

The Provision of Foreign Language Learning for Pupils at Key Stage 2

Dr Patricia Driscoll, Christ Church University College Canterbury
Dr Jane Jones, King's College London
Dr Gee Macrory, Manchester Metropolitan University

The Provision of Foreign Language Learning for Pupils at Key Stage 2

Dr Patricia Driscoll, Christ Church University College Canterbury
Dr Jane Jones, King's College London
Dr Gee Macrory, Manchester Metropolitan University

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education and Skills.

CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	7
GLOSSARY	8
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	9
• The extent of PMFL provision	10
• Time	10
• Language	11
• Staffing	11
• Resources and support	11
• Perceived effectiveness of different types of PMFL delivery	12
• Transition procedures between KS2 and KS3	13
• Primary teachers' MFL qualifications and training needs	13
• Meeting the primary language learning entitlement	14
• Recommendations	15
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION	18
1.1 Aims and objectives of the study	19
SECTION 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	21
2.1 Why learn a foreign language at primary school?	22
2.2 The time factor	23
2.3 Language awareness	24
2.4 Cultural awareness	24
2.5 Types of delivery	25
SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY	27
3.1 Primary School Questionnaires	27
3.2 Primary and Middle School Teacher Questionnaires	29
3.3 Secondary Schools Questionnaire	30
3.4 LEA Questionnaire	30
3.5 Key Stakeholder Discussions	31
3.6 School Spotlights	31

SECTION 4: PRIMARY SCHOOL SURVEY	33
4.1 When and how PMFL is offered at KS2	33
4.2 Languages offered at KS2	39
4.3 Teacher expertise	43
4.4 Staffing and sustainability of PMFL	44
4.5 Resources, support and sustainability	46
4.6 Sustainability of arrangements	48
4.7 Secondary school support	48
4.8 Meeting the challenges	50
4.9 Perceived benefits of PFML	52
4.10 A national strategy	54
4.11 Meeting the primary language learning entitlement	55
 SECTION 5: PRIMARY TEACHER SURVEY	 57
5.1 PMFL staffing	57
5.2 Teachers' foreign language expertise	60
5.3 Teachers' views of PMFL teaching	61
5.4 Support and training	65
 SECTION 6: SECONDARY SCHOOL SURVEY	 68
6.1 Selection of sample	68
6.2 Managing the transition from KS2 to KS3	68
6.3 Contributions by secondary schools to KS2 PMFL teaching	72
6.4 Transition from KS2 to KS3	74
 SECTION 7: LEA SURVEY	 79
7.1 Schools offering PMFL	79
7.2 Languages offered	79
7.3 Use of curriculum time and clubs	80
7.4 Support provided by LEAs	80
7.5 Funded support	81
7.6 Training	82
7.7 Resources	83
7.8 Plans and future developments	84
7.9 Conditions contributing to an increase in PMFL	85
7.10 Summary of findings	87
 SECTION 8: KEY FACTORS OF GOOD PRACTICE	 89

SECTION 9: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	93
9.1 Baseline	93
9.2 Aims	93
9.3 Languages offered	94
9.4 Time	94
9.5 Achievement and assessment	95
9.6 Transition from KS2 to KS3	96
9.7 Staffing	97
9.8 Training	98
9.9 Quality of teaching	99
9.10 Resources	99
9.11 Funding	100
9.12 A PMFL community	100
9.13 Inclusion	101
9.14 Fragility	102
9.15 Recommendations	103
9.16 Summary of recommendations	104

BIBLIOGRAPHY	106
---------------------	-----

APPENDICES

The following appendices to this report are available on the DfES Research Website

APPENDIX 1	School spotlights
APPENDIX 2	Discussion Forums
APPENDIX 3	Questionnaires
APPENDIX 4	Interview and Observation Schedules
APPENDIX 5	Prompt sheet for last discussion forum

LIST OF TABLES

		Page No
Table 1	Response rates for the stages of the primary school survey	28
Table 2	Responses to the Primary Teachers' Questionnaire	29
Table 3	Use of curriculum time by year group	35
Table 4	Extent of use of curriculum time by year group	36
Table 5	Regional estimates for the proportion of schools offering KS2 PMFL	37
Table 6	Differences between schools offering and not offering KS2 PMFL	38
Table 7	Proportion of schools offering specific languages	40
Table 8	Reasons for offering a particular language	41
Table 9	Reasons for ceasing to offer KS2 PMFL	42
Table 10	Teachers with expertise in specific languages, by region	43
Table 11	Actual and ideal teachers of PMFL as seen in schools offering PMFL	44
Table 12	Sustainability rates for schools using types of teacher to deliver PMFL	46
Table 13	Proportion of questionnaire respondents offering PMFL making use of resources and administrative aids	47
Table 14	Links reported between primary and secondary schools as proportion of schools with links with SLCs and of schools responding positively to the questionnaire	49
Table 15	Proportions of schools offering PMFL, of schools not offering PMFL, and of LEAs agreeing the factors that would increase the extent of PMFL	51
Table 16	Perceived benefits to primary pupils of PMFL and proportion of schools selecting each benefit as the most important	52
Table 17	Proportion of schools responding to the questionnaire with varying degrees of delivery of the PMFL entitlement	55
Table 18	Future plans for the delivery of the language learning entitlement	56
Table 19	Proportions of schools not delivering, or not substantially delivering, the PMFL entitlement in LEAs anticipating and not anticipating progress between 2002 and 2004 with plans to deliver the PMFL entitlement	56

Table 20	<i>Satisfaction and aspiration rates relating to types of teacher of PMFL</i>	57
Table 21	<i>Levels of teacher proficiency in languages</i>	60
Table 22	<i>Levels of qualification in languages reported by all responding teachers</i>	60
Table 23	<i>Levels of confidence in teaching PMFL</i>	61
Table 24	<i>Numbers of respondents presently teaching, reporting current and ideal time for teaching PMFL to year groups</i>	61
Table 25	<i>Age at which children should start MFL</i>	62
Table 26	<i>Perceived Benefits of Learning PMFL</i>	63
Table 27	<i>Proportion of respondents that support various approaches to teaching</i>	64
Table 28	<i>Proportion of first sample respondents not teaching but wishing to teach PMFL requiring types of support or training</i>	65
Table 29	<i>Training providers used by first sample teachers currently teaching PMFL</i>	66
Table 30	<i>Links with partnership schools</i>	69
Table 31	<i>Was of managing progression and continuity</i>	70
Table 32	<i>Current plans to help partnership schools deliver the PMFL entitlement</i>	72
Table 33	<i>Contribution by secondary schools to PMFL teaching</i>	73
Table 34	<i>Willingness to contribute to PMFL teaching</i>	73
Table 35	<i>Satisfaction with existing transition arrangements</i>	76
Table 36	<i>Levels of PMFL activity reported by LEAs</i>	79
Table 37	<i>Languages offered</i>	80
Table 38	<i>LEAs providing support or funding forms of support for PMFL</i>	81
Table 39	<i>Numbers of forms of support provided or funded by LEAs</i>	82
Table 40	<i>Forms of training provided by LEAs</i>	83
Table 41	<i>Resources provided by LEAs</i>	84
Table 42	<i>Proportion of pupils projected to experience PMFL before the end of KS2: numbers of LEAs</i>	85

<i>Table 43</i>	<i>Proportion of pupils projected to experience PMFL before the end of KS2: numbers of LEAs expressing interest in Pathfinder status</i>	85
<i>Table 44</i>	<i>Factors regarded by respondents as likely to increase PMFL</i>	86

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Research Team wishes to acknowledge the support of a great many people who have contributed variously to the project.

We owe a debt of gratitude to the teachers and pupils who allowed us into their classrooms. We are particularly indebted to the teachers for their openness; without their co-operation this research would not have been possible. The team also acknowledges the help provided by the Local Education Authorities for permission to visit and gather data in primary and secondary schools.

The team is very grateful to the Steering Committee, led by Simon Tanner. Their help throughout has given much important feedback as well as ongoing support for the project.

CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Patricia Driscoll, Project Director, Christ Church University College Canterbury
Dr Jane Jones, Deputy Project Director, King's College London
Dr Gee Macrory, Deputy Project Director, Manchester Metropolitan University
Professor Carl Parsons, Consultant, Christ Church University College Canterbury
Dr Ray Godfrey, Consultant, Christ Church University College Canterbury
Dr Sacha Powell, Research Fellow, Christ Church University College Canterbury
Dr Yolanda Foster, Research Fellow, Christ Church University College Canterbury
Dr Lynne Graham Matheson, Research Fellow, Christ Church University College Canterbury
Dr Joan Smith, Research Fellow, Christ Church University College Canterbury

SCHOOL SPOTLIGHT CONTRIBUTORS

Justine Earl, Research Fellow, Christ Church University College Canterbury
Simon Coffey, Research Fellow, King's College London
Aisha Khan, Research Fellow, King's College London
Cathy Brady, Research Fellow, Manchester Metropolitan University
Sheila Anthony, Research Fellow, Manchester Metropolitan University
Pura Ariza, Research Fellow, Manchester Metropolitan University

STEERING GROUP

Simon Tanner, Analytical Services, Schools Research Team DfES
Lisa Hyde, Modern Foreign Languages Team DfES
Helen Groombridge, Modern Foreign Languages Team DfES
Nigel Gee, Analytical Services, Schools Research Team DfES
Chris Maynard, QCA Consultant for MFL
Dr Alan Dobson, Consultant, former HMI
Glynis Rumley, PMFL Adviser for Kent
Lorraine Flynn, Stretford Community College
Peter Taylor, Headteacher, Worth Primary School

GLOSSARY

AEN	Additional Educational Needs (used in some contexts in preference to SEN)
AST	Advanced Skills Teacher
Comenius projects	EU funded projects linking schools and other educational institutions within the EU SOCRATES educational programme
CILT	The Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research, now renamed the National Centre for Languages (NLC)
EAL	English as an additional language (where the mother tongue is not English)
First language	The mother tongue: for many children this will be English although a number of children have English as an additional language (EAL) in some schools
Language Awareness	An understanding of the structure and concept of language
LINGUA	EU funded projects focussing on MFL teaching and learning
MFL	Modern Foreign Languages
PGCE	Post Graduate Certificate of Education
PMFL	Primary Modern Foreign Languages
SAT	Term commonly used in schools to refer to the National Curriculum tests
SEN	Special Educational Needs
SLC	Specialist Language College. Schools that have successfully obtained specialist school status for Modern Foreign Language teaching.
QCA	Qualifications and Curriculum Authority

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study was commissioned by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES), to investigate the extent of primary modern foreign language (PMFL) learning in England and the characteristics of different types of delivery. In December 2002, the DfES published a Languages Strategy for England, *Languages for All: Languages for Life*, which set out a strategy for transforming the country's capability in languages. The Strategy includes an entitlement for language learning at Key Stage 2 (KS2), to be implemented by the end of the decade:

Every child should have the opportunity throughout KS2 to study a foreign language and develop their interest in the culture of other nations. They should have access to high quality teaching and learning opportunities, making use of native speakers and e-learning. By age 11 they should have the opportunity to reach a recognised level of competence on the Common European Framework and for that achievement to be recognised through a national scheme. The KS2 language learning programme must include at least one of the working languages of the European Union and be delivered at least in part in class time (DfES, 2002: p15).

This research establishes a robust baseline from which changing provision can be assessed as primary schools move towards providing the primary language learning entitlement. The findings will help policy makers and teachers to understand more clearly the diversity of provision and the characteristics and conditions of good practice in teaching and learning PMFL as well as in transition procedures between KS2 and KS3. They also provide evidence of teachers' qualifications and training and their views about their training needs.

The research instruments developed for this purpose were:

- questionnaire to primary and middle schools (2966 returns);
- questionnaire to teachers in primary and middle schools (2825 returns);
- questionnaire to MFL teachers in Specialist Language Colleges and other secondary schools (182 returns);
- questionnaire to LEAs (113 returns);
- spotlights - i.e. individual school studies - of PMFL settings (15);
- discussion groups with a range of key stakeholders involved in PMFL provision.

The extent of PMFL provision:

- This study has established that 44% of schools teaching KS2 pupils in England offer PMFL to some of their pupils. Curriculum time is used for this in 35% of all schools. PMFL provision is not, however, as extensive as this might suggest; only 3% of schools give all pupils in *all* year groups of KS2 a PMFL session of at least 20-30 minutes at least once a week. Furthermore, only 3 of the responding schools were teaching all pupils in KS2 for 50 minutes or more a week.
- The primary language learning entitlement is therefore starting from a low baseline, and two-fifths of schools with PMFL thought their provision was vulnerable to changes in circumstances.
- Factors selected by LEAs as likely to assist an increase in the number of schools offering PMFL were: increased funding (91%), reduced pressure on the KS2 curriculum (75%) and more suitably qualified staff (69%).

Time

- The most commonly reported lesson length was 20-30 minutes and the most commonly reported frequency was weekly.
- The nature and amount of provision varied across different KS2 year groups. Older pupils generally had more time allocated and had more dedicated language lessons. These lessons were also more frequent than those for younger pupils.
- 14% of all responding schools reported that Year 6 pupils received specific PMFL lessons.
- 39% of primary teachers favoured dedicating more time to teaching PMFL.
- Pressures on curriculum time were a major factor in deciding whether to offer PMFL: 27% of schools that had withdrawn PMFL gave lack of time as one of their reasons for doing so.

Language

- French is the language most commonly taught. Of all schools teaching KS2 pupils: 40% offered French; 32% offered only French; and 8% offered more than one language.
- 60% of all schools offering PMFL taught a particular language because there was a teacher available with expertise, within the school, to teach it. Among schools that had ceased offering PMFL, 27% had done so because the specific teacher had left the school.
- 36% of schools offering PMFL taught a particular language because it was part of the local secondary school curriculum and 24% because resources were available.

Staffing

- Where it was offered, PMFL was taught by class teachers in 41% of schools; by peripatetic teachers in 16% of schools; by volunteers or parents in 15% of schools, by secondary teachers in 13% of schools, by a language teacher on the staff in 12% of schools, by Foreign Language Assistants (FLAs) in 5% of schools and by Teaching Assistants (TAs) who can teach a foreign language in 4% of schools.
- In contrast, where PMFL was offered, 45% of schools favoured a language teacher on the school staff, (who is also likely to be a class teacher) as the ideal PMFL teacher; 39% favoured class teachers, 34% peripatetic teachers, 27% favoured FLAs and only 10% of primary schools favoured secondary school teachers or TAs.
- Schools using language teachers on the school staff were the most likely to think their current arrangements were ideal (85% were satisfied).

Resources and support

- More than 50% of all LEAs respondents offered little or no forms of support to schools for PMFL. In contrast about 30% of LEAs offer over 5 different types of support for PMFL such as training, networks or links with secondary schools.

- Only 9% of schools offering PMFL had a formal record-keeping or assessment strategy and 18% had a PMFL learning statement or policy.
- Factors selected by LEAs as likely to assist an increase in PMFL included increased funding (selected by 91%). This view was supported by 72% of primary schools not currently offering PMFL.
- Among teachers not currently teaching PMFL, 82% said they would require teaching materials before they were prepared to teach PMFL and 77% would require schemes of work. There was a significant lack of awareness amongst teachers about the types of resources available and the ways in which they can be used. Approximately 15% of schools reported that resources were unavailable when the LEAs reported that they provided them.
- Only 6% of LEAs reported that they had a policy in relation to PMFL.

Perceived effectiveness of different types of PMFL delivery

- Primary teachers rated benefits in terms of pupils' attitude to learning PMFL more important than other potential benefits. 37% of schools offering PMFL thought it developed a positive attitude to learning a foreign language and 22% said it developed a positive attitude to other cultures. Only 10% of teachers, however, rated developing pupils' foreign language competence as the most important benefit of PMFL.
- 71% of primary teachers thought that regular specific PMFL lessons were an effective way of incorporating PMFL into the curriculum, 66% thought that PMFL should be used at appropriate points throughout the school day and 21% favoured embedding PMFL in a cross curricular approach.
- Of schools using a language teacher on the staff, 85% reported they had sustainable arrangements. Equally where Advanced Skills Teachers (ASTs), headteachers or class teachers taught PMFL over 70% of schools reported that their arrangements were sustainable. Of those using FLAs, secondary teachers and TAs over 60% of schools reported that their arrangements were sustainable.
- Leadership and active support from the headteacher were seen as important. All the headteachers in spotlight schools devoted time and energy to promoting and facilitating PMFL.

Transition procedures between KS2 and KS3

- 49% of Specialist Language Colleges (SLCs), and 29% of other secondary schools were currently satisfied or very satisfied with their own transition arrangements.
- Approximately 50% of all primary schools reported having no transition arrangements with SLCs or with other secondary schools.
- SLCs reported considerably more links with partner primary schools than did other secondary schools. 69% of SLCs reported visiting primary schools to model PMFL teaching and 16% of other schools did so. 53% of SLCs reported planning PMFL events jointly, whereas only 5% of other schools did so. 47% of SLCs had invited primary teachers to visit their schools and 11% of other schools had done so. 50% of SLCs reported helping primary schools to develop new PMFL teaching materials, and 6% of other secondary schools.
- The most commonly reported method of ensuring progression and continuity from KS2 to KS3 was differentiation within the same class (28% of SLCs and 18% of other secondary schools). 20% of SLCs and 2% of other secondary schools place pupils in sets according to their prior MFL experience on entry to Year 7.

Primary teachers' MFL qualifications and training needs

- Approximately 25% of all teachers reported having a GCSE or equivalent in French. This is more than all other qualifications combined.
- All responding primary teachers said they were much more likely to know a few words or be able to use the language in basic conversation than to be fluent.
- 41% of all responding teachers said they were not at all confident about teaching PMFL. This included 9% of those currently teaching PMFL.
- A third of LEAs reported having given some PMFL training to primary teachers during the year 2002-2003. A fifth of teachers teaching PMFL said they had used LEA training.
- About two-thirds of LEAs gave the availability of more primary teachers with suitable qualifications as something that would assist an increase in the number of schools offering PMFL. Three-quarters of schools not currently

offering PMFL agreed. In the same context, a similar number of LEAs mentioned the value of more training opportunities.

- There is a sizeable pool of potential PMFL teachers: 36% of primary teachers not currently teaching PMFL said they would like to do so and of the rest 61% gave a lack of confidence as their reason for not wanting to teach PMFL. Of those primary teachers requiring support 75% wanted training in PMFL teaching; 61% wanted personal language training.
- Of the responding secondary teachers 82% said they were not currently contributing to PMFL but would be willing to do so given training and support. Of these 86% said they needed additional funding, 79% said they needed additional resources and 42% said they would need training in primary pedagogy before they could be effective.

Meeting the primary language learning entitlement

- Half of all responding teachers thought PMFL should be a statutory requirement, including 70% of those currently teaching PMFL.
- Before the primary language learning entitlement is realised, the amount of work to be done varies greatly from one LEA to another. Only 2 LEAs estimated that more than 80% of their schools offer PMFL; 19 LEAs estimated that over 40% of their schools offer PMFL, whereas nearly 40 LEAs reported that fewer than 20% of schools offer PMFL. Almost 60% of LEAs anticipate an increase in the number of schools offering PMFL between 2004-2005 and 2009-2010, but the projected increase falls short of all KS2 pupils having the opportunity of the primary language learning entitlement.
- 53% of LEAs reported they have plans to expand PMFL and 20% stated that PMFL featured in the LEA's development plan.
- There is potentially a tension between teachers' desire for a national and coherent framework and their desire for maintaining the flexibility of approach that currently exists, which allows for a diverse range of delivery models.
- A more clearly defined KS2 primary language learning entitlement is seen as a way of increasing a common learning experience for all pupils and reducing the differences in language level attained at the start of KS3.

- On average, schools offering PMFL had lower proportions of pupils eligible for free school meals and score lower on other measures of social deprivation. They have lower proportions of minority ethnic pupils and larger numbers of pupils with English as an Additional Language (EAL). In addition, special schools offer PMFL less frequently.
- The proportion of schools offering PMFL to KS2 pupils is twice as high in the South-East as in the North-East.

