

Evaluation of the Key Stage 2 Language Learning Pathfinders

Daniel Muijs, Ann Barnes, Marilyn Hunt, Bob Powell,
Elizabeth Arweck and Geoff Lindsay
University of Warwick

Cynthia Martin
University of Reading

Research Report
No 692

Evaluation of the Key Stage 2 Language Learning Pathfinders

*Daniel Muijs, Ann Barnes, Marilyn Hunt, Bob Powell,
Elizabeth Arweck and Geoff Lindsay*

University of Warwick

Cynthia Martin

University of Reading

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

© University of Warwick 2005
ISBN 1 84478 591 2

Contents

1.	Executive summary	3
2.	Introduction	9
	2.1. Methodology	10
	2.2. Advantages and disadvantages of different delivery models	16
3.	Findings [Process/Effects]	23
	3.1. Content and delivery	23
	3.2. Teacher competence	55
	3.3. Progression and assessment within KS2	75
	3.4. Transition and transfer	87
	3.5. Sustainability and replicability	100
	3.6. Cost effectiveness	115
4.	Conclusion	126
5.	Recommendations	127
6.	References	132

Appendices

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings from the two year evaluation of the Primary Languages Pathfinder programme conducted by the Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research (CEDAR) at the University of Warwick.

1.1. Methodology

The evaluation was carried out using a mixed methodology approach, which included telephone interviews, case studies and questionnaires. The evaluation comprised five elements:

1. Telephone interviews of key staff in all Pathfinder Local Authorities (LAs) and collection and analysis of documentary evidence from Pathfinder LAs
2. A survey study in all Pathfinder LAs
3. In-depth case studies in a sample of Pathfinder LAs
4. Cost analysis of the different models
5. A desk study of existing research and analysis of existing datasets

In order to obtain an initial picture of the type of initiatives, telephone interviews were held during January to February 2004 with LA advisors with responsibility for the Pathfinder at LA level in the 19 LAs, which were repeated the following year.

Questionnaires were sent out to a sample of 500 schools from all Pathfinder areas, once at the start and once towards the end of the project, to allow investigation of change. The aim of the questionnaires was to collect descriptive data on the workings of the project in their schools, as well as their views on added value, effectiveness of workforce models, training, inclusiveness, support from the local authority and impact on the curriculum, teacher and pupil motivation and learning

A series of eight case studies was identified in order to explore the operation of Pathfinders on the ground, including the *interaction* between systems and schools, not just systems per se. Case studies here are defined as Pathfinder LAs within each of which a sample of

schools was studied. The case studies were also intended to identify examples of effective practice and factors that might impede such practice, and so suggest implementation mechanisms and processes which could be generalisable and hence of interest to practitioners and policy makers.

The main findings of the evaluation are presented in this report.

1.2. Findings

1.2.1. Content and Delivery

- French is by far the most dominant language in the Pathfinders.
- Working forwards from Year 3 proved more successful than introducing languages initially in Years 5 or 6 and then implementing them further down the age range. Some schools were moving towards providing languages from Year 3 to Year 6.
- Time for languages was found successfully in Pathfinder schools and in the best examples incorporated elements of discrete language lessons, curricular integration and cross curricular links.
- Languages were generally received enthusiastically by pupils, parents and teachers and there was a perceived positive impact on pupils' wider learning.
- Where schemes of work had been designed, adapted or provided, language learning was more effective and teacher confidence was higher, particularly where this had been carried out collaboratively.
- Cultural content and native speaker contact had enriched the language learning experience for many Pathfinder pupils.
- There remained considerable development necessary in the area of differentiation in language teaching. Nonetheless, many examples of good classroom practice were found across the Pathfinders.

1.2.2. Teacher Competence

- Languages were taught in the Pathfinders by a wide variety of staff, including most frequently non-specialist class teachers, foreign language assistants and outreach teachers from secondary schools.

- Effective models employing outreach teachers incorporated a process of empowering class teachers to gain in confidence and competence to work towards longer term sustainability.
- Collaborative 'clusters' of schools were also very beneficial in this regard. Class teachers' confidence in languages remained fairly low, despite the majority having obtained some form of language qualification.
- Continuing Professional Development (CPD) differentiated as appropriate and incorporating linguistic competence as well as methodology was found to be vital in addressing this aspect.
- The provision of quality resources was a major contributor to teacher confidence and thereby increased competence.
- Training was crucial for both primary and secondary staff to enable primary languages to achieve success.

1.2.3. Progression and Assessment

- Some Pathfinders had devised schemes of work with differentiated activities and materials matched to rising levels of difficulty to ensure progression within each year and upward through the years. However, in some cases these were not developed throughout KS2.
- In some instances there were challenges in achieving progression, for example, where children received the same content in different years with no overall strategy for progression from year to year. This problem resulted from staff moving between different year groups and limited staff expertise.
- In the majority of Pathfinders the Languages Ladder was an unknown aspect of national provision. Some Pathfinders were using the European Languages Portfolio but this was not necessarily consistent across all schools. One Pathfinder used a tiered language award with criteria.
- Generally assessment was underdeveloped in many Pathfinders. Even where assessment formed part of the local authority scheme of work and devised units, it was not always carried out and practice varied within Pathfinders.
- A range of assessment strategies was used across the case study schools which mainly involved informal monitoring.
- Recording of assessment evidence was limited although there were very good examples of practice including profile cards or sheets to record pupils' progress.

- In some Pathfinders, however, little or no attention had been paid to measuring pupils' progress. Indeed, there was some resistance to the notion of an imposed scheme and the worry that introducing assessment would change the whole nature of the experience. Individual feedback to pupils was often lacking, yet pupils were keen to receive this.

1.2.4. Transition and Transfer

- Primary-secondary patterns of transfer were complex in the majority of Pathfinder local authorities. This created real challenge in achieving continuity and progression where secondary schools received pupils from a large range of feeder schools.
- Lack of continuity in a language was a concern voiced by many, especially where the secondary school changed its Year 7 language from year to year. However, some teachers were not concerned about the change of language as they felt pupils were developing generic transferable language skills.
- In some Pathfinder schools effective transition and transfer arrangements were in place, or were developing and a minority of schools/Pathfinders were working towards a transfer document including information relating specifically to languages for transfer to secondary school.
- In many schools no meetings had taken place between primary and secondary staff. Where liaison between sectors had taken place, in particular mutual observation, this had been beneficial in encouraging teachers to evaluate their own practice.
- Very few schools mentioned any link with the KS3 Framework and a minority of schools mentioned NC levels sent to the secondary school.
- There is little knowledge amongst many primary teachers about how or if work in primary will be carried on in secondary school, and some teachers feel disheartened and frustrated that good primary languages practice in primary might be neither acknowledged nor built on at secondary.
- In some cases secondary schools were responding to work done in primaries by rethinking the KS3 curriculum or being aware of the need to rethink.

1.2.5. Sustainability and Replicability

- In most local Pathfinder authorities, there was a strong expectation that primary languages would be sustained at least at the level achieved during the Pathfinder funding.

- Schools already providing a language learning experience to all pupils throughout KS2 were very much in the minority. Provision in many schools depended on the location of staff with some foreign language skill or with the willingness to get involved.
- Threats to sustainability and growth were often associated with staff movement either within the school or away from the school.
- Of those schools *without* languages already part of the curriculum through KS2, few had made plans for extending their current provision.
- Where local authorities had responsibility for deploying visiting teachers or assistants, provision was more likely to be planned in a way that supported continuity of learning.
- While some primary teachers had risen admirably to the challenge of teaching languages, there was a significant number who did not yet appear ready to take on full responsibility for its delivery, relying heavily on visiting teachers. Without significantly more training, linguistic and pedagogical, it seems unlikely that they will be ready to 'go it alone' in three or four years' time.
- Pupil interviews provided much evidence of positive attitudes towards their language learning but, occasionally, there were also signs that the enthusiasm and initial sense of progress were tempered with some concerns about the repetitive nature of their lessons and recognition of increasing difficulties ahead, especially by Year 6 pupils nearing the end of their primary education.

1.2.6. Cost Analysis

- The overall mean cost of the Pathfinder per LA was calculated as being £400,461 including primary teacher teaching time, or £272,520 not including primary teacher teaching time.
- The bulk of this was made up of personnel costs, which accounted for over 92% of total costs. Most of the remainder was made up of the cost of resources (7%), with travel costs and communication costs making up a small proportion of the total. When teacher teaching time was deducted from overall costs, staff costs fell to 89% of total costs, with resources up to 10%.
- Costs differed significantly between local authorities, from a mean of £719 per school in the lowest case, to a mean of £19,374 in the highest case including teaching time,

and a mean of £622 in the lowest and £16,895 in the highest not including teaching time.

- The analysis revealed the need to take account of the sensitivity of certain assumptions in arriving at these estimates. These should be taken into account when considering these results.

1.3. Key Recommendations

- All primary schools should be encouraged to draw up a *policy document* for Primary Languages provision with a rationale, clear short and longer term aims, and an indication of outcomes expected, staffing, time allocation, scheme of work, resources, assessment procedures, and transition arrangements.
- Languages are most effectively integrated into the curriculum by working upwards from Year 3 and schools should be encouraged to make a start in this way.
- Schemes of work should be devised, used and developed in all cases, ideally collaboratively with other.
- Schools should be encouraged to set aside at least 40 minutes weekly plus 20 minutes incidental time for primary languages.
- Catering for the needs of all pupils and differentiation strategies in languages should be a focus for schools.
- Primary teachers' linguistic competence (and confidence) should be a priority for training.
- CPD needs to be provided for a range of deliverers: As well as primary teachers, for FLAs, native speakers from within the community, HLTAs and TAs, and secondary teachers, including ASTs.
- Primary and secondary schools should be encouraged to work in clusters, in order to build up networks, inter-school contacts between primary and secondary and to facilitate joint planning and preparation of materials.
- Assessment opportunities should be built into the schemes of work.
- Transition arrangements for primary languages between primary and secondary sectors should be improved.
- KS2 and KS3 should be thought of as a coherent whole, not as two separate programmes.

- Primary headteachers need more information about the value of foreign language learning.
- There is need for better dissemination of good practice within and across local authorities, especially involving headteachers, in order to support the integration of languages in the curriculum.
- Local authorities should appoint specialist primary language advisors or advisory teachers to oversee training and co-ordination of resources.

2. INTRODUCTION

This project aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of the KS2 Language Pathfinders. The basic intention and design was to contrast and compare different models so that the relative strengths and also any limitations of each model could be identified. The different models identified were compared on a number of dimensions:

- Allocation and use of resources. Which model of resource allocation and use is most efficient and effective?
- Impact upon the timescale of language learning throughout KS2 by the end of the decade.
- Added value in comparison with pre-Pathfinder plans. Has the additional funding allowed Pathfinders to increase the numbers of programmes without sacrificing quality?
- What different work models are used in the Pathfinders, and to what extent do they foster flexibility, creativity and a wider dissemination of resources?
- Have Pathfinders been able to develop models that do not impact negatively on the rest of the curriculum? Has introduction of language learning enhanced teaching and learning in other subjects?
- What impact have the different Pathfinder models had on pupil, teacher and headteacher commitment and motivation?
- Do the Pathfinder models differ from one another with regards to cost effectiveness?
- To what extent are the different models sustainable and reliable?
- To what extent have the different Pathfinder models succeeded in producing replicable materials, processes and resources?
- Have the Pathfinders put in place effective plans and mechanisms to ensure a smooth transition to KS3?

- To what extent is training provided in the different Pathfinders focused towards sustainability and the involvement of classroom teachers as well as language specialists?
- Are pupils with SEN and gifted and talented pupils able fully to take part in the programmes?

2.1 **Methodology**

The approach taken was grounded in the recognition that each system developed by Pathfinders within the project must be evaluated within the working context of schools and local authorities (LAs). In order fully to capture the complexity of the Pathfinder programmes, a mixed methods design was devised, incorporating quantitative and qualitative elements. This mix of quantitative and qualitative research allowed a combination of in-depth understanding of processes and statistical generalisations on effectiveness and cost effectiveness. The evaluation comprised five elements:

1. Telephone interviews of key staff in all Pathfinder LAs and collection and analysis of documentary evidence from Pathfinder LAs
2. A questionnaire to all Pathfinder LAs
3. In-depth case studies in a sample of Pathfinder LAs
4. Cost analysis of the different models
5. A desk study of existing research and analysis of existing datasets

2.1.1. Telephone interviews of key staff in all Pathfinders and LAs' collection of documentary evidence

In order to obtain an initial picture of the type of initiatives, interviews were held during January and February 2004 with LA advisors responsible for the Pathfinder at local authority level in the 19 LAs. These interviews also helped the selection of the 8 Pathfinders which were to form the nucleus of the case studies investigation.

Interviews were semi-structured using open questions supported by prompts, and addressed both the model being developed, and the key factors outlined in 'aims' above in order to ensure both consistency with regards to questions asked of different interviewees, and a

sufficient amount of flexibility to be able to respond to interviewee comments and allow information to emerge from the interviewee as well as from the pre-determined schedules.

Second interviews were conducted in November-December 2004. As well as checking on any amendments or variations from the original plan, and giving an up to date picture of the scope of the projects after 18 months of funding, these interviews included questions on costings and cost effectiveness.

Documentary evidence was also collected from these key local authority personnel and schools regarding the Pathfinder. This included Pathfinder bids which provided initial data relating to the aims; local authority context and schools' capacity; partners involved and proposed programmes together with targets; implementation plans and financial plans. Further documentation was sought from Pathfinders, including their reports to DfES but this was more variable, e.g. the number of reports produced differed and support material production was also varied.

2.1.2. Questionnaires

Questionnaires were sent out to a sample of 500 schools from all Pathfinder areas, once at the start and once towards the end of the project, to allow investigation of change. The aim of the questionnaires was to collect descriptive data on the workings of the project in their schools (including training received, workforce and resourcing arrangements, pupils and year groups involved, identification of who is delivering languages, issues of curriculum times, range of languages covered) as well as their views on added value, effectiveness of workforce models, training, inclusiveness, support from the LA and impact on the curriculum, teacher and pupil motivation and learning.

Questionnaire 1

Five hundred questionnaires were sent out to participating teachers in October 2004, who were given a month to respond. By the deadline, 207 usable responses were received, a response rate of 41.4%.

Questionnaire 2

In March 2005 a second questionnaire was conducted with the same schools. The response rate (39.6%, $N = 198$) was slightly lower than the previous questionnaire.

Both respondent characteristics and other findings did not change significantly between questionnaires one and two, in part due to the short time between questionnaires (less than half a year).

A sample of 250 schools from comparator LAs also received a questionnaire, in order to provide evidence of levels and models of provision of language learning in non-Pathfinder LAs. The comparator LAs were matched to Pathfinder LAs on a number of factors, including geography, attainment levels and urban/rural.

2.1.3. Case studies

Eight case study authorities were identified in order to explore the operation of Pathfinders on the ground, including the interaction between systems and schools, not just systems per se. Case studies here are defined as Pathfinder LAs within each of which a sample of schools was studied. The case studies were also intended to identify examples of effective practice and factors that might impede such practice, and so suggest implementation mechanisms and processes which could be generalisable and hence of interest to practitioners and policy makers.

The selection of case studies was influenced by the number of different basic models identified in the initial phase of data collection, from the telephone interviews with LA officers and the Pathfinders' initial plans. It was anticipated that, although each Pathfinder would be slightly different, it would be possible to identify typologies which could be distilled into a more limited number of distinct models. In the event, eight case studies were chosen. The process for selecting case studies passed through a number of filters, which were applied in order to all the bids:

1. Pathfinder models. The number one priority was to select a variety of Pathfinder models, with regards to aspects such as curriculum model, delivery model, training and Continuing Professional Development model, languages provided, arrangements for assessment, transition, sustainability, Special Educational Needs and Gifted & Talented.
2. Socio-demographic diversity. This second filter aimed to ensure that we had a mix of Pathfinders with regards to ethnic diversity of the student population and socio-economic status.

3. Geographic diversity. The third filter aimed to ensure that the Pathfinders represented a range of geographical areas, across the country.

The number of schools to be visited in each case study was intended to reflect the nature of the model selected and of the case study itself. The schools were selected to ensure the following characteristics were taken into account:

1. different socio-economic groupings i.e. schools in challenging circumstances and those in more affluent circumstances
2. schools of different type and size
3. schools in different locations i.e. inner-city, rural, metropolitan, borough
4. schools which were performing or improving at different rates.

A total of 41 schools were included in the sample across the eight case studies, including one special school, one specialist language college and one secondary school not a specialist language college but working on an outreach programme for languages with seven primary schools.

The case studies were investigated by three main methods: interviews, observation and collection of documentary evidence.

2.1.3.1 *Interviews.*

Each Pathfinder was visited twice, in 2004 and 2005. On each occasion interviews were carried out with the following interviewees in each school. Wherever possible the same person was interviewed each time, but occasionally this was not possible e.g. owing to absence, change of job. In some cases the deputy head was interviewed rather than the headteacher depending upon the latter's availability. The total numbers of interviews are as follows:

- 72 headteachers of the selected schools, on two occasions
- 68 teachers in those schools, also on two occasions. Wherever possible this was the teacher with main responsibility for languages in the school
- 16 adults delivering/supporting language provision from outside the school e.g. the secondary school/college
- 319 pupils, normally in groups.

In addition, interviews were held with Foreign Language Assistants where available.

Interviews were recorded and a 25% sample was fully transcribed. Field notes of interviews were also made. Transcripts were analysed using theme analysis. The interviews enabled the development of categories and typologies and comparative analyses so that, 'instances are compared across a range of situations, over time, among a number of people and through a variety of methods' (Woods, 1996, p.81). The information derived from these was triangulated with other data sources, so allowing robust pictures of how the different Pathfinder models are working in practice in schools.

2.1.3.2. *Classroom Observation*

It was essential that the evaluation included an element of observation in order to assess the impact of language learning in the classroom. Observation of language teaching was undertaken in all case study sites and in all primary schools except one, where this was declined. In most schools observations were carried out in both 2004 and 2005 ($N = 85$). The observation instrument used was high-inference, as low-inference measures are not best suited to collecting detailed qualitative information that allow judgements of quality and effectiveness (Appendix 1).

The instrument contained a purely qualitative section, where the observer noted in detail all that occurred in the lesson and an initial analysis checklist to be completed following the observed lesson. This checklist was constructed based on the team's review of best practice in teaching languages and effective teaching more generally. The data produced, therefore, support both qualitative and quantitative analysis. This type of mixed instrument has been successfully employed in a variety of projects, including the evaluations of the Mathematic Enhancement Programme Primary (Muijs & Reynolds, 2000), the evaluation of the Mathematics Enhancement Programme Secondary (Reynolds et al, 2003) and The Hay McBer Teacher Effectiveness study in the UK as well as in various projects (e.g. the Louisiana School Effectiveness Study, Teddlie & Stringfield, (1993) in the US.

2.1.3.3. *Documentary evidence*

Documentary evidence was collected from key local authority personnel and schools regarding the Pathfinder project. As well as the Pathfinder initial plans, this included minutes from meetings, project plans, materials and resources developed where available. These provided important information on the development and evolution of the project, and allowed qualitative judgements on the quality of materials produced.

Other information including school Ofsted reports, post-Ofsted planning, PANDAs, LA Reports and School Improvement Plans were consulted to provide important contextual and background information about the schools. Where Ofsted had carried out an inspection of a case study Pathfinder, their report was also examined.

2.1.4. Desk study of existing research and analysis of existing datasets

A number of datasets including the annual school census, PLASC and performance data were interrogated to both provide necessary contextual information (e.g. free school meal eligibility, special needs) for the schools in the survey and case studies, and to provide the basis for a test of possible measurable positive or negative effects on performance. These analyses were carried out on data from all schools in the sample and took into account school level variables to explore differential impact.

A literature review was also conducted on best practice in teaching and learning languages in primary schools, interrogating both the UK and international literature. This literature review provided a framework for analysing the case study and questionnaire data and developing instruments and allowed us to contextualise local practice within the international research base. The literature review was also intended to be a useful tool in its own right to help guide future developments in the field. (Hunt, M., Barnes, A., Powell, B., Lindsay, G., & Muijs, D. (in press). Primary modern foreign languages: An overview of recent research, key issues and challenges for educational practice. *Research Papers in Education*).

2.1.5. Cost effectiveness analysis

A cost analysis was undertaken of the different models of delivering languages. This analysis was designed to take into account the multiple costs associated with the Pathfinder, including personnel costs, resources, travel and overheads associated with usage of school and local authority resources. While initially a cost effectiveness analysis of different Pathfinder models was planned, the fact that no clear models could be identified from the data meant that the analysis was confined to a comparison of costs of different delivery models. Data were derived from both the questionnaires and from the case studies as well as through collection of documentary evidence and telephone interviews with key staff.

2.2. Advantages and disadvantages of different delivery models

As will become clear from the following sections, the concept of 'Pathfinder models' was highly problematic in practice. Diversity both between and not least within Pathfinders meant that developing fixed models as envisaged at the outset of the evaluation would not be in accordance with the data. Rather than pretending at spurious clarity by developing overarching models, we have attempted to construct a number of different delivery models in specific areas, which will be presented in this report. We have listed the main advantages and disadvantages of each. Just as it was not possible to construct overarching models due to the complexity of the data, it would not conform to our findings to make strong statements as to which methods are definitively more effective in reaching Pathfinder goals, as different models were found to be effective in different Pathfinders and individual Pathfinder schools.

2.2.1. Using an Outreach Teacher to Deliver Primary Languages

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good subject knowledge • Represents a good role model in terms of pronunciation and accuracy, which is vital if the aim of primary language learning is to follow a language competence model and thereby raise attainment in KS3. • Awareness of and ability to correct error • More thorough knowledge of grammar may enable language as system to be discussed more fully • Richer language input • Ability to extend pupils linguistically • More likely to have visited target language country and therefore able to develop children's intercultural understanding • May use a variety of language teaching strategies i.e. mime • Repetition and questioning strategies may be more appropriate and challenging • Pupils experience different teaching style(s) • Lessons may have more pace • Has experience of assessment strategies • A longer-term view of foreign language learning to inform planning • Potential for continuity into secondary school • If class teacher works together with outreach teacher, two teachers in classroom can facilitate group work monitoring and attention to individuals • Pupils might view language lessons with a visiting teacher as a 'special event' • A timetabled slot helps ensure that the language lesson does take place regularly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of primary experience • The visiting teacher has outsider status and may have little understanding of the primary curriculum and pedagogy • Resources used may not be age appropriate • Visiting teacher does not know class well and may therefore not be able to differentiate adequately • Less intimate knowledge of pupils may lead to uncertainties over class management • Has to teach in the 'timetabled slot' so that language learning may be 'isolated' from the rest of the primary curriculum • Lack of liaison between SMT and class teacher may make language period an add-on • Therefore less likelihood of integration and cross curricular work • Is more likely to restrict location of teaching to within classroom, rather than using other spaces such as hall for PE • May daunt class teacher to the extent of discouraging her from teaching language herself • If primary teacher is not in the classroom there may be less impact on the wider school curriculum and no opportunity for the primary teacher to be trained up or continue with language work in the periods in between lessons • Lack of continuity in case of staff/language changes • Logistical problems (transport, different timetables, school specific events)

2.2.2. Languages Delivery by the Primary Teacher

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of activities suited to the cognitive development of the age group and to the range of learning styles • In-depth knowledge of pupils' individual needs • Potential to be able to differentiate according to pupils' ability in class • Good existing working relationship with pupils • Able to integrate the foreign language into other relevant topics and general daily routine • Appropriate resources are readily available which can provide a stimulus for foreign language learning • Flexibility re timetable • Able to harness 'in-house' expertise (e.g. pupils with foreign language, parents) • May serve as role model for other teachers in the school who are less confident re language teaching • Also a role model to pupils, as language learners themselves 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of subject specialist knowledge and confidence • Linguistic repertoire may be severely limited: this may affect the primary teacher's ability to differentiate or challenge pupils • This may affect ability to integrate language into other curriculum areas • Question and answer sequences may be less demanding • May be unaware of pupils' errors or unable to correct error • May have less first hand knowledge of target language culture • Pace may be slower • May be overloaded if asked to teach language in other classes as well • Perception of already crowded curriculum • Where the primary teacher is the only primary languages teacher in her school, she may lack opportunities for support and sharing ideas with colleagues during school day

2.2.3. Use of Foreign Language Assistants in Languages Delivery

Foreign Language Assistants usually have no teacher training but may do. The short term trainees are being teacher trained but still have different expectations and prior experience

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represent a good role model in terms of pronunciation, accuracy and fluency • Able to convey the wider cultural elements and authenticity to the language • Add variety to input for pupils • Pupils generally respond well to a 'real' speaker of the language • Can contribute to the promotion of positive attitudes and the breaking down of stereotypes • May help establish 'foreign' links (e.g. e-mail exchange between pupils) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May have outsider status • Lack of understanding of the primary curriculum in the UK • Lack of knowledge of pedagogy • Less able to differentiate • Lack of knowledge of classroom management issues • May be in UK for first time with limited experience of British culture • May require induction and substantial and ongoing support and training • Need to be 'managed'/supervised • Continuity and progression difficult to achieve if FLAs (Foreign Language Assistants) move on after a year • Transport issues • Punctuality issues • May be shared between schools, which adds to logistical problems • Add cost to the school's budget

As well as different delivery models in terms of personnel, different models can also be discerned in terms of the aims of the programmes employed in different Pathfinders.

2.2.4. Languages Delivery through a Language Competence Programme

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops children’s linguistic attainment with an emphasis on performance and progression, typically in a single language • If the language content and skills are clearly defined through a scheme of work secondary language teachers can be informed precisely about what has been covered and this can be built on in KS3. • Can be an integral part of the whole curriculum: foreign language can be reinforced throughout the day at primary level by inclusion in everyday activities within normal daily routines, for example, the register, collecting dinner money, day, date and weather and simple instructions. • If delivered or supported by the primary teacher, elements of the foreign language can also permeate other topic and class work such as geography, art, science and PE. Examples of such integration (Bell, 1996; Tierney and Hope, 1998; Muir, 1999) demonstrate the feasibility of promoting real communication throughout the school day. • Potential for continuity and progression in KS3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher’s linguistic knowledge is crucial to achieving quality of teaching. • Language competence models tend to be delivered by outreach teachers • Predominance of French has an impact on diversification programmes at secondary level • Switching languages between KS2 and KS3 fails to achieve continuity • Potential for repetition of work at KS3

2.2.5. Languages Delivery through Language Sensitisation Programmes

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiates children into foreign language learning by developing an understanding of languages through encounters with one or more foreign languages • Suitable for delivery by the primary class teacher, who may be a non-specialist linguist, lacking in confidence and training. • Sensitisation programmes can be started in foundation and early years settings as well as KS2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More restricted content of language items where pupils develop some basic competence in a limited range of vocabulary and formulaic phrases without the emphasis on progression and performance found in language competence programmes • May tend to place more emphasis on listening and speaking rather than reading and writing skills

2.2.6. Languages Delivery through a Language Awareness/Multilingual Approach

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multilingual approach might be a solution to the obstacles to linear language learning at primary level • Could support cross curricular delivery • Could use and develop language skills available within a school • Reduces the problems associated with transition to secondary school, whilst laying strong foundations for language learning • Avoids the reduction in language diversity. • Enhanced ability to learn other languages at a later stage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of linguistic attainment in a single language • More use of English as a medium of teaching rather than the target languages

Analysing these models, conditions for successful practice include:

- active support from the Headteacher and the whole staff
- clear linguistic and communicative aims
- knowledge and inclusion of aspects of the target language culture
- planning based on a scheme of work
- sharing of resources and collaborative work with the foreign language department in the local secondary school
- active teaching methods with extensive use of songs and games
- links with literacy
- ICT, for example, the use of PowerPoint and an interactive whiteboard, integrated into the teaching
- reliable transfer records
- emphasis on enjoyment and enthusiasm
- extensive training and support
- links with foreign countries; e-mail or video-conferencing links

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Content and delivery

3.1.1. Summary:

French is by far the most dominant language in the Pathfinders. Working forwards from Year 3 proved more successful than introducing languages initially in Years 5 or 6 and then implementing them further down the age range. Some schools were moving towards providing languages from Year 3 to Year 6. Time for languages was found successfully in Pathfinder schools and in the best examples incorporated elements of discrete language lessons, curricular integration and cross curricular links. Languages were generally received enthusiastically by pupils, parents and teachers and there was a perceived positive impact on pupils' wider learning. Where schemes of work had been designed, adapted or provided, language learning was more effective and teacher confidence was higher; particularly where this had been carried out collaboratively. Cultural content and native speaker contact had enriched the language learning experience for many Pathfinder pupils. There remained considerable development necessary in the area of differentiation in language teaching. Nonetheless, many examples of good classroom practice were found across the Pathfinders.

