

Article

Multilingualism and Social Inclusion in Scotland: Language Options and Ligatures of the “1+2 Language Approach”

Argyro Kanaki

School of Education and Social Work, University of Dundee, Dundee, DD1 4HN, UK; E-Mail: a.kanaki@dundee.ac.uk

Submitted: 17 July 2020 | Accepted: 20 October 2020 | Published: 14 January 2021

Abstract

Recent global trends in migration, trade and overall mobility have continued to transform our objective realities and subjective experiences around linguistic diversity. More broadly, in many countries, the politics of multilingualism seem to have changed the old links between language and nation-state. In this context, Scotland is studied in this article as a case study as it acts to dispel the myth of a ‘monolingual country.’ Its recent language policy, the “1+2 Language Approach” (Scottish Government, 2012b), including regional languages, modern foreign languages and heritage languages of migrants have created opportunities as well as imbalances and issues of equity in the Scottish language habitus. Drawing on Kraus’s work (2018), this article demonstrates how the policy creates language as ‘options’ and as ‘ligatures.’ However, these ‘options’ and ‘ligatures’ are not salient and straightforward. The policy is explored on three different levels: (1) on its potential for allowing the development of multilingual communication strategies such as intercomprehension, code-switching and mixing, (2) on its commitment to linguistic justice avoiding language hierarchies and (3) on its links with dominating, neoliberal approaches to education and the economy. The article finally concludes that options and ligatures visible in language policy impose some semantic order on the confusion of layered co-occurrences of various hegemonies, or the general strain between macro and micro distinction.

Keywords

1+2 language approach; language policy; multilingualism; options and ligatures; Scotland; social inclusion

Issue

This article is part of the issue “Social Inclusion and Multilingualism: The Impact of Linguistic Justice, Economy of Language and Language Policy” edited by László Marác (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands / L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan) and Zsombor Csata (Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania / Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary).

© 2021 by the author; licensee Cogitatio (Lisbon, Portugal). This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

Recent global trends in migration, trade and overall mobility have continued to transform our realities and subjective experiences around linguistic diversity. More broadly, in many countries, the politics of multilingualism seem to have changed the old links between language and the nation-state. In this context, this article takes Scotland as a case study, and reports while it acts to dispel the myth that it is a ‘monolingual country.’ Its recent language policy, the “1+2 Language Approach” (Scottish Government, 2012b) included regional languages, modern foreign languages (MFL), the heritage languages of migrants, and sign language. It created opportunities, as well as imbalances and issues of equi-

ty in the Scottish language habitus. Drawn in part from Kraus’s (2018) work, the article demonstrates how the policy reified language as a range of ‘options’ and, often directly opposing, ‘ligatures.’ In other words, ‘options’ can be considered as opportunities that might offer professional and personal benefits, and ‘ligatures’ can be considered as ties that hold one back.

This article also uses perspectives from different academic fields and disciplines such as applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, language planning, and political science, to explore the Scottish language policy. Although the author is an applied linguist, the interdisciplinary approach to examining a language policy is necessary, simply because language is such a complex phenomenon. The author agrees that maintenance of disci-

plinary boundaries and orthodoxies goes against interdisciplinary engagement (May, 2019). Therefore, this article tries to adopt an interdisciplinary character. It references a variety of academic work, and variously sourced policy texts, which provide examples from the Scottish language habitus describing the multiply levelled layers of a language policy (Johnson, 2018). It uses the framework of options and ligatures to do this, together with three levels of analysis. On each level, a similar frame is used to demonstrate, and offer similar evidence, that options and ligatures are interwoven at each level of analysis for the Scottish language policy.

The policy is explored on a straightforward, and possibly minimal, number of different levels. First, we examine the policy's potential for allowing the development of multilingual communication strategies, such as intercomprehension, code-switching and mixing. Secondly, the article explores the policy in terms of its commitment to linguistic justice and avoiding damaging language hierarchies. Thirdly, we examine the policy's links with dominant, neoliberal, approaches to both education and the economy. The article finally concludes that 'options' and 'ligatures,' visible at all three levels in language policy, impose some semantic order on the confusion of layered co-occurrences of various hegemonies, as well as upon the general strain between macro and micro distinctions in *soi-disant* less partisan theorisations. What might be considered as an option/opportunity for one could be seen as a ligature/tie for somebody else. Language policies can easily be seen as ambivalent. The article finally takes the position that further examination on language policies is needed, using a multilingual mindset to allow for opportunities to employ an alternative discourse in language planning debates.

This article first presents the context, and then moves on to the theory, analysis and critique. It starts with information about the "1+2 Language Approach" in Scotland and presents its theoretical underpinnings. It continues with the exploration of three different levels of the policy: the development of multilingual communication strategies, linguistic justice and neoliberal approaches to education. It finishes with some concluding remarks.

2. The "1+2 Language Approach": A Language Policy

This section starts with a small clarification regarding referencing around the policy. The policy itself entails two documents: *Language Learning in Scotland: A 1+2 Approach, Scottish Government Languages Working Group Report and Recommendations* (Scottish Government, 2012a) and *Language Learning in Scotland: A 1+2 Approach, the Scottish Government's Response to the Report of the Languages Working Group* (Scottish Government, 2012b). The first document groups its recommendations under various broad headings and the latter sets out the government's responses, roughly by recommendation, suggesting some of the key actions they might need to take. The latter text thus appears to

be a repetition of the first document with the addition of key actions. This is a clarification notice since, in citation, both those documents often appear to be called Scottish language policy. This 'antiphonal' approach to policy publication and statute is simply a statement, generally, of aims followed by an account, aim by aim, of government reaction. It is a feature of contemporary civil structure, usually at a federal level.

