelic, Scots and minority languages in Scotland*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.
- Fitt, M. 1998. Scots language in the classroom: Viewpoint III. In *The Scots language: Its place in education*, ed. L. Niven and R. Jackson, 93–7. Newton Stewart: Watergaw.
- Gibson, G., and A. Gifford. 1997. Confronting dissonances: Scottish literature and language in the primary and secondary school. In *Teaching Scottish literature: Curriculum and classroom applications*, ed. A. MacGillivray, 145–59. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Giddens, A. 1991. *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Görlach, M. 1998. *Even more Englishes: Studies 1996–7*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heller, M., and M. Martin-Jones, eds. 2001. *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference*. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Hodgart, J. 1997. The Scots language in the school. In *Teaching Scottish literature: Curriculum and classroom applications*, ed. A. MacGillivray, 84–96. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hodgart, J. 1998. Scots in the classroom. In *The Scots language: Its place in education*, ed. L. Niven and R. Jackson, 77–92. Newton Stewart: Watergaw.
- Hodgart, J., and I. Macleod. 1996. Using the Scots school dictionary. *Laverock*: 29–32.
- Hornberger, N.H. 1995. Ethnography in linguistic perspective: Understanding school processes. *Language and Education* 9, no. 4: 233–48.
- Kay, B. 1998. Minority languages in Europe. In *The Scots language: Its place in education*, ed. L. Niven and R. Jackson, 19–32. Newton Stewart: Watergaw.
- Kearney, C. 2003. *The monkey's mask: Identity, memory, narrative and voice*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.
- Lambert, W.E. 1980. The social psychology of language. In *Language: Social psychological perspectives*, ed. H. Giles, W.P. Robinson, and P.M. Smith, 415–24. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Le Page, R.B., and A. Tabouret-Keller. 1985. *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leonard, T. 1984. *Intimate voices. Selected work 1965–83*. Newcastle: Galloping Dog Press.
- Lin, A. 2001. Symbolic domination and bilingual classroom practices in Hong Kong. In *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference*, ed. M. Heller and M. Martin-Jones, 139–68. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Lo Bianco, J. 2001. *Language and literacy policy in Scotland*. Stirling: Scottish Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.
- Macafee, C.I. 1994. *Traditional dialect in the modern world: A Glasgow case study*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Macafee, C.I. 1997. Ongoing change in modern Scots: The social dimension. In *The Edinburgh history of the Scots language*, ed. C. Jones, 514–48. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Macafee, C.I. 2000. The demography of Scots: The lessons of the census campaign. *Scottish Language* 19: 1–44.
- Macafee, C.I. 2003. Studying Scots vocabulary. In *The Edinburgh companion to Scots*, ed. J. Corbett, J.D. McClure, and J. Stuart-Smith, 50–71. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Makoni, S., and A. Pennycook, eds. 2006. *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Maybin, J. 2006. *Children's voices: Talk, knowledge and identity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McClure, J.D. 1995. *Scots and its literature*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- McClure, J.D. 2003. The language of modern Scots poetry. In *The Edinburgh companion to Scots*, ed. J. Corbett, J.D. McClure, and J. Stuart-Smith, 210–32. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McPake, J., and J. Arthur. 2006. Scots in contemporary social and educational context. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 19, no. 2: 155–70.
- Mercator-Education. 2002. *Scots: The Scots language in education in Scotland*. Ljouwert/Leeuwarden: Mercator-Education.
- Mercer, N. 1995. *The Guided construction of knowledge: Talk amongst teachers and learners*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Miller, J. 1993. The grammar of Scottish English. In *Real English: The grammar of English dialects in the British Isles*, ed. J. Milroy and L. Milroy, 99–138. London: Longman.
- Miller, J. 1998. Scots: A sociolinguistic perspective. In *The Scots language: Its place in education*, ed. L. Niven and R. Jackson, 45–56. Newton Stewart: Watergaw.
- Milton, C. 1997. Ma language is disgraceful: Tom Leonard's Glasgow dialect poems. In *Englishes around the World*, ed. E.W. Schneider, 185–210. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiongo. 1986. *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in Africa*. London: James Currey.
- Niven, L. 1998. Scots: An educational perspective. In *The Scots language: Its place in education*, ed. L. Niven and R. Jackson, 57–70. Newton Stewart: Watergaw.
- Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum. 1996. *The kist/A'chiste*. Dundee: SCCC.
- Scottish Executive. 2000. *Creating our future . . . minding our past. Scotland's national cultural strategy*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Office Education Department. 1991. Curriculum and assessment in Scotland. National guidelines. English Language 5–14. <http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/5to14/guidelines/englishlanguage.asp>.
- Williamson, K. 1982. Lowland Scots in education: An historical survey, Part II. *Scottish Language* 2: 52–87.