Recommendations

The PMFL entitlement is starting from a low baseline and substantial funding is needed to extend the scale and quality of current provision. There is need for an increase in policy directed and practical initiatives to support LEAs, primary and secondary schools and Higher Education Institutions so that they can meet the challenge.

Leadership

- Key personnel are needed in each LEA to promote PMFL in schools and to develop networks between primary and secondary schools and between schools and appropriate central agencies.
- Detailed guidance is needed for LEAs and schools on how they can meet the PMFL Entitlement within the timescale.
- Schools should plan for a minimum of 30 minutes protected time a week with additional time (30 minutes equivalent) for cross-curricular activities and the incidental use of foreign languages during the day.

Training and support

- Primary schools should plan to train or appoint at least one teacher on the staff who is confident and able to teach a foreign language.
- An increase in the levels and diversity of training is needed for teachers and other classroom support personnel to extend the pool of competent and confident teachers: beginner PMFL teachers; subject co-ordinators; FLAs, TAs and HLTAs; primary methodology for secondary teachers.

- HEIs should plan to modify their primary Initial Teacher Education programmes to include PMFL as a subject alongside the Foundation Subjects.
- Targeted funding for schools in disadvantaged, multi-ethnic or EAL areas to support them in meeting the PMFL Entitlement.
- Learning clusters, consortia and support networks of primary and secondary schools and the community need to be supported in order to develop practice and share resources including trained staff.

Resources

- A range of subsidised materials and resources need to be made available to schools for teaching children of different ages and stages of development, including ICT and e-learning, visual, audio and quality texts (fiction and non-fiction).
- A diversification of languages needs to be promoted and supported by quality resources and training in a range of languages.
- Effective, funded transition arrangements, including the transfer of information, need to be developed to ensure that secondary schools take account of pupils' prior learning.

Further research

- Further research is needed to examine quality teaching, pupil outcome and effective transition.

Summary recommendations

To develop PMFL from its relatively low baseline, there needs to be:

Leadership, in terms of key personnel available locally and detailed guidance for LEAs on how to meet the Entitlement;

Training and support to increase numbers of PMFL teachers and promote a diversity in languages offered; Higher Education Institutions should develop ITE programmes to include PMFL; networks need to be established;

Resource provision for children of different ages and stages and in different languages and this need to be subsidised;

Transition arrangements so that information is shared between primary and secondary schools to aid continuity in learning;

Further research to examine quality teaching, pupil outcome and transition.

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

This report discusses the current extent and nature of Modern Foreign Languages (MFL) provision at Key Stage 2 (KS2) in England. Over the last decade Primary Modern Foreign Languages (PMFL) has developed in different ways in individual schools and clusters of schools across England.

The National Languages Strategy for England (2002) set out the commitment that by 2010, every child should have the opportunity throughout KS2 to learn a foreign language. While this stops short of making foreign language learning a compulsory part of the curriculum, it represents a significant step forward for PMFL. It also raises the issue of the type of policy that should underpin this primary language learning entitlement and, by implication, the nature of the curriculum and extent of resources that will be required.

The evaluations of the Good Practice Project (Sharpe & Johnston, 2000) and the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, (QCA) Evaluation (Powell, *et al.*, 2001) have already provided valuable insights into the diversity of curriculum design in terms of teaching aims, the approaches to delivery, the allocation of curriculum time and the languages taught. They have shown how schools have pioneered innovative ways of deploying expert linguists to teach foreign languages and how they have maximised learning time by, for example, embedding PMFL in other curriculum subjects or by offering extra-curricular provision.

The demands on curriculum time have eased to some extent. First the National Curriculum (2000) and more recently the Primary Strategy: Excellence and Enjoyment (DfES, 2003) have given greater flexibility to schools, so now they are more able to include PMFL in the curriculum.

Developments in both secondary and primary education have helped with PMFL staffing. Nearly 200 secondary schools have attained Specialist Language College (SLC) status and many are involved in promoting PMFL. The dearth of appropriately trained staff is also being addressed. Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are being funded to offer PMFL as part of their primary Initial Teacher Education programmes. The government is funding a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) pilot programme for primary teachers to develop their competence and confidence in teaching PMFL. Furthermore the government has also funded nineteen 'Pathfinder'

LEAs to take a key role in co-ordinating and encouraging schools within their authorities to start or develop PMFL.

Whilst PMFL provision is expanding rather than contracting, much remains to be established about its nature and extent, as well as the rationale for early provision.

This research project employs a multi-method approach, using quantitative and qualitative data from questionnaires, as well as qualitative evidence from discussion groups and from spotlights of schools with good practice. Based on this body of data, an accurate picture of the present situation, including the aspirations and needs of stakeholders, has led to recommendations for a productive future for the teaching and learning of PMFL.

1.1 Aims and objectives of the study

The main aim of the study was to assess the extent and nature of foreign language learning in KS2, so that changes over time can be assessed against a robust baseline.

Aim 1: to assess the extent of PMFL provision and in particular, to establish:

- the number of maintained schools currently offering MFL at KS2 in England;
- the range of schools and numbers of pupils involved;
- the geographical areas where there is a high level of PMFL activity;
- the range of delivery mechanisms, structures and local circumstances under which PMFL is achieved;
- the needs of schools and teachers in setting up and implementing PMFL and how these needs are met;
- the ways in which LEAs are building PMFL capacity for schools.

Three further aims relate to the delivery, the transition from KS2 to KS3 and the experience and training needs of teachers.

Aim 2: to assess the perceived effectiveness of different types of PMFL delivery noting:

- types of PMFL delivery, mixes and configurations that are seen as effective for teachers, pupils and parents;
- good practice in the delivery of PMFL;

- factors and conditions which impact on the effectiveness of PMFL learning;
- outcomes (both positive and negative) arising from PMFL delivery;
- views of key stakeholders about the value or contribution of PMFL.

Aim 3: to investigate the variability in KS2-KS3 transition procedures and their effectiveness, including:

- the processes for ensuring progression and continuity of learning in MFL between KS2 and KS3;
- the factors and circumstances which help or hinder effective transition.

Aim 4: to explore the range of teacher qualifications, experience, and training needs, including:

- the types of teacher expertise to be found among those currently teaching PMFL;
- the views of these teachers about the usefulness of training and gaps in training;
- the foreign language qualifications and proficiency of those not currently teaching PMFL;
- the factors that might support and encourage these teachers to feel confident and competent to teach PMFL and their training needs.

SECTION 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Primary Modern Foreign Language (PMFL) learning is being actively promoted in England by the DfES. A significant landmark is the publication of the Languages Strategy for England *Languages for All: Languages for Life* (DfES 2002), which sets out a methodology to transform the country's capability in languages. The Strategy includes an entitlement for language learning at KS2, to be implemented by the end of the decade.

Every child should have the opportunity throughout KS2 to study a foreign language and develop their interest in the culture of other nations. They should have access to high quality teaching and learning opportunities, making use of native speakers and e-learning. By age 11 they should have the opportunity to reach a recognised level of competence on the Common European Framework and for that achievement to be recognised through a national scheme. The KS2 language learning programme must include at least one of the working languages of the European Union and be delivered at least in part in class time.

(DfES, 2002: 15)

This strategy together with the National Curriculum non-statutory guidelines for PMFL (QCA, 1999), the MFL Schemes of Work for KS2 (QCA, 2000), the establishment of the National Advisory Centre for Early Language Learning (NACELL) and the National Languages Framework for KS2 (DfES, *forthcoming*) raise the status of the subject and provide much needed support for schools and teachers who wish to teach it.

The development of PMFL across the UK during the past decade can be seen to be part of a worldwide phenomenon (CILT, 1995; Blondin *et al.*, 1998, Driscoll and Jones *et al.*, 2003) and it reflects a realisation that pupils need to be equipped with the competence, attitudes and skills to cope successfully with the global age. In a number of countries in mainland Europe, foreign languages have become a compulsory part of the primary curriculum (Nikolov and Curtain, 2000) and in some cases two foreign languages are being taught. Not surprisingly, English is the dominant language as the needs of the market place are reflected in the curriculum, but the broader value of learning a foreign language also appears to be a driving force (Felberbauer and Heindler, 1995; Vivet, 1995).

In Australia, Languages Other Than English (LOTE) programmes have been taught in primary schools for over 10 years (Clyne *et al.*, 1995; McKay, 1997). In recent years following the decline of the 1960's initiatives, there has been an upsurge of interest in teaching foreign languages in elementary schools (Rhodes and Oxford, 1988; Curtain and Pesola, 1994; Rhodes, and Branaman, 1998). In Canada immersion programmes for primary children have flourished for a number of years (Swain and Lapkin, 1982; Cummins, 1986; Genesee, 1987). In Scotland, following a successful national pilot scheme (Low *et al.*, 1993; 1995), there is an extension programme to introduce PMFL across all primary schools. In Ireland, the national pilot project was extended and a national co-ordinator appointed to oversee and consolidate the PMFL Initiative (Harris and Conway, 2002).

An earlier proposal to extend the teaching of modern foreign languages downwards to British primary schools was officially rejected 25 years ago, because of the unfavourable evaluation of the primary French Pilot project, conducted and published by the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) in 1974. The report concluded that there was '*no substantial gain in mastery achieved by beginning French at the age of eight*' (Burstall *et al.*, 1974: 243) and in relation to eventual attainment, there were no overall advantages except in listening comprehension. Pupils in the experiment demonstrated a more sustained and favourable attitude to learning French in the secondary school when compared with eleven-year-old-beginners (Burstall *et al.*, 1974), but these benefits were not considered to be of sufficient value at the time to warrant the expansion of primary French.

The Pilot Scheme *French from Eight* (Burstall *et al.*, 1974) was influenced by the 'critical age' theory as were the Foreign Language in the Elementary School, (FLES) schemes in the United States of America in the same period (Donoghue, 1968). The lack of the pupils' superiority later in learning fuelled the argument that perhaps younger children was not necessarily better equipped to learn foreign languages.

2.1 Why learn a foreign language at primary school?

Some of the research in this field is concerned with the 'Critical Period Hypothesis' which suggests that, in the years before puberty, a child's brain is particularly

adaptable for acquiring languages and language acquisition that takes place after puberty will be different in nature and potentially less successful (Penfield and Roberts, 1959; Lenneberg, 1967). Introducing a MFL in the primary school therefore should yield long term benefits in terms of pupils' increased linguistic attainment at some future date. In addition to the age specific attributes, eventual attainment is also likely to be increased by expanding the learning time to include KS2, so that pupils will have more time to practice and learn the language.

Research findings are complex and inconclusive. There is some evidence to support the claim that younger pupils are superior in both oral and aural performance (Ausubel, 1964, Krashen *et al.*, 1982; Singleton, 1987; Hawkins, 1987; Long, 1990; Guberina, 1991) and as children get older, a decline in the quality of native-like pronunciation is evident (Tahta *et al.*, 1981; Vilke, 1988).

2.2 The time factor

It is claimed that the amount of time spent actively learning a foreign language is a significant factor in achieving high levels of proficiency (Vilke, 1988; Edelenbos, 1990; Radnai, 1996), or is even, the most important predictor of success (Carroll, 1975). The more time spent learning, the greater the potential for increased attainment; although factors such as the age, aptitude and attitude of the learner and the effectiveness of the teaching, are also likely to have a powerful impact on pupils' achievement in MFL. Some research findings show that the frequency of lessons is important; a programme with more but shorter lessons improves pupil performance particularly with younger learners (Taeschner, 1991; Genelot, 1996).

Advocates of an earlier start contend that primary provision can promote specific competences and skills which can then be developed at a more sophisticated level in the secondary school. They also offer the young child a rich holistic learning experience which is qualitatively different in kind to the secondary provision. The question of the relative effectiveness of teaching PMFL at different ages is useful, but each age of life has its own advantages and disadvantages for language learning (Johnstone, 1994; Sharpe and Driscoll, 2002).

2.3 Language awareness

To develop an awareness of the nature of language is part of developing a general overall literacy which is a key factor in primary schooling. It is argued that language awareness offers '*a forum where language diversity can be discussed*' (Hawkins, 1984: 4) and enables pupils to develop insights into the roots and origins of words.

Tentative evidence indicates that language awareness plays an important part in PMFL learning and pupils can develop an interest in how languages work and how they are different (Bailly & Luc, 1992; Favard, 1993; Pinto *et al.*, 1995). Johnstone, (1999) point out that no clear connections have yet been made between the development of metalinguistic and intercultural awareness at the primary phase and increased success in learning a foreign language in secondary schooling. This does not mean that a connection does not exist, only that, as yet, one has not been established.

2.4 Cultural awareness

The studying of foreign languages is said to promote cross-cultural understanding and help children to further their understanding about the multilingual and multicultural society within which they live. Cultural awareness, as an intrinsic part of foreign language learning, is made explicit in the National Curriculum non-statutory guidance for MFL (QCA, 1999). Hawkins (1987) suggests that the capacity for empathy is at its height at about eight or nine and declines with the onset of adolescence, particularly among boys.

The development of positive attitudes towards foreign people is associated with the development of positive attitudes towards learning the language and that those who feel near to another culture will acquire the language and those who feel distant from it find it hard to learn (Gardener and Lambert, 1972; Schumann, 1978; Mitchell *et al.*, 1992). This view is said to be too narrow by some (Dornyei, 1990; Oxford and Shearin, 1994) as it cannot be assumed that there is a single and cohesive national culture that can be packaged and taught.

Evidence suggests that PMFL actively cultivates positive attitudes to language learning, as it develops self-confidence, enthusiasm, curiosity for languages, and an

openness to pronunciation and accents. Pupils have a greater willingness to take risks and to initiate talk (Nisbet and Welsh, 1972; Burstall *et al.*, 1974, Edelenbos, 1990; Charmeux, 1992; Vinje, 1993; Low *et al.*, 1993, 1995; Nagy, 1996; Sharpe, 2000).

2.5 Types of delivery

PMFL programmes vary in terms of their teaching aims in the allocated curriculum time and the way the lessons are organised in the curriculum. The foreign language can be timetabled as an additional subject in the curriculum so PMFL is then the central focus of the lesson. Alternatively, there is a more holistic approach, where PMFL is integrated in a variety of ways into the existing primary curriculum (Martin, 2000; Powell, et al 2000).

The embedding model implemented in Scotland requires that the foreign language is interwoven into other subject areas of the curriculum. The majority of holistic models include a stand-alone component to introduce, practise and reinforce the language systems and vocabulary. This component is economical in terms of curriculum time because the foreign language is exploited for the purposes of communication throughout the day.

Low (1999) argues that there are some difficulties with the embedding model in Scotland, in that where, if the aim of integration is undermined, there is only one teacher trained with the relevant expertise per school. In the majority of cases, the trained primary teacher of foreign languages has become a visiting specialist in their own right, dropping in to the classes of his colleagues which results in the embedding approach being '*at best difficult and at worst unrealistic*' to implement (Low, 1999: 57) as the foreign language cannot therefore, be integrated into other subjects.

The need for suitably qualified teachers for PMFL is a Europe-wide problem. The need is for teachers who are specialists both in primary education and foreign language pedagogy and who have an adequate level of foreign language proficiency. As primary school experts they will be familiar with the conditions and the framework into which, as foreign language experts, they can integrate the language and culture of other countries (Felberbauer and Heindler, 1997). The teacher's position in the school is also an important contextual factor (Driscoll, 2000). There is

evidence that the relationship between the teacher and the pupils is a crucial factor in successful language learning (Chambers, 1994; Clark and Trafford, 1996) and that, in the absence of a saturation in the foreign language through the media, it is this relationship which is the key to the positive attitudes towards learning (Pinto *et al.*, 1995; Genelot, 1996). Therefore, when the question of teacher supply is considered, it is important to appreciate that it not simply a matter of the level of teachers' linguistic proficiency or their subject knowledge; it is also important to consider their pedagogical expertise both in teaching a foreign language and in teaching learners of primary age, and more broadly their position in the school and the quality of teacher-pupil relationships.

SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY

The project combined quantitative analysis of questionnaire data and qualitative interpretation of interviews, observations, discussions and questionnaire comments. This provided a picture of the extent of PMFL teaching and learning and the range of delivery methods, staffing and resourcing strategies. The research tools selected for this purpose were:

- questionnaire to primary and middle schools;
- questionnaire to teachers in primary and middle schools;
- questionnaire to MFL teachers in language colleges and other secondary schools;
- questionnaire to LEAs;
- school spotlights of 15 PMFL settings including interviews with headteachers, teachers, pupils, secondary school language co-ordinators and LEA advisors and observation of PMFL delivery;
- discussion including a range of key stakeholders involved in the teaching, learning and support of MFL provision at KS2 and KS3.

3.1 Primary Schools Questionnaires

The primary schools survey was designed to obtain maximum accuracy in an estimate of the proportion of schools offering PMFL in some form and specifically in curriculum time.

5,358 schools teaching KS2 pupils were randomly selected from all maintained schools with Year 6 pupils appearing in the 2002 Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) except for special schools that did not appear in the KS2 Performance Tables. School samples (including the sample for the teacher questionnaire) were stratified by school types (as defined in PLASC), by LEAs and by school sizes (up to 40 pupils, 41 to 80 pupils and over 80 pupils).

The School questionnaire was produced in two forms: one for schools offering some form of PMFL (Appendix 3a), the other for schools with no PMFL provision (Appendix 3b). After follow-up letters had been sent, the 3448 schools that had not responded were sent a postcard-size questionnaire (Appendix 3c) which asked

whether the school had any PMFL provision, in which languages and whether this was during or outside curriculum time.

A random sample of 197 non-responding schools was contacted by telephone with a request to speak to anyone who would know about PMFL provision. The response was taken to indicate whether the school made any such provision.

Table 1 shows the response rates for each of stage of the survey. The 859 responses to the postcard were 25% of the schools receiving it, but only 16% of the original questionnaire sample. The telephone calls had a 100% response rate and respondents were inferred to represent the 49% of the original sample that had not responded previously.

Using these figures to weight the proportions of schools offering PMFL (48% in Questionnaire responses, 57% in postcard responses and 37% in telephone responses led to the estimates contained in the report. The estimate for the proportion of schools offering PMFL is accurate to within 2%.

The sample was designed to be representative. There were statistically significant differences in response rates between schools of different sizes and schools in different regions, but these differences were small in relation to the proportion of schools offering PMFL to KS2 pupils.

Table 1: Response rates for the stages of the primary school survey

	Questionnaire	Card	Telephone	TOTAL
TOTAL SAMPLE	5358	3448	197	5358
Total responses	1910	859	197	2966
Response rate	36%	25%	100%	
Proportion of whole sample represented	36%	16%	49%	
Positive responses	905	488	73	1466
Positives as percentage of responses	48%	57%	37%	

3.2 Primary and Middle School Teacher Questionnaire

The primary teachers' questionnaire was discussed with the project steering group and the final version of the questionnaire contained three sections. The first section covered general questions. The second section was aimed at teachers currently engaged in PMFL and investigated their qualifications and experience, training requirements, and views about PMFL teaching and learning. The third section was aimed at teachers not teaching PMFL. It sought factors that might encourage them to teach PMFL and to support them in acquiring the necessary skills, as well as their views about PMFL teaching and learning in general.

Table 2: Responses to the Primary Teachers' Questionnaire

	Total First Sample	Second Sample	Total
Number of qualified teachers in PLASC returns	13,471	11,519	24,990
Number of responses	1,254	1,571	2,825
Individual teacher response rate	9%	14%	11%
Schools	1,050	1,200	2,250
Schools responding	481	542	1,023
School response rate	46%	45%	46%
Teachers in responding schools	5,849	7,080	12,929
Response rate in responding schools	21%	22%	22%
Responding teachers per school	2.6	2.9	2.8
Positive individual responses	166	272	438
Proportion of responses positive	13%	17%	16%
Proportion of headteachers responding	7%	17%	12%
Response rate for other qualified teachers in responding schools	22%	21%	21%
Proportion of responding schools positive	27%	34%	31%

Ten copies of the questionnaire were sent to each of 1,050 schools, randomly selected in the same manner as the schools for the Primary Schools Questionnaire. Of these schools, 357 were also part of the Primary School Questionnaire Sample. Responses were received from 46% of the schools approached, but within those schools only 21% of teachers responded in the first sample (see Table 2). Although this was within the response range originally anticipated, a shortened questionnaire was produced and sent out to a completely new sample of 1200 schools randomly chosen from those not in any of the previous samples. This increased the sample size for key questions.