3.1.2. Recommendations

- All primary schools should be encouraged to draw up a *policy document* for Primary Languages provision with a rationale, clear short and longer term aims, and an indication of outcomes expected, staffing, time allocation, schemes of work, resources, assessment procedures, and transition arrangements.
- Languages are most effectively integrated into the curriculum by working upwards from Year 3 and schools should be encouraged to make a start in this way.
- Schemes of work should be devised, used and developed in all cases, ideally collaboratively with other bodies (primary clusters, secondary schools, local authorities etc.).
- Schools should be encouraged to base their planning on schemes of work, in order to assist progression and assessment. These schemes of work should be based on appropriate primary pedagogy and not on KS3 schemes of work and should be provided where possible.

- Schools should be encouraged to set aside at least 40 minutes weekly plus 20 minutes incidental time for primary languages. Primary schools have the advantage of being able to offer more exposure to languages within routines, incidental language use and integration within cross curricular work, than do secondary schools. This additional time should be exploited.
- Schools should aim towards integrating primary languages across the curriculum including cross curricular aspects in the languages lessons.
- Native speaker contact and cultural awareness should form an integral part of the primary languages experience.
- Catering for the needs of all pupils and differentiation strategies in languages should be a focus for schools.

3.1.3. Which languages; which year groups; time allocation

3.1.3.1. Context

In some schools languages had been taught prior to the Pathfinder. In a number of case study Pathfinders, languages were very well-established before the Pathfinder began, for example, through the Early Teaching of a Modern Language (ETML) project. However, in other Pathfinders, there was relatively little or no primary languages provision before the Pathfinder came on stream. Occasionally, schools had developed their structured languages provision out of a successful languages club or outside agency. Some Pathfinders had achieved full coverage, i.e. all primary schools in a local authority having languages provision (although this was not across the whole of KS2 in every school). Where primary schools involved had to sign up to a service level agreement, this enabled certain baseline expectations and requirements to be fulfilled (e.g. sending representatives to training and information sessions, providing a particular length of time for languages). Only a small minority of schools visited had a primary languages policy.

3.1.3.2. Languages

According to Questionnaire 1, French was being taught in 84% of classrooms; in 70% of cases this was the *only* language taught. In most other cases French was taught *in combination with* Spanish (4.3%) or German (3.9%). In 3.9% of cases German was the language taught. 3% used a multilingual approach. Community languages were taught by just 1% of respondents.

In Questionnaire 2, findings were very similar to those from Questionnaire 1. In 85% of classrooms, French was being taught; in 68% of cases this was the only language taught. In most other cases French was taught *in combination with* Spanish (4.1%) or German (4.0%). In 4.1% of cases German was the language taught. 2.8% used a multilingual approach. Community languages were taught by just 1% of respondents.

From all the data including case studies, most schools had chosen French: this is the 'default' language. In one Pathfinder, the ratio was 10: 1 for schools teaching French as opposed to Spanish or German; in another, French was taught in 70% of the primary schools involved. This was a common pattern, with French dominating in every Pathfinder; indeed in one Pathfinder the estimate was that French was the language in 95% of the schools. This Pathfinder had trialled on-line Spanish materials as an attempt at diversification. In another Pathfinder, there was currently more French than had been hoped, with some very strong Spanish, which was set to increase. Spanish did not reflect the secondary scene, so this language choice was likely to have eventual consequences for transition. Where it had been hoped by the Pathfinders that more diversified provision would be created this had not occurred: the majority of schools opted for French. Where Pathfinders planned to introduce lesser taught languages (e.g. Arabic), these plans had frequently not borne fruit, although there were a few instances in the case study schools of successful community languages.

There were a few examples of schools offering Italian, and offering others a combination of French and Italian. Some schools were doing a ten week pilot in Japanese, and in a minority of Pathfinders there were examples of Japanese and Mandarin Chinese being offered, usually in the form of tasters. In a few instances, 'Family Learning' classes were being held, typically after school; these included mainstream languages such as French and Spanish, as well as in one case Welsh. One Pathfinder had successfully drawn upon the strengths of the community in the establishment of a Family Learning Centre at a primary school catering for Arabic.

Occasionally, a school offered a particular language on an opportunity basis, i.e. when a member of staff happened to have some knowledge of e.g. Italian. This meant therefore that the chosen language was essentially arbitrary. Some schools alternated year on year which language was taught as part of primary languages provision, dependent on the language, which would be experienced by that cohort when they began secondary school. There were,

however, instances of schools where the teacher taught French one year and German the next, with no apparent rationale.

Pupils reacted to the dominance of French in a variety of ways. Many pupils learning French (and enjoying it) expressed a strong interest in learning Spanish, and some would have preferred to do so. Where KS2 pupils have been learning two foreign languages concurrently, some perceived this as confusing (however, the same pupils expressed a desire to learn a third foreign language). There were instances of pupils who have been exposed to more than one language having the capacity to compare their ability in learning different languages:

'I found Spanish easier to pronounce, French is more complicated.' (pupil)

Teachers could understand the pragmatic reasons for choosing French, but sometimes questioned its dominance:

'The issue is, which language? Why always French? Why not Chinese?' (languages teacher)

It is important to consider the implications arising from the dominance of French. The history of language teaching in England leads to a 'French as default language' approach, where if a primary teacher has a language it is likely to be French. This therefore is the language where they feel the most confident (although the level of confidence may not be very high). Consequently, there is the risk firstly that KS2 pupils would equate languages solely with French; not with languages more widely and language learning strategies and approaches as well as a more global appreciation of plurilingual speakers. Secondly, if French remains the dominant language in KS2, the cycle will repeat itself, in that the supply of language teachers will comprise predominantly French speakers.

3.1.3.3. Year groups

Predominantly, languages were focused in Years 5 and 6. In many schools where this was the case, the intention was to move the language further down the age range as it embedded itself in the curriculum. This model of working *backwards* down the key stage had proved problematic, as both primary and secondary have had to change schemes of work each year. Where this had occurred, working up from Year 3 was often considered more practical, as progression could be developed. Furthermore, in some schools, although

the provision was declared as taking place in e.g. Year 6, this did not mean that languages were taught throughout the year. In some cases languages were restricted for example to the summer term or indeed, after SATs in Year 6.

There was little evidence of widespread primary languages across the whole of KS2, even where a good infrastructure existed, although there were some primary schools, teaching languages throughout KS2 (i.e. where pupils started a language in Year 3 and continued with it throughout). Where Pathfinder co-ordinators were particularly strong with a clear overview of provision, schools were very aware of the implications of an entitlement across KS2 and were moving towards this. This was increasingly the case in year 2 of the Pathfinder.

In one large Pathfinder, a very high number of primary schools were teaching languages, but provision was not consistent between schools and year groups. For example, some schools involved taster sessions in Years 3 and 4, followed by discrete language learning in Years 5 and 6. In other schools languages were timetabled in Year 6 but it was at the discretion of the teachers whether to include them in Years 3-5. Schools involved in one Pathfinder focused on storytelling and songs in Year 3, language tasters in Year 4 and linguistic competence in one language in Years 5 and 6. In at least one Pathfinder, provision had been left to the discretion of the clusters, so that individual schools had started as suited their local circumstances.

There were particular challenges for schools where classes were arranged in vertical groupings, with combined year groups, for example, Year 3 and Year 4 taught together, or Year 5 and Year 6. In some schools therefore, there were problems with continuity from one NC year to the next, particularly where vertically grouped classes in small, rural schools were concerned. Where there were mixed age group classes, this would be an issue to consider in future planning to ensure that pupils' progression in languages is maintained without content repetition.

Some schools involved in the Pathfinders delivered languages additionally to KS1; usually in the form of songs and simple greetings, although a few schools had structured timetabled languages input in KS1.

In a minority of Pathfinders, the number of primary schools involved had actually reduced during the two years of the Pathfinder and in some schools, the time per week allocated to languages had also been reduced.

3.1.3.4. Time allocated to languages

One hour curriculum time allocated to languages is recommended in the draft Key Stage 2 Framework. In one Pathfinder, a school had 2 x 45 minute lessons a week, another made use of 30 minutes plus cross curricular links, whilst a third school was struggling to find 30 minutes a week and some had timetabled 20 minutes. Even within one Pathfinder therefore there was no standard time allocation. An outreach teacher commented:

'The way forward is to encourage the class teachers to find ways of extending the learning time with exposure time.' (outreach teacher)

It should also be noted that in some schools, particularly those employing visiting or part time native speakers, there might be a pattern of say 15/20 minutes whole class teaching, followed by short sessions with a number of small groups extracted from the main class, who returned to working with their class teacher, at the end of their slot with the native speaker. This means that not every child in a specific class actually had the total amount of time allocated on the timetable to language teaching.

Time had been found for languages in a number of ways. Some schools had reduced time allocated to Foundation subjects; others used some assembly and/or literacy and numeracy time. Many heads expressed concern about the 'packed' timetable in Year 6. In one school with a positive experience of tasters in Year 6, teachers were happy to go along with the inclusion of primary languages as long as *'it did not involve shoehorning another subject into an already full week.'* (primary languages teacher).

In the second year of the Pathfinder, some schools were feeling more confident about the time allocation and had undertaken reviews of the timetable and curriculum:

'We have recently worked with the LA advisor on an overhaul of the curriculum. In the past it was seen as encroaching on other curriculum subjects. We're working at a more topic based approach with more fluidity and flexibility. As this beds in we will see this as a part of not as bolt on.' (headteacher)

'We've managed to be creative with the timetable. We can put French in and not miss out on anything else. We teach History and Geography maybe on alternate weeks, but they will

still be curriculum based; we have had to work at it but it's manageable. Last year the nativity play was in French, a simple version, but the children loved it.' (headteacher)

Some staff were initially sceptical about the time needed to teach languages and others were concerned about its impact on the rest of the curriculum time especially for SATs. One Year 2 teacher, who also taught French in Year 6 pointed out:

'We're actually always going to restrict Year 6 teaching to the second half of the summer term, simply because of the timetable and SATs. I'm always going to be teaching in Year 2. Hopefully next year it'll [language teaching] be from the beginning of the year – this year it wasn't, I was embroiled in getting children ready for their Year 2 SATs tests.' (languages teacher)

'In Year 6 they're often quite busy, there isn't room in a Year 6 curriculum to slot in some enrichment, such as languages.' (outreach teacher)

As one headteacher in a Pathfinder with a well established primary languages programme said:

'The staff find it [the primary language] another pressure, because they have to try to find space for it in the curriculum.' (headteacher)

However, by the second year of the Pathfinder, most of these concerns had been eased and staff were seeing the benefits.

3.1.4. Impact on curriculum; integration within the curriculum; schemes of work; Key Stage 2 Framework

3.1.4.1. Impact

Whilst the timescale and data do not allow any definitive statement on the possible positive impact of languages on pupils' learning elsewhere in the curriculum, the professional opinion voiced by many of the participants in the Pathfinders, together with the statements made by the children themselves, would indicate that this is indeed the case. This varied in relation to the level of languages established before the Pathfinders commenced. In many schools the following was the case:

'French would not be taught now at Year 5 and 6 without the Pathfinder.' (headteacher)

However, in other local authorities, languages existed to a great extent already. As one headteacher expressed it:

'There is no point in playing around with MFL (Modern Foreign Languages); it has to be part of your school vision so that everyone has to believe in it and want to do it.' (headteacher)

In the first year, headteachers were very enthusiastic about the Pathfinders and languages generally, describing its impact positively, as 'dynamic', for example. The impact on pupils was described as

'Astonishing; a lot have discovered something new: enthusiasm and ability in a new area. Inspirational.' (headteacher)

By the second year of the Pathfinder, many schools were incorporating languages into their prospectus and report to governors. Some schools had linked languages with international partnerships more generally:

'Parents are proud of what the school is doing in terms of MFL and global awareness. The culture is important for our parents and it's fantastic that the children are aware.'
(headteacher)

The methodology and approach adopted for languages had, in some cases, had a wider impact:

'They're very well motivated. It makes a lovely change for them, a different type of lesson. They have responded so well because it's got such a multi-sensory approach. I have thought I could use the same techniques in other lessons, for example, mimes for weather expressions. There are some really good teaching methods in here, they're keen for stickers....' (languages teacher)

'The Pathfinder in MFL has a big input in enjoyment and excellence in education – the creativity side, being able to plan around a topic. It has given people the opportunity to stretch themselves and look outside the box and for pupils it has given them the notion that there is a greater world out there to be explored.' (Pathfinder co-ordinator)

The impact on the curriculum also varied according to the goals schools had in mind, and whether schools were focusing particularly on a language competence model in a single language, on taster sessions in one or more languages, on raising awareness of other languages and cultures, or simply promoting positive attitudes, or in some cases, a combination of all of these.

So, for example, goals cited by headteachers were

- language competence alongside some language awareness
- cultural awareness and positive attitudes rather than competence
- that children should be exposed to the fact that there are other languages and that they make as much sense as English
- to ensure that children are motivated, enthusiastic and confident by the time they transfer.

There were still tensions, however, with the range of demands on the primary curriculum. As one headteacher put it:

'I really feel the primary curriculum as it is at the moment is pretty squashed and to put another subject in is tough, when the agenda is still about raising attainment in the core subjects, ... essentially SATs results are still what you are judged on and I think it takes a lot of courage to say, "We're not worried about our SATs", because you are still getting these targets coming down and the pressure is on.' (headteacher)

3.1.4.2. Schemes of work (including QCA)/Key Stage 2 Framework

In order to provide consistent and effective languages provision, coherent schemes of work should be available, at least at school or local level. These schemes of work can be underpinned or can evolve from a coherent national framework and scheme of work. The availability and effective use of such a scheme of work contributes both to learners' progression in the subject and to teachers' confidence when faced with, for example, staffing changes or illness. In the specific case of primary languages, a scheme of work is particularly beneficial for a number of reasons:

- helpful developmentally, to counter to some degree a teacher's perceived or actual lack of subject competence
- important for pupils' progression and assessment (between years and key stages, across schools and across authorities)

- beneficial for the subject's coherence and status

It is especially important that pupils are not repeating schemes of work in vertical groupings. A scheme of work should not result in, for example, the prescription of French.

In the Pathfinders, there was no uniform approach to the utilisation of the QCA Schemes of Work for Key Stage 2. In some schools, they had been adopted wholesale, along with elements of the draft Key Stage 2 Framework, in others units had been successfully adapted or integrated with local authority produced materials. Some teachers were very informed about these documents, in other schools there was apparently no awareness of the guidelines.

In some cases, specialists (either local authority personnel such as advisory teachers, secondary school or Specialist Language College (SLC) teachers, or lead primary teachers from schools where exemplar primary languages practice was in place) had collaborated to produce schemes of work based on the QCA guidelines, together with packs of topic based resources including detailed lesson plans and all the necessary teaching materials such as books, CDs, videos, posters, and flashcards). Elsewhere, however, the scheme of work for Years 5 and 6 was a Year 7 one rewritten for these year groups, i.e. the Year 7 curriculum has been moved down to KS2.

Even where detailed lessons were available to primary teachers, difficulties could still arise owing to the differing amounts of time for language teaching, even in schools within the same cluster. In one case, the primary teacher found difficulty adapting planning by an outreach teacher based on 40 minute lessons, since children currently had sessions lasting barely 20 minutes.

The Key Stage 2 Framework had been piloted in some Pathfinder schools. Where opinions were given on the Framework, some teachers were concerned that it would mean the disappearance of languages other than French. In one Pathfinder, there was particular concern expressed about the introduction of literacy and especially, writing skills.

There were a number of instances where the impact of the Framework could be seen. In one observed lesson, (see below) a skilled secondary AST practised the **on** sound in French, both orally and with pupils playing with small syllable cards as a reading activity, which she declared:

'is very much a consequence of seeing the Key Stage 2 Framework draft and attending a practical session by a key CLT Language Teaching Advisor.' (outreach teacher)

Case study: Exemplar good practice of Key Stage 2 Framework/literacy and ICT linked work

The lesson was conducted by an outreach teacher supported by a native speaker assistant. The primary teacher observed and participated. Based around the interactive whiteboard, accompanied by picture and text/sound/symbol flash cards, and a song CD, a key focus was words in context incorporating the **on** sound. A previously introduced little text about a pig: *un cochon, Léon, qui habite à Lyon*, was quickly recapped, followed by a new screen with twelve hidden food items (*jambon, cornichons*,). The lesson was characterised by a high level of appropriate, planned target language. *Il aime manger – qu'est-ce qu'il aime manger? Vous avez une bonne mémoire? Où sont les citrons? Viens chercher*. Pupils went to the front and dragged coloured squares to one side, to reveal food hidden behind. Praise was given in French: *très bien, excellent. Comment dit-on 'I like? I don't like?'* *Ecoutez, répétez*. Children practised *j'aime, je n'aime pas* using a variety of repetition strategies including modelling by the native speaker. Work on individual syllables within pre-taught vocabulary items followed. Food items such as *jambon* were split into *JAM BON/ BON BON*, firstly whole class, then as pairs with smaller syllable cards at tables to reconstitute the familiar words. The lesson was characterised by pace and encouragement. *vite, vite, vite*. As pupils were doing the task, the FLA, the primary class teacher and the language teacher circulated: *Formidable. Parfait. Vous n'avez que 2 minutes. Tout le monde – ils ont déjà fini* – signalling the quickest group. *Rangez les choses dans les enveloppes. Tournez les chaises*. A new screen presented words plus heart symbols with crosses for *j'aime, je n'aime pas*. *Il faut regarder et corriger*. Pupils came to the whiteboard and dragged phrases and symbols to match. Everyone stood to carry out bold physical actions to indicate preferences. Finally an information gap pair work activity was set up, using the FLA to demonstrate with the French teacher. Pupils drew four symbols of food items they either liked or disliked and worked with a partner. As a plenary, the teacher reminded pupils of the **on** sound, which they had been practising. *Il était une bergère, et ron et ron petit patapon* was sung with gusto, first with the music and then twice without. Children were fully engaged during the whole of this energetically and expertly presented sequence.

Many teachers remained very dependent on visiting teachers or the plans and resources devised by the Pathfinder and relied on these conforming to the QCA Schemes of Work and the Key Stage 2 Framework.

It is crucial that primary schools and teachers receive support through schemes of work, Key Stage 2 Framework etc. in order for both primary and some secondary teachers working for the first time in a primary setting to feel confident to deliver languages. One outreach teacher expressed the following wish:

'I still feel there needs to be more contact in terms of what we're planning, what we're using.'
(outreach teacher)

3.1.4.3. Integration of languages into the curriculum

Table 1: Language and the Curriculum. Questionnaire 1 (Questionnaire 2 in brackets)

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Don't know
Doing MFL means sacrificing other areas of the curriculum	10.1 (10.0)	36.2 (35.6)	9.5 (9.0)	20.1 (20.2)	22.1 (21.6)	2.0 (3.6)
Learning another language is a valuable skill in its own right	82.0 (80.5)	17.0 (17.6)	1.0 (1.2)	0.0 (0.3)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.4)

It is evident from the questionnaires that teachers valued the learning of a language highly, yet were also of the view that curriculum sacrifice is inevitable in order to accommodate this.

Some schools had adjusted the timetable to fit languages in. However, there were frequently practical difficulties to overcome, as encountered in one Pathfinder, where it was discovered that not all designated outreach teachers could drive, resulting in logistical problems in organising taxis and inevitable cost increases, as well as the fact that most of the primary schools' morning timetables were fully 'booked' so that language lessons tended to be scheduled for the afternoons. It was not possible always to timetable outreach

teachers to be free in the afternoon because of the constraints of the **secondary school** curriculum. As the co-ordinator commented:

'This has a knock-on effect also in that the attempt to get the Year 6 outreach teachers timetabled to continue teaching those pupils in Year 7 has failed. A wonderful idea but failure through the exigencies of timetabling.' (Pathfinder co-ordinator)

Other practical problems encountered by visiting secondary teachers included maintaining primary languages provision during May, when the secondary, as well as the primary curriculum, is dominated by SATs, and when GCSE and A-Level orals and exchange visits may be taking place. This had resulted in a few instances in cancellations of the primary teaching, as secondary languages staff could not be released at this time.

3.1.4.4. Cross-curricular aspects

Where visiting teachers or other teachers from within the primary school were deployed, integration with other subjects was far less likely to occur. Even where teachers were primary trained teachers, if they were employed on a part time or supply cover basis to deliver the language, then little or no integration with the remainder of the curriculum took place. Consequently, primary languages were typically taught as a discrete subject and not formally integrated with other subjects, although elements might feed in to e.g. Geography. Nonetheless, several headteachers were looking at a more integrated approach, considering the curriculum and timetable carefully to make sure pupils got a balance and thinking of a cross curricular approach rather than individual subjects. Thus language might take place in Maths, ICT, Music, Art, Geography, maps and locality, Drama, role plays and dialogues, PSHE team building and work with a partner, the opportunity to ask about families and personal preferences, for double effect. In one Pathfinder, cross curricular elements were built in formally through units on healthy eating.

Table 2: Integration and Communication Skills - Questionnaire 1 (Questionnaire 2 in brackets)

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Don't know
MFL is most successful when you integrate it with other subjects	13.1 (12.4)	35.9 (35.6)	27.8 (26.5)	7.1 (7.4)	5.1 (4.9)	11.1 (13.2)
Pupils' communication skills have improved as a result of doing MFL	14.1 (13.6)	38.4 (36.4)	28.3 (30.2)	6.1 (6.5)	2.5 (2.3)	10.6 (11.0)

Despite teachers' considerable indecision on these issues, as is apparent from Table 2, it is nevertheless the case that they are more positive than negative.

Pathfinders varied in the emphasis placed on cross-curricular aspects. Some had intended to incorporate much more, but the plans had not been realised. One Pathfinder adopted a deliberate cross-curricular approach in Year 5 of its model and a special school within that Pathfinder held a school-wide Spanish day (with further days for different languages planned), incorporating a cross-curricular element through food, dress etc. Many Pathfinders mentioned occurrences of the language being used at a fairly low level outside the dedicated languages lessons, for example in registration, use of numbers or in other routines of the school day. There were also instances in the lessons observed where a languages theme incorporated a topic needed in the wider curriculum, e.g. the 24 hour clock.

A small minority of schools had attempted to implement an immersion programme in French in some curricular areas such as PE in KS2. In practice children's limited vocabulary had in some instances made this difficult to sustain. There was an issue too, over how much time was being taken up with the language to the detriment of the PE content. Attempts to incorporate a partial immersion type approach through Music were much more successful and Music lessons contained a good deal of singing in the foreign language.

3.1.4.5. Cultural awareness

Despite the clear agreement demonstrated in the Table 3, cultural content was mentioned rarely outside the questionnaires, although some schools included comments on culture in their school prospectus:

Table 3: Cultural Tolerance - Questionnaire 1 (Questionnaire 2 in brackets)

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Don't know
Learning a foreign language has made my pupils more tolerant of other cultures	13.6 (12.9)	42.4 (43.2)	29.3 (29.2)	3.0 (3.4)	1.0 (0.5)	10.6 (10.8)

'We aim to develop children's curiosity of different languages and cultures.' (School prospectus)

Nonetheless, some schools had involved native speakers, albeit on occasion peripherally, and/or trips to a target language (TL) country, or themed days, and this was viewed very positively by teachers and pupils alike. For some headteachers the benefit of languages was seen to be primarily cultural. This might be achieved by the presence of a native speaker, who could be crucial in giving pupils access to a young person from a different culture. A number of examples of native speakers from a variety of backgrounds were found. Some native speakers were young Foreign Language Assistants (FLAs), and their deployment was particularly successful in a Pathfinder model where FLAs were used primarily to deliver languages, and in another where strong teams of FLAs supported delivery by the class teacher. Native speakers were also recently qualified teacher trainees, or trainees on a school placement as part of the DfES/TDAS Primary Languages ITT Project. In a few cases, schools were using native speakers from an external provider, such as *La Jolie Ronde*, or from within the local community.

In a minority of lessons, the presence of a young native speaker appeared neither to have been planned for, nor did the FLA participate, doing little else than stand to one side.

A few examples of primary schools linking with schools abroad, via e-mail pen friend projects, were reported. In some, classes had put together work and *realia* to share with their e-mail penfriends in the target language country, and pupils were fascinated by the items sent from their partner school. Children spoke very positively of such contacts:

'We've written a letter and drawn a picture of our Dad and Mum and sent some pictures. They sent French sweets and we sent wrappers. They sent photos of France so we could see what France is like.' (pupil)

Pupils in another school eagerly described sending items to their partner school at Christmas, New Year and Easter *'because they want to know about the differences in English traditions.'* (pupil)

The same group also recalled with accuracy and enthusiasm what they had learned from an FLA about the *galette des rois* eaten in an assembly, as well as Easter traditions. These details had remained in their memory despite more than a year having elapsed since the teaching took place. In one Pathfinder, a teacher was observed going through some cards illustrated with names of months and linked cultural conventions, for example, May, Lily of the valley, November, a graveyard to depict All Saints' Day.

Elsewhere, boys in particular wanted historical details:

'I'm still waiting for them to teach me stuff about the Normandy Beaches, traditions and history – not much, but a bit about what happened TO France.' (pupil)

Where schools had a number of EAL and other pupils, who had a variety of other languages, languages were seen by many teachers as very positive:

*'If we can make an issue of language, it's something **all** children can bring something to.'*
(languages co-ordinator)

3.1.4.6. Impact on other subjects

Table 4: Language and Literacy – Questionnaire 1 (Questionnaire 2 in brackets)

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Don't know
Learning a foreign language has improved my pupils performance in literacy	5.1 (5.5)	22.3 (22.4)	39.1 (38.7)	10.7 (11.0)	6.1 (5.5)	16.8 (17.0)

Although the two years of the Pathfinders were not sufficient time to analyse the impact on other subjects in any great depth, the indications from the above Table are that teachers' professional opinion is more in favour of improvements in literacy than otherwise. In the case studies, benefits were perceived in terms of additional skills, raising attainment in other subjects through learning strategies and general communication, or through increasing pupils' confidence generally. Class teachers reported some instances of increased confidence in formerly more reticent pupils, by for example, performing in the target language in an assembly.

'In the lesson observed, the teacher encouraged pupils to use a connective in their sentence describing someone, so they are using literacy skills. Children need support with speaking and listening, it's done through a different vehicle, but it's having a knock-on effect in other subjects: listening is more attentive. They also show more confidence.' (headteacher)

It was also the case that headteacher and teachers recognised certain benefits for the wider curriculum detailed below (but the evidence for these benefits is at present perceived rather than based on improved standards):

- Helps improve literacy generally
- Helps listening and speaking skills
- Helps with group work and collaboration
- Helps with cultural and geographical awareness and knowledge.

One headteacher commented:

'I think listening and speaking skills are very positive, because that's something we are focusing on in English this year, so it [primary languages] is tying in really well.'
(headteacher)

Another headteacher remarked:

'I think it improves imagination. It improves their understanding of the global needs of the world, they can think bigger.' (headteacher)

Pupils were certainly able to identify aspects of literacy, which benefited from languages and some cited the recognition of scientific names and pronouncing place names. One commented

'it makes you realise that if accents are over the words it changes the meaning; it makes you realise how important they are, and that links with punctuation marks.' (pupil)

Lessons observed frequently included links with literacy and language learning skills, such as:

- stress on listening skills: learning to listen carefully (hitherto neglected under the Literacy Strategy)
- wall display: definitions in English of noun, verb, adjective, adverb, conjunction
- emphasis on word order and intonation for question
- *minuit, midi* linked to English equivalents
- *soleil* linked with 'solar' which is what the pupils had been doing in Science and *beau* with beautiful

Further examples of the benefits of languages included:

- self confidence and self esteem and an opportunity to access different teaching styles and approaches
- interactive ways of learning could *'only have a spin off on all aspects of learning'*
- particularly those children who struggled with English benefit from the language learning skills they pick up through learning French.

