

People and Work Unit

Welsh Assembly Government

Evaluation of the Key Stage 2 Modern Foreign Languages Pilot Projects being delivered in Wales from 2003-2006

Final Report
November 2006

32 Monmouth Road
Abergavenny
Monmouthshire
NP7 5HL

Tel: 01873 850975
Fax: 01873 855190
E-mail: peoplework@btconnect.com

Uned Pobl a Gwaith

Evaluation of the Key Stage 2 Modern Foreign Languages Pilot Projects

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. The structure of the pilot	7
3. Summary	9
4. The Impact on the Curriculum	12
- Should MFL be taught at Key Stage 2?	12
- How does MFL provision contribute to the Key Stage 2 Curriculum?	15
5. The Impact on Teaching	17
- Delivery methods	18
- Evidence of successful teaching	21
6. The Impact on Pupils	23
- at Key Stage 3	24
- at Key Stage 4	26
- at transition	30
- progression	30
- broader educational advantage	31
- the impact of bi-lingualism	32
- success in engaging all pupils	34
7. The Impact on Schools	37
- Joining the pilot	37
- adverse effects of joining	39
- costs and benefits	41
- sustainability	43
- support from CILT Cymru	44
- support from the cluster	45
- tracking progression	47
8. Assessment of the lessons from developments in Scotland, England and Ireland	49
9. Conclusions	56
Bibliography	58

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Modern Foreign Languages (MFL) pilot project was launched in the Autumn term 2003. The intention of the project was to test out a variety of models for the delivery of foreign language teaching at Key Stage 2. The models all involve at least one primary and one secondary school in partnership.
- 1.2 The pilot project forms a part of the Welsh Assembly Government's National Modern Foreign Languages (MFL) Strategy 'Languages Count'. This strategy aims to increase participation in language learning across Wales. As discussed in section 8 the pilot follows similar experiments in Scotland and England.
- 1.3 This evaluation followed the development of the project over the second two years of the three-year pilot. The aim of the evaluation was to consider the impact of introducing the study of foreign languages at Key Stage 2 on the curriculum, on teaching, on schools and on pupils' subsequent learning. Specifically the evaluation was required to report on the pilot projects' impact on the following areas:-

Curriculum – whether the introduction of MFL is judged to be a worthwhile complement to and development of the statutory curriculum.

Teaching – comparing and contrasting different teaching methods used in pilot schools and the interaction between MFL provision and the culture and ethos of the schools.

- the potential of different delivery methods to become sustainable and for wider use
- evidence of successful teaching and learning and why this is judged to be successful.

Pupils - whether involvement in MFL learning at Key Stage 2 has a subsequent impact on MFL learning at Key Stage 3 and on written/ speaking/ listening skills in English and Welsh.

- whether pupils' existing skills in more than one language have an impact on their acquisition of a 3rd or 4th language.
- whether the MFL provision has been successful in engaging all pupils to their potential, with particular attention to the engagement of boys and pupils with special educational needs (SEN).

Schools - whether the introduction of MFL learning through the pilots has had any adverse effects or created additional pressure on schools, staff and pupils.

Evaluation of the Key Stage 2 Modern Foreign Languages Pilot Projects

- the cost and benefits of the provision made within schools and the extent to which the costs are covered by the additional funding made available.
- the support provided to schools, particularly by CILT Cymru and through the Cluster model.
- processes put in place to facilitate and track pupil's transition in MFL to Key Stage 3 and beyond and how successful these are judged to be.

Costs and Benefits - an assessment of costs and benefits for both the pilot provision and the support provided by CILT Cymru.

1.4 In 2005, the second year of the pilot, the evaluators visited 123 of the 126 schools involved in the project. During these school visits interviews were held with headteachers, class teachers and with staff involved in planning and/or delivering the MFL provision. The evaluators also observed lessons in each of the clusters and consulted pupils about their responses to the pilot. Most pupils were consulted through small group discussions but in addition 26 year 7 pupils completed a written questionnaire administered in class.

1.5 In 2006, the third year of the pilot, the evaluators revisited 55 schools. This second stage of the evaluation sought to focus particularly on transition and impacts of involvement in the project at Key Stage 3 and there was a particular emphasis on consulting the secondary schools. 19 of the 21 secondary schools were involved in the second stage of the evaluation along with 36 primary schools.

Table 1.1: number of staff interviewed

	Primary		Secondary		All	
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
Pilot schools visited	103	36	20	19	123	55
Headteachers	89	28	12	14	101	42
Deputy Head	10	2	24	2	34	4
MFL pilot teacher	23	5	11	10	34	15
Class teachers	89	33	13	5	102	38
Head of Department	1	0	15	9	16	9
Total	212	68	75	40	287	108

Table 1.2: Pupils consulted

Primary		Secondary		All	
2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
291	223	75	90	366	313

1.6 In addition, in 2006 the evaluators interviewed the headteachers of 8 schools that were eligible to have joined the pilot, that is that they were feeder schools to a secondary school that was involved, but chose not to. The aim of these interviews was to explore why they had not joined.

1.7 Twenty parent questionnaires were given to each school visited by the evaluators with a request that they be distributed to pupils involved in the pilot to take home. The bilingual questionnaires were in a sealed envelope which enclosed a freepost return envelope. The evaluators were dependent on the schools distributing the questionnaires and pupils delivering them to parents. Where there was no response from a school it was assumed that the questionnaires were not distributed. In the first phase of the evaluation in 2005 responses came from 90 of the 123 schools consulted and in 2006 there were parent responses from 38 of the 55 schools visited. Table 1.3. provides details:

- on the number of schools visited and the balance between primary and secondary schools (rows 3-5);
- the total numbers of questionnaires distributed to schools (row 7), the total numbers of responses and the percentage of parents who responded (row 8);
- the total number of schools where parents responded (row 10), the total number of primary and secondary schools where parents responded and the percentage of primary and secondary schools we received parental responses from (rows 11 and 12); and
- The response rate from schools where parents responded (row 13).

Table 1.3: parent survey responses – number and percentages

Total schools = 126	2005		2006	
	No.	%	No.	%
Sample of schools visited	123	100%	55	100%
of which secondary schools	20	16%	19	35%
primary schools	103	84%	36	65%
Total questionnaires distributed to schools	2460	100%	1100	100%
Total parent response	930	38%	310	28%
Number of schools with parent response	90	73%	38	69%
Of which secondary	19	15%	9	14%
Primary	71	58%	29	53%
Return from schools where questionnaire was distributed	930	52%	310	41%

1.8 During school visits topic schedules were used to gather qualitative and quantitative data. Qualitative interview responses were coded to produce categories and percentage responses against the category areas. This enabled school staff and pupils to provide responses based on their views and experience of the pilot, rather than only responding to the evaluators'

assumptions through pre-set questions. It does mean, however, a low percentage response to an issue may only be viewed as indicative of the comparative importance of that issue, since it is a record of how commonly it was raised.

- 1.9 There were also variations in the number of interviews completed in schools. In one school, for example, six class teachers contributed their views while in others there may only be one. Some schools were very small and headteachers were also class teachers and so only one interview was done in the school. There were also varying amounts of time available to complete interviews so that in some cases not all questions could be asked. It would be misleading, therefore, to present data by school and so, where percentages are used, they represent the overall proportion of school staff who commented on a particular issue.
- 1.10 All figures used in tables were responses to closed, quantitative questions, such as “Do you think the approach used to teach a MFL in this cluster is effective?”). The percentage responses quoted in the explanatory narrative relate to the numbers of people who raised a particular issue in response to an open question such as “Can you tell me what you think the impact of this project is on pupils...” as a percentage of the whole sample.
- 1.11 In tables percentages do not always add up to 100 as ‘don’t know’ and ‘no answer’ responses are left out where they form a small proportion of overall responses.
- 1.12 Progress reports were delivered to the project steering group in December 2004, May 2005, September 2005 and January 2006 and an interim evaluation report was submitted in April 2005. A summary report was prepared in May 2005 and sent to all schools participating in the pilot project. This final report draws on an analysis of all the data collected in the two phases of the evaluation, that is school visits done in 2005 and in 2006 and is an amalgamation of previous reports.
- 1.13 Where relevant tables and findings are dated either 2005 or 2006. This occurs when the same issue has been explored in consecutive years in order to explore whether there had been any change as the project progressed.

2. The structure of the pilot

The pilot involved 126 schools across Wales. Involvement in the pilot carried a requirement for a minimum delivery of nineteen hours MFL teaching during the year. The MFL pilot project was structured to test a range of approaches to MFL teaching at KS2. The project was also structured to test the cluster model where a secondary school and its feeder primary schools work together on the curriculum and delivery of teaching. The project was managed through CILT Cymru. CILT Cymru provided training and staff support, advice and guidance, access to resources and management of the funding. Pilot schools could choose the language they wanted to teach. Most clusters (19 of the 21) taught French, although 4 of these also taught either German or Spanish. One cluster, for example, delivered German and French in alternate years. One cluster taught Spanish only and one only German. There was also a school teaching some Italian.

2.1 Timescale

2.1.1 The pilot was structured to allow for three years work. However, not all schools began work in September 2003. The evaluation found that around 10% of schools did not actually start to provide MFL teaching until September 2004.

2.2 Clusters

2.2.1 The pilot involved twenty-one clusters. At the time of the first set of school interviews, eight were full clusters involving all the identified feeder primary schools to a specific secondary school. During the course of the evaluation more schools joined the clusters but there was also a range of part-clusters, ranging from ones where most feeder schools were involved to three that involve just one feeder primary school.

2.2.2 There was a small number of pupils who went onto KS3 in September 2004 and were in year 9 by the end of the pilot. However, the evaluation focused on the year 8 cohort in 2006 as this was the first group considered to have fully benefited from the cluster structure.

2.2.3 Four clusters are headed by primary schools. It would be more accurate to describe two of these as partnerships since they involved only the primary school and the secondary school.

2.3 Welsh language

2.3.1 Education in sixty-six of the schools (nine of the twenty-one clusters) is delivered through the medium of Welsh. Welsh is taught in all other schools.

2.4 Geographical spread

2.4.1 Ninety-three schools involved in the pilot were in South Wales, ten in West Wales and twenty-three in North Wales.

2.5 Teaching delivery

2.5.1 All of the clusters involved some form of specialist language teaching. Eight clusters deliver the provision solely through a specialist language teacher from

the secondary school teaching the primary school pupils. Three involve an independent peripatetic teacher employed specifically through the project and two bought in local people who were language specialists. All others involved a mix of provision within the cluster and sometimes within the school.