In Table 2 the 2002 PLASC returns indicated that 24,990 qualified teachers were employed in the schools sampled and the number of individual responses is equivalent to 11% of them.

There is reason to presume that the 22% who responded in the second sample, were more interested in PMFL than others and that they therefore represent the important target group for any efforts to extend or enhance PMFL teaching.

3.3 Secondary Schools Questionnaire

A questionnaire (Appendix 3f) was circulated to 100 Specialist Language Colleges and 299 other secondary schools to investigate:

- processes for ensuring progression and continuity of learning in MFL between Key Stages 2 and 3;
- factors and circumstances which help or hinder effective transition.

A follow-up letter was sent to 288 schools that had not responded. Final response rates were 64% for Specialist Language Colleges and 40% for other secondary schools.

3.4 LEA Questionnaire

A questionnaire for LEA MFL advisers (Appendix 4a) was piloted in five LEAs and the final version was sent to each of the 150 LEAs in England. After two follow-up letters and two rounds of follow-up telephone calls, a total of 113 LEA responses (75%) were received.

In a number of LEAs, there was uncertainty about who would have knowledge of PMFL provision. Of these twelve LEAs requested electronic copies of the questionnaire for circulation, however only two such responses were received.

All regions were well represented in the sample. There was no evidence of systematic difference between responding and non-responding LEAs in terms of average Key Stage 4 points or absence rates as shown in the 2002 School Performance Tables. LEAs that expressed an interest in Pathfinder status¹ made up 67% of the total, and 70% of those that responded to the full questionnaire.

3.5 Key Stakeholder Discussions

Discussions were held in two contrasting LEAs involving a range of stakeholders: primary headteachers, primary PMFL teachers, KS2 pupils, secondary pupils, secondary MFL teachers, parents, governors and members of the local business community with an interest in supporting and promoting foreign language learning.

Participants were invited by letter to attend the discussion groups and permission was gained from parents of participating pupils. Prompt sheets (Appendix 5) ensured that all discussions covered the same wide variety of issues related to the different stakeholders. After an initial plenary discussion, pupils were invited to talk separately with one researcher and adult participants with another researcher. At a final plenary, the two groups could report to each other and consider the key issues. Thus both pupils and adult participants had equal opportunities to voice their opinions. All of the discussions were tape-recorded, transcribed and analysed.

3.6 School Spotlights

To explore the complex structures and processes involved in effective delivery within schools, 15 spotlights on PMFL provision were conducted using multiple sources of evidence. Each study involved a primary or middle school (headteacher, teachers and pupils at KS2), a nearby secondary school (MFL teachers), and the LEA (MFL and PMFL advisors).

Pathfinder Projects in 19 LEAs were commissioned by the DfES to promote PMFL at KS 2.

The school spotlights were selected as likely to provide insights and illustrations of good practice, so that critical interrogation of the issues and careful scrutiny of the data could be undertaken. The three project team institutions took responsibility for five spotlights each. The selection of the 15 school spotlight sites was informed by preliminary findings of the surveys, and by discussions with LEA MFL advisers and with the Steering Group. The sampling aimed to capture:

- the range of English regions;
- rural, urban and inner-city schools;
- Pathfinder and non-Pathfinder LEAs.

Fieldwork for each study involved:

- 3 days in school: interviewing headteacher and class teachers; observing a PMFL lesson; discussing with pupils their PMFL learning; questioning and conversing with selected pupils in the target language; examining pupils' PMFL work, schemes of work, lesson planning, resources used and associated documentation such as assessment and certification;
- 2 days in associated institutions or with 'connected outsiders', defined according to context and document analysis.

Interviews were recorded and copies of important documentation acquired for further analysis by the team and as a contribution to the research data bank. The following research data collection instruments were designed:

- schedules for semi-structured interviews with headteachers, primary MFL teachers, secondary MFL teachers, LEA MFL advisors, primary pupils and with secondary pupils (Appendix 4);
- schedules for *ad hoc* encounters with governors and with parents (Appendix 4);
- an observation schedule (Appendix 4j);
- an informal review of pupils' spoken performance.

SECTION 4: PRIMARY SCHOOL SURVEY

Most results in this section are derived from a postal survey of a representative sample of schools with pupils in KS2, although transcripts from school spotlights and discussion groups have further illuminated quantitative data. Two questionnaires were designed and sent to 5,358 schools in England. A short questionnaire and round of telephone calls were used as follow-up measures. The response rates for each stage of the survey can be found in Table 1 with most of the responses from headteachers.

4.1 When and how PMFL is offered at KS2

The key finding of this report is that 44% of all schools teaching KS2 pupils in England offer PMFL in some form to some pupils. This is a significant increase since the QCA commissioned report from Warwick University (Powell et al., 2000), which estimated, on the basis of LEA returns, that 21% of schools teaching KS2 pupils offered PMFL in some form.

The figure of 44% PMFL activity covers a range of provision, including schools where only a few pupils occasionally attend a lunch-time club and schools that offer timetabled PMFL lessons for all KS2 Year Groups. Some schools found clubs satisfactory because they cater for those willing and able to participate. Others expressed concerns about the selective nature of such provision especially where cost was involved. Furthermore, both the children and teachers were said to be tired and in need of a break, so clubs at lunch time or after school were not always conducive to learning or teaching.

The current state of PMFL in the country is better represented by the proportion of schools that devote curriculum time to it. Respondents to the full questionnaire and to the postcard questionnaire were explicitly asked whether PMFL was offered in curriculum time. Estimated on this basis, 22% of all schools teaching KS2 pupils devote curriculum time to PMFL. This is about twice the figure found in the Warwick report (Powell, et al., 2000). In the full questionnaire, schools were also asked a range of other detailed questions, the answers to which implied that many more schools did allocate curriculum time. Taking this into account, 35% of all schools teaching KS2

pupils are estimated to have devoted at least some curriculum time in KS2 PMFL during the academic year 2002-2003 which is about three times the figure found in the Warwick study. Their figures relate only to responses from their sample rather than extrapolated national figures, but the evidence is strong enough in this study to suggest a large increase in the number of schools, which offer PMFL in curriculum time over the past few years.

Even where curriculum time is used, this may be no more than a short session occasionally for some pupils when time permits. Even timetabled arrangements can be intermittent or subject to cancellation, especially if they are dependent upon a single teacher.

Table 3 shows the numbers of schools reporting various kinds of curriculum time activity with pupils of various year groups. The data is drawn only from responses to the full questionnaire, of which not all schools answered all the questions. No estimates of national figures have been based upon these data although some clear patterns do emerge that could be taken to be indicative of national trends. The reported use of curriculum time and specific language lessons increases with the age of pupils. It is interesting to note that the number of schools that use PMFL in classroom commands and social situations is the same as the number offering PMFL in specific lessons in Year 3, but the number of schools offering PMFL in specific lessons increases with the older year groups in KS2. Embedding PMFL in other lessons is negligible in all years. Although each form of provision is reported more often in Year 6 than any other year, there are schools that report it for other years but not Year 6. Consequently figures for Year 6 may be conservative estimates of activity. Of 725 schools reporting use of curriculum time in at least one year, only 410 (57%) mention Year 6. In relation to the primary language learning entitlement, it is important to note that so few schools use any of these approaches with all their KS2 year groups.

Table 3: Use of curriculum time by year group

	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Any Year	All relevant Years
Schools stating that curriculum time was used	125	153	278	410	725	164 ²
Schools with specific PMFL lessons	88	107	194	297	312	98 ²
Schools with PMFL embedded in other lessons	19	19	26	27	34	16
Schools using classroom commands or social situations	87	91	104	111	140	66

Table 4 looks more closely at the length and frequency of PMFL sessions. The figures shown are percentages of those schools actually offering PMFL. The largest percentage of schools gave no information. However, it is quite clear that currently the most common length of a PMFL session for Years 5 and 6, is between 20-30 minutes and the most common frequency is once a week. For Years 3 and 4 the most common length of a PMFL session is 10 minutes or less.

Some schools stated explicitly that all pupils in a particular year received PMFL. Others gave numbers of pupils receiving PMFL that came within five per cent of the number recorded on the school roll in the Pupil Level Annual Census. These are included in Table 4 as providing PMFL for all pupils. The figures are consistent with those for schools offering weekly lessons.

Schools offering PMFL to all pupils in a particular year were taken as making moderate provision if this included sessions of at least 20-30 minutes at least once a week. A lesson of more than 50 minutes at least once a week for all pupils was taken as substantial provision. Older pupils tend to have longer and more frequent lessons and PMFL is offered to more Year 6 pupils than any other Year Group.

Extrapolating from the data underpinning Table 4, approximately 7% of all schools have PMFL lessons for all their KS2 pupils and approximately 3% are making moderate provision for all KS2 pupils. The number of schools reporting substantial

² These schools with PMFL lessons in all years include some that have no Year 3 or Year 4 pupils.

provision across KS2 was extremely small, only 3 schools in the sample for Year 3. Given the size of the sample, this is represented as 0%. It is unlikely that nationally more than a very small number of schools provide substantial PMFL provision for all their KS2 pupils. It is possible to estimate that about 3% of all schools make substantial provision, in the sense defined here, for Year 6. However, the questionnaire could not detect substantial provision, which consisted of a ten to fifteen minute session each day.

Some schools taught PMFL in one term only, usually the summer term of Year 6. This was often described as a post-SATs new learning opportunity and preparation for secondary school. Others had a block of lessons at a particular time of year, special ‘languages weeks’ or taster courses. In the following extract taken from the qualitative section of the Primary School Questionnaire, a headteacher describes the ‘taster’ course offered to Year 5 and Year 6 children in her school.

Table 4: Extent of use of curriculum time by year group

	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
TIME				
0-10 minutes	20%	19%	18%	17%
11-20 minutes	3%	4%	4%	5%
21-30 minutes	13%	13%	20%	24%
31-40 minutes	4%	5%	9%	11%
41-50 minutes	1%	2%	5%	9%
Over 50 minutes	2%	2%	6%	11%
No information	57%	54%	39%	23%
FREQUENCY				
Every day	1%	1%	1%	1%
Some Days	3%	3%	3%	4%
Weekly	17%	20%	33%	42%
Fortnightly	1%	1%	2%	3%
Sporadically through the year	5%	6%	6%	7%
In a specific term	2%	3%	4%	10%
No information	70%	66%	50%	33%
ALL PUPILS	19%	22%	35%	51%
MODERATE PROVISION	9%	11%	23%	32%
SUBSTANTIAL PROVISION	0%	1%	4%	8%

All the older children receive PMFL experience in the second half of the summer term. They really enjoy this. They do some basic vocabulary and some cultural awareness. The teacher is provided by the financial support from a Beacon School where there are quality learning resources available. It adds to the multicultural/European dimension of the school.

Some respondents commented that younger children had a considerable facility for picking up a language because of a lack of inhibition and self-consciousness. This made children keen and helped develop their confidence. Some commented that KS2 was too late to begin learning PMFL, and that KS1 was a more appropriate starting point.

Table 5 shows the regional variation in the proportion of schools offering PMFL. It is notable that the proportion of schools offering PMFL in the South East is about twice that in the North East.

Approximate estimates for the proportion of schools in each LEA offering PMFL at KS2 were made on the basis of this questionnaire. LEA respondents were also asked to estimate the proportion of their schools offering PMFL at KS2. LEA estimates tended to be less optimistic than those based on the survey suggesting that LEAs are not always aware of the extent of PMFL in their authority.

Schools that offer KS2 PMFL tend to be more favoured socio-economically according to a number of measures: fewer pupils eligible for free school meals; lower scores on the Ward Indices of Multiple Deprivation, Educational Deprivation and Child Poverty

Table 5: Regional estimates for the proportion of schools offering KS2 PMFL

Region	Estimated proportion of schools KS 2PMFL	Proportion of national schools in this Region
North East	29%	5%
North West	42%	17%
Yorkshire and Humberside	38%	11%
East Midlands	36%	10%
West Midlands	35%	11%
East of England	45%	10%
South East	58%	14%
South West	47%	11%
London	44%	11%

Table 6: Differences between schools offering and not offering KS2 PMFL

	Mean for Schools Offering PMFL	Mean for Schools Not Offering PMFL
Proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals	12%	19%
Proportion of boys	51%	52%
Proportion of pupils SEN without statements	19%	21%
KS2 points	28%	27%
Percentage of White pupils	77%	72%
Percentage of Asian pupils	2%	4%
Ward Index of Multiple Deprivation ³	20	28
Ward Index of Educational Deprivation	0	0
Ward Child Poverty Deprivation Index	25	34
Area Deprivation Extent Score	11	16
Area Deprivation Concentration Score	6,744	7,224

Deprivation. Table 6 shows that current PMFL schools are slightly more successful academically, have, fewer pupils of Asian ethnicity and more White pupils. Deprivation of PMFL is to some extent related to other forms of social and educational deprivation. It is noted that to extend the primary language learning entitlement to pupils whose life chances or educational prospects are poorer than average, will require special attention.

The following vignette is an example of how one spotlight school based in a multi-lingual area incorporates PMFL into the curriculum.

³ For deprivation scores, lower numbers represent less deprivation.

This particular spotlight school is based in a multi-lingual area with over 70 languages. The aim of PMFL is to develop pupils' awareness of language through entertaining and stimulating activities and an awareness of other cultures through the informal study of languages. The school offers 12 languages from Chinese to Welsh.

PMFL begins in KS1 with informal learning such as general greetings, songs, and an understanding of different cultural festivals. The Years 3 and 4 provision is a more structured but still flexible and multilingual with 20 hours of timetabled lessons per year.

In Years 5 and 6 the focus of PMFL shifts to a main target language that is taught in cross curricular activities particularly Geography, History and Food Technology. Year 6, specifically focuses on the development of language learning skills based on the national curriculum for MFL at KS3 with a more formal approach.

Teacher proficiency has developed through involvement with the project. INSET is organised by the LEA and by the SLC. Teachers have also been inducted with e-learning with live teacher-led lessons on the internet.

The MFL teacher from the local SLC teaches for approximately 30 hours preparing the pupils for transference to secondary school. The emphasis in Year 6 remains on speaking and listening but reading and writing is also included. Assessment is mostly informal, with each pupil completing a basic Primary Portfolio Record of Achievement.

An extensive network of support has been established through the involvement of secondary schools, SLCs and the local LEA, with a dedicated MFL advisor supporting the initiative. The primary school has also developed partnerships with overseas partners.

4.2 Languages offered at KS2

Of all schools teaching KS2 pupils approximately 40% offered French; 32% offered only French; and 8% offered more than one language. Languages other than French, German, Italian and Spanish were offered usually in schools with considerable numbers of children whose first, home or community language was not English. These included Urdu, Bengali, Hebrew, Arabic, Welsh and Turkish. Japanese was taught where there were Japanese interns in school. Danish and Swedish were taught in schools involved in Comenius (Socrates) projects.

Table 7: Proportion of schools offering specific languages

	Estimated proportion
French	40%
French only	32%
German	4%
Italian	2%
Spanish	6%
Other	1%
More than one language	8%

Another reason for offering a range of languages is because of a school's main aim in teaching PMFL. Literacy was a central focus of the PMFL provision at one spotlight primary school. The headteacher and class teacher were both aware of the usefulness of PMFL learning in raising awareness of language i.e. knowledge *about* language, rather than aiming for linguistic competence in a given language. The school offers a range of languages, from Reception to Year 6. Children learn French, German, Italian and some Russian. Latin is also taught in curriculum time to a group of Year 6 children. Links to literacy are at the heart of the provision.

A small number of responding schools thought it important to draw attention to Latin and to British Sign Language. The following extract details one of the spotlight schools that had adapted their sound system so that hearing-impaired children could participate fully in the PMFL mainstream class activities.

The AST wore a microphone and the school sound field system allows language to be carried more effectively across the classroom. A communicator was signing and one of the pupils was able to answer the teacher's questions and practise articulating words. The pupils were involved in all activities such as standing when the AST said 'levez-vous' and were able to identify body parts in the whole class activities.

Table 8: Reasons for offering a particular language

	Number of Schools	Percentage of active schools responding to the questionnaire
Teachers are available	543	60%
Support staff are available	86	10%
Resources are available	215	24%
The language is offered by local secondary schools	327	36%
The language is spoken by many pupils	18	2%
There is help or sponsorship to offer the language	98	11%
This is the most popular foreign language	82	9%
Other reasons	202	22%

The most common reasons for offering a particular language are shown in Table 8. The overwhelming response was the availability of staff to teach the language (60%) though other significant factors included the languages offered in the local secondary schools 36%) and the availability of resources (24%).

Twenty-two percent of schools selected ‘other reasons’ for offering a particular language. Of these, 26% cited a specific language contact or that a parent/volunteer had offered to take the class. A further 17% of the ‘other reasons’ cited that they considered that learning a foreign language could be of benefit to children at a later stage and 17% mentioned parental requests.

The reasons most commonly reported for ceasing to offer a language were lack of time, the departure of the teacher responsible and other pressures on the curriculum as shown in Table 9. The following extracts were typical of the qualitative comments written about ceasing to teach PMFL.

The main challenges are time and an overloaded curriculum SATs create enormous pressure with several months spent on literacy, numeracy and science preparation for SATs.

It is easy for MFL to be squeezed out of an already overloaded curriculum, and as long as teachers have to meet targets, the balanced curriculum will remain under threat.

Table 9: Reasons for ceasing to offer KS2 PMFL

	Number of schools	Percentage of previously active schools responding to the questionnaire
Teachers have left	116	27%
Inability to cover costs	71	17%
Other curricular priorities	102	24%
Insufficient time	115	27%
Introduction of the National Numeracy and National Literacy Strategies	52	12%
Lack of conviction that it was beneficial to pupils	23	5%
Other reasons	180	42%

As seen in Table 9, 42% of respondents selected ‘other reasons’. Of those that selected ‘other reasons’, 18% mentioned that the main reason for ceasing to offer a foreign language was due to teacher difficulties such as parents or student teachers moving away. A further 12% of these cited falling attendance or lack of interest in extra-curricular clubs and 7% mentioned that the provision was originally offered by privately-run organisations involving fees and that they were either not well run or interest had faded. The lack of status of PMFL in relation to other statutory requirements was also considered to be an issue, as the following quotes from teachers in the spotlighted schools show.

I'd love to see PMFL made statutory ...It has to become an entitlement but there has to be professional trust in how that's done....bring in the money and training but then the government has to stand back.

I don't mind if PMFL becomes statutory as long as provision isn't too detailed and the government lets teachers make decisions on delivery.

Although there is considerable support for PMFL as a statutory requirement, there was no clear view on what the common provision should be. The demand for a common programme might be met by PMFL at various points along a continuum, from a focus on developing positive attitudes or an awareness of different languages, to a focus on developing skills and knowledge in one particular language.

4.3 Teacher expertise

The first column in Table 10 shows the percentages of all qualified teachers reported to have expertise in foreign languages; this figure includes all languages. The following columns show the expertise of qualified teachers in specific languages as a proportion of all teachers with expertise. The national figure of 14% reported as having some expertise in MFL is comparable with the 16% of respondents in the Primary Teacher Survey that were teaching PMFL but this may be no more than coincidence.

Table 10 shows the ranges of teacher expertise reported by language, by geographical region and overall. There is probably a high degree of underreporting with only 14% of teachers stating any expertise at all. Within this 14%, the most common language was French. The other three named languages were much less common. London schools reported significantly less expertise in French and more expertise in Spanish than other regions. Table 10 does not show the expertise that was reported in languages other than the four named in the Questionnaire.