In addition to literacy, pupils interviewed were often explicitly aware of help for other subjects through languages, for example:

- Maths (number practice)
- RE (different cultures)
- Music (singing)
- History
- Geography
- Science

Some potentially negative effects were mentioned by teachers, but rarely:

- Concentration difficulties for some pupils when speaking and listening
- The memory burden for some pupils in an oral/aural approach

3.1.4.7. ICT

One SLC made extensive use of ICT in languages. All its schools had interactive whiteboards and the focus was on the development of whole class interactive work and all pupils in the linked primary schools had been supplied with home computers. More widely, many schools were feeling the benefits of increased use of interactive whiteboards in languages and the introduction of ICT appeared to have been very effective in many Pathfinders. As the Pathfinders progressed, ICT was used much more, and more effectively, from a less than secure base in year 1. Many more schools in year 2 were using interactive whiteboards in languages lessons and a few had plans to incorporate further ICT-based activities for languages, such as video-conferencing. Sometimes ICT was perceived as having helped in the dissemination of existing resources and management and provision of new ones. Some headteachers talked of the 'natural links with ICT enabling cross-curricular work'.

ICT could be a source of invaluable support to primary teachers, although this on occasion was perhaps too much of a prop:

'They love playing on the computer and that does the work for you really.' (languages teacher)

Occasionally there were instances of practical difficulties: in one pyramid, a secondary outreach teacher had produced materials and activities for the interactive whiteboard, but it then transpired that in at least one adjacent feeder primary, the boards were of a different type and not compatible, so that resources had to be re-created – a time consuming task.

3.1.4.8. Broader positive/ negative effects – *learning, parents, workforce, wider school community*

The questionnaire results, almost identical in both questionnaires, indicate very clear agreement by teachers that languages have a beneficial effect (Table 5). In many of the interviews, especially from year 1 of the Pathfinder, there was a strong feeling of excitement about languages. For example, a teacher described the feeling as a *'buzz in the authority'* with the initiative and the production of interesting, effective resources and the reaction from pupils. One headteacher commented on the way languages learning had a raising of self-esteem effect on other subjects as well, creating a 'can do' culture. Most headteachers interviewed felt there were broader positive effects of the Pathfinder.

Table 5: Languages and Learning - Questionnaire 1 (Questionnaire 2 in brackets)

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Don't know
Learning a foreign language has benefits for pupils' learning more generally	27.1 (28.0)	52.3 (52.4)	12.1 (11.6)	2.5 (2.0)	0.5 (0.4)	5.5 (5.6)

'The more children understand about language, the more it will help.' (headteacher)

As another teacher said

'French is not just a language issue. It includes life skills.' (languages teacher)

Where parental opinion had been sought, or given voluntarily, this was generally very positive. On the whole, however, little feedback had been generated. Where anecdotal evidence was cited, for example through pupils feeding back their parents' views, this was positive. Some schools had involved the parents more actively, for example, inviting them to a languages assembly or to a French café simulation, or by holding workshops bringing together both parents and children, involving twilight sessions for families, which covered not only language but how parents can help their children. Events such as these proved very popular and were seen as successful. Parents were frequently viewed as regarding languages positively, because they knew their children were enjoying the experience. Some Pathfinders had involved the wider community for example, a local football club providing a learning support group offering two hours of Spanish per week. In one Pathfinder, a school had included questions on languages for the first time in its annual parental satisfaction questionnaire and responses were unanimously positive. In another Pathfinder, it was reported that:

'Key Stage 2 parents were saying how enthusiastic they were, because they realised the children would have a modern foreign language in secondary.' (languages teacher)

Where there was evidence of governors' views, these showed that they were generally interested and positive.

Some reservations were expressed by both primary class teachers and by secondary outreach teachers about the attitudes of some secondary teachers and departments towards languages. This focused primarily on transfer issues (see *Progression and Assessment*).

3.1.5. Pupils – Learning and Attitudes

3.1.5.1. Pupil attitudes

Table 6: Pupil Enjoyment - Questionnaire 1 (Questionnaire 2 in brackets)

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Don't know
My pupils really enjoy learning another language	78.9 (77.8)	19.6 (19.5)	0.0 (0.3)	1.0 (1.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.5 (1.3)

The overwhelmingly positive views expressed in Table 6 were reflected elsewhere in the data. Most teachers interviewed agreed that pupils thoroughly enjoyed their languages lessons and that motivation was high. The pupils themselves were generally very positive towards languages in all the Pathfinders and across all year groups, both in the views expressed when groups of pupils were interviewed and when lessons were observed. This was true of both the first and second year of the Pathfinder; in several cases, pupils found it difficult to cite any aspect of languages they did not enjoy. In one school all children interviewed were in strong agreement that they continued to enjoy their language lessons. One boy responded: *'Of course I do [enjoy French].'*

Occasionally, staff perceived pupils' reactions as mixed; this related to some pupils' difficulties with reading and writing in the primary language.

There were several examples of pupils reporting back to parents, who were prompted to come into schools to enquire about the language work. Elsewhere, older siblings were teaching younger siblings. As one teacher described it:

'In Year 3 today, because we've not yet done Quelle est la date de ton anniversaire? I had one child come and say, "I can answer another question... I can answer Quelle est la date de ton anniversaire? And I said, "How do you know that?" and she said, "because my sister's doing it in Year 5." Or children will come up and say, "When are we doing the song about..?" [from another year group]. Children are teaching each other at home.' (languages teacher)

Aspects of their foreign language learning, which pupils enjoyed include:

- songs (often to familiar tunes)
- games (although this fades slightly for some pupils further up KS2)
- *“actions to make you understand. It’s very interactive”*
- the interactive whiteboard
- speaking in pairs and groups: *‘It’s more enjoyable than sitting down, not just being asked questions. It’s good because you actually get to get up.’*
- team activities
- learning about the foreign country
- learning to spell as well as speak
- putting the words together in sentences
- encouragement (for example through stickers and stamps)
- praise
- teacher checking on work
- feeling ‘grown up’ by doing a language.

‘It’s like a break from Maths and Literacy and History. Because otherwise you’re just doing the same: English, Maths, History. If you asked some of the children in our class, ‘What is your favourite subject?’ They would say PE, French and Art.’ (pupil)

Pupils often mentioned specific language topics they had enjoyed (such as numbers, days of the week etc.)

Pupils saw the benefits of primary languages as:

- helps with English spelling
- helps with listening skills
- helps with memorising
- you become more confident
- you communicate better with people
- helps later at secondary school
- it is an advantage to learn when you’re young *‘because your brain slows down when you’re older.’*
- *‘You can also teach your brothers and sisters, if you learn. Pass it on to them’.*
- useful in a future career
- helps parents: *‘you can help Dad and Mum on holiday’*

- useful for travelling abroad - otherwise *'If you want a pork chop you might end up getting egg and chips.'*

Many pupils expressed a desire to travel abroad; and several had already visited a target language country either privately or through school. Some who had visited German speaking countries liked the reaction from native speakers:

'People smile at you and respect you for trying to speak their language.' (pupil)

One boy wanted to emulate an older brother:

'I enjoy French because I like my brother, and my brother's really good at doing French and I'd like to be like my brother when I'm older.' (pupil)

However, there were aspects of learning languages some pupils viewed more negatively:

- speed of tapes played
- confusing visuals: *'Some of the pictures look the same too'*
- learning pronunciation
- just repeating
- memorising lots of words
- spelling in the target language (e.g. silent letters)
- confusion if learning two or more languages
- occasional embarrassment when they forget something orally
- *'having to wait for other people to answer the question, who don't know the answer when you do.'*
- Not understanding what is being said/going on. *'When I'm in a mood, I don't like coming, because I get confused [about] what she says and I don't remember.'* (pupil)

There was some indication that the target language of the classroom was not being explicitly taught:

'Last lesson she asked us to put our hands up if we were eight or nine... we don't normally know things like "put your hands up" so we have got like to guess' (pupil)

3.1.5.2. Pupil learning

In most lessons observed, there was a purposeful working atmosphere and a positive attitude to language learning. In these lessons, pupils in some classes were working at basic single word level; in others pupils were already familiar with a range of structures. Generally, where a specialist teacher was involved, the level of language taught was higher.

Many teachers felt that pupils knew a lot, retained vocabulary from one week to the next, and their accent was good. Teachers were aware of cross over effects on literacy, where pupils were *'familiar with verbs, nouns, adjectives.'* (primary teacher)

As mentioned above, pupils could find games less appealing as they moved up towards Year 6.

In one Pathfinder, however, while all protagonists viewed the presence of languages as a valuable addition to the children's educational experience, the degree to which children were actually developing knowledge of and about language in order to take part in genuine or even pseudo-real exchanges, classroom *communication* may be questionable.

Some pupils felt learning languages helped improve their memory skills.

'We can pick up stuff even if she is not teaching it. She keeps on saying something and you realise you understand what she's saying without really learning it.' (pupil)

Several teachers provided pupils with strategies for memorising vocabulary and pupils were very appreciative of these. Where learning strategies were deployed, these were very powerful, and pupils used them willingly:

- looking at the words on the wall
- learning the grammar
- *'She tells you how you can improve like when you're singing songs, the pictures you could put in your head.'*
- *'She will pick up a point that we need to work on and prints it off on the computer.'*
- *'She tells you how to pronounce the words properly, for example, like this morning some people couldn't say the 'j' in 'jouer' properly so we practised.'*

- *'Comments at the end to help you improve, for example, Well done, but try to improve on xxx.'*

3.1.6. Provision for SEN/G & T

3.1.6.1. Differentiation generally

Generally across the Pathfinders there appeared to be little evidence of differentiated provision, although some schemes of work and associated materials did incorporate differentiated activities, and some lesson plans indicated that differentiation should be included. Instead there was an emphasis on involving everyone. One response from an outreach teacher was fairly typical of what was observed across Pathfinders:

'The one thing, which we don't do, is differentiate in lessons. It's normally, "This is what we're going to be able to do at the end. Everyone involved.'" (outreach teacher)

There were instances, however, of differentiation strategies other than by outcome for both SEN and G&T pupils in some schools:

- By task: Differentiated activities provided for both lower and higher attainers
- By questioning: Differentiated oral questioning
- By support: Greater or less support from teacher/materials as appropriate.

In one school, the presence of a native speaker had allowed the primary teacher to divide the class for some tasks, as she explained:

'When we have the FLA and do the reading, some of them are so good, she took the brighter ones and gave them a chance of talking to her, and reading with her and they got on very quickly.' (languages teacher)

Where outreach teachers or FLAs visited a large number of schools, differentiation could be very challenging. For example, on observing one FLA, while his knowledge of children's names was remarkable, there was heavy reliance on primary teachers in identifying pupils of different abilities for the various activities. The fact that differentiation was carried out largely by the class teacher's selection of pupils to respond to teacher questions had its advantages in that they knew their pupils far better than the visiting assistant. However, there were also flaws in this system, identified by the pupils themselves who (at least in Year 6) complained

of bias in the selection of their classmates by the teacher. The AST was also aware of the risks:

'There is the tendency... if they don't put their hands up, they won't get chosen, will they? Because there are some children who don't want to.' (outreach teacher)

This unwritten policy – noted during observation – was seriously threatening some pupils' performance. It seemed quite acceptable for some pupils not to contribute to the French lessons.

Where a class had been split into two groups for the French assistant's visits, this setting arrangement enabled the groupings to be differentiated according to pace of learning. In fact, there was a noticeable difference in the rate of participation by pupils in the two groups. While possibly making the lesson planning and delivery easier for the assistant and the class teacher, the implications of this early form of setting by ability had not been considered in the context of transfer to secondary school.

Several pupils were aware of the need to differentiate:

'Some pupils are at different levels; we need three groups: low, medium, high.' (pupil)

3.1.6.2. Learners with special educational needs (SEN)

Teachers' responses to the questionnaires demonstrate their conviction generally that pupils with SEN can benefit from languages. From interviews too, the impression was conveyed that languages can be a real boost for shy or less able pupils. Throughout the two years of the Pathfinder, teachers interviewed were often convinced that SEN learners were benefiting from languages.

Table 7: Pupils with Special Educational Needs - Questionnaire 1 (Questionnaire 2 in brackets)

	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly	Don't know
Pupils with SEN don't get a lot out of MFL	1.0 (1.2)	4.5 (4.5)	5.5 (5.1)	19.5 (19.7)	68.5 (67.8)	1.0 (1.7)

'At times they find it difficult because they find their own language difficult, but because it's fun, it doesn't seem to be the same pressure for them. Their own expectations are that they can do it, because they are encouraged by other members of the class.' (languages teacher)

Initially, and for some Pathfinders, throughout the two years, teachers perceived SEN children as indistinguishable from all other pupils and welcomed this as evidence of a 'level playing field for all'.

'It almost lends itself because they're back to speaking and listening, which I think is a great leveller, because they haven't done it before. A boy who is statemented with SEN in my class has greater confidence in French – he would not do as much in English. They're not always struggling with the written word. Perhaps because it's a level playing field: no-one's fluent in French, so they're ready to have a go. There's total inclusion.' (languages teacher)

In the second year of the Pathfinder, it was noticeable, however that some children were struggling to maintain the momentum, as one class teacher commented:

'Already, thinking of one child in Year 3, he has got to the stage where he is really falling behind. That is an issue that has to be addressed in the future.' (outreach teacher)

'They're just taught along with the rest of the class. It's great to start with and then after a couple of months they drop off, they can't cope with the additional demands of vocabulary. If you feel they're going to struggle you differentiate, so put them with partners that will help.' (languages teacher)

Pupils were aware of this issue, and expressed concern for fellow classmates 'getting left behind'. Some teachers were worried about the ability of less able pupils to 'keep up' when all four skills were involved, i.e. when reading and writing were introduced.

Oral work was described in one school as popular with all pupils, including the lower achievers, but there were a few children who found working with the pupil's book difficult, because they had reading difficulties in English. Finding ways to support these children was hard. Some schools had utilised specific ICT resources and software for SEN pupils, for example, *Clicker*.

Primary languages had been integrated successfully in one special school visited, where pupils were very enthusiastic and an FLA had made a very positive contribution to all aspects of the work.

'We feel quite positively that because we are a special school, why shouldn't we have these opportunities? So, you know, we weren't providing them, so it's a very positive step forwards.' (languages teacher)

3.1.6.3. Gifted and talented learners

In the first year of the Pathfinder, even in schools with well established provision, the approach still appeared to be 'whole class' teaching. There was less evidence of particular provision for Gifted and talented (G & T) children or of their reactions. Where an investigative approach was adopted, this was felt to be of benefit to gifted and talented pupils:

'With the gifted and talented, the investigative approach actually lends itself quite well to stretching them at their own level.' (languages teacher)

There was a trend evident in some Pathfinders towards developing more challenging work for higher ability pupils in the latter stages of the two year period. One school provided an Easter School, initially for G & T pupils, but then offered it more widely, with a carousel of languages. Another Pathfinder offered some dedicated sessions for G & T, which included languages but it was very time-consuming to organise and the experience was not repeated in the second year.

Most teachers seemed to differentiate by outcome for more able learners, but some reference was made to 'speaking faster' or involving the pupils as demonstrators of language etc. It was also the case that when teachers felt less confident, stretching able pupils was more challenging:

'You might be able to stretch children but this is harder for the non-specialist, you're not fluent, that's the frustrating thing.' (languages teacher)

Some brighter pupils felt that they were held back to allow other pupils to speak and get the points when they knew the answers. One pupil wished to continue French only *'If we had a*

teacher who knew our level.' In the same school, another pupil mentioned the need for a challenge:

'It would be more fun, if may be, if we could have a challenge, something that would challenge us, because some people who do know it, don't put in so much effort, because they think, "I know that." (pupil)

These pupils recognised that the visiting teacher from the secondary school was unaware of their prior experience and of how much they could do. They had several suggestions for ways of improving the situation:

- any visiting teacher should start by giving a short test, which would enable her to know at which level to start
- the teacher should allow different amounts of time before expecting an answer, giving the newcomers or those without the additional experience of the French club, slightly longer to respond
- the class should be divided into groups: expert, intermediate and beginners.

3.1.7. Pedagogy/methodology

Pupils tended to see their languages as topic based as opposed to structurally based:

'We do a certain topic every half term and we don't stop until everyone knows how to say the words.' (pupil)

Languages lessons observed frequently involved:

- Topic based language (animals, numbers etc.)
- Songs (often with accompanying gestures, sometimes with words to read, occasionally with dancing too)
- Games
- Conversations
- Videos
- Puppets
- Stories (mostly familiar and often incorporating props, reading and acting)
- Puzzles, word searches, crosswords
- Colouring

The routines in these lessons were often evidently very well-established. Examples of good practice were frequently observed:

- objectives shared with the pupils at the start of the lesson
- recap and practice of familiar material
- variety of (short) activities resulting in good pace
- throwing a soft toy in a personal information question/answer session
- use of visual aids and *realia* to motivate and aid memory
- use of whiteboards for numbers test
- active involvement of pupils (often in kinaesthetic activities)
- inclusion of all pupils
- incorporation of sound/spelling links
- all four language skills incorporated at appropriate level
- linguistic structures/patterns highlighted
- language learning strategies included

Most lessons were primarily teacher-led focusing on whole class presentation or practice, although occasional examples of pair work were seen.

Methodology and approaches to primary languages are varied. Some saw the aims as enthusing the children through games, songs, fun activities, without incorporating much in the way of structure. The emphasis in these cases was on listening and speaking - a common pattern for many schools in some of the Pathfinders. Many teachers, however, spoke of the desire to improve pupils' awareness of language and languages, as well as developing their competence and confidence in a particular language.

However, the package of learning provided in some schools was primarily based on intensive question and answer work, with lots of repetition and recapitulation. Games and competitions – typically between girls and boys – formed the backbone of the lessons observed. The children responded well within the confines of the language presented. Their understanding of instructions and teacher talk in the target language was good but there was little evidence of sentence construction and knowledge about language. In one case, the AST tried to express her own worries about the lack of 'initiation' or spontaneous use of language by her own pupils:

'When they say 'Ça va?' to me, I am delighted because they don't very often ask you anything. They are all happy to answer.' (AST)

In most Pathfinders, however, there was a distinct move towards incorporating more reading and writing in the lessons as primary languages became more embedded. In some schools this was a result of revisions to the scheme of work following the publication of the draft Key Stage 2 Framework in recognition of the need to prepare pupils adequately for their move to secondary school. Some teachers acknowledged the difficulties for pupils with written French in particular:

'Children are still learning to spell English words phonetically; when they see French words written, they have problems with pronunciation. Also, the grammar, they get confused about sentence structure and are only just developing terminology. French is a complex language to write; they need to know the terms in order to write.' (languages teacher)

Pupils were generally very perceptive of the methods used in languages and the skills of their teachers; they were aware of revision and recap activities and the thinking time allowed in good oral activities.

'Mrs X is really good because she knows everything in French, the accent and she can teach us how to say and write it properly. Everything that you'd like to do you get to do. It's really good that Mrs X teaches it because she gives you stuff like time and you work at it until you're really good at it.' (pupil)

Pupils' concerns about the need to memorise new words were allayed when given techniques and recap activities:

'Sometimes it goes into your head and it starts to escape but then we lock it up again.' (pupil)

Pupils appeared to be very aware of differences in teaching approaches, when their languages are delivered by, for example, an FLA and a class teacher. They sometimes perceived the latter as relying too heavily on games and not getting the same level of pupil participation. Some were apparently aware of their teachers' ability in the target language. In one school pupils said they preferred the visiting teacher because:

'She knows all the words correctly, she doesn't get mixed up, she's good at the games; has all the right equipment, CDs, a box of equipment.' (pupil)

Target language use is very important for languages to succeed. Subject knowledge expertise and teacher confidence in the use of the target language had an impact on the pace of the lessons observed. For example, in one case, with a secondary specialist teacher, the whole lesson was conducted almost exclusively in the target language with emphasis on correct pronunciation from the pupils. However, not all visiting specialists, including native speakers, used target language to best effect and some used very little and many missed opportunities were observed. So, for example, in another lesson, also delivered by a subject specialist, English was used as the means of communication throughout. Praise, instructions and explanations were all in English and target language was not maximised in the presentation and practice phases of the lesson. Where class teachers were less confident, little French was used for classroom instructions or even praise. Encouragingly, in the second year of the Pathfinder, many teachers had increased (and improved) their use of the target language in lessons.

In lessons where links were made between the foreign language and English, with reference to sound symbol relationships or explicit structures, there was a marked increase in mixed medium teaching, with a predominance of English to explore and discuss language.

3.2. Teacher competence

3.2.1. Summary

Languages were taught in the Pathfinders by a wide variety of staff, including most frequently non-specialist class teachers, foreign language assistants and outreach teachers from secondary schools. Effective models employing outreach teachers incorporated a process of empowering class teachers to gain in confidence and competence to work towards longer term sustainability. Collaborative 'clusters' of schools were also very beneficial in this regard. Class teachers' confidence in languages remained fairly low, despite the majority having obtained some form of language qualification. CPD (differentiated as appropriate) incorporating linguistic competence as well as methodology was found to be vital in addressing this aspect. The provision of quality resources was a major contributor to teacher confidence and thereby increased competence. Training was crucial for both primary and secondary staff to enable primary languages to achieve success.

3.2.2. Recommendations

- Primary teachers' linguistic competence (and confidence) should be a priority for training. Appropriate resources are key: these should include CDs or DVDs to support pronunciation and to provide models for both pupils and teachers.
- The level and diversity of training for teachers needs to be further developed. CPD needs to be provided for a range of deliverers: As well as primary teachers, for FLAs, native speakers from within the community, HLTAs and TAs, and secondary teachers, including ASTs. *NB. Training substantial numbers of primary teachers may affect language diversification.*
- Both primary and secondary teachers should receive methodological training appropriate to the key stage and the subject.
- Differentiated training should be provided for teachers at different stages in implementing primary languages. Schools just starting out need one type of training, as do primary class teachers just beginning to introduce primary languages into their own classes. Schools with some experience and building on previous years' work need training to help them sustain and develop provision, as do primary languages co-ordinators.
- Teachers should be given the option of continuing to observe MFL teaching to enable them to support or take over Primary Languages delivery.
- Contact between the outreach teachers and primary colleagues needs to be improved.
- There is a wide range of quality resources available through the Pathfinders; this should be provided and exploited in order to meet the linguistic and methodological needs of the teachers. Such resources have proved in some cases almost comprehensive in their coverage.
- Schemes of work should be accompanied where possible by teaching packs, including lesson plans, visuals (flashcards or OHTs), audio CDs, DVD and CDROM, so that the busy primary teachers have minimal additional burdens searching out appropriate resources and preparing sessions.
- Primary and secondary schools should be encouraged to work in clusters, in order to build up networks, inter-school contacts between primary and secondary and to facilitate joint planning and preparation of materials.
- ITE providers should be encouraged to adapt their current primary PGCE and undergraduate courses to ensure that all trainees are informed about the Primary Languages entitlement and can support and contribute to its effective implementation.

- Similarly, secondary PGCE courses need to be modified so that secondary languages trainees are better prepared to support/work with primary colleagues in the delivery of languages, as well as being better equipped to meet the developing needs at KS3 and particularly in Year 7.

3.2.3. Deliverers

3.2.3.1. Who is teaching languages?

The majority of teachers in the project were themselves teaching languages (Table 8). In 21% of cases, this was done with a secondary specialist. In other cases, language assistants, external language specialists (often local authority personnel) and volunteer native speakers assisted. The questionnaire responses do not indicate however, the extent of each partner's contribution in the case of shared teaching, and to what extent primary teachers are taking the lead in delivery rather than team teaching or assisting. Where the teacher was not delivering languages herself, the lessons were most likely to be taught by a secondary specialist. External language specialists were also used. Other answers included delivery by a range of teachers in the school or by the headteacher. Results didn't change much from questionnaire 1 to questionnaire 2. The proportion of respondents themselves teaching languages had risen by over 3% compared to questionnaire 1. The proportion of respondents claiming the teacher taught with the help of an external language specialist had risen from 21 to 22.5% compared to questionnaire 1.

Table 8: who is delivering MFL in your classroom? Questionnaire 1 (Questionnaire 2 in brackets)

	<i>Percentage</i>
The class teacher	61.7 (65.1)
The teacher and a secondary specialist	21.4 (22.5)
The teacher and a specialist Language Assistant	7.8 (7.7)
The teacher and an external language specialist	6.8 (6.5)
The teacher and a volunteer native speaker	6.3 (5.9)
A secondary specialist	13.1 (11.0)
An external language specialist	7.8 (7.9)
A volunteer native speaker	1.5 (1.3)
Someone else	13.1 (10.9)

Note: some respondents ticked more than one category on their questionnaire

Effective staffing is essential to a successful primary languages programme. In some case study Pathfinders, the most frequent teachers of primary languages were the primary teachers, who were mainly non-specialists, supported perhaps by visiting trainee teachers from abroad, as well as FLAs, HEI undergraduate volunteers, or PGCE trainees with language skills, sixth formers studying languages, or secondary, usually Specialist Language College (SLC) teachers. Specialist Language Colleges already have a remit to provide outreach work and there was a perception that Pathfinders had helped increase the range and volume of this work. *'Planning has been more coherent and strategic.'* (outreach teacher). Occasionally, the original plan had been for *all* secondary schools to become involved in outreach work, but this did not happen, and the SLC was delivering the vast majority of the languages. Some part-time teachers were former secondary teachers.

Elsewhere the delivery model was mixed, including primary teachers alone in some schools and outreach teachers in others, the intention in the latter case being that the class teacher should reinforce the language across the curriculum where possible and appropriate. In some of these Pathfinders, the model was gradually to enable the class teacher to take full responsibility for languages after observation and joint working with a visiting specialist (often from an SLC or a local authority advisor/consultant). Although this was the vision in many schools, the reality on the ground was often that the class teacher remained somewhat reluctant to take over the teaching independently, especially in those instances when primary teachers were passive observers.

In effective examples of this model, the visiting teacher left a plan and materials with the class teacher, who used these to follow the lesson up or to teach the lesson with a different group of pupils. In cases where the class teacher was less (or not at all) involved, this could be viewed as a missed opportunity for professional development. The visiting teacher might start by acting as a role model and the class teacher would gradually take a more active part team-teaching on a small scale. This would help build confidence both in subject knowledge and pronunciation and in pedagogy, whilst support was available, before having to teach independently. Demands on even the most conscientious primary teachers were indicated by the following example. In one large junior school teachers were initially given protected time to observe the outreach teacher, but as time went on and pupils became familiar with the visiting specialist, primary members of staff observing were increasingly taken out to cover any other absences in the school. As the outreach teacher remarked, *'Primary [teachers] have no time just to sit and watch.'* In several schools, primary teachers took the period when the visiting specialist delivered languages as 'free' time or time to catch up with administrative tasks, and might or might not stay in the classroom, which had implications for

them taking over from the outreach teacher. Nonetheless, in the second year of the Pathfinder, the teacher observation model was in some cases bearing fruit and the class teacher was taking on the responsibility.

In an outreach model, the need was clearly felt for class teachers to sustain languages in the period *between* outreach teachers' visits. In some Pathfinders, language learning was not always taking place between outreach visits due to other pressures. Problems could be intensified, if, as is typical, the outreach teacher had no time to spend in the school outside of the actual lesson.

'I've had little influence on what [the outreach teacher] actually delivers, a – because of my slight lack of knowledge and b – because she's popped in and gone on to the next one, so we've had little time to liaise really.' (languages teacher)

Thus the level of primary class teacher follow up varied. Some schools seemed to fall back on a reliance on the outreach lessons. This was even the case in supportive schools. This situation had generally improved in the second year of the Pathfinder.

'Usually it is impromptu: 10 or 15 minutes of French at the end of lessons, but the timetable is very busy and it is sometimes less.' (languages teacher)

Identifying key link staff in primary schools who can champion the work in their school and perhaps take on a language as well was perceived by outreach teachers to be beneficial.

In one Pathfinder, Foreign Language Assistants were delivering languages, alongside a few ASTs and some outreach SLC teachers, with a large number of class teachers providing 'follow-on' lessons. These FLAs received an intensive programme of training and were then nurtured by local authority advisors. Elsewhere, native speaker FLAs as well as teacher trainees from France and Spain were used to support primary class teachers to deliver languages. All these teachers were supported in this Pathfinder by primary languages consultants. However, native speakers were less successful in those Pathfinders where they were not adequately trained and the quality of the languages input was therefore more ad hoc and less reliable.