We now move on to explore how the "1+2 Language Approach" has emerged in Scotland.

The Scottish Government currently has decision-making powers and responsibility for its educational policy, in its own Parliament, Holyrood in Edinburgh, devolved from Westminster and the UK Government. In 2012, Scotland commissioned the Languages Working Group. Constituted by policymakers, practitioners, local authorities, teacher educators, parents and business representatives, this body was tasked with producing a 'language report.' The report centred on language learning, with 35 recommendations (Scottish Government, 2012a). Although it was, in its own frame of reference, concerned with education, it turned out to have a wider focus, dealing with language matters on a broad social level, rather than a simply school-based one.

Consequentially, the Scottish government published a language manifesto, adopting in this way the European 1+2 language policy for Scotland, with the aim of completing its implementation by 2020 (Scottish Government, 2012b). This non-statutory initiative was called the "1+2 Language Approach" (Scottish Government, 2012b). As a language manifesto, the Scottish Government (2012b) addressed language in Scottish society and took notice of languages in Scotland. It thereby became a language policy rather than simply a policy about teaching and learning in MFL. The policy was based on the 1+2 language model adopted by the European Union and ratified at the European Council of Barcelona in 2002. This brought Scotland, theoretically at least, in line with many other European countries. According to the 1+2 language model, all EU citizens would learn two foreign languages in addition to their mother tongue, and their language education would start from their early years and be a matter of lifelong relevance and availability. The Scottish Government adopted this initiative in 2012, almost 10 years after the 1+2 language model had been ratified by the rest of the EU in Barcelona in 2002, and its implementation, notionally, started immediately.

From the 35 recommendations, in the first document (Scottish Government, 2012a), 31 recommendations were fully accepted whilst four were partially accepted by the answering 'antiphonal' document (Scottish Government, 2012b). Most recommendations concerned early language learning; however, there were also recommendations about language teaching and learning in secondary schools and teacher education. The first of the partially accepted recommendations is the matter of Content and Language Integrated Learning

(Scottish Government, 2012b, p. 20). Partial acceptance in the response document (Scottish Government, 2012b) allowed schools to decide the best approach to implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning in secondary schools. The broad statement here appears to condone school-level decision-making about all language-teaching approaches. The second partial acceptance (Scottish Government, 2012b, p. 21) concerned qualifications for teachers as the 1+2 language model was implemented. It deferred the process of deciding on the level and appropriateness of language qualifications for licensed teachers, either beginning or ending their qualifying courses, to one arbitrated by the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS). Today, in 2020, GTCS has not changed any of its teacher requirements regarding languages. The third partial acceptance of the policy document (Scottish Government, 2012b, p. 22) alters the policy's view of what universities should do about the "1+2 Language Approach." It replaces recommendation with broad statements about the relations between schools and universities on the matter of language learning, creating an open arena entirely for the judgement of universities. The fourth partial acceptance is of the original policy requirement for the ablest of young people, with requisite qualifications, to be recruited for language education in secondary and primary schools. The government's response to this was a statement (Scottish Government, 2012b, pp. 22–23) that it would invest in the current workforce, and its Career Professional Development. It would also consider the specific recruitment of linguists as part of a national recruitment strategy, a step which broke the policy's link between primary schools and secondary language teaching departments and sectionalised interests in the teaching of MFL.

3. Theoretical Underpinnings

The context of this case study has already been set. Now, the theoretical underpinnings of this article are enumerated and examined, with brief but necessary accounts of their implications for aspects of policy.

Nowadays, migration, new forms of mobility and general demands for effective communication preoccupy language policy and political theory discourses (May, 2014). Often discussed and explored as globalisation, matters of multilingualism and social inclusion are being described and resolved through linguistic research.

According to May (2014), maintenance and support of minority languages, bilingual and/or multilingual education, acquisition of a global lingua franca and endorsement of national languages are all included in language policy documents that foreground language status and use. At the same time, language policy uses political formations and their theoretical debates to create and strengthen links between language and citizenship; these debates, from political theory, explore arguments about social inclusion, either through the exist-

tence and use of a shared and almost always dominant language, or through individual and public multilingualism (Ricento, 2006). In either case, linguistic diversity and social inclusion emerge here as facets of political and social praxis across a spectrum between monolingual and multilingual policy approaches, with complex and rather multi-layered relations between them (Marácz & Adamo, 2017).

According to Grin and Civico (2018), the engagement of states in language policy formation, and its theorisation, is essential. States might have small languages that need to be protected as they are in danger of disappearing; in urban settings, several languages cohabit and people experience multilingual daily lives. Language policy has to deal with linguistic diversity, which always has such apparent paradoxes associated with it (Grin & Civico, 2018). A first paradox here is, of course, that linguistic diversity pushes to increase and decrease, at the same time (Grin & Civico, 2018). The increase happens when people subjectively experience multilingualism and its effects in urban settings. The decrease occurs in linguistic diversity when small languages lose their speakers and disappear as individuals, public spaces and collectivities move towards one language, and away from others. A second paradox takes place where linguistic diversity can be considered, simultaneously, as threatened and threatening (Grin & Civico, 2018). For example, states often take measures for the forced revitalisation of minority languages, while they arbitrate between languages as they compete over material and symbolic resources, instituting policies which promote some languages at the expense of others. Grin and Civico (2018, p. 30) talk about protection and promotion, as well as arbitration and demarcation, in their examination of language policies concerning linguistic diversity and, therefore, social inclusion.

