White Paper

Primary Languages Policy in England – The Way Forward

This White Paper is the outcome of the RIPL Primary Languages Policy Summit, which took place on Friday 23rd November 2018 at the British Academy.

How to cite this paper: Holmes, B. and Myles, F. (2019). *White Paper: Primary Languages Policy in England – The Way Forward.* RiPL: www.ripl.uk/policy/

"It has never been more important for young people to learn a foreign language than now. An outward looking global nation needs a new generation of young people comfortable with the language and culture of our overseas trading partners."

Rt Hon Nick Gibb MP, Minister for School Standards [i]

Bernardette Holmes and Florence Myles

We acknowledge the contributions of:

Janet Enever; Suzanne Graham; Rowena Kasprowicz; Gee Macrory; Rosamond Mitchell; Victoria Murphy; Alison Porter; Angela Tellier.

With thanks to all the Summit participants who commented on earlier versions of this document.

About RIPL

The Research in Primary Languages (RiPL) network was born out of a series of workshops bringing together researchers and practitioners to address current issues in primary foreign language learning and teaching. A real need was felt for closer dialogue and collaboration, in order to inform policy (www.ripl.uk).

Table of Contents

1. Statement of Purpose

The statutory requirement to teach a modern or ancient language in primary schools from the age of seven took effect from September 2014.   In September 2018, the first cohort of primary language learners to have studied a modern or ancient language at key stage 2 made the transition from primary to secondary school.   The outcomes and potential impact of four years of language learning as a statutory part of the national curriculum are becoming apparent. It is time-critical to review the state of languages in primary schools in England, examining the extent to which the statutory requirement has been implemented, and to what effect.

Evidence from inspection findings, research, and teacher testimony indicates that policy decisions alone are insufficient to ensure that successful teaching and learning programmes for primary languages are in place. There is a clear need for an implementation strategy, informed by current research findings.

This White Paper seeks to inform such a strategy and sets out a number of recommendations towards the full implementation of current government policy for primary languages in England.

2. Primary matters – understanding the current national context

Why we are where we are

The decision in June 2012 to introduce the statutory requirement for all maintained primary schools to teach a foreign language from Year 3 to Year 6 was a key part of the National Curriculum Review. As put forward by the then Secretary of State, the reform set out to *modernise* and *democratise*[ii][1] the national curriculum, raising standards and setting out high expectations for every learner in all subjects.

In common with high-performing schools in this country and other major jurisdictions, the intention was *to add breadth to the primary curriculum by requiring all schools to teach a foreign language* […]

The new foreign languages programme of study will require an appropriate balance of spoken and written language. Pupils must learn to speak in sentences, with appropriate pronunciation. They will have to express simple ideas with clarity. Pupils should also learn to write phrases and short sentences from memory. They should develop an understanding of basic grammar. And they should become acquainted with songs and poems in the language studied. Teaching should focus on making substantial progress in one language.

Concurrently, the National Curriculum Review brought about a number of other significant general changes:

- While the emphasis was on all children mastering curriculum content and reaching expected standards, there was greater autonomy for schools and freedom for teachers to decide on the nature and scope of their curriculum with less prescription in most subjects other than maths, English and science.

---

[1] Italics are used for all direct quotations from named sources; full reference details appear in Section 8.

- Programmes of study in subjects other than the core subjects were to *be much shorter to allow for the maximum level of innovation at school level for the development of content in these areas*. Teachers were to be given *freedom to develop more innovative and effective approaches to teaching*.

- It was noted that *common to many of the highest-performing jurisdictions which enjoy great teaching [was] a clear and structured approach to setting out high expectations, with a strong school accountability.*

- Primary schools were *to describe subject content in a way which [made] clear both what should be taught and what pupils should know and be able to do as a result,* but at the same juncture, *the system of levels and level descriptors [was to] be removed and not replaced.*

Following the principles underpinning national curriculum reform, the current languages programmes of study for key stages 2 and 3 were published in September 2013. It is evident that the expected outcomes of the statutory period of language learning from seven to fourteen are ambitious.

- From a policy perspective, language learning at key stage 2 (DfE, 2013a)[iii] should establish the foundations of learning how to learn a language and enable pupils to develop an appreciation of how language works in addition to making substantial progress in one language.

- There is intended cross-phase coherence in the policy requirements for key stage 3 (DfE, 2013b)[iv] which state that *teaching may be of any modern foreign language and should build on the foundations of language learning laid at key stage 2, whether pupils continue with the same language or take up a new one.*

- To meet current policy demands, primary schools should set out a structured programme of learning to ensure progress against the attainment targets defined in the programme of study, and secondary schools should take into account the outcomes of key stage 2 at transition and build on prior learning at key stage 3.

To raise standards in language proficiency in line with other major jurisdictions, certain strategic decisions could have been expected, to support effective teaching and learning cross phase, in relation to:

- the choice of language or languages to be taught;

- the time allocation to be given to language teaching over each key stage; and,

- general agreement with regard to the core content of the curriculum for each key stage in relation to grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, phonics, knowledge about language, and intercultural understanding.

By implication, four years after the introduction of the statutory requirement, it could be expected that:

- the majority of primary and secondary schools should already share, or be working towards, a clear and agreed understanding of what constitutes substantial progress in one language by the end of each key stage; and

- where pupils continue with the same language from key stage 2 into key stage 3, there should be at least an outline agreement at local level of what pupils will be taught and should be able to do as a result of their language learning.

However, this is not the case.

Current inspection and research evidence finds that there is great variation in primary language provision across the country and that a number of factors continue to impede the development of coherent provision of language teaching from ages seven to fourteen.

This White Paper identifies key priorities that must be addressed if the ambitions of the national curriculum reform are to be met. These priorities relate to:

i. Planning for substantial progress in one language in a national context where level descriptors have been removed and where greater autonomy has been given to individual schools and academies;

ii. Defining appropriate expectations and outcomes relating to available curriculum time in each key stage;

iii. Developing pedagogic approaches that take account of teachers' subject knowledge and the characteristics of pupil intake at local level;

iv. Developing local agreements on the choice of (a) language or languages to be taught, (b) curriculum models, and (c) subject content, in order to support smooth transition at the point of transfer from key stage 2 to key stage 3;

v. Strengthening monitoring and assessment arrangements to ensure that reliable information on pupil achievement and outcomes in primary languages are communicated to receiving secondary schools.

