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Abstract

TRANSLINGUALISM AND SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES OF GAELIC MEDIUM EDUCATION TEACHERS IN A LINGUISTICALLY LIMINAL SETTING

John Knipe, Ph.D.
George Mason University, 2017
Dissertation Director: Dr. Rebecca Fox

Scottish Gaelic, among the nearly 7,000 languages spoken in the world today, is endangered. In the 1980s the Gaelic Medium Education (GME) movement emerged with an emphasis on teaching students all subjects via this ancient tongue with the hope of revitalizing the language. Concomitantly, many linguists have called for problematizing traditional definitions of language. The notion of translingualism, the idea that languages are not discrete, monolithic entities, runs counter to the ideology of languages as specifically representing one culture and one place. As language revitalization programs such as GME have a documented history of asserting traditional language ideologies, teachers are major purveyors of language ideologies, and language ideologies shape language policies, the goal of this qualitative case study was to explore the language ideologies of GME teachers in an urban setting as those ideologies relate to translingualism and to understand the core components of second language acquisition.
(SLA) that those teachers believe are essential in such a setting. The data sources include semi-structured, focused interviews with five participants. Through open, axial, and selective coding, a number of themes emerged. The findings suggest that language ideologies regarding translingualism are complex; furthermore, some of the components of SLA particular to GME in urban settings include making the language relevant to students and modeling the language outside of the school. Implications for this study for policy makers, practitioners, and researchers are discussed.

Keywords: Gaelic Medium Education, Second Language Acquisition, Translingualism, language ideologies, reversing language shift
Chapter One

About amn’t, aren’t I, and am I not, of course there are no right or wrong answers about language in the sense that there are right and wrong answers in Arithmetic. ‘Good English’ is whatever educated people talk: so what is good in one place or time [would] would not be so in another. Amn’t was good fifty years ago in the North of Ireland where I was brought up, but bad in Southern England. Aren’t I would have been hideously bad in Ireland but was good in England. And of course I just don’t know which (if either) is good in modern Florida. Don’t take any notice of teachers and text-books on such matters (Hooper, 2007, p. 766).

This advice offered in 1956 by C.S. Lewis to one of his readers may seem an ironic injunction from a reputable Oxford professor and writer. However, his statement, which shifts language usage from the dichotomous categories of good or bad and right or wrong to more complex categories that are nuanced and take broader sociocultural conditions into account, is not unlike the mantras that comprise translingual approaches to language. Like many of Lewis’ contemporaries, many language teachers today have conversely internalized what Canagarajah (2013a) calls a monolingual orientation toward language teaching and practice. Unlike translingualism, a monolingual orientation sees languages as fixed, independent entities that should follow a standard form.
According to most research, there are between 6,000 and 7,000 languages spoken in the world today (e.g., Hale, Krauss, Watahomigie, Yamamoto, Craig, Jeanne & England, 1992; Lewis, 2009). The figures may range, however, from between 3,000 and 10,000 (Crystal, 2000; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998; Wurm, 1998). Crystal (2000) attributes this variation to a number of factors including researchers’ misunderstanding of the differences between dialects and languages and the lack of hard data. Regardless of the number of languages that exist today, it remains clear that many languages are facing obsolescence (Crystal, 2000).

Research studies in sociolinguistics show that language is directly related to culture (Fishman, 1991; Pennycook, 2010a, 2010b), identity (Hornberger & McKay, 2010; Norton, 2000), and power (Fairclough, 2001; Hornberger & McKay, 2010; Rahman, 2002). Many people fear the loss of language will lead to a loss of cultural diversity and human knowledge (Errington, 2003; Fishman, 1991; Harrison, 2007; Krauss, 1992). Therefore, over the past three decades, some researchers have started to consider the future of minority and endangered languages (Walsh, 2005; Whaley, 2009). A number of movements have begun around the world to revitalize these languages; these movements range from policy initiatives (Bamgboše, 2000; Lo Bianco, 2010) and community projects (Dorian, 1998; Fishman 1991) to the creation of schools dedicated to language preservation (Hornberger, 2008; Peter, 2007).

Scottish Gaelic, spoken by fewer than 60,000 people, is categorized as an endangered language (i.e., a language reduced to minimal spheres of society and potentially in a position of near extinction) (Ó Néill, 2005a). Gaelic Medium Education
(GME) is a program that was adopted in the Gàidhealtachd (i.e., Gaelic-speaking region) of the Outer Hebrides and Inner Hebrides Islands of Scotland in the 1980s that involves teaching k-12 school subjects via the Gaelic language for the purpose of reversing language shift (RLS). RLS is the process in which speakers of a minority language (i.e., a less spoken language in a given society) or an endangered language, work to stem the tide of language oppression or extinction (Fishman, 1991). GME has since spread throughout the country of Scotland and accounts for 1.7% of the student population (Ó Néill, 2005a). Over the past decade, the GME movement has spread from the Gàidhealtachd to urban centers in the Lowland regions of Scotland where another minority language and a number of immigrant languages are also employed (Macleod, 2010; MacKinnon, 2010).

As GME is relatively new in urban settings, there is much to be explored. Students in such settings, for example, come into regular contact with a number of languages, and could potentially mix those languages with Gaelic during the school day. The implications on the future of the language are great and have led to my present study.

In this chapter, I present a rationale and justification for my study, a statement of the problem, the purpose for my study, the research questions that have emerged from my conceptual and theoretical frameworks, the significance of my study, and detailed definitions of terms related to my study. In Chapter Two, I explicate the aforementioned frameworks. I also present the context and explain the current research that has informed my study. In Chapter Three, I explain the methodology I used for my research. In Chapter Four, I present the findings of the analyzed data, and in Chapter Five, I summarize and discuss the findings, and provide implications and recommendations for further research.
Rationales for Research

As there has been a recent emphasis on revitalizing the Gaelic language through both policy initiatives (i.e., top-down) and grass-roots movements (i.e., bottom-up), the research regarding language ideologies of Gaelic speakers is rather limited (MacKinnon, 2010; McEwan-Fujita, 2005, 2008, 2010a; McLeod, 2006). Shaul (2014) explains that language revitalization efforts must consider the multiple functions of the language. Furthermore, languages, linguistics, second language acquisition, and language revitalization are of personal interest to me, particularly in the Scottish context.

Research rational for research. As language is always changing and new issues emerge, there is always work to be done in the field of sociolinguistics. Some research has been conducted on the topics of language ideologies (e.g., Kroskrity & Field, 2009), language attitudes (e.g., Garrett, 2010), and translingualism (e.g., Tung-Chiou, 2010); however, research regarding the nexus specifically of language ideologies and translingualism as it relates to educators in Scotland, a nation with three official languages that are in constant contact, is scant.

The calls for research regarding translingualism in a globalized society are numerous. Canagarajah (2013b) makes the distinction between modernist globalization and postmodern globalization, the former focusing on form and structure and the later concentrating on variation and function. Blommaert (2010) adds that “globalization forces sociolinguistics to unthink its classical distinctions and biases and to rethink itself as a sociolinguistics of mobile resources, framed in terms of trans-contextual networks, flows and movements. This unthinking and rethinking is long overdue” (p. 1). Though
many have taken up Canagarajah’s (2013a, 2013b) call for adopting a translingual orientation in their pedagogical practices, and others have likewise problematized foundational language ideologies (Tung-Chiou, 2010), Matsuda (2014) claims that there is not enough research with regard to its implications. Furthermore, Field and Kroskrity (2009) add that language ideologies as they relate to language contact and change have only begun to be explored in recent times.

There is also a need for more research of language ideologies in educational settings. As teachers continue to perpetuate language ideologies as part of the “hidden curriculum,” the cycle of hegemonic languages and monolingual or purist ideologies continues (Cockrell, 2010). Shoba (2010) and Kay (1998, 2006) call for more research regarding Scots in education. With regard to Gaelic, Macleod (2010) adds that there is a direct need for research regarding the current use of Gaelic in its multiple contexts, including education. She continues that research should be done with specific focus on Gaelic in various geographic locations and social settings.

Though some research has been conducted with regard to Scottish Gaelic learners (MacCaluim, 2007), and still others have specifically evaluated Gaelic Medium Education (GME) at a time in which discussions of language revitalization and bilingual education were particularly polemical, and tensions between “outsider” (i.e., non-Gaelic speakers) researchers and insiders (i.e., those from the Gàidhealtachd, or Gaelic speaking area of Scotland) made for considerable difficulty (Mitchell, 1992; Murray & Morrison, 1984), Bosch (2010) argues that “additional work is desperately needed on current factors of language contact, language change, and indeed code-switching during this
contemporary period of demographic change, and the retrenchment and readjustment of Gaelic speakers throughout the Gàidhealtachd” (p. 278).

Finally, as many Gaelic speakers have migrated into urban centers in recent decades, there is a need for more research regarding developing dialects and varieties. McEwan-Fujita (2008) explains that “more and more Gaelic speakers are becoming professionals of various kinds, and most of them are moving up and moving out of the traditionally Gaelic-speaking areas of the Hebrides and settling across the mainland of Scotland” (p. 91). McEwan-Fujita (2010b) furthermore continues that there needs to be more examination of the variations between Gaelic communities in rural and urban settings. Kay (1998, 2006), Imamura (2003), and Shoba (2010) argue for more research with regard to the role of Scots in education. As there is some evidence of newly documented translingual practice between Gaelic and Scots (Kane, 2014; Watson, 2010), the call for research is timely.

**Professional rationale for research.** Eventually, I hope to teach in higher education. Although this intrinsic case study could be used to speak directly to the case of language ideologies of GME teachers, I hope to use it to inform future studies I would like to conduct regarding language revitalization and second language acquisition. There are RLS projects at work on nearly every continent. It is my desire that this research will contribute new understandings of current phenomena surrounding language revitalization and thus add to the growing body of literature regarding multilingualism and language ideologies.
In addition, this study will touch on many areas important to the education and professional development of teachers working in the contexts of bilingual and/or translingual settings. The growing field of educational linguistics incorporates many of my areas of scholarship and will contribute to an understanding of how applied linguistics, second language acquisition, critical language awareness, and sociolinguistics all connect in the school setting, and more importantly teachers’ understandings and applications of first and second language in their classroom. This study touches on all of those areas in that GME teachers must constantly work to understand and teach how language relates to power, identity, and culture.

**Personal rationale for research.** In addition to the research and professional rationales for conducting this study, I also have an important personal reason. My mother is from the Gàidhealtachd, and while I learned smatterings of Gaelic words as a child, Scots was my true heritage language. I grew up listening to Scots and Scottish Gaelic singers, memorizing poetry by Robert Burns, and being read stories and cartoons such as Oor Wullie. Nonetheless, having been instilled with an admiration for my culture and heritage early on, I engaged in teaching myself the Gaelic language around the age of eleven. I quickly learned of the importance of language revitalization as I engaged with family members who knew the language and a variety of friends I made in the online community. Eventually, I took a distance course through Sabhal Mòr Ostaig, the world’s only Gaelic medium institution of higher education.

I completed a Bachelor of Arts degree in Spanish, a Master of Education degree in Integrated Curriculum and Instruction, and have concomitantly pursued a Master of
Arts degree in Spanish Linguistics during the summers of my PhD program. My interest in linguistics and languages has led me to ask a number of questions in comparative grammar and phonology; however, I began to develop a particularly strong affinity for the fields of second language acquisition, language education, and sociolinguistics, especially in multilingual societies.

During my time in my PhD program, I have conducted a number of studies regarding teacher education, language revitalization, and language attitudes and language ideologies in a number of communities that use Spanish, Spanglish, African American Vernacular English, and Ixil, a Mayan language. It was during these studies that I came upon the concept of translingualism. The notion of translingualism, coupled with my existing scholarly work and strong commitment to second language acquisition research, sociolinguistics, language revitalization, and Scottish languages, has provided me with an individual context for studying an important occurrence in 21st century language contextual development and revitalization.

**Statement of Problem**

In urban Scotland, where contact zones (i.e., areas where languages come in contact) involve the use of more than one minority autochthonous language (i.e., Scottish Gaelic and Scots) and English, there is a need to understand language ideologies of teachers as teachers promote certain perspectives on language. Particularly, as the goal of GME is to promote the use of Gaelic in society, it is essential to understand teachers’ views of what the Gaelic language should be.
Several researchers have called for traditional notions of language (i.e., the monolingual orientation) to be problematized (Blommaert, 2010; Canagarajah, 2013a, 2013b; Field & Kroskrity, 2009; Kroskrity & Field, 2009). Canagarajah (2013b) explains that shifting easily between multiple cultural and linguistic spaces is becoming part and parcel of our Postmodern, globalized world. Students are already bringing translingual practices into the classroom, but overall stated policies generally require those students to adopt practices that comply with a foundational monolingual orientation during the school day.

Translingualism, however, should not be regarded as a product of Postmodernism. In fact, such ideologies have existed throughout history. Translingualism has historically existed with the English language (Canagarajah, 2013b; Hsy, 2013; Kellman, 2000), as well as Eastern languages (Canagarajah, 2013b), Native American languages (Kroskrity & Field, 2009), and a number of other languages (Canagarajah, 2013b; Makihara & Schieffelin, 2007).

Particularly in RLS settings, the stakes are even higher. Fear that one’s endangered language will be changed at its core has led many who are engaged in RLS endeavors to adhere to linguistic purism and standardization (i.e., the monolingual orientation) (e.g., Dorian, 1981; MacCaluim, 2007; Mooney, Peccei, Labelle, Henriksen, Eppler, Irwin, Pichler, Preece, & Soden, 2011). Canagarajah (2013b) explains that those in this camp are often lauded for their ideologies. Studies conducted by Parodi (2008) and McCarty, Romero-Little, and Zapeda (2008), however, found the need for students to feel
a sense of ownership or agency of their heritage languages in order to overcome the stigma of learning Spanish and Navajo respectively.

Furthermore, language ideologies (i.e., rational responses to language) along with language attitudes and language practices ultimately shape language policies (Shohamy, 2006; Spolsky, 2009). Teachers can be major enactors and purveyors of language ideologies in a trickle-down effect by passing those ideologies on to their students whether purposefully or inadvertently; this is especially the case in linguistically liminal settings (i.e., settings where two or more minority or endangered languages come in contact with a predominant language) (Canagarajah, 2013a, 2013b; Fishman, 1991; Shoba, 2010). Furthermore, their language ideologies can affect language policy.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore teachers’ language ideologies, particularly as those ideologies relate to translingualism, in a setting where the endangered language being used as the medium of instruction is in contact with a dominant language (i.e., Scottish English), another minority language (i.e., Scots), and a number of immigrant languages. This is of particular importance as teachers are major purveyors of language ideologies (Goodman, 2014; Hult & King, 2011; López, 2008; Varghese, 2011), and language ideologies affect language policies (Shohamy, 2006; Spolsky, 2009). GME, along with many of other RLS-oriented programs, seems to be working with what Canagarajah (2013b) calls the *monolingual orientation* in mind.

This monolingual orientation is rooted in a language ideology that sees languages as fixed, monolithic entities and therefore holds that intergenerational language
transmission should be pure and standardized (Milroy & Milroy, 1999). A proposed alternative to this language ideology is known as the *translingual* orientation (Canagarajah, 2013b). This ideology sees languages as fluid and focuses on the function of language over form. Whereas a monolingual language ideology focuses on the form of language (i.e., grammar and structure), the translingual orientation focuses on function. In other words, teachers working with a translingual orientation would be permissive of such practices as switching back and forth between languages. While some in recent years have experimented with allowing translingual practice in the classroom, its benefits have yet to be tested (Matsuda, 2014) and the monolingual orientation remains the norm in classrooms.

**Research Questions**

In order to better understand the language ideologies relating to translingualism of GME teachers in linguistically liminal settings, the following two research questions were answered this study:

1. What are the language ideologies, related to translingualism, of teachers in a GME school in a linguistically liminal setting?

2. What do these teachers believe to be key elements of second language acquisition in such a context?

The first research question addresses the language ideologies, or specific sets of beliefs about what language should be, that GME teachers hold in a setting where a number of languages, including other minority languages, come into contact. The second research
question addresses what areas of second language acquisition these teachers believe are pertinent to teaching in such a setting.

**Significance**

Many sociolinguists and educational linguists have called for more research regarding language ideologies as language ideologies affect language policies (Shohamy, 2006; Spolsky, 2009). Moreover, there is a critical need to understand language ideologies in language revitalization settings (King, Schilling-Estes, Fogle, Lou, & Soukup, 2008). Though the findings from my study are not transferrable, they may help to influence, encourage, and inform those engaged in RLS efforts to work for the improvement of mother tongue education and teacher preparation particularly in urban settings. There are a number of educational institutions in urban settings working with the goal of language revitalization. Also, my findings will be significant for the many endangered language communities considering codification and standardization. Finally, this study will contribute to the growing body of research regarding language ideologies in general.

**Language Terminology and Definitions**

Languages, like words, are often defined by those with power and prestige (Dorian, 1998; Fishman, 1991; Stavans, 2005, 2008). Many have debated the differences between languages and dialects (Crystal, 2000; Kay, 2006; Nihtinen, 1999; Niven & Jackson, 1998; Zondag, 1998). Filmer (2003) explains that “languages have armies, dialects don’t” (p. 257). Furthermore, through events such as migration, colonialism, and war, many languages have gained speakers at the expense of others (Dorian, 1998).
Geographically defined countries, determined by those in power who therefore spoke the language variant of power, developed standardization and policies for their eponymous languages thereby securing the languages’ statuses (Canagarajah, 2013b; Dorian, 1998). As a result, some varieties of languages, as well as some languages altogether, have been marginalized or are no longer spoken.

A number of metaphors and a common vocabulary have developed to discuss the position of languages in terms of status and number of speakers. Terms such as threatened, endangered, dying, vulnerable, minority, small, moribund, and at risk are among the many that have been employed to refer to languages that are either used by few speakers or used by the minority group in a given society (Duchêne & Heller, 2007; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998, 2006; Heller & Duchêne, 2007; King et al., 2008; Krauss, 1992; Leonard, 2008; Romaine, 2008; Whaley, 2009). Dead, sleeping, vanished, disappeared, superseded, destroyed, and buried are some metaphors used to describe languages that are no longer spoken in our current world (Crystal, 2000; Errington, 2003; Millar, 2006; Nettle & Romaine, 2000; Whaley, 2009). By extension, languages can be killed, murdered, lost, and decimated (Dixon, 1997; Robins & Uhlenbeck, 1991; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000, 2001), preserved, sustained, saved, brought back, revitalized, awoken, fortified, and reconstructed (Dixon, 1997; Dorian, 1981; England, 1998; Fishman, 1991; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998, 2006; Harrison, 2007; Hornberger, 2008; Ó Néill, 2005b). Here I discuss some of terms relating particularly to my study.

**Endangered languages.** A number of scholars and organizations have begun to categorize the vitality of languages, that is, the potential for languages to continue as
useful means of communication (e.g., Fishman, 1991; Harrison, 2007; Robins & Uhlenbeck, 1991; Wurm, 1998). Terms such as *vital, moribund, endangered,* and *extinct* are some of the most common words employed to discuss the health and vitality of a language. Many languages have lost speakers and status as a result of policies, intimidation, and a number of other factors.

**Reversing language shift.** Whaley (2009) explains that the literature regarding endangered languages began to appear in the 1980s and 1990s. This literature brought about a new understanding of the scope of language loss, both in number and consequence. As a result, many researchers, community members, and governments began to take on the task of reversing the trend of language loss. Reversing language shift (RLS) is the process of revitalizing languages. A number of scales have developed in order to classify languages and offer recommendations for their revitalization. One of the earliest, and perhaps the most salient, is Fishman’s (1991) 8-stage Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale or the GIDS.

**The GIDS.** Fishman (1991) compares his scale to the Richter Scale used to measure earthquakes. The higher the number is on his 8-stage scale, the more perilous the situation. Walsh (2005) explains that a language found in stage 8 is in basic need of being rebuilt before the revitalization efforts of RLS can continue. In this stage, the few remaining speakers of the language are either isolated, restricting their ability to use the language, or elderly, in which case a more organic use of vernacular is all but vestigial (Fishman, 1991, 1998). While Dorian (1981) explains that many linguists and anthropologists are often apprehensive of examining the language at this point in fear that
the version they find will be debased, Fishman (1991) encourages that native speakers, bilingual or not, typically remember more than they previously thought they would when they are interviewed. Fishman’s (1991) work continues to categorize each stage along with recommendations for how to move endangered languages further along the scale. Languages used in every sphere of society by all generations would be considered at stage 1.

Other scales. While the GIDS has become somewhat of a standard in RLS endeavors, it is not without critics. Hinton (2003), for example, notes that Fishman’s (1991) scale is geared more toward RLS of European languages. Some have built on Fishman’s scale while still others have developed their own scales for measuring the achievement of RLS. Around the same time that Fishman wrote about RLS and showcased the GIDS, Kincade (1991) proposed a 5-stage scale that categorized languages between viable and extinct.

Crystal (2000) devised a scale that involves 6 stages. The first stage involves increasing prestige within the dominant community; the second, an increase in wealth; the third, legitimate power in the eyes of the dominant community; the fourth, presence within the education system, the fifth involves preserving a written form of the language; and the sixth entails making use of electronic technology. While Crystal has done extensive work in the preservation and RLS of endangered languages in general, he has also written some on Welsh and the other Celtic languages.

Minority languages. While much attention has been given to revitalization of languages in peril, there are other minority languages that, while they are not in danger of
dying out, are not being given equal status in all spheres of society. According to the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, a minority language is a language that is “traditionally used within a given territory of a State by nationals of that State who form a group numerically smaller than the rest of the State’s population; and [is] different from the official language(s) of that State” (Council of Europe, 1992). The word “minority” here according to Paulston (1997) does not necessarily relate to the quantity of speakers, but rather to the subordinate nature in which the language finds itself in society. Sometimes the phrase “small languages” (Dorian, 1998; Heller & Duchêne, 2007) is used. Many of these languages have not been given equal status in areas of education, government, and other societal spheres (Gorter & Cenoz, 2011; Hornberger, 1998; Kay, 1998).

**Nonstandard and vernacular languages.** To round out the conflicts related to language use in education, recent discussions have also included nonstandard and vernacular languages. Nonstandard languages are languages that do not follow the rules of the standard form or dialect (Milroy, 2007). Standard language has been defined as the “variety of language that is used by governments, in the media, in schools and for international communication” (Standard and nonstandard language, n.d.).

There are endangered, minority, and nonstandard languages spoken around the world. Vernacular languages are those which, while they may or may not have standard forms, are varieties of lower prestige than the standard dialect (Green, 2002). African American Vernacular English (AAVE) (Baugh, 1999), Scots (Shoba, 2010), and Spanglish (Stavans, 2003) could be classified as vernacular languages.
Diglossia. Ferguson (1959) explains that diglossia is the use of two dialects or languages used by one community. These languages or dialects may be discussed in terms of an H or high variety and an L or low variety. H languages or dialects are often highly codified and elite forms whereas L languages or dialects are vernacular and used in daily conversations.

Snow’s (2013) discussion of diglossia builds upon Ferguson’s (1959) earlier model. He further adds the categories of traditional diglossia, revived diglossia, and modern diglossia. Traditional diglossia, he explains, involves a community using a sacred language (e.g., Sanskrit in India, Classical Arabic in Egypt) as the high variety. Cases involving revived diglossia would see colonial communities reviving a dialect or language once used as a form of asserting national or regional identity (e.g., Sinhalese in Sri Lanka). Finally, modern diglossia emerges when a modern standard language becomes the high variety and is often related to the low variety language. Generally, this involves a more powerful neighboring country that shares a history or cultural identity. With the case of Scotland, many view Scots as the L language and English as the H language.

Chapter Summary

The case of GME is only one example among many of grassroots movements working to revitalize an endangered language. Those working with a monolingual orientation might argue that GME in urban settings runs a greater risk of being a futile endeavor as students will be in constant contact with Scots, Scottish English, and other immigrant languages and therefore use Gaelic only in school. Those with a translingual
language ideology would argue that as languages are not monolithic entities, GME in urban settings could therefore allow for students to float in and out of linguistic spaces, and create new identities, language registers, and cultural artifacts.

As teachers promulgate language ideologies, schools act as plausibility structures that reify those language ideologies, and language ideologies affect language policy, this study hopes to explore the language ideologies of GME teachers working in an urban setting, particularly as those ideologies relate to translingualism. In the following chapter, I further define terminology related to language revitalization and language ideologies while providing a conceptual framework for my research. This framework includes both theories that inform my study as well as the specific context for my research.
In this chapter I present a conceptual framework for my research that includes a discussion of language shift and reversing language shift and culminates in the historical background of such phenomena as they are pertinent to my study. Next I draw on some basic theories and concepts that pertain to educational linguistics; specifically, I address second language acquisition, language attitudes and ideologies, linguistic liminality, translingualism, dialogism, conscientization, and critical applied linguistics. Finally, I provide a synthesis of previous studies that are related to, and therefore influential for, my study.

