



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH
The Moray House
School of Education

Extending the 1+2 Language Strategy: Complementary schools and their role in heritage language learning in Scotland.

Dr Andy Hancock, University of Edinburgh
Jonathan Hancock, Centre for Education for Racial Equality
in Scotland (CERES) University of
Edinburgh

Contents

1. Introduction	p. 3
2. Literature Review	p. 5
3. Methodology	p. 14
4. Findings	p. 18
5. Discussion and Further Considerations	p. 44
6. References	p. 56
Appendix 1: Questionnaire	p. 64

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Data from the Scottish Schools Census (Scottish Government, 2018a) highlights the increasing number of children and young people living in Scotland today who speak languages other than English. Currently there are very few opportunities for these children and young people to use and develop their first languages in mainstream schools for educational purposes. Consequently, it has been left to the efforts of concerned minoritised parents to establish and organise schools themselves in order to develop their children's heritage languages as it is integral to their identity, home literacy practices and cultural traditions (Curdt-Christiansen & Hancock, 2014). These complementary schoolsⁱ (also known as 'community', 'supplementary' or 'heritage language' schools) operate in the evenings and weekends and play a vital role by acting as spaces to support the development of children's social, linguistic and cultural capital (Hancock, 2012a).

An investigation into heritage language learning in Scotland is timely for two reasons. First, the only mapping exercise of complementary school provision in Scotland was over ten years ago (McPake, 2006). Since the publication of the report significant changes have taken place in the linguistic makeup of Scotland as a result of increased mobility and globalisation.

Second, the Scottish Government's 1+2 Language Strategy, launched in 2012, has refocused attention on language policy in education and the provision for language learning in Scottish schools. Contained within the Strategy is a commitment to further develop links involving 'cultural organisations' and 'language communities' to 'derive maximum benefit from foreign language communities in Scotland' (Scottish Government, 2012: 24). Whether these 'links' are to support language learning within or out-of-mainstream schools is not clear. However, it is important to

gain insights into the perspectives of ‘language communities’ and complementary school providers to inform Scottish Government policy.

This report draws on data gathered from two knowledge exchange seminars, an Internet trawl, an online questionnaire and telephone interviews with complementary school providers across Scotland. The project was undertaken under the auspices of the Centre for Education for Racial Equality in Scotland (CERES) and funded by a University of Edinburgh Knowledge Exchange and Impact grant.

1.2 Aims of the study

The research was devised to provide up-to-date information about the provision for learning heritage languages outside of mainstream schools. Although linguistic minority communities may be aware of the provision in their geographical region, it remains a hidden and untapped national resource. This research will help policy makers and educators to identify ways in which complementary schools can help shape and inform the development of the 1+2 Language Strategy.

The aims of the research were therefore:

- to collate existing information about the nature and scope of complementary schools in Scotland;
- to collect more detailed information directly from providers about heritage language learning and their awareness of and involvement in the 1+2 Language Strategy;
- to identify aspects of the 1+2 language Strategy which could be enhanced and strategies for achieving this.

1.3 Organisation of the Report

The report begins with an overview of linguistic diversity and language policy in Scotland that has helped shape heritage language learners and complementary school provision. The next section explains the methods for collecting data. This is followed by the key themes emerging from the findings. The concluding section discusses aspects of the 1+2 Language Strategy which could be developed and strategies for achieving this.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Heritage Languages

Using Thürmann, Vollmer & Pieper's (2010) language-in-education definitions, the different categories of languages in Scotland include: regional languages (Gaelic and Scots); modern foreign languages (MFL), consisting mainly of official languages of the European Union (such as French, German and Spanish), and the languages of migrants (including the acquisition of English). This report deals only with the heritage languages of migrant communities, defined as all the languages used in society, other than the dominant language (English), regional languages (Gaelic and Scots) and British Sign Language (BSL). That said, 'heritage language' and 'modern foreign language' are not mutually exclusive, as there have been moves in the past to include heritage languages within the portfolio of modern languages offered for a range of national examinations by the Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA). For example, Cantonese, Mandarin (simplified and traditional) and Urdu are modern languages available at National 3, 4 and 5, Higher and Advanced Higher courses.

The social, cognitive, cultural and economic benefits of bilingualism have been widely documented. On an individual level, children and young people are able to communicate and interact with their family and extended family. Enhanced vocabularies and wider phonological systems have been found to give bilingual children enhanced metalinguistic skills; that is, the ability to talk about language and how it works and a facility for learning further languages more easily (Christie, Robertson, Stodter & O'Hanlon, 2016). Furthermore, empirical studies have shown that bilingual speakers consistently outperform their monolingual counterparts on cognitive tasks such as switching attention, working memory and problem-solving skills (Bialystok, 2011) Therefore, it comes as no surprise that accumulating research points to the benefits of bilingualism on academic achievement when conditions are favourable to bilingual development (Cummins, 2000; Thomas & Collier, 2004). On a national level, bilingual citizens are more attuned to intercultural encounters and

can also contribute to the economy through trade and tourism (British Council, 2017; Hogan-Brun, 2017).

Polinsky & Kagan (2007) define heritage language speakers as individuals who have been exposed to a particular language in childhood but who do not subsequently acquire it fully because another language usurped the original language. Heritage language learners vary widely in their early oral and script experiences at home or in other social contexts and as a result, they tend to develop vastly different skills in both oral language and literacy skills (Zhang, 2016).

In the current policy context in Scotland, migrant children and young people are faced with two or more competing languages, one of which is the language of education and upward social mobility. There is a strong incentive, therefore, for those in the language minority to learn the language of power in order to participate fully in mainstream society, whilst a lack of provision for heritage languages results in language loss. Lo Bianco (2016) refers to this state of affairs as the ‘classic 3-G attrition problem’, where the languages of migrants are being eroded across three generations, during a transition to the full use of English rather than bilingualism (heritage language plus English).

That said, the relative success of intergenerational transmission of minority languages does vary widely and also depends on family language policy (FLP) (King, Fogle & Logan-Terry, 2008; Spolsky, 2012). FLP encompasses the ideologies attached to different languages, and how these ideologies shape interactions and language practices in the home and among family members, and the extent to which parents manage and regulate their children’s and their own language practices. Furthermore, parents may or may not believe that attendance at part-time or weekend-only heritage language schools is a worthwhile pursuit (Hancock, 2006).

2.2 Linguistic diversity in Scotland

Heritage language learners are not a homogeneous group but are a manifestation of a number of factors and migratory flows that have contributed to the linguistic make-up of Scotland. For nearly half a century, the linguistic demography of Scotland has been characterized by large settled communities of citizens originally from commonwealth countries. These included Urdu and Punjabi speakers from Pakistan and Cantonese and Hakka speakers from Hong Kong. Most Scottish Pakistanis are Muslim and have their heritage in the central Punjab part of Pakistan, including Faisalabad and Lahore. In the 2011 census over 50% of Pakistanis were born in the United Kingdom. Although a breakdown of data is currently not available for Scotland, one would expect a similar percentage, given the nature of the settled community. Chinese neighbourhoods were first established in Scotland in the 1960s as economic uncertainty in Hong Kong caused workers from the rural New Territories to look for work opportunities abroad. Now almost 30% of the Chinese inhabitants are born in Scotland.

More recently, the expansion of the European Union (EU) in 2004, 2007 and 2013 brought 13ⁱⁱ new countries into the Union, most of them in Central and Eastern Europe, presenting new opportunities for free movement of labour. These phases of enlargement have brought a substantial arrival of migrant workers to Scotland seeking employment, especially from Poland, who contribute to the country's economy by working in hospitality and catering; in agriculture; and in food processing sectors (Hudson & Aiton, 2016). Furthermore, the children of migrants have added to the linguistic diversity and the richness of mainstream multilingual classrooms (Rolf & Metcalf, 2009; Hancock, 2012b). The 2011 census saw an eighteen-fold increase in the number of people who spoke Polish at home over the last decade, accounting for just less than half of the EU national residents in Scotland. Other significant EU nationals in Scotland by country include (in order of population size) Spain, Italy, Romania, Lithuania, Latvia and Hungary. For insights

into Eastern European children's social interactions after migration to Scotland see Sime and Fox (2015).

Issues relating to immigration and border control are still a reserved matter and managed by the UK government in Westminster. The UK Government's 'policy of dispersal', introduced by Immigration and Asylum Act 1999, set out proposals to relocate refugee and asylum seekers from London and the southeast of England to the rest of the UK. Until this time, the majority of people seeking asylum arrived into, and claimed asylum in these geographical areas. Glasgow City Council was the first local authority in the UK to sign up to the dispersal agreement and from 2001 onwards significant numbers of individuals and families from countries subjected to political and economic instability were housed in the city (Stewart 2012; Phipps & Fassetta 2015). In 2008 there were almost 3,000 asylum seekers in 'dispersed accommodation' in Scotland, falling to about 2,000 in 2012. This reduction is due more to measures which prevent people getting to the UK to apply for asylum rather than an actual reduction in the number of refugees worldwide. These 'New Scots' are from a wide variety of heritage language backgrounds including Farsi, Arabic, Pashto, Kurdish, Roma and Shona. Clearly this demographic fluctuates depending on developments in the countries suffering from conflict and persecution. For example, as a result of the humanitarian crisis in Syria, over 1,000 Syrians refugees have arrived in Scotland since 2015 as part of the UK government's Vulnerable Persons Resettlement (VPR) scheme and accommodated by councils across Scotland.

Another distinct group are the so-called 'elite' children and young people with English as an additional language (EAL) whose parents travel for business, academic and diplomatic reasons. These families may have short-term residence and the children's acquisition of English is frequently not perceived as a problem but viewed by educationalists as an advantageous educational resource in an increasingly globalised world (Hancock, 2012b).

Measures have been put in place by the Scottish Government to address the nation's demographic stability and sustainable economic growth. One such initiative was the Fresh Talent scheme (introduced in 2004 but discontinued in 2012), designed to encourage non-EU students who have graduated from Scottish Universities to stay in the country. This type of initiative, alongside public opinion welcoming migrant workers, are still on the political agenda as a way to fill the current workforce skills gap (McCollum, Nowok & Tindal, 2014).

Taking into consideration all the migratory factors and patterns above, heritage language learners can be characterized by the notion of 'super-diversity' (Vertovec, 2007). Such a phenomenon is distinguished by a dynamic interplay of variables among scattered, multiple geographical-origin, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified migrants. This kind of complexity provides an unmatched potential to promote the linguistic resources of school age children and young people as a part of the 1+2 Language Strategy.

The number of heritage language users residing in Scotland has grown substantially over the years and has become increasingly more diverse. The 2017 Statistics for Schools in Scotland (all publicly-funded primary, secondary and special schools) identified 53,052 (9.5%) pupils whose main home language was not English, Gaelic, Scots, Doric nor Sign Language (Scottish Government, 2018a). This proportion of children and young people learning English as an additional language (EAL) showed an increase of 90% from 2010 when the data was first recorded nationally (Scottish Government, 2018a).ⁱⁱⁱ The highest concentrations are still to be found in the urban areas with the greatest number of these children and young people with EAL attending schools in Glasgow (19% of the school population), followed by Aberdeen (15%), Edinburgh (12%) and Dundee (7%).

Furthermore, the 2017 Pupil Census confirms 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, 2018a). In 2017 the top five home languages in order of pupil numbers were Polish, Urdu, Punjabi, Chinese (Mandarin and Cantonese) and Arabic.