3. Current challenges – defining the problems

The majority of primary schools are responding to statutory requirements to introduce a language at key stage 2, but progress towards full implementation is uneven across the country. Taking account of the most recent evidence from schools responding to the Language Trends Survey 2018[v] and evidence presented at the recent RiPL Primary Languages Policy Summit, it is improbable that policy requirements will be fully met without further central guidance and support in a number of key areas.

The following factors are currently preventing the successful implementation of the primary languages policy:

- Time allocation

Around 80% of schools allocate on average between 30 minutes and up to one hour per week for language learning, although comments indicate that this is often irregular or eroded by other priorities (p. 12).

Key stage 2 provision is often interrupted, particularly in Year 6 when the focus is on SATs. Other examples of intermittent provision describe "block" timetable arrangements, where subjects may be taught intensively over the course of a week or two and then not covered again for another half term.

71% of responding schools say that finding sufficient curriculum time to teach a language is a major challenge.

Taking account of available research from the OECD (Education at a glance 2014), international comparisons of the proportion of curriculum time made available for the instruction of languages in primary schools in other major jurisdictions reveal that time allocation in England is normally below the OECD average (4%). Spain allocates 10%, Italy 9% and France, Germany and Finland 6%. In England, the normal allocation of 30 minutes per week to language learning in primary schools would equate to just over 2% of available curriculum time. [vi]

- Disparity in expectations of pupil progress

Around four out of five primary schools report that they are offering continuous provision for languages, with built-in progression as required by the national curriculum, for all pupils in Years 3 to 6. […Yet] *there is disparity of perception between what primary schools believe they are achieving and what secondary schools judge their feeders have achieved* (p. 12).

While 51% of primary teachers believe that their pupils have attained the expected level of competence as set out in the key stage 2 programme of study only 12% of secondary teachers agree (p.13).

- Planning for progress

Overall, there is a very limited amount of cross-phase planning for progress. Only 16% of primary schools say they take part in network or cluster meetings with secondary schools.

Secondary schools take responsibility for teaching languages in 6% of primary schools and provide the scheme of work for a further 2%. A very small proportion of schools say that they collaborate with their secondary schools in developing units of work in languages (2%) or in planning lessons together (1%).

- Lack of coherent cross-phase planning leads to demotivation

The lack of continuity in curriculum planning from key stage 2 to key stage 3 means that secondary teachers take little or no account of prior learning and as a result, pupils are required to start learning the language again from the beginning, which for many pupils involves repeating what they have already learned. This can lead to demotivation and can result in an early loss of interest and curiosity in language learning, which may be a contributory factor to low uptake of languages at key stage 4.

- Teachers' subject knowledge

42% of responding schools say that language teaching is provided by class teachers alone, while 46% of schools say that specialist teachers (often on the staff) are responsible for primary provision.

- Access to professional development

In 58% of responding schools where class teachers are involved in delivering languages, there has been no CPD for languages in the past year.

62% of responding schools identified improving staff languages proficiency and/or boosting staff expertise and confidence as a continuing challenge.

- Monitoring and assessment arrangements

There has been an increase in the number of primary schools carrying out some form of assessment of their pupils' progress. 52% carry out informal assessment of each child and a further 14% keep group records of class progress in language learning. Only 16% of schools say that they carry out a formal assessment of each child, while 15% make no assessment of their pupils' language learning and keep no record of progress.

- Transition arrangements

Just under half (47%) of primary schools have some form of general contact with their secondary schools but only 18% exchange information on language teaching informally, and only 9% provide data on pupil progress in language learning at the point of transfer.

- Lack of consistency between primary schools

According to Language Trends, *the lack of consistency between primary schools, in a context where secondary schools take pupils from many different feeders, is one of the barriers to smooth transition and hinders coherent progression in learning.*

- Deficits in the development of subject knowledge in ITT and CPD

Research also finds inconsistency in initial teacher training which affects provision. The Carter Review of Initial Teacher Training (2015)[vii] found great variability in the development of subject knowledge in ITT programmes. Carter observed that *in subjects like modern foreign languages, […] trainees are more likely to lack subject knowledge, experience and confidence […], meaning that ITT needs to address core subject knowledge [...] to give primary teachers the necessary knowledge as well as confidence to teach them effectively.*

Current ITT provision of primary modern foreign language pedagogy varies from 1.5 hours in total to 2 hours per week, depending on the course provider. This is clearly unsatisfactory.

Carter noted that one year ITT programmes are too short to fully address subject knowledge. He recommended that schools, therefore, should include subject knowledge as an essential element of professional development, particularly in the NQT year and early career.

Carter made further recommendations about Continuing Professional Development proposing that the DfE should make funded in-service subject knowledge enhancement courses available for primary teachers to access as professional development – particularly in subjects such as modern languages. At present, there are few funded opportunities for professional development in primary languages.

- School accountability

There continues to be a range of forms of accountability in place for primary schools, including published data and school inspection.[viii] The focus on headline measures and performance tables relating to test scores in English reading, English writing and mathematics at the end of key stage 2 puts pressure on schools to prioritise the core subjects of English and mathematics over all other areas of the curriculum, including primary languages.

The new Ofsted Framework 2019 will attempt to redress the balance and will put the wider curriculum at the heart of the inspection process.[ix] Amanda Spielman, HM Chief Inspector of Education, stated that *the focus will be on the substance of education and a broad curriculum. Leadership will be judged on whether the curriculum has purpose and a clear design. (Leadership) includes how well the curriculum is implemented through well-taught and appropriately sequenced content, thoughtfully designed assessment practice and consideration of an appropriate model of progression.*

The renewed inspection focus on the broad curriculum should mean a higher status for subjects other than English and mathematics, such as primary languages. The introduction of a new judgment in the Ofsted Framework under Quality of Education should ensure that schools do not narrow down their curriculum, by looking at three distinct aspects:

intent – what it is that schools want for all their children;

implementation – how do teaching and assessment fulfil the intent; and finally;

impact – what are the results and wider outcomes that children achieve.