First, I discuss the concepts of language shift and reversing language shift broadly. Next, I give the particular historical background of these phenomena and the development of the languages I focus on in my study, namely Scottish Gaelic, Scots, and Scottish English. The role of each language in educational settings has changed greatly over time. This leads to a discussion of the history and current status of Gaelic Medium Education. Then, as the focus of my research is on language ideologies, a field of inquiry in both educational linguistics and sociolinguistics, I give a brief overview of the concept. I also give a brief description of the relationship of my research to the closely related areas of second language acquisition and language attitudes. Next, as my research questions explore the language ideologies of teachers in linguistically liminal settings
with regard to translingualism, I explain what is meant by *language ideologies* and *linguistically liminal*. Finally, I explain the concepts and theories guiding my study. On the one hand, my research involves the various language ideologies that one can hold while on the other, I am interested specifically in teachers’ language ideologies. Here I have created a concept map (Figure 1) that serves as a guide for this chapter.

![Figure 1. Concept map for my study.](image)

**Language Shift**

Language shift, the process whereby the language of a speech community is displaced, often by a more dominant or high variety language, is occurring at an unprecedented rate (Fishman, 1991, 2001; Lo Bianco, 2010). Language shift may involve either partly or fully giving up the use of one’s first language (Dwyer, 2009). Projections about the number of languages that will be lost in this century range from 50% to 90% (Austin & Sallabank, 2011, pp. 1-2) though these figures have been contested (Whaley,
2009). In this study, I explain how language shift has occurred in both Scottish Gaelic and Scots. In the following subsections, I provide information about the factors that influence language shift, particularly as these factors are present in the case of GME.

**Political factors.** Language shift is a reality. It may be the result of direct proscription or, perhaps more insidious, caused by affective and economic factors. For example, Bamgboṣe (2000) notes that national legislation often favors certain languages while other languages are ignored. Fishman (2005) claims that while rarely are there policies in place in the modern era that ban the speaking of a given language, it can be argued that policies neither bar nor support any specific languages. Dorian (1981, 1998) adds that hegemonic classes also act with an “ideology of contempt” for linguistic minorities (p. 7). Many languages have been on the receiving end of such policies and political attitudes – Basque and Catalan in Spain, Scottish Gaelic in Scotland, Yoruba in Nigeria, Kurdish in Turkey, and Turkish in Denmark to name a few. Scottish Gaelic, as well as Scots, has only recently been offered political protection and GME is a relatively new option.

**Emotional factors.** Though legislation may account for some language shift, Hornberger (1998) adds that more often economic and emotional factors are at work (p. 43). Colonialism is one pivotal factor that led to a decline in many local, indigenous languages and ideologies around the world (Dorian, 1981; Fishman, 1991; Macedo, 2000; McCarty, 2003; Ó Néill, 2005b; Rahman, 2002). The enactment of laws, education systems, and economic structures that required or worked through the medium of the colonizers’ languages left the colonized with practically no choice but to adopt their
oppressors’ languages. Local languages, identities, and ways of knowing quickly became replaced by those of power and prestige (Bamgboye, 2000; Fishman, 1998; Harrison, 2007; Macedo, 2000; Meyerhoff, 2011; Mooney et al, 2011; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000) leaving many local languages confined to limited spheres of society (Fishman, 1991). While in modern society, such formal colonial practices are seen as violations of basic human rights, and outright attempts of one group to subjugate another are met with more than a furtive glance, the results of such oppression continue (Wolterstorff, 2008). The use of Scottish Gaelic, as will be explained, was punishable by law throughout much of Scotland’s history. While GME works to promote the language in modern times, English has become the language of power in Scotland.

**Economic factors.** Closely related to the emotional factors that can lead to language attrition are the economic considerations. The nature of technology and an emergence of new communicative tools (e.g., the internet, cellular phones) have allowed for facilitated intercultural exchange and business operations around the world. Globalization, the “process of increasing international integration of economic life” has led many to work toward learning languages of power for economic and political gain (Whaley, 2003, p. 969). Aronin and Singleton (2008) note that with this trend English has unequivocally become a lingua franca. As people the world over work toward economic advancement, they are learning English in order to compete. In many contexts, institutions of business and higher education have switched to the employment of English as the medium of communication (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). English in Scotland, as in many countries, is a necessary commodity for human capital.
Glocalization. The term glocalization appeared in the 1980s and has been used to express the convergence of global forces and grassroots movements (Sharma, 2009). Whaley (2003) adds that many have reacted to globalization by asserting their own cultures and identities (p. 3). Fishman (as cited in Aronin & Singleton, 2008) maintains that greater awareness and financial backgrounds from governments have led to an increase in the use of regional languages though this is an area of ongoing debate.

While language shift may seem to point to a dismal future for endangered languages (i.e., languages that are close to obsolescence), minority languages (i.e., languages with fewer speakers in a given society than another language), and marginalized languages (i.e., languages that are given a lesser status by public officials), Aronin and Singleton (2008) explain that there equally exists an uptake in multilingualism. They continue that “the dual nature of globalisation is expressed in the term glocalisation, which captures our understanding of the contemporary world as multifarious and non-homogeneous, created through a multitude of diverse local values, behaviours, symbols and activities” (p. 7).

Reversing Language Shift

With the understanding that language is tied to culture, identity, power, and ethnicity (Fishman, 1991; Fox, 2012; Harrison, 2007; Mooney et al, 2011; Norton & Toohey, 2004), a great deal of discussion has ensued with regard to the loss of human knowledge that occurs with language shift. Furthermore, the notion of language rights, or language human rights, has placed the discussion of reversing language shift (RLS), the endeavor to stem the tide of language loss, in the context of social justice (Hornberger,
1998; Krauss, 1992; Lagerspetz, 1998; May, 2001; Paulston, 1997; Phillipson, 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1994, 2000). Fishman (1991) argues that for the process of RLS to be effective, there must be an emic, or internal, response to a perceived threat of language loss, and it must involve both systems and communities as well as individuals. GME is an internal movement that is working toward RLS.

**RLS in education.** With increased knowledge of the nature and importance of language diversity and language revitalization, a number of bilingual and immersion schools have emerged with to promote endangered languages. These programs exist in both developing countries (e.g., Malone & Paraide, 2011) as well as in the developed world (Martin-Jones, Hughes, & Williams, 2009). Some of the difficulties teachers have faced in bilingual schools are adequately balancing content and language instruction, understanding and employing second language acquisition theory, and applying essential critical theory with regard to the socio-historical context of language (Cammarata & Teddick, 2012; Norton & Toohey, 2004). This is especially true for schools committed to language revitalization (Peter, 2007).

There is the further need for critical language awareness (CLA), that is, the understanding of the deeply entrenched relationship between language and power, the complexities of language, and the role of language ideologies and language attitudes in the classroom (Fairclough, 2013; Hornberger & McKay, 2010). This concept is discussed in greater detail later in this chapter.

**Linguistic Landscape of Scotland**

Here I provide a specific background the linguistic landscape of Scotland.
Scotland has a long cultural and linguistic history. While there are currently three languages considered autochthonous, each has had its own struggles and has come into contact with other languages. The current linguistic debates have come about after centuries of war, colonialism, oppression, and struggle. Though other languages existed in Scotland, the oldest language that is currently still spoken is Scottish Gaelic.

**Scottish Gaelic.** Scottish Gaelic, sometimes called simply Gaelic or Gàidhlig in the language itself, made its way to Scotland from Ireland in the first few centuries of the Common Era (McLeod, 2006). It had become noticeably separate from Irish Gaelic (i.e., Irish) by the seventh century (2006). From at least the tenth century through nearly the fifteenth century, Gaelic was spoken throughout most of modern day Scotland (Ó Néill, 2005a). By the seventeenth century, new settlements and migration patterns had pushed Gaelic to the Highland region (i.e., the northwest) of the country (Szasz, 2007).

Linguistically, the language is in the Celtic family and closely related to Irish and Manx, the latter spoken on the Isle of Man between Ireland and Scotland. It is also more distantly related to Welsh, spoken in Wales, Breton, spoken in Brittany, France, and Cornish, the language once spoken in Cornwall England. The former three languages are further categorized linguistically as Goidelic languages while the latter three are considered Brythonic. In Figure 2, I have devised a graphic that shows the relationship of the Celtic languages.
Through a series of royal deaths and a number of political mergers, Scotland and England found themselves ruled by the same king. The Act of Succession in 1701 led to the dissolution of the Scottish Parliament thus placing all decision-making for the two countries at the Westminster Parliament in London (Szasz, 2007). This started a chain reaction starting with the Gaels uprising and ending with a ban on Highland culture (i.e., the Act of Proscription) and the Battle of Culloden in which upward to 2000 Scots were injured or killed (Reid, 2002).

Another event that reduced the number of Gaelic speakers was the creation of the Society in Scotland for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge (SSPCK) (Szasz, 2007). The SSPCK worked toward educating Scots on matters of religion; the caveat was that this instruction was only allowed in English. In fact, one of the main goals of the SSPCK

*Figure 2. The Celtic language family (*Extinct status)*
was eradicating the Gaelic language (p. 98). As wealthier Scots and clan leaders had their children educated in English, English became the language of power in Scotland.

The lack of education in Gaelic further forced the language to the sidelines. The 1872 Education Act offered compulsory education in Scotland, but the act ignored any policy on Gaelic altogether (MacLeod, 2003). In 1891, An Comunn Gaidhealach, a board of Gaelic speakers, was founded to help with language revival efforts (Matheson & Matheson, 2000). The board put pressure on policy makers. A “Gaelic clause,” not introduced until the 1918 Education Act, was the first to recognize and allow the instruction of Gaelic but only as a subject (p. 1). It would be another 40 years before it was accepted as a medium of instruction, and then only in primary schools (Trudgill, 2000). Many argue that it was too little too late. While Gaelic was the language of nearly half a million people in Scotland in 1740, the language had dropped to nearly a quarter of a million by 1891 (Ó Néill, 2005a).

If policy, forced expulsion, and dominant language education were not enough to take a toll on the Scottish Gaelic language and culture, World War I saw a disproportionate number of casualties among its Highland regiments (Ó Néill, 2005a). Continued oppression has forced the language into severe endangerment. Though some Gaelic speakers fled to Nova Scotia in the 1700s, the majority of Gaelic speakers today live in the Highlands and Hebrides Islands. Recent estimates show fewer than 60,000 speakers as of 2001 (Ó Néill, 2005a; McLeod, 2006). Despite its relatively few number of speakers, there are currently a number of Gaelic dialects and regional pronunciations (Dorian, 1981).
**Gaelic Medium Education (GME)**. In the early 1980s, many proponents of the Gaelic language began looking to other languages that had experienced some success in revival. Educational tourism began with scholars and other interested parties visiting Wales to refuel passion for indigenous languages and learn effective measures for revitalization (MacLeod, 2003). From this fervor, the Comhairle nan Sgoitteara Araich (CSNA) was established to help achieve the survival and growth of Gaelic; playgroups, community groups, and some Gaelic Medium Education (GME) were soon underway (p. 4). Murray and Morrison (1984) explain that “the aim of the [GME] project was to produce Gaelic/English bilinguals with a mastery of . . . both languages together with an appreciation of the nuances, emotional overtones and cultural dimensions of the two languages” (p. 16) as well as “instill in the pupils a much-needed sense of identity and confidence in themselves as people . . . and foster in them an interest in and a sympathy with the affairs of the own locality” (p. 91). The “two languages” referred to here are English and Scottish Gaelic.

An Comunn Gaidhealach combined with many other organizations dedicated to Gaelic revival efforts to form Comunn na Gàdhlig (CnaG) (Matheson & Matheson, 2000). GME became one of the major cogs in the revitalization machine. While there were very few students enrolled in GME institutions in the early 1980s, the most recent data shows that there are approximately 2,000 pupils currently in GME programs (MacLeod, 2003).

As the demand for GME increased, so increased the need for highly qualified Gaelic-speaking teachers. Sabhal Mòr Ostaig (SMO), the world’s only Gaelic medium
college, was founded by Sir Iain Noble in 1972, with the “particular interest in economic development, and the example of the Faroe Islands greatly influenced his thoughts, and in particular the way in which the islanders interwove economic development and language development” (Sabhal Mòr Ostaig, 2012, p. 10). In recent years SMO has teamed with the prestigious University of Aberdeen to prepare Gaelic-speaking teachers for careers in GME (Sabhal Mòr Ostaig, 2012).

Though GME has been developing at many levels in recent years (Nicolson & McIver, 2003), Fishman (1991) argues, education alone is not enough to revive a language. Another aspect that plays an important role is a change in policy. As Scotland regained its own Parliament in 1998, there has been a great deal of headway made in the area of self-determination and regionalized policy to the point of a recently failed referendum for renewed independence (The Scottish Government, 2013). The Standards in Scottish Schools Act of 2000 considered Gaelic education a National Priority and requires that all local authorities specify their plans in achieving the goal of developing the language (MacLeod, 2003). A study conducted in 2003 showed that 66% of the population of Scotland supported the promotion of Gaelic (Market Research UK, 2003). Finally, the Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act 2005 was enacted following the United Kingdom’s 2001 ratification of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages making Gaelic “an official language of Scotland commanding equal respect with the English language” (Dunbar, 2006; McLeod, 2006, p. 6). The act gave the Bòrd na Gàidhlig, originally founded in 2003, the role of developing a national Gaelic Plan to help with the language’s development.
While the status of Gaelic is severely endangered, its rate of decrease has slowed in recent years. Fishman (1991) argues that revitalization efforts are most effective when members of the language community recognize and take up the cause themselves. Apart from policy and education, many Gaelic speakers have sought other practical means of promoting the language. SMO offers degrees that couple Gaelic with media, communications, development, business, music, and education. As a result, new markets for the language have evolved. BBC now offers programming in the Gaelic language, for example. Ó Néill (2005a) explains that considerations of Gaelic programming should be made for the Gaedhealtachd [Gaelic-speaking region] as well in urban areas. The 2011 census reports have not been publicized yet to see if such efforts are having an effect (STV Edinburgh, 2013).

As the RLS effort takes hold, more schools are opening to offer GME to students across the country. While Gaelic has traditionally been associated with the Highland and Island regions, the recent migrant settlements, especially in the cities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, have created a need for GME in urban settings. Each district has dealt with this differently; some schools offer additive bilingual programs (i.e., programs that offer GME in the lower grades and gradually shift the medium of instruction to English), while others offer GME throughout the years of schooling.

Scots. One language that supplanted Gaelic in Scotland was Scots. Scots, sometimes called Lallans or Doric, has sometimes been slighted the limelight because, from a linguistic perspective, it is more elusory. Its status as a language has long been debated. In the public eye, it has sometimes donned the moniker of “bad English”
(Shoba, 2010, p. 385) or “slovenly debased dialect” (Kay, 2006, p. 29). Descriptive linguists would give credence to Scots as a legitimate means of communication (Labov, 1972; Kay, 2006). Some classify it on a continuum with English (Received Pronunciation or RP) at one end, Scottish English somewhere in the middle, and Scots and the other end (Shoba, 2010; Smith, 2012). In Figure 3, I have created a graphic that shows this continuum.

Figure 3. RP to Scots language continuum

Still, many linguists have classified it as a distinct language or a “pre-standard language” (e.g., Dósa, 1999, p. 85). More specifically, some refer to Scots as an ausbau language (Millar, 2006, p. 63). An ausbau language is marked as separate from an abstand language; the former is closely related to another language but is uniquely able to convey meaning across all registers or spheres of society. It may even be somewhat intelligible with another language. An abstand language, on the other hand, is a language that has no other close relative with which to be confused (Kloss, 1993). Therefore, while Scots is relatively close to English in many regards, it has a distinct literary history and can be used in all spheres of society without the help of English. Görlach (1998) refers to
Scots as a “Halbsprache or half-language” (p. 13). McClure (1998) explains that as there are a variety of dialects of Scots itself, Scots cannot be called a dialect. Leith (1983) adds that “to call Scots a dialect of English is to ignore its development during Scottish independence and to reduce its status to that of the regional dialects of English” (p. 161).

Scots, like English, can be traced to the Anglo-Saxon invasion of Britain that occurred in the 400s (Shoba, 2010). Originally called Inglis, it was the language of the Royal Court in Scotland from 1100 to 1707 (Kay, 2006). Scots was clearly labeled as a language distinct from English and fit for use in matters of politics and diplomacy under Queen Elizabeth I (Horsbroch, 1999). It had replaced Gaelic in that regard and was replaced in turn by English (Matheson & Matheson, 2000). In fact, since that time until recently, English was the only recognized official language in Scotland (2000). However, Scots grew up separately from English. Scots came from the Northumbrian dialect of its Anglo-Saxon predecessor whereas English developed from the East Midland dialect of Mercia (Kay, 2006).

Scots absorbed several words and speech patterns from Gaelic and Danish given its proximity to both people groups (Kay, 2006). Words like loon for boy and fash for to anger came from Dutch and French respectively; these came about because of specific trading ties between these countries and Scotland (Collins pocket Scots dictionary, 1996, p. ix). Scots continued to develop as a language spoken across all registers (e.g., church, community, government).

Because Scots is an ausbau language and speakers can slide from English (RP) to Scottish English to Scots with relative ease, it has not declined at the same rate as Gaelic.
It is spoken by masses of people in urban settings and rural settings alike. Even so, it has lost any status of prestige and has been limited in its affordance of official use. The National Curriculum has adopted its use in some minor ways (e.g., short presentations of poems in Scots, units of Scots vocabulary in history class) (Niven & Jackson, 1998; Education Scotland/Foghlam Alba, 2014)

**Scottish English.** English, as in many parts of the world, has recently dominated in areas of commerce and economics, education, and law. One factor that dealt a blow to the social status and prestige of Scots was the decision of the Church of Scotland to adopt the English version of the Bible for official use (Collins pocket Scots dictionary, vii). The Act of Union in 1707 meant that those Scots who were in political offices had to use English in order to maintain positions of power. It was only a matter of time before Scots was considered unrefined in the domains of the elite. Though many Scots in positions of power tried to suppress their Scots tongue, its closeness to English made it an easy resource to draw from on occasion. Robinson (1985) states:

> Residual Scottish features were . . . regarded as sullying what might otherwise have been exemplary refined English, and it was all but universally accepted as desirable for anyone with pretensions to being ‘polite’ that he should write and speak English with ‘propriety’ – that is, according to the standards of London society. (p. xi)

This top down effect resulted in eliminating Scots, not only from official status, but also from other domains. With Scots being marginalized in issues of governance and spirituality (i.e., the Parliament and the Kirk), it was taken up by many literary figures
such as Robert Burns, the writer of Auld Lang Syne and scores of other works (Kay, 2006). Hugh MacDiarmid, Robert Louis Stevenson, Sir Walter Scott, Sir David Lyndsay, and King James I are just a few of the writers who could wax eloquent in the “mither tongue” (McClure, 1998, p. 9).

With Scots relegated to a position of low prestige, a new form of English arose. Scottish English maintains intelligibility with RP and some level of respect in official spheres, while still maintaining some details that separate it from RP. While Scottish English has become recognized as its own dialect, it is still considered by many to be a low variety and attitudes toward this variety can be quite negative (Jenkins, 2010; Kay, 2006). Nonetheless, English, of one variety or another, has become the mainstream medium of instruction for most of the educational institutions in the country. My study, however, focuses on GME. As the study looks at language ideologies in educational settings, it is situated within the field of Educational Linguistics.

**Educational Linguistics**

Hornberger (2001) explains that the field of Educational Linguistics, a field which came about in the early 1970s, covers inter alia: “second language acquisition; language choice, maintenance and shift; language and ethnicity; descriptive analysis of speech acts and discourse; educational implications of linguistic diversity; language planning; bilingual education” (p. 272). Educational linguistics further allows for inquiry into language attitudes and language ideologies of teachers and students. The development of this field has both informed and been informed by the research regarding second language acquisition (SLA) as well.
One of the most salient features of the discipline is that it is multifaceted but is also problem-centered and asks critical questions specifically with regard to underrepresented groups (Hornberger, 2010; Hult & King, 2011). Among other topics, language policy and SLA, itself a relatively new field, have been at the forefront of the field of Educational Linguistics. My research is multilayered in that it focuses on the language ideologies of teachers who work with an underrepresented group (i.e., those who engage in translingual practice) within an underrepresented group (i.e., those using Scottish Gaelic).

**Second language acquisition.** The early field of SLA focused on language teaching over language learning (Gass, 2013). However, since the late 1990s it has developed into a literature-rich field that covers issues of language pedagogy and andragogy and language acquisition and learning spanning the fields of psychology, sociology, education, and linguistics among others (Gass, 2013; Ortega, 2009). Some issues of SLA research that are pertinent to my research are cross-linguistic influences, linguistic environment, motivation, and social dimensions of language learning.

Many SLA researchers have recently begun to explore notions of identity and identity formation. As students learn and acquire languages and discourse with those around them, their identities are affected. One of the issues particular to my research is that of code-switching, which Gass (2013) explains is the use of more than one language within a given conversation and is a common occurrence among bilinguals; this is one among many practices deemed acceptable by those who adopt a translingual ideology of
language. Swain and Deters (2007) explain that the most recent research within SLA theory “prioritizes sociocultural and contextual factors in addition to acknowledging individual agency and multifaceted identities” (p. 820). As many of the students within GME settings, especially those areas outside of the Gàidhealtachd, are not from Gaelic-speaking homes and their only exposure to Gaelic is inside the school, the agentive role of learners in a sociocultural context that is linguistically liminal is crucial. This perspective of SLA research intersects with the fields of applied linguistics and sociolinguistics.

Language attitudes. Garrett (2010) explains that language attitudes are the visceral or emotional responses that people have regarding language. For example, many dialect surveys have shown some North Americans to consider a Southern dialect of English to sound uneducated (2010). Others consider the stereotypical New York City dropping of the “r” sound in words like “fourth” to sound lower class (Labov, 1966). While my research questions do not directly involve language attitudes, it is essential to consider language attitudes as they often develop from language ideologies.

Language ideologies. In order to understand language ideologies, it is first important to trace the history of the term ideology. Along with a rise in nationalism, a stronger global emphasis on the separation of church and state, and Constitutionalism, the term idéologie (i.e., ideology) was a legacy of the French Revolution (Klaits & Haltzel, 2002). According to Gee (2012), this new concept, or “science of ideas,” was an invention of Antoine Destutt de Tracy in the early 1800s and “ran counter to established ideas of Church and State that people came in different (lower and higher) ‘grades’ by
birth and were inherently fit from birth for different roles in life” (p. 5).

Woolard (1998) explains that there are four major themes that arise in discussions of ideologies. Ideologies can be understood as mental phenomena or beliefs and ideas that are consciously maintained. She states that ideologies can also be conceptualized in a manner that emphasizes social positions and experiences. She then adds that ideologies can also be understood in a third way, closely related to the second, as relating to positions of social, political, and economic power. Finally, she offers that ideologies can be rooted in “distortions” or in “limitations [of] human perception and cognition” (pp. 5-7).

In French, and concomitantly in English, the word ideology has political overtones (Mayr, 2008; Thompson, 1990). Woolard (1998) explains that “ideology is seen as ideas, discourse, or signifying practices in the service of the struggle to acquire or maintain power” (p. 7). People can maintain ideologies about a number of things. These ideologies affect policies. Language ideologies, regulations, and linguistic practices all interact with one another and lead to the creation of language policy. Language ideologies, as noted in Figure 4, can affect policy at a number of levels.
Language policies may vary from the world regional level to the national level, regional level, state or department level, and even down to the classroom level. It is not uncommon for classrooms to have language policy that is markedly different than the language policy at the national level (Kay, 1998; Niven & Jackson, 1998). I am specifically interested in the language ideologies of teachers in Scotland, more specifically as they relate to translingualism, a term that will be defined later in this chapter.

Silverstein (1979) states that language ideologies are “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure or use” (p. 193). He explains that it is essential to consider the ideas speakers have about the value, purpose, and significance of language. While the field of inquiry known as language ideology may be definable, Woolard (1998) adds the caveat that “although efforts have been made recently to delimit language ideology, there is no single
core literature, and there are a number of different emphases” (p. 3). Language ideologies
“enact ties of language to identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology”
(Woolard, 1998, p. 3). In other words, what people believe about language is related to
their worldviews.

Language ideologies are reflected in language attitudes (Garrett, 2010) and thus in
language policies (McGroarty, 2010). Myers-Scotton (2006) explains that attitudes are
“more unconscious assessments” (i.e., affective or visceral reactions to language)
whereas language ideologies are “more constructed assessments” (i.e., rational beliefs
about how language ought to be). The study of language ideologies has taken many
forms. Some have traced language ideologies as they related to gender (Higgins, 2010;
Pavlenko, 2004; Silverstein, 1985). Others have focused on the link between language
ideologies and culture (Kasper & Omori, 2010). I am particularly interested in the
continuum of language ideology that sees a monolingual orientation at one end and
translingualism at the other.

**Linguistic liminality.** As noted above, issues of language contact as they relate to
Gaelic have traditionally invited discussions of Gaelic’s influence on English and the
effect of English on Gaelic. However, as many Gaelic speakers are moving from the
Highlands and Islands (i.e., the Gàidhealtachd) to the Lowland regions, Gaelic has come
into contact with Lowland Scots as well. Scots, as was discussed, has a long history
throughout Scotland, but more recently in the Lowland regions. Therefore, English,
Gaelic, and Scots, Scotland’s three autochthonous languages have been in recent contact
again (Breeze, 2010). In the midst of all this, the GME movement has spread from the
Gàidhealtachd to a number of cities in the region.