- 2.5.2 The majority of the lessons were delivered weekly for between 30-45 minutes, with a minority having fortnightly lessons for a 1 hour. By the second year of the pilot all the schools were delivering lessons on a termly basis throughout the year. Two clusters which initially ran the lessons in a concentrated period in the Summer term, after SATs were completed, changed to spread the work more evenly through the year. Their experience was that the concentrated approach created real pressure on staff, particularly if, as happened in one area, key staff members were missing through illness during the delivery period.

3. Summary

3.1 The Curriculum:

3.1.1 School staff, parents and pupils all agree that the introduction of MFL at KS2 is a worthwhile addition to the statutory curriculum. It is seen as a good thing because:

- There is a perception that the younger a child is, the easier it is to learn a language. School staff observed that KS2 pupils were less inhibited in speaking new words.
- The focus on speaking and listening at KS2 means that language learning can be introduced in a 'fun' way, encouraging a positive approach at KS3.
- Children become more aware of other cultures and peoples.
- There is a positive effect on language skills in English and Welsh.

3.1.2 Over half of school staff identified a positive impact from the introduction of MFL teaching on the general KS2 curriculum and over a third had developed specific curriculum links.

3.1.3 The MFL pilot project had helped to develop or strengthen effective links between primary and secondary schools which had resulted in a sharing of teaching methods and raised awareness of ways to link the KS2 and KS3 curricula.

3.2 Teaching:

3.2.1 All teaching approaches used in the pilot were judged as successful by parents, pupils and schools in engaging pupils and developing enjoyment of language learning.

3.2.2 The involvement of specialist teachers, however, was seen by a large majority of school staff to be important. Specialists may be teachers visiting from the secondary school, peripatetic teachers or primary school teachers who know the language being taught well.

3.2.3 Specialist teaching that is led by the secondary school was seen as particularly valuable for progression, since it created opportunities to develop an integrated, staged curriculum. Where lessons were delivered directly by secondary school teachers there was an additional benefit in transition, especially where pupils were taught in year 7 by teachers they had worked with in year 6.

3.2.4 High quality MFL teaching was achieved 'in-house' by some primary schools through the enthusiasm and hard work of the teachers involved.

3.2.5 Success in MFL delivery was judged primarily by pupils' enjoyment and enthusiasm for the lessons. There was evidence that pupils were learning about other countries and peoples as well as languages.

3.3 Impact on pupils:

3.3.1 The MFL pilot project was judged by school staff, pupils and parents to have had a beneficial impact on pupils. It was described as having a beneficial impact on transition to secondary school and MFL learning at KS3. The strength of the school cluster was key to the impact on transition and progression. Without a full cluster schools cannot plan for progression.

3.3.2 As the project progressed, school staff saw more evidence of a positive impact on transition, with 56% in 2005 saying there was an impact compared to 89% in 2006.

3.3.3 Most of the assessment of impact on KS3 was qualitative. Less than a quarter of schools surveyed were collecting quantitative data. However, where such data were being collected the impact of the pilot was consistently shown to be positive.

3.3.4 Pupils all said that MFL learning at KS2 had helped them in KS3 and 81% of parents of KS3 pupils said their children's MFL study in the secondary school had been helped by involvement in the pilot.

3.3.5 There was evidence of a sustained interest and enjoyment of MFL study, with year 8 pupils and parents still very enthusiastic. 88% of parents wanted their child to study an MFL to GCSE.

3.3.6 However, despite enjoyment in learning languages only 64% of primary school pupils and 46% of secondary school pupils involved in the pilot anticipated studying MFL to GCSE. Estyn studies suggest that take up at KS4 is influenced by a range of different factors unrelated to enjoyment of language learning.

3.3.7 Having a degree of fluency in two languages (Welsh and English) is seen to provide an advantage in learning a 3rd or 4th language. However, the evaluation identified differences in how the advantage is perceived according to the linguistic background of the pupils and the type of school. These fall into three broad categories:

- a. pupils whose home language is Welsh and who could be said to be 'naturally bi-lingual'
- b. pupils whose home language is English but who attend Welsh medium schools, frequently from the age of four or younger, and who have acquired a high degree of fluency in both languages from the school setting
- c. pupils whose home language is English and who are taught Welsh as a second language only in school and who could be described as Welsh learners.

The main MFL learning advantage was perceived to be with pupils in Welsh medium schools who have a high degree of fluency in both languages.

- 3.3.8 The MFL project was successful in engaging both boys and girls. It also was frequently able to involve pupils with special needs because of its focus on listening and speaking.

3.4 Impact on schools:

- 3.4.1 Schools applied to join the pilot project either because they had an existing interest in MFL or European work or because they were part of a cluster where the lead school did.
- 3.4.2 There was evidence that many teachers were highly committed to the project and its success. This was a key strength to the project but could also be a vulnerability if the work came to rely on their enthusiasm and leadership and if for any reason, they then left.
- 3.4.3 Parents and school governors were enthusiastic about the project and this was an incentive for schools to become involved. 80% of school staff said the project had had a positive impact on the school including promoting staff development and stronger clusters.
- 3.4.4 Nearly half the schools in the pilot identified no difficulties in introducing the project. Where there were problems they mainly were caused by pressure on the primary school curriculum, insufficient staff time and incomplete clusters.
- 3.4.5 89% of schools said that the funding available for the pilots had covered their costs. The main cost was in paying for specialist teaching. There were also costs associated with cluster meetings and staff development sessions and with buying resources.
- 3.4.6 In order to make KS2 MFL provision sustainable, school staff said there needed to be enthusiasm from teachers, consistency and planning in delivery and specialist teachers available. Parents also identified the need for progression planning and over 80% of school staff said that it was important to have a full cluster in order to maintain this learning advantage.
- 3.4.7 CILT Cymru's support and development role was appreciated. The organisation's role in providing training, advice and guidance was valued as was their help in solving problems and difficulties. CILT Cymru was seen as helping with problems with the cluster and in managing the funding.

4 Impact on the curriculum

Key findings:

School staff, parents and pupils all agree that the introduction of MFL at KS2 is a worthwhile addition to the statutory curriculum.

It is seen as a good thing because:

- * There is a perception that the younger a child is, the easier it is to learn a language. School staff observed that KS2 pupils were less inhibited in speaking new words.
- * The focus on speaking and listening at KS2 means that language learning can be introduced in a 'fun' way, encouraging a positive approach at KS3.
- * Children become more aware of other cultures and peoples.
- * There is a positive effect on language skills in English and Welsh.

Over half of school staff identified a positive impact from the introduction of MFL teaching on the general KS2 curriculum and over a third had developed specific curriculum links.

The MFL pilot project had helped to strengthen and develop effective links between primary and secondary schools which had resulted in a sharing of teaching methods and raised awareness of ways to link the KS2 and KS3 curricula.

- 4.1 School staff, parents and pupils were all asked whether MFL should be taught at KS2. There was an overwhelmingly positive response to this with 90% or more of each group consulted supporting the introduction of MFL in primary schools. Pupils and parents were initially more enthusiastic than school staff but the evaluation found that primary class teachers, in particular, became more positive about the value of MFL learning at KS2 as the pilot progressed.

Table 4.1: Should MFL be taught at Key Stage 2?

Respondent	Yes - %		No - %		Don't know - %	
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
School staff	77	90	7	3	16	7
Parents	99	93	1	7	0	0
Pupils	100	100	0	0	0	0

- 4.2 The benefits of teaching a foreign language at Key Stage 2 are described as being:-

- the enthusiasm and excitement of pupils in learning a new subject

Evaluation of the Key Stage 2 Modern Foreign Languages Pilot Projects

- the lack of self-consciousness of primary school pupils when participating in class
- a perception that the younger a child is the easier it is to learn a new language

Parent comments:

Children are more willing to use a new language to practise than when they are older. If children start to learn another language at a young age they don't fear the thought of the challenge of learning.

My son is looking forward to going to high school to continue French. He has been inspired!

When we are on holiday I feel so proud of my son as he has a good attempt at Spanish even though he only knows a little, but the shop owners love it when he attempts to chat in Spanish.

My eldest daughter took part in the first year of the pilot scheme and now that she is in secondary school, the benefits are already evident. She is also aware that she will be able to converse with others when we go to France in the summer – evidence of confidence in using the language. I am delighted my second daughter has the same chance to take part in the scheme.

More relaxed and younger teaching methods can be used i.e. colour by numbers, jigsaws etc. which help the child to learn a MFL through play activities instead of reciting boring conjugated verbs etc. My child is learning French very quickly through some wonderful play activities. She thinks it is fun and really enjoys the lesson each week. A BRILLIANT SCHEME!!

As well as being of academic importance /development I believe learning a new language also helps with social skills. I strongly believe learning a new language is a huge benefit and I'm extremely pleased that my daughter has had the opportunity to participate – long may it continue!

We need to be wholehearted about teaching MFL and they need to be taught in an environment in which the children are uninhibited and have plenty to say – at primary school. By the time they get to secondary school children have become inhibited and it's too late.

- 4.3 Parents' comments emphasised a perception that it is easier to learn a new language when young. A third of parents added comments on the questionnaire

giving this as their prime reason for supporting MFL study at KS2. Parents indicated that they saw learning a language as important, with most (over 70%) agreeing that their child is likely to need to speak another language in adult life. Other comments from parents emphasised the importance of MFL learning in broadening understanding of other cultures and countries (11% of secondary school parents and 14% of primary school parents). Primary school parents also commented on the value of MFL learning at Key Stage 2 as a preparation for secondary school.

- 4.4 Parents were clear that learning another language was important educationally and in preparing their children for adult life. Despite the increasingly common use of English internationally, three quarters of the parents responding disagreed with the view that their child was unlikely to need to speak another language as an adult (tables 4.2 and 4.3). It was clear from talking to pupils that many had already had some experience of visiting a European country (most commonly Spain) and most expected to in the future.

Table 4.2 It is unlikely that my child will need to speak another language in adult life

	Strongly agree - %	Agree - %	Don't know - %	Disagree - %	Strongly disagree - %
Primary school parents	1	4	18	43	34
Secondary school parents	3	3	17	43	33

Table 4.3 There is no need to learn another language since English is spoken everywhere

	Strongly agree - %	Agree - %	Don't know - %	Disagree - %	Strongly disagree - %
Primary school parents	1	1	2	40	57
Secondary school parents	2	4	2	42	51

- 4.5 Parents saw a general benefit in being able to speak a number of languages (table 4.4) and also agreed that learning a language provided a valuable skill in itself (table 4.5).