It is clear that under the new framework *Ofsted will challenge schools where too much time is spent on the preparation for tests at the expense of teaching.* That said, there has been very limited inspection of primary languages since the introduction of the statutory requirement to teach a language from the age of seven. If the subject is to be taken seriously, primary languages must feature more prominently in the Ofsted inspection process from September 2019. This change to the Ofsted Inspection Framework should incentivise schools to develop more detailed planning of the primary languages curriculum to ensure depth and breadth of learning and clear progression.

In sum, schools are facing a number of challenges in implementing primary languages policy, leading to inequity of opportunity for primary pupils across the country. The principal problems in schools relate to time allocation, teacher subject knowledge and language proficiency, limited access to professional development and a lack of a shared and agreed understanding of pupil progress at the point of transfer from primary to secondary schools.   Given the central importance of subject knowledge to good teaching, the variability of initial teacher training in subject knowledge development is a cause of concern. The current infrequency of Ofsted inspection of primary languages is a further cause of concern.

4. Lessons from research into primary language learning[x]

To address the current challenges facing primary schools in implementing primary languages policy, it will be crucial to base future policy decisions on a deeper research-informed understanding of how primary children learn a new language and of the conditions which make it possible for pupils to make progress in language learning in the primary classroom. Key insights are provided by recent research

that have clear implications for practice and should inform policy-related decisions, and be included in subject knowledge development in ITT and CPD.

i.   Rich and plentiful input

Input plays a particularly important role in middle childhood (from ages 6/7 to 11/12). During much of this phase, children learn implicitly, by being immersed in the language and using it. However, for implicit learning to take place, rich and plentiful input, as well as opportunities to use the language meaningfully, are necessary. The balance between implicit learning and more explicit forms of learning starts to shift gradually during middle childhood.

The typical KS2 language classroom does not provide such a context, and research has shown repeatedly that young classroom learners do not have an advantage over older learners in terms of linguistic development unless input is plentiful. Nonetheless, when consistently taught, young classroom learners can and do make linguistic progress, commensurate with the amount of input.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE: sufficient time needs to be allocated to language learning

ii.   Cognitive development in middle childhood

Middle childhood is characterised by very active cognitive development. While children are still primarily driven by emotional engagement and intrinsic motivation (approval from adults and peers; enjoyment of active, motivating and varied activities), they are increasingly capable of concentration and sustained attention (behavioural engagement) and start being motivated by more goal-oriented activities. They are also developing an increasingly autonomous sense of self as a learner and are starting to plan, and reflect on, their learning activities (cognitive engagement), which can therefore become increasingly cognitively and linguistically challenging. However, KS2 children are not yet fully autonomous learners, and levels of attainment reached are related to the amount of timetabled time, and quality of FL input, available.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE: activities need to be enjoyable but should also capitalise on emergent learning strategies and cognitive changes during the course of middle childhood

iii.   Metalinguistic awareness and links to L1 Literacy

KS2 children have developing L1 skills, including growing oral and written literacy skills, and a broadening vocabulary. Overall, strong early L1 literacy skills are associated with higher FL attainment; both may be related to individual differences in aspects of working memory, still developing at this stage. The development of L1 literacy in either English or another language (in the case of EAL children) supports the development of metalinguistic awareness which allows explicit grammar instruction in the foreign language to be more effective, building on grammar instruction already offered in L1. The interrelationship between children's first language (normally English), any other language that they speak, and the taught language can be strengthened to benefit all areas.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE: links with L1 literacy and all languages children know and are learning need to be strengthened, for both monolingual and EAL children

iv.   Progress motivates

KS2 children are generally highly motivated when starting to learn a language, and are primarily interested in learning languages as a means of face-to-face communication, e.g. for holidays and travel, particularly enjoying encounters with language assistants, link schools abroad etc. As in other areas of the curriculum, they are motivated to continue studying by a sense of self-efficacy and competence ("I can do this"), and also by awareness of progression ("I am steadily learning more"), and motivation can decline when this sense of progression and achievement is lacking. Teacher encouragement, and a variety of increasingly challenging learning activities, contribute to sustaining motivation and classroom engagement.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE: sustain engagement and self-efficacy; ensure clearly planned progression to boost motivation and increase uptake of languages in later years

v.   Central importance of context in which children learn: teaching time, teacher language proficiency, teaching approach

A range of empirical research, including studies within the context of England, demonstrates that for primary language learners, learning outcomes and motivation are very much influenced by a number of interacting factors: teaching time and teacher language proficiency play a very important role for learning outcomes, which may be limited when teaching time is short and teacher proficiency is below B1 (approx. AS level). Teacher training in language pedagogy has an impact on young learners' attitude and sense of self-efficacy. A teaching approach that aligns with learners' goals for language learning has also been found to be important for motivation. This is particularly important across the transition between primary and secondary, where a sense of progression is needed to sustain motivation. The impact of these factors carries over into secondary school. Furthermore, these factors are closely intertwined: in a large longitudinal study in England, the primary schools where learners made the most progress employed teachers with high levels of language proficiency and training, and dedicated 60 minutes a week to the subject.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE: sufficient teaching time; teacher language proficiency and training; appropriate pedagogy; progression

vi.   EAL children in the foreign language classroom

According to the latest DfE statistics, the percentage of pupils with English as an additional language 2010-2018 has increased steadily in primary and secondary schools. Currently 21.2% of children in state-funded primary schools have English as an Additional Language (EAL)[xi], resulting in a highly heterogeneous population, with some schools having none and others 99%. However, official guidance issued to language teachers tends to be generic and to ignore this large subset of the primary population, assuming a context of monolingual English-speaking pupils. There is research evidence that EAL children are at an advantage when it comes to foreign language learning outcomes, and that the language classroom might be the only context in which they are not at a communicative disadvantage when compared to their monolingual peers. Anecdotal evidence suggests, however, that EAL learners

are often withdrawn from the language class to receive additional English-language support. This seems to be misguided, when language lessons can play an important role in enhancing EAL children's metalinguistic understanding and give them confidence. Additionally, as multilingual speakers, EAL children can provide an important resource in the language classroom.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE: recognise and draw upon the multilingualism of EAL children in the language classroom

5. Finding solutions – Towards an Implementation Strategy

Taking into account evidence from schools and lessons from research and stakeholder contributions from the RiPL Primary Languages Policy Summit, the following areas should form a framework for further action in developing an implementation strategy for primary languages policy.