Table 10: Teachers with expertise in specific languages, by region

	All Languages		French		German		Italian		Spanish	
North East	176	9%	140	80%	31	18%	6	3%	14	8%
North West	594	10%	438	74%	112	19%	18	3%	44	7%
Yorkshire and Humberside	404	9%	292	72%	68	17%	5	1%	33	8%
East Midlands	299	9%	210	70%	40	13%	7	2%	14	5%
West Midlands	320	8%	218	68%	41	13%	9	3%	16	5%
East of England	329	8%	240	73%	51	16%	10	3%	26	8%
South East	569	9%	381	67%	70	12%	12	2%	22	4%
South West	358	10%	285	80%	65	18%	9	3%	29	8%
London	359	9%	163	45%	33	9%	21	6%	43	12%
National Figures	3408	14%	2359	69%	511	15%	97	3%	241	7%

'Some teachers haven't had any experience of a foreign language for 20 years'. Sometimes it was a question of confidence, especially in pronunciation, whilst for

others it was a question of competence, as one headteacher commented: *'The teacher is trying hard but is not fluent'*. Some respondents reported teachers' unwillingness to take on extra work if they do not feel their subject knowledge is secure. The dearth of teachers appropriately qualified and confident to teach PMFL must be addressed if the primary language learning entitlement is to become a reality.

4.4 Staffing and sustainability of PMFL

Table 11 shows that in 41% of schools with PMFL, it is taught by class teachers, which agrees with the 39% that would ideally like class teachers to deliver PMFL. A language teacher on the school staff was favoured by rather more schools (45%) and peripatetic teachers by rather fewer schools (34%) but only 10% of schools favoured a secondary teacher. The proportion of schools actually using these specialist teachers was rather low. The satisfaction rates shown in Table 11 are proportions of schools using a particular type of teacher who said that, that type of teacher should teach PMFL. The aspiration rates are proportions of schools not using a particular type of teacher who said that that type of teacher should teach PMFL.

Table 11: Actual and ideal teachers of PMFL as seen in schools offering PMFL

	Who does teach PMFL?	Ideally who should teach PMFL?	Satisfaction Rate	Aspiration Rate
Class teacher	41%	39%	58%	27%
Peripatetic teacher	16%	34%	54%	30%
Headteacher	8%	3%	24%	1%
Advanced skills teacher	2%	5%	57%	5%
Language teacher on school staff	12%	45%	85%	40%
Teaching assistant	4%	10%	39%	9%
Foreign language assistant	5%	27%	61%	25%
Native speaker	10%	-		
Secondary teacher	13%	10%	46%	5%
Volunteer/parent	15%	4%	12%	2%
Other	-	3%		

The highest satisfaction rate for existing arrangements was for a language teacher on the staff (85%), who is likely to be one of the class teachers. It is interesting to note

that only 5% of FLAs actually teach PMFL, but 27% of schools favoured them as an ideal PMFL teacher, 61% of schools that actually use FLAs were satisfied with them. The least desirable PMFL teachers for primary schools and those that were nominated the least in the aspiration rate were headteachers (1%), volunteer/parent (2%), secondary teacher (5%) and ASTs (5%). It should be noted however, that 57% of schools that use ASTs were satisfied with their arrangements.

Additional qualitative comments suggested more support for the class teacher than was indicated in the quantitative data. These comments indicated a tension between the merits of the class teacher, who is an anchor for the children, who knows them best, and who may be able to capitalise on opportunities to use PMFL spontaneously through the school day, and a specialist language teacher, on the staff or peripatetic, who has specialist knowledge of foreign language and culture. One respondent commented on the need to avoid *'just dabbling in the language'*.

Table 12 shows the most secure arrangements for using a particular type of teacher. Of the schools that stated that their arrangements were secure or fairly stable, 85% of them⁴ used a language teacher on the staff, compared with 70% of those who used class teachers, and 58% of those who used peripatetic teachers. This suggests that having a language teacher on the school staff is the most effective way of achieving sustainability. By contrast, schools using native speakers and parents or volunteers were less likely than average to have sustainable arrangements.

This is borne out by qualitative comments showing that many schools that had withdrawn PMFL because of the loss of the parent or the volunteer doing the teaching as the reason.

⁴This applies only to those schools answering the question concerning the sustainability of their current arrangements for FL

Table 12: Sustainability rates for schools using types of teacher to deliver PMFL

	Schools using these teachers with secure arrangements	Schools not using these teachers with secure arrangements
Class teacher	70%	56%
Peripatetic teacher	58%	63%
Headteacher	71%	61%
Advanced skills teacher	79%	62%
Language teacher on school staff	85%	59%
Teaching assistant	61%	62%
Foreign language assistant	63%	62%
Native speaker	55%	63%
Secondary teacher	63%	62%
Volunteer/parent	48%	64%

4.5 Resources, support and sustainability

Headteachers highlighted a need for a range of resources. Table 13 shows the resources that schools find useful. Audio tapes and CDs were used by 51% of respondents, and books and videos were also popular. Local Schemes of Work and QCA Schemes of Work were more often used than LEA Schemes of Work. However, only 34% of Respondents used local Schemes of Work and only 24% used the QCA Schemes of Work. The findings also suggest that schools do not appear to use certain resources. They appear to make little use of KS2-KS3 transfer forms, assessment strategies, formal record keeping and PMFL policies, though the proportions found in this survey should be taken as indicative of national trends.

In the analysis of responses, 83% of schools with secure sustainable arrangements reported that they had a PMFL policy and 88% reported having formal record keeping or assessment strategies.

Table 13: Proportion of questionnaire respondents offering PMFL making use of resources and administrative aids

	Proportion of active schools reporting use of the resource / aid.
QCA scheme of work	24%
LEA scheme of work	8%
Local or in-house scheme of work	34%
Language portfolio from CILT	6%
Audio tapes/CDs	51%
CD-ROMs / other ICT material	32%
Video	36%
Books	47%
Development plan including PMFL	24%
PMFL learning statement/policy	18%
Formal record keeping/assessment strategy	9%
Reports to parents	19%
KS2-KS3 transfer form.	7%

In relation to the materials or support provided by LEAs 53% of respondents reported that they were not in receipt of teaching materials but would like to have them and 60% wanted specific funding for resourcing PMFL. The question of funding underpinned concerns frequently expressed about quality of provision particularly about developing sustainable arrangements. Of those teaching PMFL, 38% wanted schemes of work however 22% not currently teaching PMFL also wanted schemes of work. The following extract is from an interview with a headteacher in one of the spotlight schools.

A scheme of work is available for all Year Groups in both Key Stages. This is adapted from a QCA version. In addition there is a policy for German written by the advisory teacher. Assessment is at the end of the year in the form of a report about their learning. It is a matrix of assessment-tick boxes of 'I can do' statements.

Whilst not commonly used, LEA schemes of work can prove to be very useful as the following quote from a headteacher exemplifies:

We follow a simple scheme designed by (The LEA). The scheme of work has progression and builds on prior experience. It has recently been supplemented

with interactive ICT resources as well as tape, video and handbook. All staff new to (The LEA) have a free half day induction.

There is scope for LEAs not just to provide more resources but also to structure schemes of work. Schools considered these useful in the planning of PMFL and saw them as an aid to sustainability. Other desirable resources included staff training (35%), links with secondary teachers (33%) and visiting specialist teaching staff (33%). LEA advisers for PMFL were considered to be a desirable resource by 20% of respondents. It should be noted that currently there are nationally only 11 PMFL advisers funded by LEAs and 27 MFL secondary advisers; some of whom, also have the responsibility for primary schools.

4.6 Sustainability of arrangements

Specific funding for PMFL was recommended by 60% of respondents. This issue affects all other aspects of resources and, in particular, staffing for sustainable provision. Sustainable PMFL arrangements were reported by 83% of schools having a PMFL policy, 88% of those using formal record keeping or assessment strategies, and 87% of those using KS2-KS3 transfer forms. In each case, the sustainability rates in schools not using these resources was about 30% lower, indicating a possible link to sustained activity in PMFL.

4.7 Secondary schools support

Few primary schools reported any type of link either with SLCs or other secondary schools (see Table 14). The most commonly reported form of contact was secondary MFL teachers visiting primary schools, but even this was only mentioned by 20% of all schools offering PMFL, yet among 14% of primary schools reported that MFL teachers from the SLC visited them.

Table 14 shows how few primary schools were supported by their local secondary schools. Very few schools named a specific secondary school with which they had developed links. Few respondents report being supported in any way by SLCs, although some positive comments were made about the work of ASTs in SLCs.

Table 14: Links reported between primary and secondary schools as proportion of schools with links with SLCs and of schools responding positively to the questionnaire

	Proportion of those schools reporting links with SLCs	Proportion of all schools offering PMFL
Secondary teachers visiting the primary school	14%	20%
Children visit the secondary school	6%	10%
Primary teachers visit the secondary school	5%	7%
Teachers have telephone/ e-mail contact	5%	6%
Children have e-mail contact	1%	1%
Teacher meeting	10%	13%

Qualitative comments show that such visits are sometimes combined with taster lessons or mini courses, especially for Year 6 pupils. Other examples mentioned include visits by Year 7 pupils to their former primary schools to talk about their secondary school language learning and visits by secondary school based Foreign Language Assistants to primary schools. Very few instances of such links were mentioned, but where they existed they were reported to be of considerable benefit to pupils.

About half the schools delivering PMFL reported no transition arrangements. Only 12% sent reports of pupils' work or information such as pupil profiles to KS3 teachers. Only 6% reported joint meetings, 5% reported pupils' work was being sent to secondary schools and 3% organised joint planning events. There is a great need to expand and enhance current transition arrangements to ensure progression of pupil learning between KS2 and KS3.

A number of the qualitative comments noted the lack of transition arrangements and the impact on pupils as illustrated from the following comment.

We also need to stop the perennial revisiting in Year 7, the stuff already done in Year 6. Children become bored and switch off!

About a quarter of schools offering PMFL reported links with schools abroad. It is likely that most of these links are through Comenius (EU Socrates programme)

projects and some through the exploitation of town-twinning or other arrangements facilitated by the LEA. A few schools operate their own links with schools abroad or correspond, sometimes electronically, on an independent basis. Although many links are through continental European networks, schools reported many worldwide links. Such links promote the diversification of foreign language provision to include languages other than French.

Some schools replied with the question *'How do we make links?'* or with some other expression of interest. Help is clearly needed and LEAs are in a good position to provide the necessary first steps.

4.8 Meeting the challenges

In the words of one headteacher, the main challenges in establishing sustainable PMFL provision are, *'time, resources, finance, expertise.'*

Table 15 shows that the specific funding, the availability of suitably qualified staff, and a reduction in statutory requirements for other subjects are the three factors most commonly thought likely to influence schools to increase or introduce PMFL learning. There was agreement about the importance of these factors across all three groups of respondents, which represented schools with current PMFL, schools not currently offering PMFL, and respondents from the survey of LEAs. However, funding, training and a reduction in statutory requirements were highlighted more by LEA respondents than by schools.

Whilst there is considerable consensus about the main challenges: each school has its own cultural context, needs and priorities. Special schools and schools with large numbers of EAL pupils were strongly represented in primary schools offering no PMFL. Their needs and circumstances require consideration and respect. One respondent commented: *'As a school with considerable deprivation, we will need help with inclusion issues'*. Some schools prioritised the needs of EAL pupils and paid no attention to the issue of PMFL.

[PMFL] is not my problem to resolve (yet). We have difficulty funding teachers of English and other languages to support children with English as a 2nd Language.

Many respondents also agreed that the availability of training was important for the expansion of PMFL. One saw training as essential to *'enable enough teachers to teach [PMFL] without it being patchy or failing like Nuffield French did 30 years ago'*. There were very few comments on the nature of the training although those that did were similar in their message, such as *'good quality training away from school and NOT during twilight sessions when staff are tired'* or *'regional conferences and support groups would help'*. Some stressed the need for good oral skills and a knowledge of *'appropriate primary methods'*. One wrote of *'having the expertise to deliver the curriculum with the confidence to speak French outside the specific lesson plans'*.

Table 15: Proportion of schools offering PMFL, of schools not offering PMFL, and of LEAs agreeing the factors that would increase the extent of PMFL

	Schools offering PMFL that agree	Schools not offering PMFL that agree	LEA respondents that agree
Availability of suitably qualified staff	68%	74%	69%
Availability of specialist language advisors	18%	25%	33%
Specific funding	74%	72%	91%
Availability of training	43%	48%	65%
Reduction in statutory requirements for other subjects	57%	61%	75%
PMFL becoming statutory	40%	49%	-
Less emphasis on quantitative results	47%	47%	-
Central government policy	-	-	57%
PMFL school network	23%	15%	-
Support from secondary schools/SLCs	31%	32%	-
Schemes of work	-	48%	41%
Parental demand	13%	14%	24%
Other factors	3%	8%	-
None	3%	3%	-

4.9 Perceived benefits of PMFL

When asked to select the most important benefit of PMFL (see Table 16) about half the respondents chose either that it develops positive attitudes to MFL learning or that it develops positive attitudes to other cultures. The figures were very similar for schools offering PMFL and for those not offering it. Smaller numbers of schools chose the development of basic PMFL competence, the development of language learning skills or the creation of enjoyment. Only 1% of schools chose benefits for general academic achievement.

Qualitative comments highlight PMFL as curriculum enhancing. Above all, it is seen as curriculum-enhancing, *‘different and exciting’*, *‘fun and enjoyable’* for children. As one Year 8 boy commented, *‘when you’re having fun, you soak in everything...we think about what we do’*. In a similar vein, an adviser thought that *‘In Primaries the point of learning is to engender a love of language learning...if they enjoy it they will*

Table 16: Perceived benefits to primary pupils of PMFL and proportion of schools selecting each benefit as the most important

	Proportion selecting this benefit as most important	
	For schools that offer PMFL	For schools that do not offer PMFL
It develops a positive attitude to learning a foreign language	37%	27%
It helps children develop confidence and social skills	5%	5%
It provides further breadth in the curriculum	6%	6%
It develops language learning skills	8%	10%
It enhances general academic achievement	1%	1%
It develops positive attitudes about other cultures.	22%	23%
It provides a basic foreign language competence.	10%	18%
It provides a foundation for secondary school learning	2%	2%
It develops a greater awareness of language (e.g. grammar)	1%	1%
It creates enjoyment.	8%	7%

learn from it...not just the language but thinking & listening skills' PMFL learning can provide much pleasure, especially with *'a more conversational and fun games approach'*, within the routine of the school day. Many of the comments showed real support for PMFL; one headteacher said: *'We must go for this whole- heartedly'*.

Some schools were managing to 'squeeze' time because they are convinced of the benefits for the children: *'It gives the children confidence in speaking French and enjoyment of the subject'*. One Year 3 child commented that: *'Learning Spanish is good because all the children including the slow ones get a go and get confidence because everything is repeated'*.

Other schools reported cross-phase benefits: *'Our children have fun with the language and secondary schools report that our children come to them with good basic vocabulary and a willingness to have a go'*.

Schools see different benefits in PMFL and this suggests that they have different views of what it entails. Care needs to be taken to ensure that this enthusiasm is maintained. Some respondents gave very negative views on the subject. The qualitative comments below are typical of these views.

I am not prepared as the headteacher to impose in any way any more work on my staff

The timing of this initiative is unfortunate. A broad and balanced curriculum has not yet been restored to most primary schools

In my opinion something must be kept fresh for the secondary sector. Most areas of English, Science and Maths have been introduced at far too early an age promoting an attitude in children 'we have already done that'. This has caused vast problems for primary/secondary transfer and attitudes to learning in secondary schools

The backdoor method of funding here? I am fed up with pockets of money being made available, all of the form-filling, satisfying criteria. I am 45 and the product of a secondary modern school. I have not been taught foreign languages since 1969 when I left Junior School. Until a government grabs hold of foreign language and makes it part of the NC we will remain backwoodsmen...and where is the time coming from?'

In general the findings in this section corroborate with the findings from primary teachers, secondary teachers and LEA surveys.

4.10 A national strategy

48% per cent of primary teachers reported that PMFL should be made statutory. The main reasons were the importance of developing children's cultural awareness, and their understanding of themselves as Europeans. They also suggested that an early start would capitalise on children's lack of inhibitions in learning foreign languages and their learning of English.

Some schools asked for a national PMFL policy and/or a strategy that is not too constraining. In addition there is a need for quality training and resources and the political will to move this forward. As one headteacher said, *'The Government must drive this initiative, as it did NLS and NNS; anything less will not be effective.'*

Qualitative comments showed a concern for quality in PMFL and for equality of opportunity, as can be seen in the following comment.

We need access to the personnel with the skill, confidence and enthusiasm to deliver MFL teaching at a cost schools can afford within a limited budget. How? Government commitment and funding to enable schools to provide quality teaching that is accessible to all and that is consistent over time, not here today gone tomorrow.

Another wrote:

I am in full support of a foreign language being taught in KS2. Delivering this aim effectively is the key issue. If we are to deliver 'quality teaching' of a foreign language then it should be properly funded. I have attended seminars in my area on this initiative and suggestions for funding people to deliver (PMFL) have alarmed me; armies of language students, existing staff that have holidayed in foreign countries and can speak little of the language. This does not seem to suggest quality.

Fairness, sustainability and equity of various kinds in meeting the primary language learning entitlement are issues that raise strong feelings in many schools. The following quote is fairly typical of headteachers' comments in interviews, *'We need to ensure that this initiative is not allowed to suddenly disappear again leaving schools without support and allowing PMFL to die out again.'*

4.11 Meeting the primary language learning entitlement

All schools responding to the questionnaire as offering PMFL, were asked to consider where they stood currently in relation to the primary language learning entitlement described in *Languages for All: Languages for Life* (DfES 2002). Table 17 shows only 3% of schools claimed to deliver the primary language learning entitlement fully at this stage and 53% claimed not to do it at all.

When asked about future plans for delivering the primary language learning entitlement, of the 413 respondents who reported minimal delivery, 106 said they had future plans to do so, compared with 225 who said they had no future plans for full delivery of the primary language learning entitlement.

A further 168 respondents were unsure about the extent to which they currently deliver the primary language learning entitlement. Table 18 shows responses to the question on plans as percentages of schools currently at various stages in delivering the primary language learning entitlement.

Many schools not offering PMFL currently but with plans to do so, intended to strengthen links with secondary schools (44%) and/or to make curriculum time available for PMFL (41%).

Table 17: Proportion of schools responding to the questionnaire with varying degrees of the PMFL entitlement

Level of Delivery of the Entitlement	Proportion of Questionnaire Respondents
Not at all	53%
Minimally	22%
Partially	14%
Substantially	8%
Fully	3%

Table 18: Future plans for delivery of the PMFL entitlement

Plans to deliver	Not Deliver-ing	Delivering PMFL and stating that the Entitlement was delivered					Total Deliver-ing PMFL	Total
		No Response	Minim-ally	Partially	Substant-ially	Fully		
No response	3%	70%	20%	52%	82%	94%	45%	23%
Not Sure	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%
No Plans	62%	20%	55%	22%	4%	2%	33%	48%
Current Plans	18%	10%	26%	26%	14%	4%	22%	20%

Table 19 shows an almost identical distribution of responses to the question about plans in LEAs that anticipated progress between 2002 and 2004 and in those that did not.

Only 28% of schools with PMFL and 29% of those without it expected to deliver the primary language learning entitlement by 2008-2010.

In conclusion, whilst professing enthusiasm and a place for PMFL in a broad and balanced primary curriculum, primary schools are concerned with the practical issues of resources, the competing demands on curriculum time, stability and availability of staffing for PMFL and the funding to secure PMFL arrangements.

A supply of suitably trained teachers is pivotal in delivering the primary language learning entitlement so that teachers have the necessary knowledge and skills in the subject and pedagogy and they have the confidence to promote PMFL and co-ordinate provision in partnership with LEAs and secondary schools.

Table 19: Schools not delivering or not substantially delivering the PMFL entitlement in LEAs anticipating and not anticipating progress between 2002 and 2004

Plans to deliver the PMFL entitlement	Schools in LEAs not anticipating progress	Schools in LEAs anticipating progress
No information	16%	15%
Not sure	10%	10%
No plans	54%	54%
Current plans	21%	21%

SECTION 5: PRIMARY TEACHER SURVEY

The readiness of primary school teachers is a key concern in the implementation and sustainability of the primary language learning entitlement. This section reports on their experiences and views taken primarily from the results of the questionnaires but also from the spotlight school evidence.