In these models involving native speakers, from whatever source, the importance of substantial and ongoing support cannot be emphasised enough (Martin and Farren 2004,

Martin and Mitchell 1993). In another Pathfinder, a headteacher suggested that it is '*really important to be clear about expectations with a teacher from another culture.*'

A minority of schools was considering using HLTAs for languages; a few already deployed a TA to do so. The potential for appointing classroom assistants with language skills was seen by some respondents to be a real advantage; however at present this development is in its very early stages and has not been realised with any degree of regularity.

Most Pathfinders did not enforce a particular model and where, in a few cases, an individual primary school wanted to adopt their own preferred model, this had happened.

3.2.3.2. Staffing issues

A key area in this respect is ensuring that primary schools have confidence that they will be able to staff languages long term. Key issues include provision for staff mobility, staff illness and staff with appropriate linguistic skills.

Difficulties arose where there was long term illness of a key member of staff, for example, a secondary languages teacher, necessitating outreach teachers to cover secondary work. As one outreach teacher put it:

'We get problems with staff shortages. If suddenly there is a teacher off sick, and there's no one to cover her, then I can't leave the [secondary] school ... because that would be two teachers away from the school. Sometimes it's too late for supplies, so that can be a problem.' (outreach teacher)

Guaranteed appropriate staffing is crucial as a confidence factor in primary schools to work towards 100% coverage. This was a problem in cases where primary class teachers who had been given training in languages and had experience and developed some expertise moved to KS1.

One secondary outreach teacher expressed the need for a long term plan for how other people with language competence (including native speakers) '*can be trained and supported with a real career to make the national policy work.*' (outreach teacher). This same point on career structure applies to FLAs.

The arrival of Preparation, Planning and Assessment (PPA) as a statutory requirement in September 2005 was seen in one school as an opportunity to release the AST entirely from class time so that she could 'float' and deliver more French. In another instance, primary class teachers (who had sat in on language lessons in the first year of the Pathfinder), no longer remained in the classroom to observe, and the decision had been taken to employ the current language teacher directly as a part time teacher of French for 2005/06, whilst the remainder of the staff have their PPA time. This contradicted the model put forward by the SLC, based on the secondary teachers' delivery being part of in-school training for class teachers. Elsewhere, every primary teacher in a school was to be released for one day a fortnight, with all class teachers from a year group having their PPA time simultaneously to enable the whole year team to work together. Thus the whole year group would be taught one day a fortnight by alternative arrangements and one of the subjects of the day would be the primary language. This had the advantage that the language would be built in as a regular feature of the curriculum. The duration of language lessons was to change from 20 minutes in Years 3 and 4 and half an hour in Years 5 and 6 each week, to 45 minutes fortnightly, although concern was expressed about the effect of the long gap between the sessions on the retention of vocabulary.

It is evident that, if outreach teachers are deployed to release primary teachers for PPA time, this mitigates against any plans to enable the class teachers to work towards autonomy in their languages teaching. This would also contradict the intention of the draft Key Stage 2 Framework, where languages are intended to be integrated across the curriculum rather than delivered in stand alone discrete elements.

Where staffing involved visiting teachers (whether FLAs, secondary outreach teachers or other colleagues), there were occasional logistical problems involving mainly transport.

Where PGCE primary languages trainees had been involved, this was very positive. There were occasionally NQTs who had completed a PGCE incorporating languages and numbers are, of course, increasing.

3.2.4. Linguistic competence and confidence

As both the first and second questionnaires report, the vast majority of respondents had completed a PGCE or BEd and 68% had specialised in a subject as part of their teacher training. Specialisms were highly varied, though in majority were not languages subjects.

Nineteen respondents had specialised in French, 2 in German, and 1 in Italian. The most common specialism was English (30 respondents).

Table 9: Respondents' language qualifications. Questionnaire 1 (Questionnaire 2 in brackets)

	Percentage of respondents
Vocational Qualification in a Foreign Language	7.2 (6.4)
GCSE/O-level	71.0 (73.1)
A-level	41.5 (42.7)
Degree	15.0 (15.8)
Qualification obtained abroad	6.8 (6.4)
Other	6.8 (4.7)

The qualifications cited by respondents are markedly higher than those found in the baseline research carried out in a previous study (Driscoll, Jones and Macrory, 2004) where approximately 25% of teachers were qualified up to GCSE (or equivalent) in French. This is probably the result of the nature of respondents to this questionnaire, who were teachers involved in leading the Pathfinder in their schools and therefore more likely to be the person with the highest language qualification in the school. The majority of respondents to the current study had completed a GCSE or O-level in a foreign language (71%), but only a minority of respondents had successfully pursued this at A-level (41%) or university (15%). The majority of those respondents who had obtained a GCSE/O-level qualification had done so in French (50.9%) or French and German (20.3%). A similar distribution was, unsurprisingly, found among A-level holders (French 58.0%, French and German, 17.3%) and degree level (French 48.2%, French and German 10.9%). Qualifications in languages other than French and German were rare. The mean respondent had been a teacher for 16.3 years, and had been working in her present position for 7.1 years. 29.1% were between 51 and 60 years old, 25.2% between 41 and 50, 25.7% between 31 and 40, and 19.4% between 20 and 30. Languages co-ordinators therefore appear to be largely experienced teachers. 88.2% of respondents were female.

Respondents to questionnaire 1 were asked to rate their competence in the languages taught. Due to the limited number of languages taught frequently, statistical analysis is only valid for French, German and Spanish. The mean competence rating (out of 10) for French was 5.5, for German 4.8 and for Spanish 3.2, which points to low confidence levels in terms of language knowledge among many teachers in this sample. Teachers rated their

competence in delivering languages somewhat higher, their mean score being 6.2. However, over a third of teachers rated their competence in this area at 5 or below.

This lack of linguistic competence is not that surprising in view of the fact that 47.9% of respondents claim not to have been involved in any professional development activities to improve their language competence as part of the Pathfinder. 21.7% had participated in one activity, 10.3% in two, 6.4% in three and 13.8% in four or more such activities. The picture is somewhat more positive when it comes to participation in events aimed at improving language teaching skills. 39.4% of respondents had not participated in any such professional development, 22.2% had participated in one event, 12.1% in two, 9.1% in three and 17.2% in four or more activities. Activities designed to improve language competence were most likely to have taken the form of conference attendance, classroom observation, or collaboration with secondary schools (39%, 36% and 31% respectively), but workshops (28%) and one day training programmes (23%) were also common. Least frequently encountered were secondments/sabbaticals and distance learning (1.5%).

Respondents were again asked in questionnaire 2 to rate their competence in the languages taught. Due to the limited number of languages taught frequently, statistical analysis is only valid for French, German and Spanish. The mean competence rating (out of 10) for French was 5.7, for German 4.7 and for Spanish 3.3, which shows no significant change compared to questionnaire 1. However, when asked whether their confidence had increased since the start of the Pathfinder, 35% claimed that this had been the case. Teachers rated their competence in delivering languages somewhat higher, their mean score being 6.6. This is a significant increase compared to questionnaire 1, and when asked whether their confidence had increased, 37% said this was the case.

Fewer respondents than in questionnaire 1 claimed not to have taken part in any professional development activities to improve their language competence as part of the Pathfinder, though the decrease was modest (from 47.9% to 44.3%): 25.7% had participated in one activity, 11.0% in two, 5.8% in three and 11.2% in four or more such activities. The number of respondents having participated in events aimed at improving language teaching skills had also increased: 33.1% of respondents had not participated in any such professional development (a decrease of over 6%), 28.4% had participated in one event, 12.0% in two, 8.9% in three and 17.6% in four or more activities. Most of the increase in participation in professional development compared to questionnaire 1 was attributable therefore for respondents who had taken part in one such activity.

As revealed in questionnaire 1, in some cases, colleagues appeared to support languages, but were unwilling to teach themselves, mainly due to a lack of confidence in their language skills. By questionnaire 2, in some schools colleagues were very supportive of the programme and had even taken up language teaching themselves. However, in many cases teachers appear to feel somewhat isolated in their schools, with colleagues unwilling to commit, largely due to time constraints or a lack of linguistic competence.

The primary teachers interviewed in the case study schools varied immensely in their qualifications and teaching experience for teaching languages. A few had degree level language, some an A-level in (usually) French; many others less than this and some are learning the language *ab initio* as they teach it or observe the visiting teacher. In most cases, even those teachers with an A-level qualification were not fully confident in their subject knowledge as their experience was often many years previously. One headteacher expressed it thus:

'They can read and understand but feel they have no spoken expertise and are worried about putting themselves in the spotlight.' (headteacher)

From observations, apart from native speaker teachers and language assistants, the level of foreign language skills of the primary class teachers was generally rather weak (with some extremely good exceptions).

Confidence was definitely an issue: as one outreach teacher put it:

'It is really a question of trying to cajole some of them into even doing some of the little things like taking the register in German.' (outreach teacher)

Many class teachers still relied on the secondary teacher's presence.

'There is tremendous variation in how much they will join in and how much they follow up afterwards.' (secondary AST)

An outreach teacher in one Pathfinder referred to the increasingly active role of several of her class teacher colleagues, but recognised that there was a long way to go before even these keener and more confident teachers could take over entirely the whole provision. It was also the case that in the second year of the Pathfinder, primary teachers were generally demonstrating increased levels of confidence. Many found the use of ICT and audio based

resources helpful in ascertaining correct pronunciation and intonation, thereby increasing their confidence in acting as the linguistic model for the pupils.

'Now they work really hard to incorporate lessons into the timetable. They find the resources useful and see the value of reinforcement of literacy skills, speaking and listening skills.'
(headteacher)

Nonetheless, in some schools, headteachers favoured appointing a specialist teacher. *'I do feel with languages, it is important that some should have more than just the basic skills, more than just a rusty O level.'* (headteacher)

Some schools reported considering languages skills and qualifications when recruiting new staff, and by the second year of the Pathfinder, headteachers were certainly more aware of applicants' language qualifications and experience when making new appointments, clearly with sustainability of languages in mind.

Primary teachers were generally very aware of the need to improve their linguistic competence:

'I could count to 100 three weeks ago but it is coming down now so I need to revise again now. I can confidently count up to 40 – 50. But the children enjoy it so I shall keep on doing it.' (languages teacher)

Indeed, some class teachers were daunted by seeing specialist or newly qualified languages teachers teach and felt discouraged rather than inspired about teaching languages themselves.

'I think words like frog are quite difficult to pronounce.' (languages teacher)

Similarly, even attending meetings at which language 'specialists' are present, could require a certain amount of courage. As one primary teacher expressed it:

'I found it [the networking group] a little bit daunting at first. It was daunting because I felt they were specialists in their field and I wasn't. ... I didn't feel qualified to speak with conviction really, having not experienced teaching it [the foreign language] in the same way as the other subjects.' (languages teacher)

However, some teachers were pleasantly surprised by the French required:

'When I came to do French I thought it would be all je suis, tu es, il est, etc. but it is not like that at all. I am quite confident with colours, numbers, days of the week and all that.'

(languages teacher)

Where good (comprehensive) materials were provided centrally, even teachers with relatively few qualifications or little experience of the language felt more confident.

'The plans written by [the LA] are superb: for teachers starting to teach French, they can be self-sufficient with no extra work.' (languages teacher)

In some Pathfinders, FLAs had been very helpful in linguistic training, providing ideal models for pronunciation and intonation.

3.2.5. Pedagogy/methodology

The quality of the teaching observed was mixed. Sometimes the linguistic model presented was far from adequate and lessons consisted almost entirely of repetitive games or songs. Pupils appeared to be very aware of the difference between learning and just repeating:

'If we get them wrong, she just keeps saying the same words, répétez – usually we get it right, but then she just reminds us again – and reminds us again after that...' (pupil)

There is a clear difference in this context between merely repeating language (i.e. utilising poor and demotivating presentation and practice techniques) and recycling language effectively so pupils feel confident, competent and engaged.

One French national considered that the involvement of the class teacher in her language lessons affected what she was able to do with the children. *'I think it is interesting for the children to see the teacher learning something with them.'* She felt she was able to be more effective when the teacher joined in and offered a good example to the pupils, but when the teacher was not involved, it was harder work.

A co-ordinator in one Pathfinder saw a challenge in the need for primary teachers to engage more with the language work and, indeed:

'to step up their efforts and skills to be able to teach a proper form of language syllabus – one based on the national curriculum, not just the fun-like, basic level as at present.'
(Pathfinder co-ordinator)

As one headteacher pointed out:

The structure of the lessons is largely determined by the teachers' personal confidence and knowledge.' (headteacher)

This was also seen as a need to ensure there is real challenge in the work so that as teachers become more confident, they can demand more of the children.

'There's no point in having worksheets for worksheets' sake. There must be purpose to the activities. What's the point of colouring in animals, just because they have French names instead of English?' (languages teacher)

3.2.6. Resources

There is no doubt that good resources (and schemes of work) are contributory to the success of primary languages. One Pathfinder used the slogan *'everything a busy primary teacher needs'*. This does not of course necessitate commercially produced resources, although these can be very effective. It does not preclude either the individual teacher's creativity in supplementing or replacing resources and ideas. What is important is that the resources address three vital aspects of languages:

- The linguistic competence of the (class) teacher (through providing an aural and written linguistic model).
- The methodology and approach to be adopted.
- By the first two points, the confidence of the (class) teacher.

In one Pathfinder, which supplied videos and CD-ROMs with taped sections designed especially for teachers to practise, these were a source of reassurance to class teachers. In the words of one teacher:

'The children aren't actually learning from you, the onus is taken away from you, because they are learning from the tape and they always have French natives on the tape. That takes away some of the self-consciousness...' (languages teacher)

However, there were frequent instances of primary teachers adapting resources for languages, which they would normally use in other areas of the curriculum. Where this synergy between the primary teacher's expertise and the linguistic competence/confidence existed, primary languages could be extremely effective.

'At the moment we would expect if staff stay as they are, that they will continue to do the best they can to deliver what they can, for example with the interactive resources they could carry on the same kinds of lessons, if a teacher has the confidence and the right tone/accent, although if they are confident about finding resources, they can rely on that for the correct modelling of accent.' (headteacher)

In one Pathfinder, the SLC had taken the lead in producing language packs and web-based materials. Worksheets used in primaries have been produced mostly by SLC teachers. Another Pathfinder purchased packs produced by a different local authority for each of its schools. The Pathfinder local authority which produced these packs issues them to all primary schools, adopting a centralised model. Another Pathfinder has made external commercially produced French packages available to their primary schools. In cases such as this, most schools supplemented these resources with others (both commercially produced and self-made or adapted).

The financial implications of a secondary school providing several sets of flash cards and materials across a number of primary schools was raised. Whose ultimate responsibility should it be to the foot the bill for such materials?

One teacher described the *'inordinate amount of time'* spent making resources to be shared amongst several primary schools. *'If I am making fun activities for four different schools. The cost of that in terms of time is phenomenal.'* (outreach teacher)

It is not always sufficient to provide visuals on CD-ROM to be downloaded and printed later. Where a primary teacher taught the language immediately following the demonstration lesson, she needed a hard copy of materials to take, physically, to the next session.

There has been a proliferation of new KS2 languages resources over the last few years – Pathfinders were often taking advantage of this new material. Mention was made by many of CDs, CD-ROMs, 'Big Books' in the target language as well as materials incorporating puppets and other resources. One SLC had produced via their 'content creation team' a CD,

which went out to all primaries as an extended story board. This is a resource which could be used with the interactive whiteboard like a huge book.

In several instances, schools had received a single 'free' copy of a CD-ROM or video, but had to supplement these out of their own budgets in order to provide enough resources for each class.

Furthermore, availability of suitable materials for primary level appeared to vary according to language: the dearth of materials for Spanish, for example, was deplored in some cases.

In some Pathfinders, a positive spin-off from the production of materials and schemes of work as well as ICT resources had been the sharing of such items with other (not always neighbouring) local authorities.

In other cases, teachers were increasingly having recourse to the internet in order to generate their own worksheets and materials. As one headteacher said:

'All the teachers now have laptops and they do use them well and they do now, quite creatively, download things, adjust, and adapt, and adopt and modify.' (headteacher)

There were several examples of both headteachers and teachers spending time additional to their paid hours in order to either investigate resources or to create materials. A number of teachers admitted funding materials out of their own pockets. This added time and expense should be allowed for.

In one well resourced Pathfinder, a headteacher commented:

'Teachers feel comfortable with it [the LA scheme] because the beauty of it is that you don't have to be a French specialist to use it.' (headteacher)

3.2.7. Training—needs and provision/CPD

3.2.7.1. Developing Primary Teachers

In many Pathfinders, central training was provided mainly by the local authority. This included (not all represented in all local authorities):

- demonstration lessons

- team-teaching on the ground
- INSET delivered in schools when appropriate
- intensive training for FLAs
- use of CILT videos
- centrally offered training events
- training on the QCA schemes of work and draft Key Stage 2 Framework
- visits by primary teachers to a 'Centre for Excellence' school

At least one Pathfinder offered training differentiated according to the experience of the languages teachers. However, there were instances of teachers still not accessing training made available through the secondary school, local authority or with Pathfinder funding. For some teachers, professional development had therefore been limited to, at the most, attendance at cluster, pyramid or Pathfinder meetings, with an ensuing, continuing lack of awareness of developments and support available to them.

There were also examples of committed and enthusiastic teachers, especially part timers, using their own unpaid time, either in order to observe specialist teachers or to attend training sessions. In a few cases, secondary outreach teachers were working with feeder primary schools in their free periods.

The need to be realistic about the amount of CPD any one individual can attend was indicated by several teachers. According to one:

'There is a limit to the number of courses you can go on, and the number of days you can take out of your own job. Twilight meetings are more possible.' (teacher)

It was most effective if an AST could focus single-mindedly on delivering and supporting primary language teaching. As one excellent AST explained:

'I am not involved in anything else as a school issue. I made it very clear that I could only deal with primary on my AST day – I teach five out of the six lessons on that day.' (AST teacher)

In contrast, there were examples of ASTs whose remit included a very limited role in primary and who were distracted by several calls upon their time and expertise.

Effective training sessions mentioned by teachers included those where centrally produced schemes and materials were explored, leading to a feeling of confidence that the class teacher could deliver the languages both methodologically and linguistically. As languages expand, differentiated training programmes may be necessary, linked to class teachers' experience (or lack thereof). Many training sessions were held in 'twilight slots', although a few headteachers did not favour these. Some class teachers had been given opportunities to participate in extended training courses (e.g. ten twilight sessions and two Saturdays).

Several interviewees, especially headteachers, held strong views as to *the timing* of professional development:

'In-service training is so important it should be during the working day. It certainly shouldn't be on a Saturday. I don't think twilights are the best answer. I don't think going for two hours a week for n weeks is a good way of training. I think a more intensive and valued way of working, where people are given time during their working day, and realise that whoever set it up, feels it is important enough for it to be given that time....' (headteacher)

Supply cover could be a problem:

'If they are just afternoon courses or just morning courses, you cannot get a supply teacher ... They are just not out there. That becomes quite a headache when you have maybe three members of staff you want to get on a course and you can't get even one supply.'
(headteacher)

There is also the question of the *use* of the training time. One headteacher gave the example of an effective model of staff training in another curriculum area. In this instance, funding had been given to the primary school for a certain number of days – for example, eight days over the whole school year – for training, resourcing and planning. This included quality time and space to review resources and plan, not necessarily to receive direct input.

One Pathfinder reduced the training made available in the second year and switched the focus from language to ICT skills. Training was felt to be very beneficial when it focused on both language and pedagogy and when it was delivered (or jointly delivered) by a practising primary teacher.

One Pathfinder provided linguistic refreshment by attendance at weekly classes given by the FLAs (at Beginners and Intermediate levels, with accreditation planned). Some Pathfinders

involved external bodies in the delivery of training (both linguistic and methodological), e.g. CILT and the Open University. In one case, a dynamic headteacher had personally attended some CILT training courses. This led to locally organised follow up sessions not only for the pyramid *but also for other non-Pathfinder schools* by CILT Primary LTAs and CILT Associate Trainers.

Secondary schools, including SLCs, provided training for some primary colleagues, although provision varied. It was the case in some schools that some training for secondary consultants and outreach teachers had been funded by the school rather than the Pathfinder. There was some evidence that part timers might unwittingly be excluded from training opportunities. As one teacher put it, *'Who will pay? The SLC? The host primary school? As a part timer, INSET passes me by.'* (outreach teacher)

Training also consisted of sharing lessons and joint planning with outreach teachers (although often there was little time for liaison) and on a few occasions, the outreach teacher gave feedback on lessons taught by the class teacher. There were occurrences, however, of primary teachers not having received any structured training. Many primary schools relied heavily on the SLC or local authority for training, advice and resources.

There were also a few instances of Pathfinders organising study visits to a target language country for languages teachers. These training opportunities abroad for primary teachers often took place during half term. Where they were offered, they were very well-received as there is clearly great potential for subject knowledge development.

There were some comments related to distance learning. According to one headteacher, *'people are fed up with the amount of CPD offered by distance learning and a lap top. Staff do not want to be sitting in front of a computer screen. They want face to face contact.'* (headteacher)

There were also several instances of primary staff who had received training, leaving the primary school/cluster/local authority. One secondary AST wondered if primary languages were going to be sustainable if the teacher doing the training had to keep starting afresh with new primary colleagues and re-do the training. Another primary teacher pointed out:

'One of the problems is that, when we first started, we trained everybody, but people move on.' (languages teacher)

There were a number of primary teachers evident in the data who had financed their own linguistic training, through evening classes and self-study, for example, to increase their competence and confidence in the language.

In some schools, particularly small, rural schools, in which primary teachers were typically responsible for several areas of the curriculum, lack of time was an issue – to release staff for training and to permit the often sole member of staff trained to disseminate what they had learned.

Nonetheless, knowledge of the availability of training and support were clearly important as a boost to primary teacher confidence. In the words of one headteacher:

‘Staff are feeling quite competent in it, because they know the training is available and that the support is in place... It helps a lot to know that you’re not going to be expected to do anything without that pre-training.’ (headteacher)

3.2.7.2. Developing Secondary Teachers

There was evidence in a number of Pathfinders that some secondary teachers found teaching particularly the Year 3 and 4 classes challenging. One secondary teacher who taught 15-16 year olds explained:

‘Getting down to the levels of understanding of the younger Year 3 pupils is a difficulty to be overcome..’ (outreach teacher)

Another very skilled secondary AST declared she was uncertain

‘Who should take the lead in disciplining primary pupils. It is difficult to know whether and how to intervene over discipline. If I were the class teacher, I would feel much freer to pull them up for things. It’s a bit like looking after other people’s children.’ (secondary AST)

Two particular areas for professional development for secondary specialists working in primary were

- story telling
- singing nursery rhymes, finger and action rhymes and exploiting songs

Generally, there was a sense that secondary teachers (as much as primary teachers) needed reassurance about what they are doing.

'I feel very much ... I hope it's OK, people seem to be happy with what we've done, but I don't really know.' (outreach teacher)

There were also issues over continuity of staffing, with some secondary teachers being deployed in primary for a single year, or less, and then returning to the secondary languages department, without, on occasion, passing on much information to their successors in the primary school, even where those came from the same MFL department. In several instances, expertise was being built up but lost almost at once.

Many Pathfinders had set up networks of schools (often involving groups of feeder primaries and a secondary school, although sometimes solely primary schools). These were referred to variously as 'clusters', 'pyramids' etc. and could be very valuable in sharing and disseminating resources and methodology, (See Martin C, 2000, 2001a, 2001b). Effective CPD was also provided through the visiting teachers in some of the outreach models. For one headteacher, the opportunity for staff to talk with other colleagues and plan jointly meant that

'It's adding value to the actual curriculum and further strengthening the partnerships we're working on.' (headteacher)

3.3. Progression and assessment within KS2

3.3.1. Summary

Some Pathfinders had devised schemes of work with differentiated activities and materials matched to rising levels of difficulty to ensure progression within each year and upward through the years. However, in some cases these were not developed throughout KS2. In some instances there were challenges in achieving progression, for example, where children received the same content in different years with no overall strategy for progression from year to year. This problem resulted from staff moving between different year groups and limited staff expertise.

In the majority of Pathfinders, the Languages Ladder was an unknown aspect of national provision. Some Pathfinders were using the European Languages Portfolio but this was not necessarily consistent across all schools. One Pathfinder used a tiered language award with criteria.

Generally assessment was underdeveloped in many Pathfinders. Even where assessment formed part of the local authority scheme of work and devised units, it was not always carried out and practice varied within Pathfinders. A range of assessment strategies was used across the case study schools, which mainly involved informal monitoring. Recording of assessment evidence was limited although there were very good examples of practice including profile cards or sheets to record pupils' progress. In some Pathfinders, however, little or no attention had been paid to measuring pupils' progress. Indeed, there was some resistance to the notion of an imposed scheme and the worry that introducing assessment would change the whole nature of the experience. Individual feedback to pupils was often lacking, yet pupils were keen to receive this.

3.3.2. Recommendations

- Schools should be encouraged to base their planning on coherent schemes of work which will assist progression throughout KS2.
- Particular attention should be given to planning where vertical groupings occur in order to avoid content repetition.
- Assessment opportunities should be built into the schemes of work.
- Pupils should receive individual feedback on their performance as in other subjects.

- Methods of recording progression, for example profile sheets, should be developed.
- Teachers should receive training in assessing languages.

3.3.3. Introduction

It is clearly important to include progression in language learning across the key stage so that substantial repetition of the same material does not occur from year to year and key stage to key stage, and that if topics are revisited then these are revised, built on and extended linguistically and cognitively with increasing demand and challenges placed on learners. Progression refers to a broadening of contexts in content; a development of each of the four skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing as well as language learning skills; a deepening acquisition of linguistic knowledge and ability; and an expansion of cultural awareness. As the Pathfinder was a two year programme of activity there was insufficient evidence to measure progression fully.

Assessment is a tool to measure the progress achieved in pupils' learning. It is also a means of providing feedback of progress and performance which is vital for every learner. Positive, supportive feedback with constructive messages about concrete ways to improve can be encouraging and motivating and can be a factor in increasing confidence.

3.3.4. Key Stage 2 Framework and schemes of work

As reported in the section on schemes of work, there was no uniform approach to utilisation of the QCA schemes of work in the Pathfinders and, whilst the Key Stage 2 Framework has been piloted in some Pathfinder schools, in others there was apparently no awareness of the guidelines. It is clear that coherent schemes of work should be available and used efficiently in order to ensure consistent and effective primary languages provision and learners' progression in the subject.

In some Pathfinders schemes of work have been devised which contain differentiated activities and learning materials with an emphasis on progression. In some cases, however, these schemes of work were not fully developed throughout KS2. In two Pathfinders, the presence of an AST for MFL has meant the constant reworking of the schemes of work for the different years, and in the light of national developments, so as to avoid too much repetition and ensure progression. In some schools teachers described progression as more structured activities towards the top half of the school. Where non-specialists were

involved, the provision of schemes of work and materials, which had been matched to rising levels of difficulty to ensure progression, was highly beneficial in guiding pupils' learning: *'I think, rightly or wrongly, what I feel is driving the progression issue at the moment is probably the materials that the teachers are using, and [...] with the graded material that is very much determining [...] the progression of the curriculum delivery as we currently stand'*. (headteacher)

In many instances, schemes of work were evolving as the Pathfinder progressed. In some Pathfinder schools, all four year groups, 3, 4, 5 and 6 were involved, in others just Year 3 and Year 4 or just Year 5 and Year 6. In creating a coherent scheme across the full key stage, schools recognised the need to modify current working:

'... I think one of the challenges is progression through the school. I think we are very mindful of the fact that if we got it right, the pupils who are now in Year 3 and 4, coming through to Year 5 and then moving into Year 6 will be at a different starting point than our current Year 6s are. ... we need to look at our current Year 6 unit in the light of that. So I think that's the key challenge.' (headteacher)

In some schools, progression was viewed as an important element whilst still maintaining enjoyment:

'It [Languages]'s getting a more structured progression and we're trying to build on the progression; it's not just a fun thing; it is fun, but it's not just fun ...' (headteacher)

'[...] the main emphasis should be on children enjoying learning a foreign language. For me, that is fundamentally important.. Secondly, that it isn't just enjoyment and no progression, that we are making progress, and children will move from knowing individual words, putting phrases together, developing the capacity to have conversation [...] it] would be fantastic if we could by the end of Year 6, [...] have] children [...] with] conversational French, so it is very, very much around the spoken capacity.' (headteacher)

In one Pathfinder, one school noted the impact of the Key Stage 2 Framework:

'As you walk round, you'd probably say no, but it has affected our thinking in terms of the future. Particularly, looking at progression, the fact that we're moving to Year 3, Year 4, Year 5, Year 6, it's been a major factor of our thinking for the future'. (headteacher)

However, there were challenges in achieving progression in some instances. For example, in one school children in different years (Reception, Year 4 and Year 5) were receiving the same content – basic personal information plus colours, numbers, pets etc, but there was no overall strategy for progression from year to year. The problem was that the staff expertise was scattered and staff moved around between different year groups from time to time and most of the class teachers had limited skills and were only just about capable of dealing with these basics. This concern was reiterated by a headteacher from another Pathfinder:

‘When you get up to the juniors, there has to be progression. That has always been my concern, that there is no real help for progression across the primary school and if you’re not careful, you’re going to be teaching the same basic things at Year 6 that you’re teaching in Reception, because the staff themselves are not able to move on.’ (headteacher)

Significantly, as it is a feature which may not become too apparent in a two Year Pathfinder, progression from Year 3 through Year 4 and through Year 5 to Year 6 was perceived by one headteacher as beginning to become more challenging.