Table 4.4: The more languages you can speak the better

	Strongly agree - %	Agree - %	Don't know - %	Disagree - %	Strongly disagree - %
Primary school parents	52	42	3	2	1
Secondary school parents	54	39	2	5	0

Table 4.5: Being able to learn a language is a valuable skill

	Strongly agree - %	Agree - %	Don't know - %	Disagree - %	Strongly disagree - %
Primary school parents	69	28	1	1	1
Secondary school parents	54	43	1	1	2

4.6 School pupils agreed with adults in seeing language learning as easier when you are in primary school. 40% said it was easier to learn a language when you are young and many cited Welsh as an example, identifying how starting in Infant school had been a good thing. 97% of primary school pupils and 93% of secondary school pupils involved in the pilot thought that it is important to be able to speak foreign languages. Some primary pupils (28%) also identified the fact that MFL study would help with transition, both because of knowing the teacher (where applicable) and in providing a ‘headstart’ in studying.

4.7 School staff comments reflected the parent view that children are able to benefit from language teaching in primary school and there was some support for starting from year 1. The main benefits identified were in the general promotion of language skills and use of language and in raised confidence in language learning (28% of positive responses). For some there was a cumulative effect in that they identified skills learned being transferred to other areas of the curriculum (18% of positive comments).

Excellent in French and anything they enthuse about burns over to other areas of the curriculum. (class teacher comment)

4.8 In some cases there was also evidence of the enrichment of teaching methods as a result of involvement in the pilot.

In Welsh language learning we use the games and successful strategies used in French. (class teacher comment)

How does MFL provision contribute to the KS2 curriculum?

4.9 Schools were asked what impact the project had had on the KS2 curriculum. The majority of teachers and senior managers said there had been a positive impact (table 4.6).

Table 4.6: impact of the project on the curriculum - % response

Respondent	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Don't know
Headteachers	55	20	5	20
Teachers (other)	57	25	6	12

4.10 In the first phase of the evaluation 41% of school staff talked about curriculum development during the first phase of the evaluation and of these 75% said that involvement in the project had had a positive effect on the curriculum. The impact varied from the development of new programmes of work, to a 'Europeanisation' of the standard curriculum which involved references to 'broadening' pupils outlook and ideas on how to include international perspectives. Table 4.7 illustrates how people described the curriculum as being enhanced.

Table 4.7: Evidence of impact on Primary Curriculum

Cross-Curricula Impact %	Widen Horizons %	Other %
63	20	17

- 4.11 This was further explored in the second phase and all schools were asked whether curriculum links had been developed with other subjects though the pilot project. A third identified links (table 4.8).

Table 4.8: curriculum links developed through the MFL pilot in the cluster - % response

Respondent	Yes	No	Don't know
Headteachers	31	44	26
Teachers (other)	33	58	8

- 4.12 In primary schools, cross curricular impacts were identified in the teaching of English and Welsh (27% of positive responses) and also in history, geography and general cultural awareness (27% of positive responses). Other areas where an impact was identified were I.T. (see 5.2) and music.
- 4.13 There was also evidence of impact on the KS3 curriculum with 80% of staff responding saying that involvement in the pilot project had had a positive impact on the secondary school curriculum (table 4.9).

Table 4.9: Evidence of impact on Secondary Curriculum

Curriculum Advanced %	Cross-Curricular Impact %	Other %
57	14	29

- 4.14 The main identified inhibitor to curriculum impact was time. 67% of respondents said that lack of time prevented the project work having a broader impact. A second inhibitor, identified by 13% of staff who commented, was lack of expertise. This reflected the frustration of some teachers at not being able to undertake reinforcement work because they did not feel confident in the MFL.
- 4.15 Over a third of the neutral comments (table 4.6) related to seeing MFL as a '*stand alone subject*' outside the core KS2 curriculum. For some (17% of the neutral impact responses) the response was described as a protection for the provision, in that MFL was currently seen as a 'fun' subject at KS2 and linking it into the core curriculum, it was felt, could jeopardise this.
- 4.16 The small number of school staff who saw the MFL provision as having a negative impact on the curriculum were most likely to cite pupils' enthusiasm for the MFL work as leading to impatience with other work (60% of negative responses).

5. Impact on teaching

Key findings: All teaching approaches used in the pilot were judged as successful by parents, pupils and schools in engaging pupils and developing enjoyment of language learning.

The involvement of specialist teachers, however, was seen by a large majority of school staff to be important. Specialists may be teachers visiting from the secondary school, peripatetic teachers or primary school teachers who know the language being taught well.

Specialist teaching that is led by the secondary school was seen as particularly valuable for progression, since it created more opportunities to develop an integrated, staged curriculum. Where lessons were delivered in the primary school by secondary school teachers there was a benefit in transition, especially where pupils were taught in year 7 by teachers they had worked with in year 6.

High quality MFL teaching was achieved ‘in-house’ by some primary schools through the enthusiasm and hard work of the teachers involved.

Success in MFL delivery was judged primarily by pupils’ enjoyment and enthusiasm for the lessons. There was evidence that pupils were learning about other countries and peoples as well as languages.

- 5.1 There was very little criticism of any kind of the teaching provision (3% of headteachers and 2% of teachers offered criticism). In most cases the criticism was that there was not enough, or insufficient depth to, provision. School staff were interested in, and appreciative of, the teaching methods used by colleagues in the pilot project. 92% of school staff described the teaching quality in the project as being very good (table 5.1) and 22% identified effective teaching methods as being a key strength of the provision.

Table 5.1: school staff satisfaction with current teaching quality

	Very good %	Good %	average %	Poor %
School Staff	92	6	2	0

- 5.2 The evaluation found that there was little difference in pupil or parent responses to the pilot whatever the teaching approach. Nearly all the work being done through the pilot project was characterised by the enthusiasm of the teacher involved in delivering the lessons. The methods used were in line with Estyn’s recommendations for effective MFL teaching, including the emphasis upon oral skills, the use of pair and group work to enable students to

practice these skills and the use of specialist resources such as interactive whiteboards.¹

- 5.3 Whatever the model of specialist teaching provision the majority of primary classroom teachers either sat in during the lessons or were actively involved in delivering or assisting in the delivery of the session. There were, nevertheless, examples of primary teachers who do not participate in the language lesson and who were, therefore, not fully aware of what work was covered. There were additional variations within clusters in the extent to which classroom teachers in the primary school reinforced the MFL lesson. 36% of primary staff said that they regularly reinforced the lesson through other areas of the curriculum. 44% said that they sometimes did. 19% said that they never did.
- 5.4 There was comparatively little change or development in teaching approaches during the course of the pilot project. 19% of staff said that primary teachers had become more involved in the teaching in the last year as they grew in confidence but 17% said class teachers were now less involved, usually due to staff changes or timetable changes. This would suggest that, where there is consistency in staffing, class teacher involvement increases but that frequent staff changes can counteract this impact.

Delivery methods

- 5.5 Despite the clear satisfaction with all types of teaching approaches the overall view was that specialist teaching was important. Over 80% of school staff (table 5.2) said it was important to have specialist staff to deliver MFL lessons at KS2. Five of the eight non-pilot primary schools interviewed by the evaluators identified having a funded specialist teacher involved as a condition of being involved in MFL provision in the future.

Table 5.2: primary school staff assessment of the need for specialist MFL teachers: % response

	Important		Not important	
	Head	Teache	Head	Teacher
The importance of having specialist teachers for MFL provision in the school	81	84	15	14

- 5.6 The pilot involved a range of specialist teachers from secondary school MFL specialists to peripatetic teachers or primary teachers with an in-depth knowledge of a language and appropriate methods for teaching it. Preferences for the type of specialist tended to reflect the type of delivery staff had experienced during the pilot (tables 5.3 and 5.4). Those with a secondary school teacher visiting tended to think this was the best approach to provision and those with in-house delivery processes wanted to maintain their independence.

¹ *Aiming for excellence in modern foreign languages: Estyn guidance for schools and local education authorities*. Estyn, 2002. Pdf file:
<http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/AimingforExcellenceMFLE.pdf>

Table 5.3: class teachers that believe the current approach to teaching MFL is effective

	Yes %	No %	Don't Know %
Class teachers	96	2	2

Table 5.4: head teachers and deputy head teachers that believe the current approach to teaching MFL is effective

	Yes %	No %	Don't Know %
Heads and deputy heads	91	2	8

5.7 Whether a peripatetic, or secondary school teacher or other outsider, having a teacher come in to the school to teach was seen as having benefits:-

- Pupils enjoyed having someone different to teach them and in every cluster using an external teaching source pupils identified having a different teacher as a positive aspect of the language lesson.
- Primary staff valued the 'visitor' model because it removed the pressure of preparing and delivering the lesson and this was a significant aspect of their enthusiasm for the project.
- Primary school teachers also commented that the MFL lesson was protected by having someone come in and so did not get crowded out by other, urgent, needs as could happen with non-core work.
- Not all primary school teachers joined in with the MFL lesson but many of those that did said that the pupils benefited from seeing them as learners and this helped them to fully engage in the reinforcement work done between lessons.
- Finally, primary teachers appreciated the staff development opportunities of watching how a language specialist delivered an MFL lesson and many commented that they had been able to incorporate some of the techniques and approaches taken into their work, especially in teaching Welsh in English medium school.

5.8 After involvement in the pilot only 6% of primary school teachers said that they wanted to take over the teaching and only 9% said that they felt they could. This reluctance was not only evident when a teacher lacked MFL experience. For example, even a teacher who had done an MFL 'A' level said that she was unwilling to teach the language in her class because, having never taught it, she did not have the time to adequately prepare and deliver the lessons.

5.9 78% of school staff commenting said that the involvement of specialists was core to the quality of the work. The specialist teachers' ease with the language meant that lessons usually offered an 'immersion' model where almost no English or Welsh was used during the session and pupils became used to understanding the spoken language. The specialist teacher was also able to be more flexible, responding to opportunity rather than being forced to stick to a rigid lesson plan.

Transition links

5.10 Whilst all types of specialist provision was valued, that which was linked to the secondary school was described as offering particular advantages. Primary school teachers saw the specialist teacher as important in ensuring there is progression in learning the language. The evaluators were told that a skilled teacher who is teaching the language correctly, and with knowledge of what will be covered next, could ensure there was successful transition to a KS3 course. Concern was expressed that, without a specialist, work may have to be re-done, with a consequent loss of interest. Parents were also concerned that the scope to build on KS2 work was not lost.