5.1 PMFL staffing

Where teachers said their school offered PMFL, 43% report that it was delivered by a language teacher on the school staff, 25% reported that it was taught by the primary class teacher and 10% by a peripatetic teacher and 8% by the secondary teacher. Note that this survey was not designed to give estimates of national teaching patterns and these figures should not be set against those in Table 11, but rather treated as indicative of national trends. However, the response that it should be the class teacher is very similar (24%), the peripatetic teachers receive higher support (38%). Satisfaction rates for types of teacher are shown in Table 20: 83% of respondents reported that they were satisfied with the staffing arrangements when a language teacher on the staff taught PMFL. Very few primary teachers stated that it was ideal

Table 20: Satisfaction and aspiration⁵ rates relating to types of teacher of PMFL

	Positive Responses to “Who Teaches?”	Positive Responses to “Who Should Teach?”	Satisfaction Rate	Aspiration Rate
No one	43%	5%	10%	1%
Primary class teacher	25%	24%	37%	20%
Secondary teacher	8%	5%	37%	2%
Headteacher	2%	2%	12%	1%
Peripatetic teacher	10%	38%	57%	36%
Language teacher on school staff	43%	29%	83%	27%
Teaching assistant	12%	2%	17%	2%
Foreign language assistant	12%	11%	45%	10%

⁵ Aspiration rates are the proportion of those not using a particular type of teacher who thought that type of teacher should teach PMFL.

for PMFL to be taught by secondary teachers, although the satisfaction rate when they do is the same as for a primary class teacher. Foreign Language Assistants (FLAs) were considered to be the ideal teacher by only 11% of respondents.

In summary, then, it appears that a third of the respondents show a preference for PMFL to be taught either full or part-time by a language teacher on the school staff. There is no obvious reason why full-time primary class teachers could not be trained to be the language teachers on the staff. The following vignette depicts a school where all of the teachers have been trained to teach PMFL across the school.

The headteacher is committed to developing PMFL, it is part of the school development plan and the school has targeted money for training. He said that PMFL is a way to support mother tongue learning and to ensure that pupils should leave primary school feeling like linguists.

French has been a consistent part of the curriculum for four years and is taught from Reception to Year 6. The headteacher promotes a strong collaborative culture of professional learning and he favours the classroom teacher as key deliverer of PMFL, he said *'this is a more realistic model than relying on specialist teachers'*

There is a whole school approach to training with 2 staff INSET days dedicated to interactive approaches to PMFL. The headteacher partial funds a native speaker who works with the class teachers once a week. The headteacher also organised all members of staff to attend a 3-day training course run by CILT. The headteacher stressed the importance of quality training to help develop class teachers' confidence and show them that it is both *'manageable and doable'*.

Class teachers throughout the school felt it was important that their pupils saw them *'having a go'* at French, and that languages is seen as fun and possible. Links are made with literacy and class teachers have identified relevant strands of the curriculum comparing for example, the different placing of adjectives in French and English.

The school sees PMFL as an integral part of the curriculum and has a longer term commitment of delivering 10% of the curriculum through PMFL. The key approach is to build self-esteem and confidence in both teachers and young learners so that the school supports a learning culture. When recruiting new teachers, the headteacher is looking for a willingness to teach languages. The headteacher said that *'MFL is one of the coat pegs we hang our learning on... it's offering diversity away from the prescribed curriculum'*. He considered with excellent training and a focus on creativity, flexibility and fun, it is possible for the primary practitioner to deliver a quality experience of language learning that can also be transferred to other aspects of children's learning.

There were however, numerous qualitative comments referred to the clear advantage of having the class teacher or another primary teacher who is trained to teach PMFL at KS2 and who knows the children. One stated that *'pupils give more respect to their regular teacher'*. In one spotlight school the PMFL co-ordinator in the primary school felt strongly that PMFL staff needed to understand the age group and the teaching approaches that work best with them. Their view was that good classroom management flowed from this relationship and expertise and from knowledge of the children. However, they recognised their dependence on outside help and their vulnerability if the key primary school teacher left the school. They reported that for PMFL to be successful there is a need for more than one PMFL teacher on the staff.

Time is needed however, to develop teachers' subject knowledge and skill to teach PMFL. Some respondents commented that primary teachers should teach PMFL. One teacher stated quite bluntly that *'full time teachers have enough to do'*. About twenty respondents commented on the difficulties facing small schools in particular, with comments such as *'in a small school and a small staff of five, expertise is bound to be limited'*. There is also a perception that the skills involved are difficult. One teacher wrote of linguistic competence as *'hard to learn for teachers'* and another stated that *'most teachers or TAs do not have time to learn a language'*. Although secondary teachers received a relatively low level of quantitative support the qualitative comments show that primary respondents valued their subject and methodological expertise. Pronunciation was frequently mentioned. As one teacher said *'It is hard to unlearn a bad accent!'* The following vignette from a school spotlight site shows how one whole LEA has capitalised on FLAs to promote PMFL.

FLAs are present in every school and the LEA feels strongly that they make an enormous contribution to the competence and motivation of pupils. Their training with the advisory teachers outside the classroom and their observation of experienced teachers equips them to teach with a high degree of competence and skill, involving learners in auditory, visual and kinaesthetic activities. Such is their involvement that a number of FLAs stay into a third year of teaching, becoming highly skilled. A further advantage is the cultural aspects of using FLAs. In general, the LEA believes that PMFL promotes positive attitudes rather than tolerance of other cultures, something perceived as vital in a white working class area with some racial tension. In one school in particular, there is a Senegalese FLA who is a very positive role model for the children.

5.2 Teachers' foreign language expertise

More teachers acknowledged a greater degree of proficiency in French rather than in German, Italian or Spanish. This imbalance is not as considerable as that found in the extent to which these four languages are taught. As Table 21 shows, teachers were much more likely to know a few words or be able to use the language in basic conversation than to be fluent. Sixty per cent of responding teachers claimed that they had basic conversation or only a few words in French, but only 9% described themselves as being 'fairly fluent' or 'fluent'. The level of competence described is based on self-assessment. It is not clear how far something described as basic conversation is grammatically accurate or correctly pronounced, but these results give some idea of the models of language available to the pupils. Native speakers were rare.

Table 21: Levels of teacher proficiency in languages

	Proficiency Level					
	None	A few words	Basic conversation	Fairly fluent	Fluent	Native speaker
French	14%	33%	27%	7%	2%	0.1%
German	17%	18%	9%	2%	0.6%	0.1%
Italian	19%	7%	2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%
Spanish	20%	11%	4%	0.8%	0.3%	0%

NOTE: Other languages were mentioned, but the data given were too complex to analyse in this report.

Table 22 shows that the disparities between French and the other named languages (German, Italian and Spanish) are greater in terms of qualifications than in terms of proficiency. Over a third reported having a GCSE equivalent or better in French. This is more than all other qualifications combined.

Table 22: Levels of qualification in languages reported by all responding teachers

	Qualification Level				
	None	GCSE equivalent	A level equivalent	Degree	Other
French	36%	27%	7%	3%	0.7%
German	26%	9%	3%	0.7%	0.3%
Italian	22%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%
Spanish	23%	3%	0.7%	0.7%	0.3%

NOTE: Many teachers mentioned other languages, but the data given were too complex to analyse simply here.

Table 23: Levels of confidence in teaching PMFL

Level of confidence	All respondents	Those currently teaching PMFL	Those not currently teaching PMFL
Not at all confident	41%	9%	48%
Not very confident	27%	19%	29%
Fairly confident	22%	44%	18%
Very confident	8%	27%	5%

Although many teachers support the idea of PMFL, levels of proficiency and qualification in the foreign language are not high. This has an effect on levels of confidence.

Table 23 shows a clear difference between those currently teaching PMFL and those who are not currently teaching. Over two-thirds of those currently teaching PMFL considered themselves confident or fairly confident in teaching PMFL. In contrast three quarters of those not currently teaching PMFL said they were not very confident or not at all confident.

Teachers not currently teaching PMFL were asked if they would like to do so and 36% said they would. This suggests that there is a sizeable pool of potential PMFL teachers. Of the rest 61% gave a lack of confidence and 36% gave '*not speaking a foreign language*' as their reason for not wanting to teach PMFL.

5.3 Teachers' views of PMFL teaching

Teachers currently teaching PMFL were asked a further series of questions about PMFL teaching in schools. Very few respondents gave information about the length of time used to teach PMFL to different Year Groups, but as Table 24 shows the majority wanted more time than was currently used.

Table 24: Numbers of respondents presently teaching, reporting current and ideal time for teaching PMFL to year groups

	All respondents	Over 20 minutes	Satisfied	Wanting more	Wanting less
Year 3	55	42	15	39	1
Year 4	58	45	17	39	2
Year 5	92	73	26	53	4
Year 6	92	86	36	52	8

Overall 50% of all teachers said PMFL should be a statutory requirement, however 70% of those teachers currently teaching PMFL believed that it should be statutory. This suggests strong teacher support for PMFL in KS2.

For all teachers age seemed to make little difference to opinions on this matter, but teachers who had been in post longer were slightly less likely to support making PMFL statutory: 54% of teachers who had been in post for less than one year thought that it should be statutory, compared with 42% of those in post for longer than ten years. The most frequently cited reasons were the need to have a closer relationship with mainland Europe, to give pupils a broader world view and the belief that languages are more easily learned when introduced at a young age.

Those who did not want PMFL to be statutory offered reasons such as lack of adequate staffing, pressure of time on the curriculum and concern about attainment in English. However, the following extract from discussion with six pupils in a spotlight school of different gender and ability, shows some of the benefits of learning PMFL on children's first language and literacy skills.

One of the children had dyslexia; he appeared to be very positive about learning German. He said he had more confidence in writing in German than in writing English and that it had helped his confidence in other subjects.

Teachers were also asked the ideal age at which they thought children should start learning PMFL. As can be seen from Table 25 almost two-thirds of those who replied stated that they thought that children should learn a PMFL in KS1, a view echoed by pupils themselves in one of the discussion groups.

Table 25: Age at which children should start MFL

Age	Number of Respondents	Proportion
Before 7	92	63%
7	37	26%
8	5	3%
9	4	3%
11	2	1%
12	2	1%

Typical comments on the questionnaire include ‘ *children at a very early age are more willing to take risks and are happy to try new sounds – they pick up other languages much quicker than later on in life*’.

Teachers were asked to rate ten potential benefits of PMFL on a one-to-five scale, with 5 indicating strong agreement. Table 26 shows the proportion of schools currently teaching PMFL that selected a particular benefit as most important. In general, there was little difference between those currently teaching PMFL and those not currently teaching PMFL.

As Table 27 shows regular and specific language lessons were favoured by 71% of all teachers. However, this proportion was even higher for those already teaching PMFL

Table 26: Perceived Benefits of Learning PMFL

Benefit	Proportion of schools currently teaching PMFL that selected this benefit as most important
Develops a positive attitude to learning foreign languages	37.0%
Helps develop confidence and social skills	4.7%
Provides further breadth to the curriculum	6.1%
Develops language learning skills	8.4%
Enhances general academic achievement	0.8%
Develops a positive attitude to other cultures	22.2%
Provides basic foreign language competence	10.2%
Provides a foundation for secondary school learning	1.8%
Develops greater awareness of language	1.3%
Creates enjoyment	7.5%

Table 27: Proportion of respondents that support various approaches to teaching

Approach	Proportion supporting the approach	Proportion of those currently teaching PMFL	Proportion of those thinking PMFL should be statutory
Regular and specific language lessons	71%	75%	79%
Using PMFL throughout the day	66%	68%	70%
Embedding PMFL in the curriculum, e.g. Geography or P.E.	21%	23%	26%
Having extra curricular classes	15%	15%	13%
Exchange visits and ICT links with the country	44%	47%	46%

(75%) and those thinking PMFL should be statutory (79%). Using PMFL throughout the day was less popular than specific lessons but it was still strongly supported.

The current delivery arrangements were seen to have certain advantages. In particular, the children's enthusiasm and enjoyment were noted. One teacher commented '*the children enjoy the work – they do not regard it as work*'. This is also a theme that emerged from the school spotlights. In some areas PMFL was primarily viewed as enjoyable, a welcome break from the tighter control of other subjects. These views are consistent with views expressed in qualitative responses to the Primary Schools Survey.

Many primary teachers support the idea of teaching PMFL in primary schools; they perceive numerous benefits for pupils, but have reservations about the lack of curriculum time, appropriate linguistic and methodological subject knowledge. The lack of time available was frequently commented upon as a significant challenge. Time is needed not only for teaching but also for the preparation of resources and planning progression. Other reservations, such as those relating to teacher's subject knowledge or any potential negative impact of PMFL on pupils' acquisition of English, may be addressed through equipping teachers with appropriate knowledge and skill.

5.4 Support and training

The need for training was mentioned by more than half the respondents. Table 28 shows that materials and schemes of work are highly regarded means of support. Although personal language training and training to teach PMFL were not the most commonly mentioned forms of support, they were mentioned very frequently.

The need for training raises the question of how best to use colleagues who may be able to provide valuable guidance and support. It suggests that any networking or links should be clearly focussed on teachers' expressed needs. For example, a secondary language teacher might provide school-based training for one or more primary teacher, by visiting the primary school, modelling lessons and spending time discussing teaching methods and resources. This is illustrated in the following school spotlight example where an AST supports primary colleagues.

The LEA adviser considers that the (secondary) AST is a good model...(the AST) builds primary teachers' confidence gradually and moves them from dependence on her to independence. The practice she introduces is sound, achievable and sustainable.

Alternative responses to those offered in the questionnaire sections included a request for games (25%); more stimulating visual aids (19%) and native speakers to improve pronunciation in foreign language learning (15%).

Respondents were asked where they would seek advice and training for PMFL. The most popular sources of advice were LEAs (43%) and colleagues from the same

Table 28: Proportion of first sample respondents not teaching but wishing to teach PMFL requiring types of support or training

Support / Training	Proportion of non-teaching respondents requiring this
LEA language adviser	60%
KS2 schemes of work	77%
Teaching materials	82%
Links with primary colleagues	38%
Links with secondary colleagues	30%
Language assistants	55%
Other support	18%
Personal language training	61%
Training to become fluent in a language	51%
Training to teach PMFL	75%
Other training	7%

Table 29: Training providers used by first sample teachers currently teaching PMFL

Type of training provider	Proportion of Active Teachers
LEA	21%
Independent organisation	4%
Primary school	3%
Secondary school	2%
CILT	6%
Evening class	5%
Other provider	10%

school (33%). Table 29 shows that LEA advisers are also the most commonly used training providers, though only 21% of sample teachers said they had used them.

Colleagues from secondary schools do not figure significantly; they were chosen by only 2% of primary teachers as a source of advice. This suggests a need to make better use of the support that secondary schools can provide. The failure to highlight the role of the secondary school in helping primary teachers to develop their skills may reflect primary teachers' lack of familiarity with the potential of secondary schools as a source of advice, but it also may be indicative of the lack of good support and training that secondary schools make available for primary colleagues. In either case there is scope for improvement.

The following extracts from the school spotlight sites show how cross phase links have informed primary and secondary teachers' practice.

The secondary teachers said they give feedback to the primary schools on pupils' progress at the end of Y7. They also mentioned that their own teaching methods and style have been influenced by the teaching and learning they have seen in the primary school.

The secondary teacher appreciated the input of the primary teachers in helping with appropriate methodology for younger learners. She saw the sharing of her linguistic knowledge and the class teacher's knowledge of the children and the appropriate methodology as the key to success.

To conclude, subject expertise was often seen as crucial for teaching PMFL. Those teaching a PMFL had a relatively low level of self-perceived subject knowledge, but were sufficiently confident to teach PMFL. Other teachers cited lack of subject

knowledge, lack of confidence and a need for training in appropriate methodology as reasons for not teaching. Provided certain requirements were met, 36% would actually be willing to teach PMFL. These requirements include training in language and in pedagogy. This suggests that appropriate in-service training could extend the pool of competent and confident teachers of PMFL.

SECTION 6: SECONDARY SCHOOL SURVEY

Focussing on the perspective of secondary MFL teachers, this section examines their current involvement in PMFL. Particular concerns of secondary MFL teachers are discussed, including time, resources, training and the need for a coherent approach based on clarity about the content and extent of the primary language learning entitlement.

6.1 Selection of sample

A questionnaire (Appendix 3f) containing closed and open questions was issued to 399 secondary schools, of which 100 were SLCs and 299 were other secondary schools. The sample as a whole is not nationally representative as there are a disproportionate numbers of SLCs. However, as SLCs have an important role in supporting the realisation of the primary language learning entitlement, the SLC perspective was expressly sought so separate response rates are expressed for SLCs and other secondary schools.

The overall response rate was 46%, with 64% of SLCs responding and 40% of other secondary schools responding.

Additional data was drawn from in-depth specialist interviews undertaken with a small sample of secondary MFL teachers for the school spotlights (Appendix 4f).

6.2 Managing the transition from KS2 to KS3

Secondary teachers were asked to identify the types of links they had with primary schools in relation to PMFL. Considerably more links existed between SLCs and their primary link schools than between other secondary schools and their primary link schools. Joint planning of MFL events and the sharing of teaching materials were the most commonly mentioned types of link (see Table 30). Twenty-two SLCs mentioned teaching in primary schools, although the nature of this varied widely from offering taster classes to delivering a series of KS2 lessons in each feeder primary school. Responses to the 'other links' section included short taster courses at Easter or Summer breaks. In marked contrast the other secondary schools had much lower

Table 30: Links with partnership schools

	SLCs	Other secondary schools
Joint planning of MFL events	53%	5%
Joint course planning meetings	38%	4%
Secondary teachers observe primary teachers	16%	3%
Primary teachers observe secondary teachers	41%	8%
Pupils' PMFL work/reports/records sent to secondary schools	27%	6%
Cross-phase staff meetings to discuss pupils' achievements	19%	3%
Sharing teaching material	50%	3%
Details of primary schemes of work sent to secondary schools	33%	4%
Informal telephone or email communication with primary teachers	47%	11%
Other links	33%	18%

levels of involvement. Although nine mentioned teaching in primary schools, their contribution was limited with a focus on taster lessons. Informal or e-mail contact was the most commonly cited link mentioned by 11% of the other secondary schools. However 18% of respondents in this group reported that they had other links. Of these, 4% reported that they liaised with primary schools over curriculum content. There is a clear need for secondary schools to develop these links to ensure continuity and progression of pupils' learning.

The diversity of pupils' experience of PMFL makes it important to ensure that their needs are met as they enter and progress through secondary school in order to avoid regression and de-motivation during Year 7. Schools have a range of strategies in place to manage progression and continuity from KS2 to KS3.

Table 31, shows that 27% of SLCs were modifying (or had modified) courses to accommodate PMFL learning and 25% had other arrangements in place. Furthermore, 13% of SLCs and 5% of other secondary schools assessed their pupils on entry. Some set their pupils according to ability and prior PMFL learning from the January

following entry. In some cases, bilingual children or those with a special aptitude were fast-tracked in their foreign language study to early GCSE.

After differentiation, the approach most commonly mentioned by other secondary schools was the consultation with pupils and parents about the choice of language and the transfer of information and records. In general, the need for face-to-face contact between secondary and primary teachers, certainly in other secondary schools, is severely limited, making the conveying of paper information highly important.

There were 25% of SLC respondents that chose 'other arrangements'. These responses said that they were able to manage progression and continuity having taught in the primary school; they therefore knew the children's levels of achievement at the point of transfer to secondary school.

About a quarter of both SLCs and other secondary schools mentioned in the other arrangements that they managed progression through delivering 'catch-up' revision or quick courses at the beginning of Year 7 to bring all pupils up to the same level. Also mentioned, albeit, less frequently, were comments about identifying and fast-tracking pupils who were more able linguists, through assessment on entry to Year 7 or with an assessed PMFL certificate of achievement from the primary school.