‘One of the things the Pathfinder has made the school aware of, is that at the top end of the school, the French has not been challenging enough. The same sort of effect as when the ICT began to filter through’. (headteacher)

As reported in the section on schemes of work, there were particular challenges for schools where classes were arranged in vertical groupings, with combined year groups. Future planning for these mixed age group classes will be crucial to ensure pupils’ progression in primary languages is maintained without content repetition.

Progression from the pupils’ point of view included children in one Pathfinder referring to what they saw as increasing difficulty in the content of lessons.

‘Last year it was all answering questions about how old you were and your brothers and sisters but now it is harder and we have to talk about a lot of different things.’ (pupil)

They noted greater emphasis on writing with the introduction of worksheets.

It was interesting to note the comments of pupils who had recently been to Germany. They recognised, among other things, that

a) German pupils seemed to know a lot more English than they knew German;

b) There was a lot of language that they did not know!

They no longer thought of their own competence in quite the same way. As one boy put it: *'When you do it here it feels as if you know loads but in Germany you feel like you only know three words or something.'* (pupil)

It is clear that progression within KS2 is an important issue and that equally secondary schools will need to react in order to achieve progression from KS2 to KS3. One thing to emerge during the secondary Head of Department's networking meetings in one Pathfinder was that secondary teachers recognised, albeit grudgingly (according to the Principal of the SLC) that 'their' Year 7 syllabus was now being taught in the primary schools and that therefore there was need to adjust their schemes of work for Year 7. This aspect of progression will be discussed further in the section on transition and transfer.

3.3.5. European Languages Portfolio and the Languages Ladder

In the majority of Pathfinders, the Languages Ladder was an unknown aspect of national provision, although in some cases schools acknowledged the need for a better formal record of pupils' levels of attainment. Headteachers generally seemed unaware of the Languages Ladder and even amongst teachers there was confusion or scant knowledge: *'I don't think anybody has a clear idea of what levels are required. And if you go to some of these meetings, where people 'in the know' are present, they often say, 'Well, this will become easier when the Languages Ladder comes in.'* (primary teacher)

In one Pathfinder, it was anticipated that the Languages Ladder would have impact, but interviewees had slight knowledge of the proposed scheme, although there was an assumption that existing schemes of work could be adapted to suit.

In one Pathfinder, the SLC was planning to implement the Languages Ladder and it was hoped that this would entice more secondary schools to get involved by becoming the accredited centres for their area and engage some of the local primaries too.

In the local authority telephone interview, one Pathfinder said they used to use the European Languages Portfolio but they now use the National Languages Recognition Scheme, that one school in this Pathfinder has been trialling the Languages Ladder to assess pupils' attainment and other primaries are all using the National Languages Ladder. In reality, during case study teacher interviews no-one mentioned its use as a means of measuring pupils' progress.

In one Pathfinder one school cluster had decided not to trial the Languages Ladder as three out of the four schools had significant staffing changes.

Some Pathfinders were using the European Languages Portfolio (ELP); in one Pathfinder this has been tailored to fit the multilingual delivery model. In one Pathfinder the European Languages Portfolio was being used in only one of the five case study schools: pupils explained that once or twice they had to fill out speech bubbles in the ELP, which they sometimes used during silent reading to talk to the person next to them.

One local authority was a participant in the pilot of the primary version of the European Languages Portfolio and was committed to encouraging its use in schools with KS2 pupils. One of the newly appointed primary language consultants has been given the remit to promote the ELP. The main summative assessment tool within this Pathfinder local authority was a tiered language award with criteria. Pupils can achieve this award whilst they are still at primary school and may also have the opportunity to continue further when they move on to secondary school. When the award was initially piloted, this was used in Year 6, but the award has now been written into the new Year 4 scheme of work for the local authority. According to the Pathfinder bid, a measurement of success was that all schools with KS2 pupils should be participating in this award scheme by 2005/06, with pupils in Years 5 and 6 being encouraged to work towards a higher tier than those in Years 3 and 4. All secondary schools will also participate, enabling pupils to achieve the appropriate awards in their chosen languages. As forms of summative assessment, this language award and the European Languages Portfolio are in increasing use but progress is slower than planned.

3.3.6. Formative and summative assessment for progression

Assessment is a crucial tool in helping to achieve progression, by using assessment information in the planning of pupils' learning, by measuring pupils' learning and by providing feedback to show pupils how they can improve. Generally assessment was underdeveloped in many Pathfinders.

In some Pathfinders objectives were clear and assessment was built into the scheme of work with targets for Year 6 or suggestions for an end-of-unit activity as a useful opportunity for the assessment of pupils' progress.

'The majority are working at Level 3. They are very focused on what pupils need to do to reach the levels and share it with the pupils' (headteacher).

However, even where assessment formed part of the local authority scheme of work and devised units, monitoring of pupil progress was patchy and varied across the year groups and across the case study schools within Pathfinders. A range of assessment strategies were used across the case study schools visited:

- no assessment
- informal monitoring of work in class
- observation of pupils' participation
- the use of whiteboards and 'show me'
- teacher assessment during the lesson, by listening to what they have been doing, what they are saying, observing them and discussion
- the French teacher had a record book in which she kept a personal record of the work the children do, with a view to feeding back to class teachers anybody who is particularly able and also those who are struggling. This enabled her to write a French comment on pupils' annual reports.
- monitoring of verbal output (everyone had the opportunity to take part, for example, through team games and the class teacher could watch the pupils' performance)
- feedback to pupils' responses to questions
- monitoring children's ability to answer the questions posed
- *'I sometimes do a quick test, and that's when I might use a tape, or the FLA, because sometimes when the FLA has spoken, they look at me when she's spoken, although she's speaking the same as me. So I do 'quick ten' - I might do numbers, or whatever topic we're doing, so that I get some idea. In Year 3 their puppet is French and they write about their puppet in their French book – i.e. je m'appelle Pierre. J'habite à Lille en France'* (primary teacher). An issue was that too much writing can take up a whole lesson, which was only 20 minutes.
- looking at their workbooks/ worksheets
- self-assessment 'I can do....'
- photographic evidence
- Over the year the Year 6 teacher took in a couple of pieces of written work, for which comments rather than a mark or grade were given as feedback, and the focus was on what was good in each piece of work rather than errors. Writing was not done during a 30 minute lesson as pupils could do that later as a back up with a member of staff.
- end of section assessments
- half- termly or termly assessment

One example of assessment included producing pieces of information, for example, an e-mail to a friend possibly describing family, pets, characteristics or a presentation dialogue (pupils were not told they were being assessed, but it was used as part of information on assessment). Where the SLC was involved, in many cases teachers relied on the secondary visiting AST to make formal assessments at the end of Year 6. However, in some cases primary teachers questioned the appropriateness of the assessment used:

'Pupils do a lot of speaking, but in the test they saw the words written down. Pupils found it difficult because they hadn't seen the words. Assessment didn't match the teaching'.

(primary teacher)

Case study: Exemplar of good practice of peer assessment

In all classes observed pupils were made aware of the level they were working at. In general this was level 3 and the reason for this was explained, for example, *'because you're listening to descriptions within a context and hearing opinions this is a level 3 piece of work'* (secondary AST). In one lesson involving peer assessment pupils gave PowerPoint presentations of descriptions and opinions of celebrities. Clear assessment criteria were discussed with the pupils beforehand: *'what are we looking out for?'* Answers elicited from the pupils included spellings, right word, pronunciation, good balance of words and pictures, and the use of PowerPoint to create animations, add pictures, sound and movement effects. Assessment sheets were handed out and explained (Ratings A-D for categories for 6 items relating to quality of text, quality and choice of illustration, quality of oral presentation and overall impression.) After each presentation there was whole class discussion in English about the merits of the work; children were very discerning in awarding marks and there was good discussion about whether to award A/B, etc. and why. In the plenary there was a further discussion: *'how could you have got a better mark?'*

In four case study Pathfinders the mention of assessment produced an admission that little or no attention had been paid to measuring pupils' progress and there was scant evidence of assessment strategies or procedures. In two of these no formal assessment took place:

'(Pupils' progress in French is not monitored.) Not really, no. We just practise it.' (primary teacher)

In one case this could be linked to the fact that the local authority has had to concentrate its energies on delivery. *'We'd be happy to do it; we haven't thought about it in any formal way but I am sure that the children would be happy to participate.'* (primary teacher)

A typical reaction to the mention of the word assessment was: *'That is something we are going to put into next year's development plan.'* (headteacher) Indeed, there was some resistance to the notion of an imposed scheme and the worry that introducing assessment would change the whole nature of the experience:

'At the moment, it is a subject you can have a lot of fun with and the children can enjoy it. The vast majority of children are not reluctant to have a go – and that's vital. But I have a concern that it may become more demanding in that we may need to do assessments and the fun will start to disappear. Teachers have enough to do without all that.' (primary teacher)

'Please no conventional assessment. No language SATs. Let's have something creative and fun. That tells a teacher, if a child has got that, they can talk about their family, friends, hobbies, their pets, if they've got that, they could write a short story using adjectives.' (headteacher)

One outreach teacher expressed dismay at the increasing pressure for introducing assessment into the lessons. The lack of action on assessment was often justified: e.g. *'We did not want to be too heavy on that initially; we wanted to get languages built up before putting too much pressure on staff and pupils.'* (outreach teacher)

In one school the peripatetic secondary teacher recalled a recent cluster meeting at which assessment was raised. *'The general consensus is that the pyramid wants to steer away from assessment as such: Nobody wants to brand pupils with levels.'* (primary teacher). It was vaguely envisaged that when primary teachers wrote their report, they would incorporate a comment about the language course. Later on it might be possible to put in tick boxes or 'can do' statements.

3.3.7. Recording evidence of progression

In a number of Pathfinders recording evidence of progression was achieved through pupil assessment folders including written work, tick box, and self-assessment sheets. In some cases a kind of portfolio was planned that would go up with pupils to each year group, as they moved on.

'What it is, ... at the start of the unit of work there's questions that they have to answer and then as they go on, they'll be given time each week to fill in about things that they've learnt. ... the idea with this is that it will then go on up to secondary school with them. We're also

trying to evaluate, prior to each unit and post each unit of work, to see how children have progressed.' (primary teacher)

In another Pathfinder forms are completed annually to record what has been covered.

'It's ongoing really because most of the work is mainly oral, but at the end of the unit, the children have a smiley face sheet [with] which they can self-evaluate. At the end of KS2 in Y6, before they go on to secondary school, pupils do a smiley face sheet to say what they've learnt and what they've enjoyed and that's taken with them to secondary school'. (primary teacher)

Case study: exemplar of good practice of recording evidence of progression for learning

One Pathfinder had developed the use of profile cards with child friendly 'I can' statements, 'What we've learnt this term', 'What we need to work on' and information on how to progress from one level to another. Children received a certificate at the end and stood up in praise assembly. Another had developed pupil's self-assessment sheets to record progress at different levels in Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing and Awareness. *'... we do it in an informal way by the class teacher, but also (there is) something that's been developed by the local authority, which is very simple ...this particular one is just a single page, it's only been developed at level 1 so far, but it just enables the children to give a tick, if they feel they've achieved an objective. It's a kind of self-assessment, but then it says, 'My Witness', as a second column. They must have a friend maybe who evaluated it with them or it could be a teacher, so it could be self-evaluation, it could also have an adult feeding into it.. As I said, I'm trialling this at the moment, I'll be adding Level 2 and Level 3, as they are developed.'* (primary teacher)

Very little mention was made of the use of NC levels, although in some cases there was evidence of some development in this area:

'That again is something I think that the local authority are just ... beginning to bring in. they're identifying the different levels now, and I know talking to our Year 3/4 staff, they were on some recent training with that and looking at that; ... that's really helpful, because it actually helps us to identify specifically what we're looking for and what skills we're looking for children to be able to acquire by the end of particular year groups. So, at the moment, it's really a sort of ad hoc, ... informal monitoring that we've been doing in school and ...

evaluating the children at the end of modules of work, rather than ongoing ... assessment at the time. (headteacher)

One teacher mentioned an assessment sheet produced by the Pathfinder, which gives a very good guide up to level 4 in Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing, but no record of marks was kept. There were difficulties for peripatetic teachers. For example, one visiting teacher who taught 19 classes found it difficult to know all the pupils' names; she could give information regarding bandings of ability but she would need assistance from the class teacher for names in recording assessment levels later.

In schools where there was no quantitative measure of attainment, the qualitative evidence was often extensive, from performance in assemblies to realisation that some less confident children had *'come out of their shells'* (headteacher). Assessment was seen more to be a question of monitoring by checking out how pupils had retained knowledge from previous lessons by the general recapitulation questions at the beginning of each lesson.

Where there had been little emphasis (if any) on assessment, headteachers thought that evidence could be extracted from the planning, the French books and the comments on the reports to indicate progress but nothing more formal. In many schools reading and writing were minimal. *'I've never marked anything!'* (outreach teacher). Sometimes a prize was given, for example, when someone designed a poster. In response to a question about evidence of what the pupils could do now after two years in the Pathfinder which they could not do before, one teacher admitted she had nothing.

Case study: exemplar of a well developed assessment system and recording

In one school the co-ordinator kept records of assessment for all the pupils and the pupils all had individual portfolios with their own work. A school portfolio contained pupils' self evaluation sheets which listed items with columns: 'I can', 'I can with help', 'I've forgotten' and evidence of pupils' work at different levels. There was clear progression of what Year 6 had achieved this year compared to last year's Year 6. In this school assessment begins orally in lower KS1 and assessment is written into the new units through the activities. *'Not being a language specialist this is really helpful. It's useful to know when to assess and what to assess'* (primary teacher). An exciting development was planned for the future: *'When they leave in Year 6 they will do a final piece of writing. We now have the facility through ICT, well we will have, to have the possibility to interview them and record this on MP3 and up-load this onto the secondary school's website to see what stage each pupil is at. We're just waiting for the local authority to give parental consent for this, because of child protection issues, but we will be able to access this in the summer. We have good relationships with the high school.'* (primary teacher)

Although informal assessment was conducted in some schools, there was no evidence of marking.

'We don't actually keep any statutory sort of assessments; it's just conversation here and there; we don't actually put any kind of pressure or measure on their ... [work]... it is [informal monitoring], very much so, yes. [...] it can only be orally and via observation. There's actually no formal written assessment. We may at the end of the year perhaps add a comment about how they tackled learning French and their approach to it.' (primary teacher)

In some cases, even where assessment opportunities were provided in schemes of work or where language awards were used, pupils on the whole did not report that their work/performance was 'marked' in any way other than general encouragement to the class as a whole. In all schools in one Pathfinder, pupils were unanimous and immediate in their chorused reactions 'no!' about whether they received feedback about how they were getting on. Upon reflection, pupils in one school thought they were getting better, because more was being expected of them. They swapped books when little tests were marked and the teacher kept a record of the scores. Pupils felt they did not really know how they were

getting on, because although the teachers kept a record, they did not share the information with the pupils.

Several pupils would appreciate feedback on how to improve and make progress. In many lessons teachers tended to give general praise to the class as a whole.

'I think it would be nice if they told us how we were doing, because if we weren't doing well, they could actually help us.'

'They just say très bien, but they don't tell you individually, they just say it to the whole group.'

'You need to know, whether you need to concentrate more.'

'Sometimes I feel sad if I haven't been doing well.'

'Sometimes it can be quite hurtful if you find out you are bad at something and you thought you were good at it.' (pupils)

Pupils in one school said they were given a 'special mention' and a sticker for French at the end of the week. Some of the children had a chart in the classroom and once this was complete, they got a commendation. They were not awarded marks as such and writing was limited to labelling shapes or matching pictures and words. In another school pupils said there were no marks for French, because written work was not done in French, nor tests, although there were worksheets, mainly for colouring type tasks. House points were awarded if teams did well in oral games.

3.4. Transition and transfer

3.4.1. Summary

Primary-secondary patterns of transfer were complex in the majority of Pathfinder local authorities. This created real challenge in achieving continuity and progression where secondary schools received pupils from a large range of feeder schools.

Lack of continuity in a language was a concern voiced by many, especially where the secondary school changed its Year 7 language from year to year. However, some teachers were not concerned about the change of language as they felt pupils were developing generic transferable language skills.

In some Pathfinder schools effective transition and transfer arrangements were in place or were developing and a minority of schools/Pathfinders were working towards a transfer document including information relating specifically to languages for transfer to secondary school.

In many schools no meetings had taken place between primary and secondary staff. Where liaison between sectors had taken place, in particular mutual observation, this had been beneficial in encouraging teachers to evaluate their own practice.

Very few schools mentioned any link with the KS3 Framework and a minority of schools mentioned National Curriculum (NC) levels sent to the secondary school. There was little knowledge amongst many primary teachers about how or if, work in primary will be carried on in secondary school, and some teachers felt disheartened and frustrated that good primary languages practice in primary might be neither acknowledged nor built on at secondary.

In some cases secondary schools were responding to work done in primaries by rethinking the KS3 curriculum or being aware of the need to rethink.

3.4.2. Recommendations

- Transition arrangements for primary languages between primary and secondary sectors should be improved.
- KS2 and KS3 should be thought of as a coherent whole, not as two separate programmes.
- Primary schools should introduce more coherent programmes, so that the aims and outcomes of primary languages are clearer to secondary schools and they know what foundation they are building on.
- Secondary schools should:
 - treat information exchange more seriously and act on information received.
 - plan carefully to adjust practice in KS3 and especially in Year 7.
- Funding should be provided:
 - to allow for the inevitable changes in the KS3 curriculum that will be required as KS2 primary languages beds down.

- for training secondary teachers in developing effective differentiation strategies to cater for the range of different experiences where setting potential is not available.
- Secondary PGCE courses need to be modified so that secondary languages trainees are better prepared to support/work with primary colleagues in the delivery of languages, as well as being better equipped to meet the developing needs at KS3 and particularly in Year 7.
- Further national research should be conducted to examine particular key issues such as transition, in a limited number of case study schools.

3.4.3. Choice/continuity

Many Pathfinder schools had started by introducing languages into Years 3 and 4 and had not, as yet, reached the transition point between the primary and secondary sector. Where transfer occurred, primary-secondary patterns of transfer were complex in the majority of Pathfinder local authorities, with children moving on to secondary schools in sometimes two or occasionally three different local authorities in some cases, so that pupils could not necessarily continue immediately in Year 7 with a language studied in Year 6. Most secondary schools took pupils from a wide range of primary schools and were unable to adjust the languages on offer to provide continuity in a specific language. Indeed, even the special strategies adopted by the SLC were not always capable of dealing with all the issues arising out of the mixed experience of languages pupils brought with them.

Where pupils transferred to a number of different schools, liaison with a range of schools naturally became more complicated:

'I think one of the practical problems with that is that all the children don't all go to the same school, so you are having to liaise with a number of schools and that always sets up difficulties. But I think if you can set up something positive with the main feeder secondary, then that's something that we can work towards, isn't it?' (headteacher)

Transfer was less of a problem where the SLC was the main link secondary school and most children transferred to the SLC at the end of the year. However, in some cases, even where the SLC led the teaching in a cluster of schools, pupils did not necessarily transfer to the SLC. One headteacher referred to the difficulty of transition as pupils transferred to 20 schools:

'Only a very small number (6/7) go to the SLC, 55 others have 2 years' French and possibly will not do French when they transfer because the high school may do Spanish or German in the first year or go back to basics.' (headteacher)

In another Pathfinder many children transferred to the independent sector or to schools in neighbouring local authorities.

'They go to so many different secondary schools, it's difficult to consolidate what you're doing to make sure that continuity and progression happens' (headteacher)

Lack of continuity in a language was a concern voiced by many, especially where the secondary school changed its Year 7 language from year to year:

'I did speak to the secondary teacher, and she was explaining that sometimes Year 7 begin with German and then it's French, and then it's German, and so on. So, it's difficult, and it was quite an issue on one of the Pathfinder courses—if you're going to encourage KS2 French or whatever, it's so difficult, if then a year is lost, when they go to secondary, because it's a different language that's being taught. I understand the children can pick it up a year after, but the input, the amount of inputthat a KS2 school has got to give, it seems a shame not to pick it up immediately.' (primary teacher)

In one Pathfinder some parents queried why their children were studying German instead of another language since there was less German taught at secondary school in that area. The SLC becoming a 'partner' secondary school had helped to alleviate fears in this case.

Transition was perceived to be a problem because of the number of secondary schools to which pupils go, some outside the local authority. Those doing German who went on to the SLC were well catered for. *'It is useful for them to be ahead.'* There was an awareness that at secondary school some pupils would not continue with French. However, one co-ordinator wondered whether having learned one language, the children might find it easier to learn another.

Some teachers were not concerned about the change of language:

'I don't think it matters, I think it more important that they've actually tried a different language, whichever language it is, than to have made it all the same. In fact, I think it gives you a much broader perspective, as I've known several children in the past who learnt a little bit of French, not got on particularly well with it, then a little bit of Spanish, loved it and then

it's actually made more sense, the French has made more sense to them after they've learnt another language. So, it doesn't always follow that it needs to be the same. I think it's the whole idea of just learning another language and because we do a lot of it verbally anyway, the links you begin to see and they use that in terms of words from other languages that get taken up by English or in other countries and so they begin to see those links and they can see where they come from, so it gives them a much broader perspective.' (primary teacher)

'When they [the pupils] know they're going to transfer through to whatever school and some of them will be doing Spanish, I've never heard any of the children complain about it and [say,] 'oh it's been a waste of time doing this'. It's an excitement that they are going to learn another language.' (primary teacher)

In one Pathfinder where there was an emphasis on a multilingual investigative approach and thinking skills in languages, teachers felt that a change of language at secondary would not be detrimental, as pupils were developing generic language skills:

'I think what we're doing is laying the foundations for a more problem solving approach; we're teaching them skills of remembering and learning language, that it should positively effect whatever language they go on to look at.' (primary teachers)

3.4.4 Information transfer/communication

In some Pathfinder schools effective transition and transfer arrangements were in place or were developing. These included general transition activities, for example:

- meetings with secondary staff
- good liaison with the High School with the Year 6 teacher going to a meeting at the High School and the High School sending staff to the primary school in the summer term
- series of visits – sometimes reciprocal
- involvement in secondary activities, e.g. French day
- homework Club in Year 5 and ICT club in Year 6 so children meet the secondary school teachers and familiarity develops
- standard pro-forma of formal assessment records
- (electronic) core transfer document, including SATs results
- areas of collaboration, e.g. ICT
- pupil induction days at the secondary school

- transfer of more sensitive information verbally
- parents' information evening.

There was evidence of local authority meetings between primary and secondary staff to outline the Pathfinder languages project and some schools/Pathfinders were working towards a transfer document including information relating specifically to languages for transfer to secondary school. In some Pathfinder schools, this was already well developed and examples included:

- pupil portfolios/profile cards/certificates to take to secondary school to show what they have achieved including the level
- records of children's achievement in French with photocopied material of assessed work and NC levels
- information relating to French attainment with levels
- the European Languages Portfolio
- own 'Languages Portfolio' with records of language skills, including languages spoken at home, overseen by the teacher but completed by the children
- a tiered language award with criteria
- meetings with the secondary school languages staff
- mutual observation planned for some staff, observing secondary colleagues in a local secondary school to which many pupils transfer, and a secondary teacher coming to watch Year 6 French teaching.

Case Study: example of good practice in transition

Transition to KS3 had been of particular interest to one local authority and transfer to the secondary sector had therefore been a key area for exploration. As a Pathfinder the intention has been to build upon earlier experience of transition initiatives and to extend opportunities for primary and secondary teachers to observe each other's teaching in literacy and numeracy as well as in early language learning. A practical example of a transition project in practice, co-ordinated by the primary AST, was found in one school, which had received funding for teacher release time, so that AST and secondary colleagues could work together. This had involved several secondary MFL teachers, including some from the independent sector, observing the primary AST at work.

According to the headteacher, *'They have been overwhelmed at the quality of the work going on. It is about whether the secondary schools are able, willing, to take on board where we're at. Everyone comes away thinking, 'This is amazing, this is fantastic,' but then the onus must be on them [the secondary schools] to take it forward.'* (headteacher)

Effective transition mechanisms generally relied heavily on the co-operation of both sectors. Sometimes transfer was facilitated by personal contacts such as the fact that in one Pathfinder the primary AST had worked closely with the secondary AST, who happened to be in the school to which many of the junior school children transferred. However, this sort of link, which relies on personnel, is vulnerable as was demonstrated by the fact that the latter was leaving the local authority with the resulting comment: *'We are going to have to take a step back now, which is unfortunate'* (primary AST). Equally, transfer mechanisms need to be more robust than those which depended solely on the assumption that outreach teachers in Year 6 would automatically pass information on to secondary colleagues.

In some schools where languages were new to the curriculum, there were no mechanisms yet in place for providing information about language learning. Indeed, one teacher said: *'nothing in the Pathfinder has been remotely discussed with that'*. In one Pathfinder where languages were more established, the only information passed on previously to secondary schools had been a list of topics covered, but no information on individual children's achievement. Even where transfer documents were available in some Pathfinders, the extent of use varied between the case study schools. More significantly, in a large number of schools, although there may be transition arrangements in place, or a core transfer document, no specific information was sent about what children had done in languages. In some schools there were meetings with secondary staff for literacy and numeracy but not for languages:

'I keep nagging about it. I've raised it regularly at Headteacher group meetings. I've raised it with people who have come down about transfer. We had a very able group last year. Were they going to secondary school and starting all over again? The situation is still unresolved. No information is passed on: it should be; it's not happening. Secondary schools now want less information. It will only be really effective if all schools teach the same language and get to the same level' (headteacher)

"I have mentioned this would be useful. No information goes. We give them what they ask for. Last year I was concerned because they were going to put them into mixed ability groups: the pupils could be bored if they're doing the same stuff again. The secondary school knows the areas they've covered, for example, greetings, weather.' (primary teacher)

Consistency in terms of information transferred to secondary schools would be helpful:

'...I know the Year 7 teachers were really keen, obviously, for us to take on board the very first part of the curriculum, but as ... KS2 we need to be, each primary, teaching in a similar way—[if] the record keeping, in an ideal world, was the same for everybody, then the information received to all the secondary feeder schools would be similar, and maybe they'd feel confident that a good job was being done. But if it's done in a patchwork fashion, with no paperwork given to us to send back, it's going to lose its legs, isn't it?' (primary teacher)

In one Pathfinder, secondary schools would know informally pupils had been part of the pilot but they had never spoken to the languages department of any high schools.

'Formal assessment is passed on to the SLC. It's something I will have to consider doing for other secondary schools. It will switch pupils off if they have to start at the same level' (headteacher)

It is important that information exchange be treated more seriously by the secondary sector and that secondary schools act on information received.

'We need to find a way to document what the child has done in the primary sector and to give it real credibility and then get the secondary schools looking at that information and taking those children where they are at rather than at where they think they are.' (primary teacher)

The situation in this Pathfinder was that with not all primary schools providing languages, secondary teachers were going back to basics.

One teacher was unaware whether any information was transferred across to Year 7. She went on, *'I think there is going to have to be good communication between us and secondary so that our children are not taken back to repeat again.'* (primary teacher). In another instance the outreach teacher had no idea how the transition would be managed, and whether children would even be asked whether they had learned any language in primary, and was also unaware that the Pathfinder was a two year programme about to come to an end.