We also consider the distinction from Grin and Civico (2018) while we draw on Kraus's (2018) work to examine the parallel notions of 'option' and 'ligature' in the creation of linguistic identity. Kraus had, in turn, conceptually relied on Dahrendorf's (1979) earlier distinction between options and ligatures in modern societies. For Dahrendorf, options are related to the future, whilst ligatures look to the past, in the building of a social reality. Kraus (2018) works on this distinction in discussing linguistic diversity. On one hand, language communities whose language is disappearing are bound to lose both culturally and historically mediated ligatures, active ties with and from the past. On the other hand, learning new languages, and being open to multilingual dimensions in modern literate societies constitute options and allow people to acquire new, worldwide viewpoints that permeate and overrule national identities (Kraus, 2018). According to Kraus (2018), our linguistic identities are related to the ligatures and options that our linguistic repertoires offer us. For example, maintaining Gaelic through Gaelic Medium Education could be seen as an effort to maintain Scottish linguistic and cul-

tural identities, a ligature to history and culture; however, this ligature can impede the dissemination of knowledge, because one can only use English to communicate beyond the local community, an option which opens new professional opportunities. Kraus (2018) continues this argument by exploring the formation of options and ligatures stemming from the juxtaposition and intertwining of minority, immigrant, national and traditional languages as well as of aspirant or already-dominant *linguae francae*. As Kraus and Kazlauskaitė-Gürbüz (2014) believe, multilingualism could offer a kind of balance between different languages; the balance, however, is disturbed because options and ligatures in the domain of language change all the time and are very context-dependent. This article agrees with the position taken by Kraus and Kazlauskaitė-Gürbüz (2014). Furthermore, the theoretical clarity of some aspects of linguistic ethnography, distinctions between discourse and conversation, the macro and the micro, have been subject to important programmatic critiques (for a fuller account see Blommaert, 2015). In this article, the primacy of these aspects in ethnographic linguistic accounts of social inclusion, via the distinction between ‘options’ and ‘ligatures,’ helps explore and understand how language policy creates options, in the sense of possibilities of choices, while simultaneously generating ligatures, historical and culturally mediated ties, in the area of education. In this case, of course, I limit the examination to the “1+2 Language Approach” (Scottish Government, 2012b) in Scotland, and therefore occlude, and exclude, the urgent appeals for notice of similar processes and trends in other geographies and histories such as the case of Catalan or the traces of similar process and structure in Euskara.

Importantly, also, “language policy should be conceptualised and studied as multiply levelled or layered” (Johnson, 2018, p. 465). A multiply layered understanding of a policy context includes micro-macro distinctions in the policy’s world, as well as the distinctions the policy itself might make. Blommaert (2013) memorably describes the intertwining of layers, ideologies and hegemonies on a macro, meso and micro level and their co-occurrences, layered across time and space. The concepts of ‘options’ and ‘ligatures,’ the binary ends of a single parameter, visible in language policy, impose some semantic order on these layered co-occurrences from various hegemonic origins. As one can see, particularly later on in this article, general strains between macro and micro distinctions still continue, while macro and micro discourses/conversations can both emerge to shape a single policy. Options and ligatures can appear together, within the same discourse, for the same structure and/or agent. So, most things, and all policy points, can be seen as ‘options’ or as ‘ligatures,’ depending on evaluative perspectives. That, of course, makes language policies ambivalent, if not ambiguous. Social inclusion, particularly in the sense of linguistic justice, cannot be based on ambivalence; a major rational point

of justice, in philosophical terms, is to banish ambiguity. Examination of individual ambiguities and the, often repetitive, exposure of such evaluative contradictions indicates that our analysis fits with a recognisable theoretical frame. ‘Ligatures’ and ‘options,’ and their theoretical equivalents, or patterns of process, should be considered, together, as necessities for the evaluation of any language policy.

4. The “1+2 Language Approach” and the Development of Multilingual Communication Strategies

Here, the policy’s potential for allowing the development of multilingual communication strategies is explored. These are mainly approaches such as intercomprehension, code-switching, and mixing, in language use. As we will see, the policy does not develop a clear potential for promoting and nourishing multilingual communication strategies.

According to Meulleman and Fiorentino (2018), students and adults should be trained to acquire and use receptive or intercomprehensive language skills. That means that:

People can learn how to understand what is said or written in a foreign language without necessarily being able to speak or write that language, provided it is closely related to at least one language they are already familiar with. (Meulleman & Fiorentino, 2018, p. 138)

For example, word resemblance between romance languages (derived from Latin) becomes apparent quickly, especially if one sees the words in writing, but also when one hears them spoken. Maiden, Cappellaro, and Lahiri (2020) provide plenty of examples of similarities and differences between languages and how these could be used as a way to overcome our language anxiety, and perhaps improve rates of language acquisition. Exploiting similarities and differences between related languages has also been explored as a simple learning framework for languages in education (Castagne, 2007).

Furthermore, code-switching and language mixing are also considered to be innovative pedagogical approaches with immense pedagogical value promoting multilingualism (García, 2007, 2009). Under the term ‘translanguaging,’ these pedagogical methodologies, intercomprehension, code-switching and mixing, are promoted as multilingual communication strategies, even though the term ‘translanguaging’ appears to be conceptually and terminologically difficult to define, however popular it becomes (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017).