Table 31: Ways of managing progression and continuity

	Proportion of SLCs	Proportion of other secondary schools
Secondary course modified to accommodate PMFL learning	27%	4%
Pupils assessed on entry	13%	5%
Transfer information and records consulted	19%	10%
Allocation to sets on entry dependent on PMFL experience	20%	2%
Choice of languages offered according to PMFL experience	9%	7%
All pupil start a new language	11%	7%
Consultation with pupils and parents about PMFL choice	8%	8%
Work differentiated within the same class	28%	18%
Other arrangements	25%	8%
Not applicable	9%	16%

The pupils' perspectives about assessment in the PMFL Discussion Forums gave some interesting insights into their views.

Most KS2 pupils thought that there should be tests in PMFL, and that these should be like the tests they have in Maths, Science and History because *'tests help you remember'*. Although it was noted by one pupil that the test should not be *'too hard'*, and by another who thought that his class would not have learnt enough to be tested on.

All KS3 pupils thought that there should be tests, but they thought that there should be support from the teacher. At the same time, all were adamant that tests in KS2 should avoid the characteristics of tests which they have, and dislike in KS3: *'too long'*, *'too much material to learn'*, *'too hard if test is with tape'*. They recommended that tests should be in the form of quizzes.

The teachers and advisers in the Discussion Forums also felt that assessment was important *'we've got to let the secondary teachers know what our children know and the only way is through assessment.'* In their view the assessment should be ongoing and formative and conducted by the teacher against a national set of criteria. It should also involve the children. The need for training was also mentioned, for the PMFL assessment to be reliable, particularly for inexperienced PMFL teachers.

The Head of MFL in one of the secondary schools explained that pupils are audited and assessed on entry to the school on three levels:

Firstly whether they've had any [PMFL experience] at all. Secondly whether they've had enough to be able to sort of help lead the class and thirdly if they've done quite a lot, in which case we run special courses, accelerated courses for them, which means they actually effectively are fast-tracked ... and we have an accelerated programme for them.

Specialist interviews revealed a positive view of the potential benefits of a well-planned and executed KS2 PMFL. One Head of MFL suggested that, if pupils could leave primary school able to construct sentences in the target language, the secondary school could ensure much more rapid advancement than is currently possible. At the same time, teachers insisted that this would depend on there being *'a stipulated minimum requirement at KS2'* (Head of MFL), a view echoed by almost half of primary school respondents.

The following extract from a school spotlight shows how collaborative arrangements between primary and secondary teachers enable the secondary teachers to take on board what the children already know from primary school and are able to build on their learning at the secondary level.

The SLC teacher sees children coming into secondary school with a good approach to learning. They are motivated and uninhibited. They have quite a good vocabulary and she thinks they will be ready to build quickly onto sentence level work (as in the literacy strategy) and be familiar with grammatical terminology. Since the SLC teacher has such a big input at primary level in terms of preparing schemes of work and providing resources for all linked primaries, she is able to pass on her knowledge of the children and of the work they have covered to the colleagues at the secondary school.

6.3 Contributions by secondary schools to KS2 PMFL teaching

As table 32 shows, 94% of SLCs and 28% of other secondary schools reported that they had plans to help partner primary schools deliver the primary language learning entitlement.

The range of types of support already being offered to PMFL particularly by SLCs, are shown in Table 33. School visits were common: 69% of SLCs and 16% of other secondary schools reported visiting primary schools to model PMFL teaching whilst 47% of SLCs and 11% of other secondary schools had invited primary teachers to visit secondary schools. In addition 44% of SLCs organise staff development days for PMFL whereas only 2% of other secondary schools are involved in with primary schools in this way. Collaborative approaches to create resources, to allow specialist linguists and generalist primary teachers to work together in a mutually beneficial partnership, were also popular: 50% of SLCs (6% of other secondary schools) share and help to develop teaching materials.

Table 32: Current plans to help partner primary schools deliver the PMFL Entitlement

	SLCs	Other secondary schools
Yes	94%	28%
No	3%	53%
Don't know	2%	18%

NOTE: The columns do not sum to 100% because some respondents did not answer this question.

Table 33: Contributions by secondary schools to KS2 PMFL teaching

	SLCs	Other secondary schools
Offering PMFL enhancement courses to primary teachers	28%	2%
Running staff development days	44%	2%
Helping develop and sharing teaching materials	50%	6%
Visiting primary schools to model teaching	69%	16%
Inviting primary teachers to visit the secondary school	47%	11%
Offering e-learning	12%	1%
Support through e-mail or telephone contact	27%	3%
Other	16%	19%

As can be seen from Table 33, 19% of secondary school respondents chose the ‘other’ option. Of these, 34% reported that secondary teachers gave taster lessons to Year 6 classes and 12% reported that they had some form of outreach programme involving meetings with primary schools. One example of this was provided by the Head of MFL in a grammar school who explained that his school identified those in which PMFL was minimal through a questionnaire to partner primary schools. His school then targeted these schools with taster courses in PMFL provided by Year 12 pupils as a part of a school ‘industrial project week’ for sixth formers. The plan at this school was to build upon the existing level of involvement over a number of years.

A head of MFL in one of the other secondary schools commented how they were contributing to KS2 PMFL teaching.

We were the host school for a meeting for the primary school teachers only two weeks ago and our next step is to now go into primary school and be taught how to teach primary school pupils...the actual methodology of teaching primary school children we need to learn, particularly me. So I see it as a two-way thing.

Table 34: Willingness to contribute to KS2 PMFL teaching

If you do not currently contribute to PMFL teaching in KS2, would you be willing to do so given adequate training and support?	SLCs	Other secondary schools
Yes	25%	82%
No	-	5%
Don’t know	3%	8%
Not answered / Not Applicable	71%	6%

In Table 34, respondents not currently contributing to PMFL teaching in KS2 were asked whether they would be willing to collaborate if provided with appropriate training and support. For many SLCs this was not applicable as they did contribute, 25% of them responded in the affirmative, as well as 82% of other secondary schools.

This shows a considerable amount of goodwill on the part of secondary school teachers. However, capitalising on this goodwill calls for support, resources and training. Of teachers shown as willing to support PMFL teaching, respondents indicated that additional funding (86%) and additional resources (79%) would be needed in order to enable them to work effectively. In addition, further training was indicated by 42% in PMFL pedagogy, 29% in mentoring or observation and 21% in cascade teaching.

A part of the challenge for secondary teachers is to approach primary schools in an appropriate way. A Head of Department in an SLC highlighted this point in an interview, she said *‘The main challenge is to get the staff in the primary schools to take it on board and not for just us to go in and take over’*.

In some areas effective secondary-primary partnerships based on collaboration and equal relationships are helping to promote a PMFL culture in the school. Interviews with PMFL teachers reveal real concern that the emphasis should be firmly on *partnership* with primary colleagues and not that the secondary school should be seen as, *‘a big brother’*. The aim is to empower primary teachers to teach languages with confidence. This implies developing methods suitable for use by non-specialists, so that the skills of the specialist MFL teachers are combined with the skills and knowledge of primary class teachers to produce workable, effective methods and resources.

6.4 Transition from KS2 to KS3

Whilst many schools are positive about the primary language learning entitlement, there were concerns about ensuring continuity between KS2 and KS3. There is no guidance for KS2 either about what should be taught or how it should be assessed. Leaving primary language learning entitlement open to arbitrary interpretation does

nothing to help the problem of inconsistency in pupils' experience of PMFL. As one respondent commented:

How little is meant by primary language learning entitlement and how much? How can continuity be achieved when a wide range of interpretations (of PMFL) feed into a school?

Pupils entering KS3 with varying levels of PMFL experience can be a testing experience for both pupil and teacher. Twelve SLCs and 19 other secondary schools stressed the challenge of transition. The role of the LEA in providing support was discussed by six SLCs; one school mentioned that the LEA could provide '*a common assessment sheet*'. Three other secondary schools mentioned an enlarged role for the LEA with a priority on the commonality of provision at KS2.

The challenge of adequate and appropriate differentiation was raised by teachers as a major issue in 29 SLCs and 47 other secondary schools. One secondary teacher commented, '*we need to adopt a more flexible student-centred approach which will cover different abilities and learning styles*'.

Seven SLCs and 27 other secondary schools explicitly raised the challenge of maintaining the interest of pupils with previous PMFL experience as other pupils cover the same ground. One teacher remarked that, '*some pupils are turned off by having to repeat certain things*'. In one of the school spotlight sites, three ASTs each work with a cluster of twelve schools. The following extract from this spotlight school indicates the reported level of children's attainment on entry in Year 7.

At least 40% of their new entrants arrive with level 4 or more in Listening and Speaking in MFL. The SLC arranges for these children to be fast tracked so that some of them are able to sit their GCSE French in Year 9.

This problem is likely to persist as long as there are differences between PMFL curricula in different primary schools. Ensuring a more consistent approach in KS2 would help to eliminate this problem and enable progression in pupils' learning to take place.

As for pupils with no previous PMFL experience, the challenge was seen as ‘*not feeling left out*’. This was raised as an issue by 7 SLCs and 13 other secondary schools. Commonality of opportunity and differentiation, particularly in relation to specific languages taught would remove this potential barrier to learning. Only 13% of SLCs and 10% of other secondary schools reported being very satisfied with current transition arrangements. Clearly, there is still much work to be done. Whilst it could be argued that this apparent dissatisfaction is simply an indicator of secondary teachers’ increased awareness of the need for high quality transition arrangements, there is no scope for complacency. It was apparent from the survey responses that many schools face problems over transition; the secondary teachers’ responses reflect their concern that effective cross-phase arrangements will need to be in place if KS2 to KS3 transition is to be smooth and progressive. One or two of the secondary schools in the school spotlight sites, highlighted the role of the LEA in developing strong transition and liaison arrangements to promote progression. The following extract from an SLC teacher shows the outcome of such a partnership.

Since the SLC has according to the teacher become so involved in providing strong support for the primaries, the Y7 schemes of work now include reference to the Y6 scheme of work. The result of this is that Y7 teachers are able to proceed more quickly and in greater depth on key topics, whilst providing more differentiated material where needed.

There is evidence of existing and of developing links between secondary schools (especially SLCs) and primary schools. It should be noted that the enhanced resources of SLCs appear to be having an impact on primary-secondary liaison. At present lack of time to forge and develop links is a barrier to further development. A number of strategies are in place to manage progression and continuity from KS2 to KS3 and

Table 35: Satisfaction with existing transition arrangements

	SLCs	Other secondary schools
Very satisfied	13%	10%
Fairly satisfied	36%	19%
Not very satisfied	30%	28%
Not at all satisfied	13%	26%

others are planned or under development. A start has been made by some schools in modifying courses at secondary level to accommodate PMFL learning.

Secondary MFL teachers welcome the advent of PMFL, but reported concerns that there needs to be a commonality of provision in KS2 so that pupils start in Year 7 having covered similar content. Some use is being made of existing documentation, such as assessment reports and pupil information profiles, without this cross-phase continuity and progression is difficult to manage. Transition arrangements take time, not only to prepare and consult the documentation but also to develop a mutual cross phase understanding.

Most SLCs and over a quarter of other secondary schools plan to help primary schools to deliver the primary language learning entitlement. A range of types of support is already being offered by secondary schools to primary schools, with an emphasis on primary and secondary teachers working in partnership. Secondary MFL specialists and primary class teachers are undertaking some collaborative work on resource development. Secondary teachers not currently contributing to PMFL teaching in KS2 are indicating a willingness to do so in the future. For secondary schools to provide successful support to primary schools, they will need adequate support, resourcing and training. The time factor is a major concern.

The need to empower primary non-specialist teachers to teach PMFL effectively has implications for the development of new methodologies, achieved by collaboration and pooling the expertise of specialist MFL teachers and generalist primary teachers.

At present, appropriate differentiation to meet the needs of a wide diversity of pupils is at present a major challenge. One problem is that some pupils become demotivated as work covered in KS2 is repeated in KS3. Pupils without any KS2 experience of PMFL can feel left out when taught alongside those who have taken part in PMFL learning. Commonality of provision in KS2 would contribute greatly to eliminating these problems.

Very few schools are completely satisfied with existing transition arrangements. They are concerned that more effective cross-phase arrangements need to be in place if pupils are to reap the potential benefits of primary language learning entitlement.

SECTION 7: LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY SURVEY

This section examines the current support currently given by LEAs to PMFL development and LEA plans for the future. The conditions that would contribute to an increase in PMFL teaching are considered and examples of current and planned innovatory practice are described.

Questionnaires were issued to all LEAs in England. A total of 113 responses were received, including three by telephone and one that responded to the pilot, but not the final questionnaire. All regions were well represented in the sample and the response rate was good (75%).

7.1 Schools offering PMFL

Respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of schools in their LEA providing KS2 PMFL including clubs. The extent of the MFL activity in primary schools varies enormously around the country (see Table 36), whilst only two per cent of LEAs estimated that they have KS2 PMFL in more than 80% of their schools; forty one per cent of LEAs reported KS2 PMFL in fewer than 20% of schools. Levels of PMFL activity were categorised as 0-20%, 20-40%, 40-60%, 60-80% and 80-100%.

Table 36: Levels of PMFL activity reported by LEAs

Percentages of schools with PMFL	Percentages of LEAs
0-20%	41%
20-40%	36%
40-60%	14%
60-80%	7%
80-100%	2%

7.2 Languages offered

Respondents were asked what languages they knew were being taught within their authority. Table 37 shows that in 30 LEAs (27%), French was reported to be the only language taught. There was no systematic difference between LEAs who had expressed an interest in Pathfinder status and those who had not, except Spanish was offered in 56% of authorities who had applied, compared with 46% in all LEAs.

Table 37: Languages offered

Language	LEAs Responding	Number of LEAs reporting the language being taught	Proportion of LEAs reporting the language being taught
French	113	108	96%
German	113	55	49%
Italian	113	35	31%
Spanish	113	52	46%
Other Languages	113	28	25%

There were no major regional differences in which named languages were offered except that Italian is taught in a relatively high proportion of LEAs in the East of England (7 out of 9) and a relatively low proportion in the North-East (0 out of 8) and South-West (2 out of 13).

7.3 Use of curriculum time and clubs

Details of known forms of PMFL delivery were provided by 104 LEAs. Of these, 89% of responding LEAs, reported that PMFL is taught in curriculum time, 93% reported that PMFL is taught in lunch-time clubs, 58% in after-school clubs and 14% in other forms. It is noted that these apparently high figures mask variations between schools within the same authority.

7.4 Support provided by LEAs

Respondents were asked to identify how support for PMFL was provided or funded by the LEA. LEAs differed widely in what they offered. Those that had expressed an interest in Pathfinder status emerged as more active in providing support.

Table 38: LEAs providing support or funding forms of support for PMFL.

	LEAs providing support		LEAs funding support	
	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion
PMFL Adviser	5	5%	11	10%
Secondary MFL Adviser	18	17%	27	25%
Support from Secondary Specialists	13	12%	9	8%
Peripatetic Teachers	3	2%		
Native Speakers	2	2%	1	1%
Foreign Language Assistants	12	11%	6	6%
Training	22	20%	14	13%
Schemes of work	4	4%	6	6%
Web Site	8	7%	3	3%
Staff Meetings	7	6%	5	5%
Teacher Visits	16	15%	7	6%
Modelling Teaching	11	10%	10	9%
One to One Support	14	13%	9	8%
Networks	22	20%	14	13%
Links with Secondary Schools	18	17%	12	11%
Links with Business	3	3%	3	3%
Conferences	11	10%	3	3%
Other Provision	27	25%		

7.5 Funded support

Table 38 shows that 27 LEAs provide funding for secondary MFL advisers and 11 employ PMFL advisers. Only 14 LEAs currently fund training courses for PMFL. Clearly without a budget or advisers in post LEAs are likely to find training difficult to provide. In contrast, training is provided but not funded in 22 LEAs. As can be seen in Table 38 the types of support that are offered in LEAs on a non-funded basis also include developing networks, support from secondary advisers and links with secondary schools. This level of non-funded support is indicative to a degree of the level of goodwill on the part of teachers, advisers, FLAs and so on, in giving freely of their time to develop PMFL, and of the willingness of schools to pay for LEA support in order to develop their PMFL provision.

Table 39: Numbers of forms of support provided or funded by LEAs

Number of types of support	LEAs making provision		LEAs making and funding provision	
	Number	Proportion	Number	Proportion
0	28	26%	68	62%
1	21	19%	12	11%
2	10	9%	9	8%
3	11	10%	3	3%
4	6	6%	8	7%
5	7	6%	2	2%
6	6	6%	2	2%
7	4	4%	2	2%
8	4	4%		
9	3	3%	1	1%
10	3	3%		
11	4	4%	1	1%
13	2	2%	1	1%

NOTE "LEAs making provision" includes both funded and non-funded provision.

The LEA questionnaire offered 18 categories, see Table 39, from which to select types of support provided to primary schools for PMFL teaching. A very varied picture emerges with 20 LEAs offering between 6 and 10 different types of support, and 6 LEAs offering more than 10. At the other extreme 21 LEAs were offering only one type of support and 28 LEAs were offering none at all. In summary, more than 50% of all LEA respondents currently provided very few or no forms of support for schools and none of the responding LEAs provided the entire range of categories of support.

There were some discrepancies between LEA reports of what resources and support were available to schools and the school reports of what they needed but believed was unavailable. About 15% of schools who stated that the resources were unavailable were in LEAs that provided them, suggesting a lack of information and communication between LEAs and schools.

7.6 Training

A third of LEAs reported that since September 2002 they were training primary teachers for PMFL. The forms of training reported are shown in Table 40. Note that 3 LEAs stated that training had been offered but did not specify the form it took. Courses after school were the most common (26), with courses during the school day provided almost as often (22). Very few courses lasted more than one day. Some 39

Table 40: Forms of training provided by LEAs

	Proportion of LEAs making provision
Courses lasting 1 day or less	22%
Courses lasting 2-3 days	5%
Courses lasting 4 – 6 days	1%
Courses lasting more than 6 days	0%
Courses during the school day	20%
Courses after school	24%
Courses in school	9%
Courses out of school	11%

out of 109 (36%) LEAs reported that they are or have been providing training of some sort.

There is a need for a variety of different types of training dependant on the level of language competence and experience of the teacher. Training needed during the initial setting up period would be likely to be different from that required in subsequent years, when the emphasis would be on enabling sustainability. LEAs have a role to play in providing specialist support to enable schools to take control of the development process themselves. The following two extracts are from LEA advisers.

We have talked to teachers about...what sort of areas of the curriculum...could accommodate some language work and how they could start to make some links. So we are not actually giving them any training, but ... we will ... put a person in the school [who has]... some time to do the development work, who is a language expert. The [primary] teacher has an ownership of the process but the language expert provides the language expertise.

The LEA has primary ASTs who work in their own school and one associated primary. INSET is provided for each class teacher. Funding is provided for anyone doing a CILT course or GCSE. The LEA works with Specialist Language Colleges to set up a primary liaison teacher to observe and help primary teachers.

7.7 Resources

Table 41 shows resources provided by the LEA to support primary teachers; 45 LEAs (41%) stated explicitly that none were provided and a further 35 LEAs (32%) made

Table 41: Resources provided by LEAs

	Proportion of LEAs making provision
Audio tapes	20%
ICT	15%
Videos	17%
Reference books	17%
CDs	17%
Fiction books	17%
Realia	12%
Other Resources	15%
No resources	41%
No response	32%

no response. Those LEAs that responded selected a range of diverse resources; these are detailed below. In addition to these, 28% of LEAs reported that they provided e-learning to support PMFL developments.

7.8 Plans and future developments

Fifty-three per cent of LEAs reported plans to expand PMFL and 20% stated that PMFL featured in the LEA's development plan however, only 6% of respondents said that their LEA had a PMFL policy. The following school spotlight extract shows how one LEA is planning to develop its PMFL activity.

The LEA is now developing a Borough wide PMFL strategy with an understanding of the crucial role of the SLC in developing a staged approach to PMFL. The LEA is also improving a professional development centre with language teaching resources for KEY Stages 2, 3 and 4, with an AST for resource development.

When asked to give projected proportions of children who would have had access to PMFL teaching before the end of KS2 in the years 2002-2003, 2004-2005 and 2009-2010, 38% of LEAs stated that they anticipate moving up at least one category between 2002-2003 and 2004-2005 and 58% anticipate such progress between 2004-2005 and 2009-2010 (see Table 42). It is important to note that only 31 of LEAs reported that more than 80% of pupils would experience PMFL before the end of KS2 and the picture is worse in LEAs that expressed an interest in Pathfinder status.