In many schools there had been no meetings between primary and secondary staff. Even headteachers did not meet, although there were one or two personal contacts. A future suggestion in one school was to invite the head of languages to see the children in action, as they were not sure enough was done to accommodate children with reading, speaking,

listening and writing skills in French. The teacher hoped the secondary school would set pupils in future. One teacher recognised the value of learning what goes on in secondary:

'...the first thing that springs to mind is that I need to make a visit to the high school and really get to grips with what they are doing there so that I can tailor what we're doing here to meet their needs more. Well it makes sense [to adjust to their scheme], doesn't it really?' (primary teacher)

Mutual observation is certainly a valuable way of learning to understand each other's context and needs and to promote staff development. Where liaison between sectors had taken place, it had been beneficial in encouraging teachers to evaluate their own practice:

'It has given an insight, it was a revelation, you never think about these kids that come up from primary to secondary school. They belong to the secondary school, ... and seeing them in this primary element has been quite an eye opener.' (outreach teacher)

In one school, discussion at headteacher level was taking place about the range of transition projects, which were over burdening the Year 6 curriculum and which required rationalisation. This school had separate, excellent English, Science and Design Technology transition programmes. Each of the transition projects typically consisted of three lessons in the primary school and one lesson in the secondary school, so a languages transition project would have to sit within all of these. Some pupils might experience French during their intake day at secondary.

Transition issues affect transfer from KS1-KS2 as well as KS2-KS3:

'...because I know what they are doing in the infants, I've said to (the AST) that we might have to amend our Year 3 plans, because I know how well they're coming up, how much they can do.' (primary teacher)

In two Pathfinders there were plans for liaison with other primary schools locally. In one Pathfinder within the cluster of primary schools they were looking towards primaries getting together and having a French afternoon and two schools were going to France together the following year. In another, they felt the next step would be to liaise with other primary schools, but there had been a certain amount of ill feeling because of imminent closures.

3.4.5. Links to KS3 Framework/National curriculum

Very few schools mentioned any link with the KS3 Framework and a minority of schools mentioned NC levels which are sent on to the secondary school.

In some cases secondary schools were responding to work done in primaries by reorganising pupils into sets. For example, in a cluster where the secondary teacher visited to teach, setting had been achieved because she had taught all the Year 6 classes from five schools. As a result she reported a significant difference in what the Year 7s had achieved:

'Year 7 are used to speaking to each other in French: there's no "Why do I have to do French?" They love it. Last year I knew exactly where the children were, we had a list of vocabulary and topics that the children had done and they had tests in June and NC levels before they came up' (secondary teacher).

In the second year of the Pathfinder she was teaching Years 4, 5 and 6, so setting them would be more difficult as she did not have personal knowledge of the pupils, although tests were still planned. In another Pathfinder the secondary school in which the secondary AST worked now set Year 7 much earlier, as they had found some children were disaffected. However, they had not grouped children into 'primary French and not primary French' since, although some children had not learned a European language, they were skilled at community languages and were in fact able linguists. In a further Pathfinder, 2005/06 will be a pilot year for transition, used to explore the process of setting in Year 7. In future pupils with previous languages experience will be identified and their performance in the secondary school's Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing assessments will be monitored. Pupils would be *'graded according to merit'*. As a consequence, it might be necessary to run a special grouping. In one Pathfinder a secondary school was taking the top set, regardless of whether they had been doing primary languages, and accelerating children into a GCSE in Year 9.

If the potential for grouping is not available, secondary departments will need to develop effective differentiation strategies to cater for the range of different experiences:

'I have spoken to one secondary teacher who reassures me it's not a problem when children go into that particular school; they are quite well used to having differentiated abilities on entry at 11.' (primary teacher)

However, secondary teachers do not universally welcome the growth of primary languages work:

'The kids who have had German in their primary schools are streets ahead of the others. This can be a problem.' (secondary teacher)

There was still a feeling that many secondary schools did not really value or take full account of the work done in primary schools. Concern was expressed by primary teachers and heads that secondary schools would not acknowledge their pupils' prior language learning, which would lead to work covered in KS2 being repeated in KS3. One primary headteacher felt that there was little the primary school could really do to influence what happened at secondary school, particularly when they fed into so many schools. Often the response from the secondary was simply *'that's nice'* but everyone knew that the pupils would start again.

'I was worried that our children would be fired up with enthusiasm here and then they go to whatever secondary school it is and they start again from scratch and then they become disaffected. It's like pouring water on that flame, isn't it?' (primary teacher)

'But also, it doesn't have a street cred, if they're being asked to do very simple things. The design of MFL needs to keep on taking on board that early language skills need to be designed for children to access at different ages, but with different images that are modern and have high street credibility. [...]' (primary teacher)

In one Pathfinder where schools concentrated on the oral approach to language learning, teachers were less anxious about repetition:

'If they go to secondary school and are doing French there, they will have done no written work, so the secondary school will have to introduce the written work. It's [then] not so much a question of their repeating everything, they will have orally similar sorts of things that they're doing, but they won't have done the written work. It actually gives the children, we find, a bit of a confidence boost, because 'Ah, this is something we can already do'. (primary teacher)

One primary languages co-ordinator wondered whether some secondary schools were really aware of how much some children could do in French by the time they entered year 7. The

situation was especially difficult where not all primary schools were providing languages and secondary teachers were going back to basics.

'I was asking [the secondary teacher who visits primaries to teach] what happens with the children, because in the school where she teaches they'd had 3 years of French before they got to secondary school, and she said they did originally hope to fast track them, but because the children come from such disparate areas and there's only a few that do it and then the rest have none, there weren't [...] enough for them to do this and have a special class for them. So in a way it feels like a bit of a waste that they have to start back at square one, because [...] they must feel [...], 'well we've done this, we did this ages ago. Why are we having to do it again?' (primary teacher)

One SLC was dealing with this through enrichment lessons, giving pupils in year 7 the same language teachers as involved in outreach work. They also tried to group children according to language learnt, but this was not always possible. The attitude of some secondary schools was shown by the fact that some children had been re-doing the same tier of a language award again at secondary school.

One language teacher expressed concern about the consistency of teaching competence and content which would impact on transfer:

'I worry that other schools are just getting someone's Mum in, and that all sorts of things are being taught all over the place, and from the secondary school's point of view, what are they coming to me with, completely random things, wrong things?' (outreach teacher)

In some cases secondary schools were responding to work done in primaries by rethinking the KS3 curriculum, or being aware of the need to rethink:

'We were suspicious to begin with. It was new, and now thankfully we've stopped talking about that ... We're seeing things happening in the primary that are going to affect our teaching, our future in the secondary. Yes, it's an exciting period, but it's going to be an upheaval, and we are going to have to re-write our [secondary] schemes again.' (outreach teacher)

In one Pathfinder in the first ten weeks of Year 7, a new theme *Les vacances* was introduced, to include *avoir, être*, get pupils talking about the present and the past. In the outreach teacher's view, this would not duplicate and overlap with what had been done in

primary. But inevitably there would come a time when there was repetition of what had been done in primary and then it would be interesting to measure the pupils' attitudes, perhaps by means of a questionnaire with the Year 7 pupils, to elicit how they were finding languages at the beginning of secondary school.

In one Pathfinder where the SLC led the teaching of languages, starting early moved the whole programme down a stage. Their aim was to get pupils to the end of KS3 at the end of year 8, start GCSE in Year 9, complete end of Year 10. They felt this would open up other opportunities and they might end up with better GCSE results. At the end of KS2 pupils would receive certificates to say they had reached the end of a unit and would bring their portfolios to secondary school. Secondary staff would know what level they had been working at. This would allow for acceleration groups as well as support groups.

Clearly language learning in the primary phase will have an impact on the secondary curriculum and secondary schools need to plan carefully to adjust practice in KS3 and especially in Year 7. It is particularly important that the two curricula for the top of KS2 and early KS3 are aligned, both in terms of content and teaching style. This is especially so in Year 6 and Year 7 where a coherent approach and mutual understanding are crucial to progression.

One concern was entitlement at KS4. One French teacher commented: *'When teachers in the secondary school are saying, 'They can drop their language,' you think, Is it right to be starting it earlier? I find this (optional status at KS4) disheartening.'* (primary teacher)

3.5. Sustainability and Replicability

3.5.1. Summary

In most local Pathfinder authorities, there was a strong expectation that primary languages would be sustained at least at the level achieved during the Pathfinder funding.

Schools already providing a language learning experience to all pupils throughout KS2 were very much in the minority. Provision in many schools depended on the location of staff with some foreign language skill or with the willingness to get involved. Threats to sustainability and growth were often associated with staff movement either within the school or away from the school. Of those schools without languages already part of the curriculum through KS2, few had made plans for extending their current provision. Where local authorities had responsibility for deploying visiting teachers or assistants, provision was more likely to be planned in a way that supported continuity of learning.

While some primary teachers had risen admirably to the challenge of teaching languages, there was a significant number who did not yet appear ready to take on full responsibility for its delivery, relying heavily on visiting teachers. Without significantly more training, linguistic and pedagogical, it seems unlikely that they will be ready to 'go it alone' in three or four years' time.

Pupil interviews provided much evidence of positive attitudes towards their language learning but, occasionally, there were also signs that the enthusiasm and initial sense of progress were tempered with some concerns about the repetitive nature of their lessons and recognition of increasing difficulties ahead, especially by Year 6 pupils nearing the end of their primary education.

3.5.2. Recommendations

- Primary headteachers need more information about the value of foreign language learning.
- Similarly, a concerted campaign needs to take place targeting secondary headteachers so that the status of primary languages can be raised and steps can be taken to take account of the impact of primary provision on secondary schools.
- There is need for better dissemination of good practice within and across local authorities, especially involving headteachers, in order to support the integration of languages in the curriculum.

- While initiatives to introduce children to foreign language learning in KS1 are welcome, these should not distract schools from building a coherent and progressive programme throughout KS2.
- If further funding becomes available, time should be allowed for key appointments to be made so that developments can take place in a more organised way.
- Local authorities should appoint specialist primary language advisors or advisory teachers to oversee training and co-ordination of resources.
- Training courses should be provided at national and local level, not only for developing language skills of primary teachers, but also to support the mentoring skills of secondary outreach teachers.
- Local Authorities and schools should consider carefully the terms of employment and working conditions of permanently resident native speaker assistants. A valid career path for such posts should also be established.
- The use of PPA in the context of language provision should be carefully monitored.
- Primary language teachers should recognise the need to introduce more challenging activities in the final years of KS2 and should be supported in this with appropriate resources and training courses.

3.5.3. Introduction

Sustainability, in the context of educational provision, refers to the ability of local authorities and schools to maintain the teaching and learning of a subject or keep an activity operating. It was important, therefore, to ask questions at every stage of the research, to all participants, about their expectations of maintaining and extending provision. It was also essential to identify those factors which favoured maintenance and/or growth potential in order that other authorities and schools - inside the Pathfinder group and beyond - might take advantage of the positive experiences and replicate those conditions relevant to their own local requirements.

One of the key tasks of the Pathfinders was:

'to make significant progress along the continuum in working towards delivering language learning throughout key stage 2 by July 2005'.

The specific additional funding was to be used to introduce primary languages or to expand existing provision. Pathfinders were selected on the premise that they were planning to

develop *'effective and replicable models of KS2 language provision'*. The case-studies of the research were similarly chosen to represent a range of these models.

As with many forms of publicly funded projects, there was an expectation that the momentum generated by the new activity would be maintained beyond the two year period of specific funded work, that schools would continue to develop *'along the continuum'* towards the full implementation of national policy. One headteacher demonstrated this supposition in practice by referring to the fact that the service level agreement with the local authority, which had been started under the Pathfinder project to provide weekly visits by foreign language assistants,

'was now embedded in the school's finances and would therefore continue'. (headteacher)

Other headteachers, in discussing mechanisms to ensure sustainability, dealt with the issue in a much vaguer, abstract way. Statements such as the following were frequently noted:

'The mechanism of sustainability is the commitment.' (headteacher)

'...only our enthusiasm and our motivation to make it, to want to make it work...'
(headteacher)

'Well, the Pathfinder effectively won't have any impact on where we go in the future now because we are absolutely committed to two languages in year 6, we've got two units of work in Year 5 and we've got our work for Year 3/4.' (headteacher)

One of the problems for the researchers, encountered very early in the project and arising throughout, was, indeed, to identify exactly what the Pathfinder grant was being used for. Even some of those directly responsible for deploying funds at school level sometimes found it difficult to establish how the Pathfinder funding had made a difference and, more significantly, how the work would continue beyond the end of the designated two years. In part this related to the difficulty in disentangling different funding sources which may have been used with Pathfinder funding to support a new initiative. This made the task of analysing costs particularly challenging. Alongside the considerable vagueness expressed about the financial and other means for continuing primary languages, there was often also manifested a sense of optimism, faith even, that things would be sustained and would even continue to grow. In the words of one primary class teacher:

'The end of funding will make no difference in this school because the Head is supportive of languages and will make sure that it continues.' (primary teacher)

Of course, the phrase *'make no difference'* implies maintaining the status quo. This school had yet to 'spread' languages throughout KS2 and the headteacher, while correctly being defined by one of her colleagues as 'supportive', was not yet able to guarantee that the full entitlement would be in place by the due date.

The positive influence of supportive school management is crucial in sustaining any curriculum development. In another school, one headteacher who was about to leave her post raised questions over the future of languages. She expressed her doubts in this way:

'If I were to remain Head, I would ensure this continued, working with the SLC to employ FLAs to provide expertise with the LSA, continue to use ICT resources and the resources the AST has developed.' (headteacher)

It was recognised that a new headteacher might have different priorities.

Sustainability in education has dimensions beyond the purely financial. Questions needed to be considered on the issues of staffing, actually finding appropriate people to do the work and keeping them in post. Initial training and further professional development of those directly involved in teaching were also addressed.

The learning experience of the pupils themselves was not overlooked since, with the reduction in status of languages in KS4 – from statutory requirement to entitlement – there was an expressed hope, already mentioned in the Green paper that introduced the change, that pupils would be so enthused by their primary language learning that they would be motivated to continue with languages beyond the option stage in Year 9.

The issues of transition and transfer have been analysed in detail earlier in this report but, in discussing how schools were planning to keep their languages developing, sustaining the achievements of the Pathfinder and building upon them, primary teachers and local authority staff stressed the need to make more - and more effective - links with secondary schools. As well as the usual reasons cited: recognition of pupils' achievements, sense of progression, continuity of learning, there was the broader and more fundamental issue of developing the national policy. If after all the efforts made before, during and after the Pathfinder programme, secondary schools continued to take little or no account of language provision among their feeder schools (and it was suggested by several primary teachers during interviews that this was, indeed, the situation in their area), there was bound to be increasing scepticism in those primary schools where languages had yet to be properly introduced. Authorities with less developed primary languages policies might also find reasons or pretexts to delay allocation of funding to this aspect of the curriculum.

3.5.4. Leadership and management

The Pathfinders represented a wide range of practice in the way they were managed financially. At one end of the spectrum, local authorities used the funding to make new appointments at advisor or advisory teacher level specifically to implement the local policy of introducing or extending primary languages. In some cases, Pathfinder project development was impeded or, worse, delayed for up to as much as six months by the arrangements necessary for such appointments. Fortunately, in at least one case, these new appointments, originally temporary, had been made permanent or had their fractional part-time contract increased. In these cases, therefore, the chances of sustaining developments have been increased, although by local authority rather than DfES Pathfinder funds.

At the other end of the spectrum, funding was channelled directly to one or more Secondary Language Colleges who then used the money to increase their outreach work. Where this applied, the authority's role was restricted to a relatively light touch monitoring of financial processes rather than detailed accountability over educational targets.

Of course there were several other examples among the local authorities where finances were split between local authority directed activities and those supported by direct funding to schools. To decide which of these approaches offer the best chance of sustaining provision (or increasing provision) is not really possible, since so many other factors come to play. However, it is possible to point out some of the advantages and disadvantages of these and other means of managing the project, at least in financial terms.

The appointment of specialists to local authority advisory teams has the advantage of identifying clear points of contact for all the people associated with the new or extended activity. Provided that primary languages is the sole or main activity of the person, it means that there is oversight of key aspects such as training, dissemination of good practice, production of schemes of work and resources and monitoring of what actually goes on in the schools. As one local authority interviewee put it:

'This local authority is not faced with headteachers and teachers asking "How shall we fit primary languages in?" The scheme is so well established now that the local authority is beyond that stage. The experience is replicable because the structures are there, even if the context is different.' (LA co-ordinator)

A strong local authority team also means mobility between schools, something not achieved to the same extent by co-ordinators based in a secondary school or, for example, an advanced skills teacher (AST) tied to a time-table in one or just a small number of primaries.

Networking, for example, putting headteachers in different parts of the authority in touch with one another over specific elements of language provision can also be enabled by this approach. However, this has not happened in all local authorities. Headteachers in two of the case study local authorities pointed out during both interviews that they had missed the networking with other headteacher colleagues whose schools were participating in the Pathfinder project.

Other benefits of local authority 'control' over provision were the appointment and induction of peripatetic foreign language assistants (FLAs) and the organisation of centrally located language and pedagogic training for class teachers. In one authority where the Pathfinder has funded additional numbers of FLAs and advisors' salaries, the advisory teacher explained:

'observations of FLAs are taking place nearly every day and observation proformas are completed following each lesson'. (advisory teacher)

This model, it was argued, was a good one for sustainability since the schools committed themselves to buying the services of the FLAs at a reasonable cost, while the local authority itself covered the greater proportion of the salary costs.

Such strong investment in a single person or small number of people to manage the delivery of primary languages, however, had its risks. People change careers, are promoted to new positions - as had been the case in at least one local authority. In one area there were fears that the local authority team would not continue in the same way as during the Pathfinder funding. One headteacher interviewee voiced the opinion:

'The three co-ordinators have worked very successfully as a team and it seems a pity that they will be broken up as a team after just one year.' (headteacher)

In another, one headteacher, recognising the possibility of political change at local level and the potential shifting of educational policies that might follow, stated:

'Were the local authority policy to change, it would be a very retrograde step because classroom teachers, even if they are currently much more confident about what they are doing, they would not be able to go up to the level of delivery of the assistants; they don't have the linguistic capability, the cultural knowledge or the energy to sustain that kind of work on top of their usual work.' (headteacher)

It was rare that advisors or advisory teachers had a single specialism such as primary languages. Even then, the work could end up rather skewed in nature with over-emphasis

on one aspect of delivery. This was certainly the case in one local authority, not one of the case-studies, where a newly appointed advisory teacher had found herself having to spend far too much time on developing resources in four languages to enable key teachers in schools to begin, as she put it:

'to convert paper promises into realistic activities'. (advisory teacher)

Numbers of schools taking part in the Pathfinder programme and their geographical location also determined how much time the local authority's language advisor could dedicate to particular schools. In one of the local authorities over 250 schools were said to be part of the Pathfinder while in another, only about 20 schools started in the first year. Also, in the latter authority, in the second year, the advisor was dividing his time between the first group of schools that had come into the scheme and the second wave. There was some indication that some teachers in the first group felt that the continuing professional development (CPD) provision had flagged somewhat.

Also, local authority based staff may not always be able to devote the necessary amount of time to primary languages. Their work may be re-directed to other priorities. The senior advisor in one local authority warned during interviews that the level of activity of his advisory teacher colleagues during the Pathfinder funding (four days per week each) could not possibly be sustained. He had estimated that £21k per annum of their Pathfinder work was subsidised by their not taking on more general local authority activities. In another local authority, the model adopted was one in which secondary ASTs went out to teach in local primaries. But the allocation of time was very variable across schools with, in one case, as little as 15 minutes contact time per class every two weeks.

For one language advisor in a local authority not included among the case-studies, concerns over sustainability were *'at the top of the list'*. That local authority model specialist was based on what he defined as *'coaching'* whereby secondary expert teachers or consultants sat in with non-primary class teachers demonstrating and working alongside them to build up their language skills and confidence. In the second year of the Pathfinder, this model was perceived to be too costly in time and money. Besides, there was a limit to the amount of expertise available and it was acknowledged that the amount of support needed had been underestimated.

There were, however, also advantages where the responsibility for managing the delivery of primary languages was based in a secondary school, most usually a Secondary Language College. In one local authority without a specialist advisor, the primary schools involved were very confident about sustainability. This authority built on previous pilot projects and

had considerable collaboration with outside agencies. The mood of optimism pervaded the teacher interviews during the case-study. A couple of examples suffice:

'It is so embedded in our curriculum that it will never disappear.'

'It will continue. We're not reliant on the Pathfinder any more. We have sustainability. Staff are trained so we don't need the visiting teacher.' (primary teachers)

Even in this local authority, though, few schools had *complete* plans for teaching languages through KS2.

Elsewhere, there had been problems. One practical difficulty encountered was a long term illness of a member of staff. This had really affected the capacity of the secondary school to sustain the work and had led to re-prioritising of duties and responsibilities. Some outreach work suffered, therefore, as secondary teachers were clawed back to the College. Solutions included more use of classroom assistants. But this one incident demonstrated the tenuous nature of provision and the need for what the co-ordinator called greater

'guaranteed capacity before setting out to involve even more primary schools and reach 100% coverage'. (LA co-ordinator)

In one local authority where day to day management of the Pathfinder had been the responsibility of the single Secondary Language College, there had been real problems about convincing other secondary schools to get involved. The original model was to have five secondary schools, each with a number of associated primary schools. This had been a successful model in the past for sports and PE in the borough. It had not worked, however, in languages. In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that the strength of opposition from other secondary schools in the borough had taken the Secondary Language College co-ordinator by surprise. It was recognised that the adjustments required in some schools (not language colleges) were rather complex and not likely to take place without better will to succeed.

A 'Building Schools for the Future' programme in one authority was perceived to have created a significant amount of concern about secondary closures and reorganisation. For many secondary schools, therefore, primary languages were not seen to be a priority in secondary heads' minds. As a result the Pathfinder had been obliged to reduce its scope from the first to the second year - hardly a policy designed to deliver the hoped for expansion in the bid – in order to concentrate efforts on *'going deeper into those primary schools already involved'* (Pathfinder co-ordinator).

3.5.5. Staff and staff expertise

In local authorities where significant numbers of FLAs were employed, there had been relatively few difficulties in recruiting native speakers to take part in primary languages. Some were recruited from abroad for short periods, but many had applied locally for these peripatetic posts and were in the second or third year of work. There can be no doubt that they brought, in most observed cases, youth, vitality, culture and authenticity to the language learning experience of the children. With intensive training and nurturing by local authority staff, and effective deployment in the schools, they were performing a very useful function in delivering the contents of national or local schemes of work. What some may have lacked in pedagogy, they made up for with the variety of their activities and the humour and sense of progress they generated in the children. One Pathfinder, operating in this way, through the direct employment of a larger team of FLAs, had enabled more schools to sample the presence of primary languages free of charge before deciding to enter a service level agreement to maintain their presence.

However, there were drawbacks to the use of FLAs. Apart from the fact that they were teaching in many different schools during the working week and could not therefore be expected to know the children as well as the class teachers (one such assistant was teaching over 900 pupils over a two week cycle), they were tending to concentrate their efforts, naturally, on the spoken language, leaving less interesting activities to the classroom teachers. In doing so, they seem to have created a bias which could make the class teachers' task more difficult.

It is also important as far as sustainability is concerned for local authorities where FLAs are employed longer term to create a career path for them. The idea of a new designation of higher skilled teaching assistant with a proper salary scale, pension rights etc. would mean fewer talented people leaving what is perceived to be a temporary 'fill-in' job.

Perhaps a distinction should be drawn here between FLAs who work over one school year and return home thereafter and those who may be resident in the UK. Short term assistantships are usually based in one or two schools. Some primary schools were offered FLAs as part of the local authority's provision through the Pathfinder, but were having to find the cost to sustain what they appreciated as a useful foreign presence from their own budgets.

It was felt by several headteachers that primary teachers' confidence was not yet at the point 'to go it alone'. They were still relying on secondary teachers being present. Some, it was

considered, may, even in the longer term, be capable only of support work. One headteacher was actively considering alternative solutions:

'We are also looking at a wider range of options: language assistants and other people with language competence, including native speakers, who are not necessarily tied to a timetable. There is a need to consider a long-term plan of how these kinds of people can be trained and supported with a real career to make the national policy work.' (headteacher)

The use of native speaker assistants was seen to be a very cost effective way of ensuring basic levels of provision, but it was recognised by most headteachers in most local authorities that it was necessary to increase the linguistic and methodological skills of the classroom teachers if the whole of KS2 was to be provided with a proper languages diet in the future. There was still very heavy reliance in a number of local authorities on the presence of external experts, either in the form of FLAs or secondary outreach teachers. One headteacher, though perhaps overstating the case, stressed the need for continuing support:

'The initial idea of going in and setting something up and the primary teachers then taking it on themselves is difficult to run. They have so little time and for them to turn around and start writing schemes of work and to start producing all the materials without any help is very, very difficult. I don't think it is enough for primary colleagues just to be sent on X amount of courses and to be told: there you go, that's your training and that's enough.' (headteacher)

Getting the class teachers to take a more active role in lessons when they observe assistants or visiting teachers, and in between visits, were acknowledged to be problems for sustainability in at least three local authorities. In the words of one AST:

'There is tremendous variation in how much they will join in and how much they follow up afterwards.' (AST)

One outreach teacher was proud of the increasingly active role of several of her class teacher colleagues, but there was also the recognition that there was a long way to go before even these keener and more confident teachers could take over entirely the whole of the teaching.

Some classteachers interviewed admitted that it was not always possible to devote as much time to languages in between the FLAs lessons. One confessed:

'Usually it is impromptu: 10 or 15 minutes of French at the end of lessons, but the timetable is very busy and it is sometimes less.' (primary teacher)

This was not untypical of reactions. The challenge of getting primary classroom teachers to engage more with the language work should not be underestimated. There were success stories in some local authorities where:

'as resources are developed and the teachers are more ready to have a go when the door is shut' (Pathfinder co-ordinator) language confidence, boosted and supported by a good supply of materials and ICT developments, is seen to be less of a problem. But in others, there was still a long way to go before schools could *'go it alone'* (Pathfinder co-ordinator).

One discerning headteacher pushed the argument further and considered that her own teachers needed:

'to step up their efforts and skills to be able to teach a proper form of language syllabus – one based on the national curriculum, not just the fun-like, basic level as at present.' (headteacher)

Some Pathfinder local authorities with substantial, previous experience of primary languages had fewer problems with sustaining their provision. This was at least partly due to the fact that efforts had been made to produce a clearly defined scheme of work and resources to accompany it as well as a continuing programme of training sessions. Access to technology was also seen to provide an additional 'mechanism for sustainability'. One headteacher summed it up thus:

'The fact that we've been doing it for so long and it's custom and practice and it's what we do; we have the resources that (...) have provided available and when these interactive whiteboards really kick in across all classes and the links through to the Internet, the world's our oyster because there are so many more resources available.' (headteacher)

Resources were considered to be the key mechanism for sustainability in another Pathfinder. The advisor/co-ordinator, as mentioned earlier, had decided to focus on materials development in four languages with teachers' guides to accompany the learning resources, but justified the concentration of effort in this way:

'I think that you cannot rely on individual people for sustaining provision. It has to be something more permanent and accessible. It's really the training of class teachers through the resources.' (advisory teacher)

Sustainability depends very much on staff turnover (or lack of it) and staff expertise. Therefore, a major challenge facing schools is that of retaining key staff, especially those who have been 'trained up'.

One headteacher was particularly worried about the possible departure of a key classroom teacher who had been supported over two years with various training. In another school, a Year 6 class teacher, having spent five years building up her French and French teaching skills, was going to move year groups the following year to KS1, where she would not immediately use her newly acquired skills. The move, prompted by a desire for professional development and work with different age groups, would leave a gaping hole in the school's French provision. There was the hope that the next Year 5 teacher would be able to develop her skills rapidly, '*provided the same level of support was maintained*' (headteacher). But this was not guaranteed.

This kind of scenario was reported as a single incident in the research, but such staff movements within schools are certainly not unusual and can create major obstacles for maintaining provision, let alone expanding it. There were also schools in which a particular teacher provided language teaching in classes other than her own, either to help boost class teachers' confidence and skills or simply because there was no other language 'expertise' available in the school. Sustainability in these circumstances was also threatened by the possible departure of such persons.