(MFL in primary is good) *As long as they build on their knowledge rather than 'start again' once in year 7.* (parent comment)

5.11 The most common model for delivering the lessons was through a teacher from the secondary school or a peripatetic teacher supported by the secondary school. The value of having a teacher from the secondary school was identified in two specific areas.

- Pupils appreciated getting to know a teacher from the secondary school because it made the whole process of transition more comfortable. This was particularly the case when the teacher went on to teach the same pupils in year 7.
- The involvement of the secondary school teacher in delivering the Key Stage 2 pilot helped to ensure that progression was recognised in the delivery at Key Stage 3, especially where a full cluster was involved. There was some evidence, although the sample was small, that where the delivery was done 'in-house' by primary schools liaison with the secondary school was less effective and pupils' previous language learning was less likely to be taken into account in year 7.

5.12 The value of secondary school involvement is illustrated in parent responses. Whilst over 50% of parents of KS3 pupils overall felt that studying MFL in primary school had been beneficial in helping their child settle into the secondary school only 12% of those whose children had been taught in an 'in-house' primary school programme felt this was the case.

In-house delivery

5.13 The benefit of having MFL provision delivered by staff within the primary school was seen to be in the scope to bring MFL work into the broader curriculum, although this still relied on the teacher involved having some fluency in the language.

5.14 School staff that said it was not important to have specialists to deliver MFL lessons focused on the importance of enthusiasm. Their view was that enthusiasm backed up by effective resources was more important than a language specialism. Although this view was a minority one (see table 5.2) there was evidence in the evaluation to support it. With the exception of a concern raised in one cluster secondary school about pronunciation, MFL

lessons run by primary school teachers were viewed as successful by pupils, parents and secondary school colleagues.

- 5.15 However, such lessons were usually planned and run with some involvement from the secondary school and sometimes were augmented by less frequent specialist led lessons. It was also clear that the primary school teachers involved were very committed to the work and either had a good working knowledge of the language they were teaching or were investing time in developing their language skills. For example, four teachers from one cluster were attending a French evening class. In one primary school a member of the support staff was involved in delivering the lessons because of her language expertise, showing a prioritisation of language skills over teacher training.

Evidence of successful teaching and learning and why this is judged to be successful

- 5.16 As already identified, there was a very high level of satisfaction with the teaching quality across the schools (table 5.1). Nearly all teachers felt that the quality was high or very high. This finding is reinforced by the responses from pupils and parents. Pupils consulted nearly always enjoyed the lessons and many identified that it was their favourite. The lessons were frequently described as fun but pupils also identified that they were excited to be learning something new about another country and culture. In a survey of 26 pupils in year 7, for example, nearly half said that they had enjoyed learning French in year 6 because their teacher had been good and 16 said that they had enjoyed learning about another country and language.
- 5.17 The lessons all focused on active oral participation. The use made of written work varied and tended to increase during the pilot. Over half of the teachers involved said that teaching methods had developed and improved during the pilot project. New resources were being used in most cases, including an increase in the use of interactive whiteboards, the internet and CD roms. There was also an increase in the spread of more traditional teaching methods including workbooks and the use of games and songs.

Table 5.5: curriculum development changes in the way the MFL pilot was run in the cluster - % response

Respondent	Yes	No	Don't know
Headteachers	18	69	13
Teachers (other)	33	60	6

- 5.18 Lessons were described as fun by 87% of primary school pupils and teachers noted the enthusiasm engendered by the sessions. Pupils identified the use of games, songs, interactive white board and the predominance of oral work as making the MFL lessons different and successful. Even the 11% that described the work as difficult sometimes said it was also enjoyable. Pupils liked the use of songs because, they said, it helped them remember the work. A quarter of the pupils identified the specific qualities of the specialist teacher, such as

confidence in their pronunciation as valuable in lessons. Involvement of the class teacher was seen as important by a quarter of pupils.

Table 5.6: Pupil’s assessment of MFL lessons - % response

Response	Yes	No
Primary pupils who enjoy their MFL lessons	97	4

Table 5.7: parents of KS2 and KS3 pupils assessment of MFL lessons at KS2 - % response

	Disagree	Do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree
(KS3) My child enjoyed learning a new language at primary	6	4	62	26
(KS2) My child is enjoying learning a new language in primary school	4	3	46	45

5.19 Parents of KS2 pupils were asked whether they saw evidence of broader learning from their child’s involvement in MFL (table 5.8). 75% felt their child had become more aware of other countries since starting to learn an MFL and 87% felt that learning another language would help their child better understand people from other countries.

Table 5.8: parents of KS2 pupils assessment of broader learning impacts of MFL teaching - % response

	Disagree	Do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree
My child is more aware of other countries since starting to learn a foreign language	12	12	54	21
Learning a new language will help my child better understand people from other countries	8	3	62	25

6. Impact on pupils

The MFL pilot project was judged by school staff, pupils and parents to have had a beneficial impact on pupils.

It had had a beneficial impact on transition to secondary school and MFL learning at KS3. As the project progressed school staff saw more evidence of a positive impact on transition with 56% in 2005 saying there was an impact and 89% in 2006. The strength of the school cluster was key to the impact on transition and progression. Without a full cluster, schools cannot plan for progression.

Most of the assessment of impact on KS3 was qualitative. Less than a quarter of schools surveyed were collecting quantitative data. However, where such data were being collected the impact of the pilot was consistently shown to be positive.

Pupils all said that MFL learning at KS2 had helped them in KS3 and 81% of parents of KS3 pupils said their children's MFL study in the secondary school had been helped by involvement in the pilot.

There was evidence of a sustained interest and enjoyment of MFL study, with year 8 pupils and parents still very enthusiastic. 88% of parents wanted their child to study an MFL to GCSE.

Despite enjoyment in learning languages only 64% of primary school pupils and 46% of secondary school pupils involved in the pilot anticipated studying MFL to GCSE. Estyn studies suggest that take up at KS4 is influenced by a range of different factors unrelated to enjoyment of language learning.

Having a degree of fluency in two languages (Welsh and English) is seen to provide an advantage in learning a 3rd or 4th language. However, the evaluation identified differences in how the advantage is perceived according to the linguistic background of the pupils and the type of school. These fall into three broad categories:

- a. pupils whose home language is Welsh and who could be said to be 'naturally bi-lingual'
- b. pupils whose home language is English but who attend Welsh medium schools, frequently from the age of four or younger, and who have acquired a high degree of fluency in both languages from the school setting
- c. pupils whose home language is English and who are taught Welsh as a second language only in school and who could be described as Welsh learners.

The main MFL learning advantage was perceived to be with pupils in Welsh medium schools who have a high degree of fluency in both languages. Teachers and parents of pupils from Welsh-medium schools who have achieved bi-lingualism tended to be the most enthusiastic about MFL learning and the benefits bi-lingualism brings in the acquisition of a 3rd or 4th language.

The MFL project was successful in engaging both boys and girls. It also was frequently able to include pupils with special needs because of its focus on listening and speaking.

Key Stage 3

- 6.1 The evaluation was not able to follow any pupils beyond year 8 and so any evidence of impact at KS3 is, necessarily, speculative.
- 6.2 Teachers were asked what evidence they saw of impact when pupils entered year 7. The majority of school staff believed that involvement in the pilot would have a positive impact on studying at Key Stage 3 (see table 6.1). As the project progressed school staff became more convinced that there was a positive impact on KS3.

Table 6.1: Impact of MFL on Key Stage 3

	Positive KS3 %		Neutral %		Don't Know %	
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
School staff	70	89	0	9	30	1

- 6.3 Nearly all secondary school staff involved in the pilot said that the KS2 work had had a positive impact on language learning at KS3. 15% of KS3 staff identified specific impact measures -

last year I worked out the levels they achieved at the end of year 7. On average they were about half a level higher.

standards have risen ... and we are reaching level 6 by year 8.

We've already done (in year 6) what we would have covered in the first two terms of year 7)
(secondary teacher comments)

- 6.4 However, the use of quantitative measures was rare and most of the measures used to judge impact were qualitative, focusing on observations of interest levels, confidence and enthusiasm. 96 school staff commented on progression planning and only 26% described specific planning processes. 22% described adaptations or developments of work plans or schemes of work and 10% the use of portfolios or workbooks that were taken into the secondary school and/or assessments undertaken at the end of year 6 that allowed for pupils to go into sets in year 7.
- 6.5 The most commonly identified impact by secondary school staff was in the increased enthusiasm for language learning observed in pupils as they come into year 7. Pupils were also described as being more confident, especially in their willingness to contribute orally in class and their oral contributions were considered to be of a higher quality. A small number of staff (4%) said that the impact had faded as the year progressed. Where there is not a full cluster there

is a concern that the advantage gained cannot be sustained and even some evidence of a negative impact where pupils have to go over the same work again.

- 6.6 All schools that had formal measures for tracking pupils’ progress identified a beneficial effect from the pilot. However, less than a third of secondary school staff said that they had developed formal systems to monitor the progression of pupils involved in the pilot.
- 6.7 Some primary schools said that they rarely receive feedback from secondary school about pupil progression, leaving them unaware of the impact of the pilot. *“we don’t get feedback. I’d hope to get feedback, I’d like to know what’s being taught, how much is being done”* Primary school teacher
- 6.8 There were examples of significant work on tracking progression being done in a few clusters. One secondary school described how their tracking process was enabling them to look at how attitudes to language learning changes between years 8 and 9 and another is using its main database to log changes in achievement levels. In addition, at least two clusters are exploring the option of ‘fast-tracking’ pupils through to GCSE one or two years early, so reducing the pressure of a language being in ‘competition’ with other GCSE options and capitalising of the benefits of an ‘early start’ in learning a foreign language.
- 6.9 Parents of pupils in secondary school were asked whether they felt involvement in the pilot had been helpful in MFL learning at KS3. In the last year of the pilot 81% agreed that there had been a benefit in language learning from KS2 to KS3, an increase from 71% during the second year when parents were more likely to say they did not know what impact there would be. However, parents were less likely to strongly agree that the pilot had had a beneficial effect than they had been in 2005.

Table 6.2: Parents’ views on the impact of the pilot on language learning at KS3. % response

	Disagree		Do not know		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
KS3 parents								
Learning a foreign language at primary school has helped my child continue learning a foreign language at comprehensive school	4	8	25	7	30	49	41	32

- 6.10 Parent responses indicated that pupils’ enjoyment of learning a new language was being sustained, and even slightly improved, through their transition to the secondary school. Parents show little change in their child’s enthusiasm for language learning up to year 8 (table 6.3).