Adding to the mélange of the three indigenous languages, cities in Scotland are harbingers of many immigrant communities. Pennycook and Otsuji (2015) use the term metrolinguistics to describe a speaker’s adoption of languages other than their mother tongues in order to assume the identity of their new communities. Many use the term contact zones which Pratt (1991) defines as “social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power such as colonialism, slavery, and their aftermaths” (p. 34).

The term liminality, from the field of anthropology, further adds the notion of being in a transitional state, on the threshold. Specifically, van Gennep (1961) uses the term to refer to rites of passage. As language norms are changing and new registers are emerging, particularly with regard to Gaelic in urban settings (McEwan-Fujita, 2008) and new identities are forming, this term seems fitting. Romaine (2008) explains that “we are crossing a threshold of irreversible loss of species and languages into a fundamentally changed and less diverse world” (p. 1). As liminal can encompass both physical and metaphoric borders, it is an appropriate term for what is currently happening in the Lowland regions, particularly in urban centers. Furthermore, liminal is a term that also captures the essence of languages that are endangered and therefore liminal in existence, as well as languages that are minority or marginalized in nature and therefore liminal in acceptance. Linguistic liminality, therefore, encompasses the dynamic and complex nature of contact zones, includes various types of languages, and focuses on the exchange of languages in real time that occurs through and across languages that are in contact
geographically or not. Linguistic liminality often results practically in translingualism.

**Frameworks of Language**

In order to understand translingualism, it must be positioned in relationship to its counter-ideology, the monolingual orientation. The two ideological stances are not dichotomous in relationship, but rather could be represented on a continuum with translingualism at one end and the monolingual orientation at the other (See Figure 5).

Here I will present an overview of both. Next, I will present an overview of Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of dialogism.

**Monolingual orientation.** Beginning with Aristotle and Plato, the philosophical assumption known as *essentialism* has imbued the western psyche. Janicki (2006) explains that essentialism is “the belief in the existence of one correct meaning of words and in the power of definitions that give us ultimate information about the essence of the things to which the words defined refer” (p. 7). Since the classical age, essentialism has become part and parcel of expressed language ideologies and shaped what Canagarajah (2013a) calls the *monolingual orientation*.

Blommaert and Verschueren (1992) explain that during the Romantic movement, philosopher Johannes Gottfried Herder developed his Heredian triad which saw language, community, and place as being one and the same. In this sense, each language was seen as unique and compartmentalized (Canagarajah, 2013b). As such, various ways of speaking became categorized as monolithic entities.

A rise in literacy saw an increased call for standardization. Woolard (1998) adds that “codified, superposed standard languages are tied not just to writing and its
hegemonic institutions but to specifically European forms of these” (p. 21). This led to a new system of hegemony separating those who spoke and wrote in the standard variety from those who spoke nonstandard or low varieties of the newly standardized languages. Canagarajah (2013b) adds that the Enlightenment, industrialization, nation-state formation, structuralism, and colonization were in direct tension to the notion that “languages are mobile, heterogeneous, and hybrid resources that combine with other semiotic resources to make meaning in context” (p. 23). He continues that the Chomskyan paradigm created false dichotomies and further that Structuralism led to people viewing languages as products as opposed to a means for communication within given contexts.

With new movements toward standardization came forms that were then considered official and eventually gained the status of being more correct (Mooney et al, 2011). This way of thinking became embedded in the western psyche to the point that such dialectics are nearly never questioned today (Milroy, 2007; Thomas, 1991). Even so, society as a whole began to change. Blommaert (2010) and Vertovec (2010), for example, discuss *super-diversity*, the mass migration of peoples with their languages, ethnicities, religions, epistemologies, and races as changing the paradigms of identity. Despite globalization and this new notion of super-diversity, the paradigm of discrete languages, and variation within those languages, still reigns supreme. Many urban settings in Scotland, for example, have seen an increase in immigrants from Southeast Asia and Eastern Europe in recent decades yet in both English medium schools (Shoba,
2010) and GME settings (see Pre-pilot Study in Chapter Three), the monolingual orientation is the norm.

Blommaert (2010) states that “globalization forces sociolinguistics to unthink its classical distinctions and biases and to rethink itself as a sociolinguistics of mobile resources, framed in terms of trans-contextual networks, flows and movements. This unthinking and rethinking is long overdue” (p. 1). Canagarajah’s (2013b) most recent work, challenged mostly for its untested theoretical presumptions (Matsuda, 2014), has likewise called for scholars to begin investigating the language ideology of what he calls monolingualism (i.e., the notion that languages are bounded and separate) and purism (i.e., the notion that languages should remain unchanged or unadulterated despite contact with other languages) (Thomas, 1991). He has proposed, along with Kellman (2000) and Schwarzer, Bloom, and Shomo, (2006), the notion of translingualism to counter the current ideology.

**A translingual ideology.** Jeremiads have been written regarding the dangers of language mixing, and fears that an ostensibly lax language ideology that focuses on function of language over form of language will lead to labile language policy are plenty (e.g., Cheshire, 1998; Weber & Horner, 2012; Zimmer, 2005). Many countries have adopted a formalist language ideology with the monolingual orientation in their national language policies (e.g., L’Académie Française in France, The Icelandic Language Committee in Iceland, La Academia Real in Spain).

Translingualism, a term that has been around for nearly three decades (Scott, 1990), and began to gain greater currency with the works of Kellman (2000) and more
recently with Canagarajah (2013a, 2013b), is an ideology that runs counter to this monolingual orientation. Originally translingualism was defined as “the purposive and artful reproduction within one language . . . of features from another language” (Scott, 1990, p. 75). The focus in this definition, as well as many early definitions of the term, however, was on written texts. Now, however, the term has come to serve as an umbrella that encapsulates any linguistic practices that show the fluid nature of language.

Canagarajah (2013b) explains that while many terms have arisen to explain concepts of switching between languages and registers (e.g., code-switching, code-meshing), they often see the practice as a result of a cleaved mind. The term translingualism, however, sees it as a practice commensurate with the multifarious identities of many people. In other words, the translingual ideology does not see languages as discrete. Speakers may choose to switch between languages, borrow phrase patterns from one language or another (i.e., calque), or borrow words from one language or another for a variety of reasons. Language, as seen from a translingual orientation, is therefore fluid. As Canagarajah (2013b) explains, speakers may float between linguistic spaces while keeping their minds intact. This theory of language further states that “communication transcends individual languages” and that it “transcends words and involves diverse semiotic resources and ecological affordances” (p. 6). Whereas the monolingual orientation focuses on the form of language, the translingual orientation is more concerned with function. In societies where more than one ethnolect or language is used, negotiating for meaning takes many forms. Throughout Scotland, for example, style shifting between Scots and English is common and in urban settings in particular, recent
evidence shows code-switching and calquing between Scottish Gaelic, English, and Scots (Kane, 2014).

It is in these liminal spaces that new communicative practices have emerged. Abby Figueroa (Santa Ana, 2004), a speaker of Spanish and English, confirms this sentiment with her personal experiences. Regarding her usage of both languages she states “at the very least it helps me express myself more precisely. A larger vocabulary, dozens more idioms, más chistes [more jokes], all this and more makes my world more colorful” (Santa Ana, 2004, p. 284).

The ideology in which languages are seen as fluid and not limited to space or time is sometimes referred to as Language Validity Ideology (Payne, 2010). This descriptivist orientation emphasizes and validates vernacular language as a meaningful, albeit unquantifiable, means of communication. Harris (2009) has been a chief proponent in deconstructing monolingual orientations of language ideology. Bakhtin (1981), Gee (2012) Pennycook (1990), Butler (1990) Hymes (1972), and de Certeau (1984) have all emphasized the communicative nature of language.

Canagarajah’s (2013a, 2013b) works offer both detailed explanations of this new theory as well as suggestions for their use in classroom practice and literacy. He makes a call for more research into ideologies of translingualism. Matsuda (2014), while he sees some of the benefits to a translingual approach to language ideologies, challenges the fervor with which many have implemented translingual writing. He, along with Canagarajah (2013b) himself, calls for continued research in this area.
The continuum of language ideologies with regard to how language is defined ranges from linguistic purism to translingualism. It might be said that linguistic purism focuses on language structure while translingualism sees language as embedded in social norms. While the landscape of language ideologies is changing, researchers are varied as to their opinions (Figure 5).

![Figure 5. Continuum of language ideologies.](image)

Many linguists have been trying to stretch the monolingual orientation paradigm to make more sense of these cross-language relations; Blommaert (Mutsaers & Swanenberg, 2012), for example, discusses *superdiversity*, “a new concept that jettisons the rather rigid toolkit of speech communities, ethnolects and mother tongues in favour of notions of truncated repertoires and resources that better capture the plurality of styles, registers and genres of people living in a globalized world.” Jørgensen (2008) adopts *poly-lingual languaging* to discuss the transitioning between languages while Pennycook and Otsuji (2015) refer to the adoption of new languages in urban communities as *metrolinguistics*. 
All of these terms are attempts to problematize the dominant language ideology that flows from the Herderian tripartite, the idea that one language is tantamount to one culture and one place (Canagarjah, 2013a). Canagarjah (2013a), however, takes a more postmodern approach in his development of the idea of translingualism. This term, he argues views languages not as monolithic entities that are separate, but rather as codes which can be meshed, borrowed, and overlapping. Whereas previous models and explanations within the paradigm of the monolingual orientation saw language mixing as interferences or the result of a “cleaved mind,” the notion of translingualism sees such practice as intentional and a natural communicative function of the human mind (Canagarajah, 2013a, p. 6).

Sayer (2008), focusing on the communicative nature of language, states, “from a sociolinguistic perspective, languages don’t ‘get corrupted’; they simply change” (p. 96). Filmer (2003) adds that “languages are social constructs, constantly in flux, not unchanging monolithic entities” (p. 257). Some like Kachru (1989) and Jenkins (2010) have straddled the fence arguing for a discussion and validation of varieties within languages like English (e.g., Singlish, Scottish English). This puts them closer to a communicative orientation leaning toward a translingual ideology of language. Bakhtin (1981) likewise noted the importance of communication over structure with regard to language, though he never denounced discrete language categorization. Matsuda (2014) has a leaning toward a translingual understanding of language, though he argues that this is a theory in need of research. Figure 5 has been provided to facilitate and understanding of the contrast between the monolingual orientation and the translingual
orientation. Rather than being a dichotomy, it is more accurately represented as a continuum. While someone might adhere to a more monolingual orientation in one area (e.g., phonology) they may be more translingual in orientation in other areas.

**Dialogism.** Bakhtinian understanding of language and second language acquisition sees communication as dynamic and context-dependent. In this theoretical paradigm, language is not only seen in relationship to its practical use in social interaction, but in its relationship to past speech acts and future speech acts. Swain and Deters (2007) add that the “dialogic perspective creates a greater space for human agency” (p. 829).

Canagarajah (2004) explains that “what motivates the learning of a language is the construction of the identities we desire and the communities we want to join in order to engage in communication and social life” (p. 117). This is relevant to my study as it is positioned in a sociocultural context in which more a number of language, cultural, and ethnic minority groups are coming together in a rich context of linguistic diversity and oppression. It is therefore important to consider how the teachers at my research site are navigating a situation in which many of the students are beginning to take ownership of the language through mixing the various cultural and linguistic components from their own lived experiences.

**Frameworks of Teachers’ Language Ideologies**

**Conscientization.** Paolo Freire’s (1970) work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, advocated for education to be a means to support indigenous, minority, and oppressed groups. He (1974) later expounded on this idea with a concept known conscientization, or
critical consciousness. Kincheloe (2008) defines conscientization as “[involving] the development of new forms of understanding that connect us more directly to understanding, empathizing with, and acting to alleviate suffering” (p. 13). This suffering could take many forms.

Freire’s (1970) work, though born in the context of a post-colonial Brazilian society, has been adapted as a framework for educators and teacher educators the world over. Teachers have the role of leading this social transformation. One of their goals should be to increase students’ awareness of historical and current systems of oppression (Kubota, 2004). A deep understanding of legacies of privilege and oppression are central to critical consciousness. In the context of urban settings in Scotland, there is more than one oppressed language group. I am interested in how GME teachers account for the representation of these multiple identities and realities in the language itself. Their reflection on, and furthermore their reaction to, historical power struggles involves conscientization. Their considerations of the relationship of these struggles to language is understood through the lens of Critical Applied Linguistics.

**Critical applied linguistics.** Language Awareness (LA), as Fairclough (2013) explains developed in the 1980s in order to consider relationships of power and language, specifically in educational settings. He argues, however, that LA was naïve in that, while it emphasized the need for the development of social capital in students through language development, it failed to recognize social inequality of students’ social and economic status that could a focus on linguistic ability could not fix. Fairclough (2013) argued that Critical Language Awareness (CLA) placed the student’s real life context at the heart of
language teaching and learning.

Pennycook’s (2010a) closely related concept of Critical Applied Linguistics (CAL) also emphasizes the need to consider power and language relationships with language students. The goal is to consider social and political aspects of language. Pennycook continues that CAL is more than simply mixing notions of critical theory and applied linguistics. It is a call to questioning embedded ideological assumptions as they relate to identity, culture, gender, and so on. He adds that this is something that has been lacking from traditional language classrooms. In my study, I am interested in teachers’ ideologies and how they view the agency and liberty that students take with Gaelic.

**Synthesis of Relevant Research**

For this literature review, I began by searching in the following databases: JStor, Language and Linguistics Behavior Abstracts (LLBA), and ERIC. I specifically looked for the term *translingualism*. The search produced only eight results, the majority pertaining to translingualism in literacy rather than oracy. At that point, I began to expand my search by looking for research articles under the identifier *language ideologies* in general. While this search produced more results, the majority of these research articles involved language ideologies as they related to gender, bilingualism, and multilingualism, for example, rather than the notions of translingualism and the monolingual orientation.

I then searched specifically for the terms *language ideologies* and *Scotland* together. Here I was able to find research related to language planning, policy, and revitalization of Scottish Gaelic, as well as an article focusing on a Scots dialect;
however, my overall literature search produced no research related to language ideologies of translingualism or cross-linguistic phenomena.

Finally, in order to keep abreast of the most current applications of terms, as well as instantiations of translingualism in the Scottish Gaelic and Gaelic Medium Education contexts, I used Google, basic search and alerts, to find up-to-date newspapers, journals, and blogs from related online forums and social media groups. Language is not static and is in constant development; it is for this reason that I am also including more contemporary sources to inform the most recent applications and uses of vocabulary available. I am also a member of a number of online forums and Facebook groups that deal with issues of RLS, GME, endangered languages, the Scots language in education, language policy, language ideologies, and translingualism. Members of these sites occasionally engage in wikis that collate references and bibliographies related to these topics. Engaging in scholarly exchanges has allowed me to immerse myself in actual trends relating to dialectal changes and topics of translingualism occurring within Gaelic-speaking communities.

**Second language acquisition.** While a plethora of research studies exist with regard to SLA including several that focus on SLA in the Gaelic context (e.g., McEwan-Fujita, 2010a), my search found none that discussed teachers’ perceptions of second language acquisition within GME. A phenomenological study conducted by Cammarata and Tedick (2012), however, sheds some light on the difficulties teachers face in their attempts to balance content and language instruction in immersive environments. The findings of this study, which were derived by analyzing interviews and “lived experience
descriptions” or journal entries of three teachers in immersion school settings, suggest that the teachers struggled in a number of areas.

For example, as teachers are certified in a content area and not in language, many of the teachers did not initially see value in focusing on the language they used as much as the subject area they teach. Another difficulty teachers faced was being afforded the proper resources and support, including accountability for language acquisition in the classroom. Some teachers also discussed the isolation felt in immersion settings. Having to collaborate as needed in their content areas left them little time to discuss language issues. The focus was on keeping up with English medium schools in their context with regard to their content areas. Finally, teachers expressed the feeling that they are taking a “stab in the dark” when it comes to knowing which language points to focus on when teaching in their subject areas (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012, p. 261). The teachers called for support in balancing content and language in immersion settings. This study highlights the need for teachers to have language support in SLA within immersion contexts.

Another study conducted by Swain (1985) challenged the common assumption proposed by Krashen (1985) that input is the most important determinant for successful second language acquisition. In other words, students need to process comprehensible written and oral messages in order to become active users of the L2. However, as Swain’s (1985) work showed, interaction and output are as essential. Specifically, she worked with students in a French immersion school. She compared their performance on written and spoken tasks with that of French L1 students of the same age category. The French
L1 students performed higher showing that students need opportunities to take risks, not only in scholastic settings, but in a variety of contexts. Ortega (2009) explains that Swain’s (1985) study concluded that the “missing element in this school immersion context was sufficient opportunities for the children to actually use the language in meaningful ways, through speaking and writing” (p. 62).

With regard to phonemic awareness and phonemic production among students in GME, some research has been conducted. Nance (2014) for example, compared production of the lateral /l/ among older speakers in the Gàidhealtachd, middle-aged speakers from the Gàidhealtachd but living in an urban setting in Scotland, and GME students in both the Gàidhealtachd and an urban setting. Her findings suggest that younger speakers produce a fewer number of lateral variants and that L1 interference may account for some of this. She further suggests that the variation among younger students in GME may represent a change in progress that may be accelerated given the status of the Gaelic language. While this study speaks to phonetic variations within Gaelic, it does not discuss the specific role of teachers in GME settings and their ideologies with regard to such change.

Studies regarding the affective domain in the field of SLA have been well documented (Gass, 2013; Ortega, 2009). A student’s affect involves his or her emotional response to language learning as opposed to their cognitive processes or aptitude. Affect could include responses such as culture shock, language shock, anxiety and social distance, for example (Gass, 2013). One study conducted by Guiora, Brannon, and Dull (1972) consisted of 411 participants all of whom were studying foreign languages at the
Defense Language Institute. The study first tested students level of empathy using quantitative tools such as the Micro-Momentary Expression Test (MME). Three months later, the participants were given the Authenticity of Pronunciation (AP) test to measure their ability to mimic native speakers in pronunciation activities. The researchers found a positive correlation between participants’ levels of empathy and their ability to “authentically pronounce a second language” (p. 111). While this study considers students’ empathy with regard to learning a second language, I was unable to find any studies relating to empathy and second language teaching.

Language attitudes. Many studies have been conducted regarding language attitudes in general (Garrett, 2010; Meyerhoff, 2011; Payne, 2010; Trudgill, 1990). Evaluating peoples’ visceral responses to language varieties has been an area of continued research across the globe (Myers-Scotton, 2006). Attitudes of the Scottish people toward Scottish Gaelic have even been considered. In MacKinnon’s (1981) study, for example, most non-Gaelic speaking citizens of Scotland who were surveyed, had positive views of the Gaelic language. Ronneburg (2000) has also considered language attitudes toward the Scots language, specifically the Glaswegian dialect.

While dialects of Scottish Gaelic have been investigated and catalogued (e.g., Dorian, 1981; Robertson, 1908), and registers have even been identified (McEwan-Fujita, 2008), there has been no research specifically cataloguing teachers’ attitudes toward the Gaelic language. One question on MacKinnon’s (1981) survey does ask average citizens about their attitudes toward providing education in Scottish Gaelic throughout the
country. The overall survey found that most citizens had positive attitudes toward Gaelic and Gaelic Medium Education.

Links between Scottish Gaelic and education have been discussed (Nicolson & MacIver, 2003), as well as the links between Scots and education (Niven & Jackson, 1998; Shoba, 2010); however, my literature searches have produced no results with regard to research of Scottish teachers’ language attitudes. As issues of language ideologies affect language attitudes and language attitudes affect language policy, there is a definite need for this type of research within Scottish educational settings. Furthermore, there is a need to consider language ideologies behind such language attitudes.

**Language ideologies.** Some research has been done with regard to language ideologies within Scotland with an emphasis on communicative practice. McEwan-Fujita (2008), for example, found that as more Gaelic speakers have moved to the city, and are thus working with and around English and Scots speakers, new varieties and registers of Gaelic have emerged. Though many Gaelic speakers in her study do not see this as problematic, the push for linguistic purism in reversing language shift has remained constant (Mitchell, 1992). Martin-Jones, Hughes, and Williams’ (2009) study with the Welsh language, also a minority Celtic language, similarly shows how people’s changing lives in Wales, from a traditional agrarian to a more globalized lifestyle, require new language ideologies. Shoba (2010) noted the language attitudes of teachers, students, and parents after introducing a unit in Scots at one school. Participants saw Scots as a debased variety of English rather than a valid communicative form.
One study, conducted by McLeod and O’Rourke (2015) investigated “new speakers” of Gaelic and their perceptions of linguistic authenticity (p. 155). In other words, their research explored the extent to which new speakers, defined as separate from “learners” in that they did not grow up with the language but have acquired some level of proficiency for the active use of the language in their daily lives, believe there is a need to mimic or attain a variant of Gaelic that is comparable to that of native speakers. The findings from a series of interviews and focus groups suggest that new speakers often adhere to a purist view of language in which “good Gaelic . . . doesn’t use too many loans from English and . . . uses Gaelic idioms and Gaelic words (p. 165). Furthermore, most new speakers believe that the standard form of Gaelic should be connected to the Gàidhealtachd. These findings are in line with Canagarajah’s (2013b) monolingual orientation.

**Language mixing.** Scotland’s population, just shy of five and a half million, is largely concentrated in a few cities (e.g., Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen) (National Records of Scotland, 2012). Gaelic speakers have recently been moving from the Gàidhealtachd to these urban centers in order to find jobs. As a result, the demand for GME has increased (MacLeod, 2003). As Scotland’s three autochthonous languages continue to be in contact with one another, new dialects and registers are forming (McEwan-Fujita, 2008; Nance & Stuart-Smith, 2013; Kane, 2014). This phenomenon could have effects on policy in education as citizens, teachers, and policy-makers alike have varying language attitudes and ideologies. At the heart of my research is the language ideologies of teachers.
Some research has been done with regard to code-switching patterns of Gaelic speakers in Nova Scotia. Mertz (1982) describes a break in intergenerational transmission with many using English as the base language while employing some Gaelic words and greetings on occasion. Nevertheless, research regarding code-switching among GME students and teachers’ validation of such practices is lacking.

Native speakerism. Recent articles have asserted the theory of native speakerism; this concept dichotomizes language speakers, and therefore teachers, with the labels “native speaker” and “non-native speaker” (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Pennycook, 1994). Those who are declared native English speakers, are granted more prestige; those who are defined as non-native speakers are often the recipients of discrimination (Canagarajah, 2012; Holliday & Aboshiha, 2009; Phillipson, 1992). Holliday and Aboshiha (2009) call for a more postmodern research paradigm that considers “unspoken discourses” (p. 669).

A number of studies have been done that problematize this dichotomy (e.g., Davies, 2003; Kachru, 1990; Phillipson, 1992; Singh, 1998). Nonetheless, O’Rourke and Ramallo (2011) explain that little attention has been paid in the literature to discussing the dichotomy in minority or endangered language contexts. They explore the use of the terms native speaker and non-native speaker in Irish and Galician. Their study suggests that the terms are typically associated with specific geographic locations. For example, they explain that in the case of Irish, the term native speaker was used to refer only to Irish speakers who were from remote coastal areas in the southern, western, and northwestern regions of Ireland. They conclude that such dichotomies are not helpful as new speakers of the languages play an important role in revitalizing them and terms like
native speaker and non-native speaker are both ambiguous and no longer appropriate.

In the context of Scottish Gaelic, the concept of native speaker has been touched upon in the literature (e.g., Dorian, 1981) but treated more fully by MacCaluim (2007). He discusses the complexities of the term itself and then further explains the relationship between those usually given the title of native speaker and learners of the language. For example, he explains that typically, the term has been reserved for those who grew up in the Gàidhealtachd speaking only Gaelic or Gaelic and English from birth. Nonetheless, he adds that the term involves some ambiguity as many speakers of Gaelic are now growing up in cities speaking both Gaelic and English.

MacCaluim (2007) continues that in these contexts often one or both parents are from the Gàidhealtachd, but due to an overreliance on GME to transfer knowledge of Gaelic to their children, these speakers are growing up with limited registers and fluency in the language. Finally, he explains the relationship between those who are usually called native speakers and Gaelic learners. One of the difficulties, he shows, is that Gaelic learners usually see native speakers as falling into one of two categories: native speakers who are unhelpful, discriminatory, or lacking in empathy and native speakers who are either anti-learner or anti-Gaelic. In other words, many Gaelic learners report finding it difficult to practice the language with those considered native speakers. They perceive that their lack of native-like pronunciation and full competence in the language causes native speakers to revert to English for communication. Others claim that native speakers believe there to be a distance between native speakers and learners in terms of identity and sociocultural positioning. As a result, they consider all learners to be
outsiders or outgroup.