Some schools had good links with local higher education institutions and were thus making good use of the gradually increasing numbers of trainee teachers on placement. In no way, however, could this be considered a guaranteed form of provision unless those same trainees took up a permanent post in their practice schools. In one primary school, two classroom assistants who were providing some language time in addition to their regular duties had decided to spend a year following the initial primary languages training at the local university. The headteacher was disappointed at what was going to be a year of reduced language experience for her pupils. However, she had high hopes that the two women would return to teaching, with better developed linguistic and pedagogical skills, in *her* school rather than any other.

Reforms to the teaching profession, specifically the introduction of Preparation, Planning and Assessment (PPA) was perceived to be both an advantage and a threat to primary languages. On the one hand, it will provide an opportunity to schools to use FLAs or other classroom assistants with language skills to fill the time vacated by teachers. One headteacher explained:

'The reason why I have decided to do that is that we've got to supply this PPA time. So the teachers have got to come out of class and I don't want to just buy in Jo Bloggs supply teacher to go into the class...because we are supposed to also be raising standards...so if I am going to put some one else in there, I would rather it was for something specific and it might as well be for French.' (headteacher)

For another headteacher, however, PPA was likely to cause financial problems.

'The Pathfinder has given a boost but my concern is that if it is not carried on there will be real difficulties. And there are so many other drains on schools' resources. The arrival of PPA in September will create special problems. MFL has not been funded properly and it doesn't look as if it is going to be. MFL could well fall by the wayside because it's not an immediate priority.' (headteacher)

It is clear from this overview of staffing issues that sustainability is not yet guaranteed across the local authorities. The different models provide different challenges for maintaining the level of teaching and learning that the Pathfinder has helped to generate. Very few schools had secure plans to cover the whole of KS2 teaching. Quite a few schools were found to be developing pupils' language skills in KS1 even though KS2 was not fully 'covered'. This was simply because the language teaching was taking place where the teacher's skills were to be found and encouraged.

It was discovered that in one case study school, children in different years (Reception, Year 4 and Year 5) were following an identical syllabus, receiving the same content: basic personal information plus colours, numbers, pets etc. But there was no overall strategy for progression from year to year. Staff expertise was scattered and staff moved around between different year groups from time to time. Most of the class teachers had limited skills and were only just about capable of dealing with these basics. This model is almost bound to grind to a halt when pupils realise that they are covering the same work over and over again.

Staffing was perceived to be a real problem. The slogan '*train and retain*' was used by one co-ordinator based in a Secondary Language College to stress the need for a coherent programme of initial and further CPD. Even the current outreach teachers, he claimed, needed support in their new mentoring role of training and supporting their primary colleagues.

3.5.6. Children's experiences

As mentioned in the introduction, sustaining the enthusiasm of young learners is crucial to the success of primary languages. There were signs that older pupils (Year 6), although still very excited about foreign language learning, were becoming aware that lessons were getting more difficult and that there was, as one boy put it *'an awful lot of words to learn.'*

Children referred to what they saw as increasing difficulty in the content of lessons and pupils who had been learning for more than one year were suggesting that they were losing some interest in the teaching:

'In German, all we have to do is repeat what the teacher says – that's a bit boring.' (pupil)

Games were popular but there was some feeling that they wanted more than just games. One Year 6 boy expressed some frustration with games:

'It's a fair lesson but sometimes when you do games, it's pushing it a bit over the edge. We don't want to waste our time. We want to go to school and learn. French games go on too long.' (pupil)

Another problem with games was that the brighter pupils felt that they were held back to allow other pupils to speak and get the points when they knew the answers.

Many pupils appreciated their class teacher's expertise in the foreign language, their style of teaching and the new way of relating to them through foreign language lessons. Others, however, made comments which demonstrated that they clearly understood the difference between French and the subjects in which they had to work hard for the SATs. They could also recognise the differences in teaching approaches between visiting native speaker teachers and the class teacher, the latter appearing to them to rely too heavily on games and not getting the same level of pupil participation.

These points are mentioned to draw attention to a potential problem. Language learning currently tends to be a light-hearted, fun experience which primary pupils, with very few exceptions, enjoyed immensely. As long as it remains so, pupils will 'play along' with the lessons and learn accordingly. The nature of the teaching was such that adequate skills to teach the basics may be acquired by non-specialists. However, in order to sustain pupils' enthusiasm, they also need to be provided with more variety in lessons, including more challenging work so that:

- a) content is more appropriate for their stage of cognitive development;
- b) the status of foreign languages is raised in their minds so that it is seen to be more than just a break from 'real' lessons;

- c) there is obvious progression from year to year;
- d) there is more convergence between children's foreign language learning experience in primary and secondary school, thereby enabling
- e) secondary schools to acknowledge and take greater account of the prior learning of pupils entering year 7.

3.6. Cost Analysis

3.6.1. Summary

The overall mean cost of the Pathfinder per LA was calculated as being £400,461 including primary teacher teaching time, or £272,520 not including primary teacher teaching time.

The bulk of this was made up of personnel costs, which accounted for over 92% of total costs. Most of the remainder was made up of the cost of resources (7%), with travel costs and communication costs making up a small proportion of the total. When teacher teaching time was deducted from overall costs, staff costs fell to 89% of total costs, with resources up to 10%.

Costs differed significantly between local authorities, from a mean of £719 per school in the lowest case, to a mean of £19,374 in the highest case including teaching time, and a mean of £622 in the lowest and 16,895 in the highest not including teaching time.

3.6.2. Recommendations

- Better accounting of costs needs to be encouraged in future Pathfinder programmes, including full reporting of spending on different aspects.
- Full account needs to be taken of costs and opportunity costs when making choices on delivery models, especially where scale up of Pathfinders programmes is desired. The large amount of voluntary time spent in Pathfinder cannot necessarily be replicated elsewhere.
- Funding for Pathfinders needs to be provided on the basis of full costs, with distribution of resources over a lower number of Pathfinders being more desirable in terms of testing models for scale up than underfunding a larger number of Pathfinders.

3.6.3. Introduction

While evaluation has long focused on the effectiveness of intervention programmes in delivering the desired outcomes, interest in studying value for money and cost is more recent. However, it is clearly a key element of any evaluation if we are to be able to make valid judgements on the value of any given intervention in education, in view of the many competing claims for time and resources in an environment in which these are always going

to be constrained. Methodologies generally described as cost effectiveness analyses have therefore become increasingly popular, though they are by no means without problems.

Firstly, the term cost effectiveness analysis refers to evaluation of programmes in terms of both their costs and effects. This means that the effect of the programme needs to be quantifiable and clear, such as would be the case if the aim was an increase in GCSE grades. In programmes such as the languages Pathfinder, where the aims are broader and less readily quantifiable, this becomes problematic, especially as no overarching Pathfinder models were found.

A related term is cost-benefit analysis, which refers to analysis where not just the cost but the outcomes are quantifiable in monetary terms. In education this would be the case where we would be looking at the impact of an intervention on the future earning potential of students, for example. In the case of the languages Pathfinder, this would not be possible as the relevant data are not available.

Cost-value analysis relates costs to qualitative judgements on the impact of programmes. This is obviously easier to do in cases such as this where the outcome data is not in itself quantitative, but has the disadvantage that no clear quantitative measure of effectiveness can be given.

3.6.4. Instruments and methodology

Determining the costs of educational interventions is a complex and fraught procedure, in part because full costing, including the use of opportunity costing, is uncommon in education. Also, participants in educational interventions are often not aware of the full costs thereof. Funding usually only takes into account direct costs and programmes are often undercosted with regards to, in particular, time spent by participants. Educational interventions such as this one rely to an extent on enthusiasm propelling participants to additional effort, which is one of the key problems when interventions, however successful they appear, are scaled up.

The ideal method of collecting costs would have been to put in place mechanisms to directly collect data on time spent, and any expenditure made, in schools and LAs through, for example, logs, accounts and diary methods. However, the scope of this evaluation did not allow us to expend this type of effort, and the burden this would have placed on school and local authority personnel would have been problematic. Therefore we opted to use

interviews with local authority advisors and teachers and headteachers in the case study sites as the means of data collection.

The team established the main cost categories in terms of the Pathfinder as:

3.6.4.1. Staff costs

Including:

- Local authority advisor time
- Local authority administrative and clerical staff time
- Other local authority staff time (e.g. ICT staff, management)
- Primary teacher time
- Secondary teacher time
- Foreign Language Assistant time
- School administrative support time
- School management support time
- Other school staff support time

Staff costs are by far the greatest cost in most educational interventions and were therefore a key factor in this analysis. Staff costs are determined by staff pay and time spent on the project. Both posed challenges in this context.

Staff pay was difficult to collect directly, both due to the high number of people involved in the project, especially on the teacher side, and to the confidentiality of pay and reward. Salary was therefore calculated as a common mean for all staff in a category. Teachers, school managers and AST salaries were calculated based on the official teacher pay scales. An average teacher was rated as being at scale point 4. Where specific mention was made of more experienced teachers, upper scale point 1 was used. Management scales were used for staff identified as such. Headteachers were rated as higher on the management pay scales if they were secondary than if they were primary heads. Salary of local authority advisors was based on point 20 of the Soulbury grades. Language Assistant salaries were based on research including contact with schools and heads, and study of job advertisements in the Times Educational Supplement. Local authority administrative time was based on typical secretarial and administrative salaries, as gathered from informants at Newcastle City Council.

Time spent on the project was gathered through the local authority advisor interviews, during which advisors were asked to estimate the time spent on the project by themselves, other local authority staff, and school based staff, and through the case study visit interviews, where teachers and heads were asked to estimate their own time spent on the project. It is clear that, as this is again an indirect measure, and estimating time spent on particular activities is sometimes hard for individuals. It was noticeable in the data that while there was a high level of consensus between teachers on their own time spent on the project, this was not the case for local authority advisors. This was largely due to the different models employed in different local authorities, though in some cases advisors appeared to have overestimated actual time spent on the project (65 hours a week and 60 hours a week being mentioned). As our view was that these numbers represented either exaggeration or poor time management skills, these were revised downwards to the maximum allowed under the European Working Time Directive, 48 hours.

Interviewees were asked to rate the number of hours spent per week, as this was considered to be a timescale that respondents could quantify relatively easily. This did mean that we were left with the task of calculating actual number of hours per week, taking into account holiday and leave. For teaching staff and Learning Assistants, this was done using the official terms and conditions for the profession, which stipulate a 195 day year, which equates to 39 weeks. For non-school staff this exercise was again more complex. We decided to follow precedent from work done by the Department of Health, suggesting a 42 week year taking into account holiday, leave and sickness.

Another issue that came to the fore in these analyses was what exactly to include as part of teaching staff work, as it could be argued that we did not have to include teaching time as teaching staff would be engaged in the teaching of other subjects when not teaching languages anyway. However, from a cost effectiveness perspective this would have been problematic, as this would not have taken into account the opportunity cost associated with teaching languages as part of the Pathfinder. This opportunity cost was associated with the fact that time spent teaching languages had, in view of the limits of school time, been to the detriment of teaching another subject or other activities in the school which may have made an equally valid claim on teacher time (Levin & McEwen, 1999). However, in terms of additional costs of the Pathfinder it could also be argued that these costs should be left out. We have therefore undertaken both analyses, with the proviso that additional preparation time for the development of Pathfinder materials has been added.

As is clear from the above, the results described here were subject to a number of assumptions around salaries, working time and so on which make any findings tentative. A sensitivity analysis was carried out to explore the susceptibility of findings to changes in these assumptions, and this will be discussed below. As well as this, the fact that data were collected on the basis of interview and self-report makes the analyses susceptible to unreliability caused by faulty recall, perceptual errors and self-presentation bias. By collecting data from a range of respondents (local authority advisors, teachers, heads), we have attempted to build in triangulation of data sources, which has allowed us to arrive at mean values which are more stable and reliable than individual estimates. The only data for which this was not possible was data on local authority advisor time, which was based solely on local authority advisor self-report.

3.6.4.2. Travel costs

Including:

- Local authority advisor travel
- Secondary teacher travel
- Primary teacher travel
- Other staff travel
- Travel is further subdivided by mode of transport (e.g. car, rail)

Travel costs were again based on self-report estimates from interviews with local authority advisors, headteachers and teachers. Respondents were asked to estimate average miles travelled for Pathfinder purposes in one week, and were asked whether this was done by car or public transport. Costs were calculated as being 38p per mile for car transport, a commonly used cost estimate in the public sector. It was found that public transport was not used to any extent for Pathfinder travel.

3.6.4.3. Cost of development of resources.

This included:

- Development of own resources. This included the cost of materials, bought in expertise, and time additional to that covered under staff costs.
- Bought in resources, such as packs and materials, e.g. Pilote, Early years.
- 'Free' resources, such as materials provided to schools by the local authority.

Estimating development costs of resources, especially self-developed, but in some cases purchased as well, was found to be difficult for respondents. They often had little idea of the cost of materials or time spent on the development of resources. This was not true of all respondents, some of whom were able to provide detailed estimates. However, many respondents, at both the school and local authority level were unable to do so. In these cases, an additional 5% was added to the total cost for the local authority (this being the mean cost of resources in educational interventions, Levin 2000). In cases where the data were incomplete, an additional 3% was added. Again, this points to the strong reliance of the data both on reliable reporting from respondents and on assumptions about cost factors.

3.6.4.4. Cost of use of existing resources.

This included hired office space, stationery and materials costs, use of other school resources, mailing costs and ICT use.

We have not estimated the cost of use of classrooms and local authority offices used by advisors. This is potentially contentious, as the same argument made for estimating teaching time on languages (opportunity costs) could also be made for use of classrooms, local authority offices etc. However, collecting these data would have stretched the resources of the evaluation team, as respondents would have found it difficult to give a reliable estimate of the cost of classrooms or offices in their buildings. Collecting the data would therefore have required the estimation of the value of buildings used by each local authority and school, then a calculation of the approximate value of rooms used. This would have required both an extensive study of local property markets (in view of large differences between, for example, Richmond and Oldham, but also within local authorities, e.g. Tynemouth or Meadowell in North Tyneside), and of use of individual rooms by teachers and other Pathfinder staff.

Data on materials, stationery etc. were collected through interviews with LA and school respondents. Again, the extent to which respondents were able to quantify this differed strongly, and was strongly related to the extent to which they could quantify developed and bought resources. Where respondents were unable to quantify, this was included in the 5% or 3% addition mentioned above.

3.6.4.5. Communication costs.

This included fixed and mobile phone calls made for the Pathfinder, e-mails, post and text messaging.

Data were again collected through interview. Fixed line phone calls were costed at 12p/minute, in accordance with standard BT tariffs. Mobile phone calls were costed at 20p/minute, the average rate for Vodaphone, the largest operator in the UK. This estimate did not incorporate possible corporate rates, so may be an overestimate. Post was costed at the standard second class rate of 21p. Again, this did not take into account corporate rates, so may again be an overestimate. E-mail communication was deemed as being negligible in cost.

3.6.5. Overall Estimated cost of the Pathfinder

The overall mean cost of the Pathfinder per local authority was calculated as being £400,461 including primary teacher teaching time, or £272,520 not including primary teacher teaching time.

The bulk of this was made up of personnel costs, which accounted for over 92% of total costs. Most of the remainder was made up of the cost of resources (7%), with travel costs and communication costs making up a small proportion of the total. When teacher teaching time was deducted from overall costs, staff costs fell to 89% of total costs, with resources up to 10%.

Calculated by school, the average cost per school (primary Pathfinder) was estimated as £7,119 including primary teacher teaching time, though this calculation was complicated by differences among respondents within a local authority on the number of schools involved in the Pathfinder, and comments relating to the fact that some schools nominally perceived to be in the Pathfinder were said not to be actively participating. Deducting primary teacher teaching time the average cost per school fell to £6,508.

It will be noted that these cost estimates were higher than the actual allocation of funding for the Pathfinder (taking into account that this is a yearly estimate). This was largely due to undercosting of staff time.

There were significant differences between Pathfinders in cost, the lowest calculated cost being just over £115,000, the highest over £1.7 million including teaching costs, and between £39,859 and £865,105 not including primary teacher teaching time. These differences in part reflected large differences in the number of schools per Pathfinder. However, costs per school also differed significantly between local authorities, from a mean of £719 in the lowest case, to a mean of £19,374 in the highest case including teaching time, and a mean of £622 in the lowest and 16,895 in the highest not including teaching time.

Significant variance existed in local authority level costs as well. The main elements of these were local authority advisor staff time. Costs for admin/secretarial support were the second largest cost post, while additional costs were taken up by resource development and purchase and line manager time. Local authority advisors spent an average of 16.2 hours a week working on the Pathfinder. This mean hid significant variance, however, with the lowest number being 2 hours a week and the highest 48. In most local authorities one advisor was working on the project, in some it was two or three.

At the school level, the main cost was teacher time. Teachers involved in the Pathfinder spent an average of 1.8 hours a week on this activity. Variance was far smaller than among local authority advisors, ranging from 30 minutes a week to 14 hours (a small number of ASTs in one local authority). Not including ASTs, the range was 0.5-2.5. It has to be pointed out that these means applied to teachers involved in the Pathfinder only. The number of teachers involved differed depending on the Pathfinder, with just 7 schools involved in the smallest, and 474 in the largest, though in the latter actual involvement was said to be 'patchy' (this was taken into account in the analyses by halving the nominal number of teachers involved in this Pathfinder local authority).

Depending on the model used, significant costs were associated with work by secondary teachers and/or Foreign Language Assistants. Differences here will be discussed when the cost effectiveness of the different models of delivery is examined more closely.

As mentioned above, resource development and purchase formed the bulk of the remaining costs. Many respondents found it hard to estimate costs in this area. In local authorities where reasonable estimates were made, they ranged from £4,500 to £61,000, with most estimates being around £20,000. Local authorities varied strongly as to whether the bulk of costs were made up of purchases of existing resources or the development of new resources.

3.6.6. Sensitivity analysis

As mentioned above, the cost effectiveness analyses undertaken were based on a number of assumptions, which could strongly affect the findings of this section. To test the impact of these assumptions, a sensitivity analysis was carried out on the two key variables in the analysis, time spent on the project by key staff and salaries of key staff. This allowed us to estimate the extent to which changes in these assumptions were likely to affect the final result of the analyses.

3.6.6.1. Time

The time variable was especially crucial with regards to the amount of time spent by local authority advisors and teachers. Both were analysed.

For local authority advisors, the first analysis looked at a downwards revision (to 37 hours a week) of the time estimates of those advisors that had put in very high estimates of their own time. This did not have a significant impact on overall staff costs, which reduced by less than half a percentage point. The impact on costings for individual local authorities was greater, but still remained below 2% in all cases. Following this, a similar analysis was done revising upwards (to 10 hours a week) the time commitment of local authority advisors who had estimated their time at less than 10 hours a week. This had a similar impact on overall and local authority specific costs as the downwards revision of high outliers. A further set of analyses attempted to look at the sensitivity of the analyses to this variable by looking at the impact of increasing/decreasing advisor time by two hours across the board. This led to an impact of .6 of a percent. Overall, then, it can be concluded that the analyses were not overly sensitive to changes in reported advisor time. As advisor time is the bulk of total local authority level time, the impact of changes on estimated time commitments of other local authority staff will be smaller.

The main staff cost was teacher time. A number of sensitivity analyses were conducted on this variable. A first analysis consisted of a downwards revision of all high estimates to 3 hours a week. This included ASTs and specialist teachers, who in some cases were estimated to do up to 37 hours a week on Pathfinder work. This led to a total impact of 8.7% on staff costs, and up to 18% impact in some local authorities. An across the board revision, whereby teacher time was increased by two hours for all teachers, resulted in a highly significant 19% increase in overall staff costs. An even greater impact was obtained where all low estimates were revised upwards to 2 hours a week. The total impact of this was 27%

on staff costs, with the impact on some individual local authority estimates being even larger. Therefore, it can be concluded that the analyses were highly sensitive to errors in the estimates of teacher time. Luckily in most cases significant triangulation existed, with data from a range of interviewees allowing for higher reliability of these estimates than of the estimates of local authority advisor time or resources, which would (hopefully) have limited this problem.

3.6.6.2. Salary

As mentioned above, assumptions regarding salary scale points were made in calculating salary costs. In general, it was assumed that staff were towards the midpoint of scales, unless indications were given that staff were, e.g. 'experienced'. Again, sensitivity of the analyses to errors in this assumption was tested using both advisor and teacher salaries as examples.

A revision of advisor hourly rates by 10% resulted in a change to overall salary costs of just 0.4%, once again showing limited sensitivity to changes in local authority level salary costs. A 10% upwards revision of teacher salary costs had a stronger impact, increasing salary costs by just over 6%.

Overall, then, it would seem that the analyses were highly sensitive to errors in the reporting of teacher time spent on the project. There was some sensitivity to errors in estimation of teacher salary rates, and of course these could be exacerbated because of differences in salaries between local authorities. This is a serious caveat around these analyses. The analyses were far less sensitive to errors at the local authority level. However, school level variables were probably more reliable due to triangulation from different data sources (interviewees) than local authority level variables. As the other variables accounted for less than 8% of the total cost, sensitivity to errors therein would have been limited.

3.6.7. Cost differences for different delivery models

As mentioned earlier, it was not possible to arrive at overarching Pathfinder models. However, it was possible to discern, across Pathfinders, different delivery models (see section 2). The three main ones identified were use of an outreach teacher, use of primary teachers and use of FLAs in delivering primary languages. The relative cost of these alternatives depended on the inclusion or exclusion of primary teacher time as an

opportunity cost. If an outreach model is given as 100%, then the relative average cost of the other models is:

- Including primary teacher teaching time:
 - If secondary outreach = 100%
 - FLA model = 63%
 - primary teacher model = 115%

- Not including primary teacher teaching time:
 - If secondary outreach = 100%
 - FLA model = 63%
 - primary teacher model = 79%

As with the other analyses in this section, attention needs to be drawn to a number of assumptions. The first assumption relates to training costs. It was assumed that while training costs would be highest for primary teachers, in view of the language competence issues identified above, there would still be significant training needs for both secondary outreach teachers and FLAs in terms of primary pedagogy, as suggested in our recommendations given above. Further assumptions were similar to those mentioned above, with regards to salary costs, overheads and time, and were therefore sensitive to variations in salaries. It may, for example, be the case that if the employment of FLAs were to increase strongly, salary costs would increase due to scarcity of suitably qualified staff in the marketplace.

These figures are also a mean, and therefore dependent on the specific staff configuration and capacities within particular local authorities.

Finally, these cost estimates do not constitute a recommendation for any particular model. Rather, they need to be read in conjunction with the advantages and disadvantages of the different models discussed in section 2, and interpreted with care taking into account local circumstances, capacity and salary and wage conditions.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Overall, this evaluation shows that the Pathfinder has made a significant contribution to either building on existing foreign languages provision or by starting up languages in schools and local authorities (LAs) where this was not previously provided. Time for languages was found successfully in Pathfinder schools and in the best examples incorporated elements of discrete language lessons, curricular integration and cross curricular links. Languages were generally received enthusiastically by pupils, parents and teachers and there was a perceived positive impact on pupils' wider learning. The Pathfinder has generated a great deal of enthusiasm amongst participating teachers, pupils and heads, who appear convinced of the advantages of language learning in terms of cognitive development and cultural understanding. Many examples of good language teaching practice were found in the classrooms, and many Pathfinders had produced excellent resources and worksheets.

The Pathfinder has allowed LAs and schools to experiment with different delivery models, something which appeared to be occurring within as well as between LAs. This diversity has allowed schools and LAs to adapt the Pathfinder to local needs and capacity, but has also meant that overarching delivery models were not present in this diverse landscape.

Alongside these successes, this evaluation also points to a number of challenges for the development of languages in primary schools. Teacher capacity is a key factor if national roll out is envisaged. Primary teachers appeared to lack confidence and linguistic skills, while secondary outreach teachers often lack knowledge of primary pedagogy. Training and professional development will therefore have to be key elements of any national programme. Better differentiation, which caters fully to the needs of pupils with Special Educational Needs and Gifted and Talented pupils, is a continuing development need. Assessment and progression were other areas in need of further development. It is clear that schemes of work need to be developed that include assessment mechanisms to prevent unnecessary repetition and hence help to avoid lack of progress. Transition mechanisms to secondary likewise need developing, and some rethinking of the KS3 curriculum will be necessary as a result of the KS2 Languages entitlement. Finally, if national provision is to be successful, full account needs to be taken of capacity issues and associated costs.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Content and Delivery

- All primary schools should be encouraged to draw up a *policy document* for Primary Languages provision with a rationale, clear short and longer term aims, and an indication of outcomes expected, staffing, time allocation, scheme of work, resources, assessment procedures, and transition arrangements.
- Languages are most effectively integrated into the curriculum by working upwards from Year 3 and schools should be encouraged to make a start in this way.
- Schemes of work should be devised, used and developed in all cases, ideally collaboratively with other bodies (primary clusters, secondary schools, local authorities etc.).
- Schools should be encouraged to base their planning on schemes of work, in order to assist progression and assessment. These schemes of work should be based on appropriate primary pedagogy and not on KS3 schemes of work and should be provided where possible.
- Schools should be encouraged to set aside at least 40 minutes weekly plus 20 minutes incidental time for primary languages. Primary schools have the advantage of being able to offer more exposure to languages within routines, incidental language use and integration within cross curricular work, than do secondary schools. This additional time should be exploited.
- Schools should aim towards integrating primary languages across the curriculum including cross-curricular aspects in the languages lessons.
- Native speaker contact and cultural awareness should form an integral part of the primary languages experience.
- Catering for the needs of all pupils and differentiation strategies in languages should be a focus for schools.

5.2. Teacher Competence

- Primary teachers' linguistic competence (and confidence) should be a priority for training. Appropriate resources are key: these should include CDs or DVDs to support pronunciation and to provide models for both pupils and teachers.
- The level and diversity of training for teachers needs to be further developed. CPD needs to be provided for a range of deliverers: As well as primary teachers, for FLAs, native speakers from within the community, HLTAs and TAs, and secondary teachers, including ASTs. *NB. Training substantial numbers of primary teachers may affect language diversification.*
- Both primary and secondary teachers should receive methodological training appropriate to the key stage and the subject.
- Differentiated training should be provided for teachers at different stages in implementing primary languages. Schools just starting out need one type of training as do primary class teachers just beginning to introduce primary languages into their own classes. Schools with some experience and building on previous years' work, need training to help them sustain and develop provision, as do primary languages co-ordinators.
- Teachers should be given the option of continuing to observe languages teaching to enable them to support or take over primary languages delivery.
- Contact between the outreach teachers and primary colleagues needs to be improved.
- There is a wide range of quality resources available through the Pathfinders; this should be provided and exploited in order to meet the linguistic and methodological needs of the teachers. Such resources have proved in some cases almost comprehensive in their coverage.
- Schemes of work should be accompanied where possible by teaching packs, including lesson plans, visuals (flashcards or OHTs), audio CDs, DVD and CD-ROM, so that the busy primary teachers have minimal additional burdens searching out appropriate resources and preparing sessions.
- Primary and secondary schools should be encouraged to work in clusters, in order to build up networks, inter-school contacts between primary and secondary and to facilitate joint planning and preparation of materials.
- ITE providers should be encouraged to adapt their current primary PGCE and undergraduate courses to ensure that all trainees are informed about the primary

languages entitlement and can support and contribute to its effective implementation.

- Similarly, secondary PGCE courses need to be modified so that secondary languages trainees are better prepared to support/work with primary colleagues in the delivery of languages, as well as being better equipped to meet the developing needs at KS3 and particularly in Year 7.

5.3. Progression and Assessment

- Schools should be encouraged to base their planning on coherent schemes of work which will assist progression throughout KS2.
- Particular attention should be given to planning where vertical groupings occur in order to avoid content repetition.
- Assessment opportunities should be built into the schemes of work.
- Pupils should receive individual feedback on their performance as in other subjects.
- Methods of recording progression, for example profile sheets, should be developed.
- Teachers should receive training in assessing languages.

5.4. Transition and Transfer

- Transition arrangements for primary languages between primary and secondary sectors should be improved.
- KS2 and KS3 should be thought of as a coherent whole, not as two separate programmes.
- Primary schools should introduce more coherent programmes, so that the aims and outcomes of primary languages are clearer to secondary schools and they know what foundation they are building on.
- Secondary schools should:
 - treat information exchange more seriously and act on information received.
 - plan carefully to adjust practice in KS3 and especially in Year 7.
- Funding should be provided:
 - to allow for the inevitable changes in the KS3 curriculum that will be required as KS2 primary languages beds down.