Table 42: Proportions of pupils projected to experience PMFL before the end of KS2: numbers of LEAs.

	Proportion of Pupils with PMFL Experience at the End of KS2				
	0% - 20%	20% - 40%	40% - 60%	60% - 80%	80% - 100%
2002-2003	55	23	10	4	2
2004-2005	29	29	16	9	4
2009-2010	5	10	15	18	31

Table 43 shows the projected proportion of pupils who would have had access to PMFL in LEAs expressing interest in Pathfinder status. They demonstrate a need for a concerted effort to promote PMFL with teachers in schools, with advisors in LEAs and with parents.

Table 43: Proportions of pupils projected to experience PMFL before the end of KS2: numbers of LEAs expressing interest in Pathfinder status.

	Proportion of Pupils with PMFL Experience at the End of KS2				
	0% - 20%	20% - 40%	40% - 60%	60% - 80%	80% - 100%
2002-2003	34	18	9	4	1
2004-2005	14	22	16	8	3
2009-2010	2	6	10	15	27

Developing a PMFL culture in schools so that all KS2 children have the opportunity to learn takes time and commitment from at least one source.

7.9 Conditions contributing to an increase in PMFL

Respondents were asked to indicate which factors would be influential in contributing to an increase in PMFL teaching in their LEA (see Table 44). By far the most commonly selected factors were increased funding, less pressure on the KS2 curriculum and the availability of more suitably qualified teachers. This is consistent with the views of primary schools reported in Section 4. Further evidence comes from comments made by an LEA PMFL adviser interviewed, who explains:

When we thought about doing a Pathfinder we thought how can we draw that expertise together...then I 'questionnaired' all of the primary schools and...the big story was that that most primary headteachers were quite into the idea of languages but there were two big concerns...curriculum overload and ...primary teacher expertise.

Table 44: Factors regarded by respondents as likely to increase PMFL.

Factor	Respondents	Pathfinder interested respondents
Central Government policy	57%	45%
Increased funding	91%	88%
Parental demand	24%	22%
New Initiatives	46%	55%
More LEA support	53%	56%
More help from MFL Advisors	33%	38%
More suitably qualified teachers	69%	68%
More suitably qualified support staff	49%	51%
More training opportunities	65%	72%
More school support, Schemes of Work etc.	41%	42%
HE or ITE initiatives	28%	32%
Advanced Skills Teachers	51%	54%
Less pressure on the KS2 Curriculum	75%	71%
Other Factors	17%	19%

A number of initiatives are being piloted or are planned by LEAs around the country to overcome the lack of specialist staff. One LEA adviser was suggesting re-training KS4 MFL teachers to deliver PMFL in KS2 and KS3. Another LEA was developing ICT resources giving pupils internet access to a native Spanish teacher in real time. A third LEA was using PGCE trainees from the local university to provide specialist language skills.

The school spotlights highlighted the important role of the LEA PMFL adviser in enabling schools to develop and sustain PMFL arrangements. Participants found the personal involvement of PMFL advisers particularly influential and valued the part they played in setting up regional support mechanisms such as steering groups and support groups. The school spotlight evidence also indicated that where there is a PMFL adviser in post, schools are more likely to have a coherent PMFL programme, which is well resourced and where training opportunities meet the needs of teachers. The PMFL adviser in the following extract from a school spotlight site has been in post since 1992, and therefore has had over ten years to promote good practice.

The MFL /PMFL adviser has supported a number of schools to the point where they are on target to meet the PMFL entitlement. Class teachers in the LEA teach a number of languages including, French, German, Spanish and Italian in time-tabled lessons. The adviser feels that this is the strength of the provision in that it is sustainable. When a teacher leaves a primary school there are still plenty of teachers with sufficient expertise for pupils' PMFL learning to continue uninterrupted. In addition the LEA provides a sizeable and expanding resource base for teachers to use.

The PMFL adviser has promoted networks between primary and secondary schools to enable them to work closely together. She also orchestrates extensive training opportunities. There are 3 ASTs who work with clusters of primary schools and some primary schools receive support from the SLC in its community development plan. The LEA also ensures FLAs are available for primary schools that decide to fund them.

The importance of having an adviser with a specific PMFL brief appointed to the authority, even if only on a part-time basis, was underlined. One LEA PMFL adviser interviewed commented

Certain sorts of networks...are being promoted as very good practice and the way forward...but...the message that I am getting all the time is that there are lots of people who are involved in supporting and promoting languages and looking at ways of disseminating good practice, but if you haven't got someone in post centrally to actually co-ordinate that then it is not going to work...I was told that a number of ...Advanced Skills Teachers are floundering because...they are not having anybody who can actually co-ordinate, who understands their practice...you really do have to have somebody centrally so you capitalise on all these exciting things.

Questionnaire responses did not suggest that more help from advisers would be likely to increase PMFL, perhaps, in some cases, because advisers were thought to be doing a lot already or perhaps because there are still so few PMFL advisers, teachers are unaware of their value.

7.10 Summary of findings

The results in this section represent the perceptions of LEA respondents. Current levels of PMFL activity as reported by LEAs vary enormously around the country. French is the most commonly taught language. PMFL is taught within curriculum time by some schools in 89% of LEAs. A variety of types of funded and non-funded support is offered by some LEAs, but over 50% of them offer very few types of

support or none at all. About a third of LEAs responding to the survey had provided some form of PMFL training, mainly brief in nature. Only just over a quarter provide some PMFL resources.

LEAs indicated plans to expand PMFL during the course of the next six years. The view of most LEA respondents was that increased funding, an easing of pressure on the KS2 curriculum and the availability of suitably qualified teachers were factors that would help make this expansion possible. School spotlight evidence suggested that support from a PMFL adviser is a very important factor in enabling schools to set up and sustain PMFL.

SECTION 8: KEY FACTORS OF GOOD PRACTICE

The research team attempted to target spotlight schools that were deemed to have good practice based either because of their model of delivery or because some factor of their practice had been highlighted for example, the use of ICT. In fact, in most cases, it was impossible to isolate one particular factor, different elements of good practice overlapped with others. The schools involved also varied greatly in their locations, their intakes and the resourcing of their provision. However, there were key factors in most, if not all of the school spotlight sites which appeared to drive good practice. These included the following:

- the enthusiasm of the PMFL teachers and their ability to enthuse the pupils and their colleagues. The teachers were committed to ensuring lively and enjoyable learning for the pupils;
- the primary teachers had an appropriate level of language competence and felt confident in their delivery and engagement with the language;
- in some cases secondary teachers worked closely with their primary colleagues and had an understanding of the needs of primary pupils;
- all primary class teachers and language teachers on the staff including co-ordinators have participated in training. Many had participated in the training provided by the LEAs or HEIs. They were also keen to learn about new training opportunities. Many teachers provided in-house training for their colleagues in school;
- all of the primary staff had adapted teaching strategies from teaching other subjects;
- the teachers accessed and used a wide variety of resources. Many of them used resources from other curriculum areas e.g. mathematics. Many teachers were involved in sharing materials, e.g. with other schools in cluster arrangements or with school links in international projects;
- resources included puppets and toys, books, realia and ICT learning support, in particular videos, audio-tapes and CDs. Some schools were using Interactive White Boards. This availability of resources provided a library of resources for teachers and pupils alike to exploit.

- Lessons were well structured with clear learning intentions. They were interactive and had good pace. They were also inclusive of all pupils.
- The focus ranged from only Listening and Speaking skills, to Listening and Speaking, Reading and Writing. Consolidation was a strong feature of the learning so that pupil responses became automatic. This was undertaken with liberal use of songs, games and role-play.
- PMFL learning was timetabled but also embedded in the routines of school life with foreign language signs around the school, and opportunistic use of the foreign language in assemblies and for greetings. This also started in the Nursery class in some cases.
- Primary age pupils were invariably enthusiastic about their experiences and Y7 pupils recalled their experiences with similar enthusiasm. They were about how enjoyable PMFL had been and how useful it had been for their transition to secondary school in terms of language learning readiness.
- PMFL lessons were timetabled in curriculum time for at least 30 minutes a week and the PMFL provision was part of whole school planning. Cross-curricular opportunities for learning were evident. Most schools had a well-developed scheme of work to ensure progression and as support for sustainability.
- Assessment was a feature of the PMFL provision although the practice varied greatly. Assessment ranged from simple 'I can do' statements and 'smiley faces' to informal descriptive reporting and end of unit assessments. The focus was mainly on formative assessment for learning and designed to highlight pupil achievement.
- Progression was supported in schemes of work and in the expectations of older pupils as they progressed through to Y6. National Curriculum levels on entry to Year 7 at secondary school reached level 4 in listening and speaking in some cases but never less than level 2 according to the informal assessments carried out by the researchers. In this respect it should be noted that the research team had intended to use the composite picture used in PMFL research carried out in Ireland, but as the delivery and assessment were found to be so disparate across the school spotlight sites this had to be abandoned. Instead, a combination of teacher assessment and the informed judgement of the researchers were used to assess attainment.

- In most cases, PMFL teachers were in contact with LEA advisers, and some were supported by ASTs and colleagues in local secondary schools and SLCs. FLAs and TAs were also highly valued where they taught PMFL. The collaboration focused on learning and teaching, transition and progression. Dialogue between primary and secondary schools was well established in most school spotlight sites.
- Crucially, the support and enthusiasm of the headteacher was evident. Their leadership was tangible in their support for PMFL. This was evidenced in PMFL as part of the School Development/Improvement Plan with directed funding, however modest, and in the creation of a whole school PMFL culture. Headteachers acted strategically to foster PMFL and negotiate with the LEA. Examples of how headteachers' enthusiasm and leadership of PMFL manifested themselves are illustrated in the following extracts from spotlight school interviews or reports of discussions with headteachers:

The headteacher had taken the initiative to consult the LEA Adviser to develop Spanish and had involved the staff and governors, all of whom had given their full support. There is a policy statement on PMFL on file. The commitment of the headteacher is tangible in the inclusion of PMFL as a priority area in the school development plan. She has also included PMFL as part of her performance management objectives with very concrete plans for development. She considers a key role of hers is that of 'enabler' of the staff to be able to develop and sustain the practice.

The 'Languages for All' document is a step forward. I think I can use it to push for a greater priority and emphasis on PMFL in our school. Some funding would help further, to release language teachers to teach other classes and establish some sort of continuity. I also went to the local university PMFL conference. This has inspired me to rename our policy 'Languages and Cultural Awareness' rather than just 'French' and link it more to PSHE, making it cross-curricular and embedded in school rather than isolated, and providing opportunities for other language 'taster' sessions.

The headteacher is both committed and enthusiastic, and proud of the fact that the school has had this provision for such a long time. He is firmly committed to the idea of 'modern languages being an essential part of being a fully rounded person' and believes in 'giving children an exciting start as early as possible'.He is keen to be involved in PMFL teacher training and committed to sustaining provision in the longer term, believing that 'if you want to find time, you can find time'.

Headteachers in the spotlight schools had an agreed PMFL policy and had the support of governors, teachers, pupils, parents and the school community. This gave the headteachers the ammunition to deal with those issues that arose clearly as obstacles to the development of PMFL and that included:

- lack of time to promote PMFL and lack of space in the curriculum;
- lack of appropriately qualified staff;
- the problem of ‘Spanish and vanish’ type teachers in unsustainable arrangements such as those with drop –in teachers with a knowledge of a particular language and no other available qualified staff in the school;
- lack of funding;
- inappropriate schemes of work;
- lack or lack of access to resources;
- a ‘big brother’ approach by secondary specialists in building relationships;
- lack of central investment to support PMFL;
- unclear policy on the primary language learning entitlement;
- inadequate liaison and transition arrangements with local secondary schools that led to the single clearest identifiable negative outcome in terms of pupils’ demotivation when having to repeat work in Y7 already covered in the primary school.

In conclusion, it can be said that the spotlight schools demonstrated a willingness and enthusiasm to embrace the PMFL strategy, preferably on the basis of professional trust. In the words of one headteacher:

I'd love to see PMFL made statutory ...It has to become a primary language learning entitlement but there has to be professional trust in how that's done...bring in the money and training but then the government has to stand back...

SECTION 9: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 Baseline

This study has established that 44% of schools in England offer some form of PMFL to some of their KS2 pupils. Some curriculum time is used for this in 35% of schools. This indicates that there has been a considerable increase in PMFL since the Warwick evaluation commissioned by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority in 2000 (Powell et al., 2000). However, PMFL provision is not as extensive as this might suggest. Many schools do very little and the introduction of PMFL is starting from a low baseline. Only 3% of schools give all their KS2 pupils a PMFL session of at least 20-30 minutes at least once a week and only three responding schools reported that they offered PMFL to all KS2 pupils for over 50 minutes a week. The primary language learning entitlement is starting from a low baseline.

9.2 Aims

Both the primary school survey and the primary teacher survey showed that the most important benefits of PMFL were thought to be developing positive attitudes. 37% of those already teaching PMFL selected positive attitude to language learning as the most beneficial, and 22% selected developing positive attitudes to other cultures. In contrast benefits relating to developing a basic competence in a foreign language was selected by 10% of those teaching PMFL. Enjoyment of learning was highlighted as a key benefit both in the spotlight schools and in the qualitative comments on questionnaires.

A large proportion of schools delivering PMFL loosely defined their teaching aims and very few of these schools had a PMFL learning policy. In contrast, all of the spotlight schools had policy statements and schemes of work which clarified aims. These aims mostly included: achieving a basic level of competence in a foreign language; developing cultural awareness and promoting positive attitudes to learning a foreign language. In some spotlight schools cross curricular links, for example with literacy, were a core part of their programme.

Secondary schools in general welcomed PMFL, but there was no consensus among them about what the outcomes of PMFL should be. However, almost all secondary

teachers interviewed for the school spotlights were keen to have a clearer idea of what they could expect from PMFL in terms of knowledge and skills. The implication of this is that secondary schools would prefer a commonality of provision amongst their feeder primary schools. It is difficult to see how this could be achieved without extending that common approach to the whole country. There was no clear view on what the common provision should be. Some schools aim to develop an awareness of different languages while others focus on developing skills and knowledge in one particular language. There is a definite need to establish a national languages framework where the content, aims and expectations for PMFL are clear. It is however, also important that schools have the freedom to develop creative and innovative ways of incorporating PMFL into their curriculum.

9.3 Languages offered

Although the provision of PMFL is at an early stage in England, there is already some evidence of diversification. In some schools a range of foreign languages are offered whereas in others one foreign language is offered. French is the language most commonly taught. It is offered by 40% of all schools teaching KS2 pupils. It is the only language offered by 32%. Spanish is offered in 6%, German in 4% and Italian in 2%. In 8% of schools teaching KS2 pupils, more than one language is offered.

Reasons for offering a particular language varied, but clear trends are evident. 60% of schools with PMFL offered a particular language because there was a teacher available with expertise to teach it. Among schools that had ceased offering PMFL, 27% had done so because the teacher had left the school. 36% of schools with PMFL offered a particular language because it was part of the local secondary school curriculum and 24% because resources were available.

9.4 Time

The amount of time devoted at present to PMFL in the curriculum is limited. The most commonly reported lesson length was 20-30 minutes and the most commonly reported frequency was weekly.

The nature and amount of provision varies across KS2 year groups. Older pupils generally have more time allocated. They are more likely to have dedicated language

lessons than younger pupils. 14% of schools reported that Year 6 pupils received specific PMFL lessons.

One of the main difficulties found by primary schools in the delivery of PMFL was pressure of time in what some saw as an overcrowded curriculum. Where those already teaching PMFL expressed a view on the adequacy of the current time available, the majority favoured dedicating more time to it. A way to minimise the amount of curriculum time allocated to PMFL is to integrate it into other curriculum subjects such as numeracy or geography.

The school spotlight evidence suggests strongly that where more time is devoted to PMFL children achieve much more. If the aim is to give pupils foreign language competence, this will require a programme that takes considerably more than the 20 minutes per week currently allocated in many schools. To sustain progress in PMFL, schools need to give all KS2 pupils sessions of at least 30 minutes at least once a week within curriculum time, plus daily exposure which will increase learning time to approximately one hour a week. Delivering the primary language learning entitlement will require a considerable investment of curriculum time and other staff time, which most schools do not think can be made given other curriculum demands currently placed upon them.

Time is also required, both in primary and secondary schools, for training and for liaison.

9.5 Achievement and assessment

It is not possible to summarise national levels of attainment in PMFL, because there is currently very little summative assessment or record keeping. Only 9% of schools offering PMFL reported having assessment strategies or formal record-keeping tools. Even in the spotlight schools, summative assessment was mostly limited to “I can do” tick boxes with nouns and simple phrases. Only 7% of primary schools send any formal records concerning pupil achievement to secondary schools. In the absence of a clear picture of attainment across the country, it is evident that under suitable conditions KS2 pupils can develop language learning skills and foreign language competence to a level that would assist their progress in KS3.

In one spotlight school all pupils received 30 minutes of PMFL per week. Year 2 pupils were, for example, reported to be achieving National Curriculum Level 1 in Speaking and Listening. Year 5 pupils also received 30 minutes per week and the more able were reaching Level 4 in Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing. In another spotlight school, where ten languages were introduced, Year 3 children responded to foreign language instructions given in P.E. and appeared confident and able to answer simple questions in two languages in the classroom. They also were reported to be achieving National Curriculum Level 1 in Speaking and Listening. What can be achieved by pupils in schools with very good practice can be achieved elsewhere, but not without similar staffing, training, support, resources and leadership.

9.6 Transition from KS2 to KS3

Arrangements for foreign languages in the transition from KS2 to KS3 are not well developed. 50% of primary schools reported having no transition arrangements with SLCs or with other secondary schools.

SLCs reported considerably more links with partner primary schools than did other secondary schools: 53% of them reported planning PMFL events jointly, whereas only 5% of other schools did so. In view of the value placed upon support from SLCs, there is a need either for more SLCs to be created or for other secondary schools to take on the role of supporting partner primary schools.

The diversity of pupils' experience of PMFL makes it important to ensure that their various needs are met in order to avoid regression and demotivation during Year 7. 27% of SLCs were already modifying (or had already modified) courses to accommodate primary PMFL learning. The most commonly reported method of ensuring progression and continuity between KS2 and KS3 was differentiation within the same class. 20% of SLCs and 2% of other secondary schools set pupils for MFL on entry to Year 7.

Only 49% of SLCs and 29% of other secondary schools were currently satisfied or very satisfied with their own transition arrangements.

Transition is a problem in all subjects, but PMFL has additional difficulties caused by the lack of a coherent, common framework in primary schools. As well as problems due to pupils having different achievements, there are others arising from secondary teachers not understanding what has happened in KS2 MFL.

9.7 Staffing

There are a wide range of models of staffing in PMFL. Where PMFL was offered, it was taught by class teachers in 41% of schools; 16% used peripatetic teachers; 15% used volunteers or parents.

In contrast, 45% of schools thought that a language teacher on the school staff would be the ideal teacher and 39% favoured the class teacher whereas 34% favoured peripatetic teachers.

Almost a hundred qualitative comments stated that the ideal PMFL teacher should know the pupils, know the school and know about primary pedagogy. Class teachers know their pupils' idiosyncrasies and learning styles. They have also formed relationships within which pupils can feel confident in using a foreign language. They share a knowledge of what is being learnt in other subjects and can make cross-curricular links.

Peripatetic teachers in contrast are likely to be proficient in the language and have an extensive knowledge of specific language teaching pedagogy. Many primary teachers are aware of the importance of subject expertise and many see their own lack of expertise as a reason for not teaching PMFL. Foreign Language Assistants, Teaching Assistants and Higher Level Teaching Assistants are rarely used to teach PMFL. This is a potential untapped source of expertise.

Teachers were much more likely to know a few words or basic conversational competence than to be fluent in a language. Even in French, only 9% described themselves as being 'fairly fluent' or 'fluent'. Few teachers have qualifications in

foreign languages. Forty one per cent of teachers said they were not at all confident about teaching PMFL. This included 9% of those currently teaching PMFL.