The main point, here, is that “creating bridges of understanding across languages” (Maiden et al., 2020, p. 69) is simply as important as the development of multilingual communication strategies, intercomprehension and translanguaging, etc. These are all ‘options’ that open new doors to us. Those communication strategies

could give us the confidence to understand other languages, to understand other people and to be more open to multiple ways of thinking. Of course, they are also possibly conceived as ‘ligatures.’ Exposure to multilingualism can be perceived as menacing; monolingual people can often feel isolated and hesitant towards speakers of other languages. For them, exposure to other languages might trigger unknown and unexpected feelings of uneasiness and awkwardness; they do not know how to deal with foreigners, what they are saying and what to expect from them. The only way to erase these feelings is through education. As Maiden et al. (2020, p. 70) argue:

Feelings of alienation can be alleviated if societies are aware that ‘foreign’ languages are not inaccessible barriers to comprehension, that many doors into other languages are already open, and that what seems alien may be much more familiar than might at first appear.

Their argument continues by claiming that it is our “right” to be given access to language education, and education systems have a “duty” to allow people to gain access to languages (Maiden et al., 2020, p. 71). In other words, the feelings of ligature should be replaced by feelings of confidence and options that bring optimism rather than alienation and exclusion.

Introductions to other languages and the use of multilingual pedagogical approaches, appropriate to demonstrations of those bridges between languages, could, first, reduce alienation and exclusion by bringing people closer in society, allowing them to develop similar ligatures of social identity, openly and in a way which allows discussion; secondly, they allow liberal education systems to create for their members/students access to languages that could be ‘options,’ making students more “free” and more “powerful” as they have the command of other languages (Maiden et al., 2020, p. 71).

The “1+2 Language Approach” (Scottish Government, 2012a) does not refer explicitly to any multilingual communication strategies in its policy. This language policy simply refers to effective teaching methods and recommends them for language learning, for example in primary school settings. The use of songs and rhymes, games, direct teaching, paired and group activities are all mentioned by name alongside more general, but still teaching-specific, recommendations, such as a whole school approach to language learning, encouraging skills to develop and helping children to learn better (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 15). According to the policy, pupils also need contact with native speakers, for example with the employment of language assistants, and the widespread use of technology. “Pupils must have a real sense of what the language sounds like when spoken by a native speaker, and how to engage in conversation with a native speaker” (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 32). “Short blocks of language learning” embedded into the daily school routine were recommended, as well

as the use of target languages (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 17).

As we see, the language policy suggests pedagogical approaches, in its effort to develop a language educational policy, that could offer development of pupil language skills and improvement of their learning, both of these could be considered as advantages/options for pupils. The policy tries to convince us of its holistic language approach, promoting language to the centre of whole-school teaching and learning approaches, to the extent that language constitutes a conscious basic element of the daily school routine. However, Phipps and Fassetta (2015, p. 16) argue that

[Scotland] does not have statutory time allocation for foreign languages. While primary schools are encouraged to offer a foreign language, in practice the teaching is left very much to an individual school’s priorities and to the human and financial resources they have access to.

Language learning in Scottish primary schools does not have an established curriculum time, nor it is considered as an established curriculum subject, and insufficient time is allocated to satisfy any language proficiency goals (Phipps & Fassetta, 2015). Furthermore, the policy does not encourage the implementation of any other specific pedagogical approaches, nor any multilingual communicative strategies. Rather, it fails to demonstrate that embracing the co-existence of multiple languages is a necessary part of the implementation and creation of pedagogical approaches in a school setting (Oliva, Donato, & Ricciardelli, 2019). In the context of modern language lessons, monolingual learners are discouraged from using their L1 prior knowledge in order to develop translanguaging skills between their L1 and L2 (Oliva et al., 2019). Its persistent and pervasive preference for ‘target language,’ as well as for ‘native speakers,’ forces us to regard its efforts simply as a method to produce a series of parallel monolingualisms, as described by Grosjean (2010). Considering languages as separate language entities first suppresses our ability to credit literacy anywhere except in our L1, and it inevitably fits nationalistic ideas about languages (Piller, 2001). It also converts educational options to educational ligatures by tying them to specific national languages and educational systems.

5. The “1+2 Language Approach” and Linguistic Justice

The concept of linguistic justice has provoked many debates because of its complex and recondite nature and definition (Gobbo, 2018). This article does not explore linguistic justice as a matter of how efficient and fair the linguistic Scottish language regime is, taking into account, for instance, specific approaches towards linguistic justice in the literature (for example, Gazzola & Grin, 2013). It is often acknowledged that sociolinguistic

perspectives, as well as perspectives from other fields, i.e., applied linguistics, are missing in all debates on linguistic justice, whilst research data from those fields are also lacking (Gobbo, 2018). Key terms in such debates are often misunderstood, as different meanings emerge depending on the field and the academic background of authors (Gazzola, 2014).

Linguistic justice has evolved as a term of increasing importance in scientific debates (for a full review see Alcalde, 2018). This article uses interdisciplinary lenses, and references scholars from different academic fields. Linguistic justice is considered, here, in a more general sense, as the avoidance of damaging language hierarchies in education and society. These language hierarchies constitute linguistic inequality, domination and exclusion promoted by different layers of technologies of power, i.e., policy, law, parents' opinions, etc. (Martín Rojo, 2015). The next section of the article is written from an applied linguistic perspective but uses other academic fields and their strands to explore, inform and interpret the case from an applied linguist's position. As we will see, linguistic justice is not served as a clear and straightforward purpose from the policy itself. Indeed, the policy endorses, hides and promulgates the same language hierarchies and inequalities which already exist in Scottish society.