- for training secondary teachers in developing effective differentiation strategies to cater for the range of different experiences where setting potential is not available.
- Secondary PGCE courses need to be modified so that secondary languages trainees are better prepared to support/work with primary colleagues in the delivery of languages, as well as being better equipped to meet the developing needs at KS3 and particularly in Year 7.
- Further national research should be conducted to examine particular key issues such as transition, in a limited number of case study schools.

5.5. Sustainability and Replicability

- Primary headteachers need more information about the value of foreign language learning.
- Similarly, a concerted campaign needs to take place targeting secondary headteachers so that the status of primary languages can be raised and steps can be taken to take account of the impact of primary provision on secondary schools.
- There is need for better dissemination of good practice within and across local authorities, especially involving headteachers, in order to support the integration of languages in the curriculum.
- While initiatives to introduce children to foreign language learning in KS1 are welcome, these should not distract schools from building a coherent and progressive programme throughout KS2.
- If further funding becomes available, time should be allowed for key appointments to be made so that developments can take place in a more organised way.
- Local authorities should appoint specialist primary language advisors or advisory teachers to oversee training and co-ordination of resources.
- Training courses should be provided at national and local level, not only for developing language skills of primary teachers but also to support the mentoring skills of secondary outreach teachers.

- Local Authorities and schools should consider carefully the terms of employment and working conditions of permanently resident native speaker assistants. A valid career path for such posts should also be established.
- The use of PPA in the context of language provision should be carefully monitored.
- Primary language teachers should recognise the need to introduce more challenging activities in the final years of KS2 and should be supported in this with appropriate resources and training courses.

5.7.1 Cost Analysis

- Better accounting of costs needs to be encouraged in future Pathfinder programmes, including full reporting of spending on different aspects.
- Full account needs to be taken of costs and opportunity costs when making choices on delivery models, especially where scale up of Pathfinders programmes is desired. The large amount of voluntary time spent in Pathfinder cannot necessarily be replicated elsewhere.
- Funding for Pathfinders needs to be provided on the basis of full costs, with distribution of resources over a lower number of Pathfinders being more desirable in terms of testing models for scale up than underfunding a larger number of Pathfinders.

References

- Bell, E with Cox, K. (1996) Integrating a modern language into the infant school curriculum, in: A. Hurrell & P. Satchwell (Eds) *Reflections on modern languages in primary education: Six UK case studies* (London, CILT), 43-54.
- Driscoll, P, Jones, J and Macrory, G (2004) The Provision of Foreign Language Learning for Pupils at Key Stage 2, DfES Research Report RR572
- Hunt, M.; Powell, B.; Barnes, A.; Muijs, D & Lindsay, G. (forthcoming) Primary Modern Foreign Languages: an overview of recent research, key issues and challenges for educational policy and practice. Accepted for publication in *Research Papers in Education*
- Levin, H. & McEwan, P. (1999). *Cost Effectiveness Analysis 2nd Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Levin, H. (2000). *A Comprehensive Framework for Evaluating Educational Vouchers*. New York, National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education: 39.
- Martin, C. (2000) Modern foreign languages at primary school: A three pronged approach? *Language Learning Journal* 22 5-10
- Martin, C (2001a) Early MFL learning for the millennium. *Education 3-13* 29 2 43-48
- Martin, C (2001b) Review and analysis of national and international research on the provision of modern foreign languages in primary schools. Report for the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. London: QCA
- Martin, C. and Farren A (2004) Working together. Native speaker assistants in the primary school. London: Cilt.
- Martin, C and Mitchell, R (1993) Foreign language assistants in the primary school. *Language Learning Journal* 8 32-34
- Muijs, D. & Reynolds, D. (2000). School Effectiveness and Teacher Effectiveness: Some Preliminary Findings from the Evaluation of the Mathematics Enhancement Programme. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11(3), 247-263.
- Muir, 1999 Classroom connections, in: P. Driscoll and D. Frost (Eds) *The teaching of modern foreign languages in the primary school* (London, Routledge).
- Reynolds et al 2003 – please remove this one
- Teddlie, C., & Stringfield, S. (1993). *Schools make a difference: Lessons learned from a 10-year study of school effects*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Tierney and Hope, 1998 *Making the link* (London, CILT).
- Woods, P. (1996b). *Researching the Art of Teaching: Ethnography for Educational Use*. London: Routledge.

Case Study 1

This Pathfinder is one of the largest LAs in the country with over 400 primary schools starting Primary Languages generally from a fairly low base line, although some retain provision from an earlier period. Delivery was based on the principle of several specialist colleges, either language or technology colleges, and their partner secondary schools, working with their feeder primaries in clusters. These schools covered a range of types, circumstances and geographical spread from small rural schools to affluent urban and suburban districts. The overall aim was language competence, with an immersion project in one cluster, and a cross-curricular project in another non-case study site. In line with secondary MFL provision, languages were French, German and Spanish, although French was the main language and the one being delivered in the five case study schools. Across the Pathfinder, some schools had started in Year 6 and were working down Key Stage 2, and in others, schools were building up from Year 3, as was happening in the case study schools. In some schools there were tasters of languages other than French, or other additional provision at the top of Key Stage 2.

Delivery typically involved mainly secondary ASTs (and some non-AST secondary teachers), going out into several of their cluster primaries as outreach teachers. In one of the case study schools, with an already long established and continuing tradition of primary French, delivery was by a part time primary teacher supported by a secondary AST. In another, native speakers offered discrete teaching, as well as supporting an immersion project in both Key Stages 1 and 2. In the other three schools, secondary outreach teachers undertook the language teaching with the intention of training primary teachers. This was working most effectively, where there was continuity of staffing at both primary and secondary level, although staff turnover was having implications for the training model. Maternity leave had meant the loss of some expert teachers. Some schools were planning to use the language lessons as an opportunity for primary teachers to have their PPA time. Nonetheless, visiting teachers considered that primary teachers were very supportive of the language work.

Coverage in terms of classes and year groups being taught increased in the course of the Pathfinder. In schools where language teachers, whether primary or secondary, came in to the school from outside, the staffing model resulted in little integration with the rest of the curriculum. Some schools were following schemes of work created jointly with their associated secondary colleagues, and in others, teachers were working to their own plans. Schools enjoyed autonomy in their choice of resources, and teaching was not based on centrally provided Pathfinder-wide materials. Some teachers were spending a good deal of time producing appealing materials, and in the second year of the Pathfinder these were more likely to involve increased and imaginative use of the interactive whiteboard. One case study school had used Pathfinder funding to purchase tablet PCs for pupil use. Language teaching, which was predominantly oral, consisting of songs and games thoroughly enjoyed by pupils, and was supported by generous funding for teachers to attend CILT conferences and other CPD events. There was as yet little evidence of assessment or transition documents, which was perhaps a consequence of the energy the Pathfinder was concentrating on starting up and initial delivery in the early years of Key Stage 2. The additional input offered by young native speakers had served to bring language learning alive for several teachers and their pupils, who generally found Primary Languages exciting. Overall, teachers saw little need for differentiation as teaching was still in the beginner stages. In contrast, some pupils were keen to have their prior learning, whether in Key Stage 1 or as part of clubs, recognised and built upon.

There were particular challenges for small rural schools with vertically grouped classes, and primary teachers with multiple responsibilities. Lack of time for the often sole member of staff to attend Primary Languages meetings or to disseminate training could be an issue. Despite the complexities, this was a Pathfinder in good heart, and one head teacher's recommendation to other schools was 'Go for it!'

Case Study 2

Case study 2 is a compact Urban LA, whose primary schools are amongst the highest achieving in the country. All primary, secondary and special schools in the LA were involved in the Pathfinder, which built on well established Primary Languages provision. At the forefront of developments in Primary Languages, this Pathfinder had long experience of European funded projects as well as strong links with an HEI. The Pathfinder project aimed to achieve the LA target of Key Stage 2 entitlement to Primary Languages in 66 % of primary schools by 2005/06 and in all schools by 2007/08.

In some schools, participation in the Pathfinder consolidated existing provision and developed it in others, which were starting from a lower base. All primary schools had language work within curriculum time in Years 5 and 6, increasing numbers in Years 3 and 4 and about a third throughout from Year 1. The model developed in this LA was largely one of language competence, although there was some language awareness.

The main deliverers in this Pathfinder were the class teachers in an exchange of expertise within a school. A service level agreement enabled schools to have additional blocks of input from a team of FLAs, who worked on a peripatetic basis, moving round schools in a carousel and for whom a well administered programme was in place. These native speakers, as well as teacher trainees and newly qualified teachers from France and Spain, contributed to the international dimension, and supplemented class teacher, AST and in 2004/05, delivery and support by three Pathfinder Consultants appointed with Pathfinder funding. Pathfinder funding enabled the employment of private providers to support in-school provision in targeted schools, both within and outwith the curriculum, including Family Learning classes. This Pathfinder was also involved in the creation of a course for teaching assistants and higher level teaching assistants.

French was taught in 90% of schools, based on pre-Pathfinder materials, and an existing LA-wide scheme of work, which was being updated and extended in the course of the Pathfinder to cover all four years within Key Stage 2. This already drew on the QCA Schemes of Work for Key Stage 2 and was being adapted in the light of the draft Key Stage 2 Framework, which the LA had trialled. Other languages included Spanish, Italian, and Japanese. Family Learning classes were available in a few schools, and were a popular means of enabling parents to learn alongside their children. The LA already hosted an extensive collection of Primary Languages resources and Pathfinder funding was used to add to these and create a dedicated website and on-line database, available on schools' intranet. Teachers appreciated the availability of these materials and the high quality training and support provided by the ASTs and Pathfinder Consultants, who each worked with clusters of schools, sometimes delivering lessons and acting as role models, and in others providing detailed lesson plans for primary teachers. There were examples in the case study schools of highly skilled, energetic and enterprising teachers able to take the lead in heading up teams of class teachers. The latter continued, in some instances, to lack confidence and school and staff development will therefore continue to be required. There was some indication that the on-site training model of class teachers watching and copying an 'expert' might be at risk, owing to the possibility of using language specialists to provide PPA time in some schools. Assessment practice varied, with an LA award and the European Languages Portfolio in increasing use across schools, particularly in Years 5 and 6. Transfer to the secondary sector was a key area for exploration for this Pathfinder, and mutual observation of classes by primary and secondary teachers had taken place in several schools. Pupils were generally enthusiastic about their language lessons: 'French is my favourite lesson.' Several wanted feedback on how to improve and make progress. All the case study schools stated that Primary Languages would continue beyond the Pathfinder. Sustainability was not anticipated to be a major issue, on account of the long history of Primary Languages, supporting structures, and strong lead in strategic planning and co-ordination.

Case Study 3

Case study 3, located in two neighbouring urban districts, was intended to be a joint Pathfinder. However, in reality, the two local authorities worked almost entirely independently of each other. Each was separately funded and the management and delivery of the two programmes was quite different.

LA1

In LA1, Pathfinder funding enabled expansion and consolidation of an already existing language competence model based primarily on the employment of peripatetic foreign language (French and Spanish) assistants. Primary languages had begun in 1999 with the local authority taking a lead in co-ordinating one of the Good Practice projects promoted by CILT. This was a small scale project involving only four schools teaching French to years 5 and 6. However, strong interest from other schools meant that the project expanded rapidly. Furthermore, the authority supported this expansion financially through a number of initiatives, including Education Action Zones.

An arrangement had been adopted by which schools opted into a service level agreement with the authority to maintain the provision. Pathfinder funding had helped introduce new schools to this scheme. This commitment from schools and the LA had resulted in almost all of the one hundred and twenty primary schools in the city providing some form of foreign language experience for their pupils, although few had extended their provision throughout KS2. The LA had already created a number of advisory teacher posts to provide essential co-ordination, liaison between schools and training for the growing team of FLAs, the main elements in the delivery of teaching. Some teaching was also provided by outreach work from the Specialist Language Colleges, by teachers at 'destination' secondary schools and by teachers in the primaries with some experience of MFL some of whom had AST status. Some of the primaries had been designated Centres of Excellence and served as points of dissemination for other primary language providers. Whilst French dominates, there were real efforts to increase provision of Spanish. Beneficial international links had been established bringing many visitors – and visiting teachers – to the city's schools.

Expansion of provision had been facilitated by a dedicated and dynamic advisory team. They were largely responsible for the recruitment, induction, training and monitoring of the assistants and they supported other teachers in cross phase liaison and outreach work. They had also produced schemes of work and training materials which defined very precisely the content of lessons and set out a very clear methodological framework.

While the consistency of approach guaranteed a good foundation for replicability, there were still areas needing further development, notably:

- sustaining the supply of able assistants and providing them with career prospects;
- ensuring that class teachers, currently observing the work of the FLAs and other MFL 'specialists', take a more active role in lessons and gain the necessary confidence – linguistic and methodological - to be able to take on full responsibility for language classes;
- establishing an assessment scheme which will provide evidence of pupils' achievements in all language skills.

Schools visited were uniformly optimistic about the future of primary languages although less certain about how they were going to meet, in full, the requirements of the national policy.

LA2

LA2 went into the Pathfinder from a much lower base-line than its neighbouring authority. However, unlike LA1, the main thrust for primary languages development has come and continues to come from its one Specialist Language College. Pathfinder funding was

channelled through this school. At the beginning of the Pathfinder, the SLC was working with seven of the LA's fifty-nine primaries (its own partner schools). The number of primary schools involved increased marginally but, in the later stages of the Pathfinder, there was also more 'in depth' work in those specific schools to develop languages across KS2.

Most participants encountered accepted that the collaboration with LA1 had been beneficial, but it was clear that there had been relatively little contact after the initial developmental stage.

Several factors, labelled as 'unfavourable' by the main protagonists, had created a difficult climate for primary language developments. Only four of the Borough's secondary schools had retained languages as a compulsory subject in key stage 4. This inevitably reduced the capacity of secondary schools to take on responsibility for developing languages in their feeder schools. There was also considerable 'leakage' at the primary-secondary transfer stage with some parents selecting secondary schools in neighbouring LAs for their children. The precise extent of this problem at the time of the case-study visit was not investigated but there is no doubt that if it was, indeed, significant, it did not help the development of strong systems for transition and it may also have affected the morale of teachers interested in primary languages in both primaries and secondary schools.

Despite some difficulties in attaining all the aims of the Pathfinder, notably the commitment of other secondary schools to develop similar outreach language teaching, there had been a number of worthy initiatives on the part of the SLC, including special events for gifted and talented pupils, experimentation with a family learning scheme, the production of ICT resources and associated training, and surveys of pupil attitudes.

There had also been real efforts to diversify provision which had resulted in an increase in Spanish and some more German being taught. The level of some teachers' competence, however, was rather low, therefore providing a rather poor model for pupils.

The main obstacle to be overcome, if the authority's schools are to be ready for 2010, is the over-reliance on the single SLC and the lack of interest and engagement - so far - from other secondary schools in creating new 'families' of schools.

Both LAs benefited from the proximity of HEIs, providing specialist initial and in-service training. Primary teachers in both authorities were also supported if they took advantage of language refreshment classes, some of which, in LA1, were organised by LA staff themselves.

Case Study 4

This LA is in an industrial area characterised by a relatively disadvantaged, multi-cultural population with low income and high unemployment. There are also pockets of middle class areas typical of suburbs in major conurbations. The Pathfinder project aimed to extend language provision (Specialist Language Colleges were already working with some feeder primary schools), deliver primary languages to 40 (out of c. 50) primary schools and, in light of tensions in the area, use languages as a way of building community cohesion and tolerance.

Apart from some outreach provision by SLCs, primary schools did not have any language teaching before, although one reported an earlier aborted attempt and two had language clubs outside school hours. Delivery varied: in some schools class teachers (often only one teacher) delivered language teaching, in others secondary teachers from the SLC delivered, with primary teachers reinforcing languages between visits. One school recruited an NQT with PGCE language qualifications in the second year in addition to SLC provision. In year 2 of the Pathfinder, language teaching in some schools was supported by (often shared) FLAs. The languages taught also varied: some schools introduced French or Spanish (based on teachers' skills), while others alternated according to what the SCL considered appropriate for what is taught in Y7 (e.g. French one year and German or Spanish the next).

Languages tended to be introduced in Y6 and Y5 (especially when in vertical groups) and then extended to Y4 and Y3. Schools were aware of implications for progression. Language teaching was a mixture of developing awareness, competence, and confidence in speaking and listening. Vocabulary was combined with structure and grammar, presented in games and interactive activities. In some schools, language teaching was integrated with the QCA schemes of work, in others, also with the KS2 Framework. Materials used varied: secondary teachers had their own materials, primary teachers drew on a mix of commercially available resources in print and CD-ROM form and supplemented these with material on dedicated web sites. Overall, pupils had a positive attitude towards languages and were very motivated ('It's a great experience...' [pupil]), as were staff, although some primary teachers were concerned about lack of skills.

The LA offered a series of courses covering linguistic skills and pedagogy (QCA schemes and KS2 Framework) in year 1 and focusing on ICT skills (e.g. use of interactive white boards) in year 2. This provided teachers with opportunities to study the units of study, receive information about resources and how to use them, and garner suggestions for classroom activities. LA organised study visits to France allowed some to improve their language skills further. A second cohort of schools joined the Pathfinder in year 2.

Although assessment was included in some schemes of work, teachers across the case study schools tended to rely on informal assessment or pupils' workbooks. Transition and transfer arrangements were in most cases in place for subjects other than languages. Even for schools who work with SLCs, the wide range of secondary schools pupils go to was cited as a barrier for ensuring consistent procedures for languages.

Even where schools in the case study had no firm arrangements in place to sustain language teaching, they expressed commitment to it, but raised the issue of funding.

'I think that there should be a programme throughout all schools where children have access to learning modern foreign languages [...], as just the same entitlement as you have to learning Geography, History, English, Maths, Science and the funding should be there to make it happen' (headteacher).

Case Study 5

This LA is a large authority - geographically and regarding the number of primary schools - with a mix of urban and rural areas. Language delivery was well established and very strongly LA led. In some schools, languages had been present since the early or late 1990s, although on the back burner for some of the time. The Pathfinder project aimed to revitalise provision and extend it to all schools. Over 260 schools were involved at the start of the project.

The main language was French, although there was also some Spanish and German. Delivery was strongly resource based: the LA produced materials for all three languages (videos, CD, books) and has been updating them (interactive CD-ROMs). Some case study schools added other commercially available material (printed, taped, CD-ROM). Schemes of work in some schools combined LA materials with QCA material. All case study schools reported strong support from the Pathfinder co-ordinator, both for delivery of INSET or lesson observations and differentiated training. In year 2 of the Pathfinder, one teacher reported attendance of the primary French TTA course and two teachers reported CPD led by secondary schools in their clusters.

Provision varied across the case study schools. Primary teachers delivered in all schools, most of whom trained in using the LA produced resources. In two case study schools, French was introduced in a cross curricular way (simple vocabulary, phrases, numbers) to develop children's curiosity of different languages and cultures. In one of these, French was in the Y6 time-table, while it was left to the other teachers to include it in their year groups. In another school, pupils had taster sessions (register, cross curricular elements) in different languages before settling into French in Y5 and Y6. These were about language and cultural awareness. Each year group worked with the year specific LA resource. Short periods were included in KS1 (e.g. songs in French).

In a fourth school, language teaching was time-tabled, consisted of various languages, and was mainly oral, to further awareness of language as a connection between people. Y5 and Y6 did 3 languages in year 1 of the Pathfinder. Although content and methodology broadly followed the LA resources, additional resources provided opportunities to 'taste' other languages, especially Spanish and German, the latter to facilitate pupils' choice in secondary school. Some schools offered language clubs outside school hours. In all case study schools, the emphasis was on speaking and listening (which allowed for inclusion), although there was a trend towards more writing. In some schools, language teaching was supported by 6th formers from local secondary schools, FLAs, students from French universities, and PGCE students. One school had offered Y6 pupils a trip to France, another was planning such trips.

Pupils displayed a positive attitude and enthusiasm towards languages ('It's actually nice to learn a language because ... you might go to that country' [pupil]), as did staff, some of whom enjoyed the challenge of using their language skills, while others had issues with skills, despite available training.

Assessment practice across the case study schools varied ranging from informal assessment (discussion and observation) to pupils' self-assessment ('I can do' lists) to annual pro formas. For most schools, the usual primary-secondary links were in place for transition and transfer, but only some noted languages on the transfer form or included them in Y6 pupils' end of year reports.

All case study schools endorsed the idea of primary languages and made some provisions for sustaining them, but the need for staff training and concern that the KS2 Framework will make any languages other than French recede were noted.

'I strongly [...] believe that we need to equip children to communicate in another tongue, whichever one we choose' (headteacher).

Case Study 6

This urban LA is characterised by a mixture of areas with high concentrations of manufacturing employment, deprived wards, and areas with a large proportion of Asian ethnic groups. The Pathfinder project aimed to build on a Nuffield sponsored language project which had been present in two primary schools, one of which had developed primary languages and thus provided a base on which to build good practice. The approach and delivery of this school served as the model for taking languages forward in the LA context: a strong multi-cultural focus and emphasis on cross curricular activities. The model involved language delivery from Y3 onwards, taking an investigative approach in Y3 and Y4, a cross-curricular approach in Y5, and discrete language lessons in Y6. The latter also establishes links with KS3, often in combination with two languages, French and Spanish.

Ten schools initially took part in the Pathfinder project, with plans to extend it to half (30–40) of the LA's schools. Delivery was mostly by (non-specialist) class teachers. In some case study schools, they were supported by trainee teachers from Spain (native speakers), PGCE students from a local HEI, and Spanish teachers relaying lessons through Gradepoint. International links (e.g. Comenius, British Council, school trips) or links with specialist secondary schools (to which primary schools feed) also supported language activities in the schools. In a special school, language teaching was mainly about cultural awareness (e.g. cultural activity days) and competence in very basic language skills.

Pupils found language lessons enjoyable and were excited by languages ('they love to be able to stand up and say letters or numbers in a different language and to show they can do it' [headteacher]). Staff were very interested in sharing their language knowledge with the children. Overall, teachers saw no particular need for differentiation (special needs, gifted and talented), as most tasks did not involve a lot of reading and writing and the investigative approach lent itself to stretching pupils at their own level.

Language teaching was also supported by LA training and support as well as LA developed materials (a dedicated web site and in year 2 of the Pathfinder schemes of work). A study visit to Spain offered teachers language training. Despite the particular delivery model, language provision was an evolving feature in all case study schools, with adjustments regarding progression (e.g. separate units for Y3 and Y4), staff changes (one school employed a former supply teacher to deliver French in Y6, another employed a TA to deliver French in Y5 and Y6), change of languages (one school dropped Spanish in Y5 and Y6, another added Italian to facilitate transition), change of school context (one school put languages on hold while engaged in ISP (Intensifying Support Project), another needed to review its whole curriculum), etc. in year 2.

Some schools had a language policy and included language provision in their development plans. All schools had schemes of work (supported by various resources), with QCA elements, although rarely integrated with the KS2 Framework. Assessment varied across the schools, ranging from photographic evidence to pupils' work and plans, the latter in conjunction with the LA's suggested assessment. Transfer and transition arrangements also varied: some schools made secondaries aware of primary languages, had language related links or planned transition units, while others did not.

All the case study schools stated that language provision would continue beyond Pathfinder funding because they were committed and languages had come to be embedded in the curriculum.

'...in OFSTED speak, the benefits far outweigh the disadvantages. We've found it to be enriching, it's given us different opportunities, it's widened the pupils' appreciation ...'
(headteacher)

Case Study 7

Case study 7 is a joint Pathfinder consisting of two LA's. LA1, the lead LA, is an urban LA with a nationally representative sample of school types and achievement, despite some of the most deprived wards in the country. It is in an Excellence in Cities area, as well as being a Diversity Pathfinder LA. LA2 is one of the country's largest LAs with a complex mix of urban, rural and deprived areas. There was no MFL adviser in LA1, but prior to the Pathfinder the local Language College had developed its primary programme and had decided to roll this out to the rest of the LA. The Pathfinder project aimed to deliver primary languages to all 50+ primary and special schools in LA1 and to replicate this process in many of the 250+ primary and special schools in LA2.

The model developed in this LA was a language competence model with a scheme of work developed for use throughout KS2 and a range of high quality materials developed by the Language College for all schools to use. The model was built on the assumption that primary classroom teachers would be the deliverers, and French was the main language taught, although there was some German and Spanish. The materials were largely in print form and in CD form. Teachers appreciated the Pathfinder planning and resources and there was heavy dependence on this in some cases. Pupils had a positive attitude to their French lessons and were very motivated. Staff were also positive in the main, although at times concerned about their lack of skills. In some cases the introduction of primary languages was viewed as an opportunity to be creative with the curriculum with the potential of linking languages with other subjects and reflecting on the impact of methodology in other subjects. By the end of the two year Pathfinder resources had been developed for four years of teaching. However, school and staff development is still required to reach the entitlement of languages throughout KS2 in most schools.

A range of INSET was arranged by the Pathfinder co-ordinator that examined the units of study and the resources and provided ideas for using them, pointing out where teachers might have difficulty and guiding them with suggestions for activities they might do with the children. A core team of ASTs worked with clusters of schools providing on-site training and acting as a role model for the class teacher, who was able to observe a teacher with good language skills as well as the methodology used. There was evidence in the second round of visits that class teachers were developing the confidence to be self-sufficient. The plan for a differentiated training programme will help to sustain the project.

Although assessment was built in to the schemes of work, assessment practice across the case study schools varied from little evidence of assessment to examples of very good practice where teacher assessment pro formas and pupil assessment pro formas were well developed and the school had collected a portfolio to demonstrate a range of levels of attainment. Transition and transfer arrangements were in place in three of the schools visited, but more consistent procedures will need to be developed for transfer of language-specific information.

The schools in this case study were relatively confident about sustainability, although they consider continued support and training important.

'The Pathfinder in primary languages has a big input in enjoyment and excellence in education – the creativity side, being able to plan around a topic. It has given people the opportunity to stretch themselves and look outside the box and for pupils it has given them the notion that there is a greater world out there to be explored' [primary teacher].

Case Study 8

This is an Associate Pathfinder based on a cluster including a Language College and seven primary feeder schools. This cluster was already part of the DfES ICT Test Bed project with the aim to invest in ICT as a means of improving learning and seeing its impact on management. The Language College was one of eighteen schools selected to be part of the DfES/CILT Good Practice Project (GPP) and became a hub for primary languages.

The curriculum model used in this pathfinder involved a range of languages. In Year 3 work was based on story telling and songs. Each story was presented in English although from French, German, Mandarin Chinese, Punjabi background, but with foreign language elements, for example, phrases for repetition. In Year 4 there were language tasters in these languages, based on an 'all our languages' programme developed under the GPP which was taught in three of the feeder schools alongside the literacy hour with the explicit aim of developing transferable language learning skills and introducing pupils to the key skills and concepts of language learning. In years 5 and 6 pupils learnt French or German following a scheme of work devised by the language college adapted from the Year 7 scheme of work. They have also developed some very good resources, making excellent use of ICT; all primary classrooms had an interactive whiteboard and had access to stimulating languages materials. Objectives were clear and assessment was built in.

There were regular meetings between the language college staff and primaries and some joint inset where all year 6 primary teachers from the cluster schools met at the language college for training. Initially primary languages was delivered mainly by the secondary teachers co-ordinated by the Advanced Skills Teacher, and by FLAs. By the end of the evaluation there was a primary languages co-ordinator in each primary school. There has been heavy reliance on the language college not only for the programme of work, lesson plans and resources, but also for the delivery of lessons. It is questionable how well schools will be able to continue without the high level of support received during the Pathfinder funding. It was encouraging, however, to see non-specialists teaching on the second round of visits.

Pupils have developed a positive attitude to language learning, although there is some concern over long-term motivation: 'I don't think I want to do any more French: when you do it for a while you get tired of it. I would like to do Spanish: 2 years French is enough' (pupil).

Transition was a major concern, as there was considerable inconsistency of languages provision within the LA and adjoining LAs. Whilst the SLC had established a process for helping pupils who are not part of the Pathfinder cluster to reach a similar level as others in their cohort, other schools will be receiving some pupils who will have done two years of French and provision for these was unknown.

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
Online: www.dfespublications.gov.uk

© University of Warwick 2005

Produced by the Department for Education and Skills

ISBN 1 84478 591 2
Ref No: RR692
www.dfes.go.uk/research