**Need for Further Research**

Despite the call from Blommaert (2010) and Canagarajah (2013b), there is still a dearth of research regarding the notion of language ideologies in general. While some work has been done in the field of language ideologies, such as that of Silverstein (1979), Woolard and Schieffelin (1994), Dorian (1998), Woolard (1998), Holliday and Aboshiha (2009), and Payne (2010), it has been largely theoretical and has still focused on issues of language ideology relating to power and gender or prejudice and native speakerism, for example, without necessarily challenging the basic assumptions of what constitutes a language. Furthermore, these proposals have largely focused on ideologies within the realm of English dominant and western societies.

Many have recently been working on the revitalization of Scotland’s oldest living language, Scottish Gaelic (MacCaluim, 2007; Mitchell, 1992). Some have even focused their attention on the role of teachers in the process of this reversing language shift (RLS) (Mitchell, 1992; MacLeod, 2003; Murray & Morrison, 1984; Nicolson & MacIver, 2003). Despite its controversy, some have even looked at the role of Scots in education (McClure, 1998; Shoba, 2010). After having searched various databases (e.g., LLBA, JStor, Amazon.com) and libraries, there appears to be no existing literature that investigates language ideologies of teachers in Scotland with regard to Canagarajah’s (2013b) discussed theory of translingualism. Furthermore, as some work has been done with regard to language mixing within the region recently, specific research regarding
teachers’ language ideologies about such practices in Scotland is timely (Nance & Stuart-Smith, 2013; Kane, 2014).

**Language Policy**

Language policy, what McGroarty (1998) defines as “the sum of decisions about and practices related to language,” is affected by a number of factors. Shohamy (2006) and Spolsky (2009) enumerate three such areas that have come to bear on language policy: linguistic practices; official, and often unofficial, regulations regarding language; and language ideologies. It must be mentioned, however, that each of these works to mutually affect the other (Figure 2). It is the last of these that has become central to my research. Shannon (1999) explains that when language policy is absent, “teachers rely on language ideology to make sense of their practice” (p. 172).

**Chapter Summary**

In this chapter, I have presented a discussion of language shift and RLS giving a historical background of the languages of Scotland. Next, I have positioned my research within the field of educational linguistics. I then provided some guiding frameworks for my study; specifically, I gave both a background of translingualism and dialogism as well as conscientization and critical applied linguistics. Finally, I have presented a synthesis of research that relates to mine.

Scotland is home to three autochthonous languages: Scottish Gaelic, Scots, and English. Though Gaelic is endangered and Scots considered a nonstandard language, all three maintain official status. Furthermore, all three have some use in education though Gaelic and Scots have been marginalized in this regard. Little research exists with regard
to ideologies and attitudes toward these three languages and there is currently no available literature with regard to teachers’ language attitudes or language ideologies as they pertain to these languages.

Within the dialectic of language attitudes and ideologies, an overarching language ideology, that Canagarajah (2013a) refers to as a monolingual orientation, is predominant. This paradigm sees languages as having “their own unique systems and [holds that] they should be kept free of mixing with other languages for meaningful communication” (Canagarajah, 2013a, p. 1). Though linguists have long since recognized that communicative practice is multimodal, and often absorbs structures, words, and practices from other languages, this monolingual orientation, Canagarajah (2013a) argues, has kept us from having deeper discussions about the linguistic competence of speakers in liminal spaces (e.g., borderlands, language contact zones). With an increase in technology and migration, these spaces are no longer strictly geographic.

As Scottish Gaelic, Scots, and English remain in constant contact, especially in urban centers, and there is a current revitalization effort in process with regard to GME, there is a need for more research with regard to teachers’ language ideologies. Canagarajah (2013a, 2013b) and Blommaert (2010) also echo the need for more research regarding translingual practice in liminal spaces. My goal is that this research will address important aspects of these translingual practices.
Chapter Three

In this chapter, I outline how I conducted my research. I first position myself as a researcher in terms of background and epistemological stance. Next, I give the background for my study, which includes discussions of a preliminary pre-pilot study and a pilot study I had previously conducted. Then, I explain how the site and participants were chosen for this study. Next, I delineate how I specifically collected and analyzed my data. Then, I discuss the efforts I made to ensure ethics, quality, and validity for my study. Finally, I explain the boundaries and limitations of my study. The following questions guided the:

1. What are the language ideologies, related to translingualism, of teachers in a GME school in a linguistically liminal setting?
2. What do those teachers believe are key elements of second language acquisition in such a context?

As teachers construct their own language ideologies, my goal was to understand their lived experiences and subjective perspectives. Furthermore, in order to better understand their beliefs about second language acquisition in their given context, observation was essential. As language ideologies are personally constructed, I used a qualitative approach to understand teachers’ language ideologies with regard to translingualism and their beliefs about core elements of second language acquisition in a
linguistically liminal setting. The primary data source for this study were focused, semi-structured interviews. Researcher memos and field notes were also used to gain a more holistic understanding of the teachers’ language ideologies, as well as the school setting in general.

**Researcher Identity**

I have also spent a great deal of time learning Gaelic, as well as engaging in and with the Gaelic language and culture. As my mother is from the Gàidhealtachd, I have traveled extensively there to visit my family and friends. I also took a short course at SMO, the world’s only Gaelic medium institution of higher education. Although my background and interactions have given me some insider insight to the Gaelic culture, it is essential to note that I am not a native speaker nor had I previously had any direct experiences with GME in the k-12 setting.

I have been engaged in language study for over two decades and spent over a decade in the classroom teaching languages (i.e., Spanish, Latin, ASL, ESL, and French), as well as linguistics. As a result, I have thought a great deal about the issues of SLA and language pedagogy/andragogy. Furthermore, I have generally taken a constructivist approach in my teaching of languages and other subjects. As a teacher, my aim has always been to maintain a student-centered approach that involved an inductive methodology. Although I believe direct instruction of grammar is still essential, I believe in a strong emphasis on language in use in which “learners extract regularities” (Gass, 2013, p. 272). For example, rather than teaching my students all the declensions of Latin nouns up front, I believe it is more beneficial to offer examples and have students derive
rules when possible. This can be beneficial when introducing new information and in assessing students (e.g., Blaz, 1999, pp. 55-56).

Furthermore, I have spent many years immersing myself in the literature of critical theory (Stake, 1995). Much of my research and advocacy have centered on social justice. For example, I have previously explored the importance of language human rights and advocating for the use of minority languages in official contexts. Moreover, I believe there is an inextricable link between language and power; in other words, there is a need for oppressed language groups to assert their identities and have their languages, or dialects as the case may be, validated. Although my research and practice have been greatly influenced by both constructivism and critical theory, in my research, I take an epistemological stance Berger and Luckman (1966) refer to as social constructivism.

While positivism maintains that notion that “there is only one fully correct way in which knowledge can be divided up” (Lakoff, 1987, p. 265), and post-positivism holds that social realities can be studied and analyzed much like the natural world, free of value and with cause and effect relationships (Maxwell, 2013; Mertens, 2005), social constructivism, a branch of constructivism, asserts the socially constructed nature of reality (Berger & Luckman 1966). Social constructivism may be further divided into two forms. The strong form is often referred to as radical social constructivism (Burr, 2015) and a weak form known as realist social constructionism (Elder-Vass, 2012). Ultimately, however, the social constructivist believes the social world is constructed and cannot be separated from its embeddedness in a unique, complex social setting (Burr, 2015). Guba (1990) adds that methodologically, the constructivist works at “depicting individual
constructions as accurately as possible” (p.26). While I believe that the material world exists independent of our thinking, I also believe, and for the purposes of this study, that social realities can only be understood in light of social contexts. It is essential, therefore, to explore the social settings in which the research takes place; it is also necessary to understand the historical, political, and cultural backgrounds that underlie the research site.

Rather than reporting objective findings as absolute, I worked to present participants’ interpretations of their specific case (Charmaz, 2011; Guba 1990). Given the highly personal nature of the participants’ knowledge construction, it was important for them to share their own stories, identities, and ideological stances. Furthermore, it was essential for me to understand my own biases and perceptions and how these may affect my interpretation of the participants’ experiences. Charmaz emphasizes the need to constantly consider ways in which my background, experiences, and positions, as well as those of the participants, may affect the data. In order to compensate for that, I kept detailed researcher memos before, during, and after every phase of data collection and data analysis.

Research Design

As my study investigated the beliefs of teachers in a complex social setting, I chose to conduct a qualitative case study. Case study is often used to describe and explore situations and events. Through detailed investigation, the case study researcher usually seeks to answer questions such as how, why, or what (Yin, 2009). The unit of analysis is established and the boundaries are set.
Given my stance as a social constructivist conducting case study research, I drew primarily from the works of Robert E. Stake (1995, 2006). Stake (2006) explains that while research questions need to be formulated in order to guide the study, “too much emphasis on original research questions and contexts can distract researchers from recognizing new issues when they emerge” (p. 13). He adds that in the end some questions may “have dropped out, some may have evolved, and some new questions may have become important enough to deserve review” (p. 14). In my specific case, the unit of analysis was GME teachers’ language ideologies. My second question originally dealt with the interface between the participants’ stated language ideologies and their teaching practice. However, while observing this relationship between participants’ ideologies and practice, I was able to ask more probing questions about how they felt when there was a contradiction between the two. In other words, the second research question was able to be rolled into the first research question. Furthermore, observations suggested a much more prevalent discussion of the participants’ beliefs about second language acquisition as it pertained to their specific setting. Therefore, I formally changed my second research question to focus on this.

Following a social constructivist paradigm, I hoped to answer my research questions while also considering potential data that may emerge in the given context. In other words, I believed it was important to be prepared for new or unrelated themes that may land outside of previous theories but nevertheless expected the participants to hold to more traditional monolingual language ideologies. This preconception was formed by the literature, calls for research that mentioned the need to challenge the typical
monolingual orientation, and a pre-pilot study and pilot study that I conducted previously. Here I present a brief overview of those studies.

**Pre-pilot Study**

Last year, I began my research into GME. For my first study, which I will refer to as my pre-pilot study, I interviewed three teachers from various GME settings throughout Scotland. Using semi-structured, focused interviews, I sought to explore the concepts of conscientization and second language acquisition of GME teachers. As GME is a unique case with very few urban immersion schools in existence, finding participants proved challenging. I began by contacting friends who I knew within GME. For example, I contacted my former Gaelic teacher from Sabhal Mòr Ostaig to enlist her help. I also reached out to GME teachers on social networking sites such as Linkedin and Facebook. Eventually, an administrator of a Facebook group devoted to GME served as a de facto gatekeeper for the study. After I emailed her requesting that she personally post my call for participants, she asked my permission to send it to all the GME teachers in Scotland as she was also a listserv administrator. This availed me of a number of participants.

For the purposes of that qualitative study, I chose to interview the first three to respond to my call for participants. The only criterion was that they be currently employed GME teachers. One of the participants, who was donned the pseudonym Dòmhnall, was a non-native speaker of Gaelic who taught primary grades in a GME school near a major metropolis area. Seònaid, the second participant, was a primary school teacher and ceannard, or headmistress, in the Hebrides Islands spent some time
working between two rural GME schools. My third participant, Ealasaid, worked primarily as a ceannard in a large GME school in an urban setting.

Given the limitations of time and financial resources, I conducted all of the interviews via Skype. My primary research interest for the study was to explore GME teachers’ conscientization, or critical consciousness, as well as their understanding of current SLA research. The themes that emerged from that study were as follows: language is related to cultural identity, language is related to power, language shift is negative, language learning requires agency, and GME offers hope for the language’s vitality.

From this pre-pilot study, I became more interested in teachers’ language ideologies as they related to language contact. More specifically, I was interested in how teachers perceived the role of English, a dominant language, and Scots, another minority language within Scotland, in their own language revitalization efforts. This planted the seed for what would eventually become my pilot study.

During the pre-pilot study, my third participant, Eilidh, noted the unique nature of her setting. It was in an urban community where her students, the majority of them not speaking Gaelic as their mother tongue, were in regular contact with English, Scots, and other languages. Given my interest in language contact, language ideologies, and second language acquisition, especially in linguistically liminal settings, I knew this would be a prime setting for my dissertation research. In the process of what Reybold, Lammert, and Stribling (2013) call “thinking forward” about my potential research trajectory, and knowing my personal, professional, and research goals, I decided that I needed to
maintain the relationship with this teacher as she could serve as a gatekeeper to this site and other participants. We developed rapport that would prove invaluable as I began considering research sites for my dissertation. It was then that I began to consider specific research questions and methods for my dissertation study.

**Pilot Study**

While trying to find participants for the pre-pilot study, I was able to secure a number of contacts. In order to pilot my methods for this current study, I contacted one teacher who lived in a rural community within the Gàidhealtachd, or traditionally Gaelic speaking region of Scotland, where GME has its roots. This afforded me the opportunity to pilot my interview protocol in particular. I believed this would give me the opportunity to conduct a qualitative case study that was both intrinsic, or focused on the participant himself, as well as instrumental in that I would be able to pilot my methods and potentially do a cross case study (Stake, 1995, 2006).

My pilot study, like my pre-pilot study, consisted solely of a semi-structured, focused interview. My participant, who I refer to as Stìúbhart, is a GME teacher in the Hebrides Islands. This interview, as I will explain, allowed me to understand my participant’s stated language ideologies, as well as consider his own language use. Findings suggested that his language ideologies vary between a monolingual orientation and a translingual orientation in both theory and practice. For instance, he had no problem with students changing the language from the inside (e.g., borrowing English turns of phrase) but suggested at other points that students are unable to fully express themselves in pure Gaelic. In practice, he explained that it was a constant battle to keep
students from mixing in English. On the other hand, he explained that in some instances one language may be more suited to expressing a certain idea or concept.

During the pilot study Stiùbhart informed me that although those in the Gàidhealtachd share both a national identity and a history of language oppression with speakers of Scots, Gaelic speakers from the Highlands share a closer connection with Norse history and culture than with Scots. Therefore, the interview questions dealing with the influence of Scots on urban Gaelic that would apply to this current study did not apply for my pilot study.

Furthermore, my original interview questions focused on lexical and semantic items of language. During the pilot study, however, my participant discussed phonological issues. He expressed a somewhat neutral ideological stance toward students speaking Gaelic with non-native accents whereas he was less accepting of code-switching. Since my pilot study, an article has also appeared in an online newspaper regarding a new dialect of urban Gaelic being spoken with a Scots accent and with some instances of calquing from Scottish English and Scots (Kane, 2014). As a result, I adjusted my interview for this current study. The current interview protocol includes questions that deal specifically with phonological issues as noted in newly forming dialects of urban Gaelic. This would include teachers’ perceptions and ideologies regarding students speaking Scottish Gaelic with nontraditional accents such as a Lowland Scots accent.

Both my pre-pilot and pilot study helped me better understand the background for my current study. I gained a better understanding of the context of GME, the
sociopolitical backdrop, and linguistic concerns that were pertinent, or in other cases not vital. I was also able to build rapport with who would eventually become my dissertation site gatekeeper. Kezar (2000) explains that pilot studies are often useful in helping to “enhance research design, conceptualization, interpretation of findings, and ultimately results” (p. 385).

Although both studies were beneficial in understanding the backdrop, I became aware that a first-hand experience would enrich any data. By being on site I would be able to see how stated language ideologies would manifest themselves, or not, in classroom instruction. Also, I was also able to revise my interview protocol. Next, interviewing participants in both rural and urban settings I was able to understand some basic issues germane to the discussion of RLS in Gaelic specifically. For example, as I discovered in my pilot study, in trying to create a more standard Gaelic for the purposes of education, several new words have emerged, often creating a disconnect between older speakers and younger speakers and speakers from the Gàidhealtachd and speakers from the rest of Scotland.

**Site Selection**

Eilidh, one of the participants in my pre-pilot study introduced me to her setting, one that was linguistically liminal, urban, and unique. This site, in contrast with the site discussed in my pilot study with Stiùbhart, gave me a better understanding of the specific language ideologies in an urban setting and allowed for future cross-case analysis between the birthplace of GME and a context with super-diversity (i.e., overlapping
cultures and diversity within diversity caused by modern increases in migration and globalization) (Blommaert, 2010).

The vision of the Eilidh’s school is explicitly to help maintain and revitalize the Gaelic culture and language. All class subjects are taught through the medium of Gaelic and every effort is made to use Gaelic in every sphere of the school (e.g., dining hall, classrooms, office). Signs throughout the school use both English and Gaelic; Gaelic, however, is given preference and is always used first. The school is also unusual in that it offers GME from primary through secondary school.

Since my pre-pilot study, I maintained contact with Eilidh, the head teacher of the school. We exchanged emails and phone calls and she kept me abreast of the progress of the school. Last year, I approached her and requested permission to conduct research on site. She served as my gatekeeper and granted me one month to be on site at the school and, given the unique status of the school, the tenuous nature of language revitalization, and the historical and political backdrops of Scotland, asked that I furthermore be respectful of both the site and the teachers. She also asked that I allow the teachers at least one week to be with the students at the beginning of the scholastic year before I come.

I then secured the appropriate permissions to conduct research at the school. This included securing an IRB from George Mason University as well as obtaining authorization via email from the local school council in Scotland. Such authorization required that I provide a criminal background check and share my proposal of study for their review. Upon review, they asked that I make some slight changes to my interview
protocol (e.g., removing questions about specific ages) as to further anonymize the participants. After addressing their concerns, I was given permission to begin my study.

The school itself is set in a postindustrial part of a major city, which I call Bailteil (i.e., urban in Gaelic) in Scotland. It is not far from a major train station, and a number of bus routes have regular stops near the school making it accessible to students from throughout the metropolitan area. Located a short walking distance from the school, which I have given the pseudonym “Bailteil School,” is a large and thriving university with students from across the globe.

The neighborhood in which the school lies is heavily populated and made up of a number of old red and blonde sandstone tenement houses that stretch whole city blocks. The architecture in nearby neighborhoods ranges from Edwardian and Georgian to Postmodern. There are a number of shops, restaurants, cafes, bars, and pubs lining parallel streets. They offer foods ranging from authentic Indian cuisine and Japanese sushi to fish and chip platters. Within blocks of Bailteil School are a number of houses of worship including a Buddhist temple, a Presbyterian church, and a Sikh temple, further showing the cultural, ethnic, and religious diversity represented in this context.

The school, like many buildings in the neighborhood is several stories tall. It houses around 500 students from ages 3-18. The only signage outside of the school lists the name of the school first in Gaelic and then in English. The school is equipped with a full-sized soccer pitch, a gymnasium, a cafeteria, and an auditorium. As the student population is quite large, there are slightly under 100 members of ancillary, administrative, and teaching staff.
**Participants**

In my pre-pilot study, I interviewed Gaelic medium teachers about their general experiences in GME, their understanding of SLA theory and CLA, and their perspectives on language revitalization. My only criterion for participants for that study was that they be Gaelic medium teachers. As the GME movement is small, representing fewer than 2% of Scotland’s nearly 700,000 students (The Scottish Government, 2014), so was my participant pool. Next, I conducted a pilot of my methods with one GME teacher from the Hebrides Islands. The selection criterion for the participant for that study was also that he or she be a GME teacher in Scotland.

Despite the large number of teaching staff at Bailteil School in comparison with other GME schools throughout Scotland, I limited the number of participants by using criterion-based selection. I wanted a cross sample of participants that would allow me to get a multiplicity of perspectives. I chose a site and participants using criterion-based selection (Patton, 2015). Furthermore, the participants came about through emergent selection (Patton, 2015; Reybold, Lammert, & Stribling, 2013). Patton (2015) explains that this involves “adding to a sample to take advantage of unforeseen opportunities after fieldwork has begun” (p. 240). Flyvbjerg (2006) explains, “Context-dependent knowledge and experience are at the very heart of expert activity” (p. 222).

Reybold, Lammert, and Stribling (2013) explain “purposeful selection is the best strategy to obtain ‘information-rich’ cases” (p. 702). Stake (1995) adds that the goal of case study research is not generalization but rather, like ethnographic research, it is particularization. Therefore, I spent my first week on site visiting classrooms, the
cafeteria, the playground, and the staff room. It was the easiest to have deeper conversations with the teachers during short coffee breaks and lunch breaks in the staff room. During that time, I was able to get to know most of the teachers on a personal level and build strong, comfortable rapport. Many teachers were interested in getting to know more about “American culture,” as well as my family and interests. I, likewise, got to know about their personal lives and passions. These discussions were very natural and one teacher even added that I was “like one of them.” She added that “a lot of visitors and teachers-to-be come and go but rarely get to know the teachers here. You also bring us snacks which endears us to you as well!” In the staff room, primary school teachers often sat at one end while the high school teachers sat at the other. I tended to sit in the middle to maintain conversations with people in both groups.

I also visited a number of classrooms to observe during my first week. Some teachers were more formal about setting up times to visit while others allowed me to “drop in any time.” Through classroom observations I was able to see the teachers in action. I observed a number of classes in both the lower grades as well as an upper school classes in math, chemistry, physics, biology, shop/carpentry (called “technical”), French, English, geography, computer, and physical education. I was able to monitor interactions and relationships between students, staff, and students and staff. I paid close attention to and took note of teachers’ own language patterns (e.g., code-switching, various registers, borrowing words). I also focused on the ways in which teachers reacted to their own students who engaged in translingual practice.
This process challenged me to change one of my research questions. While observing, I became less concerned about the teachers’ use of translingual practice in their own teaching, the focus of my original RQ2. I became more interested in how they balanced content and language instruction in their classrooms despite the overwhelming influence of English the students experienced in this setting, or more broadly, how they viewed the role of second language acquisition their particular context. In order to help me best answer the research questions, I hoped to secure a cross section of participants who would represent a variety of perspectives and practices. Therefore, the number of participants was not chosen in order to generalize their responses, but to get a variety of language ideologies within the school.

My goal was to select both native speakers (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS), males and females, teachers from both the primary school and high school, teachers and teachers from a variety of age backgrounds and subject content areas. I then contacted my potential participants and invited them into my study. After contacting seven potential participants, 5 agreed to take part in my study. In the following section, I have given the background of the participants who were selected for this study.

Morag. Morag was selected as a participant for this study for a number of reasons. Not only is she unique in her status as a native speaker of the language from the Hebrides Islands, but she happened upon her career as a GME teacher later in life. Morag, between 40 and 50 years old, explained that despite speaking Gaelic only in the home, she had to learn English when she began attending school. Although she is from the Gàidhealtachd, local school policy in her area required that students use only English
in the classroom. She admits that despite potential punishment and stigma attached with
the language, she and friends would secretly use Gaelic on the playground. They were
taught that educated people used English.

Morag migrated to the Lowland areas of Scotland and lived for a short while in
England. She became a nurse and married an Englishman who spoke no Gaelic.
Nonetheless, she still speaks Gaelic with her family back in the Hebrides Islands and
speaks in both Gaelic and English with her children. Upon the death of her husband, the
difficulties of single parenting, she explained, led her to abandon her goal of pursuing a
PhD and led her to look for alternative forms of work. She claims that GME allowed her
to continue to engage with the two things she holds as priorities: science and her
language. Morag now teaches science in the high school. As a great deal of technical
jargon is involved with the teaching of sciences, and one of her objectives was to prepare
students for a national standardized test in the subject area, I believed she would provide
specific information about translingualism and her experiences with the use of English in
her classroom. Though she considers herself a fluent native speaker of Gaelic, she admits
to lacking confidence in her spelling.

**Norman.** Norman, over the age of 50, came to learn Gaelic as an adult. Having
grown up in the northeast of Scotland where Scots was the predominant language, he did
not have any known contact with Gaelic speakers. As a musician, he eventually began
taking music classes at Sabhal Mòr Ostaig. There he learned more about the Gaelic
language and culture. He eventually began to take Gaelic language classes at the college
and supplemented his learning online. Norman considers himself proficient in the
language and teaches science in the high school. Although there are a number of non-native learners at the school, Norman was unique in his ability to speak Gaelic having only learned it as an adult. Furthermore, teaching a technical subject field such as his brings about unique difficulties with maintaining a strictly Gaelic classroom.

**Mavis.** Mavis, between 20 and 30 years old, was selected for the study given her role as an English teacher as well as for her background with Gaelic. Like many of the students in the school, she grew up with a dual identity. Although she spoke mostly Scottish English in the Lowlands of Scotland, she moved with her Gaelic-speaking family to the Hebrides when she was a preteen. Her mother spoke some Gaelic to her and her sister, but her only formal background with the language was as a subject in her English medium school for six years and as a subject in university for two years. She explains, “I don’t think it comes as natural to me as it does to the native speakers.” Despite spending many of her formative years in the Gàidhealtachd and being exposed to the language in the community and at home, she separates herself from native speakers.