2.3 Complementary Schools

As indicated above, with the exception of Urdu and Chinese, there are almost no opportunities in mainstream schools to learn the heritage languages in use among Scottish school children and young people. Attempts by the Polish community to lobby for Polish as an examination subject at National 4 and 5 and Higher level (Martowicz & Roach, 2016) have been rebuffed by the Scottish Government. Li Wei (2006) believes that the establishment and expansion of the complementary school sector in the United Kingdom (UK) can be viewed as a direct result of a system of linguistic apartheid in tandem with monolingual and assimilationist school policies. Nwulu (2015:15) goes further and distinguishes three different types of provision based on the motivation behind establishing the school: *conserving* the linguistic and cultural heritage; *compensating* for underachievement and inadequate mainstream provision and a *counter-cultural* dimension which seeks to challenge dominant discourses that perpetuate racism and discrimination.

The last two decades have seen a wave of scholarly activity in a variety of locations acknowledging the pivotal educational and social role of complementary schools, such as England (Creese, Bhatt, Bhojani & Martin, 2006; Lytra & Martin 2010; Walters, 2011; Ganassin, 2018), the United States (US) (Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus 2008, Beaudrie, Ducar & Potowski, 2014), Canada (Curdt-Christiansen, 2008, Aravossitas, 2014), Australia (Chen & Zhang, 2014) and the Netherlands (Li & Juffermans, 2014). By comparison research examining the complementary school phenomena in Scotland is relatively scarce, with the exceptions of Hancock (2012a, 2014, 2016) and Bell (2013).

These weekend and evening schools serve a vital role in developing children's social

capital through participation in shared cultural activities and engaging with role models from similar backgrounds. These ‘separate spaces’ provide children and young people with safe havens to build resilience and explore complex questions of nuanced identity (re) construction and (re) invention as they navigate diasporic social, cultural and linguistic contexts (Francis, Archer & Mau, 2009; Tereshchenko & Archer, 2014; Nwulu, 2015). This peer networking and socialization is especially important in those areas of Scotland where minority families are geographically isolated. By the very nature of community-led initiatives and parent-initiated schools, complementary schools also provide a site for more productive parent-teacher engagement as well as community engagement more widely (Ramalingam & Griffith, 2015).

Although teachers in complementary schools encourage children and young people to use the heritage language (Bonacina-Pugh & Gafaranga, 2011), learners use their agency and employ the languages at their disposal on their own terms. A number of scholars have pointed to this translanguaging as a natural phenomenon in complementary school contexts and an integral part of pupils’ identity formation (Li Wei, 2014). It is also evident that their flexible bilingualism performs an important function as a tool for thinking and literacy learning (Hancock, 2012a). That is, the teacher taps into the children’s pre-existing cultural and linguistic knowledge and draws on the learners’ multilingual skills to support the discussion of concepts and skills. In this way, pedagogical practices are co-constructed by both teachers and learners (Creese and Blackledge, 2010; Hancock, 2012a). Maylor et al. (2010) also argue that complementary schools help to reinforce English language learning, make children more effective communicators, and support problem-solving abilities and reading proficiency.

2.4 1+2 Language Strategy

In 2011 the Scottish Government set up a Languages Working Group to consider a strategic approach to language learning based on the European 1+2 model and

Barcelona Agreement. The ambitious aim was that, by 2020, every child in Scotland should have mastered the basics of two languages in addition to their mother tongue by the time they leave primary school. The Group's report and recommendations, *Language Learning in Scotland: A 1+2 Approach*, were published in May 2012 (Scottish Government, 2012). Scottish Ministers welcomed the report and its 35 recommendations, either in full or in part, while recognising that taking these forward would require discussion, collaboration and partnership with local authorities, schools, parents and other key stakeholders.

This attempt to radically reform national language learning and to create the conditions to nurture plurilingual citizens includes earlier access to language learning for children at the primary stage (L1 in primary one and L2 in primary 5), enhanced partnership between primary and secondary schools, more extensive and more effective use of technology and regular access to native and fluent speakers to stimulate young people's interest in language learning.

There are two recommendations in the report and accepted by the Scottish Government that are key to this research project.

Recommendation 2. The Working Group recommends that local authorities and schools develop a 1+2 strategy for language learning within which schools can determine which additional languages to offer. As part of this strategy, consideration should be given to teaching modern European Languages, languages of the strong economies of the future, Gaelic and *community languages of pupils in schools* (authors' emphasis in italics).

Recommendation 33. The Working Group recommends further development of the links involving *cultural organisations*, local authorities, *language communities* and schools (authors' emphasis in italics).

The discourse above indicates a commitment to broaden the scope of languages on

offer. However, a review of progress in implementing the 1+2 Language Strategy conducted by Christie et al. (2016) found that French and Spanish remain the most popular L2 languages mentioned within local authority strategies. The review also found that many local authorities had still to decide on L3 language but Spanish, German and French proved to be the most popular L3 languages under consideration. Within local authority strategy plans there does appear to be a move to offer a greater diversity of languages with Mandarin, Polish, BSL and Urdu mentioned as L3s for primary schools and Mandarin, Japanese and Norse stated as L3s for secondary schools (Glen, 2017). However, implementation plans for this stage of the strategy varies a great deal across the country (Christie et al. 2016).

The promotion of languages within the scope of 1+2 Language Strategy is also determined by changing ideologies mediated through political and economic considerations. The Scottish Government report explicitly states that ‘account should be taken of...languages of the strong economies of the future’ (Scottish Government 2012: 14). This can be illustrated by China’s re-emerging position of strength within global economics and trading systems and subsequent demands, within both business and political circles, for Chinese to be taught in schools to support Scotland’s commercial activity with China. A new era of educational cooperation between China and Scotland in 2006 (Scottish Government, 2006) and a third strategy for engagement in 2012 has seen Chinese government investment in the creation of 40 Confucius Hubs across 21 local authorities in Scotland as well as 60 Hanban teachers to support teaching of Mandarin.

The implementation of 1+2 echoes prevailing ideologies that perceive Western European languages or languages that are considered to have economic benefits as the most appropriate languages to teach (British Council, 2017), whereas the heritage languages used daily in homes across Scotland are given little, if any recognition. This study aims to redress this balance by providing insights into the provision of heritage language learning in complementary schools in Scotland.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The research was devised to provide up-to-date information about provision for learning community languages outside of mainstream schools. A multi-strategy and mixed methods approach was undertaken in order to gather both quantitative and qualitative data and to support data triangulation (Creswell, 2013).

The research design included four overlapping phases.

Phase 1: Knowledge Exchange seminars

Two half-day seminars were held at Moray House School of Education, University of Edinburgh; the first was held on 4th November 2015 and the second seminar was held on 21st April 2016. Invited guests included Mahara Ruby and Jim Anderson (Goldsmiths University of London) and Joanna McPake (University of Strathclyde). Both seminars were well attended, with 59 registrations for the first and 35 for the second.

The seminars brought together representatives from Scottish Government, Education Scotland, the Polish Consulate, Scotland's National Centre for Languages (SCILT), academics, practitioners (mainstream and complementary schools), local authority staff from across Scotland, (Stirling Council, Highland Council, Dumfries and Galloway Council, City of Edinburgh, Scottish Borders), NGOs (Black and Ethnic Minority Infrastructure in Scotland (BEMIS)), and students. Using the networks above and an online research questionnaire helped establish a database of complementary school providers for future networking.

Phase 2: Internet search

During the first stage all local authority English as an additional language (EAL) co-ordinators were contacted via the Scottish EAL Coordinating Council (SEALCC) and asked for any available information about complementary school provision in

their area. EAL support services and teachers were considered the first point of contact because of their advocacy role in schools and knowledge of learners' and parents' heritage backgrounds. Local authorities have different methods for collecting information about community languages; for example, in some authorities the EAL team or race equality officer is responsible, and in others community languages are grouped under modern languages. To supplement the local authority trawl, a desk-based Internet search was conducted to identify complementary schools. This was intended to confirm the schools identified by local authorities and also pinpoint others that may have been missed.

Phase 3: Questionnaire survey

The questionnaire was composed of four sections. The first section collected information about the school, including the date it was established, the local authority it is based in, the accommodation used, the aims of the school, number of teachers (including parent- and student-teachers), teacher qualifications and professional development needs, and financial support. The second section focused on pupils at the school, asking for the number of pupils, age range, size and organization of classes, and whether pupils came from bilingual or English-speaking homes. The questionnaire then turned to learning and teaching, collecting information on languages taught at the school, ways in which the school supported the 1+2 Strategy, social and cultural activities, and the availability of teaching materials and resources. Finally, a set of questions asked about assessment in the school, including details of homework, tests and reporting assessment to parents. The full questionnaire is provided in appendix 1. A pilot of the questionnaire was sent to three teachers at separate complementary schools to gain feedback on the design and make adjustments.

The questionnaire was distributed through a link Bristol Online Survey (BOS) tool designed for use by University staff. This web-based survey tool provides a variety of question types and complex data flows can be built up by the use of filter

questions. BOS has the benefit of allowing participants to edit and make changes and the use of set questions supports reliability. The survey also allows for quantitative and qualitative data to be collected and displayed to aid analysis. In addition to closed categorized or ranked questions, a number of 'open' questions were included where respondents were invited to expand on the question in free text format, for example, 'Please give details of any other reasons you have identified'. O'Cathain and Thomas (2004) argue that researchers should be encouraged to use open questions as part of structured questionnaires, as it allows respondents to elaborate on the answer and identify new issues not captured in the closed questions, thereby improving the quality of the data and analysis. With an increasingly widespread Internet, online questionnaires serve as a speedy communication medium and allow quick completion and submission and data collation (Sheehan, 2001). However, a deluge of online information can also distract participants from completing the survey.

Phase 4: Follow-up semi-structured interviews

Several respondents to the online questionnaire indicated they would be willing to provide further information about their complementary school. As such a number of follow-up telephone and face-to-face interviews between these individuals and the Principal Investigator (PI) were set up. Extra (2010) believes there is a need for complementary data collection when exploring linguistic diversity in multilingual contexts as validity issues arise from different approaches. Questionnaires allow for greater reach but the answers are frequently defined within the boundaries set by the researcher's questions. Whereas, semi-structured interviews offer a potentially richer response, giving the interviewer a chance to probe and explore the themes in more depth and to gain a more illuminating understanding of the issues. However, an inherent limitation in this approach is the possible mismatch between participants' self-reports and reality. That said, the semi-structured interviews were framed from a collection of topics covered in the questionnaire to provide reasonable consistency across a range of interviews, whilst remaining loose enough to allow for a free-

flowing conversation to capture individual variation (Rubin and Rubin, 2005).

Findings from the four phases of the research are presented in the next section of this report.

4. Findings

4.1 Complementary School Providers

From the support of the EAL Co-ordinators and the Internet search 62 complementary schools or classes were identified as making provision for 18 different heritage languages after school hours or at the weekend. The languages included Polish, Cantonese, Mandarin, Arabic, Urdu, Punjabi, Hebrew, Hindi, Russian, Greek, Japanese, Farsi, French, Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian and Dutch. It seems likely that this is not the full extent of the provision as some schools may wish not to publicise themselves, or do not have webpages or Facebook accounts as only a small number of children or young people are enrolled.

The number of schools and centres is a decline from McPake's (2006) audit. However, a fundamental change in the linguistic demographic is evident as McPake's audit identified only one Polish school whereas now there is a network of 18 Saturday schools, established by the Polish community, which provide nearly 1300 young Scots of Polish heritage with two to four hours of classes of language, culture and history of Poland a week.