Table 6.3: Parents' views on the impact of the pilot on language learning at KS3. % response

	Disagree	Do not know	Agree	Strongly Agree
My KS2 child enjoyed learning a new language at primary	5	4	62	26
My KS3 child is enjoying languages in the comprehensive school	4	4	66	25
My year 8 child is enjoying learning languages	3	6	70	21

- 6.11 97% of primary school pupils said that they were enjoying learning another language and nearly all of these said that they were looking forward to continuing MFL learning at secondary school.
- 6.12 All KS3 pupils interviewed said that their involvement in the KS2 pilot had made language learning easier for them in the secondary school. 11% said they were enjoying learning MFL even more in secondary school while 21% said that they were not enjoying it as much as they had when in primary school. 66% of secondary school pupils described their MFL lessons as fun, with teaching methods that involved games and activities.

Key Stage 4

- 6.13 Parents were asked whether they would like to see their child continue studying a foreign language to GCSE.
- 6.14 Table 6.4 shows that overwhelmingly parents want their child to take a foreign language at GCSE. Parents were enthusiastic about sustaining language learning, with 88% of both primary and secondary school parents keen that their child continue to GCSE level. Parents of secondary school pupils are less enthusiastic than those of primary school pupils (see 'strongly agree' column, table 6.4) but both sets want to see their children learning languages at a higher level. Parents of pupils in years 8 and 9 are as keen (table 6.5 shows 91% want their child to study MFL until GCSE) although the 'strongly agree' percentage continues to diminish. Parents with children in Welsh medium primary schools were more keen for their child to study a foreign language at GCSE but by secondary level their response matched that of parents with children in English medium schools. Estyn has found that significant numbers of schools report that some pupils, particularly lower achieving pupils, feel that one language is enough.² These attitudes may be shared or encouraged by parental attitudes. However the picture is not consistent across Wales and Estyn reports that many schools successfully promote two or more languages.

² Estyn (2004) *Aiming for Excellence in Modern Foreign Languages*. Estyn Guidance for Schools and Local Education Authorities, Cardiff: Estyn

Table 6.4: Parents’ views on sustaining language learning at KS4. % response

	Disagree		Do not know		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	KS2	KS3	KS2	KS3	KS2	KS3	KS2	KS3
All parents								
I would like my child to continue studying a foreign language until GCSE	2	2	8	7	48	59	40	29

Table 6.5: Parents’ views on sustaining language learning at KS4 in years 8/9. % response

Parents of pupils in years 8 and 9	Disagree	Do not know	Agree	Strongly agree
I would like my year 8/9 child to continue studying a foreign language until GCSE	0	9	64	27

6.15 Parents of both male and female pupils felt equally strongly that studying a foreign language at GCSE was important. By year 7 (table 6.6) parents of boys showed a greater enthusiasm (see ‘strongly agree’ column) than those of girls. This goes against the research findings cited by Estyn that there is a gender bias towards females in the take up of foreign languages at Key Stage 3.³

Table 6.6: Parents’ views on sustaining language learning as the pilot project progressed and by gender. % response

	Disagree		Do not know		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
Parents of KS3 pupils								
I would like my child to continue studying a foreign language until GCSE	3	2	8	7	45	59	45	29
I would like my (female) child to continue studying a foreign language until GCSE	1	3	8	10	41	59	50	26
I would like my (male) child to continue studying a foreign language until GCSE	4	3	8	3	50	59	38	32

6.16 There is a difference in the strongly agree column in table 6.6 between 2005 and 2006. This suggests that, as the project progressed, parents’ enthusiasm for MFL GCSE study grew less strong. This may reflect the fact that by 2006 a higher proportion of parents had children in year 8 and their enthusiasm was waning or it could be because many schools ran special information sessions for parents at the beginning of the pilot project, introducing the MFL

³ Ibid.

programme, but did not continue to involve parents. Nevertheless, overall agreement with wanting a child to study an MFL to GCSE stays consistently high. Parents of ‘naturally bi-lingual’ pupils, that is pupils attending Welsh medium schools in predominantly Welsh speaking areas, were the least likely to want their child to study a MFL to GCSE level (64%) and parents of ‘Welsh learner’ pupils, who attend English medium schools most likely (93%).

- 6.17 However, pupil responses illustrated that enjoyment of learning and acknowledgement of the importance of other languages did not equate to a commitment to studying them at GCSE level. Only 64% of primary pupils expected to continue learning an MFL and only 46% of those interviewed at secondary school were expecting to study an MFL at GCSE level despite their current enthusiasm for the subject. Even at primary school there was some evidence that pupils were distinguishing between their interest in learning the language and the idea of taking a GCSE in it. As one group explained, although it is really important to be able to speak other languages, you need to choose GCSE subjects that you think you will do well in.
- 6.18 One school submitted a small written survey of twenty-six pupils from the pilot who were less than halfway through year 7. This found that although twenty-one were enjoying learning the same language with the same teacher, only eleven were sure that they would like to carry on studying it.

Table 6.7: Year 7 pupils and their response to the pilot

	Smile	Undecided	Frown
I am enjoying learning a language in Year 7	21	4	1
I feel confident learning the language	18	8	0
This is a subject I would like to carry on studying	11	13	2
I would be interested in learning another language	15	8	3
I have begun to understand more about France	22	4	0

Inhibitors to learning a foreign language at Key Stage 4

- 6.19 Amongst the pupils consulted boys more likely to identify a need to focus on subjects they felt they would have the best chance of succeeding in over those they were interested in. Estyn’s analysis is that pupils of both sexes are likely to choose subjects they expect to do well in. However, the Estyn report goes on to note that boys are more likely than girls to have negative attitudes toward MFLs. In explaining the negative attitudes of boys toward MFL, Estyn cites their tendency to be placed in lower sets, their reluctance to participate orally and their tendency to produce untidy work, which tends to reduce their marks. Estyn also argues that boys often perceive MFLs as female subjects, a perception that is reinforced by the scarcity of male MFL teachers.⁴ A number of teachers we spoke to recognised this, and one cluster had involved male teachers in the project, in order to try to reverse this trend.
- 6.20 Estyn attributes the perception of difficulty in MFL to the slower progress that pupils tend to make through the levels compared to other subjects, because

⁴ Ibid.

they have not studied MFL for as long. If, as some teachers hope, students progress through the levels faster, this effect may be reduced. More broadly, Estyn's analysis suggests that take up at Key Stage 4 is influenced by a number of different factors, including, the quality of teaching, reluctance from some schools to promote MFL, particularly to lower achieving pupils, the way option sets are structured, negative attitudes amongst boys toward MFLs, the lack of time allocated to MFL and the infrequency of lessons.⁵

- 6.21 The evaluators explored the influences on take-up of foreign languages at GCSE with both teaching staff and parents. Teaching staff cited the growing reluctance of pupils as they grew older to participate in class, to try new pronunciation and risk getting it wrong. Secondary school teachers working in primary schools frequently commented on how eager the pupils, male and female, were to contribute to the class and how refreshing this was. This willingness to try out new words was seen as rapidly evaporating with pupils from year 7 on becoming increasingly self-conscious and unwilling to risk making mistakes. The reluctance of boys to participate in oral work is noted by Estyn (see above).
- 6.22 Teachers also identified that language learning required a specific academic discipline that could make it unattractive. This view was reflected by pupils who had older siblings and who often identified that these did not enjoy learning a foreign language because it was 'hard' and that they expected to feel the same. These pupils were developing their expectations of how hard it was to study a foreign language from such reported experiences rather than from their current experience through the pilot.
- 6.23 Parents were asked whether they thought it was hard to learn another language (table 6.8). Parents whose children attended Welsh medium schools were less likely to view studying another language as hard although the gap between them and parents whose children went to English medium schools closed somewhat at secondary school level.

Table 6.8: It is hard to learn another language

	Strongly agree - %	Agree - %	Don't know - %	Disagree - %	Strongly disagree - %
All parents					
All primary school parents	5	35	6	41	13
Welsh medium primary	3	28	5	43	20
English medium primary	7	38	7	40	8
All secondary school parents	5	46	7	29	13
Welsh medium secondary	0	45	3	24	26
English medium secondary	2	47	9	28	12

⁵ Estyn (2004). *Aiming for Excellence in Modern Foreign Languages*. Estyn Guidance for Schools and Local Education Authorities. Cardiff: Estyn
http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/Modern_Foreign_languages.pdf

Transition impact on Pupils

6.24 Parents of pupils that had been involved in the pilot were asked about its transition benefit to pupils. Parents of pupils at KS2 had high expectations of its impact on transition to KS3 with 92% projecting that it would be helpful. 51% of parents of pupils at KS3 agreed that it had actually been helpful and 29% reserved judgement, saying they did not know.

Table 6.9: Parents’ views on the impact of the pilot on transition. % response

	Disagree		Do not know		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	KS2	KS3	KS2	KS3	KS2	KS3	KS2	KS3
Learning a foreign language in primary school will help/ has helped my child in the comprehensive school	2	18	3	29	37	41	55	10

6.25 Generally school staff believed that the pilot project had had, or would have, a positive impact on transition links. As the pilot progressed staff identified a greater impact on transition with over 90% of teachers and 88% of headteachers saying that involvement in the pilot had had a beneficial effect during the second phase of the evaluation. This was seen as being a result of improved contact between primary and secondary schools. The only areas where it was seen to have had no or little impact was where there were pre-existing strong links or where the cluster size was too small to impact.

Table 6.10: Impact of MFL pilot on transition

	Positive %	
	2005	2006
School staff	56	89

6.26 The key factor in ensuring a benefit at transition was the strength of the cluster. Teachers and pupils identified that involvement in the pilot had a beneficial impact on transition that went beyond foreign language learning especially where the secondary school was involved in delivery of the teaching. In these clusters most year 6 pupils said that they had visited the secondary school and liked seeing teachers there that they knew. They had either had lessons delivered in the secondary school or had visited the school for particular activities. Pupils and teachers said that the benefits of this contact could be seen in improved confidence in class when starting year 7.