**Bruce.** Bruce, also between the ages of 20 and 30, is one of the youngest teachers in the school. Bruce was selected for his background with the language as well as for his role as a primary school teacher. As the school’s bilingual model uses only Gaelic in the early grades, Bruce’s role as an early model of the language for students is essential. Bruce grew up with Gaelic-speaking parents from the Hebrides Islands and is a product of GME. Having grown up in Bailteil, he attended a Gaelic medium school. Although his parents spoke Gaelic in the home and he considers himself a fluent speaker who is quite connected to the Gaelic community, he would not classify himself as a native speaker.
**Gavina.** Gavina, between the age of 30 and 40, was also raised in the Bailteil area. She was selected as a participant for her role as a primary school teacher as well as her unique background with GME. Gavina, like Bruce, grew up in the Bailteil region of Scotland and also went through GME herself. She also used some Gaelic in the home, her parents being from the Hebrides Islands, but was also reluctant to call herself a native speaker. Furthermore, Gavina did not initially study Gaelic or education in university. Her focus was art. Gavina’s primary goal while in university was to use art as a means of therapy. During a stint doing service work in Africa as a teacher, she decided that upon her return to Scotland she would consider pursuing certification to teach. When she returned, she decided upon teaching in a GME environment given her own abilities and background in Gaelic. Below is a chart that provides participant information (Table 1).
Table 1

*Participant Information Chart*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>Subject matter taught</th>
<th>Native or non-native speaker</th>
<th>Exposure to Gaelic</th>
<th>Went through GME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morag</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>High School Science</td>
<td>Native speaker</td>
<td>Spoke only Gaelic until school; family spoke Gaelic in the home</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>High School Science</td>
<td>Non-native speaker</td>
<td>Learned as an adult</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mavis</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>High School English</td>
<td>Non-native speaker</td>
<td>Mother’s side of the family spoke Gaelic</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>Non-native speaker</td>
<td>Parents spoke Gaelic in the home</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavina</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>Non-Native Speaker</td>
<td>Parents spoke Gaelic in the home</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection**

Yin (2009) explains that much of the work that case study researchers do is comparable to the work of historians. He adds that two differences are that case study researchers can also avail themselves of interviews and observations though, in my case, the latter did not serve as data to be analyzed but rather to assist me in understanding the case. In keeping with qualitative case study design, I spent the first week of fieldwork observing the teachers in their natural setting. I began by keeping researcher memos and
field notes from around the school. Although these field notes were not fully ethnographic in nature, they were informed by ethnography. Eckert (2009) explains that ethnography, in which the researcher is positioned as a participant observer, is a “process of discovery” that “defines and refines its questions and its selection criteria as it goes along” (p. 137). Furthermore, she explains that whereas data collection techniques such as survey focus on the typical and universal, ethnographic research is interested in the local and particular. Finally, she states that “an ethnographic study will go into a community to find out what social categories are salient” (p. 137). In my case, I was able to refine my second research question after considering the role of second language acquisition in this particular setting as I observed it.

Blommaert and Jie (2010) explain that formal ethnography is rare and usually can last years. Given my limitations of time and resources, I only borrowed techniques from ethnography. Blommaert and Jie (2010) explain that “context is a matter for ethnography” but that ethnography is more than description; it is description with interpretation with considerations of ontology and epistemology. School signage, bulletin boards, curriculum, and interaction between teachers and students will all be used to help give me a broader understanding of the use of language and the language ideologies prevalent in the school. While observations were not analyzed, they provided more information about how GME works and particularly in an urban setting; furthermore, observing the context allowed me to consider categories to investigate more deeply (i.e., the participants’ beliefs about pertinent second language acquisition issues in their context).
**Focused interviews.** Given my researcher inquiry stance, I agree with Stake (1995) that “the interview is the main road to multiple realities” (p. 64). For my study, I conducted semi-structured, open-ended interviews. Specifically, these were what Yin (2009) refers to as focused interviews. He adds that though they are typically shorter than in-depth interviews and have a focused direction, they can still maintain a natural, conversational style. The interviews, conducted during my second and third weeks on site, were between 60 and 90 minutes long and audio recorded with the permission of the participants using Audacity software on my computer.

The beginning of the interview (Appendix B) included questions that were used to elicit background information (e.g., age categories, educational and language background) from the participants. This helped me to contextualize their responses. The next part of the interview focused explicitly on language ideology and speech production of the participants and their students. The final part of the interviews asked more broad questions about participants’ experiences in their GME setting. The goal throughout the interview was to gain “thick description” of the participant’s experiences and perspectives (Stake, 1995, p. 39). The interviews were conducted in English though both the participants and I used Gaelic on occasion.

The interviews used here were adapted from those in my pilot study according to the specific needs of my new participants (Kezar, 2000; Stake, 1995). For example, language issues in urban contexts are quite different from those in rural settings (Pennycook, 2010). At this phase, I relied on the continued ethnographic component of my data collection. I engaged in member checks throughout the interview by asking
participants to define terms, clarify statements, and summarize (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Furthermore, the observations informed my interviews allowing me to include relevant questions for particular participants as discussed below.

Observations. Blommaert and Jie (2010) explain the importance of going beyond the interview for this by stating “ethnographic fieldwork is aimed at finding out things that are often not seen as important but belong to the implicit structures of people’s life. Asking is indeed very often the worst possible way of trying to find out” (p. 3). From a social constructivist perspective, this involves better understanding of the culture and context of participants. Blommaert and Jie (2010) explain that ethnography is more than simply description; it must be embedded in and discussed in the terms of context. Thus, as my site is set in a context of current and historic political controversy, capturing contextual details was an essential accompaniment to the interviews I conducted.

Some have debated the merits of GME, claiming that it is not the best use of taxpayer money. On the other hand, some in the field of GME have pushed for a preservation of what they might call a pure Gaelic. It was important for me to consider this during my observations and field notes which began upon arrival at the school and continued throughout the duration of the four weeks. My field notes included observations from the classrooms as well as throughout the school environment in general. I was also diligent in maintaining researcher memos.

Particularly, I visited the classrooms of the participants, spending three hours of instruction time in each class. As some class hours are dedicated to testing, discussion, and otherwise, this specific time allotment allowed me to a) spend an adequate number of
time in each class given my time constraints, b) give teachers the opportunity to choose when they wanted me to observe, and c) lessen the impact of my presence may present to the students. I watched the participants’ classroom instruction, and, given my knowledge of Gaelic, paid particular attention to the language they use themselves as well as the language they allowed from their students. I kept note when they borrowed English words, calqued (i.e., directly translated phrases and idiomatic expressions from English to Gaelic), or code-switched. This helped inform my interviews and also allowed me to consider follow up questions that related the teachers’ stated ideologies to their actual practice in the classroom. For example, during classroom observations I noticed Norman use the English word “folder” with Gaelic plural ending “-an” with his students forming the word “folderan [folders]” as a mix of Gaelic and English. During his interview, I asked him how he felt about engaging in translingual practice in that specific instance. I also used Audacity, the same software I used to record the interviews, to record each classroom observation. This allowed me to review the recordings later to ensure that did not miss anything during my initial observations. Below is a chart that explains my data collection process (Figure 6).
Figure 6. Process of data collection.

Data Analysis

While observations and field notes occurred during my entire time on site and furthermore helped me to understand the data, the focused interviews served as my primary source for data analysis. Although it is often addressed as a separate phase of
research, the data analysis phase was not clearly distinct from my data collection phase. Charmaz (2011) explains that the constant comparative method of analysis allows the researcher to both collect and analyze data at the same time. For example, while interviewing participants, I took researcher memos. When I noticed my second participant, like the first, begin to discuss her status as a native speaker I took detailed notes as to how this unfolded. These researcher memos, served as an initial form of descriptive coding. This iterative process of initial coding breaks down the wall between the data collection and data analysis stages in that the researcher is constantly drawing comparisons across the data (Charmaz, 2011).

Next, I transcribed the interviews and considered my coding framework. Adair and Pastori (2011) explain, “One of the main challenges to any qualitative project guided theoretically by an emphasis on the voices of informants is creating a coding framework that represents an emic perspective rather than a purely etic construction” (p. 35). In order to give full credence to the participants’ emic (i.e., insider) perspectives, I read the transcripts multiple times looking at both whole text and individual parts or phrases (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012). This process allowed the themes to emerge from the words of the interviewees, as follows.

I searched for emergent themes using open, axial, and selective coding (Reybold & Halx, 2012; Wolcott, 1990). During open coding, I searched for preliminary chunks of meaning within the data using both in-vivo and descriptive coding. Saldaña (2016) explains that in-vivo coding involves reading the interview transcripts and looking for participants’ own words that make themselves amenable to “bolding, italicizing, [or]
highlighting” (p. 75). While reading through the transcription of my interview with Bruce, for example, I highlighted the following sentence: “But I think if you’re pronouncing Gaelic properly that it’s actually very difficult to do an accent [from this area]” and then underlined the phrase “pronouncing Gaelic properly.”

I also used descriptive coding. This involves reviewing the transcripts to look for overarching topics. Saldaña (2016) explains that during descriptive coding, the researcher summarizes portions of the text using short phrases that describe the main topic of what is being said. For example, Morag stated, “I really do think that we have to focus on language being specific to their everyday lives.” In this instance, I used the descriptive code “Importance of making the language relevant.”

Next, I began looking for relationships between codes in what is known as axial coding. Axial coding involves relating categories and subcategories to each other while selective coding relates the categories to existing theory or broader categories (Charmaz, 2011). As these themes emerged, I saw some, such as a discussion of the link between language, place, and culture, connect back to my conceptual framework (i.e., Herders tripartite). Other themes, such as “making the language worthwhile,” were unexpected, yet something all of the participants addressed. Finally, more abstract themes connecting my axial themes began to emerge across participants in what is known as selective coding. Below I have included an example from my data analysis process. First, I show an example of how the open codes emerged from the interviews (Table 2) and then how I moved from open codes to selective codes (Table 3).
### Table 2

**Open Coding Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants’ actual words</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Open code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We maintained a strong connection to the Islands. We were always aware that’s what our culture was</td>
<td>Believing there is a direct link between a geographic location and culture</td>
<td>Linking place and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As well as to create Gaelic speakers, we’re kinda wanting to create an interest in Gaelic culture</td>
<td>Believing there is a link between the language and culture</td>
<td>Linking language and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because we grew up in Bailteil, I kinda learned Gaelic like that and so I would say I’m fluent, but I wouldn’t say I’m native</td>
<td>Believing there is a link between geographic location and language</td>
<td>Linking language and place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

**Open, Axial, and Selective Codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open codes</th>
<th>Axial codes</th>
<th>Selective code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linking place and culture; Linking language and culture; Linking language and place</td>
<td>Espousing the Herderian Tripartite</td>
<td>Relating the Gaelic language to supralinguistic concepts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality/Validity

Maxwell (2013) explains that the researcher must identify potential threats to validity as well as propose strategies to overcome these threats. In the following section, I discuss my attempts to reduce researcher bias and reactivity through the collection of thick data and the use of member checking.

**Subjectivity and reflexivity.** Although subjectivity and reflexivity are inevitable in qualitative research, Maxwell (2013) explains that the researcher must be mindful and transparent with each. As previously noted in this chapter, much of my time as a researcher has been spent steeped in the literature of critical theory and second language acquisition. Furthermore, my personal rationale for study indicates a strong interest in the preservation of Scottish Gaelic. As such, it would be easy for me to pursue a line of inquiry related to language revitalization as well as the politics surrounding the GME movement; however, I kept my research questions at the forefront of my mind while coding.

Furthermore, I engaged in member-checking both during and after the interview to be sure my presentation of data accurately conveyed the participants’ perspectives. This involved follow-up questions during the interviews, questions for clarification during the site observations, and subsequent emails after my site visit to clarify any issues that arose during data analysis. Finally, a colleague helped with coding a portion of the data in order to enhance validity. I also recorded thick descriptions and elected to present the findings predominantly using the participants’ own words in stand-alone quotes in
order to offer authentic representations of their beliefs and experiences and minimize the effects of researcher bias.

**Ethics**

Despite the fact that my only criterion for participant selection was that the participant must be a GME teacher, I was careful to ethically present my data in a way that fully masked participant identity. This was done to ensure that participants responses could not be used against them. As there are relatively few GME teachers in Scotland, it was important for me as a researcher to mask my specific site identity and participants’ identities to the greatest extent possible. Although I state that the school and the participants are in an urban setting, as this location is vital for understanding the case, I did not specify the name of the city in which the study takes place. Furthermore, each of the participants was given a pseudonym.

As it has historically happened that participants in research studies have been exploited or have not been acknowledged or compensated for their participation, Schilling (2013) also makes it clear that it is important to consider “giving back to the community” (p. 268). I engaged in brainstorming with Eilidh, the head teacher of the school in which I conducted my research, for ways in which I could give back. The hope was to shift from “participant-observer” to “participant-collaborator” (Zembylas, 2005, p. 471). As the gatekeeper for my research, Eilidh had suggested that I could teach a couple classes regarding the American political process and the various political parties in light of the upcoming presidential elections in the United States. Other options included offering after-school tutoring or offering students classes in either British Sign Language
(BSL) or American Sign Language (ASL) or Signed Exact English (SEE). Given the time constraints, I was instead able to assist in several classrooms and chaperone on a field trip.

**Boundaries**

As my research methodology is a qualitative case study, I have delimited my unit of analysis as the language ideologies of GME teachers in an urban setting, as those language ideologies relate to translingualism and their perspectives regarding second language acquisition. This case was embedded in a sociopolitical context that contains critical concerns of linguistic and ethnic oppression and even recent pushes for self-determination (i.e., nationalism). Though other issues did arise during the ethnographic observations or the interviews (e.g., the politics of GME, students’ perspectives and language ideologies), I was interested primarily in the language ideologies of the teachers as they relate to translingualism and second language acquisition. Any other information or themes that emerged may be used as a future pull out case study.

**Limitations**

While I was granted permission to work within the school setting, the head teacher gave permission for me to be on site for only one month. Blommaert and Jie (2010) suggests that a true ethnographic study should last at least a year. It is for this reason I used aspects of an ethnographic study to inform my research questions and interview protocol. This allowed me to gather information through observation and teacher reflection in the most efficient way possible.
Furthermore, although the gatekeeper for my study is respected in the school, her role as the headmistress for the entire school could have caused some participants to guard their responses or report beliefs they thought would most please their administrator. To counter this, I assured the participants that I would do my best to mask their identities by use of pseudonyms.

As my visit was also early in the school year, students only had two weeks to adapt to their teachers and school setting. The head teacher informed me that the majority of the students are returning students, but I was also aware that dynamics may be different from what they might be later in the academic year. The rapport between students and teachers may be different than it would be once the school year has been in session for a while. Moreover, as some students may be new, teachers may grade their language and have different expectations of students’ language production thereby shading their interview responses. To counter this, I specifically asked teachers in the interviews to think of specific instances in which events occurred. Rather than evoking their current feelings, they were therefore called upon to think of how they have handled students’ use of code-switching, calquing, and other manifestations of translingual practice.

Finally, my researcher bias is another limitation to this study. Although I addressed this in the researcher identity section of this chapter, I have attempted to counter this limitation by keeping researcher memos and notes as well as securing a second coder for my data. Furthermore, I also had a colleague code some portions of my data.
Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have explained the research methods that allowed me to study my research questions. This qualitative case study took place in an urban GME setting where speakers of the language come into regular contact with Scots, Scottish English, and other languages. Once on site, I selected five teachers as participants for my study. I conducted semi-structured, focused interviews and took field notes of site observations, both in the classrooms and in the school community in general. I analyzed my data using open, axial, and selective coding. In this chapter, I have also noted the ways in which I controlled for quality and validity as well as the ethical considerations I had to take into consideration. Finally, I have discussed the boundaries of my qualitative case study as well as the limitations.
Chapter Four

“Gaelic is in the blood”

The purpose of this study was to investigate the language ideologies of GME teachers in an urban setting in Scotland. Through case study, I investigated GME teachers’ beliefs about language and language revitalization in a complex context of globalization where an endangered language, a minority language, languages of immigrants, and a language of power coexist. Furthermore, I explored these teachers’ understandings of second language acquisition in this context. Given my stance as a social constructivist, I hoped to understand the participants’ responses about translingualism and second language acquisition in their specific context. Findings were drawn primarily from semi-structured, focused interviews. Through open, axial, and selective coding, emic themes emerged. In this chapter I present the findings, which are organized by research question followed by themes. The research questions that guided this study were:

1. What are the language ideologies, related to translingualism, of teachers in a GME school in a linguistically liminal setting?

2. What do these teachers believe to be key elements of second language acquisition in such a context?

Research Question 1
What are the language ideologies, related to translingualism, of teachers in a GME school in a linguistically liminal setting? Although field notes were used to help secure a firm understanding of school and classroom policies and activities and informed my interview questions, the findings for Research Question 1 were derived primarily from semi-structured, focused interviews. As language ideologies relate to one’s specific beliefs about what language is, interviews were determined to be the best way to investigate the question in a detailed manner. Through open, axial, and selective coding of the interviews, three main themes, and a number of corresponding subthemes, emerged. These main themes are: defining the Gaelic speaker, defining the Gaelic language, and relating the Gaelic language to supralinguistic concepts (i.e., concepts that go beyond language such as culture, place, and power). These themes, and their related subthemes, are addressed in the following paragraphs.

Defining the Gaelic speaker. The first theme that emerged across all the interviews related to participants’ beliefs about what it means to be a Gaelic speaker. All five participants use the Gaelic language in their classrooms on a daily basis. However, the participants each reported varying levels of fluency. Furthermore, as the initial questions in the interview protocol related to the participants’ personal, educational, and linguistic backgrounds, they each began by sharing detailed information about their identities. Specifically, all of the participants classified themselves as Gaelic speakers by establishing boundaries and assigning themselves labels (e.g., fluent learner, native speaker). They also situated themselves as Gaelic speakers in relationship to the community.
As the goal of Research Question 1 was to understand participants’ beliefs about language and language boundaries (i.e., whether languages are separate, monolithic entities or may overlap in a hybrid manner), it is important to note that none of the participants spoke explicitly to any notions of hybridity with regard to their identities. In other words, they spoke of the Gaelic language and the English language as separate and positioned themselves as either Gaelic speakers who spoke English or English speakers who spoke Gaelic. They also used terms such as “learner,” “heritage speaker,” and “native speaker” to refer to themselves.

Bruce, who grew up in Bailteil, defined himself as a “fluent heritage speaker.” Although his parents spoke Gaelic in the home, he did not grow up in the Gàidhealtachd and would therefore not consider himself a native speaker of Gaelic. Nonetheless, he did feel that he was part of the Gaelic community. He explained, “I think there’s a real warmth in the Gaelic community; there’s a real feeling that we are a minority and that there’s a real kind of unity in the Gaelic community in a lot of ways.” Although he did not self-identify as a native speaker of Gaelic, he positioned himself as an insider by employing the word we. Echoing Bakhtin (1981), Gee (2011) explains that language does not exist in a vacuum. For that reason, words like the and we are considered deictics, or pointing words, whose prior reference must be considered and the word must be understood in context. In this case, the deictic we is used to refer to Gaelic speakers.

Gavina was likewise apprehensive to refer to herself as a native speaker. With regard to self-classification she explained,
I wouldn’t say I’m a native speaker because I learned Gaelic. Like, my father would speak to me in Gaelic when I was younger, but I had more English going to school than I had Gaelic. So, most of my Gaelic came from learning it through school, but all my family are native speakers.

First, Gavina made the distinction between fluent speakers and native speakers. While some might ascribe the nomenclature “heritage speaker” to Gavina, she considered herself a fluent learner whose mother tongue was English. Nevertheless, during the interview, when referring to spelling conventions in Gaelic she stated, “We’ve got a lot of combined letters that make a single sound.” Her use of the deictic word *we* showed that she identifies herself as in-group (i.e., a Gael) as well.

Not only did she discuss her own identity as a Gaelic learner; she went on to explain how the language relates to nationality. She explained, “You get a pride in being Scottish when you speak Gaelic.” She continued with the theme of relating Gaelic to community and nation adding,

Any time I’ve traveled with other Scottish people, they’ve wanted me to teach them Gaelic because they felt that they’re not as Scottish because they can’t speak what should be our national language, you know, because they feel that that’s who we are as Scottish people.

The overlapping theme of the Herderian tripartite, as will be discussed later, is also present in her discussion of language and identity.

Mavis, one of the youngest participants in the study, did not consider herself a native speaker or a fluent speaker. As an English teacher, she uses English more than any
of the other participants. Her mother spoke some Gaelic (e.g., basic commands) at home with Mavis and her sister and would also use it when speaking to her side of the family; Mavis did not attend a Gaelic medium school as a child, but rather she studied Gaelic in university. She considered herself a proficient heritage speaker but consistently spoke of herself as a learner. Although she used Gaelic while teaching in the classroom, she expressed her lack of confidence in the language. Nonetheless, she made the link between language and identity stating,

I’m really close to my mum and her side of the family and I think Gaelic was just part of the identity or culture. People always say, “Gaelic is in the blood.” That it’s just part of you; it’s in you.

Despite her lack of confidence in speaking Gaelic, she considers Gaelic part of her identity.

**Defining the Gaelic language.** While participants addressed sociocultural issues of Gaelic they also discussed specific linguistic phenomena. Going beyond discussing their role as Gaelic speakers and the relationship between language and identity, they went on to define the Gaelic language itself. In the following section, I present the themes that related to purely linguistic issues. Participants discussed their beliefs about phonological issues, as well as structural matters such as code-switching or mixing of English and Gaelic, calquing (i.e., directly translating phrases from English into Gaelic), borrowing words, and the use of English syntax while speaking Gaelic.

**Phonological components.** One of the most salient themes that emerged during the interview pertained to the phonological makeup of Gaelic. Following the interview
protocol, all five of the participants addressed their beliefs about phonological components, varying in their acceptance of learners use of nontraditional phonological variants when speaking Gaelic. However, none of the participants fit neatly into a monolingual orientation or a translingual orientation with regard to phonological variation. For example, three of the participants expressed a lack of acceptance with regard to students speaking with non-native accents; nonetheless, they explained that a new dialect was inevitable and should be embraced.

With regard to the Gaelic phonology and the Bailteil dialect of the language, Bruce, a Bailteil native explained shared his thoughts. The International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) has been used in parentheses to clarify pronunciation.

If you’re speaking Gaelic and your pronunciation is correct, and I feel comfortable saying this because I’m [from this area] and I know that I speak with [the local] accent, and I know that, but I have to really slow down so I’m certainly not criticizing anyone’s accent. But I think if you’re pronouncing Gaelic properly that it’s actually very difficult to do an accent [from this area]. For example, if you look at our “l” sound – so if you’re saying what the day is . . . “latha” (IPA /luː̞/. If you say “latha” (IPA: /luː̞/), you’re wrong. You have to say “latha” (IPA /luː̞/. Like the Gaelic for London is “Lunnainn.” You don’t say /luːnən/. It’s more like /luːɡən/.

Here he explained that despite speaking Gaelic with Bailteil accent, he assumed the existence of a standard phonological variation of the language that is more correct.
Morag, a self-identified native speaker from the Hebrides Islands, on the other hand, admitted a distaste for the Bailteil variation of Gaelic, but did not consider it wrong. She believes that the language is changing and a new dialect is emerging. She explained,

The accent here is very monotone – it sounds like a humming whereas the Gaelic spoken traditionally as a native speaker is very sing-songy. So, then to hear my sing-song language, as it were, in a very flat monotone is quite strange. However, her explanation continued:

I think we just have to accept that there’s going to be a Bailteil Gaelic. And there’s nothing wrong with it. You know, I can’t say to somebody who speaks fluent Bailteil Gaelic that they’re wrong, because they’re not. It’s perfectly fine to their time and place in life, so I say get up and get on with it. The accent sounds strange though.

Morag is accepting of new varieties and does not therefore fit into a purist ideological mold in this sense.

Norman, a learner himself, related a frustration with the number of phonological varieties that exist within the language. His desire for a more standard version of Gaelic arose out of a difficulty trying to speak Gaelic with native speakers. Some of the complication, he added, comes from the lack of a standard pronunciation. He explained,

When you’re learning a language, you have to sound right. But we’re trying to keep the language going and there’s so many different ways of speaking it – so many different islands with slight differences. I think it would make it easier if
people were, if there was more of a kind of – you know you’ve got BBC English. You know people speak that way. It would make the language more accessible to learners if we had that version of Gaelic.

Even so, he commented on the value of multiple language varieties. He continued,

I’m not sure if the native speakers would appreciate that, but it would be easier to make the language grow faster if there was only one way of doing it, but I’m not at that end of the spectrum either. I do appreciate the great authenticity, and it’d be sad to lose that if people stop speaking a certain way.

While Morag prefers to hear the language spoken as it was by her friends and family when she was growing up, Norman wants a standard traditional Gaelic to be promulgated for the sake of easier learning.

**Structural and lexical components.** During the Language Ideology Section of the interview, participants also addressed a variety of sentiments about structural matters such as the concepts of code-switching (i.e., the transitioning between Gaelic and English within a single sentence), calquing (i.e., translating English phrases directly into Gaelic), and borrowing words from English. Rather than fitting neatly at any one point along the monolingual to translingual continuum, participants’ responses, as well as their own practice, demonstrated the complicated nature of language in general, and Gaelic, in particular. Gaelic is an endangered language with a long history of influence from the colonizers’ language (viz., English), a long oral tradition, and a recent uptake in speakers in urban areas where English has become the lingua franca. As a result, discussions regarding which words should borrowed from English and which words should be
Gaelicized and added to the Gaelic lexicon are far from straightforward. There is no set convention for naming new inventions in Gaelic, for instance.