PRIMARY LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY

i. Language up-skilling: increased availability of funded specialist language training for primary trainees and primary class teachers to improve subject knowledge and levels of fluency and accuracy in the language to be taught;

ii. Initial Teacher Training: introduction of a requirement for all ITT providers to include subject specific pedagogy in the ITT curriculum with a primary languages specialism and extend the time allocation for the development of subject knowledge;

iii. Continuing professional development: increased access to funded CPD opportunities with release time to support the understanding and implementation of the programme of study, including planning for substantial progress in one language, and guidance on the inter-relationship of language skills and the effective teaching of listening and speaking, reading and writing, and grammatical understanding in the foreign language; ensuring greater coherence between the teaching of English grammar, punctuation and spelling and the teaching of a modern or ancient language;

iv. Research into appropriate age-related pedagogy for all learners with regard to stretch and challenge from key stage 2 into key stage 3, including a focus on bilingual and multilingual children (EAL) and SEND.

CURRICULUM PLANNING

v. Development of non-statutory guidance on minimum core content defining what should be taught, to whom and when, while leaving decisions relating to the choice of language or languages and the development of innovative and appropriate pedagogy to local and regional consortia, involving primary and secondary schools, networks and multi-academy trusts working in cross-phase collaboration;

vi.   Sharp focus on explicit whole-school policy and curriculum planning to fully embed the national curriculum requirements for primary languages, and to develop effective partnerships between head teachers and governors, strengthening school accountability to make sure that schools set out appropriately sequenced content, thoughtfully designed assessment practice, and clearly planned progression for language teaching and learning in the school development plan;

vii.   Development of non-statutory guidance on effective curriculum models of delivery, including examples of existing strong practice, taking into account realistic expectations of pupil outcomes related to the amount of time allocated to primary language learning;

viii.   Where possible, develop curriculum models that increase the proportion of curriculum time made available for language learning to be closer in line with the time allocations provided for language learning in other major jurisdictions; and ensure that time allocated is not eroded by competing priorities;

ix.   Consideration and piloting of cross-phase scheme(s) of work initially for Year 6 and Year 7 pupils (expanding to include Year 5 up to year 8) in an agreed language across primary and secondary school networks/consortia to ensure continuity, progression and smooth transition, in order to boost motivation and increase uptake at GCSE.

ASSESSMENT AND REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS

x.   Development of a nationally recognised benchmark in line with all major jurisdictions around the world (for example, A1 on the CEFR) by the age of transfer from KS2 to KS3 with clear descriptions of what children should know and be able to do, referenced explicitly to the expected outcomes in the programme of study;

xi.   Set up strong regional and local infrastructure to link primary and secondary schools and improve coordination of learning and communication of pupil information at the point of transfer;

xii.   Transition arrangements in place for each child to move to secondary school with a clear statement of learning outcomes against agreed core content benchmarks.

ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY TO IMPLEMENT PRIMARY LANGUAGES

xiii.   Increased use of technology in professional development including a feasibility study of how to deliver language proficiency and subject content pedagogy training online to initial teacher trainees, newly qualified teachers, and primary generalist teachers; use of technology as a means to connect individual teachers and networks of schools to help overcome difficulties of distance and capacity to attend training or liaison meetings;

xiv.   Increased use of technology in the primary languages classroom to provide high quality primary language learning resources and the possibility of interaction with native speakers of the language through Skype and other applications;

xv.   Development and pilot of an e-folio to capture the learning journey and outcomes of primary pupils, reducing teacher workload and paper-based record-keeping. This would accompany the child and inform the next teacher in the secondary school of what has been achieved;

xvi.   Possible pilot of remote foreign language teaching in primary schools, learning lessons from e.g. the successful British Council and Plan Ceibal initiative teaching English in Uruguayan public schools remotely using video-conferencing technology (over 80,000 children aged 9-11).

FUTURE STRATEGIC ROLE OF RESEARCH

Research has a role to play in all stages of policy development and implementation. Research should inform, develop and evaluate the impact of policy and can and should influence and support effective curriculum planning and classroom practice.

xvii.   Development of a collaborative programme of research objectives in primary languages to find policy-solutions to current challenges. Areas of priority include:

- Impact of the amount and distribution of time allocation to language learning in the curriculum;
- Pedagogies appropriate for this age group, including a focus on EAL and SEND;
- Curriculum models that support structured and planned progress;
- Curriculum models that support intercultural learning and cultural enrichment;
- Transition (planning for progress; motivation; transition models Y6/Y7);
- Links with literacy;
- Cognitive and social benefits;
- Development in the use of technology;
- Research into the role of senior leadership in primary languages policy implementation and the achievement of learning outcomes.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

It is clear that at the current time children at key stage 2 do not receive equal opportunities to learn a new language. There are schools and school networks which illustrate exemplary practice, but a high quality curriculum is not consistently provided in all schools. Children's opportunities are limited by the conditions in which they are taught and these conditions vary from school to school. There are differences in the length of time primary schools allocate to language teaching per week and how the time is distributed across the year and the key stage. There is significant variation in teachers' subject knowledge and language proficiency and a lack of professional development opportunities. Curriculum planning rarely involves cross-phase collaboration.   In most cases, teachers of primary and secondary schools at local level do not share an agreed understanding of what pupils will be taught and should be able to do as a result of their learning at key stage 2. As a result, secondary schools seldom build on the foundation of language learning laid at key stage 2. This lack of continuity leads to demotivation and can contribute to an early loss of interest in language learning at secondary school.