The Internet trawl revealed a variety of complementary school websites. Many contained basic information in both the heritage language and English about the aims of the school, classes, staff, extra-curricular activities, calendars, enrolment, fees and contact details. Some covered additional information such as examination results, reference to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, 2018),^{iv} learning resources/materials, photo galleries of activities and celebrations, and YouTube films with contributions from teachers and children. One school had downloadable up-to-date policy documents on topics such as Homework and Anti-Bullying.

Some sites of worship did not have formal language lessons but provided opportunities for learning languages and literacies through other activities. For example, a Hindu temple had Carnatic music classes where the children learnt vocabulary and a variety of scripts (Tamil, Telugu/Kannada and Malayalam) to support the understanding of the system of classical music commonly associated with southern India, as well as Sri Lanka.

Diverse minority language communities

The range of schools from the Internet trawl illustrates the heterogeneous nature of minority communities. For instance, the diversity of the Chinese community has precipitated a range of Chinese schools serving the different needs of the community. For example, Edinburgh alone hosts five distinct schools: two schools for Cantonese and Hakka-speaking children with heritage ties to Hong Kong with Mandarin and Cantonese classes; one small school for Cantonese and Hakka-speaking children with heritage ties to Hong Kong and located at the True Jesus Church; and one school with a 24-year history with provision for Mandarin-speakers from mainland China and affiliated to the Chinese Consulate. Finally, a new school set up by professionals for Mandarin-speakers incorporating diverse teaching methods and encouraging non-native speakers.

Arabic is the primary language of education and discourse in numerous countries across the Middle East and North Africa. Arabic also functions as the language of Islam for Muslims across the globe with Arabic taught in mosques for the recitation of the Qur'an (Shah, 2008). Not surprisingly, the internet scan revealed a diverse range of provision for the teaching of Arabic within Edinburgh: after school classes at the Mosque teaching Arabic alongside the study of the Qur'an; a Libyan school, supported by the Libyan Embassy in London, teaching a condensed curriculum programme to support children and young people to maintain their heritage language and curriculum knowledge before returning home; Arabic Saturday school open to all nationalities with a focus on learning Arabic, without religious texts, and acting as

an examination centre; and single-community classes organised by families in community centres once or twice a week (e.g. Sudanese).

The online questionnaire was sent by email to all 62 complementary schools and cultural organisations identified by local authorities and the Internet trawl. Furthermore, the Polish Consulate helped distribute the questionnaires to Polish Saturday schools across Scotland. In total, there were 21 responses to the questionnaire (33% response rate). This is in line with response rates for external surveys (Sheehan, 2001) although there may have been a number of influences on the low response rate.

The precariousness of the complementary sector means some schools were no longer operating or changed contact details and a number of emails bounced back as 'undeliverable'. In some cases, organisations identified as possibly making provision for heritage language learning contacted us to say that currently they did not have the resources to provide teaching but could we help them with sources of funding as they were keen to maintain their children's heritage language. This was particularly true for the cultural organisations associated with asylum seekers and refugees. Some organizations emailed us saying they felt the questionnaire did not apply to them because they were just a small group of parents and children meeting in a community centre. Finally, we were aware that some organisations may not have been able to respond because the questionnaire was in English. Unfortunately, the diversity of the sector meant it was not possible to provide translations of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was sent to all registered Mosques as *Madrasses*^v feature strongly in the lives of Scottish Muslim children and young people. Although *Madrasses* focus heavily on the Qu'ran and Islamic education, they are also sites for the learning of Arabic, Urdu and Bengali. *Madrasses* can reinforce the cultural, linguistic and religious identities of pupils. However, practices within *Madrasses* are not well

understood outside of Muslim communities and there is a lack of evidence of the impact of language tuition on children and young people (Cherti and Bradley, 2011).

The questionnaires that were returned came from a range of local authorities across Scotland with the majority based in City of Edinburgh or the Greater Glasgow area. A small number of schools were based across several local authority areas, and the presence of complementary schools was also recorded in northern local authorities such as Aberdeen City and Highlands. The respondent schools represented a number of different taught languages; Polish (7) was the language most widely represented, followed by Mandarin, Cantonese or 'Chinese' (6), while some offered European languages such as French, German, Greek, Portuguese and Russian. Arabic and Punjabi complementary classes were also available in Edinburgh. Certain schools offered English language learning in addition to learning the heritage language.

The schools varied widely in size; the largest was a Chinese school with 1100 pupils and 150 teachers and 50 classes, while other schools only had around 20-30 pupils and 3 or 4 teachers. In general, the Chinese and Polish schools had the largest numbers of pupils and staff. Many of the Polish schools had been established since the accession of Poland to the EU in 2004, with one established as recently as February 2016. For details of Polish Saturday schools in Scotland see Kohlbek & Jezior (2015) and Martowicz & Roach (2016). The majority of Chinese schools were more established, with several active since the early 1970s, but new schools continue to be set up including one in 2016. One Japanese complementary school had been active since the early 1980s, and a Greek school had been active for over 50 years. The majority of other European language complementary schools were set up in the last 10 to 15 years.

Children and young people attending complementary schools

Schools catered for all age groups, from those under the age of five (43%) to adults (43%) but principally for those between the ages 5 and 16. All schools had provision for 5 to 11-year olds. Over half (57%) catered for students aged 17-18.

Schools were asked how many pupils attending their school come from (i) homes where neither parent is a native speaker of English? (ii) bilingual homes (only one parent is a native speaker of English)? (iii) homes where both parents are native speakers of English? It is acknowledged that 'native speaker' is a contentious term and there are obvious sensitivities around gathering data of this type. Four schools indicated that did not monitor information on pupil background. For the Polish and Chinese schools the vast majority of the pupils come from homes where both parents speak the heritage language. In a Punjabi school 100% of the pupils came from Punjabi speaking families, whereas in the smaller schools making provision for European languages, the percentage of bicultural homes was significantly higher. For example, schools making provision for Portuguese (80%), French (70%), German (60%) and Greek (45%). The highest percentage belonged to a Japanese School where 74 out of the 100 pupils (74%) came from dual heritage families. Schools with the highest percentage of pupils from families where the heritage language was not spoken included a Greek school (5%) and a French school (5%).

Class organisation

Not surprisingly the number of classes varied greatly, from three schools, making provision for Arabic, Portuguese and Punjabi with only three classes each to a Chinese school with 50 classes. Some of the smaller schools had classes with a very small number of children whereas the largest schools, such as the Polish and Chinese had class sizes of 15-25 children. Class sizes appeared to average around 10 pupils. One Polish school capped class sizes at 30 pupils.

Some schools had larger class sizes for the primary age range which then got smaller as age of classes increased. As one Russian school commented:

At the moment we have 13 classes covering ages from 2 up to late teens. The classes are capped at 13 pupils; they are fairly full up to age 9, with a fairly sharp drop-off afterwards.

Schools were asked how they organized classes, for example according to age or language competence. For the majority of the schools age was the main criteria for class organization but this was also influenced by language proficiency:

Generally on age, and older children on language competence, linked to age.

Both, although more often than not we sacrifice ability over age in order to create a more homogeneous class.

Both. We try to put children in classes within their age group, but sometimes a child is working with younger (or with older) children if their language competence requires it. It depends a lot on the time the child has spent in Poland and in Scotland.

A mixture of both: age is the main criterion, but in some cases we split the age group in two by language competence (currently this is the case for age group 10-12).

Age is by far the most important criterion. Occasionally, friendships influence decisions as well, but language competence is (almost) entirely disregarded.

Two schools indicated that they tried to minimize the range of ages within the one class:

We organise classes according to age and Polish language competence. In some classes we have children with 2-3 different ages because of their level of Polish.

Both. Try to keep to maximum 2 years difference in age within a class. Large differences in language competence within a class.

For a smaller number of schools language competence was the main criteria:

We have tried both schemes and sometimes a mix of both of them. However, language competence is the main drive.

Both: we try to have groups organized by age but competence in the language is a key factor as well for the learning process within the group.

One school highlighted the challenges of having a range of ages in the one class:

We try to combine both. Language competence and whether Greek is a first or second language is the basis but we don't have children of diverse ages in the same class for emotional, social and psychological issues. The maximum age gap (is) 3 years and this is rare.

Two schools (Chinese and Japanese) indicated that they operated a system of learners repeating a year based on the annual assessment of their language and literacy skills:

We organise classes according to mainly age but some pupils repeat the same year due to the lack of their language competence.

We start accepting students from age 5 at the beginner class, then we will assess the student progress to see if they can progress to next class level, however, normally the students will not repeat the same level more than 2 years. When the students are at S3, we will encourage the students to start the National 5 course subject to assessment by the relevant teachers.

One school, of Russian, used the practice of the teacher continuing with the same class to ensure continuity and progression:

We do not have a school-wide policy on this, and no agreed progression framework. As far as possible teachers tend to stay with the same group of pupils over the years rather than handing them over.

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

The amount of time students spent a week in classes depends on the language taught. The majority spent 1-3 hours on a Saturday in class during term time, whereas most of the Polish schools allocated 4-6 hours on a Saturday. One Polish school had after school classes of 1-2 hours. A Punjabi school also had two hours of classes (3.30-5.30) after school on a Friday. The Greek schools provided the most extensive hours. The schools were open on some weekdays after school (6-8), as well as the weekend, giving a total of 12-20 hours teaching a week. Age did not appear to be a factor in the amount of time learners were expected to attend classes.

Homework

All the schools except one set weekly homework. This homework depended on the individual teacher and varied according to the age of the learners:

The homework is varied and depending on the age, level of learning and whether Greek is first or 2nd language.

It varies depending on the level and teacher. At the early years it is kept to a minimum.

We do not have a school-wide policy on homework, so this is up to individual teachers.

Some schools provided more detail of the type of homework given to different ages and stages:

Reading and Spelling is the most common one for the primary classes which essay and text analysis for the more senior ones.

Usually worksheets reflecting what was discussed during the lesson. It may be a spelling sheet for the younger children, a poem analysis for the older students.

Grammatical exercises and close reading for younger children. Essay writing for older children.

We work with small children (P2-P3 age) so every now and again (not every week) we give them little reading materials to go through at home as well as small puzzles and activities.

The homework largely depends on each individual teachers. Normally will include some writing ([Chinese] characters on lower classes and sentences for higher classes).

Some at home reading and usually 1-2 pages of exercises per week.

Some schools indicated that the amount and type of homework was determined by the textbooks:

Fill the gaps, true or false, connect two columns, etc... related to the text studied.

Regular homework is set weekly to extend learning and to revise classwork.

The textbook with homework sheet, which teacher will give out as homework.

Children's homework is to practice what they learned in class.

One Chinese school commented that the homework was important for progression in students' learning:

Challenges are set for...pupils to pass. Then they can move onto the next level.

The majority of schools (70%) made use of mainstream school premises at the weekend for accommodation, while almost a fifth (18%) were attached to religious centres. Other types of accommodation included Colleges of Further and Higher Education and community centres. Using mainstream schools as accommodation had benefits such as the use of gymnasiums for sport activities and discounted rates for premises. However, some schools felt that they were restricted from using mainstream school's technology, as discussed later.