Progression

6.27 Where the cluster was small and/or the cluster relationship was not strong the concern was that the learning achieved by pupils would not be recognised as they moved into year 7 and so they would have to repeat a lot of work. Although this repeated work was popular with some pupils, because they felt confident in being able to do the work, it was also described as disheartening by others. In one cluster, for example, the secondary school staff had not seen

the teaching being done in the primary and expressed reservations about the quality. No plans had been discussed for building on the pupils' learning. As noted in section 7, this problem has been encountered in Scotland.

- 6.28 There were also, however, some very interesting examples of how progression *was* being planned within the project. Two clusters had identified an aim of 'fast-tracking' pupils involved in the pilot through the GCSE programme so that most would sit their GCSE in year 9 or 10. This approach offers a range of advantages. It keeps up the pace of the year 6 work making an attempt to preserve the advantage of language study; builds engagement before year 9, the point when boys in particular are likely to become harder to engage; and offers pupils an on-going advantage since they have the opportunity of gaining an early GCSE and do not have to balance choosing a language over a subject that they feel they may achieve a higher grade in.
- 6.29 In the above examples, the primary class teachers and peripatetic or secondary teachers worked together to place pupils into sets before they entered year 7. Teachers in year 7 identified the usefulness of these recommendations and could build their programme to meet the needs of the sets. Around 15% of school staff said that their schools put pupils into sets before progressing into the secondary school. Pupils in one such cluster were appreciative of the advantage their involvement in the pilot had given them in going into 'top sets'.

I like to be in top set so then I wouldn't be embarrassed just in case you get a question wrong and they would laugh. (Year 7 pupil describing the benefit he has gained from being in the pilot.)

- 6.30 The French department in a secondary school where the full cluster was involved in the pilot had undertaken a major piece of work in rewriting all their programmes of work up to GCSE to accommodate and build on the learning pupils had done in year 6. This school identified that 173 of the circa 200 intake in September 2004 had been involved in the pilot project. They ran an intensive course for the other pupils to bring them up to level on starting the course.

Broader educational impact

- 6.31 Teachers were also asked whether involvement in the project had any wider educational impacts. 23% (table 6.11) saw a development in literacy skills. Pupils were described as benefiting from developing skills in analysing language, how sentences are constructed. One head teacher described how many of their pupils had very poor skills in their first language and saw the MFL pilot, along with the Welsh they were learning, as having a beneficial effect on their communication skills.

Table 6.11: Impact of MFL on Literacy Key Stage 3

	Positive Literacy %	Negative Literacy %	Don't Know %
Staff	23%	0	77

6.32 A third of school staff that commented on wider benefits said that involvement in the pilot project had been beneficial in developing pupils listening skills. As identified above, the teaching delivery focuses on oral work and this was seen to help develop the pupils' capacity to take in verbal information.

6.33 A third of school staff that commented said that involvement in the pilot had enhanced pupils' confidence in learning. Pupils felt able to contribute actively and this was seen as important especially for less academic children who were usually the slowest in the class.

It is more interesting because the teacher is treating me individually, same as everyone else, not most attention to one person. Pupil response.

6.34 The pilot was also described as having a beneficial effect on pupils' attitudes to other languages. Teachers commented particularly on the impact on Welsh language provision. Two-thirds of the schools were involved in teaching Welsh as a second language and 38% of staff said that involvement in the pilot was having a positive impact on this teaching.

Table 6.12: Impact on Welsh

	Positive %	Negative %	Neutral %	Don't Know %
Staff	38	13	6	43

Positive impacts on Welsh were described as:-

- Improving teaching - primary school staff witnessing the MFL lesson who identified that they had observed techniques and ideas on how to deliver Welsh lessons; and
- Pupils' improved interest in learning languages.

The impact of pupils' existing skills in more than one language on their acquisition of a 3rd or 4th language

6.35 The responses from school staff, parents and pupils all showed a significant perceived benefit of fluency in English and Welsh when learning a 3rd or 4th language. The evaluation identified that there are three main variations within the English/Welsh bi-lingualism of pupils in Wales.

- a. pupils whose home language is Welsh and who could be said to be 'naturally bi-lingual'
- b. pupils whose home language is English but who attend Welsh medium schools, frequently from the age of four or younger, and who have acquired a high degree of fluency in both languages from the school setting

- c. pupils whose home language is English and who are taught Welsh as a second language only in school and who could be described as Welsh learners
- 6.36 The evidence from the evaluation suggests that there are different issues around bi-lingualism and the acquisition of a 3rd language for these three groups.

Table 6.13: advantage provided by bi-lingualism in learning a 3rd or 4th language - % response

Respondent	Positive		Neutral		Don't know	
	Head	Teache	Head	Teache	Head	Teache
Welsh medium schools with predominantly naturally bi-lingual pupils	81	57	5	29	14	14
Welsh medium schools with predominantly pupils whose home language is not Welsh	92	88	8	12	0	0
English medium schools with Welsh learners	59	70	23	17	18	13

Welsh medium schools with pupils that have acquired bi-lingualism are the most positive about the advantages of bi-lingualism in further language learning. This is likely to be because these schools are the most experienced in language teaching at primary school level and their pupils have successfully experienced classroom language learning. Teachers in Welsh medium schools with predominantly naturally bi-lingual pupils were less positive than the headteachers. They tended to identify problems with incorporating no Welsh speaking pupils into classes and some of these (14%) felt adding the requirement to learn another language was putting pupils under too much pressure.

- 6.37 In English medium schools the neutral responses were primarily related to an uncertainty about the impact of the teaching of Welsh. Teachers in these schools tended to be more positive than headteachers.
- 6.38 Parents were also asked whether they felt that their child learning English and Welsh had provided an advantage in learning a 3rd or 4th language. Their response largely mirrors that of school headteachers.

Table 6.14: Parents' views on the impact of the pilot on language learning at KS3. % response

Being taught Welsh and English has given my child a good start in learning another language	Agrees/ strongly agrees
Welsh medium schools with predominantly naturally bi-lingual pupils	81
Welsh medium schools with predominantly pupils whose home language is not Welsh	95
English medium schools with Welsh learners	58

6.39 The positive impacts were identified in three broad areas. The main impact was seen as being in the confidence with which pupils approached learning a new language. Other impacts were grammar and pronunciation.

- Grammar was seen as benefiting because pupils were used to different sentence structures and word orders.
- Pronunciation benefited because pupils were accustomed to hearing and using words that sounded different and used different vocal sounds.
- Confidence in using the new language was enhanced because pupils were used to communicating productively in more than one way.

Table 6.15: Factors identified in bi-lingualism that assist the acquisition of a 3rd or 4th language.

	Grammar %	Pronunciation %	Confidence %
Staff	22	27	51

6.40 Negative impacts were seen as being the danger of pupils becoming confused of they were learning both Welsh and a foreign language. There was also a concern from some teachers that pupils may prefer learning a foreign language to studying Welsh and that this could have a negative impact on Welsh.

The success of the MFL provision in engaging all pupils to their potential

6.41 School staff were asked whether the MFL provision had been successful in engaging all pupils (table 6.16). Over 90% said that it had. Table 6.17 shows that staff saw developing confidence in learning a language as the main evidence of engaging pupils and this was linked to their enjoyment of the experience. This response was reinforced by pupils who, with very few exceptions, said that they were really enjoying MFL lessons in primary school.

Table 6.16: Has the MFL provision engaged all pupils

	Yes %	No %
Staff	91	9

Table 6.17: illustrating staff overall opinion of the benefits to pupils

	Confidence %	Enjoy %	Progress %
Staff	83	8	9

6.42 Table 6.18 shows that over 90% of all parents said that their children were enjoying learning a foreign language. There was little variation across the two parent surveys in this high rate, although there was a significant change in the strongly agree column with KS3 parents. This is likely to be because their children were older (48% of parents responding to the second survey had a child in year 8 or 9 whereas the first parental survey only involved pupils in year 7). Parents of girls were slightly more likely to report that their child enjoyed the learning than those of boys.

Table 6.18: My child enjoys learning MFL - by gender and age

	Strongly agree -%		Agree - %		Don't know -%		Disagree - %	
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
Primary school parents								
- of female pupils	52	49	45	44	0	2	3	3
- of male pupils	41	39	50	50	5	4	4	6
Secondary school parents								
- of female pupils	54	28	39	63	3	3	2	6
- of male pupils	48	20	41	71	6	6	3	3

Boys

6.43 At primary school level staff frequently commented that the issue of gender was less crucial, since it was common for boys to be as enthusiastic about class work as girls. This was also the finding of consultations with pupils and parent responses.

Table 6.19: illustrating staff overall opinion in engaging boys

	Positive %	Negative/Girls better %	Don't Know %
Staff	93	5	2

Special needs

6.44 School staff were also asked about the extent to which the pilot had been able to engage pupils with special needs. One cluster included a special needs school and a number of other schools had special needs units, as well as having pupils with mild special needs in mainstream classes. There was evidence of increased engagement of special needs pupils as the pilot progressed, with staff from 8 schools talking about additional inclusion when asked what had changed in the last year of the pilot. One school had a lesser involvement due to timetable pressures and one had successfully involved pupils with physical disabilities for the first time. Overall there was a very positive response with 83% of staff identifying that special needs pupils were benefiting from the pilot.

Table 6.20: illustrating staff overall opinion in engaging SEN

	Positive %	Negative %
Staff	83	17

6.45 Approximately three quarters of those who felt that MFL could have a negative effect on pupils with special needs were talking about pupils who had extreme learning difficulties. They stated that there was a large variation of ability and some reacted positively but efforts to integrate pupils had not always been successful because of the need for additional support. 76% of those who commented said that pupils with special needs were integrated into the MFL class successfully and 22% said that these pupils were struggling. Six

parents commented that they had concerns that their child with special needs was disadvantaged or losing out through the pilot.

- 6.46 However, there were examples of low ability children taking a very active part in lessons and the evaluators were given a number of illustrations of how the focus on listening and speaking skills was benefiting pupils with poor literacy.
- 6.47 The need for good progression planning was highlighted for successful work with special needs pupils as illustrated by one example provided to the evaluators. A young boy with mild special needs had progressed well in MFL lessons in the primary, with strong and enthusiastic support from his father. However, when he progressed to secondary school his low overall grades meant that he was not allowed to continue studying a language (see Estyn findings).

7. The Impact on Schools

Key Findings:

Schools applied to join the pilot project either because they had an existing interest in MFL or European work or because they were part of a cluster where the lead school did.

There was evidence that many teachers were highly committed to the project and its success. This was a key strength to the project but could also be a vulnerability the work came to rely on their enthusiasm and leadership and if, for any reason, they then left.