An implementation strategy for primary languages should now be developed as a matter of priority in order to operationalise the solutions proposed in this White Paper in relation to time allocation, primary languages pedagogy, ITE and CPD provision, curriculum planning, assessment and reporting, transition arrangements, and the use of digital technology. We also propose a strategic role for research in primary policy development, implementation and evaluation.

Some decisions can be made at school and local levels, but other decisions need to be made at national level and involve the Department for Education and other non-ministerial government departments such as Ofsted and other professional organisations. All decisions should be informed by specialist research evidence.

We make the following recommendations:

1. **Time allocation:** Professional bodies and lead researchers, with the support of the DfE, should develop clear non-statutory national guidance on the amount of time that should be allocated to language learning at key stage 2; giving examples of effective curriculum models which illustrate how time is best distributed per week, per term, per year and per key stage.

   RIPL recommends a minimum of one hour per week (with a non-statutory minimum of 140 hours allocated to primary language learning over the four years of key stage 2, i.e. 35 hours each year)

2. **Primary Languages Pedagogy:** To strengthen the quality of teaching and ensure equity in language learning across the country, the DfE should invest in professional development for primary teachers by providing funded opportunities to strengthen primary language subject knowledge, pedagogical understanding and language proficiency.

   - **ITE provision:** The DfE should require initial teacher training providers to extend the amount of time allocated to primary languages subject specialism and stipulate a statutory minimum amount of time for subject specific pathways;

   - **CPD provision:** The DfE should develop a primary TSST (Teacher Subject Specialist Training) route for non-specialist primary teachers.

3. **Curriculum planning:** The DfE, working with professional bodies and lead researchers, should commission the development of non-statutory guidance on the minimum core content for primary languages at key stage 2, defining what children should know and be able to do across the key stage in relation to pronunciation, phonics, grammatical structures and vocabulary. Increasing mastery of the new language should be underpinned by a structured approach to knowledge about language which draws on the interrelationship of literacy in the first language, any other languages that children speak, and the teaching of the new language.

   RIPL recommends that language-specific details should be given in relation to the phonics, grammatical structures and vocabulary that should be taught over key stage 2, while leaving decisions relating to the choice of language or languages and how the core content is taught to local schools and regional consortia, involving primary and secondary schools, networks, and multi-academy trusts in cross-phase collaboration.

4. Transition arrangements: In the short term, at the very least, primary schools should provide receiving secondary schools with a clear statement of what pupils in the class have been taught and what pupils should know and be able to do at the point of transfer from KS2 to KS3.

    -   Where primary and secondary schools can collaborate, head teachers should encourage smooth transition by supporting teachers to develop continuity of approach from Year 6 to Year 7, by sharing common expectations of outcomes and/or developing a cross-phase scheme of work;

    -   In the mid-term, each child should receive a clear statement of learning outcomes against agreed benchmarks at the end of key stage 2;

    -   In the mid to longer-term, the DfE, the Teaching Schools Council and Regional Commissioners, and Ofsted should incentivise schools to work in local and regional consortia, involving primary and secondary schools, networks and multi-academy trusts in order to develop and agree clear and structured programmes of language learning which provide continuity and progression across key stages 2 and 3. This aligns with recommendations put forward in the Modern Foreign Languages Pedagogy Review (2016)[xii].

5. Assessment and reporting: Professional bodies and lead researchers, in partnership with the DfE, should agree and approve a nationally recognised benchmark (for example, A1 on the CEFR) by the age of transfer from KS2 to KS3 with clear descriptions of what children should know and be able to do, referenced closely to the expected outcomes in the programme of study.

    -   Develop and pilot an e-folio: Professional bodies and lead researchers, with the support of the DfE, should oversee the development of an e-folio to capture the learning journey and outcomes of primary pupils. This would accompany the child and inform the next teacher in the secondary school of what has been achieved;

6. Digital technology: Schools should develop more frequent and effective use of technology to strengthen teachers' subject knowledge, including language up-skilling; and to provide high quality resources for language lessons, including the possibility of online class-to-class interaction with schools abroad.

7. School accountability: Ofsted should include a focus on primary languages in their next inspection cycle under the new Framework, in particular with regard to gathering evidence of intent, implementation and impact related to curriculum planning.

8. School leadership: Schools, supported by other professional bodies, as appropriate, should develop effective partnerships between senior leadership and governors to strengthen school accountability and make sure that schools set out appropriately sequenced content, thoughtfully designed assessment practice and clearly planned progression for language teaching and learning in the school development plan.

9. **Strategic role of research:** The DfE should include a focus on the implementation of primary languages policy in the next round of social research aims, in order to garner high quality evidence to inform policy development and delivery of primary languages at key stage 2, taking account of the research priorities raised in this White Paper.

10. **Create a National Task-Force for Primary Languages (NTPL):** The DfE should consider setting up a National Task-Force for Primary Languages, to address the challenges inherent in fully implementing the statutory order to introduce the learning of modern or ancient language from the age of seven. As shown throughout this White Paper, primary schools face particular challenges which are distinct from those facing secondary schools. It is clear that if primary languages are to build the foundation for future language learning, these challenges must be addressed as a priority.

The central purpose of the NTPL would be to support school-led improvement in the teaching of languages in primary schools. The Task-Force would work with lead practitioners, head teachers and a range of other individual partners and organisations with expertise in languages, including researchers, school networks, cultural institutes and universities across the English regions to implement the recommendations in this White Paper. The creation of NTPL is critical at this stage to inform and support the work of the new National Centre for Excellence for Language Pedagogy and its hubs that focuses on key stages 3 and 4.