Funding

Funding for schools came from a mix and variety of sources. Over half (67%) of the schools were funded through student fees, and over a third (38%) received financial support from embassies or consulates. Less than a third (29%) of the schools

received some funding from the local authority (such as paying some teachers' salaries) and support in kind, such as rent-free premises. Two schools turned to other sources of funding. One school teaching a European language received a home government grant for the promotion of language learning abroad and a Chinese school received a donation from an overseas charity. In other situations, schools were entirely self-funded and relied on volunteer teachers and board members with annual fees collected from parents to cover the cost of the rental of premises. In one rural area, parents contributed to the cost of a minibus to transport children and young people to the school.

Free text comments from schools indicated sources of financial support from home governments and local authorities was becoming more difficult to access as the following responses suggest:

In the first years of its existence, the association was supported by the French government and local authorities but not anymore.

We did receive some funding towards teachers' salaries through the Cypriot Education Authority. We have submitted an application for more funding this year...unfortunately we no longer receive any support from the Greek government.

We used to be in receipt of a [Council] grant, but lost it with the recent reorganization/cut in grant funding and it does not look like we will be able to receive it again any time soon.

The school is linked with the [the church] and this unfortunately limits the grants we can apply for.

As a result of limited grants some schools had to raise membership fees or became more reliant on donations from parents and local businesses. Many schools organized fundraising activities such as jumble sales, coffee mornings and raffles.

Reasons for studying heritage languages

Schools were asked to say what they thought the main reasons students had for studying a heritage language. They were given a list of possible reasons and asked to

rate these as ‘very important’, ‘quite important’, ‘of little importance’ and ‘no importance’. Scaled points (4, 3, 2 and 1) were attached to these responses and percentages applied to the proportion of the total number of points available to each reason. Schools could also add additional text comments.

Schools saw learning to read and write the language as most important reason for studying it (98%), followed very closely by learning to understand and speak the language (97%). Opportunities to meet others from similar backgrounds (86%), enjoyment (84%), and access to history, culture, religion (80%) were also rated quite high, whereas, value for future employment opportunities (73%), and to gain a qualification (72%), were ranked lower and therefore, viewed as less important elements.

Schools were also asked to expand on the reasons for studying a heritage language, and many of the providers believed parental perspectives were a very important factor, as the following comments reveal:

Family pressure and parental expectations.

At the age of our students, learning this language is essentially a choice of theirs parents.

It is parent's decision and children are not keen to attend additional classes.

Most children go to school due to parents’ demand.

It is the views of parents that are more important probably more than the children since they are so young. For the children themselves it is the enjoyment that is most likely the best motivator.

One written response recognised the need to keep first languages skills in order to sustain communication with family members back home:

For some children it is important to keep the language to maintain good relationships with family in Poland.

Another answer for the reason for studying a heritage language was high parental aspirations interwoven with a sense of maintaining national identity:

It's part of being ambitious and Polish, and maintaining our national identity. Education plays a big part in child development in Poland, and the majority of parents are very supportive.

Feedback from one respondent felt the school provided an important support mechanism for a diverse diasporic community:

The school is an integral part of the Greek community in [city] and provides support to families who may have recently emigrated as well as the ones who have been here longer.

Reasons for studying the heritage language was also interwoven with religious observance and reading religious texts:

The Holy book of Sikhs is in Punjabi so it is important for them to learn Punjabi.

[The school] has also very close links with the Greek Orthodox Church and the two form a very strong network.

School aims

When asked about the aims of the school, all schools unanimously indicated (1) to understand and speak the language and (2) to read and write the language. The vast majority (86%) also stated the school's aim was also to access history, culture and religion. Just over three quarters (76%) said to gain a qualification. Some respondents listed other aims including to act as an information hub for parents and a socializing environment for community members from a similar cultural heritage.

One school expanded on the aim of a shared cultural heritage by stating:

To make Polish children proud of their roots, give them a sense of self-esteem and confidence in who they are.

One Chinese school extended their aims to include a wider cultural purpose and an element of social justice:

Our school has an Equal Opportunity Policy and strives to promote Social Inclusion Strategy.

Whereas another Chinese school had an additional aim related to community cohesion:

Other objectives of our school are to promote Chinese culture and cultural exchange within the community to lead to greater racial harmony.

The schools reported on a wide range of extracurricular activities to support the socializing needs of the children and young people, particularly associated with expressive arts such as drawing, drama, and music. Some of the activities offered were also linked to cultural interests such as a chess club (Russian school), Greek dancing, guzheng (Chinese zither), Kung Fu and Tai Chi.

In the Chinese schools, some of these cultural activities have a strong association with traditional literacy skills such as calligraphy, learning and reciting Chinese poetry and preparation for choral speaking competitions. These speaking competitions take the form of contestants reciting poems or prose in front of judges, who award prizes for different age groups. Scores are based on several criteria such as intonation, volume of the voice, pausing positions and quality of the content as well as on nonverbal criteria, including manner, posture and eye expression. The performances can be delivered by an individual or in chorus.

Many events revolved around festivals and traditions such as Chinese New Year, Vaisakhi (Sikh New Year) Eid al-Fitr (Muslim religious holiday marking the end of Ramadan, the Islamic holy month of fasting), Fasching (German Carnival) and National Days. There were also end-of-academic year graduations and prize giving as well as social events such as sports day, trips, theatre excursions, guided walks and barbeques.

A number of schools organized events beyond the school gates such as:

We recently organised a Greek film screening in the Centre for Contemporary Arts in Glasgow.

These respondents looked for opportunities to reach beyond their own language community. For example:

We run regular events, some are for our [Polish] pupils only, but many are open to the Scottish community. We hold an annual Open Day and invite all our friends, supporters and stakeholders.

We are working on an intergenerational project to bring together the first wave of Greek/Cypriot migrants in Scotland with the ones arriving in the last few years due to the economic crisis. We also hope the same project will contribute on having a record of the history of the community and its evolution throughout the years. The building is used by other nationalities including Africans, Russians, Romanians and Syrians and we hope to expand the project to include all ethnicities in the future.

The association that our school belongs too [has a] project called 'Young explorers of Polish Scottish Heritage' and its main objective is to educate both Scottish and Polish children on our mutual history.

We run small Polish libraries as subsections of the school libraries in the two schools we operate in and organise Open Days for parents of our students. Next school year we plan to organise activity sessions in Polish for other students (including those of other ethnic origins) at the two schools as well.

Teachers' qualifications and professional learning

A complex picture emerges in relation to the background of the teachers at complementary schools with schools utilizing a combination of unqualified parents, visiting international students, degree holders, teachers qualified within Scotland and teachers trained outside of the UK. Teachers had a range of qualifications, with many holding Masters or other degrees from Scotland and their country of origin. The largest Chinese school commented:

The majority of our teaching staff are university students and degree holders.

A number of the schools provided details of their teachers' qualifications and achievements on their websites. For example, several of the Polish complementary schools employed teachers who had Masters degrees from Polish universities, in

subjects such as Philology, Pedagogy, Special Education, Speech Therapy and Applied Social Psychology, while others had obtained degrees in English and Polish. One Polish school commented:

We have a lot of professional teachers as we have a larger community to draw from.

However, some of the smaller language communities (such as Japanese) relied more on parents and stated ‘we do not require degrees’. Over 70% of the schools said they had parent-teachers but the numbers varied from 1 to 6. One Chinese school had 15 and the largest Chinese school had 70.

Professional learning needs

Schools were asked what they thought the professional development needs were of their teachers. Almost three quarters felt ‘differentiated learning’ (73%) was important, while over half emphasized ‘active learning’ (59%) and ‘classroom management’ (55%). Less than half viewed the ‘1+2 Language Strategy’ (45%), ‘assessment’ (41%) and ‘ICT and technology’ (32%), as a particular need for their teachers.

Written feedback showed that there was often a mismatch in teaching styles between the teachers who were educated in their heritage country and the pupils who attend schools in Scotland, as the comment below illustrates:

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

Responses also indicated that it was felt that teachers required professional learning to take into account the widespread phenomena that the pupils’ heritage language is being replaced by English as their dominant language of education and learning:

Specific training for teaching Polish as a foreign language to children of Polish heritage.

Teachers just use traditional methods rather than looking at influences from English.

Teaching resources

The Schools were asked to give details of the teaching materials and/or textbooks that they use. Some schools said they had to rely on books used in mainstream schools in their heritage country as the following show:

Japanese textbooks used in Japanese mainstream schools.

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

Some schools used a mixture of resources because of the diverse needs of the learners and their different proficiency levels:

The textbooks are a combination...based on the needs of the class. We order books from the Greek embassy, we buy the ones used in mainstream schools from Greece and we also use resources targeted [at the] Greeks of diaspora. We have an extensive library of books and quite often the resources are depending on the teacher and what he/she is familiar with. The knowledge level of the class however is the basis for any teaching materials.

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

We have a library, including a large library of textbooks, with a mix of mainstream and heritage language-specific materials. These tend to be bought either by the school or by the parents themselves in consultation with the teachers.

One Arabic school adopted a trial and error approach:

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

Some Chinese schools had to make provision for different language varieties and the diverse needs of the school:

For Mandarin class, we order "Zhongwen" textbooks and exercises book compiled by the Chinese Language College of Jinan University for Overseas Chinese and their children from UK Association for the Promotion Chinese Education. We also have pinyin book and exercise for Mandarin class. For adult non-native speaker class, we use HSK textbooks. For Cantonese classes, we use "Let's Learn Chinese" from UKFCS^{vi}

Some schools sourced resources from their heritage country. These texts were designed specifically for language learners in diasporic communities:

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

We get our textbooks from overseas and some of the books from other Sikh Gurdwaras for example from Manchester and Birmingham.

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

We start introducing additional books such as "Easy Steps to Chinese for Kids" and a set of "Diving into Chinese level 2" story book for some classes.

Most of the Polish schools used an imported textbook, by *Malgorzata Pawlusiewicz*, published in the USA and written for students studying Polish abroad.

A number of the schools reported that they used a combination of textbooks and other teaching and learning resources:

We design our own teaching materials and excerpts from Polish children's literature but we also use some chapters from textbooks brought in from Poland which are used there in mainstream schools.

A combination of textbooks available in the market and self-developed teaching resources.

Mainly textbooks from overseas...internet resources, Polish magazines for teenagers.

Two schools, of Russian and Greek, noted that many teachers use material from the Internet which is becoming increasingly more available. Furthermore, the children also use websites and apps privately to support their learning

Two schools, of Polish and Russian, expanded on the challenges of the curriculum as the following written comments indicate:

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

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

Almost all the schools mentioned wanting access to more technology such as smart-boards, laptops, projectors and tablets to support teaching and learning. Some schools commented on the challenges of accessing technology when using mainstream school premises:

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

I would love to have computer and internet access, but it is forbidden by the IT providers with [] Council.

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

Assessment

The schools used a range of methods to assess students' progress in their heritage language. Most commonly, assessment took the form of weekly, termly or annual tests. For example:

Teachers run assessments according to the requirements of the Polish education programme. Often once per term.

One school, of Portuguese, used tests to assess against the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR):

Teachers do 'small' tests in class and children can sit 'certification' tests at the end of 120 hours of learning (from next academic year onwards), according to the European policy on this matter.

A number of schools used other forms of assessment tools in addition to, or instead of formal examinations as the following suggest:

Through tests and observation in the class and of their homework.

For group 5-11 Pupils' progress is via several activities (understanding and generation of language). We try to observe the three types of assessments: formative, interim, and summative.

Some schools talked about more informal assessment and teachers' using their 'own professional judgement' and 'on-going evaluation'.