Parents and school governors were enthusiastic about the project and this was an incentive for schools to become involved. 80% of school staff said the project had had a positive impact on the school including staff development and stronger clusters.

Nearly half the schools in the pilot identified no difficulties in introducing the project. Where there were problems they mainly were caused by pressure on the primary school curriculum, insufficient staff time and incomplete clusters.

89% of schools said that the funding available for the pilots had covered their costs. The main cost was in paying for specialist teaching. There were also costs associated with cluster meetings and staff development sessions and with buying resources.

In order to make KS2 MFL provision sustainable, school staff said there needed to be enthusiasm from teachers, consistency and specialist teachers available. Parents identified a need for progression planning and over 80% of school staff said that it was important to have a full cluster in order to maintain this learning advantage

CILT Cymru's support and development role was appreciated. The organisation's role in providing training, advice and guidance was valued as was their help in solving problems and difficulties. CILT Cymru was seen as helping with cluster problems and in managing the funding.

Joining the pilot

- 7.1 The most commonly stated reason for joining the pilot project was that the school was a pre-existing member of a cluster (fifty responses - 51% of all. Because schools were able to identify more than one reason, the total number of responses is greater than 100%.) and the decision had been made by someone else within the cluster.
- 7.2 30% of school staff said that joining the pilot was, in part, motivated by a pre-existing involvement or commitment to promoting an international or European culture within the school. 15% of primary schools were already involved in some form of MFL provision. However, having an interest in MFL provision and cultural links with other countries appeared to be not enough to

encourage involvement. Eight schools interviewed by the evaluators that were in project clusters but had not joined the pilot all had existing international or MFL links.

- 7.3 29% of school staff said that their school had joined the pilot because of the enthusiasm of an individual within the school or cluster. These individuals were seen as both taking on a lot of the work to develop the project and working to enthuse colleagues. Very often this role involved resolving some of the problems that arose through the pilot, especially smoothing over problems with colleagues.
- 7.4 Other reasons given for joining the pilot included a school development ethos that encouraged new educational initiatives, an interest in improving transition links, a belief that languages are most effectively learned when children are young and pre-existing links with CILT Cymru.

Progressive approach

- 7.5 Schools were often involved in other activities to expand and improve their provision. One cluster, for example, was involved in taking pupils to the secondary school for lessons in five subject areas, of which MFL was one. Another cluster is led by a comprehensive school that formed a transition team, focusing on literacy, at the same time as it developed this project and has placed the project within the work of this team. In such cases, involvement in this pilot project was seen as part of an overall development strategy. Table 6.10 shows that over half the teachers interviewed highlighted the positive impact the project has had upon transition links.

European ethos

- 7.6 A pre-existing European ethos within the school or a wish to promote internationalism could work to encourage schools to embed the MFL provision through other classroom or extra-curricula activity. 12% of primary schools were involved, or had been in the past, in developing links with schools in other European countries. Eighteen interviewees specifically identified that parents and school governors particularly welcomed the pilot because of its scope to broaden children's understanding of Europe (see also parent responses).

I feel that it is really important that children learn European languages as early as possible. I think we are way behind the Europeans in language learning/speaking. It is really important for business, holidays and a general understanding of other cultures.

British children should be encouraged to speak other EU languages or they will be left behind other EU countries. Youngsters in the EU are far more fluent in English at an earlier age than UK children.

The world is changing rapidly and our children need to be equipped.

Languages are a first step to mutual understanding – breaking down cultural/ethnic barriers.

(parent comments)

In the first parent survey over 120 parents added comments to their questionnaire responses that focused on the importance of their child having an understanding of Europe and 52 saw learning a language as important because of the likelihood of their child working in another European country in the future. There was a similar strongly supporting parental response in the second survey.

- 7.7 52% of school staff said that extra-curricula activities had been developed to broaden pupils' understanding of the country whose language they were learning. These included trying food and drink, developing 'pen-pals' and email links with schools abroad and running lunch-time 'clubs'. One school, however, identified that a pre-existing after-school language club had suffered because parents now saw the class-time provision as having taken over.

An educational opportunity

- 7.8 39% of school staff identified the project as offering a significant educational opportunity. Headteachers, in particular, saw involvement in the pilot project as an example of good practice in education. Although it was frequently stated that the primary school curriculum is very crowded already this project was appreciated because of the perceived freedom it offers teachers to work creatively. Teachers commented on how they enjoyed taking part, how it had provided scope for them to expand their skills and to take pleasure in working in an unpressured way with children.
- 7.9 30% of secondary school staff commenting identified how the project had provided a new, or improved, status for MFL within the school. 23% said that it was fun for the pupils and provided confidence in learning.

Has the introduction of MFL learning through the pilots has had any adverse effects or created additional pressure on schools, staff and pupils?

- 7.10 The evaluation sought to identify whether involvement in the pilot project had had any adverse effects or created additional pressure for schools. Nearly half school staff responding identified no difficulties at all and stated general satisfaction with the way the pilot was working (table 7.1).

Table 7.1: any difficulties encountered in the delivery of MFL at KS2 - % response

Respondent	Yes	No
Headteachers	56	43
Teachers (other)	50	50

- 7.11 Emphasis changed on the two key problem areas as the pilot progressed. Initially staff were most likely to say that lack of time and a crowded primary school curriculum was the key problem (39% of responses in the second year of the pilot; 12% of responses in the third year). By the third year of the pilot the most commonly raised issue (24% of responses in third year; 19% in second year) was the additional pressure on staff with the pilot being seen to

rely often on the good will and enthusiasm of individuals. The problem was seen to arise largely from a lack of time within the school day leading to staff devoting their own time to make sure it worked. This varied from teachers using their lunch time to travel to cluster schools to give a lesson, to teachers in the cluster meeting in their own time, to teachers undertaking training in their own time.

'I spend my own free time visiting primaries. I enjoy it but I'm not paid for the time.' (teacher comment)

Whilst this was seen as a strong endorsement of staff commitment to the project, it was also viewed as a vulnerability. Such commitment could not be expected of all staff members and when, for any reason, the key staff member was away, it could create difficulties. There were examples of problems arising where staff had left, been sick or gone on maternity leave where colleagues having to take over, found the task onerous.

- 7.12 The difficulty of fitting MFL provision into a busy curriculum was described as, in some cases, restricting reinforcement work following lessons and, in others, stopping the involvement of more year groups in the provision. There was also concern that other subjects, particularly English and Welsh, were losing time. In the first parent survey 3% of parents (29) added comments to their questionnaire responses about their concerns that MFL provision could be having an adverse effect on core subject teaching in primary schools. The second parent questionnaire explored this issue in more detail and found that this was not a general concern and that around 80% of parents of both KS2 and KS3 pupils did not want to see core subjects prioritised over MFL teaching.

Table 7.2: The time spent learning a foreign language would be better spent learning core subjects

	Strongly agree - %	Agree - %	Don't know - %	Disagree - %	Strongly disagree - %
Primary school parents	2	4	12	59	20
Secondary school parents	1	4	14	58	22

- 7.13 6% of school staff respondents identified a problem with mixed age classes in primary schools. Some schools involved in the pilot are extremely small and a class may involve a range of year groups. Even in the larger schools it was common for there to be mixed year groups. This was seen as creating a problem where work was focused on bringing year 6 pupils to a particular point in their language development so that progression to year 7 was facilitated. To avoid pupils in year 5 repeating a year's work classes were sometimes being split for MFL lessons. This had an implication for reinforcement work during the week since it could mean that the class teacher was unable to sit in during the lesson.
- 7.14 A small number of school staff (6%) reported difficulties at transition arising from part-clusters. Secondary school teachers were having to manage classes where some pupils had been involved in the pilot and others had not. The resultant difficulties were either described as being pupils not willing to go

over material they felt they already knew, or in finding time and processes to bring non-pilot pupils up to a common level.

- 7.15 A small number of staff (2%) cited difficulties with accessing and organising funding.

The costs and benefits of the provision made within schools and the extent to which these costs are covered by the additional funding made available

Costs

- 7.16 There were varied costs to the school depending on how the project delivery was organised. All schools were funded to release staff for training run by CILT Cymru and primaries funded to fund specialist teaching time. There were variations in how schools accessed funding, with some having match funding from local authorities and some not. Schools were asked whether the funding covered their costs and 89% said that it did. There were some variations from schools that identified that the pilot was very generously funded to others than said that they had received no funding through their cluster arrangement at all and had had to absorb all additional costs or raise funding themselves.
- 7.17 The main use of the funding was to pay for teaching time where teaching was delivered by non-primary school teachers such as secondary school or peripatetic teachers. 36% of respondents had received funding through the cluster to buy MFL related resources for the school and 9% had developed their own resources (including the development of workbooks).
- 7.18 The evaluation found a significant variation between a majority of schools that said they would not be able to run MFL provision at Key Stage 2 without the additional funding provided by the pilot project, and a small number of schools that had a pre-pilot involvement in some MFL provision and clearly stated that they intended to continue, funded or not. The evaluators were also told that some clusters that had unsuccessfully tendered to be included in the pilot project had said that they would go ahead anyway. Six of the eight non-pilot schools involved in the evaluation have some form of MFL provision, varying from after school clubs to teachers visiting from the secondary school.

Benefits to schools

- 7.19 Schools were asked whether there had been benefits from involvement in the project. Most school staff said that MFL provision had had a positive impact on their school.

Table 7.2: impact of the project on the school - % response

Respondent	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Don't know
Headteachers	83	10	2	5
Teachers (other)	78	8	4	10

Half of these said that a key benefit had been parents' enthusiasm for the project. Involvement in the project had provided prestige and was also seen as popular with governors.

Primary and secondary school collaboration

7.20 73% of the staff who commented on the impact of the MFL pilot on the culture and ethos of the school said that it had had a positive impact on developing or strengthening primary/secondary school partnerships. Staff commented on the value of this in three core areas:

- The improved partnerships were seen as having an impact of teaching styles. 44% of schools said that there was collaboration on teaching styles between primary and secondary partners in the cluster. Primary school staff, in particular, were pleased when colleagues in the secondary school were clearly learning from primary school work.
- There was also evidence that the improved partnerships were impacting on curriculum development. In particular there were examples of work being done to link the primary and secondary school curriculum so that pupils could progress as they moved schools.
- There was evidence that both primary and secondary teachers felt they had gained a better understanding of the work of their counterparts. Teachers clearly valued this, although the precise benefits that flowed from the development were harder to identify. The impact appears to have been through the way in which a better understanding of each other's work has strengthened relationships and links, which made, for example, problems between primary and secondary schools, easier to resolve.