Additionally, The NTPL would provide:

- Research-informed professional development programmes (ITE and CPD);
- Up-to-date online information on effective teaching methods;
- Accessible summaries of research on primary language learning and teaching;
- Support for the development of strategic learning networks of primary and secondary language teachers in order to plan pupil progress and smooth transition from KS2 to KS3;
- Language up-skilling of primary practitioners;
- Opportunities to participate in classroom-based interventions to improve the quality of teaching and learning and pupil outcomes;
- Large scale research (subject to funding) on key priorities in relation to language learning, for example:

    - Pedagogies appropriate for this age group;
    - Cognitive and social benefits of language learning;
    - Transition (progression; motivation; transition models);
    - Curriculum planning;
    - Investigating the multilingual advantage of EAL children;
    - Exploring links with literacy;
    - Impact of digital technology on cognition, motivation and progression;
    - Role of digital technology in supporting and sustaining teacher networks;
    - Language policy development into better integration of literacy, the learning of a new language, and English as an additional language across the primary curriculum.

7. Summit participants

Dawn Maria Alexander-Joseph	Hackney Learning Trust and the Primary Schools Network
Dr Nick Andon	King's College London, BAAL
Prof. Wendy Ayres-Bennett	University of Cambridge, AHRC MEITS project
Ian Bauckham, CBE	Ofqual, Department for Education, The TENAX Schools Trust
Jane Bland	Rushey Mead Educational Trust
Alison Chard	Springfield Primary School, Sale, Trafford
Bernadette Clinton	Hackney Learning Trust and the Primary Schools Network
Linda Dupret	St Paul's C of E Nursery & Primary, Brighton
Prof. Janet Enever	University of Reading, RiPL
Vicky Gough	British Council
Prof. Suzanne Graham	University of Reading, RiPL
Catherine Gregory	Department for Education
Richard Hardie	Business in the Community
Jesús M. Hernández González	Spanish Embassy Education Office
Bernardette Holmes, MBE	Speak to the Future, RiPL
Philip Harding-Esch	All-Party Parliamentary Group on Modern Languages
Jo Hutchinson	Education Policy Institute
Gill Jones	OFSTED
Dr Rowena Kasprowicz	University of Reading, RiPL
Prof. Neil Kenny	British Academy
Geraldine Kirkup	Our Lady of Mount Carmel R C Primary School, Tameside
Benoît Le Dévédec	Institut Français
Sarah Lister	Manchester Metropolitan University
Dr Gee Macrory	Manchester Metropolitan University, RiPL
Nick Mair	Independent Schools' Modern Languages Association
Tom Martell	Education Endowment Fund
Julie McCulloch	Association of School and College Leaders
Prof. Rosamond Mitchell	University of Southampton, RiPL
Maggie Morgan, MBE	St Paul's C of E Nursery & Primary, Brighton
Prof. Victoria Murphy	University of Oxford, RiPL, Chair of NALDIC
Prof. Florence Myles	University of Essex, RiPL Chair
Suzanne O'Farrell	Association of School and College Leaders
Karl Pfeiffer	Goethe Institut
Dr Alison Porter	University of Southampton, RiPL
Clare Seccombe	Association for Language Learning
David Shanks	Harris Federation (ITE)
Dr Angela Tellier	University of Essex, RiPL
Raquel Tola Rego	Hackney Learning Trust and the Primary Schools Network
Natalie Torrance	Springfield Primary School, Sale, Trafford
Pascale Vassie, OBE	National Resource Centre for Supplementary Education
Dr Fang Zhou	Confucius Institute

8. References

[i] Languages boost to deliver skilled workforce for UK's businesses, 3 August 2018.
https://www.gov.uk/government/news/languages-boost-to-deliver-skilled-workforce-for-uks-businesses

[ii] Letter to Tim Oates, Director of Research and Assessment, from Rt Hon Michael Gove, Secretary of State, *National Curriculum Review*, 11 June 2012 Department for Education.
https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130903122111/http://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/l/secretary%20of%20state%20letter%20to%20tim%20oates%20regarding%20the%20national%20curriculum%20review%2011%20june%202012.pdf

[iii] Department for Education (2013a). *Languages Programmes of Study: Key stage 2*.
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/239042/PRIMARY_national_curriculum_-_Languages.pdf

[iv] Department for Education (2013b). *Languages Programmes of Study: Key stage 3.*
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/239083/SECONDARY_national_curriculum_-_Languages.pdf

[v] Tinsley and Doležal (2018). *Language Trends 2018: Language teaching in primary and secondary schools in England. Survey Report.* British Council.
https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/language_trends_2018_report.pdf

[vi] OECD (2014). *Education at a glance 2014 – OECD 2014 Indicators.*
International comparisons of time allocation for languages, Reference Table D1.3a Instruction time per subject in primary education.
http://www.oecd.org/education/Education-at-a-Glance-2014.pdf

[vii] *Carter Review of Initial Teacher Training*, Sir Andrew Carter OBE, January 2015.
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/399957/Carter_Review.pdf

[viii] Department for Education (2018). *Primary school accountability in 2018: A technical guide for primary maintained schools, academies and free schools.*
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/763614/Primary_school_accountability_technical_guide_2018_.pdf

[ix] Ofsted (2018). *Chief Inspector sets out vision for new Education Inspection Framework.* 11/10/2108. Press release.
https://www.gov.uk/government/news/chief-inspector-sets-out-vision-for-new-education-inspection-framework

[x] Please refer to the Annex for a bibliography of relevant research references.

[xi] Department for Education (2018). *Schools, Pupils and their Characteristics First Language.* (Tables 5a and 5b).
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/719226/Schools_Pupils_and_their_Characteristics_2018_Main_Text.pdf

[xii] Bauckham, I. (2016). *Modern Foreign Languages Pedagogy Review: A review of modern foreign languages teaching practice in key stage 3 and key stage 4*. Teaching Schools Council.
https://www.tscouncil.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/MFL-Pedagogy-Review-Report-2.pdf

Annex – Selection of relevant research publications

Andrews, J. & Lawrence, T. (2018). *School funding pressures in England*. London: Education Policy Institute.

Aukrust, V. G. (2007). Young children acquiring second language vocabulary in preschool group-time: Does amount, diversity, and discourse complexity of teacher talk matter? *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 22, 17–37.

Blake, R. (2016). Technology and the four skills. *Language Learning & Technology*, *20*(2), 129–142.