The "1+2 Language Approach" (Scottish Government, 2012a) also emphasises the diversity of Scotland by including Scotland's own languages, Gaelic and Scots, together with what it calls "community languages," and British Sign Language (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 6). It follows international trends in language education systems which introduce language learning in the early stages of primary school or even pre-school. Yet it simultaneously emphasises the early introduction of languages related to powerful economies, such as Chinese, and Portuguese (Brazil), among others (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 12). It characterises Scotland as a leading competitive nation, citing this as the reason why Scotland cannot refuse its young people opportunities to learn an additional language (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 12). The policy is clear about offering options, those future opportunities that languages can provide for young people. It encompasses all the languages of Scottish society, addressing in this way the linguistic diversity of Scotland (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 6), and creating and confirming hierarchical and ideological bonds between languages and their speakers (Kraus, 2018), together with rehearsing, often imaginary, ties to a specific society and educational system.

Scottish policy also refers to Gaelic and encourages the learning of Gaelic through Gaelic medium education (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13). Gaelic was recognised as an official language of the United Kingdom in 2003 and has been protected and promoted by the Scottish Government through the development of statutory language authority, Bòrd na Gàidhlig, a Gaelic broadcasting authority, as well as a Gaelic medium education

(for more information see Dunmore, 2019). All the above efforts have envisaged establishing culturally and historically mediated ligatures to promote and revitalise Gaelic. The Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act of 2005 was also passed to secure status for Gaelic as "an official language of Scotland commanding equal respect with the English language" (Walsh & McLeod, 2008, p. 35). However, as Dunmore (2019) highlights, the status of 'equal respect' is not clear, in terms of its derivation, what it means in practice, or how it could support Gaelic against English. This last is probably the classic example of the ambiguity and contradiction of linguistic policy productions.

One could wonder how culturally- and historically-mediated ligatures could be sustained. In education, issues of teacher shortages and problematic recruitment of teachers for Gaelic medium education, as well as the scarcity of books and literacy resources in Gaelic, could be seen as obstacles in the revitalisation of Gaelic (Kanaki, 2020), destroying the future opportunities/options of, and for, Gaelic speakers. At the same time, those obstacles also destroy attempts to establish cultural and historical ligatures with Scottish Gaelic, and particularly with the cognate Goidelic Gaelic languages in Eire, the Isle of Man and Cornwall. Contrasts might be drawn particularly between Eirise (Irish Gaelic), which is recognised as the official language of Ireland by the EU and is spoken by some 30% of the population (see Ó Ceallaigh & Ni Dhonnabháin, 2015) and the other Goidelic languages.

Scottish policy also refers to Scots recognising the Scots language as part of Scotland's historic language diversity (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13) and promoting language and cultural ligatures. However, Scots does not exist without controversy. Sebba (2019) highlights that Scots provides a classic example of the difficulty of distinguishing between a 'dialect,' and especially a 'dialect' of English, and a 'language' referring to all the associations with inferiority that language matters usually encounter. Political tendencies and social forces who wanted an independent Scotland considered Scots as a cultural marker, therefore they included language questions in the census; the findings were controversial, demonstrating and revealing language ideologies. As Sebba (2019, p. 339) notes, "according to some, the census provided no useful information, while according to others it demonstrated that there was a robust Scots-speaking population, and a clear public understanding of what it meant to be a speaker of Scots."

Furthermore, hostilities between languages are also present and these can also be viewed as an 'option' or 'ligature' for one language or another. Public views sometimes oppose Gaelic revitalisation because of the tension between Gaelic and Scots, in Scots speakers identified by Dunmore (2017, p. 737):

An ideology framing the Scots language as a ballast to pro-Gaelic policy—or, possibly as a rival linguistic identity—often emerge....Gaelic tended not to be

viewed as a national language for Scotland because of perceived opposition to its revitalisation, particularly among speakers of Scots.

Apart from the minority languages, Scotland also has community languages. The 2017 Pupil Census shows that children and young people come from a variety of heritages with 157 different languages spoken in the home compared to 136 different languages in 2010 (Scottish Government, 2018). The Scottish policy, report and recommendations (Scottish Government, 2012a) also includes ‘community languages.’ According to the policy (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13), all the languages of pupils should be celebrated in their community, and pupils should maintain and develop their own mother tongue. However, it was up to local authorities to design a language strategy that would encourage the continuation of mother tongue learning and provide and ensure possible resources to do so. Ligatures with mother tongue are encouraged.

But, in reality, as Hancock and Hancock (2018) observe, only Urdu and Chinese are taught in some Scottish schools and there are almost no other opportunities in mainstream schools to learn other heritage languages. Polish should be mentioned here as one example of the lack of consideration of heritage languages of migrants (Kanaki, 2020). Polish is the largest community language in Scotland according to the 2011 Census (NRS, 2013), spoken as their main language by 61,000 speakers, i.e., 1.2% of the population. Poland was the third most popular location of birth for adult responders to the 2011 census in Scotland. Unfortunately, there is no Scottish provision of any form of formal language teaching, or any offer of school language qualification in Polish. The Scottish Qualification Authority does not offer any qualifications in Polish, and there is no opportunity for teacher training under GTCs for heritage languages such as Polish (Hancock & Hancock, 2018; Kanaki, 2020).