An oft-cited example of this quandary that various staff members shared during the site observation, is what to do with the word “computer.” They explained that some scholars and linguists argue that a new Gaelic word should be formed for the invention using Old Irish (i.e., the parent language of Scottish Gaelic) words. Others would argue that a new word should be invented using existing Scottish Gaelic words. Still others maintain that the English word, in this case, should be Gaelicized and adopted, while a final group suggests simply borrowing the word from English in its original form. In this situation, the word was adopted from English and Gaelicized, giving Gaelic the new word “coimpiutair.”

Although it may appear that Gaelic is changing as English gains influence, in some situations it is to the contrary. For example, during a school walkabout, one of the school administrators explained that the concept of months was novel for ancient Gaelic culture, Gaelic speakers rather referring to changes in seasons and astrological occurrences. Therefore, the names for months of the year were adopted from English. As a result, older fluent native Gaelic speakers, she explained, would use words like “January” and “April” when speaking Gaelic. However, the administrator added that recent attempts to revitalize Gaelic have led some leaders in the movement to push for a monolingual Gaelic approach. As a result, most Gaelic learners are taught the Gaelic words for the months. Bruce, who teaches in the primary school, explained some of the difficulties that arise from such changes,
Gaelic is such an oral language and for many native speakers you’ll find that when they’re speaking, so much of what they’re saying is . . . is . . . kinda peppered with English words. So, for any sort of modern words, we always just use the English, whereas very recently, I would say within the last ten years or so, there’s been this massive push to have everything translated and everything in Gaelic; and, what that creates is a sort of disconnect between native speakers and the people that have learned it . . . em . . . because it’s almost like they’re speaking a language that native speakers can’t really understand, they can’t really engage with.

He later added,

I do understand that languages have to change and we have to modernize, and you know I want there to be Gaelic industries. I want there to be Gaelic in the media. I want there to be Gaelic in Parliament, and I understand that they need to update their vocabulary as well, but I worry that the native speakers and the traditional Gaelic speakers are being a wee bit lost and a wee bit alienated in their own language sometimes.

He added, “I know that languages have to grow and languages have to change, but not to the extent where Gaelic speakers that we’re descended from don’t really feel at home in their own language anymore.” He later expressed,

I think it’s just too hard for a language to remain pure. I think the way the world is now, people mingle and come together in different ways and it’s a bit unnatural that a language will remain that way.
Bruce’s ideology furthers the notion that those involved in the revitalization of Gaelic are often torn between wanting to maintain the heart of the Gaelic language while allowing for adaptation in a modern society.

Discussing the changing language and the new dialects and terminology developing in the Lowlands that separate it from the language traditionally spoken in the Highlands and Islands, Bruce explained,

I don’t think it’s a disconnect of malice; I don’t think it’s a disconnect, a conflict of communities. I think it’s just a slight disconnect in terms of the vocabulary and things that are used - that a Sabhal Mòr Ostaig student in 2015 would use compared to what my Uncle Liam Callum uses who’s 85. He’s a crofter. He wouldn’t understand what you were saying a lot of the time.

He went on to explain that Sabhal Mòr Ostaig, the world’s only Gaelic medium institution of higher education, along with many radio and television programs offered in Gaelic, employ “Mid-Minch Gaelic,” a newly developing variation of Gaelic. This currently developing type of Gaelic is the result of dialect levelling. In other words, this informally accepted form of Gaelic has become a sort of amalgamation of a number of Gaelic dialects. It is reflective of a new generation that is working to revitalize the language and sees standardization and linguistic purism at the heart of the movement.

Morag offered another dialect that she believes is taking hold among GME. When discussing what variation of the language was considered the norm, she explained,

I think because of the regions where the Gaelic teachers now come from, the majority of Gaelic teachers now come from either South Uist or Lewis, so it’s
expected that those two dialects will be the ones that will survive through time, whereas the others will be lost because the kids aren’t being exposed to them.

Morag also echoed Bruce’s sentiment that the newer forms of Gaelic are not as permissive to borrowing English words as native speakers might be.

While native speakers may use English words on occasion, Bruce distinguished such practice from something his students do on occasion. As learners, they will often use English words in the middle of their sentences because they have either forgotten the Gaelic word, do not know the Gaelic word, or, as Bruce believes, do not feel like taking the time to access the word. He explained:

They’ll (the students) say things like “Bha ise hurting feelings agam” (Lit. “She was[emphatic] hurting feelings at me”) for “She was hurting my feelings.” So, they got that kind of head on of trying to phrase . . . trying to structure their sentence in a Gaelic way. They’ve got the Gaelic phrasing right, but they just have to borrow a few words from English.

In this instance, Bruce expresses tolerance for borrowing words for the sake of long term language learning.

Like Bruce, Gavina is also a fluent heritage speaker of Gaelic from the Bailteil area. She too expressed some of the effects of changing English words into Gaelic for the sake of language purity. She added,

Sometimes, when I look at Gaelic and think that there’s a lot of new words for Gaelic which we never used to have, and they’re like modern day words that they’re putting into Gaelic, I think, “What’s the point of putting that in Gaelic?”
Like my parents would never say that, and I suppose in that sense, that’s trying to keep the language pure, but at the same time, the only way a language will grow is if it changes and develops and moves on with the times.

She continued, “I suppose at the end of the day every language borrows words from other languages and I suppose it’s just about how you then adapt it into your own language without completely changing it.”

Similar to Gavina, Morag, who teaches high school science, expressed an acceptance of borrowing words from English, not solely on the basis of historical precedent, but as part of the normal process of language change. She explained,

I would be fine with borrowing words. I think that’s natural – Gaelic being such an old language. I mean, we have to borrow words from English sometimes. It’s just a fact. The kids naturally will because they find it easier to kind of switch between the two.

Morag, a native speaking science teacher, made numerous metaphorical parallels between language and nature noting the need for adaptation in order to survive.

Norman, a non-native proficient speaker of Gaelic, discussed practical reasons for allowing students to borrow words from English. His beliefs were not rooted in precedent or in the philosophical nature of language, but rather in the necessity for learners to communicate effectively in his classroom. This sentiment is fitting with a translingual approach to education. Furthermore, he stated that Gaelic words for things and ideas in his field, the sciences, are not always available. He explained,
Because I’m teaching science, I don’t wanna see them straining or getting stressed out – try and find Gaelic words for things that are almost impossible to say.

Because sometimes, the words haven’t been invented yet for scientific things. To tell you the truth, you just kinda appear false – trying too hard.

This exhibits a crucial concern faced by many engaged in language revitalization. Apart from sharing their beliefs about borrowed words, participants also discussed the concept of code-switching.

One specific example Bruce shared was the change that has recently occurred in the Gaelic language with regard to counting. While former generations followed a vigesimal counting system (i.e., counting system based on the number 20), GME schools have begun teaching a newly invented decimal system, following the English-speaking model. Like in French as spoken in France, Gaelic has traditionally preferred the vigesimal system in which the word for numbers like 80 translate directly into English as “four twenties” and 93, for example, translates directly as “four twenties thirteen.” Now, however, GME has begun teaching the newly created decimal system (i.e., based on the number 10). Bruce explained,

So, the older way of counting is like the French way. So, like . . . it’ll go like ‘deich, fichead, deich air fhichead [ten, twenty, ten on twenty], da fhichead [two twenties] would be forty . . . whereas now what we would use and what I would teach the children is deich, fichead, trithead, ceathrad, caogad, siagad, seachad, ochad [ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, sixty, seventy, eighty].
Although Bruce showed an acceptance of the new words calqued from English, he explained instances where he is not as accepting. He continued,

I know that I teach the language in 2015 and not 40 or 50 years ago. So, I’m happy to use newer vocabulary, but . . . I know an example we were talking about the other day is – what a lot of our children will say is, like in the place of saying “I was like,” they’ll say “Bha mi mar [Literally ‘I was like’].” That isn’t, that isn’t Gaelic. That’s obviously just taking from an English turn of phrase and then changing it into that. So, if I heard them say that, I would, you know, I would try and remind them that that’s not really, you’re not really speaking the language, you’re just directly translating from the English.

While Bruce showed a general disapproval of calquing in this situation, he nevertheless maintained that he, like his students, makes occasional use of borrowed words and morphological calquing and shared the following example:

If they were trying to tell me “I was watching a film,” they might say “Bha mi a watcheadh” because “eadh” (IPA/əɣ/) is very common for our verbs (the equivalent of “ing.”) – so “watcheadh” (IPA /wa-tʃəɣ/). But we do that ourselves. Like you would hear us . . . we might say words like “wonderachadh” (IPA /wɔn-dər-ə-xʌɣ/) (for wondering). We’ll say quite often “Bha i really math” for “It was really good.”

He further explained,

If you’re pronouncing your phonics correctly, it’s easier to take those English words but to put them into . . . to make them sound Gaelic – like “watcheadh”
(IPA /wa-tʃəɣ/), it’s like you put your Gaelic head on – you know you need to
borrow a couple English words, but you’re still using your Gaelic sentences.
Bruce continues to exemplify the complexities of language ideologies; his responses
show that he does not neatly fit the monolingual orientation or the translingual
orientation.

Whereas Bruce discussed some disapproval of code-switching and calquing,
Morag explained,

I think it’s a unique skill. It happens, you know, and again, I think we just need to
relax. I think we’re in danger of being too tense about the whole thing. I think, if
we make it difficult and uncomfortable, then why would people want to do it?
She later explained, “It’s very easy to slip in and out of both languages, and I have asked
myself this question, ‘Is that a big deal?’”

She continued,

Gaelic is changing. It’s really hard to say. I think if there is an acceptable way for
them to structure their sentence or say a sentence without using too many English
words, then they should be encouraged to do that – definitely!
In this statement, Morag first showed concern for maintaining a standard or “acceptable”
syntactic structure, but immediately shifted to the importance of keeping Gaelic lexical
items.

She later explained that native speakers like herself borrow words from English as
an expression of their hybrid identities. The use of English words while speaking in
Gaelic, she maintained, may be arbitrary, but it may also be “matter of fact” and the
result of being a bilingual speaker who finds one word or way of stating something more apt in one language than another. She added “‘So’, for example, is a Gaelic word now.”

Gavina, likewise expressed the belief that code-switching and calquing can be a form of students owning the language and showing creativity. She stated,

A lot of children, especially in the upper primary would say “OMC” instead of “OMG,” like “Oh my God.” They’d say “OMC” which is “Oh mo chreach! [idiomatic “Oh my heavens!”]” They try and make it more relevant in Gaelic now. The first time I heard a child say “OMC” I was confused and they were like “Oh mo chreach, miss.” And I thought “Oh, that’s actually quite cool; that’s quite clever.” I was quite impressed with that one.

She also believes that such practices encourage the use of the language, further commenting on the students’ use of “mar” (i.e., “like” in English). She added,

It doesn’t really bother me when they use ‘mar’ for ‘like’ in Gaelic. I think it just makes them use Gaelic more – probably not grammatically correct, but then neither is using ‘like’ and ‘so’ through your sentences [in English].

Norman shared his views regarding the phenomena of code-switching and calquing. Although in his immediate response, he found it jarring to use any English words, he later commented on his own practice of “Gaelicizing words.” He used the example of the English word “folders,” a word that would commonly come up in his class.
“Folderan.” Yeah. That just sounds better. For plurals in Gaelic, you add ‘ean’ or ‘an’ at the end of words. If you say ‘folders’ it sounds terrible. If you say ‘folderan,’ the proper Gaelic plural, it doesn’t sound so bad.

Nevertheless, he described a proclivity to revert to the “pure” Gaelic word altogether when possible.

Furthermore, Norman expressed a disdain for the practice of borrowing English words when speaking Gaelic, believing that it generally can be traced to laziness among students. He explained,

It annoys me when people inject an English word into a sentence when they’re speaking Gaelic, and I think, “Wait a minute. You know the Gaelic word for it, you just haven’t bothered to get into that part of your brain.”

He later explained that some technical terms do not exist in Gaelic and in such cases using English words was acceptable. However, he explained, given the opportunity, students often opted for English words despite knowing the Gaelic words for them. His language use in the classroom, as found from participant observation, showed that he also occasionally borrows words from English when speaking in Gaelic. However, he was not as apt to code-switch or calque.

Mavis, the English teacher, was more permissive with regard to her students code-switching. She explained,

I probably do that myself. I don’t think there’s anything wrong with it. Maybe I should, when I think about it. I just think sometimes, the way I am myself, I find
it a lot easier to switch between the two and if I can make myself understood then that’s fine by me.

She later added,

In some ways it does frustrate me, but in other ways it’s just one of those things you have to accept. You know, if we want Gaelic to prosper, is it something we have to accept? Can we just keep Gaelic pure, by itself, and as this separate thing? Or should Gaelic have to accept words and phrases from English? I think it would be difficult in this day and age to try and keep it by itself.

Given this response, she would appear to be more in line with a translingual approach, the approach that maintains that the goal of language is communication rather than adhering to linguistic regulation.

However, although Mavis seems to be a proponent of code-switching, she sees calquing as something inappropriate. She added, “I think there’s a danger of it, if it’s translated directly, there’s a danger of it being grammatically incorrect. Maybe that’s just the English teacher in me.” She gave some examples of things that her students do that she corrects. For instance, she explained,

In Gaelic, we have verbs which are past tense. Like, we wouldn’t [literally] say “I was doing this” or “I did that.” You have words like “rinn [I did]” or “choiseach mi [I walked].” So, the verb itself becomes past tense. A lot of the children forget that and they always start with the past tense “bha [I was]” so, “bha mi a’ choiseach [I was at walking]” instead of “choiseach mi [I walked].” Instead of just saying “rinn mi [I did]” they say “bha mi a’ deanamh [I was at doing].”
Sharing sentiments from both ends of the continuum (i.e., the monolingual approach and the translingual approach) in one utterance, Mavis added,

I think if it’s not harming anyone and if you can still make yourself understood, then fine. If you want to borrow words from English, fine. But all the while we can lose sight of the original rules and things. And I think that would be dangerous.

Unlike other participants in this study, Mavis teaches courses related to grammar; therefore, the structural propriety of language is something she is conscious of in her daily lesson planning.

**Relating language to the abstract.** While the majority of themes that arose regarding linguistic matters were lexical and structural in nature, four participants also discussed issues of language that went beyond purely linguistic phenomena. These participants related language to other sociocultural matters such as power, culture, and place. The link between power and language, particularly in education, has been well documented (e.g., Fairclough, 2013; Hornberger & McKay, 2010; Rahman, 2002). Likewise, the link between language, culture, and place forms the basis for what Canagarajah (2013b) refers to as the Herderian tripartite.

**Linking language, place, and culture: The Herderian tripartite.** The Herderian tripartite, at the heart of the monolingual orientation, was a theme that the participants of this study discussed at many points during the interviews. Without directly invoking Herder or his works, they recounted his philosophy, one that underlies contemporary philosophies of language, throughout their interviews. They shared ways in which they
believed the Gaelic language is inextricably linked to the culture and geographic region of the Gàidhealtachd. Many went as far as to see the Gaelic language as part and parcel of the current trend for Scottish self-determination (i.e., independence).

Bruce, for example, expressed surprise that the link between Scottish nationalism and the Gaelic language was not more evident. He stated,

I think a lot of people thought with this surge of interest in the Scottish National Party and that sort of nationalist agenda that, you know, that would go hand in hand in support for Gaelic, but that’s not really happened.

In other words, though there was a relatively large expression of Scottish nationalism with the recent referendum for Scottish independence from the rest of the UK, there has not been, to Bruce’s surprise, an overtly paralleled support for the Gaelic language.

Bruce later recounted further examples of the link between language and culture. He shared that in his teaching to the primary school students, he tries to pull in culture as often as possible. First, he recounted his personal experiences with speaking Gaelic, stating,

As long as I can remember, we always spoke it, and my parents, although we lived here [in Bailteil], made sure that we maintained a strong connection to the Islands. We were always aware that’s what our culture was, that’s what our background was.

Here he correlates the Gaelic language with the Hebrides Islands and with a specific culture thereby encapsulating the Herderian tripartite all at once.
He later explained his efforts to teach his students the importance of relating the Gaelic language to a specific culture. He added,

We’re really aiming not only to create, like to help children to become bilingual, but actually give them, actually open them up to Gaelic culture as well. Because, I think if you feel an attachment to the culture, and if you have an interest in the culture, you’re more motivated to learn the language and to carry on with the language, so, as well as to create Gaelic speakers, we’re kinda wanting to create an interest in Gaelic culture, so that’s still alive as well.

Bruce sees the revitalization of the Gaelic language as separate but parallel to the revitalization of the Gaelic culture.

Morag previously shared that she understood that the Gaelic language has been influenced by English and understood the hybrid nature of learners. On the other hand, she expressed concern that with the attrition of Gaelic language speakers comes the death of the culture represented by the language. She commented, “English just destroys every other language, and once you destroy language, you destroy culture.” She added, “We need to be relevant, but without losing too much. Again, languages do evolve, but you have to keep some of the history, I think.” The deictic word *the* can be interpreted to refer to the specific history of the language, which is the prior referent in her utterance; however, it could also refer to the history of the culture in which case Morag would exhibit tendencies to espouse the Herderian tripartite. As history is a part of culture, she would, by metonymy, be equating language and culture.
In her interview, Gavina made links between language and location. As previously noted, Gavina did not consider herself a native speaker. She mentioned that by the time she began her schooling, she spoke more English than Gaelic although she did speak Gaelic in the home with her family. However, she later makes the connection between language and place stating, “Because we grew up in Bailteil, I kinda learned Gaelic like that and so I would say I’m fluent, but I wouldn’t say I’m native.” For her, nativism can only be associated with a certain geographical location. Relating language to place, Gavina added,

Some children say “Oh, we need to speak Spanish because when we go to Spain, we can speak it. We can speak French when we go to France.” We need to do the same with Gaelic – make it so, “Oh, when we go here, we speak it; when people come from the States, they can use Gaelic because it’s a language that we speak here.”

Although fewer than 57,000 people speak Gaelic, Gavina also expressed, “I think [Gaelic] is a major part of Scottish culture.”

Norman, a Gaelic learner himself, echoed Gavina’s sentiments that language and culture are tied together. He stated,

One of the great things about learning Gaelic is you don’t just learn the language; it’s a window to the past. You learn about your communities, your country, history, music, poetry. You learn about all these things by keeping the language going.

He added, “It’s a continuum; it’s a window in the past; it keeps the culture going.”
Morag, likewise sees the need to equate Gaelic language and culture. Despite her belief that Gaelic should be allowed to adapt and change, she shows a preference for maintaining Gaelic that relates to culture. She explained,

I certainly think there’s a lot of old Gaelic, old croft Gaelic, as I call it. It’s very descriptive, it’s very melodic, and it tells a story in itself. . . . the language. And I think that needs to be kept.

Morag then went on to share a specific example. She stated,

Do the kids that I teach need to know what the Gaelic word for “seaweed” is? Possibly. The different types of seaweed and how you would use it? I don’t know. But I just – there are certain words that I don’t hear so often that I just think are lovely, very descriptive, beautiful sounding words and for that reason alone, they should be kept.

**Linking language and power.** Participants also demonstrated the link between power and language as they spoke about language revitalization and GME. In some situations, participants expressed critical language awareness (CLA); on other occasions participants inadvertently made the case for the power of the predominant language (viz., English).

Bruce, for example, explains how the predominance of English in society has brought about change in the Gaelic language. The Gaelic language has proverbially cowtowed to English in terms of structure, for example. Bruce, when discussing the replacement of the vigesimal words for counting by the decimal words explained, “Yeah, so these, these words were created to kind of simplify it and make it easier for people to
understand the language.” The “people” who would use the language would automatically have understood the vigesimal system. It is learners, who would generally speak English as their L1, who might struggle with the concept. Therefore, the language has been changed in deference to English speakers. While some, like Bruce, may argue that this systematic change will encourage the use of Gaelic, it has required those who speak Gaelic as the L1 to change their way of speaking.

Bruce did express CLA in a number of comments he made regarding GME, however. For example, he stated,

The vast majority of my pupils and the pupils, most of them in the school do not come from Gaelic-speaking backgrounds . . . so a lot of what we do in our job is, you’re teaching them Gaelic language and you’re teaching them to be Gaelic speakers, but you also need to help them understand why they’re here, and need to kinda try and foster an attachment between them and this, this language and not make it this abstract thing that they come and do every day, but show them that this is a real language, a living language and there’s opportunities to use this outside of just your classroom.

Bruce maintains that learning Gaelic is not simply an intellectual endeavor but rather something linked to power and opportunity. He explains that there are cognitive and economic benefits to learning Gaelic, but moreover, it exposes students to a culture that has experienced centuries of oppression.

Morag, likewise, commented on a number of advantages and opportunities GME students have. She stated,
I’d say it opens a lot of opportunities that you don’t realize that you can have by having another language – any other language; it opens up a vast amount of opportunities, but also Gaelic will open up a lot of opportunities in life. I might not have been a teacher if I didn’t have Gaelic.

Norman, as a Gaelic learner, explained the importance of continuing the legacy of the language. He explained the politics involved with those opposed to the government spending any money on Gaelic revitalization efforts. He believes that GME has an important role to play in maintaining the identity of a people and a culture that has value. He maintained,

My idea is we’re stopping the language from becoming a museum piece here. We’re keeping it going. If it became a museum piece, a lot of things would die with it – the way of hearing people sing. Or poetry. The way people express themselves. And that simply cannot happen. We need to validate the language and culture.

Norman made many references to the importance of keeping the language alive and legitimizing both the language and culture despite the voices of detractors.

**Summary of findings of RQ1.** All of the participants in this study, following the interview protocol, expressed their beliefs about what the Gaelic language is and what it should be. Participants began by situating themselves as Gaelic speakers. Bruce and Gavina, who grew up in Bailleul using Gaelic in the home, were reluctant to call themselves native speakers. They associated the Gaelic language with the Gàidhealtachd.
Mavis, who also used some Gaelic in the home and lived for a while in the Gàidhealtachd, also elected to call herself a proficient learner.

Moving on to specific linguistic attributes, participants addressed phonological, as well as structural and lexical issues of language. Bruce discussed the need for students to adhere to a standard phonological variety of Gaelic. Morag, on the other hand, explained that despite her distaste for the new variety of Gaelic that is developing, she believes it is inevitable and needs to be embraced. Although Norman believes there is beauty in the number of varieties found within the Gaelic language, he believes a standard variety would make it easier for learners.

With regard to structural and lexical items, beliefs were varied as well. Bruce, for example, discussed the complexity of trying to allow the language to adapt naturally to a modern world by adopting modern technical words and allowing the language to borrow words; however, he admitted that this could cause an alienation between generations. Furthermore, he discussed his disapproval of morphological calquing although he admitted that he often engages in the activity when speaking with friends. Morag, a self-identified native speaker, and Gavina, a self-identified heritage speaker, were more permissive of borrowing words admitting that native speakers do this naturally. At one point Norman also explained that he permits the occasional word borrowing in his class to allow students to focus on fluency rather than accuracy; however, he believed it was also symptomatic of laziness among his students. Although Mavis and Morag believe that code-switching can be helpful for communication and often indicative of a “unique skill” among bilingual students, they believe calquing to be inappropriate or incorrect.
A number of themes regarding supralinguistic phenomena also emerged. Specifically, participants encapsulated the Herderian tripartite by linking language to place and culture. Bruce, Gavina, Morag, and Norman, for example, explained that the Gaelic culture was part and parcel of the Gaelic language. Gavina added that the Gaelic language was linked to a specific geographical location. Bruce, Morag, and Norman also discussed the specific link between power and language. Bruce, for example, gave examples of how the dominant language in the community (i.e., English) has forced changes within the Gaelic lexicon and structure. Morag spoke to the power that comes from speaking more than one language. Finally, Norman spoke to the need of validating Scottish Gaelic as a worthwhile language in its own right.

Research Question 2

What do those teachers believe are key elements of second language acquisition in such a context? As the second research question guiding this study also dealt with beliefs, open and axial coding were used to analyze the in-depth interviews. During the coding process, the following themes emerged: realizing the importance of immersion, teaching with patience, teaching with empathy, modeling the language, making the language worthwhile.

Realizing the importance of immersion. One of the first themes that emerged in each of the interviews was immersion. Three of the five participants addressed the importance of immersion in second language acquisition. In her interview, Gavina specifically explained the role of Gaelic immersion as she sees it at Bailteil Gaelic School:
With GME – with any GME – you’ve got the full immersion policy where when children come into primary 1 to 3 then it is to be only Gaelic spoken. You have to converse complete with the children in Gaelic. Everything gets taught through Gaelic. If a child is not quite understanding, you would maybe do like a kind of sandwich effect – you would say it in Gaelic, say it in English, say it in Gaelic so that the most exposure to language that they’re getting is in Gaelic, so they pick it up faster. Then when they get to the end of primary 3, they would start, for their educational purposes, they would have to then start learning English. But you still speak to the children in Gaelic. So, even through, from primary 1 to 7 our policy is that we speak in Gaelic all the time through all curricular areas, even if we’re teaching English.

She shared an example of how she uses Gaelic while teaching an English lesson,

Like if we’re doing like a novel study, like in my class we’re doing an English novel study at the moment, we’ll talk about the novel, I’ll read the novel in English; we’ll discuss the novel in Gaelic. Anything that you do, you try and use Gaelic as much as possible.