Different arrangements were made for students who attended complementary schools to sit examinations. Only three of the schools were registered as examination centres; one for EDEXCEL General Certificate for Secondary Education (GCSE) in Modern Greek; one for GCSE/A-Level Arabic; and one for SQA National 5 and Higher Chinese Languages.^{vii} Two schools were also accredited as international examination centres for the Greek State Language qualification Ellinomatheia^{viii} and one school was registered with the Hanban/Confucius Institute Headquarters to conduct the Chinese Proficiency Test (HSK).^{ix}

One Chinese Headteacher, whose school was in the process of becoming a HSK centre, stated that using HSK allowed the school to assess and report students' proficiency annually using a reliable international standardized test. Another benefit of HSK was attainment at Level 4 or 5 allows students to apply to prestigious Universities in China, such as Tsinghua University and Peking University. However, the Headteacher also noted that HSK has a registration fee per student and costs

needed to be factored in for staff to be trained in the HSK system. As such, a minimum of 30-40 registered students was required to make HSK cost effective.

The vast majority of the schools relied on mainstream and independent schools to present the young people for examinations in their heritage language. Examples of these examinations included Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA), GCSE and A-Level Polish and Chinese (Mandarin) and SQA National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher Chinese Languages and Urdu. As already mentioned the number of students from Scotland sitting these examinations is unknown as the English examination boards do not provide a regional break down of their entrants. However, during an interview one complementary school teacher talked about possible communication and organizational difficulties if the mainstream school was dealing with an English examination board rather than the familiar SQA.

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

One respondent mentioned that this was dependent on the goodwill of the mainstream school allowing the space and timetabling of the examination. Sometimes the complementary school paid the fees and charged parents an administrative fee when presenting young people for examinations in mainstream schools. At least one complementary school mentioned that the only examination centre left to accept their students as external candidates was a small private school:

We have a dedicated teacher who prepares the students throughout the year and then their parents take them to [] in June, for their exams. We used to present them through some private schools in

Glasgow, but they have all stopped the GCSE/GCE examinations in favour of the International Baccalaureate.^x

The private school charged entry fees and offered a wide range of GCSE examinations from UK boards. Examples of languages offered by English Boards include AQA (Bengali, Chinese, Modern Hebrew, Panjabi, Polish and Urdu), Edexcel (Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Modern Greek and Urdu), Oxford Cambridge and Royal Society of Arts (OCR) (Dutch, Gujarati, Persian, Portuguese and Turkish). At another complementary school the parents used an independent college that also hosted Edexcel, OCR and AQA GCSE and A-level examinations for external candidates. The parents paid the examination fee including local and board fees.

Some complementary schools conducted the controlled assessment units in talking and reading at their school as these tests can be moderated by a General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) registered teacher. However, the writing and listening elements of assessment have to take place in a school acting as an SQA examination centre. One respondent noted the difficulties if the complementary school did not have a GTCS registered teacher:

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

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

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

Many schools were proud of their national examination results and publicized these on their websites. For example:

Last year we had 100% excellence (A and A*) at GCSE and A-level in Modern Greek.

The record of our students' performance in the SQA exams (National 5, Higher and Advanced Higher) [Mandarin] has been always excellent. In 2014 all students sitting the SQA exams achieved Grade A.

Reporting to parents

Schools were asked how they reported the pupils' progress to parents. All schools reported progress to parents by a variety of means including oral and written reports monthly, termly or at the end of the year. However, written responses to this question indicated that engagement with parents was important to the schools:

There is a parents' meeting once a year, but parents are encouraged to come and speak to the teachers individually if they wish to enquire about their child's progress.

Ongoing direct communication with parents.

One school, of Greek, had an informal approach to reporting to and consulting with parents as this reaction to the question indicates:

It is quite common (and occasionally time consuming) for the parents to talk to the teachers when they pick up their kids for any educational issues. The parents can also email and use social media to reach the teachers and quite often text them with their mobiles.

We conduct monthly parents' meeting and inform the parents about their children's performance.

There is a parents day in the first term and pupils' reports are issued to parents before end of academic year.

Two schools made time for teacher-parent dialogue after classes as the following suggest:

As well as there is allocated 30 minutes after class for parents to speak to teachers.

Assessments and any areas of concern are discussed with parents at close on a Saturday.

Engagement with the 1+2 Language Strategy

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

Not know much about Government's 1+2 Language Strategy. I would like to learn about Government's 1+2 Language Strategy so we can support it.

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

We do not have a policy on this. We have some links with our host school and usually have a stall for their Celebration of Languages and Cultures, but nothing really beyond this. We used to offer classes especially preparing pupils for SQA qualifications in Russian, and then, after the SQA Russian qualifications were dropped, for Russian A-Levels. Currently this is not being run due to lack of teachers prepared to take this on, but there is persistent parent interest.

I don't know yet.

One Chinese school had already reflected on the challenges of the 1+2 strategy for mainstream schools and suggested a solution by offering Mandarin lessons available online:

To offer non-Chinese speaking language teachers online Mandarin lessons and teaching platform designed by qualified native Chinese speaking teachers to enable any schools to provide Mandarin teaching to pupils. This would solve the problems of lacking of funding or qualified Chinese-speaking teachers at schools. Ultimately this project aims to empower more schools to offer Mandarin teaching and support 1+2 policy.

The questionnaire collected information on whether schools had meetings with the Local Authority about the 1+2 Language Strategy; 16 of the 21 (76%) total responses indicated they had not had not been contacted by the local authority nor were they aware of who they should approach to arrange a meeting. Only one school (of Punjabi) said they had meetings 'quite often'.

Of the five schools that did have meetings with their local authority regarding the 1+2 Language Strategy, several indicated that these were either not frequent or that they were not particularly productive:

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

Yes, but unfortunately not very productive.

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

Question 17(b) asked if any of the complementary schools have links with mainstream schools to offer activities in Heritage Language learning; 19 of the 21 (90%) responses indicated that they did not have links with local mainstream schools. However, of these 19 schools, several indicated that this was something they were seeking to develop as the following responses indicate:

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

We are mainly a Saturday school so this would be challenging although we would be very keen to do it.

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

Not yet. It is part of our strategy.

Two schools confirmed that they had links with mainstream schools:

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

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

The respondents linked these challenges to time constraints, but also highlighted the need for professional development for complementary schoolteachers.

Summary

This section has collated existing information about complementary schools in Scotland, drawing on a variety of sources including an Internet trawl, questionnaire and conversations with key stakeholders. This research has revealed that the nature and scope of complementary school provision are very variable. The mapping exercise identified provision for 18 languages. Provision for Polish and Chinese is the most extensive, reflecting current school survey data of pupils with languages other than English. There is also diversity within diversity within minoritised communities with a range of Polish, Chinese, and Arabic schools serving the different needs of the community.

While there are some well-established schools with committed community members, much of the provision is constrained by lack of resources as the schools rely on the campaigning strength of community members to self-fund, chase restricted grants from local councils or pursue subsidies from consulates. It came to our attention that a number of schools have closed recently as a result of withdrawal of funding.

The main aims of the schools were to maintain the heritage language, literacy and culture of the parents. Schools also reported on a wide range of extracurricular activities to support the socializing needs of the children and young people, particularly associated with expressive arts such as physical activity, drama, and music. Although the needs of their language community were paramount, the schools were not inward looking but they looked for opportunities to engage with the wider community in a variety of ways.

The survey revealed a mixed picture of teachers working at the complementary schools involving registered teachers trained in Scotland, teachers qualified outside of the UK, visiting international students and unqualified volunteer parents. Respondents identified a range of challenges such as finding suitable teaching resources for Scottish born children and young people, lack of ICT, diverse needs of learners, and

a mismatch in teaching styles between mainstream and complementary schools. All providers recognised the need for professional learning for their teachers with differentiated learning, active learning and classroom management considered as priorities.

Beyond Urdu and Chinese languages, which have become part of the SQA portfolio of Modern Languages, there are no Scottish examinations for other heritage languages. This was reported as a major concern by both the Polish and Russian schools. The survey revealed a very small number of schools are registered as centres for either English or overseas examination boards. The majority of complementary schools relied on mainstream schools and independent schools or colleges to enter students for examinations. Parents also played a key role in registering their sons and daughters as external candidates and paying the examination fees.

Schools revealed varying degrees of awareness about the Language Strategy with some keen to learn more about it whilst others felt it was not relevant to them. The vast majority of the Schools had not been contacted by their local authority to be invited to any discussions about the development of the Language Strategy in their area. Of the five schools that had been involved in meetings with their local authority partners regarding the 1+2 Language Strategy, several indicated that these were either not frequent enough nor were not particularly productive. How local authorities, mainstream schools and complementary schools can work more closely together in order to enhance the 1+2 Language Strategy will be discussed in the next section.

5. Discussion and Further Considerations

5.1 Introduction

This section looks at the implications of the key findings from the research in terms of policy and practice. In this way it will help policy makers and educators identify ways in which complementary schools and heritage language learning in Scotland can help shape and enhance the on-going development and implementation of the 1+2 Language Strategy. It is acknowledged that the findings that emerged from the research are based on a small sample of questionnaire returns and interviews. As such the findings cannot be considered representative of all complementary schools in Scotland. That said, the sample covered a wide range of provision and heritage language communities, which allows broad inferences to be made. The main issues and themes that surfaced during the research that warrant more in-depth discussion include: the range of provision and increasing diversity of heritage language learners; different models of support and collaboration; and examination arrangements.

5.2 Range of provision and increasing diversity of heritage language learners

What is evident from the research is that there is a diverse range of provision that supports heritage language learning. This mixed landscape of provision ranges from schools with 20-30 pupils to a school with over 1,000 pupils. Provision for Polish and Chinese is the most extensive, reflecting current Scottish schools census data for pupils with languages other than English (Scottish Government, 2018a). There is also diversity within diversity within minoritised communities with a range of Polish, Chinese, and Arabic schools serving the different needs of the community.

Walters (2011:163) describes three types of provision: those that provide heritage language lessons and knowledge about the community's cultural heritage; those that provide lessons through scriptural and religious activities; and those that provide extra tuition and support for mainstream school subjects and/or provide an alternative narrative of a community's history and cultural heritage. The first two

types are more akin to the complementary school movement in Scotland as reflected in the Internet trawl. The latter type of school is more associated with Black Caribbean communities in England, but absent in Scotland, where provision was established to compensate for educational underachievement of pupils of West Indian heritage in mainstream schools (Mirza & Reay, 2000; Nwulu, 2015).

The mapping exercise identified provision for 18 languages, but the 2017 School census shows 154 different languages spoken by pupils in Scottish schools (Scottish Government, 2018a). Taking Gaelic, Scots and BSL out of the equation, this suggests no provision exists for the teaching and learning of 136 languages. Some of these languages have very small numbers of speakers but notable omissions, in order of pupil numbers, are Romanian, Lithuanian, Bengali, Latvian, Malayalam, Hungarian and Slovak. The research also highlighted a lack of provision for asylum seekers and refugees.

It is important to stress the obvious but crucial point that not all heritage language learners are homogeneous with the same needs and experiences. Refer to Hancock (2006), Anderson et al., (2016) and Botterill & Hancock (2018), who have captured the heterogeneous nature of minority ethnic communities in Scotland in terms of mobility, language affiliations and belonging. Equally, Hopkins et al., (2015) provide insights into young people's fluid and hybrid identity construction and their engagement in inter-religious and multi-ethnic friendship groups in Scottish schools.