Situations where formal education hampers the creation of ligatures with a mother tongue have contributed to the expansion of complementary schools in Scotland (Hancock & Hancock, 2018). According to Li Wei (2006, as cited in Hancock & Hancock, 2018, p. 10), monolingual and assimilationist school policies that constitute a sort of linguistic apartheid, promote the establishment and expansion of the complementary school sector in the United Kingdom. In Scotland, although the language policy (Scottish Government, 2012b) tries to encourage links, even with a simple statement, with cultural and complementary schools, there needs to be a greater, active collaboration between mainstream schools and complementary schools—such as informal Polish Saturday schools—to support heritage language learning (Hancock & Hancock, 2018) and, therefore, to encourage greater linguistic justice for all the languages of the community in Scottish society.

As mentioned before, ligatures with mother tongues are often problematic. Familiar problems also surface as

the policy promotes English while recognising that for some pupils, while their mother tongue is not English, their first additional language (L2) should be English (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13). It is clear that this aspect of policy questions the legitimacy of other languages, as it supports a specific ideology: the view that the use and prevalence of a single language bring national cohesion, and all citizens can have easy access to all social services and goods using the same language (Martín Rojo, 2015). English, here, is an ‘option’ and a ‘ligature’; it opens opportunities to all citizens, whilst creating exclusive, cultural and political bonds within a specific society. This role of ‘option and ligature’ for English is accepted by many immigrant parents, for example in Edinburgh and Glasgow, who do not claim low English proficiency themselves, for fear that their children would not be enrolled in, or able to attend, mainstream schools (McKelvey, 2017).

English as an Additional Language (EAL) is fully recognised as part of the policy (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13) and EAL work and delivery should be incorporated within a policy of 1+2 delivery in schools and should be protected and developed as part of the roll-out of that policy (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 34). Nevertheless, Christie, Robertson, Stodter, and O’Hanlon (2016) argue that there is little evidence of consideration for EAL or English as a second language in Scotland. McKelvey (2017) also states the need for further work on improving EAL teaching practices and understanding of the benefits of linguistic diversity.

In these circumstances, multilingualism within language provision in education in Scotland seems to be a challenging task that does not serve linguistic justice. The Scottish “1+2 Language Approach,” following the EU model, is based on the monolingual assumption that people have one mother tongue, study in a monolingual school setting, and should learn two further languages, overlooking all their multilingual, contemporary school environments (Kraus, Garcia, Frank, & Climent-Ferrando, 2018).

6. Neoliberal Understandings in Language Education

In this section, the links between the Scottish language policy and neoliberal strands are demonstrated.

The 1+2 language policy follows international trends in language education systems which introduce language learning in the early stages of primary school or even pre-school (Scottish Government, 2012a). Yet it also encourages the early introduction of languages related to powerful economies, such as Chinese, Portuguese (Brazil), etc. (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 12). It characterises Scotland as a leading competitive nation (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 12), citing this as the reason why Scotland cannot refuse its young people opportunities to learn an additional language. The language used by the policy itself demonstrates a strong ideological position about language, and not simply in its plethora of econom-

ic or financial allusions. The policy considers, for example, that learning languages is a value-added object, offering opportunities to work and travel abroad (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 6).

Languages have been commodified in the policy (Kanaki, 2020); they have been considered as objects “rendered available for conventional exchange in the market” (Heller, Pujolar, & Duchêne, 2014, p. 545). Speaking ‘languages’ offers justified and justifiable employability. The 1+2 policy encouraged the introduction in schools and teaching institutions of languages that were related to powerful economies such as Portuguese and Arabic, as well as ‘the Slavonic languages,’ which also gained a mention in its list of consumable objects that might assist Scotland’s economic ambitions. Language is construed as an “object invested with market value” (Urciuoli, 2016, p. 31). Not only are languages commodified, but students can accumulate language and communication skills as personal assets (Martín Rojo & Del Percio, 2020). Languages can be viewed solely as personal assets for work, travelling abroad, performance and pleasure.

One could simply claim that the “1+2 Language Approach” (Scottish Government, 2012b) creates a neoliberal disciplinary framework in which students are trained to speak following a template such as the native speaker model. According to Education Scotland (n.d., p. 5), “children should be exposed increasingly to real-life examples of ‘fluent language in action’ through various media, songs, podcasts, or input from native speakers.” Within neoliberal logic, the Scottish language policy (Scottish Government, 2012b) emphasises the importance of international languages, associated with particular and shifting economic powers. The policy itself creates language hierarchies as it promotes specific languages. Moreover, within the neoliberal approach, this language policy (Scottish Government, 2012b) also shapes the conduct of professionals/teachers by creating guidelines according to which they need to treat language. A policy document states, for example, that:

Primary teachers do not have to be fluent in the modern language(s) they teach. However, they do need to have enough language, and sufficient expertise in using and accessing appropriate resources, so that they can include modern language teaching readily in lessons. (Education Scotland, n.d., p. 2)

The 1+2 language policy clearly prescribes that primary school teachers should have knowledge of language pedagogy, and that they need to maintain their language skills throughout their teaching career (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 27) and the policy prescribes teacher engagement with the languages they teach, that is engagement with spoken and written language, the use of media and IT, and engagement with native speakers (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 31).

As Martín Rojo (2020, p. 162) mentions:

It is the individual (encouraged by educational institutions) who assumes most of the responsibility, by consenting or resisting the perceived need to accumulate language competencies, in the understanding that this creates economic value for the person concerned, for employers and for the community.

Here, I would add that it is the same language policy (Scottish Government, 2012b) that imposes this neoliberal concept on professionals, creating options/opportunities for learning languages simply so that students can become successful learners, confident individuals, effective contributors and responsible citizens, a clear and emphasised reference to the *Curriculum for Excellence* (Scottish Government, 2008), the major preceding piece of education-related policy in Scotland.