Gavina added that the policy of Gaelic immersion at the school goes beyond the classroom. For instance, correspondence with the parents, the majority of whom are not Gaelic speakers, is also in Gaelic:

It’s the same with like anything that goes home. Once the children get to, I think it’s primary 3 or primary 4, once children get to primary 4 they should be classified that they are fluent enough that they can then translate for their parents.
So, they’ve been given instructions that they can translate for them so any homework will go home in Gaelic and then it’s then up to the children to explain to the parents what they’re meant to be doing. We don’t send, we’ll send maybe letters home if it’s for the parents, but anything for the children should be going home in Gaelic as well to promote the use of Gaelic as much as possible.

During classroom and whole-school observation, I noted that the principal language used throughout the school on a daily basis is Gaelic. In the classrooms of the lower and upper grades, teachers and students use Gaelic at all times. Classroom, hallway, and office signage is all in Gaelic with the exception of emergency information (e.g., fire escapes, medical information). Posters and student artwork that line the hallways and classrooms are all in Gaelic. As high school students walk through the hallways, they tend to speak English with one another; however, I noted that with teachers and classmates in the classrooms, they use Gaelic.

Bruce, also a teacher in the primary school, mentioned the particular importance of early childhood education in GME. He explained, “The policy is that wherever possible I will always be speaking Gaelic to the children; it’s important I think.” In his classroom, he spoke only in Gaelic. On occasion, a student would use an English word, and he would simply guide them back to Gaelic explaining the importance of using it. His demonstration of CLA came into play as he explained in Gaelic that other students do not have the same opportunities. Although Bruce usually switched between Gaelic and English in the teacher’s lounge, when a teacher came to his classroom door to ask about the lunch schedule in front of the students, Bruce responded to her in only Gaelic.
In the high school grades, the requirement for using only Gaelic becomes less definitive. Morag, a high school science teacher, explained,

First and second year I insist they speak . . . well, I think the formal word is “encourage” them in Gaelic, and with the higher classes, because there’s a lot of English content in their lessons, we have to teach them in English because their exam is in English. My rule is, if I speak to you in Gaelic, you respond in Gaelic. Nonetheless, Morag used Gaelic for the majority of her lessons. She used English on occasion to express scientific terms for which there was either no Gaelic word or for which students would need to know the English word for their standardized exams.

Morag also expressed the belief that immersion is important for second language learning. She described her own family history with regard to Gaelic learning:

My father left school at 14. You know, they all had the most amazingly beautiful handwriting and they would be beaten if they spoke Gaelic back in school. We weren’t, but my father’s generation certainly were. And the idea that you spoke Gaelic – ONLY Gaelic – meant that you were uneducated. So, they still see it as such. Even my mum would say to me that, when I first had the boys, that I would be confusing them if I was teaching them two languages or put them in GME [where they only spoke in Gaelic all day]. And I would stand in front of her and go “Do I look confused?”

Morag expressed CLA throughout her interview and likewise discussed the importance of immersion. Given the subject area she teaches, it can be difficult to use only Gaelic in all situations. She strives, however, to maintain a predominantly Gaelic-speaking classroom.
Teaching with patience. All five of the participants in this study emphasized the importance of patience when teaching as the majority of the students at the school come from English speaking backgrounds. Bailteil Gaelic School is unique in both its efforts to revitalize an endangered language in Scotland and its offering of a language other than English as the medium of instruction. This along with the school’s placement in a linguistically liminal setting, the participants say, is cause to be patient with students as they try to strengthen their abilities in Gaelic. While historical accounts show that students caught speaking Gaelic in school before the GME movement were often punished severely, the participants in this study explained that the administration at Bailteil Gaelic School encourages teachers to foster an environment that is nurturing and encouraging of the use of Gaelic without creating a sense of fear, intimidation, or burden on students. Gaelic, it is said, should be something the students are encouraged to speak rather than forced to speak.

Bruce discussed the importance of giving students opportunities to practice. He explained that in the early grades, the process of trial and error allows students to experiment; nevertheless, there needs to be an environment that is permissive of mistakes and does not drive students to give up on attempting to speak Gaelic. He maintained,

You know, you’re kinda fosterin’ . . . you try and foster an environment where you’re being encouraging and you’re encouraging them to have a go, you’re not being too hard on them if they’re, if they slip up a wee bit or they’ll get really stuck.

He added,
That’s what a lot of them need – just a wee bit of, a wee bit of encouragement and I think it’s important that you constantly encourage them just to try like if you don’t – so think of a sentence you want to say and, if you don’t know ONE word in the sentence, don’t just not try at all. Just try what you can.

He continued,

I would never mind if they say “Bha mise siteadh an seo [English ‘sit’ with Gaelic progressive/continuous morpheme ‘eadh’ added]” – I was sitting here like, you know, “bha ise a hurtheadh feelings agam [English ‘hurt’ with Gaelic progressive/continuous morpheme ‘eadh’ added]” because I know that you’re thinking and I know that you’re trying.

When asked if it bothered him when students in the above sentence “Bha ise hurting feelings agam,” Bruce responded

No. Because they’re thinking and they’re trying and I’d much rather they did that then, “Well, I don’t know that one word so I won’t say anything.” I would much rather they gave it a go because that is how you learn.

Bruce’s classroom was one in which students spoke mostly Gaelic. When they did slip into English or borrow English words, Bruce gently prodded them to try again in which case most students were able to attempt their response again using Gaelic.

Morag also expressed her reaction when she hears someone speaking Gaelic borrow a word from English. She explained,

Immediately, I want to correct them. But then I think, “Is that the right thing to do?” I’ll ask them, in a class setting, if they know the Gaelic for it? And if they
say “yes” then I’ll say, “Well, then try the sentence again using the Gaelic for the English word that you used.”

She added, “They don’t automatically make perfect links the first time around. I don’t think it’s the best thing to do to constantly correct them either.” As noted during my observations, Morag also maintained a classroom that encouraged what Gass (2013) and Ortega (2009) call risk-taking, or experimenting with language despite the chance of making errors.

Gavina was also cognizant of the vexation that often accompanies trying to communicate in a language other than one’s mother tongue. She detailed a specific instance in which one of her students had difficulty with communicating in Gaelic. She explained,

Last year I had a boy in my class who really struggled with Gaelic as well, and he found it very difficult to express himself. So, even asking him a simple question, he would get very frustrated. And with a child like that, you don’t want to say, “Well, I’m not speaking to you unless you speak to me in Gaelic” because that’s then stopping a child from being able to communicate. But with that boy, I’d say, “say as much of it as you can in Gaelic. Any words you don’t know, you can say to me in English” and then I would tell him the words in Gaelic. Then I’d get him to repeat it as well – say, “can you try and say that to me again?”

I noted during my observations that Gavina also fostered a classroom environment in which students felt free to experiment with language. During classroom observations, I witnessed one student who would often speak in English. Gavina would
encourage him to think of which of the words he had just spoken he could say in Gaelic. The student would repeat his phrases, often completely in Gaelic. In situations where he would revert to English, she would usually recast his sentence in Gaelic and respond to him in Gaelic. She would then await his response to affirm that he understood.

Mavis also expressed a sensitivity to the unique difficulties of learning Gaelic in an immersion environment. She commented,

I don’t think the students should be sort of punished or discriminated against simply because they don’t know some vocabulary or grammatical structure. It’s very difficult for the students to learn Gaelic because a lot of them don’t have it at home. They’re out in the community; they don’t hear it. I think we should be praising them a lot more rather than saying “you didn’t do this” or “you said this word instead of that word.” I think Gaelic then would become quite a strenuous thing for them – it might become quite a stressful thing.

Despite being an English teacher, Mavis required Gaelic in the classroom whenever possible (i.e., when they were not directly citing from the books they were reading or discussing). When students would say something in English, Morag would offer up a smile, and students would immediately revert to Gaelic.

**Teaching with empathy.** Along with patience, two participants emphasized the need for empathy in the classroom. Specifically, participants who did not consider themselves native speakers, mentioned the importance of understanding the experiences of their students. Both Bruce, who went through GME himself, and Norman, who learned
Gaelic as an adult, were conscious of the struggles learners face when GME is, for the majority of the students, the only exposure to Gaelic they receive on a daily basis.

Bruce expressed, “I think I have a real empathy with them because I was there as well, and I saw that. I know it’s really difficult.” In short discussions after class each day, Bruce would explain to me the struggles of particular students commenting that they came from English-speaking homes. He would discuss the understanding he felt for their situation as, though he came from a Gaelic-speaking home, he knew the difficulty of maintaining Gaelic and using it in a linguistically liminal setting like Bailteil. For him, the opportunities afforded learners in the Hebrides Islands and parts of the Highlands of Scotland, made the process somewhat easier.

Norman discussed a similar motivation to be empathetic to his students. As a learner, Norman himself noted the various specific struggles he remembered having and commented on how he exhibits patience and understanding with his own students in these situations. As no one in his family speaks Gaelic, Norman meets regularly with Gaelic-speaking friends in social settings to maintain the language. He mentioned that he worries less about making errors or mistakes as he has gained a high level of proficiency. Nonetheless, he remembers the fear he had in his early years of learning the language. He explained how this made him empathetic:

I think the native speakers could be a bit more aware of the learners’ experience and try to put themselves in our shoes and try and meet a bit more easily. It’s not a case about being shy. It’s about, you’re suddenly thinking, “Am I doing these things right? Are they thinking I’m an idiot?”
I asked Norman about specific errors he could understand among his students. He elaborated,

Spelling in Gaelic is pretty consistent, but it took me a few years to get around all the combinations of letters and how to pronounce it. I found it very difficult. Now I see there’s a system. But I can imagine every learner is going through the same thing.

He continued that he was confident that other teachers at Bailteil Gaelic School were empathetic to learners given the setting of the school and the overall nature of second language acquisition in general. He added, “I would describe the school as very nurturing, very welcoming, a safe place for many pupils.”

**Modeling the language.** Setting an example, Morag related, is good for any teacher in any context. She continued that modeling is essential, not only in areas of character and comportment in the classroom, but in issues related to language. This sentiment resonated with all five of the other participants. All five of the participants spoke often, both during the interviews and in informal conversations, about the necessity to “model good Gaelic” to the students. As the teachers had previously expressed what they thought “good Gaelic” to be, they believed it necessary to showcase such language to the students.

Although Bruce had already discussed his belief that students should speak a Gaelic with pronunciation as close to that of native speakers from the Hebrides Islands and Scottish Highlands, they should limit their borrowings from English, and they should avoid calquing from English as much as possible, he did make concessions. He specified,
“I think it’s just about compromise, like modeling good examples of good Gaelic to them, but also being able to use more recent and up-to-date vocabulary.” Bruce said he worked hard to speak slowly and clearly with students in order to be understood and make sure his phonetics were “correct.”

Morag also believed in the importance of modeling “good Gaelic” to the students. She elaborated, “There’s a great phrase in Gaelic that says “Ro de chi chlann bheag, sin iadh a chlann bheag” – what small children see, small children do.” She added, “We [teachers] are role models for them. If we expect them to do something, then we should behave accordingly.” In the classroom, Morag spoke predominantly Gaelic; furthermore, while in front of any students, Morag spoke with colleagues exclusively in Gaelic. While other teachers spoke mostly English in the teacher’s lounge, often for the benefit of visitors and ancillary staff who spoke limited Gaelic, they also mixed in a fair amount of Gaelic. Morag, however, tended to speak Gaelic the most often in the teacher’s lounge. During the interview, she asserted, “I firmly believe in the role model. Completely. Model the behavior you want and eventually it will come to you.”

Although Mavis is afforded more opportunities and justification for speaking English in the school than the other teachers given her position as an English instructor, she tries to model Gaelic for the students as often as possible. She explained,

Although I teach English, I’m a Gaelic speaker and I do try as much as I can, I say, have that bilingual classroom just so the students don’t think this is like a Gaelic-free zone. I do think it’s important for children to be able to hear teachers speaking Gaelic to each other in the corridors and stuff like that.
During my classroom observations, there was an instance where a student asked a question in English regarding a book she had chosen for their reading time in the library. Mavis smiled and said in Gaelic, “A bheil Gàidhlig agad? [Do you speak Gaelic?]” to which the girl smiled and recast her question in Gaelic.

Gavina also believed in the importance of modeling Gaelic for her students. Besides speaking in Gaelic with them and only speaking in Gaelic with her colleagues, she recognized the need to continue in Gaelic even when students are not as cooperative or in line with the Gaelic-only policies. She gave an example:

There’s a boy in my class – he finds language difficult, even in general. So, if he was in a mainstream school, he would struggle with language. So, Gaelic for him is very challenging. And he will speak to me in English most of the time, and I will speak back to him in Gaelic.

**Modeling and support outwith the school.** Three of the participants expressed the importance of parents, including those who are not Gaelic-speaking, to be active in their children’s education with regard to maintaining the language and keeping the children immersed in the language, whenever possible at home. The importance of “support outwith [outside of/apart from] the school,” has been partitioned here as a subtheme of “modeling the language.” Morag expressed,

I’m of the opinion that, I think it needs to be clear to parents because if parents aren’t on board, I think some parents actually think “Well, I don’t need to bother speaking to the kids in Gaelic because the school will deal with it” and they think “Och, well, I have a Gaelic-speaking child. Isn’t that wonderful?” You know, and
they have to take some of the responsibility as well, particularly with expectation. If you send your child to a Gaelic school, then we should expect them to be Gaelic speaking, at least 50% of the time. And parents should maybe lead by example. And if they don’t speak Gaelic, they should learn.

To encourage parents, Gavina adds,

Once the children get to primary 4, they should be classified that they are fluent enough that they can translate for their parents. So, we’ve been given instructions that they can translate for them. So, any homework will go home in Gaelic and then it’s up to the children to explain to the parents what they’re meant to be doing. Anything for the children should be going home in Gaelic as well to promote the use of Gaelic as much as possible.

Mavis added, “I think a lot of the students come from homes where parents are very supportive of Gaelic and the school and will want their children to do very well here. That’s important.” She continued that because of the school’s reputation for academic rigor, “there may be some parents who may see the school as ‘Oh, that’s fine. They’ll go there and I won’t need to push them because they’ll get their motivation from there.’” The school has made great strides with including parents in the children’s learning. Evening classes in Gaelic have been made available for parents, for example.

**Making the language worthwhile.** Whether it be fun, practical, or relevant, all of the participants in the study noted the necessity to make Gaelic, as an endangered language, worth the students’ time. They repeatedly mentioned that the sentiment among many Scots has been, as Morag phrased it, “What’s the point?” Each participant
discussed the importance of helping the students in Bailteil Gaelic School connect with the language. Participants had various perspectives as to how to engage students in learning a language they might otherwise view as antiquated or unnecessary.

Morag, for example, continued with her earlier point about students being required to learn “old croft Gaelic.” She maintained,

What I actually think now, is the majority of the children here have learned Gaelic. What they need to do is learn a very good basic use of the language in their everyday lives. And then if they so choose to go and find out the five different types of seaweed that grow, the knock yourselves out.

She continued,

I really do think that we have to focus on language being specific to their everyday lives. Because then they’ll use it. Because if it’s about 15 types of fish, are you interested? Probably not. So, I think it has to be relevant to them to use, as it were.

The importance for teaching a practical communicative language to the students as a theme that recurred in my discussions and interview with Morag. She added,

We need to teach them in a way that is relevant to today’s society and to today’s children because they’re different children from me when I was their age. I think we need to be relevant. I think that’s the key.

Morag’s belief is that education at Bailteil Gaelic School needs to be sensitive to the needs of the students or the language will not be passed on.
Gavina used words such as “modern,” “fun,” and “mainstream” to describe the way in which Gaelic needs to be taught. All of these, point to the worthwhileness of language. She explained,

Em, I think you need to make it [the language] modern. I think you need to make it something that people want to speak. I think a lot of people in Scotland think that Gaelic is a dying language and ‘what’s the point because how are you going to use it?’ I think we need to have more opportunities, more jobs, where you’re using your Gaelic – more opportunities for Gaelic to be spoken.

Morag sees a need for Gaelic speakers and those in political positions that work with language policy need to team up with those in the field of economics in order to create jobs that require Gaelic, thereby sustaining a marketplace of opportunity for the students who are going through the GME model. Furthermore, she holds that culturally responsive pedagogy needs to take into account the hybrid nature of the students at Bailteil Gaelic School. She explained,

A lot of the kids now that are learning Gaelic are inner-city kids. They come from Bailteil and they’ve never been to the Islands. They don’t have a connection with the Islands or the Highlands. They will probably never see a croft, and I think we need to get away from all the stories starting with “On the croft . . .” and “Going out to the sheep . . .” and all the children being called Màiri and Domhnall and Callum.”

She continued,
We need to make it more fun, which they’re starting to do. Like we’ve got Roald Dahl books in Gaelic now. We’ve got Jaqueline Wilson books in Gaelic. And that’s the kind of thing we need to do – just make it sort of a fun language that children want to learn. Like translate or write lyrics to tunes to pop songs like you would do in any other school. Make it more mainstream and more accessible to children that haven’t got a connection with the Islands. I think at the moment people just associate Gaelic with the Islands and if we keep it like that, it’s never going to come further forward. We’ve got to bring it into today’s society.

Therefore, Gaelic needs to, in Gavina’s mind, be made more fun and modern or it will die out. She stated, “You want something more fun – like soap operas.”

Gavina has worked hard to keep Gaelic relevant to students. She shared some of the methodologies she uses in order to encourage students to not see Gaelic as simply their “school language.” She explained,

Sometimes it’s good to just get the children to sit and let them talk, because some of them might not have the opportunity to just have a conversation in Gaelic about what they’re watching on tele the night before or their favorite pop group, but one thing we probably get is half the sentence in Gaelic, half the sentence in English. Making Gaelic something the students want to use to discuss personal issues from the affective domain, and allowing code-switching and the use of English as a crutch was a struggle that Gavina faced in these situations. She added,

We’re lacking a lot in an area, a niche for . . . everything’s technology-based nowadays. That’s all the kids want to do; they just want to go on the internet, play
games, video games, and they don’t have any of that in Gaelic. And I think we need to utilize that as well – to make sure we’re bringing it into the 21st century. We need to try as well to create more hype around it and young people. Like have Gaelic pop songs, have more modern day kind of culture stuff than just ‘oh, you need to speak Gaelic because 100 years ago, 200 years ago the Highland Clearances, the English banned it, it’s part of your culture.’ I think we need to try and make it a modern-day hype, make it a kind of fun language that they want to speak.

Finally, she stated,

Most people think that Gaelic is just something that some old people in the islands speak, that it’s a dying language but the government are trying to promote it in schools. I think we need to provide opportunities outwith [apart from] that, create more jobs where you would use Gaelic. The street signs are great, but make more kind of opportunities.

While this theme was noted across participants, it was particularly one that stood out with Gavina. Making Gaelic fun and relevant is at the heart of her mission as an educator.

Norman, empathetic to the struggles of learning Gaelic as a learner himself, explained some of the difficulties:

Sometimes I think kids just want to express themselves and have fun and sometimes it’s harder to do that when it’s not your first language. You look at kids in the playground; they’re not gonna speak Gaelic very much. They wanna have fun and express themselves, and the easiest way to do that is in English, not
their second language. They need to learn how to use it in context and in a fun way. Otherwise, they won’t.

Norman expressed on a number of occasions throughout the interview and informal discussions, “It’s important to make Gaelic fun.”

Norman expressed sorrow of the limited opportunities to use Gaelic on a daily basis, particularly for students in the k-12 age category. His belief is that the language needs to be more accessible and fun. He added,

I think to keep the language authentic is important, but I think in this environment, the trouble with Gaelic is that the numbers are quite low – speakers in the country. If you’re gonna keep it, make it easy for people to access it and learn it, it’s difficult when people have got such different accents, the words change, and so on.

The provision of more opportunities for his students to use Gaelic is something Norman has been investigating.

While all of the participants discussed the importance of motivation, both intrinsic and extrinsic, for learning and speaking Gaelic, Mavis shared some specific examples of things she has done in class to apply pressure to speak the language while maintaining a fun environment. Each of the students is assigned to a house, or school group. The houses act as teams that the students belong to throughout their schooling. The teams foster friendly competition through sports and other means of gaining points. Students get points for homework completed, community service, and a variety of other activities.

Sarah shared an example of how she used points to encourage the use of Gaelic in class.
Today, for example, I was covering a Gaelic class, and when I went in I spoke Gaelic to the class and they spoke Gaelic to me. Then immediately they started speaking English to each other. So, I said “Right, for this lesson, this is your Gaelic class. There will be no English in here. I’ll give every person 20 house points at the end of the lesson if you all speak Gaelic to each other. If I hear you speaking English, your points will decrease.” I guess it was motivating them in a way. It’s a bit superficial, but at the same time, it makes them want to speak Gaelic.

Both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for SLA have been considered among the teachers at Baileteil Gaelic School. They expressed a desire to see their students succeed, and they want the process to be enjoyable and worthwhile.

**Summary of findings for RQ2.** Although it was the last to be mentioned in each of the interviews, and therefore the last in my placement here, making the language worthwhile was perhaps the most salient theme mentioned by the participants. While transcriptions and the written word do not convey the passion with which the participants spoke, all five of the participants demonstrated a shift in tone when discussing this theme. They believed that making the language worthwhile was the most essential element to successful second language acquisition.

Bruce and Gavina, who teach in the primary grades, and Morag, who grew up in a fully Gaelic-speaking home, also spoke to the importance that immersion plays in GME, particularly in the lower grades. Modeling of the language was discussed on two levels; all five participants discussed the necessity for teachers to model “standard” Gaelic in the
school. Morag, whose children attend Bailteil Gaelic School, Gavina, and Mavis added the importance for the language to be modeled by parents in non-scholastic settings. They explained that students need to view Gaelic as “more than just their school language” as Morag put it. Finally, empathy and patience emerged as essential themes. Although they may appear as two sides of the same coin, Norman and Bruce, both of whom considered themselves non-native speakers, discussed the need for teachers to be empathetic to the specific struggles learners need whereas all the participants addressed the need for patience.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the findings of the study were organized by RQ and by themes that emerged to respond to the research question. For my first research question, participants discussed, in order of the interview protocol, their identity as Gaelic speakers, their beliefs about linguistic phenomena, and their beliefs regarding supralinguistic issues. First, each of the participants used a variety of terms to position themselves as Gaelic speakers (e.g., native speaker, fluent speaker, proficient speaker). This was often more related to where they grew up and less a matter of what language or languages they spoke in the home. Furthermore, participants had a number of views, sometimes seemingly contradictory, regarding linguistic phenomena. For example, at times they expressed permissive attitudes about code-switching and other translingual phenomena while at other times they espoused a more monolingual orientation. Finally, the participants also made connections between the Gaelic language and place, culture, and power.
For RQ2 I explored teachers’ beliefs about second language acquisition in their linguistically liminal context. I discovered that the participants believed that the immersive setting, which is at the heart of the school’s mission, was particularly important. Participants also believed in the importance of teaching with patience and empathy. Next, the participants discussed the need to model the language both in and out of school; engaging parents in the process, they argued, was crucial for intergenerational transmission of the language. Finally, all the participants addressed the need for making the language worthwhile for the students. While some spoke to the importance of creating spaces for students to use social media, read books, and listen to songs in the Gaelic language, others addressed issues of creating jobs that would be viable for Gaelic speakers in order to give GME students a goal and a purpose for learning the language apart from linguistic preservation and RLS. The findings from both research questions revealed the complexities specific to SLA in linguistically liminal settings.
Chapter Five

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to investigate GME teachers’ language ideologies as they relate to translingualism in a linguistically liminal setting. Moreover, this study sought to understand those teachers’ beliefs about second language acquisition such a setting. Semi-structured, focused interviews were used as a primary data source. Observations, though not analyzed, were used to aid in understanding the setting and interview responses. Employing a social constructivist approach, the data were analyzed using open, axial, and selective coding. The questions guiding this study were:

1. What are the language ideologies, related to translingualism, of teachers in a GME school in a linguistically liminal setting?

2. What do these teachers believe to be key elements of second language acquisition in such a context?

In this chapter I provide discussion of the findings and then provide and then provide conclusions and implications that have emerged. First, I discuss the four major findings from Chapter Four in in order of saliency. These are: the identity of GME teachers, teachers’ beliefs about students’ linguistic practices, connecting translingualism to the abstract, and making the language worthwhile. In this discussion, I make connections to the literature addressed in Chapter Two and explain how the findings
address gaps or further the literature. Next, I present conclusions and discuss implications for research, policy, and practice. Finally, I address the ways in which I ensured validity and reliability in this study and then provide final thoughts.

The Identity of GME Teachers

Following the interview protocol, all of the participants discussed their identities as Gaelic speakers. As all five participants discussed their roles as teachers and as speakers of the Gaelic language this the most salient theme for RQ1. Despite the fact that all of the participants speak Gaelic on a daily basis, they varied in their degree of confidence, language proficiency, background with the language, and nomenclature they chose to use regarding their status as Gaelic speakers.