Bouffard, L. A. & Sarkar, M. (2008). Training 8-year-old French immersion students in metalinguistic analysis: An innovation in form-focussed pedagogy. *Language Awareness, 17*, 3-24.

Burden, R., Williams, M. & Lanvers, U. (2002). 'French is the language of love and stuff': student perceptions of issues related to motivation in learning a foreign language. *British Educational Research Journal, 28(4),* 503-528.

Cable, C., Driscoll, P., Mitchell, R., Sing, S., Cremin, T., Earl, J., Eyres, I., Holmes, B., Martin, C. & Heins, B. (2010). *Languages Learning at Key stage 2, A Longitudinal Study: Final Report. Research Report DCSF_RR198*: Department for Children Schools and Families. Department for Education (2014).

Carreira, J. M. (2006). Motivation for learning English as a foreign language in Japanese elementary schools. *Japanese Association for Language Teaching Journal, 28*(2), 135-158.

Chambers, G. (2016). Pupils' perceptions of Key stage 2 to Key stage 3 transition in modern foreign languages. *The Language Learning Journal*, 1-15.

Chapelle, C. A. (2016). CALL in the year 2000: A look back from 2016. *Language Learning & Technology*, *20*(2), 159–161.

Coleman, J. A., Galaczi, Á. & Astruc, L. (2007). Motivation of UK school pupils towards foreign languages: A large-scale survey at Key stage 3. *Language Learning Journal, 35*(2), 245-280.

Costley, T., Gkonou, C., Myles, F., Roehr-Brackin, K., & Tellier, A. (2018). Multilingual & monolingual children in the primary-level language classroom: individual differences & perceptions of foreign language learning. *The Language Learning Journal*, First View, 1-13.

Courtney, L. (2014). *Moving from primary to secondary education: an investigation into the effect of primary to secondary transition on motivation for language learning and foreign language proficiency.* (PhD), University of Southampton, Southampton.

Courtney, L. (2017). Transition in modern foreign languages: A longitudinal study of motivation for language learning and second language proficiency. *Oxford Review of Education*, *43*(4), 462-481.

Dahl, A. (2015). Input and language competence in early start foreign language programmes. In T. Cadierno & S. W. Eskildsen (Eds.), *Usage-Based Perspectives on Second Language Learning* (pp. 125-154). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Diamond, A. (2002). Normal development of prefrontal cortex from birth to young adulthood: Cognitive functions, anatomy, and biochemistry. *Principles of frontal lobe function*, 466-503.

Edelenbos, P., & Suhre, C. (1994). A comparison of courses for English in primary education. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 20,* 513–534.

Enever, J. (Ed.). (2011). *ELLiE. Early Language Learning in Europe.* London: British Council.

Enever, J., & Lindgren, E. (Eds.). (2017). *Early language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Fenyvesi, K. (2018). English learning motivation of young learners in Danish primary schools. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-24.

Finch, K., Theakston, A., & Serratrice, L. (2018). Teaching modern foreign languages in multilingual classrooms: an examination of Key stage 2 teachers' experiences. *The Language Learning Journal*, First View, 1-15.

Graham, S., Courtney, L., Marinis, T., & Tonkyn, A. (2017) Early language learning: The impact of teaching and teacher factors. *Language Learning, 67*, 922–958

Graham, S., Courtney, L., Tonkyn, A. & Marinis, T. (2016). Motivational trajectories for early language learning across the primary-secondary school transition. *British Educational Research Journal, 42*(4), 682-702.

Graham, S., Marinis, T., Tonkyn, A., & Courtney, L. (2014). *Primary Modern Languages: The impact of teaching approaches on attainment and preparedness for secondary school language learning*. Final Report to the Nuffield Foundation. Available at: http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/primary-modern-languages-impact-teaching-approaches.

Guz, E., & Tetiurka, M. (2016). Positive emotions and learner engagement: insights from an early FL classroom. In D. Gabryś-Barker & D. Gałajda (Eds.), *Positive psychology perspectives on foreign language learning and teaching* (pp. 133-153). Cham: Springer.

Huang, B.H. (2016). A synthesis of empirical research on the linguistic outcomes of early foreign language instruction. International Journal of Multilingualism, 13 (3), 257-273.

Hutchinson, J. (2018). *Educational outcomes of children with English as an additional language.* London: Educational Policy Institute. Retrieved from: https://epi.org.uk/publications-and-research/educational-outcomes-children-english-additional-language/.

Kasprowicz, R., & Marsden, E. (2017). Towards ecological validity in research into input-based practice: Form spotting can be as beneficial as form-meaning practice. *Applied Linguistics*, First View.

Keeble, R. (2016). *Effective Primary Teaching Practice Report*. Teaching Schools Council. Retrieved from https://www.tscouncil.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Effective-primary-teaching-practice-2016-report-web.pdf.

Kopp, C. B. (1982). Antecedents of self-regulation: a developmental perspective. Developmental psychology, *18*(2), 199.

Lanvers, U. (2017). Contradictory others and the habitus of languages: Surveying the L2 motivation landscape in the United Kingdom. *The Modern Language Journal, 101*(3), 517-532.

Lindgren, E. & Enever, J. (2017). Employing mixed methods for the constructions of thick descriptions of early language learning. J. Enever & E. Lindgren (Eds.). *Early Language Learning. Complexity and Mixed Methods* (pp.201-221)*.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lindgren, E. & Muñoz, C. (2013). The influence of exposure, parents and linguistic distance on young European learners' foreign language comprehension. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *10*(1): 105-129.

Macrory, G., Chrétien, L. & Ortega-Martin, J. (2012). Technologically enhanced language learning in primary schools in England, France and Spain: developing linguistic competence in a technologically enhanced classroom environment. *Education 3-13: International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education, 40*(4), 433-444.

Martin, C. (2012). Pupils' perceptions of foreign language learning in the primary school—findings from the Key stage 2 Language Learning Pathfinder evaluation. *Education 3-13, 40*(4), 343-362.