Schools using language teachers on the school staff were the most likely to think their current arrangement were ideal (85% were satisfied). These teachers combine the proficiency of the specialist with that of the primary school teacher. There is a need for more primary teachers to take on this role, but they will require training before doing this.

About two-thirds of LEAs gave the availability of more suitably qualified staff a factor that would assist an increase in the number of schools offering PMFL. Three-quarters of schools not currently offering PMFL agreed that this was so.

9.8 Training

The training that primary teachers need to equip them for teaching PMFL is not the same for all. Primary teachers not currently teaching PMFL, and requiring support before being willing to do so, requested various types of training: 75% wanted training in PMFL teaching methods and 61% wanted personal language training.

A third of LEAs reported having provided some PMFL training to primary teachers during the year 2002-2003. Two-thirds of LEAs considered that providing more training opportunities was one way of helping to increase the extent of PMFL. Some innovative approaches to training are being piloted or are planned by LEAs around the country to overcome the lack of specialist staff. However, few teachers of PMFL reported training.

If a policy of diversification is pursued, there is a particular need for training to develop competence in languages other than French. Only 13% of teachers reported having a qualification at GCSE level in German. Qualifications in other languages were less frequent.

A third of spotlight schools emphasised the need for different types of training as the school progressed from setting up PMFL towards maintaining a sustainable provision.

In one of the most successful spotlight schools, teachers emphasised the usefulness of training specifically designed for their particular needs and of receiving this training in their own school.

Training implications of the primary language learning entitlement are not restricted to primary teachers. 42% of secondary teachers who said they were not currently contributing to PMFL, but would be willing to do so, said they would need training in primary pedagogy before they could be effective.

No teachers made any reference to Initial Teacher Education (ITE). However, the most intensive period of training undergone by most teachers is in their initial preparation for teaching. There is a need to make the best possible use of the opportunities this provides for PMFL training. To achieve this, the DfES needs to increase funding and authorised numbers of primary language specialist trainees; providers of ITE for primary teachers need to modify courses to equip all students to engage with the Primary language learning entitlement; providers of ITE for secondary teachers need to modify their courses to equip all KS3 teachers to respond to the changing situation in KS2 and the changing needs of pupils entering KS3.

9.9 Quality of teaching

A large majority of primary teachers thought that regular specific language lessons (71%) or using PMFL throughout the school day (66%) were effective ways of teaching PMFL. The majority of spotlight schools employed both these approaches. This is one way in which primary schools can do more than secondary schools, which are generally limited to delivering MFL only in timetabled sessions.

9.10 Resources

PMFL resources, or the lack of them, are very important to primary schools. 24% of schools offering PMFL had chosen to teach a particular language at least partly because resources for it were available. Amongst teachers not currently teaching PMFL, 82% said they would require teaching materials before they were prepared to do so and 77% would require schemes of work. Only about one third of LEAs offer a fairly wide range of types of support for PMFL and two-fifths offer none.

Teachers need far more resources than are currently available both to support their own language competence and to help them teach PMFL. LEAs and secondary schools, especially SLCs, need to assist primary schools in locating and using appropriate resources. This is especially true if there is diversification in the languages taught. Suitable resources are needed for pupils of different ages.

Diversification would have implications for the demands on publishers and other providers of resources. If publishers are to be encouraged to meet those demands, they need a clear national statement of what PMFL entails.

A significant problem relating to resources is lack of awareness. Certain types of resources were specifically mentioned in the LEA questionnaire and specifically recommended in the primary School survey. About 15% of schools that stated that these resources were unavailable were actually in LEAs that provided them. This suggests a lack of awareness and communication. All schools have access to the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority scheme of work and but only 24% of schools teaching PMFL made use of it.

9.11 Funding

Many of the conditions mentioned above as being essential for moving towards the primary language learning entitlement have considerable cost implications. 91% of LEAs and 72% of schools not currently offering PMFL saw increased funding as important for increasing the extent of PMFL provision. It is possible to regard this as an example of schools' and LEAs' constant demands for more funds, but in this case there is some substance to these demands.

The substantial funding implications of delivering the PMFL entitlement should not be underestimated.

9.12 A PMFL community of practice

Collaborative approaches to the creation of resources and to planning have the potential to allow specialist linguists and generalist primary teachers to work together in a mutually beneficial partnership. There is some evidence of a move towards this. 50% of SLCs and 6% of other secondary schools share and help to develop teaching

materials; 38% of SLCs and 4% of other secondary schools have joint planning meetings with primary schools.

In all the spotlight schools, good practice appeared to be connected to the way in which all staff were enthusiastic and supported each other in delivering PMFL.

Leadership and active support from the headteacher are crucial in implementing any educational change successfully. All the headteachers in spotlight schools devoted much time and energy to promoting PMFL and in delivering it.

9.13 Inclusion

There are a number of reasons why some schools may need special support, if the primary language learning entitlement is to be accessible to all KS2 pupils. On average, schools offering PMFL have fewer pupils of Asian ethnicity. On average, schools offering PMFL have lower proportions of pupils eligible for free school meals and score lower on other measures of social deprivation. Reduced likelihood of receiving PMFL is also related to other forms of social and educational deprivation. Extending the primary language learning entitlement to pupils whose life chances or educational prospects are poorer than average will require special attention.

Special schools less frequently offered PMFL. Schools with large numbers of pupils for whom English was an additional language (EAL) also less frequently offered PMFL. Over 30 schools had concerns about the needs of children with EAL or with Additional Educational Needs (AEN), although it was acknowledged that PMFL can be an enriching learning experience for all children in the right circumstances. One teacher commented ‘primary children need to master English first’. The issues surrounding EAL children are mainly concerned with the difficulty of enabling the children to reach targets in English and the time and resources that are needed to do this. The few schools that elaborated on this issue also commented on their policy to maintain the children’s home languages and of the danger of causing confusion with too many language sound systems and scripts.

About a quarter of headteachers of schools for Severe Learning Difficulties (SLD) wrote of the possibility of overwhelming the children with too many teachers and too

many subjects. They also mentioned the time taken up with their pupils' many physical and mental problems.

About 20 respondents commented on the difficulties facing small schools in particular, with comments such as *'in a small school with a small staff of five, expertise is bound to be limited'*.

Teachers in these schools need special training and targeted additional funding if they are to cope effectively with these problems.

9.14 Fragility

Primary teachers in general have a positive attitude towards PMFL in some form. Half of those responding to the questionnaire agreed that it should become a statutory requirement. Among teachers currently delivering PMFL, 70% supported statutory status. The level of support was rather greater among those who were newer to the profession: 54% of teachers in post for less than a year and 42% of those in post for more than ten years supported statutory status.

On the other hand, the amount of PMFL teaching that actually takes place is limited and schools often reported that their provision was not secure. Two-fifths of schools with PMFL thought that their provision was vulnerable to changes in circumstances. Schools dependent upon a single teacher for PMFL cannot assume that he or she will not leave. Only 3% of schools claimed to deliver the primary language learning entitlement fully at this stage.

Support from LEAs is also less than complete. Only 53% of LEAs reported that they had plans to expand PMFL and 20% explicitly stated that PMFL featured in the LEA's Development Plan. Only 6% of LEA respondents said that their authority had a PMFL policy.

Secondary schools also have a part to play in supporting schools towards delivering the primary language learning entitlement. Currently 94% of SLCs reported that they had plans to help feeder schools deliver the primary language learning entitlement, but only 28% of other secondary schools did so.

Perhaps most importantly, there is a tension between teachers' desire for a national and coherent framework and their desire for maintaining the flexibility of approach that currently exists which allows for a diverse range of delivery models. PMFL is currently not clearly defined. Each school has its own view of what it involves and the enthusiasm shown by schools and teachers is for PMFL as they envisage it. Without a common framework and an acceptance of what teachers and trainee teachers are being trained to do, this diversity of practice, although to be celebrated, may lead to a confusion of practice that could result in an impoverishment of pupil learning, of quality training materials and teaching resources.

9.15 Recommendations

The PMFL entitlement is starting from a low baseline and substantial funding is needed to extend the scale and quality of current provision. There is need for an increase in policy directed and practical initiatives to support LEAs, primary and secondary schools and HEIs so that they can meet the challenge.

Leadership

- Key personnel are needed in each LEA to promote PMFL in schools and to develop networks between primary and secondary schools and between schools and appropriate central agencies.
- Detailed guidance is needed for LEAs and schools on how they can meet the PMFL Entitlement within the timescale.
- Schools should plan for a minimum of 30 minutes protected time a week with additional time (30 minutes equivalent) for cross-curricular activities and the incidental use of foreign languages during the day.

Training and support

- Primary schools should plan to train or appoint at least one teacher on the staff who is confident and able to teach and /or
- An increase in the levels and diversity of training for teachers and other classroom support personnel is needed to extend the pool of competent

and confident teachers: beginner PMFL teachers; subject co-ordinators; FLAs, TAs and HLTAs; primary methodology for secondary teachers.

- HEIs should plan to modify their primary ITE programmes to include PMFL as a subject alongside the Foundation Subjects.
- Targeted funding for schools in disadvantaged, multi-ethnic or EAL areas to support them in meeting the PMFL Entitlement.
- Learning clusters, consortia and support networks of primary and secondary schools and the community need to be supported in order to develop practice and share resources including trained staff.

Resources

- A range of subsidised materials and resources need to be made available to schools for teaching children of different ages and stages of development, including ICT and e-learning, visual, audio and quality texts (fiction and non-fiction).
- A diversification of languages needs to be promoted and supported by quality resources and training in a range of languages.

Transition

- Effective, funded transition arrangements, including the transfer of information, need to be developed to ensure that secondary schools take account of pupils' prior learning.

Further research

- Further research is needed to examine quality teaching, pupil outcome and effective transition.

9.15.6 Summary recommendations

To develop PMFL from its relatively low baseline, there needs to be:

Leadership, in terms of key personnel available locally and detailed guidance for LEAs on how to meet the Entitlement;

Training and support to increase numbers of PMFL teachers and promote a diversity in languages offered; Higher Education Institutions should develop ITE programmes to include PMFL; networks need to be established;

Resource provision for children of different ages and stages and in different languages and this need to be subsidised;

Transition arrangements so that information is shared between primary and secondary schools to aid continuity in learning;

Further research to examine quality teaching, pupil outcome and transition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ausubel, D. (1964) 'Adult Versus Children in Second Language Learning: Psychological Considerations', *Modern Language Journal*, 48 pp. 420-24
- Bailly, D. & Luc, C. (1992) 'Approche d'une langue étrangère à l'école', *Études psycholinguistiques et aspects didactiques*, 2 Paris: INRP
- Blondin, C., Chandelier, M., Edelenbos, P., Johnstone, R., Kubanek-German, A. & Taeschner, T. (1998) *Foreign Languages in Primary and Pre-school Education: Context and Outcomes A Review of Recent Research within the European Union*, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research pp: 43
- Burstall, C., Jamieson, M., Cohen, S., & Hargreaves, M. (1974) *Primary French in the Balance*, Windsor: NFER Publishers, 243
- Burstall, C., Jamieson, M., Cohen, S., & Hargreaves, M. (1974) *Primary French in the Balance*, Windsor: NFER Publishers
- Carroll, J. B. (1975) *The Teaching of French as a Foreign Language in Eight Countries*, New York: Wiley and Son
- Chambers, G. N. (1994) 'A Snapshot in Motivation at 10+, 13+, and 16+', *Language Learning Journal* 9, pp. 14-18
- Clark, A. & Trafford, J. (1996) Return to Gender: boys' and Girls' Attitudes and Achievements, *Language Learning Journal*, 14, pp. 40-49
- Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT) (1995) *Modern Languages in Primary Schools: CILT Report 1995*, London: CILT
- Clyne, M., Jenkins, A., Chan, I., Tsokalidou, R. & Wallner, T. (1995) *Developing Second Language from Primary School: Models and Outcomes*, Deakin: National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia
- Cummins, J. (1986) 'Empowering Minority Students: a framework for intervention'. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56 (1) pp. 18-36
- Curtain, H. & Pesola, C. (1994) *Languages and Children – Making the Match*, New York: Longmans
- Department for Education and Skills, (2002) *Languages for All: Languages for Life* London: DfES
- Donaghue, M. R. (1968) *Foreign Languages and the Elementary School Child*, Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers
- Dornyei, Z. (1990) 'Conceptualising Motivation in Foreign Language Learning', *The Modern Language Journal*, 40 (1), pp. 45-78

- Driscoll, P. (1999) 'Teacher expertise in the primary modern foreign languages classroom', in Driscoll, P. & Frost, D. (Eds.) *The Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the Primary School*, London: Routledge
- Driscoll, P. (2000). Modern foreign languages in English primary schools: an investigation of two contrasting approaches. PhD Dissertation.
- Driscoll, P., and Jones, J., *et al.*, (2003) A systematic review of the characteristics of effective foreign language teaching to pupils between the ages of 7 and 11. In: Research Evidence in Education Library. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science research Unit, Institute of Education
- Edelenbos, P. (1990) *Leergangen voor Engels in het basisonderwijs vergeleken* Dissertation University of Groningen, Groningen:RION
- Favard, J. (1992) Les langues étrangères à l'école primaire: la problématique française', in Arnsdorf, D., Boyle, H., Chaix, P. & O'Neil, C. (Eds.) *L'apprentissage des langues étrangères à l'école primaire*, Paris: Didier Érudition pp. 29-38
- Felberbauer, M. & Heindler, D. (1995) 'Report of Group 6: Teacher Education' in *Language learning for European citizenship – report on Workshop 8B*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe. pp. 133-52
- Gardner, D. B. & Lambert, W. E. (1972) *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*, Massachusetts: Rowley
- Genelot, S. (1996) *L'enseignement des langues à l'école primaire: quels acquis pour quels effets au collège? Éléments d'évaluation: le cas de l'anglais* (Les notes de l'Iredu), Dijon: Institut de Recherche sur l'Économie de l'Éducation
- Genesee, F. (1987) *Learning through two languages: Studies of Immersion and Bilingual Education*, Boston, Mass.: Heinle & Heinle
- Genesee, F. (1978) A longitudinal evaluation of an early immersion school program *Canadian Journal of Education* 3, pp. 31-50
- Guberina, P. (1991) 'Rôle de la perception auditive dans l'apprentissage précoce des enfants', in Garbédian, M., *Le Français dans le Monde: Recherches et Application. Numero Special*, Août-Septembre
- Harris, J. & Conway, M. (2002) *Modern Languages in Irish Primary Schools*, Dublin: Institiuid Teangeolaiochta Eireann
- Hawkins, E. (1987) *Modern Languages in the Curriculum*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hawkins, E. (1984) *Awareness of Language: An Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press pp. 4

- Johnstone, R. (1994) *Teaching Modern Languages at Primary School*, Edinburgh: SCRE Publication
- Johnstone, R. (1999) 'A research agenda for modern languages in the primary school', in Driscoll P. & Frost D. (Eds.) *The Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the Primary School*, London: Routledge
- Krashen, S., Scarcella, R. & Long, M. (1982) *Child-Adult Differences in Second Language Acquisition*, Rowley, Mass: Newbury House
- Lenneberg, E. (1967) *Biological Foundations of Language*, New York: Wiley and Sons
- Long, M. H. (1990a) 'Maturational constraints on language development', *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12 pp. 251-285
- Low, L., Duffield, J., Brown, S. & Johnstone, R. (1993) *Evaluating Foreign Languages in Primary School*, Stirling: Scottish CILT
- Low, L., Brown, S., Johnstone, R. & Pirrie, A. (1995) *Foreign Languages in Primary Schools Evaluation of the Scottish Pilot Projects 1993-1995 Final Report*, Stirling: CILT
- Low, L. (1999) 'Policy Issues for Primary Modern Foreign Languages', in Driscoll, P. & Frost, D. (Eds.), *The Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the Primary School*, London: Routledge
- Martin, C. (2000) '*Analysis of national and international research on the provision of modern foreign languages in schools*', London, QCA
- McKay, P. (1997) 'Diversity, Distance, Expanding Horizons: Foreign Language Teaching in Australian Primary Schools' in K. Karavas-Doukas and P. Rea-Dickens, *Evaluating Innovation and Establishing Research Priorities*, (Conference Proceedings), University of Warwick, 20th-24th April 1997
- Mitchell, R., Martin, C. & Grenfell, M. (1992) *Evaluation of The Basingstoke Primary Schools Language Awareness Project: 1990-91*, Southampton University: Centre for Language in Education.
- Nagy, C. (1996) *L'éveil au Langage: contribution à une étude de l'activité métalangagière de l'enfant à l'école élémentaire* (Thèse de Doctorat) Grenoble
- Nikolov, M., Curtain, H. (2000) 'An Early Start: Young Learners and Modern Languages in Europe and Beyond', *European Centre for Modern Languages*, Council of Europe Publishing
- Nisbet, J. & Welsh, J. (1972) 'A Local Evaluation of Primary School French' in Entwistle, N. and Nisbet, J. *Educational Research in Action*, Open University Press / University of London Press

- Oxford, R. & Shearin, J. (1994) Language learning Motivation: expanding the theoretical framework, *The Modern Language Journal*, 78 (1)
- Penfield, W. & Roberts, J. (1959) *Speech and Brain Mechanisms*, Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press
- Pinto, M. A., Taischner, T. & Titone, R. (1995) 'Second Language Teaching in Italian Primary Education', in Edelenbos, P. & Johnstone, R. (Eds.) *Researching Languages at Primary School some European Perspectives*, London: CILT
- Powell, B., Wray, D., Rixon, S., Medwell, J., Barnes, A., Hunt, M. (2000) 'Analysis and Evaluation of the current situation relating to the teaching of Modern Foreign Languages at Key Stage 2 in England', *The University of Warwick: Centre for Language Teacher Education (CELTE)*
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, (1999) *The National Curriculum, Handbook for primary teachers in England, Guidelines for modern foreign languages at key stage 2 (non-statutory)* p142-146, London, QCA
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, (2000) *Modern foreign languages, A scheme of work for key stage 2*, London, QCA
- Radnai, Z. (1996) 'English in Primary Schools in Hungary', in Edelenbos, P. & Johnstone, R. (Eds.) *Researching Languages at Primary School some European Perspectives*, London: CILT
- Rhodes, N. C. & Oxford, R. L. (1988) *Foreign Languages in Elementary and Secondary Schools: results of a national survey*, *Foreign Language Annals*, 2 (1)
- Schumann, J. (1978) 'From The Acculturation Model for second language acquisition', in Gingras, R. (Ed.) *Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching*, Arlington, VA: Centre for Applied Linguistics
- Sharpe, K. & Driscoll, P. (2000) *At what age should foreign language learning begin?* Issues in Modern Foreign Languages Teaching, Routledge Falmer
- Singleton, D. (1989) *Language Acquisition and the Age Factor*, Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters Ltd
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1982) *Evaluating bilingual education*, Clevedon Multilingual Matters
- Taeschner, T. (1991) *A Development Psycholinguistic approach to Second Language Teaching*, Ablex: Norwood

- Tahta, S., Wood, M. & Loewenthal, K. (1981) 'Foreign accents: Factors relating to transfer of accent from the first language to a second language', *Language and Speech* 24, pp. 265-272
- Vilke, M. (1988) 'Some psychological aspects of early second-language acquisition', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 9 (1&2) pp. 115-128
- Vinje, M. P. (1993) *Balans van het Engels an het einde van de basisschool*. Arnhem: CITO
- Vivet, A. (1995) 'Sens et rôle des langues dans le développement des enfants', in Council of Europe, *Report on Workshop 17*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe

Copies of this publication can be obtained from:

DfES Publications
P.O. Box 5050
Sherwood Park
Annesley
Nottingham
NG15 0DJ

Tel: 0845 60 222 60
Fax: 0845 60 333 60
Minicom: 0845 60 555 60
On-line: www.dfespublications.gov.uk

© Canterbury Christ Church University College 2004

Produced by the Department for Education and Skills

ISBN 1 84478 306 5
Ref No: RR572

www.dfes.go.uk/research