Furthermore, according to the policy, report and recommendations (Scottish Government, 2012a), local authorities have to design a language strategy that would encourage the continuation of mother tongue learning and ensure possible resources to do so, as well as ensuring that local authorities develop a language strategy and framework to implement policy regarding any language learning (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13). Schools in each area should make informed decisions regarding language choice (Scottish Government, 2012a, p. 13). In a neoliberal language discourse, ‘choice’ is the neoliberal keyword (Holborow, 2007) and these ‘informed decisions’ on language planning and management follow the attitude of *laissez faire* (Phipps & Fassetta, 2015). As Martín Rojo and Del Percio (2020, p. 1) note, “we are viewed as ‘clients’ of services that are funded by our taxes, but which at the same time are obliged to profit from our patronage,” a foundational contradiction. This policy (Scottish Government, 2012b) delegates local authorities and schools as promoters of our options, opportunities for our future associated with the maintenance of mother tongue, as well as learning other languages. At the same time, these options become our ligatures, the ones that tie us to particular market conditions and disciplinary frameworks.

7. Concluding Remarks

The juxtaposition and intertwining of minority, immigrant, national languages, and *linguae francae* in a society can usefully be viewed from a perspective of ‘options’ and ‘ligatures’ (Kraus, 2018). Language policies become ambivalent as they present options and ligatures simultaneously. This raises questions of particular complexity, especially in the light of social inclusion. This article has used the case of the Scottish language policy (Scottish Government, 2012b) to show some of these complexities in language planning. It hopes to contribute to the debate on social justice. It encourages further research and exploration of the phenomenon of multilingualism and its politics in a context of complex diversity, and in the light of language planning and man-

agement. Further examination of policies is needed where these are explored using a non-binary multilingual framework of theorising both of ‘options’ and ‘ligatures,’ and exploring their ambiguities. As Ester de Jong (2016, p. 378) remarks, “much of our formal language-in-education policies that address linguistic diversity are firmly grounded in a monolingual mindset.” It is time to look at language policies with a multilingual mind.

Acknowledgments

I thank the editors and reviewers for their careful reading of my manuscript and their insightful comments and suggestions.

Conflict of Interests

The author declares no conflict of interests.

References

- Alcalde, J. (2018). Linguistic justice: An interdisciplinary overview of the literature. In M. Gazzola, T. Templin, & B.-A. Wickström (Eds.), *Language policy and linguistic justice economic, philosophical and sociolinguistic approaches* (pp. 65–149). Berlin: Springer.
- Blommaert, J. (2013). Policy, policing and the ecology of social norms: Ethnographic monitoring revisited. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 219, 123–140.
- Blommaert, J. (2015). Dialogues with ethnography notes on classics and how I read them. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, 138, 1–145.
- Castagne, E. (2007). Transparences lexicales entre langues voisines [Vocabulary equivalence between neighbouring languages]. In E. Castagne (Ed.), *Les enjeux de l’intercompréhension* [The stakes for intercomprehension] (pp. 155–166). Reims: Epure.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Translanguaging as a pedagogical tool in multilingual education. In J. Cenoz, D. Gorter, & S. May (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Language awareness and multilingualism* (pp. 309–321). Berlin: Springer.
- Christie, J., Robertson, B., Stodter, J., & O’Hanlon, F. (2016). *A review of progress in implementing the 1+2 languages policy*. Edinburgh: Association of Directors of Education in Scotland.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1979). *Life chances: Approaches to social and political theory*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- de Jong, E. (2016). Toward pluralist policies, practices, and research. *Language and Education*, 30(4), 378–382.
- Dunmore, S. S. (2017). Immersion education outcomes and the Gaelic community: Identities and language ideologies among Gaelic medium-educated adults in Scotland. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(8), 726–741.
- Dunmore, S. S. (2019). *Language revitalisation in Gaelic Scotland linguistic practice and ideology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Education Scotland. (n.d.). *1+2 approach to language learning from P1 onwards*. Livingston: Education Scotland. Retrieved from <https://education.gov.scot/improvement/documents/modlang12-1plus2approachmar17.pdf>
- García, O. (2007). Foreword. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. xi–xv). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Oxford: Basil and Blackwell.
- Gazzola, M. (2014). Partecipazione, esclusione linguistica e traduzione: Una valutazione del regime linguistico dell’Unione europea [Participation, linguistic exclusion and translation: An evaluation of the language regime of the EU]. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata*, 43(2), 227–264.
- Gazzola, M., & Grin, F. (2013). Is ELF more effective and fair than translations? An evaluation of the EU’s multilingual regime. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23(1), 93–107.
- Gobbo, F. (2018). How to measure linguistic justice? Theoretical considerations and the South Tyrol case study of the Calvet Language Barometer. In P. A. Kraus & F. Grin (Eds.), *The politics of multilingualism europeanisation, globalisation and linguistic governance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin’s.
- Grin, F., & Civico, M. (2018). Why can’t language questions just be left to themselves? In F. Grin (Ed.), *The MIME VADEMECUM: Mobility and inclusion in multilingual Europe* (pp. 30–31). Geneva: MIME Project.
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hancock, A., & Hancock, J. (2018). *Extending the 1+2 language strategy: Complementary schools and their role in heritage language learning in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Centre for Education for Racial Equality in Scotland.
- Heller, M., Pujolar, J., & Duchêne, A. (2014). Linguistic commodification in tourism. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 18(4), 539–566.
- Holborow, M. (2007). Language ideology and neoliberalism. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 6(1), 51–73.
- Johnson, D. C. (2018). Teachers’ language policy engagement: European perspectives and challenges. *Language and Education*, 32(5), 462–469.
- Kanaki, A. (2020). Multilingualism from a monolingual habitus: The view from Scotland. In K. Strani (Ed.) *Multilingualism and politics: Revisiting multilingual citizenship* (pp. 309–332). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kraus, P. A. (2018). From glossophagic hegemony to multilingual pluralism? Re-assessing the politics of linguistic identity in Europe. In P. A. Kraus & F. Grin (Eds.), *The politics of multilingualism europeanisation, globalisation and linguistic governance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin’s.