Reports from the complementary schools highlight the diverse range of learners attending complementary schools in terms of language and literacy proficiencies, migration histories and learners' identity construction. Scotland's Census 2011 shows the significant number of children and young people of dual heritage. This is reflected in the findings that indicate some schools have a significant number of children and young people from bilingual homes where one parent is a speaker of the heritage language. This means that teachers have to adapt to the diverse language

proficiencies and learning needs of children and young people who may not have the heritage language of the school as the main home language. Furthermore, there are also a small number of Scottish children and young people with no prior knowledge of the heritage language who attend complementary schools. It is therefore not surprising that almost three quarters of complementary schools surveyed identified greater knowledge of ‘differentiation’ as a key area for their professional learning and development.

5.3 Different models of support and collaboration

The mixed picture of provision revealed in the audit requires a flexible approach to support the 1+2 Language Strategy and cater for the diverse needs, perspectives and aspirations of the heritage language learners and their communities. These types of support can include complementary schools as a distinctive branch of provision; individualised learning in mainstream schools; complementary schools and mainstream schools working in partnership, and mainstreaming heritage languages. The benefits and limitations of each type are discussed below.

Distinctive Provision

The points for consideration at the end of this report focus on how mainstream schools can further develop links with ‘language communities’. However, these recommendations need to be viewed with a degree of caution. Some schools indicated that they valued their independence and did not think that the 1+2 Language Strategy was relevant to them. Complementary schools were established by parents to protect their languages, literacies and cultural traditions in the face of monolingual school practices. The schools also offer safe and secure spaces to marginalized communities (Creese et al., 2006) who are confronted by racism and discrimination. In addition, the head teacher responses revealed close and productive engagement with parents in the schools. Moreover, provision includes faith-based classes such as the teaching and learning of religious scripts in Gurdwaras and Mosques.

Therefore, complementary schools can be viewed as a distinctive branch of the 1+2 Language Strategy with their own resources, curriculum, examinations from their heritage country and cultural approaches to teaching and learning. These schools play and will continue to play a significant role in the maintenance and development of heritage languages in Scotland. The downside to this segregated provision is that heritage language learning remains hidden from mainstream schools. A solution is mainstream schools develop ways to acknowledge and celebrate pupils' language learning achievements through complementary school provision. This aligns well with the *Curriculum for Excellence* which values learning outside of school. The descriptors for the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (Council of Europe 2018) are a useful tool to assess and record language proficiency across educational settings. The concept of digital badges can also be applied to evaluate language and literacy learning outside of the classroom to support motivation, pedagogy and record keeping (Ahn, Pellicone & Butler 2014).

While there are some well-established schools with committed community members, much of the provision is hampered by limited resources as the schools rely on the campaigning strength of community members to self-fund and chase a decreasing number of grants. The survey revealed staff are frequently volunteers with professional learning needs. Differentiated learning (discussed earlier), active learning and classroom management were considered as priorities. Respondents also identified the challenges of a lack of technology to enhance learning, appropriate resources for learners in diasporic communities, and a mismatch in teaching styles between mainstream and complementary schools. For these reasons, closer links with local authorities and mainstream schools are recommended as outlined below.

Individualised learning

For children and young people who are geographically isolated or without access to a teacher, advances in technology can be utilized for personalization and choice of

language learning. An example of this individualized learning was communicated to the researchers by an EAL support teacher after a conversation with two primary-aged Polish pupils. The pupils described a free Polish online educational programme covering language and maths at primary level. They explained that the curriculum was divided into weekly units and after every 10 lessons there is an end of unit test. Contact can be made with a teacher through online messaging. At the end of each primary stage, learners go to a Centre, sometimes in England and sometimes in Scotland, where they sit an end-of-year test.

Another solution to the small number of heritage languages learners in a school is to replicate the model of learning-at-distance developed by e-Sgoil.^{xii} E-Sgoil was initially created in response to financial challenges and teacher shortages in certain subjects in the Western Isles of Scotland. It uses technology to connect pupils in island and rural communities to allow a wider and more equitable choice of subjects for young people across secondary schools. The initiative has now been expanded to a network of staff who are able to deliver online learning and teach a range of subjects to pupils all over Scotland. Recently e-Sgoil publicised plans to recruit online tutors to teach Arabic and Mandarin in the Western Isles (The Scotsman, 2018). This type of service delivery can be extended to include other heritage languages in response to demand from schools, parents and pupils as part of the 1+2 Language Strategy.

Complementary schools are not without detractors. Skutnabb-Kangas, (1988: 29) argues that this type of provision is ‘more therapeutic cosmetics than language teaching’. Similarly, Cummins (2000) cautions against ‘romanticizing’ the learning of heritage languages when they are marginalized from mainstream education and learners are unable to develop their first language skills to a sophisticated and academic level through part-time provision.

Therefore, the status of heritage languages can be raised by teaching them in

mainstream schools and opening up the languages to all learners. The Language Strategy Working Group recommended that local authorities and schools can determine which additional languages to offer with consideration given to languages of the strong economies of the future, and community languages of pupils in schools. In order to be effective, these classes need to have suitably qualified staff of heritage languages, evidence-informed approaches to teaching and assessment for progressive learning (including planning for differentiation when native and non-native speakers are learning side by side), and community support. The result of these initiatives will be to raise awareness of languages among the monolingual school population and thus have a positive impact on intercultural encounters and education for citizenship initiatives. Schools should also consider Content Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) as a model of language learning, where the language is taught through a curriculum area such as science or expressive arts.

One limitation of this model of support is the lack of suitably qualified teachers of heritage languages and the barriers complementary school teachers face in obtaining qualified status (Minty et al. 2008). McFarlane, Deerin & Payne (2018) show a decline (starting from a very low baseline) in ‘community language’ teachers in publicly-funded secondary schools, from 8 in 2007 to 5 in 2017. Although one can’t make the assumption that black and ethnic minority (BME) teachers equate to teachers with knowledge of languages other than English, recent statistics point to the structural barriers faced by BME individuals to recruitment, promotion and retention in the teaching workforce in Scotland (Scottish Government, 2018b).

One solution is to draw on the idea of the Confucius classroom hubs, which deploys teachers on a peripatetic basis to cluster schools and promotes the sharing of ideas and resources to stimulate the learning and teaching of Chinese. The Hub concept can be extended to other languages and include partner schools in a country that speaks the heritage language, professional learning opportunities, and the use of GTCS standards for exchange teachers.

This report does not provide a detailed roadmap for how mainstream schools can build on and engage with complementary schools, as these already exist (The National Centre for Languages (CILT), 2008; Issa & Williams, 2008; Nwulu, 2015; Ramalingam & Griffith, 2015). Although published in England, where the linguistic landscape is different to Scotland, the recommendations remain pertinent. Victoria State Government in Australia also provides advice to community language schools with exemplars of running a language programme, language teaching resources and languages professional learning.^{xiii}

Suggestions for collaboration include promoting joint training and opportunities for reciprocal paired observations of teaching and learning. The aim here is not for complementary schools to reproduce mainstream practices but to share experiences, skills and expertise. These visits should be conducted in the spirit of respectful dialogue and, where conflicting pedagogies exist, these disagreements can be used as a stimulus for critical reflection and professional enquiry. As part of this cross-fertilisation of knowledge, Kramsch (2014) calls for a shift from the communicative language teaching of the 1980s to a more interpretive and politically engaged pedagogy as foreign and heritage language teachers reflect on the impact of globalization.

At the same time it is recognized that the learning that takes place in heritage language learning contexts can complement learning in mainstream school (Archer, Francis & Mau, 2009; Creese & Blackledge, 2010). Kenner & Ruby (2013) describe an action research study with teachers from complementary and mainstream schools in East London, in which they jointly planned lessons around topics that were then taught in both settings. The complementary teachers brought a holistic perspective based on the linguistic and cultural knowledge of their communities, which enabled these resources to be brought into mainstream learning, thus creating a syncretic curriculum that led to an increase in agency of children and their families as well as teachers themselves.

Critical Connections: Multilingual Digital Storytelling (MDST) is an example of a pedagogical framework and effective partnership working involving mainstream and complementary schools (Anderson, Chung & Macleroy, 2018). Using creative multilingual digital storytelling as a stimulus, the project supported pupils' interdisciplinary learning and metalinguistic skills. Furthermore, as a model for teacher professional learning, MDST allowed teachers space, through regular meetings, to cultivate ideas, to discuss how they work in practice and then to develop and refine them.

Unfortunately, these kinds of school-community collaborations cited above have still to make significant inroads in Scotland. In the research, many complementary schools indicated that they were outward-facing and looking for opportunities to share cultural experiences with wider society, that they encouraged 'non-native' speakers to attend, and were also keen to connect better with local authorities and mainstream schools to support the 1+2 Language Strategy. Almost half of the respondents to the questionnaire viewed the 1+2 Language Strategy as a particular professional development need for their teachers. However, the vast majority of the schools had not been contacted by their local authority to be invited to any discussions about the development of the Language Strategy in their area. Of the five schools that had been involved in meetings with their local authority partners regarding the 1+2 Language Strategy, several indicated that these were either not frequent enough nor were not particularly productive.

5.4 Examination arrangements

The survey revealed schools were keen to enter their students for SQA or English Board examinations where their heritage language was available and many of the complementary schools prepared their students for these examinations. However, the schools did not always have access to a GTCS registered teacher to help with the controlled assessments. The majority of complementary schools relied on mainstream schools and independent schools or colleges to enter students for

examinations. Parents also played a key role in registering their sons and daughters as external candidates and paying the examination fees. The absence of an SQA examination was reported as a major concern by the Polish and Russian schools. For an informed debate surrounding heritage languages being studied as modern foreign languages, refer to McPake (2006).

Statistics from SQA and collated by McFarlane, Deerin & Payne (2018:11) shows a decline in uptake of French and German examination entries at National 4 and 5 levels but an increase in Spanish and Chinese. The increase in Chinese is a result of the visiting Hanban teacher initiative and the establishment of Confucius hubs described previously. More worrying is the decline in Urdu. Two main reasons lie behind this lack of up-take. First, the assumption that Urdu will only be of interest to young people of Pakistani heritage. Second, there are currently no opportunities to gain a teaching qualification in Urdu at a Scottish University, despite the fact that Standard Grade Urdu has been available since 1999. As a result, Urdu teachers employed in Scottish schools have to qualify as teachers of other subjects. McPake (2006) showed that over a third of Urdu teachers surveyed did not have any specific training in language teaching at all. For more detail of trends in entries in SQA language examinations see McFarlane, Deerin & Payne (2018).

CONCLUSION

This report argues that there is a need to build on the 1+2 Language Strategy and the increasing number of children and young people in Scottish schools who are learning heritage languages and literacies in the evenings and weekends. This requires revisiting the commitment contained within the Language Strategy to further develop links involving “cultural organisations”, deriving maximum benefit from “foreign language communities in Scotland”, and “teaching the community languages of pupils in schools”. The report makes a case for a flexible approach to support heritage language learning within the 1+2 Language Strategy and a number of suggestions have been put forward, among which developing partnerships between

complementary and mainstream schools is a key feature. If Scotland does not capitalize on the linguistic resources of its citizens it will further diminish the workforce of heritage language teachers, bilingual support assistants and interpreters/translators. This lost opportunity and the squandering of our multilingual resources will have an impact on Scotland's global outlook as a post-Brexit world becomes a reality.

Points for Consideration

The 1+2 Language Strategy recognizes the value of developing links involving 'language communities'. However, structures need to be put in place by local authorities to allow these links with complementary schools to be developed and ensure actions are established and monitored to allow effective collaboration to take place.