Mihaljevíc Djigunović, J. (2009). Impact of learning conditions on young FL learners' motivation. In M. Nikolov (Ed.) *Early learning of modern foreign languages: Processes and outcomes* (pp. 75-89). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Mihaljević Djigunović, J. (2012). Attitudes and motivation in early foreign language learning. *CEPS Journal 2*(3): 55-74.

Mihaljević Djigunović, J. (2009). Individual differences in early language programmes. In M. Nikolov (Ed.), *The age factor and early language learning* (pp. 199-225). Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (Forthcoming 2019). Foreign language learning in an Anglophone setting: classroom engagement and attainable learning outcomes. *Apples: Applied Language Studies*.

Montroy, J. J., Bowles, R. P., Skibbe, L. E., McClelland, M. M., & Morrison, F. J. (2016). The development of self-regulation across early childhood. *Developmental psychology, 52*(11), 1744-1762.

Muñoz, C. (2006). The effects of age on foreign language learning: The BAF project. In C. Muñoz, (Ed.), *Age and the rate of foreign language learning* (pp. 1-40). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Murphy, V. A. & Unthiah, A. (2015). *A systematic review of intervention research examining English language and literacy development in children with English as an Additional Language (EAL).* London: Education Endowment Foundation.

Murphy, V. A. (2014). *Second language learning in the early school years: Trends and Contexts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murphy, V. A. (2018). Literacy development in linguistically diverse pupils. In D. Miller, F. Bayram, J. Rothman & L. Serratrice (Eds). *Bilingual Cognition and Language: The state of the science across its subfields. Studies in Bilingualism, 54,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Murphy, V.A. (2019). Multilingualism in primary schools. In S. Garton & F. Copland (Eds). *The Routledge Handbook of Teaching English to Young Learners*. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis.

Myles, F. (2017). Learning foreign languages in primary schools: is younger better? *Languages, Society and Policy, 1*(1), 1-8.

Myles, F., & Mitchell, R. (2012). *Learning French from ages 5, 7 and 11: An investigation into starting ages, rates and routes of learning amongst early foreign language learners.* Available at https://researchcatalogue.esrc.ac.uk/grants/RES-062-23-1545/outputs/read/01559a37-eb0c-409a-afdf-28d515758a88.

Nicholas, H., & Lightbown, P. (2008). Defining child second language acquisition, defining roles for L2 instruction. In J. Philp, R. Oliver, & A. Mackey (Eds.), *Second language acquisition and the younger learner* (pp. 27-51). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nikolov, M. (2009). Early modern foreign language programmes and outcomes: Factors contributing to Hungarian learners' proficiency. In M. Nikolov (Ed.) *Early learning of modern foreign languages: Processes and outcomes* (pp. 90-107). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Nikolov, M. (2016). Trends, issues, and challenges in assessing young language learners. In M. Nikolov (Ed.) Assessing young learners of English: Global and local perspectives (pp. 1-17). *Educational Linguistics 25*.

Ofsted, (2011). *Modern Languages: Achievement and Challenges 2007-2010*. Manchester: Ofsted.

Ofsted & Wilshaw, M. (2016). *HMCI's monthly commentary.* Manchester: Ofsted.

Oxley, E. & de Cat, C. (2018). *A systematic review of language and literacy interventions in children and adolescents with English as an additional language (EAL)*. Retrieved from: https://osf.io/92s6v/.

Pfenninger, S., & Singleton, D. (2017). *Beyond age effects in instructional L2 learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Philips, M. (2010) The perceived value of videoconferencing with primary pupils learning to speak a foreign language. *Language Learning Journal 38*(2), 221–38.

Porter, A. (2017). Verbal working memory and foreign language learning in English primary schools: Implications for teaching and learning. In J. Enever, & E. Lindgren (Eds.), *Early Language Learning: Complexity and Mixed Methods* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Pritchard, A., M. Hunt, & Barnes, A. (2010) Case study investigation of a videoconferencing experiment in primary schools, teaching modern foreign languages. *The Language Learning Journal, 38*(2), 209-220.

Qureshi, M. A. (2016). A meta-analysis: Age and second language grammar acquisition. *System, 60,* 147-160.

Robson, S. (2006). *Developing thinking and understanding in young children*. Oxon: Routledge.

Sparks, R. L. (2012). Individual differences in L2 learning and long-term L1–L2 relationships. *Language Learning, 62*, 5-27.

Stables, A. & Wikeley, F. (1999). From bad to worse? Pupils' attitudes to modern foreign languages at ages 14 and 15. *The Language Learning Journal, 20*, 27-31.

Szpotowicz, M. (2009). Factors influencing young learners' vocabulary acquisition. In M. Nikolov (Ed.) *Early learning of modern foreign languages: Processes and outcomes* (pp. 195-211). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Tinsley, T., & Board, K. (2016). *Language trends 2015/16. The state of language learning in primary and secondary schools in England*. Reading: Education Development Trust.

Tinsley, T., & Board, K. (2017). *Language Trends 2016/17. Language teaching in primary and secondary schools in England.* Survey Report. London: British Council.

Tinsley, T., & Board, K. (2016). *Language Trends 2015/16.The state of language learning in primary and secondary schools in England*. Reading: CfBT.

Tinsley, T., & Doležal, N. (2018). *Language Trends 2018. Language teaching in primary and secondary schools in England. Survey report.* London: British Council.

Unsworth, S., Persson, L., Prins, T., & De Bot, K. (2015). An investigation of factors affecting early foreign language learning in the Netherlands. *Applied Linguistics, 36*(5), 527-548.

Woore, R. (2014). 'Developing reading and decoding in the modern foreign languages classroom.' In Driscoll, P., Swarbrick, A. & Macaro, E. (Eds.) *Debates in modern languages education,* (pp 81-95). Oxford: Routledge.

What we offer

An informative website covering all aspects of primary MFL teaching and learning www.ripl.uk

A monthly newsletter, highlighting events, new research, and primary-related projects

Reader-friendly summaries of research on language learning, teaching and multilingualism in primary classrooms

CPD training, workshops, and conferences

Consultancy and advice

Contact RiPL

ripl@ripl.uk

Research in Primary Languages