- Kraus, P. A., Garcia, N., Frank, M., & Climent-Ferrando, V. (2018). Which principles should we use to tailor language policies? In F. Grin (Ed.), *The MIME VADEMECUM: Mobility and inclusion in multilingual Europe* (pp. 88–89). Geneva: MIME Project.
- Kraus, P. A., & Kazlauskaitė-Gürbüz, R. (2014). Addressing linguistic diversity in the European Union: Strategies and dilemmas. *Ethnicities*, 14(4), 517–538.
- Maiden, M., Cappellaro, C., & Lahiri, A. (2020). Not as ‘foreign’ as you think creating bridges of understanding across languages. In K. Kohl, R. Dudrah, A. Gosler, S. Graham, M. Maiden, W. C. Ouyang, & M. Reynolds (Eds.), *Creative multilingualism: A manifesto* (pp. 69–85). Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.
- Marác, L., & Adamo, S. (2017). Multilingualism and social inclusion. *Social Inclusion*, 5(4), 1–4.
- Martín Rojo, L. (2015). *Five Foucauldian postulates for rethinking language and power* (Working Paper in Urban Language and Literacies No. 76). London: King’s College London.
- Martín Rojo, L., & Del Percio, A. (Eds.). (2020). *Language and neoliberal governmentality*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Martín Rojo, L. (2020). The “self-made speaker”: The neoliberal governance of speakers. In L. Martín Rojo & A. Del Percio (Eds.), *Language and neoliberal governmentality* (pp. 162–189). New York, NY: Routledge.
- May, S. (2014). Contesting public monolingualism and diglossia: Rethinking political theory and language policy for a multilingual world. *Language Policy*, 13, 371–393.
- May, S. (2019). Negotiating the multilingual turn in SLA. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103, 122–129.
- McKelvey, R. (2017). Language provision in education: A view from Scotland. *Social Inclusion*, 5(4), 78–86.
- Meulleman, M., & Fiorentino, A. (2018). Who can benefit from training in receptive language skills? In F. Grin (Ed.), *The MIME VADEMECUM: Mobility and inclusion in multilingual Europe* (pp. 138–139). Geneva: MIME Project.
- NRS. (2013). Statistical bulletin: 2011 census—Key results on population, ethnicity, identity, language, religion, health, housing and accommodation in Scotland. *National Records of Scotland*. Retrieved from <https://www.nrscotland.gov.uk/news/2013/census-2011-release-2a>
- Ó Ceallaigh, T. J., & Ní Dhonnabháin, A. (2015). Reawakening the Irish language through the Irish education system: Challenges and priorities. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 8(2), 179–198.
- Oliva, C. J., Donato, C., & Ricciardelli, F. (2019). Translation and translanguaging pedagogies in intercomprehension and multilingual teaching. In N. Slavkov & J. Séror (Eds.), *Translanguaging: Opportunities and challenges in a global world* (Vol. 10, pp. 157–182). Ottawa: Official Languages and Bilingualism Institution, University of Ottawa.
- Phipps, A., & Fassetta, G. (2015). A critical analysis of language policy in Scotland. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 7(1), 5–27.
- Piller, I. (2001). Naturalization language testing and its basis in ideologies of national identity and citizenship. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(3), 259–277.
- Ricento, T. (Ed.). (2006). *An introduction to language policy*. New York, NY: Blackwell.
- Scottish Government. (2008). *Building the curriculum 3: A framework for learning and teaching*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government. (2012a). *Language learning in Scotland: A 1+2 approach, Scottish Government Languages Working Group report and recommendations*. Scottish Government. Retrieved from <http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2012/05/3670/downloads>
- Scottish Government. (2012b). Government’s response to the report of the Languages Working Group. *Scottish Government*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/corporate-report/2012/11/1-2-language-learning-policy-scottish-gov-response/documents/edb4494e-7c33-48cf-abd6-5abe76dfcefc/edb4494e-7c33-48cf-abd6-5abe76dfcefc/govscot%3Adocument>
- Scottish Government. (2018). Summary of statistics for schools in Scotland: Pupil census supplementary data. *Scottish Government*. Retrieved from <http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/School-Education/dspupcensus>
- Sebba, M. (2019). Named into being? Language questions and the politics of Scots in the 2011 census in Scotland. *Language Policy*, 18, 339–362.
- Urciuoli, B. (2016). The compromised pragmatics of diversity. *Language and Communication*, 51, 30–39.
- Walsh, J., & McLeod, W. (2008). An overcoat wrapped around an invisible man? Language legislation and language revitalisation in Ireland and Scotland. *Language Policy*, 7(1), 21–46.

About the Author



Argyro Kanaki is a Lecturer in Education at the University of Dundee, Scotland. She holds a PhD in language education. Her current teaching focuses on the pedagogy of modern foreign languages, TESOL, issues around culture, and debates in international education. Argyro currently researches metalinguistic awareness and its relations with language policy and language practices.