It is not enough that the 1+2 Language Strategy simply states that links need to be developed with cultural organisations and language communities. Rather, information must be detailed enough to pick up the nuances and distinctions between and within linguistic minority groups and for language provision to be developed accordingly.

The research highlights a significant number of learners attending complementary school but also a significant number who do not have the opportunity to develop their heritage language and literacy in some type of complementary school provision. Mainstream schools need to survey pupils about the languages they are learning, and the complementary schools they are attending. This exercise can support the referral to complementary schools or explore other avenues to support heritage language learning in school.

The complementary schools stated that their main aim was to maintain the heritage language and literacy of the parents. There is a clear need to conduct research investigating how heritage languages are acquired alongside English and the two additional languages offered in primary school as part of the 1+2 Language Strategy. Studies of this type can look at the role of language learning and assess its impact on learners' mainstream academic achievement. Research of this type can contribute to the current Scottish educational interest in closing the attainment gap.

A survey should be conducted of heritage language teachers to gain an understanding of their needs and aspirations of working in mainstream schools. This audit will assist recruitment and workforce plans to support the implementation of 1+2.

Because some languages such as Polish are not a subject area taught in Scottish Schools, the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) does not have a registration category for the teachers of that language who have obtained their qualifications to teach the language in another country. GTCS should play a leading role in building the capacity of heritage language teachers in mainstream schools by revisiting their registration categories and foreign residency requirements for modern foreign languages. Heritage language teachers also provide role models for pupils and parents from diverse backgrounds.

Digital networks should be used to facilitate partnerships with schools abroad to promote opportunities for intercultural dialogue and collaboration.

The Scottish Government in collaboration with COSLA and local authorities should consider different funding options to complementary schools and establish partnership agreements that support their longer-term viability. This funding model would formalise the role of complementary schools and this contract would include the opening up of resources and facilities in mainstream schools or public buildings and the sharing of services. This agreement can include mentoring for Quality Framework Awards with the support of the National Resource Centre for Supplementary Education (NRCSE). A Code of Practice produced by NRCSE also covers 10 areas of delivery in the provision of complementary schools.

Complementary schools offer a range of cultural, linguistic and artistic activities to support the socializing needs of the children and young people. The schools were also keen to share this cultural heritage with the wider community. Creative Scotland funds delivered by partners, such as National Lottery Awards, can help with new ideas and projects to develop cultural offerings and build strong relationships in and across communities.

Local authorities and mainstream schools should extend any professional learning opportunities to staff from complementary schools. It is also recommended that where possible languages professional learning delivered at universities involves language teacher scholarship and bursary opportunities and credit bearing courses in areas such as CLIL.

Against a backdrop of declining numbers of students taking up languages in secondary schools the SQA needs to review the suite of languages offered at certificate level to reflect the linguistic communities it serves and support the implementation of 1+2 language Strategy.

It is important heritage language learners get formal recognition of their language skills. There needs to be greater synergy between mainstream schools and complementary schools where mainstream schools act as examination hubs for heritage languages.

References

- Ahn, J., Pellicone, A., & Butler, B. (2014). Open badges for education: what are the implications at the intersection of open systems and badging? *Research in Learning Technology*, 22. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v22.23563>
- Anderson, C., Foley, Y., Sangster, P., Edwards, V. & Rassool, N. (2016). *Policy, Pedagogy and Pupil Perceptions: EAL in Scotland and England*. Cambridge: Bell Foundation.
- Anderson, J., Chung, Y-C. & Macleroy, V. (2018). Creative. and critical approaches to language learning and digital technology: findings from a multilingual digital storytelling project *Language and Education*, 32(3), 195-211.
- Aravossitas, T. (2014). Communities taking the lead: mapping heritage language education assets. In P. P. Trifonas & T. Aravossitas (Eds.), *Rethinking Heritage Language Education* (pp. 141-166). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Archer, L., Francis, B. & Mau, A. (2009). ‘Boring and stressful’ or ‘ideal’ learning spaces? Pupils’ constructions of teaching and learning in Chinese supplementary schools. *Research Papers in Education*, 24(4), 477-497.
- Beaudrie, S., Ducar, C. & Potowski, K. (2014). *Heritage Language Teaching: Research and Practice*. Columbus, OH: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Bell, E. (2013). Heritage or cultural capital: ideologies of language in Scottish Chinese family life. *Asian Anthropology*, 12(1), 37-52.
- Bialystok, E. (2011). Reshaping the mind: the benefits of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 65(4), 229-235.
- Bonacina-Pugh, F. & Gafaranga, J. (2011). ‘Medium of instruction’ vs. ‘medium of classroom interaction’: language choice in a French complementary school classroom in Scotland. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(3), 319-334.
- Botterill, K. & Hancock, J. (2018). Rescaling belonging in “Brexit Britain”: Spatial identities and practices of Polish nationals in Scotland after the U.K. Referendum on European Union membership. *Population, Space and Place*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2217>
- Brinton, D., Kagan, O. & Bauckus, S. (Eds.), (2008). *Heritage Language Education. A New Field Emerging*. London: Routledge.
- British Council (2017). *Languages for the Future: The Foreign Languages the*

United Kingdom Needs to Become a Truly Global Nation. London: British Council.

Chen, S. & Zhang, Y. (2014). Chinese Language Teaching in Australia. In X-L. Curdt-Christiansen & A. Hancock (Eds.) *Learning Chinese in Diasporic: Many Pathways to Being Chinese* (pp.181-200). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cherti, M. & Bradley, L. (2011). *Inside Madrasses. Understanding and Engaging with British-Muslim Faith Supplementary Schools*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR).

Christie, J, Robertson, B, Stodter, J & O'Hanlon, F. (2016). *A Review of Progress in Implementing the 1+2 Languages Policy*. Association of Directors of Education in Scotland (ADES).

Collier, V. P. & Thomas W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1), 1-20.

Council of Europe (2018). *Common European Framework for Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume with Descriptors*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Creese, A., Bhatt, A., Bhojani, N. & Martin, P. (2006). Multicultural heritage and learner identities in complementary schools. *Language and Education*, 20(1), 23–43.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103-115.

Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* 4th Edition. London: Sage.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Cross-fire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Curdt-Christiansen, X.L. (2008). Reading the world through words: Cultural themes in heritage Chinese language textbooks. *Language and Education*, 22(2), 95–113.

Curdt-Christiansen, X.L. & Hancock, A. (Eds.), (2014). *Learning Chinese in Diasporic Communities: Many Pathways to Being Chinese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Extra, G. (2010). Mapping linguistic diversity in multilingual contexts: demolinguistic perspectives. In J. A. Fishman & O. García (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity: Disciplinary and Regional Perspectives Volume 1* Second Edition (pp. 107-122). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ganassin, S. (2018). Teaching and learning about Chinese culture: pupils' and teachers' experiences of Chinese community schooling in the UK, *Language and Intercultural Communication*, DOI: 10.1080/14708477.2018.1504953
- Glen, L. (2017). *Language Policy in Scotland: Indigenous and Community Languages*. Presentation at delivered at Policy Workshop: languages and Social Cohesion, Murray Edwards College, University of Cambridge, 5 December 2017.
- Francis, B., Archer, L. & Mau, A. (2009). Language as capital, or language as identity? Chinese complementary school pupils' perspectives on the purposes and benefits of complementary schools. *British Educational Research Journal*, 35(4), 519–38.
- Hancock, A. (2006). Attitudes and approaches to literacy in Scottish Chinese families. *Language and Education*, 20(5), 355–73.
- Hancock, A. (2012a). Unpacking mundane practices: Children's experiences of learning literacy at a Chinese Complementary School in Scotland. *Language and Education*, 26(1), 1-17.
- Hancock, A. (2012b). Inclusive practices for pupils with English as an additional language. In R. Arshad, T. Wrigley & L. Pratt (Eds.), *Social Justice Re-Examined: Dilemmas and Solutions for the Classroom Teacher* (pp.97-113). Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Hancock, A. (2014). Chinese complementary schools in Scotland and the Continua of Biliteracy. In X.L Curdt-Christiansen & A. Hancock (Eds.), *Learning Chinese in Diasporic Communities: Many Pathways to Being Chinese* (pp. 59-80). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hancock, A. (2016). Creating a dialogic space for research: a reading conference in a Chinese complementary school, *Language and Education*, 30, 126-142.
- Hogan-Brun, G. (2017). *Linguanomics: What is the Market Potential of Multilingualism?* London: Bloomsbury.
- Hopkins, P., Botterill, K., Sanghera, G. & Arshad, R. (2015). *Faith, Ethnicity and Place: Young People's Everyday Geopolitics in Scotland*. Research Report, Arts & Humanities Research Council.
- Hudson, N. & Aiton, A. (2016). EU nationals living in Scotland. *Scottish Parliament Briefing*. Edinburgh: SPICe.

Issa, T. & Williams, C. (2008). *Realising Potential: Complementary Schools in U.K.* Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Kenner, C. & Ruby, M. (2013). Connecting children's worlds: Creating a multilingual syncretic curriculum through partnership between complementary and mainstream schools. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 13(3), 395-417.

King, K., Fogle, L. & Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Family Language Policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(5), 907-922.

Kohlbeek, B. & Jezior, D. (2015). *Learning Polish in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government Polish Education Committee/ Consulate General of the Republic of Poland in Edinburgh.

Kramersch, C. (2014). Teaching Foreign Languages in an Era of Globalisation: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(1), 296-311.

Li, J. & Juffermans, K. (2014). Learning and teaching Chinese in the Netherlands: the metapragmatics of a polycentric language. In X.L. Curdt-Christiansen & A. Hancock (Eds.), *Learning Chinese in Diasporic Communities: Many Pathways to Being Chinese* (pp. 97-116). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Li Wei (2006). Complementary schools, past, present and future. *Language and Education*, 20(1), 76-83.

Li Wei (2014). Translanguaging knowledge and identity in complementary classrooms for multilingual minority ethnic children. *Classroom Discourse*, 5(2), 158-175.

Lo Bianco, J. (2016). A balanced language policy. *The Ethnic Broadcaster*, Autumn/Winter, 2016, 4-5.

Lytra, V. & Martin, P. (Eds.), (2010). *Sites of multilingualism: Complementary schools in Britain today*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Martowicz, A. & Roach, A. (2016). *Polish Language Learning in Scotland. Key Facts and Opportunities*. Cross-Party Group on Poland at the Scottish Parliament Education Subcommittee.

Maylor, U., Glass, K., Issa, T., Kuyok, K., Minty, S., Rose, A., Ross, A., Tanner, E., Finch, S., Low, N., Taylor, E., Tipping, S. & Purdon, S. (2010). *Impact of Supplementary Schools On Pupils' Attainment: An Investigation Into What Factors Contribute To Educational Improvements*. London: Department for Children, Schools and Families.