As the participants talked about their identities as Gaelic speakers, they highlighted the nuances and complexities involved in discussions of language ideologies. When considering RQ1, it became apparent to me early in the in-depth interviews that their language ideologies with regard to translingualism were nuanced and sometimes seemed inconsistent. Internal contradictions were evidenced both in conflicting statements throughout the interview, as well as through the disconnect that often appeared between their stated ideologies and their pedagogical practice that I recorded during my observations.

Despite the number of participants who were fluent in Gaelic and learned it in tandem with English, they all appeared to reserve native speaker status, for example, for those who were from the Highlands and Islands. This theme was inextricably linked with the theme regarding the Herderian Tripartite associated with the monolingual orientation
as discussed by Canagarajah (2013b) in which languages tend to be tied to one specific geographic location. O’Rourke and Ramallo (2011) and MacCaluim (2007) likewise found that in endangered language contexts, speakers often use the term native speaker only for those who are from a particular area. As they explain that the literature regarding the native-nonnative dichotomy in endangered language settings is scant, this current study revealed similar findings and adds to the body of literature in that area.

The finding concerning complex identities is also in line with recent research agendas mentioned by Swain and Deters (2007). There is a continued need, they state, to explore and understand the “individual agency and multifaceted identities” of language learners (p. 820). As discussed in Chapter Two, Gass (2013) discusses the history of SLA research in which the focus has shifted from language teaching to language learning. Furthermore, SLA research has begun to make a “social turn” which includes considerations of learners’ identities, agency, and aptitudes (Swain & Deters, 2007). These discussions, however, have failed to consider the identities and agency of the language teachers themselves.

The research by Cammarata and Tedick (2012) discusses teachers’ identities specifically in language immersion programs. In particular, their study addresses whether teachers in immersive settings perceive themselves primarily as content instructors or language instructors. However, identities are multifaceted and include more than professional status. For example, going beyond the professional status of teachers, self-identification as native speakers or nonnative speakers has thus far been absent from the literature.
As a significant number of Gaelic speakers are now new speakers or learners of Gaelic (McLeod & O’ Rourke, 2015), promulgating the notion of the Herderian tripartite (i.e., language, geographic location, and culture are one and the same) discussed by Blommaert and Verschueren (1992) and Canaragajah (2013a, 2013b), could place a distance between speakers from traditional Gaelic regions such as the Highlands and Western Islands and speakers from other areas of Scotland and the world. It could furthermore cause GME students, particularly those under the tutelage of the participants, to be intimidated when speaking with those from traditionally Gaelic-speaking areas as addressed by MacCaluim (2017). Given the endangered status of the Gaelic language, intergenerational transmission and communication are essential for the survival of the language (Fishman, 1991).

It would therefore be beneficial for teacher education programs at Sabhal Mòr Ostaig and other institutions of higher education that are preparing teachers for service in GME settings to discard or problematize the framework that labels teachers as native speakers or nonnative speakers. As teachers set the tone, as well as model the language and ideologies, their understanding of the power embedded in these terms is key. Furthermore, these programs should consider courses that involve critical discussions with teachers about the importance of identity formation of new speakers and their agency in continuing the Gaelic language.

**Teachers’ Beliefs About Students’ Linguistic Practices**

The next section of the in-depth interview dealt with the teachers’ language ideologies about the specific linguistic aspects of Gaelic. Here they discussed whether
they were accepting of students engaging in various translingual practices common among bilingual speakers. Their beliefs concerning students speaking with non-traditional accents, code-switching, calquing, and borrowing words varied considerably. As with the theme of identity, participant responses demonstrated the nuances involved with language ideologies. None of the participants’ language ideologies aligned neatly at either end of the monolingual orientation-translingual orientation spectrum (Figure 5).

For example, I shared the example of the in-vivo code in Chapter Three “pronouncing Gaelic properly.” This and similar open codes showed that participants adhered to a monolingual orientation. Participants tended to maintain that the Bailteil accent of Gaelic, as was typically spoken by students in the classroom, was incorrect. Using categories such as right and wrong or good and bad, as stated in the opening of Chapter One, shows a positioning on the continuum of language ideologies (Figure 5) that is more monolingual. While McLeod and O’Rourke (2015) found that Gaelic learners tended to believe there was a good Gaelic and bad Gaelic, and further that native speakers were those who spoke good Gaelic, my study expanded this area of research.

First, my study focused on GME teachers rather than Gaelic learners. Another surprising finding was that Morag, the only self-identified native speaker, was more translingual in her approach. Unlike Gaelic learners and most self-declared non-native speakers in this study, she was accepting of newly developing phonological variations of Gaelic. My assumption was that as a native speaker of Gaelic, Morag would be more likely to subscribe to a monolingual orientation that emphasizes standardization, particularly from her area of the Gàidhealtachd.
The belief in a standard variation of the language is more in line with the monolingual orientation delineated by Canagarajah (2013b). Furthermore, it perpetuates the notion of native-speakerism discussed by Holliday and Aboshiha (2009). If accents from the Gàidhealtachd are considered more correct, then variations that emerge from L1 interference or language contact will be marked as sub-standard. To my surprise, Morag’s translingual approach was also manifest in her acceptance of students borrowing words from English and code-switching.

Although Bruce grew up with Gaelic, his ideology is similar to that of the new speakers in McLeod and O’Rourke’s (2015) study. His belief that there is a standard pronunciation that learners should mimic bolsters the concept of native speakerism and continues the legacy that the standard form is somehow not only more correct, but better and more prestigious (Mooney et al., 2011). Furthermore, Bruce explicitly commented on the pronunciation of the lateral /l/. While Nance’s (2014) work explicitly investigated the variation of production of laterals among three groups, the focus of her research was not on the role or ideologies of teachers with regard to such practices. My research highlights the monolingual orientation implicit in Bruce’s discussion of the students’ pronunciation of the /l/ phoneme. Specifically, he urges for the “correct” pronunciation in which students would presumably activate all the traditional variants of the lateral (i.e., dental velarized lateral, dental palatalized lateral, and alveolar lateral).

All of the teachers expressed conflict with regard to practice and ideology. For example, Bruce explains that he speaks with a Bailteil accent but believes his students should not. Mavis and Bruce admit to code-switching when speaking with each other and
their friends, but they argue that this is “grammatically incorrect.” Norman, likewise, discussed his concern that translingual practice was often the result of laziness. Nonetheless, he admitted to using words like “folderan,” a Gaelicized loanword from the English word “folders.” From an ideological perspective, they have chosen a monolingual orientation that prioritizes structure; however, they fail to reify this concept in their daily practice choosing instead to focus on the communitive function of language. This demonstrates the complex nature of language teaching. Teachers are continually faced with, as seen Cammarata and Tedick’s (2012) study, having to decide which language points to focus on, or moreover, between form and function.

Two participants, however, were not as overly concerned about the correct form produced by their students. Morag, for example suggested that a new dialect is developing outside of the Gàidhealtachd and this reality should be accepted. Students, in other words, are taking the language and making it their own. Gavina, likewise says that she appreciates how students have taken ownership of the language and “made it their own.”

From the sociocultural lens of SLA, this ideology encapsulates the Bakhtinian concept of dialogism. Although all the participants acknowledge that language is living and dynamic and amenable to change, Morag and Gavina celebrated the changes that are occurring among their students. They see language as contextualized, and they see their students as language agents who have come to make the language useful for their purposes and between their current interlocutors, namely other students from their backgrounds and locale.
**Connecting Translingualism to the Abstract**

Following the interview protocol, each of the participants also discussed issues that were supralinguistic in nature. In other words, while the first part of the interview dealt with teachers’ beliefs regarding linguistic phenomena, the focus shifted to connecting language to the abstract. The immediate themes to emerge related directly to the Herderian tripartite as delineated by Blommaert and Verschueren (1992) and reiterated later by Canagarajah (2013b).

Specifically, all of the participants made connections between language and place. They all alluded to the language as spoken in the Western Islands and the Highlands (i.e., the Gàidhealtachd). Norman spoke often of his desire to see a standard variation of the language set for the sake of ease when it comes to learning; simultaneously, he admitted a love for the various ways of speaking or dialects within the Gaelic language. Norman mentioned that he had not heard of the Gaelic language growing up until he visited a fishing village in the Highlands where the language was spoken. When asked if anyone in his town spoke the language, he was surprised and explained that his hometown was Scots and English-speaking and was not a Gaelic-speaking area. Furthermore, when discussing the variations of Gaelic, he specified “so many different islands with slight differences.” Norman did not validate or discuss the possibility of new dialects that are forming in Lowland Scotland. This was common among all of the participants who related the language specifically to the region in which it has been spoken in its recent history.
Gavina was more direct and explicit in her conflation of place and language. She discussed her childhood experiences with the language. She explained, “Because we grew up in Bailteil, I kinda learned Gaelic like that and so I would say I’m fluent, but I wouldn’t say I’m native.” For Gavina, Gaelic is not associated with Bailteil despite the fact that during Scotland’s distant history, the people of the region spoke Gaelic and during its present and future there are increasing numbers of speakers in the area. Nevertheless, Gavina does connect Gaelic with Scotland in general. In discussing attitudes toward Gaelic, she explains, “We need to do the same with Gaelic – make it so, ‘Oh, when we go [to Scotland], we speak [Gaelic]; when people come from the States, they can use Gaelic because it’s a language that we speak here.’” Here she has made the link between nation and language.

Bruce also drew a connection between place (i.e., the Gàidhealtachd) and the language. He stated, “. . . although we lived here [in Bailteil], we made sure that we maintained a strong connection to the Islands. We were always aware that’s what our culture was, that’s what our background was.” In this statement, he explicitly uses the word “connection” and links place and culture. Throughout his interview, he made connections between the Gàidhealtachd, Gaelic culture, and the Gaelic language.

The connection of culture and language was also apparent throughout the interviews and observations. For example, Gavina once again stated explicitly, “I think [Gaelic] is a major part of Scottish culture.” In discussing GME and the revitalization of Gaelic, Norman explained, “It’s a continuum; it’s a window in the past; it keeps the culture going.” Making the connection between language, place, and culture is at the
heart of Herder’s linguistic philosophy (Blommaert & Verschueren 1992; Canagarajah, 2013a).

This philosophy, as stated in Chapter Two, was born of the Romantic era (Blommaert & Verschueren, 1992) and stands counter to the translingual orientation of language. The translingual mindset allows for more a more fluid interpretation of language in which languages are not discrete but can adapt to the time, place, and culture in which they are used. A translingual mindset, would see dialects such as Singlish, for example, as valid as they are useful for their settings (Kachru, 1989; Jenkins, 2010). Again, the emphasis is on the communicative role of language.

Three participants also made the link between language and power as well. Within discussions of language ideologies, Woolard (1998) explains that ideologies can relate to positions of social, political, and economic power. Bruce’s explains,

You also need to help them understand why they’re here, and need to kinda try and foster an attachment between them and this, this language and not make it this abstract thing that they come and do every day, but show them that this is a real language, a living language and there’s opportunities to use this outside of just your classroom.

Bruce recognizes the value of having students understand their role in the revitalization of Gaelic. The use of the word opportunities shows that his desire is not simply in creating language learners but, as McLeod and O’Rourke (2015) explain, “active users of the language” (p. 165). Morag also commented on the connection between bilingualism
and opportunities. Norman added to the discussion the importance of validating the Gaelic language and culture despite opposition toward efforts for revitalization.

Making the Language Worthwhile

The most salient theme for RQ2 was related to making the language worthwhile for students. This included, according to the participants, creating spaces where they can use the language in their everyday lives outside of the classroom (e.g., extracurricular activities, community activities), creating potentials for using the language upon graduating (e.g., jobs in broadcasting, jobs in offices), and creating curriculum that was practical and relevant to the students’ actual lives (e.g., books, music), and overall, making students want to continue using the language and keep it alive.

Gavina was the most passionate about this issue. She linked making the language relevant and keeping it alive stating. She focused on the importance of making the language fun, relevant, and modern; each of these served codes during the analysis phase of my research and could be further explored, but they all related to the theme of worthwhileness. Fishman (1991) explains that education in itself is not enough to continue an endangered language. Intergenerational transmission must be considered from a variety of angles. As many of the modes of technology in use today (e.g., the internet) were not in place at the time of Fishman’s (1991) original treatise on language revitalization, Crystal’s (2010) scale for classifying languages may be more apropos.

Gavina shared many examples of ways in which the language could be made more relevant. She discussed creating pop music in Gaelic, translating popular books into Gaelic, writing more Gaelic literature aimed at children, creating internet games that use
Gaelic, and creating jobs that require Gaelic. She added that Gaelic “needs to be integrated into the community.” She made comparisons between the situation of Gaelic in Scotland and the situation of Welsh in Wales and Irish in Ireland. Her thoughts are encapsulated in her statement, “We need to try and make a more modern day hype – make Gaelic a fun language that they want to speak.”

Gavina made some marked connections among language, culture, and place. Nevertheless, she explained that as the language is generally discussed in terms of its relationship to the Gàidhealtachd, many students might be unable to connect the language with their daily lives or their personal identities. She believed that making the language relevant to the lives of urban, modern students in her school, approximately 80% of whom are not from Gaelic-speaking homes, was key to sustaining the language. Gavina’s sentiments were greatly in line with Swain’s (1985) study that concluded that immersion schools often fail to provide meaningful opportunities to use the language in authentic settings.

Gavina, Morag, Norman, and Bruce all used the phrase, “What’s the point?” when discussing common attitudes of students and Scottish citizens alike with regard to revitalizing Gaelic and implementing GME throughout Scotland. Gavina stated that Gaelic should be “promoted and developed” as much is lost when a minority language dies. She asserted that Gaelic is a “major part of Scottish culture” and it “opens a lot of opportunities that you don’t realize that you have.” She continued to explain that her career path changed from being an artist to being a teacher precisely because she “had Gaelic.”
The participants saw a number of elements to be key for SLA in a linguistically liminal setting, but fostering a sense of worthwhileness in students was the most essential. Otherwise, they believed they language would become a “school language” and nothing else.

**Conclusions**

Overall, this study highlights the complexity of language ideologies in linguistically liminal settings. With Canagarajah’s (2013a, 2013b) model of translingualism as explained in Chapter Two, none of the participants fits neatly anywhere on the monolingual orientation-translingual orientation (Figure 5) continuum, for example. Like participants in my pre-pilot and pilot studies, the participants in this study manifested language ideologies that were complex. Furthermore, this study demonstrates the specific facets involved with SLA in GME. Each of the participants shared areas that they believe are essential for helping students learn the Gaelic language in a linguistically liminal setting. Specifically, four major conclusions can be drawn from this study.

First, language ideologies are often contradictory both in and among participants. The participants in this study often gave conflicting ideologies with regard to translingualism. While at some points during the in-depth interviews they expressed a proclivity toward a standard structural view of language that is encapsulated in the monolingual orientation (Canagarajah 2013a, 2013b), at other points they expressed an understanding that languages are organic and should be taught with communication in mind, a manifestation of the translingual orientation (Canagarajah, 2013a, 2013b).
Moreover, language ideologies also varied between participants. Without a presiding body that governs the Gaelic language, “everyone did what was right in his own eyes” (Judges 21:25 English Standard Version). While some may see this as a negative, this revealed teachers are given autonomy with regard to language instruction and students are being exposed to a number of language ideologies and perspectives. Language ideologies are complex and nuanced.

Second, it can be concluded that language ideologies and practice are often at odds with each other. As with worldviews and epistemologies, it is impossible to act fully consistent with our language ideologies. The participants in this study, for example, often discussed a disdain for certain language practices (e.g., codeswitching, calquing, borrowing words from English), but either allowed for such practices in their classroom or used them in their own teaching. This contradiction between belief and practice is not a moral infraction but rather a symptom of humanity. It is true that in every situation we often act contradictory to our worldviews or beliefs. Language ideologies are no different. For this reason, a top-down response that implements a standard language policy will not only fail because it is unreasonable and imposes a new power-language dynamic, but it could also cause undue stress and internal conflict in teachers who are striving to reach the policy but know that language is organic.

Third, the participants in this study generally saw the importance of emphasizing the relationship between language and power when teaching Gaelic to their students. CLA is essential in RLS settings and particularly in linguistically liminal environments. The participants also recognized the place of the Gaelic language in its socio-historical
context. They believe the importance of understanding the history of language oppression and see a need to impart that aspect of Gaelic to the students they teach.

Finally, some facets of SLA are unique or more important in RLS settings and linguistically liminal settings. For example, authentic communicative practice is essential in learning any language, but worthwhileness, in its many forms, was one of the predominant themes found in this study. While in foreign language education the communicative nature of language is emphasized, it is often more difficult for students in RLS settings to access the language, particularly in linguistically liminal settings, as there is no nexus of pop culture and the target language, for example. Moreover, there are fewer models of the language for students to follow. Teachers see the importance of making the language worthwhile and creating spaces in which the students can use the language in meaningful and relevant ways.

Implications for Research, Policy, and Practice

Research. There is a continued need for research regarding codeswitching and translingual practice in the classroom specifically as it occurs among teachers. While there have been calls for research regarding translingual practice in education (e.g., Canagarajah 2013a), the research is scant. There is also a need to understand translingual practice among students. Is such practice the result of laziness, as Bruce suggested, or is it an example of students taking ownership of the language and demonstrating hybridization as a manifestation of their agency?

Furthermore, there is a need for further research in understanding identity formation of GME teachers as part of the social turn in SLA. Much of the literature that
discusses calls for research in this area has focused thus far on the identities of students. As teachers’ language identities are transmitted in how and what they teach, whether intentionally or explicitly, it is important to consider and understand the nexus of language teachers’ identities and the agency of their students.

Finally, more research should be conducted that considers the relationship between teacher empathy and student success in immersion settings. There is an emerging body of literature that considers the social turn in SLA and student affect. Nevertheless, we must consider the role of teachers not only as grammarians and applied linguists but as mentors and role models. Understanding the impact that empathy plays on student outcomes is vital.

**Policy.** The findings of this study suggest the need for policy requiring all GME teachers to take courses regarding the confluence of language and power. CLA is essential in teaching any language, but it is of particular importance with RLS in linguistically liminal settings. Furthermore, space is needed for GME teachers, in pre-service and in-service settings, to engage in critical discussions about language ideologies with regard to translingualism. The key then is to verbalize those ideologies, dissect them, understand them, and problematize them. Through these discussions teachers are able to think more deeply about the role language plays in their specific classrooms.

It is also necessary for the creation of spaces in which students and teachers in linguistically liminal settings can use the language. While the Gaelic Language Act has allowed for more use of the country in legal settings, road signs, and other official capacities, opportunities for the everyday use of the language is lacking. It would be
beneficial for private and public sectors, grass-roots organizations (e.g., GME schools) and larger government-funded organizations (e.g., CnaG, Bòrd na Gàidhlig), and Gaelic speakers in the arts community (e.g., poets, musicians), for example to consider ways in which they can collaborate for the creation of relevant and worthwhile activities and media that would allow GME students the opportunity to see Gaelic used in non-scholastic settings.

Practice. Teachers should first be conscious of both language and content when teaching in a GME (i.e., immersion setting). They should furthermore consider ways in which they can address translingualism so that students are conscious of language and aware of the expectations of the teacher (e.g., is it acceptable to codeswitch or borrow words in a given class?). There is also a need to consider ways in which they teach with CLA. Allowing for intentional conversations of the socio-historical context of the Gaelic language is key.

Teachers must also consider ways in which they can make the language worthwhile. While many endeavors may seem outside the realm of a teacher’s ability (e.g., writing Gaelic books), engaging in collaboration and implementation of extracurricular activities is one way in which teachers can affect change. Finally, in-services should be held in which Gaelic learners can express some of the particular difficulties they faced when learning the language (e.g., orthography, grammar). This transfer of knowledge would allow native speakers to consider ways to be more empathetic to their own students with regard to specific grammar points that may be taken for granted by those whose L1 is Gaelic, for example.
Reliability and Validity

A number of steps were taken to ensure reliability and validity for this study. First, before data analysis, I outlined my researcher bias and considered my role as the researcher. This reflexivity continued throughout the data collection and analysis phases of my research. From interview to interview, for example, I considered ways that my bias might influence follow up questions and an evaluation of my findings and used this insight in framing questions slightly differently in interviews with other participants. I also worked to reduce my researcher bias by collecting thick data. During the interviews, I asked follow up questions and clarification questions.

Next I analyzed my data using both open, axial, and selective coding. In this process, I invited a colleague to code portions of my interviews and review my field notes to ensure reliability. Finally, I used the participants’ own words in the presentation of the data to minimize researcher bias.

Final Thoughts

SLA, RLS, translingualism, educational linguistics, and Scottish Gaelic have all been interests of mine for some time. This study allowed me to bring them all together in a manner that was beneficial personally, professionally, and academically. While this case study was primarily intrinsic in that I hoped to better understand the specific language ideologies of GME teachers in a linguistically liminal setting, I hope other researchers will use these findings to better understand the situations faced by those in immersive settings and inform future research. All of the participants in this study worked assiduously to achieve the missions of the school, and their interest in and care
for revitalizing the Gaelic language through intergenerational transmission gave me insight into the particular complexities that surround SLA in Gaelic Medium Education.
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Interview Guide

The goal of this survey is to get a better holistic picture of your background, education, setting, and experiences rather than to get detailed information about every part. These questions are guiding questions to help keep me, the interviewer, on track. The questions are fluid and may change slightly from participant to participant (Glesne, 2011, pp. 118-130; Maxwell, 2013). Some of these questions may not apply to every setting or participant. You may not be sure of the answer of some of the questions.

In this interview, the term “Gaelic” may be used in place of “Scottish Gaelic” as the former is generally accepted as synonymous with the second.
Personal Background

1. What is your name?

2. Where are you from? (City/town, country)

3. How old are you?

4. Describe your family (e.g., siblings, parents) and upbringing?

5. What’s something unique about you?

Educational Background

1. Where did you go to school (k-12)? College/University? Other?

2. What was your course of study? What was the medium of instruction?

3. Did you have any teachers you particularly liked or didn’t like?

4. What stood out about them?

5. As a student, what were your favorite classes? Why so?

6. What else have you done since university in terms of your professional education?

7. How would you characterize your overall education?

8. Are there any classes you wish you could have taken or subjects you wish you could learn more about?

Language Background

1. Please talk about the language that was spoken in the home when you were growing up. What language did your parents speak? In what ways did you use language with them?
2. How did you learn Scottish Gaelic? Reading and writing?

3. How many years did you study it formally?

4. Are there any particular people you feel more comfortable speaking it with (e.g., siblings, family, close friends, people in the town)?

5. Are there situations in which you feel more comfortable in English? If so, which?

6. What formal education have you had in Scottish Gaelic grammar or linguistics? Otherwise?

7. What other languages do you know? How did you learn them? How would you characterize your ability and fluency in them?

8. What is/was your interest in learning Scottish Gaelic or any other languages?

9. How fluent, proficient, or confident do you feel in Scottish Gaelic? How would you characterize your use of Gaelic?

10. How would you characterize the revitalization of Scottish Gaelic today?

Profession

1. Where do you currently teach?

2. What ages are your students?

3. What subject materials/classes do you teach?

4. How did you come upon teaching in a GME setting?

5. What jobs did you have before this?

6. What requirements were there to be able to teach in a GME setting?

7. What else have you taught since you have been teaching?

8. How would you describe your professional background?
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Your Teaching Setting

1. How long has the school in which you teach been around?

2. About how many students are in the school? What are their home languages (if you know)?

3. Are there any policies about speaking Gaelic for the staff? For the students?

4. Tell me about a time when one of your students tried to use another language in class. How do you perceive the motivation, interest, or enthusiasm of your students to use Gaelic in the classroom?

5. What kind of extra-curricular opportunities are there for the students? Do the faculty and staff use Gaelic during these activities.

6. What kind of preparation have most of the teachers had?

7. How would you describe your school and its purpose?

8. How would you characterize your students overall?

Language Ideology

General

1. An article in Deadline came out back in December that discussed changes that are occurring in Gaelic spoken in Glasgow. How does this make you feel?

2. Do you think languages should be able to grow and change in their environments?

3. Do you think languages should remain pure?

4. Do you think Gaelic should remain “pure” and/or “standard” or should it have room to change? Why?

Phonological
5. Have you ever heard anyone speaking Gaelic with a Glaswegian accent? If so, what did you think?

**Lexical/Semantic**

6. If you heard someone say “Tha i teth!” (Literally “she is hot in temperature!”) in Gaelic to mean “she’s super attractive” what would your reaction be? How about if one of your students said this? (calquing)

7. In colloquial English people use “like” as filler or as a term of approximation. What do you think when you hear someone use “mar” in Gaelic to do the same thing? How about if your students did this? (calquing)

8. When you hear someone speaking Gaelic and they use an English word or a Scots word where a Gaelic word exists, what is your reaction? How about if a student did this? (borrowing)

9. How do you feel when someone code-switches – mixes Gaelic and English or Scots in one sentence? How about if your students did this?

**Other**

1. What are some reasons that you went into teaching? Why GME particularly?

2. What types of traits do you think make a good teacher?

3. What are your favorite things about teaching?

4. What do you enjoy doing in your spare time?

5. Teaching can be a lot of work – sometimes even scary. Apart from teaching, tell me about a time when you were very scared.
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