- McCollum, D., Nowok, B. & Tindal, S. (2014). Public attitudes towards migration in Scotland: Exceptionality and possible policy implications. *Scottish Affairs*, 23(1), 79-102.
- McFarlane, A., Deerin, C. & Payne, A. (2018). *Breaking the Languages Barrier*. Edinburgh: Reform Scotland.
- McPake, J. (2006). *Community Language Learning in England, Scotland and Wales*. Stirling: Scottish CILT.
- Minty, S., Maylor, U., Issa, T., Kuyok, K. & Ross, A. (2008). *Our Languages: Teachers in Supplementary Schools and their Aspirations to Teach Community Languages*. London: Institute for Policy Studies in Education, London Metropolitan University.
- Mirza, H. S. and Reay, D. (2000). Spaces and places of black educational desire: Rethinking black supplementary schools as a new social movement. *Sociology*, 34(3), 521–544.
- Nwulu, S. (2015). *Beyond the School Gates: Developing the Roles and Connections of Supplementary Schools*. London: RSA Action and Research Centre.
- O’Cathain, A. & Thomas, K. J. (2004). ‘Any other comments?’ Open questions on questionnaires – a bane or bonus to research. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, (4)25. doi: [10.1186/1471-2288-4-25](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-4-25)
- Phipps, A. & Fassetta, G. (2015). A critical analysis of language policy in Scotland. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 7(1), 5-27.
- Polinsky, M. & O. Kagan. (2007). Heritage languages: In the ‘wild’ and in the classroom. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 1(5), 368-395.
- Ramalingam, V. & Griffith, P. (2015). *Saturdays for Success: How Supplementary Education Can Support Pupils From All Backgrounds to Flourish*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Rolf, H. & Metcalf, H. (2009). *Recent Migration into Scotland: The Evidence Base*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government Social Research.
- Rubin, H. J. & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data* 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Scottish Government (2006). *Scotland's Strategy for Stronger Engagement with China* <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/08/23080408/0>

Scottish Government (2012). *Language Learning in Scotland: A 1+2 approach, Scottish Government Languages Working Group Report and Recommendations*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2018a). Summary of statistics for Schools in Scotland: Pupil census Supplementary Data.
<http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/School-Education/dspupcensus>

Scottish Government (2018b). *Teaching in a Diverse Scotland: Increasing and Retaining Minority Ethnic Teacher in Scotland's Schools*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Shah, M. (2008). The Arabic language. In A. Rippen (Ed.), *The Islamic World* (pp. 261-277). London: Routledge.

Sheehan, K. B. (2001). E-mail Survey Response Rates: A Review. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 6(2) DOI: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2001

Sime, D. & Fox, R. (2015). Home abroad: Eastern European children's family and peer relations after migration. *Childhood*, 22(3), 377-393.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988). Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority Education: From Shame to Struggle* (pp.9-44). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Spolsky, B. (2012). Family language policy-the critical domain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33, 3-11.

Stewart, E. (2012). UK Dispersal Policy and Onward Migration: Mapping the Current State of Knowledge, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 25, 25-49.

Tereshchenko, A. & Archer, L. (2014). Identity projects in complementary and mainstream schools: the views of Albanian and Bulgarian students in England. *Research Papers in Education*, 30(3), 347-365.

The National Centre for Languages (CILT). (2008). *A Toolkit for Partnership: Our Languages Project*. Reading: CILT.

The Scotsman (2018). Arabic to be taught to Syrian Refugee children in Scotland.
<https://www.scotsman.com/news/world/arabic-to-be-taught-to-syrian-refugee-children-in-scotland-1-4731706>

Thürmann, E., Vollmer, H., & Pieper, I. (2010). *Language(s) of Schooling: Focusing on Vulnerable Learners*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024-1054.

Walters, S. (2011). Provision, purpose and pedagogy in a Bengali supplementary school. *The Language Learning Journal*, 39(2), 163-175.

Zhang, H. S. (2016). Early language input and later reading development in Chinese as heritage language (CHL) learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 26: 437–448.

Notes

ⁱ ‘Complementary school’ has become the preferred term to emphasise how the learning in these schools

ⁱⁱ Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovak Republic, Slovenia joined in 2004; Romania and Bulgaria joined in 2007 and Croatia joined in 2013.

ⁱⁱⁱ Statistics for the Annual Pupil Census need to be treated with a degree of caution for a number of reasons: a) the earlier surveys may be more unreliable as schools under reported pupils’ home language, b) data gathered in 2017 includes over 4,000 pupils who are not based in their reporting school and hence could be double counted, c) in 2017 over a thousand pupils’ home language was not disclosed, d) some minority ethnic populations such as Eastern European Roma can be undisclosed and as a result under-recorded because of the stigma attached to speaking their languages by wider society.

^{iv} Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) is a guideline used to describe achievements of learners of foreign languages across Europe. Created by the Council of Europe between 1989 and 1996, its main aim is to provide a method of learning, teaching and assessing which applies to all languages in Europe. In November 2001, a European Union Council Resolution recommended using the CEFR to set up systems of validation of language ability. The six reference levels are becoming widely accepted as the European standard for grading an individual's language proficiency. For descriptions of the language levels see <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/level-descriptions>

^v The Arabic word *madrassa* (plural: *madaris*) generally has two meanings: in its more common literal and colloquial usage, it simply means ‘school’, but increasingly it has become the term used to describe an educational institution offering instruction in Islamic subjects including, but not limited to, the Quran, the sayings (hadith) of the Prophet Muhammad, jurisprudence (*fiqh*) and law. For more detail refer to Cherti and Bradley (2011).

^{vi} United Kingdom Federation of Chinese Schools (UKFCS), founded in July 1994, is a charity that aims to promote, through its member schools, Chinese language education and Chinese culture. Since its formation, its membership has continued to increase. Today it has a membership of about 80 Chinese schools, representing over 10,000 pupils. *Let's Learn Chinese* is a new series of textbooks designed to meet the needs of children learning Chinese as a second or foreign language. It has been written with reference to the Curriculum Guide for Chinese, Asset Languages, the Key Stage 2 Framework for Languages, and the National Curriculum for Modern Foreign Languages. It is suitable for use in Chinese supplementary schools, as well as in mainstream schools. For an analysis of some of the texts see Hancock (2012a, 2016).

vii This information may be unreliable as it was not clear in the written responses if the school was referring to preparing students for the examination, facilitating an element of the examination or registered as an examination centre to conduct the full examination on the school premises.

viii Students who obtain the Ellinomatheia Certification are recognized worldwide for their Greek language qualifications, which can be used to study in universities in Greece, Europe and the USA. Students can take the Examination for the Certificate of Attainment in Greek. A certificate is issued for successful candidates at six levels: A1, A2, B1, B2, C1 and C2 with course objectives aligned to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).

ix The Chinese Proficiency Test (HSK) is an international standardized test of Chinese language proficiency supplied through Hanban/Confucius Institute Headquarters. HSK is aimed at non-native Chinese speakers' abilities and consists of six levels.

x The International Baccalaureate programme is offered in a few independent schools in Scotland. This is different to the SQA Scottish Languages Baccalaureate, as it allows young people to continue with the study of two languages, and so it fits very well with the aims of the Scottish Government's 1+2 language policy. The Scottish Languages Baccalaureate requires two, different eligible modern or classical Language Courses, at least one of which must be at Advanced Higher level.

(see <https://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/35857.html>).

xi SQA's decision to drop Higher Russian after 2015 because SQA claimed too few pupils were sitting it despite figures from SQA showing there was a 44 per cent increase in entries in 2014, with numbers rising from 36 to 52.

xii E-Sgoil is funded by the Scottish Government and Bòrd na Gàidhlig. In 2018 the Scottish Government published its Digital Learning and Teaching Strategy for Scotland *Enhancing Learning and Teaching Through The Use Of Digital Technology*. The document highlights the work, aspirations and context of e-Sgoil. The document is available at <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0050/00505855.pdf>

xiii Victoria State Government in Australia also provides advice to community language schools:
<https://www.education.vic.gov.au/school/teachers/teachingresources/discipline/languages/Pages/clsschools.aspx>

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

Page 1. Information on your school

1. What is the name of your complementary / community language school?
 - (a) Does your school have a website? Please provide the address.
 - (b) Does your school have an email address? Please provide the email.
 - (c) Please provide the name, email and position (e.g. headteacher, committee chair) of the main contact for your complementary school.
 - (d) How do you advertise your school? Tick as many as apply
 - Online
 - Posters / Leaflets
 - Word of mouth
 - Other(i) If you selected 'Other', please specify.
2. What local authority is your school based in?
3. What date was your school established?
4. What are the aims of your school? Tick as many of the below as apply.
 - To understand and speak the language
 - To read and write the language
 - Access to history, culture and religion
 - To gain a qualification
 - Other(a) If you selected 'Other', please specify.
5. What type of accommodation does your school use?
 - Mainstream school building
 - Community centre
 - Religious building
 - Other(a) If you selected 'Other', please specify.
6. How many teachers does your school have?
7. How many 'parent-teachers' (teachers who have children studying at the school) does your school have?
8. How many of the teachers at your school are full-time students (at university or college)?
9. What qualifications (GTCS-registered; teaching qualification outside Scotland; classroom assistant qualification; other) do the teachers at your school hold? Please list staff members and their qualifications.
10. What are the professional development needs of your teachers? Tick all that apply.
 - Classroom management
 - Differentiated learning
 - Active learning
 - Assessment
 - 1+2 Language Strategy
 - ICT and Technology
 - Other(a) If you selected 'Other', please specify.
(b) Please give any further details about professional development needs.
11. Do you receive any financial or other support from any of the following? Tick as many as apply.
 - Student fees
 - Financial support from the local authority
 - Fundraising activities
 - Charitable sources
 - Donations from the community
 - Financial support from the embassy or consulate
 - Grants from educational bodies
 - Rent-free accommodation or premises
 - Volunteer teachers
 - Other(a) If you selected 'Other', please specify.
(b) Please give any further relevant details regarding funding for your school.

Page 2. Information on your pupils

- 12. What number of pupils attend your school?
- 13. What age ranges does your school teach? Tick all that apply.
 Under 5 5-11 12-16 17-18
 Over 18 (including adults)
(a) Please give details about the number of classes and size of classes.
- 14. How many pupils attending your school come from:
(i) Homes where *neither* parent is a native speaker of English?
(ii) Bilingual homes (only one parent is a native speaker of English)?
(iii) Homes where *both* parents are native speakers of English?
- 15. Do you organise your classes according to age or language competence? Please give details.

Page 3. Learning and Teaching

- 16. What languages are taught at your school?
- 17. In what ways does your school support the Scottish Government's 1+2 Language Strategy?
(a) Do any of your school staff offer Heritage Language teaching in mainstream schools?
(b) Does your school have links with local Primary schools to offer activities in Heritage Language learning?
(c) Does your school have meetings with the Local Authority about the 1+2 Language Strategy?
- 18. How many days and hours of teaching occur each week?
- 19. Does your school run any other social or cultural activities? Please give details.
- 20. Please give details of any teaching materials and / or textbooks that you use. For instance, are textbooks brought in from overseas? Are they used in your heritage country in mainstream schools, or are they written specifically for children learning abroad?
- 21. What educational resources, including technology, are used at your school? What extra resources and technology would you like at your school? Please give details.

Page 4. Assessment

- 22. What homework do you set? Please give details.
- 23. How do assess pupils' progress?
- 24. How do you report details of assessment to parents?
- 25. Do you use a local authority school as an examination centre? Please give details of the examination / qualification board and exam level (e.g. GCSE / A-Level / N5 / Higher / Advanced Higher / HSK for Mandarin).
- 26. What do you think are the main reasons for your students choosing to study a heritage language? Rate the following based on their importance.

	Very Important	Quite important	Of little importance	No importance
For enjoyment				
To understand and speak the language				
To read and write the language				
Opportunities to meet others from similar backgrounds				
Access to history, culture, religion				
Future employment opportunities				
To gain a qualification				

(a) Please give details of any other reasons you have identified.