Staff development

7.21 56% of school staff respondents identified a benefit in staff development from the pilot. This might have involved attendance at MFL courses but was also, as identified earlier, seen as a result of observing colleagues' lessons and building links between secondary and primary schools and across the cluster. Primary school teachers who did not speak Welsh but who were teaching Welsh frequently commented on how their experience of the pilot had helped improve their approach to teaching Welsh. It was partly this response that led to an emphasis on the value of a language specialist running the lesson.

7.22 Over 70% of school staff said that the pilot project had had a positive effect on the primary/secondary school cluster. It was described as improving communication within the cluster, supporting the development and sharing of new resources and helped to build links between primary and secondary provision. The particular value was seen in schools coming together for curriculum work and, for some schools, MFL was their first experience of curriculum based transition links.

School development

7.23 38% of school staff respondents commented on the project's role in supporting school development. This impact varied from primary schools that were competing for pupils, who identified that involvement in the project was encouraging parents to send them their children, to schools working to develop

a multi-cultural ethos. One school, for example, described how, as a result of the project, they had re-written their Mission Statement.

Pupil development

7.24 45% of respondents identified pupil development as a key benefit for their school in taking part in the pilot. Staff were pleased to see how much their pupils were enjoying and gaining from the MFL teaching and even teachers who were sceptical about the long-term benefits were very positive about the experience that the pupils were having.

The potential of different delivery methods to become sustainable and for wider use

7.25 Whatever the delivery method, the enthusiasm of individual teachers was described as crucial to the success of the project. Over 50% of school staff identified the approach of an individual teacher as being vital to the impact of the project. But the evaluation also illustrated the high turnover of teaching staff. Over a quarter of staff interviewed in the last phase of the evaluation said that there had been changes in the personnel involved in the delivery of the project in the last year.

year 7 experienced three different teachers this year, so continuity was lost because of frequent staff changes. (teacher comment)

7.26 The strength of the project in identifying and harnessing the enthusiasm of individual teachers is a key element but may also indicate a weakness in its sustainability and in promoting wider involvement. It cannot be assumed that every school contains a teacher with a real commitment to MFL. A significant proportion of the schools involved in the pilot were already involved in some form of international or MFL activity and it is likely that these were the ones most attracted to the pilot. If the pilot provision is to be expanded it would need to involve the non-committed and even the resistant.

the teacher that was previously involved is less involved this year due to timetable changes. This has proved problematic because other teachers are less interested. We are in the process of changing things but the success depends on individual teachers. (teacher comment)

7.27 School staff were asked what they saw as the key barriers to standardising MFL provision at KS2 and the need for specialist teachers was the most commonly raised.

Table 7.3: key barriers to MFL provision at KS2? - % response

Issue raised	% school staff raisin issue
Lack of specialist teachers	44
Lack of funding and resources	26
Reliance on individual teacher’s enthusiasm	15
Lack of time	15

7.28 There was a strong feeling that a significant investment in training would be needed in primary school teachers to develop their skills to the point where they could deliver a third language. Alternatively, staff said that funding was needed to support specialist provision through secondary school teachers visiting the primaries, which was seen as aiding transition, or through peripatetic teachers delivering to whole clusters.

Support provided to schools by CILT Cymru

7.29 During the first evaluation phase 44% of head and deputy head teachers and 56% of class teachers rated the support provided by CILT Cymru as good or very good. Headteachers were frequently not directly involved in the delivery of the pilot and, therefore, were less likely to know of CILT Cymru’s role (table 7.4). As the pilot progressed people became even more positive and in the second phase 66% of school staff commented positively on the training and advice on teaching and on the resources provided by, or flagged up by, CILT Cymru. CILT Cymru was also described as being beneficial to the functioning of cluster by over 13% of staff. There were also examples provided of how CILT Cymru had helped in ‘trouble shooting’ when difficulties arose for schools. CILT Cymru’s role in managing the funding for the project was also appreciated by pilot schools.

Table 7.4: Headteachers & Deputy Heads Rating of CILT Cymru (2005)

	Very Good %	Good %	Not Good %	Don’t know %
Staff	22	24	8	45

Table 7.5: Class Teachers Rating of CILT Cymru support (2005)

	Very Good %	Good %	Not Good %	Don’t know %
Staff	26	30	4	39

7.30 Table 7.5 above illustrates the fact that many class teachers were either not aware of who CILT Cymru are or what they do. However, quite often they would be aware of the individual working for them and praise them individually.

7.31 Negative reactions to CILT Cymru were often related to time issues, with staff stating that they did not have time to read written material sent to them, although overall reactions to the materials were good. There was also a view that many of the issues relating to the development of the project could be dealt with within the cluster and that CILT Cymru's role was only really needed when there were problems in the cluster. Where staff had called specifically on CILT Cymru for support to help solve a problem they were much more likely to value CILT Cymru’s role.

7.32 There was a relatively high level of apathy towards meetings and training partly because many of the pilot schools were dependent on external provision and, after the initial meeting, they did not see the point of regular meetings because the provision is working. In contrast, there was a higher positive

response to the materials that CILT Cymru distribute with 78% of staff who commented saying they found the materials useful. Teacher evaluations of the annual central conferences run by CILT Cymru have been overwhelmingly positive. Teachers from primary and secondary schools identified that they appreciated learning techniques shown that they could use in other areas of teaching as well as MFL.

Table 7.6: rating to CILT Cymru materials on offer

	Positive%	Negative%	Neutral%
Staff	78	11	11

7.33 The evaluation found a high level of staff turnover in the schools involved in the pilot. This meant that head and class teachers who may have had a significant input from CILT Cymru earlier in the project had either moved on or changed role and that those who replaced them were frequently unaware or unclear about CILT Cymru's role. This may mean that they are not making full use of the support that CILT Cymru is able to offer.

Support from the cluster

7.34 The second phase of the evaluation focused on the role of the cluster model and its impacts. It was clear that both teachers and head teachers saw having a full cluster as important and most believe that the cluster model is important to the quality of MFL provision.

Table 7.7: importance of the cluster model - % response

	Important		Not important		Don't Know	
	Head	teache	Head	Teache	Head	Teache
The importance of the cluster model to the quality of MFL provision in the school	67	71	26	21	7	9
The value of having a full cluster to MFL provision in the school	83	81	17	8	0	11

7.35 In seventeen of the areas involved in the pilot project the project was run through a full or significant cluster model where all, or most, of the primary schools were involved along with the secondary school the majority of their pupils progress to.

7.36 The value of having a full cluster was seen by nearly all school staff as being in its role in progression and transition. It was not possible for the secondary school to build on KS2 learning unless it had been done by at least a significant majority of pupils entering KS3. Where such pupils were a minority in the class this was seen as creating difficulties as they were frustrated by having to repeat work, although there was a advantage identified for lower ability pupils in being able to, initially at least, excel in a subject they had already studied.

7.37 The cluster model supported the project because it provided schools with access to shared ideas and resources. 34% of school staff identified the importance of

cluster meetings and communication between schools to the quality of the work. Being within the cluster also stimulated motivation and enthusiasm in teachers –

although the quality of the provision is basically reliant on the secondary teacher, the enthusiasm of the cluster encourages better reinforcing and collaboration.(teacher comment)

- 7.38 Teachers described working collaboratively within the cluster, supporting each other in running events and clubs and this practical aspect of the support offered by the cluster is illustrated by the greater importance teachers gave to it than headteachers. Where teachers saw the clusters as unimportant it was because either the cluster was ineffective, especially in cases where it was an incomplete cluster, or that they were choosing not to get involved. Over half of those who did not see the cluster as important, described the MFL provision in their school as a discrete option run by someone else (that is, a specialist teacher) and, by implication, not their concern.
- 7.39 A small proportion of participating schools (10%) said that the cluster had been very strong before the project and so the pilot had had little effect. A small proportion of teachers (4%) and of Headteachers (3%) said that they were disappointed with the level of support from the cluster.
- 7.40 Clusters frequently ran meetings in addition to the CILT Cymru support meetings. These tended to generate a more positive reaction than the CILT Cymru ones probably because they had a broader agenda, although they were often a direct bi-product of the MFL pilot. Such meetings were used to discuss transition issues and were often very informal. In some cases these meetings were semi-social, enabling teachers to effectively develop relationships that helped in dealing with the functioning of the cluster.

Table 7.8: MFL impact on cluster meetings

	Positive %	Negative %	Neutral %
Staff	82	5	14

- 7.41 Where the project was working through full or nearly full clusters, the scope for planning and developing the curriculum, progression routes and tracking processes was greatly enhanced. Where there were incomplete clusters involved, or pupils moved outside the cluster to continue their education, the concern was that they would have to repeat the work they had done. There was also evidence in at least one cluster that pupils moving outside the cluster were being criticised for their pronunciation.
- 7.42 Where was evidence that the way that the cluster's involvement in the pilot was planned and set up had a significant impact on the effectiveness of the cluster. The more open and inclusive the development process, especially where it involved class teachers as well as head teachers, the more likely the cluster was to function well. Clusters that enabled primary and secondary school staff to contribute on equal terms were also likely to be more effective in staff development (see Scottish pilot findings section 13). Where there had

been a ‘top-down’ process of secondary school led work being ‘sold’ to the primary schools as a package, school staff had often had to invest considerable amounts of time and energy in building trust and forming effective partnerships.

Processes to facilitate and track pupil's transition in MFL to Key Stage 3 and beyond and how successful these are judged to be

7.43 Secondary school staff were asked whether steps had been taken to build on the KS2 MFL work. During the first phase of the evaluation 63% of schools said that they did not have any formal tracking systems in place. In contrast, by the second phase, 47% of headteachers and 65% of subject teachers said some steps had been taken to track pilot pupils’ progress. Of those that said they had taken steps, half talked about changing work plans, 13% mentioned the introduction of tracking methods and 19% mentioned using assessments based on portfolios or workbooks to structure progression.

Table 7.9: Transition to KS3 by 2006 - % response

	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	Head	teacher	Head	Teacher	Head	teacher
Steps have been taken to build on KS2 work	47	65	24	18	29	16

7.44 As noted above, wherever tracking processes were in place a beneficial impact of the pilot was noted, but the majority of schools were still only able to report on observations and qualitative improvements in class involvement. The first full cohort of pupils will be entering year 9 in 2006 and then making GCSE option choices. It will be important to monitor what, if any, impact the pilot has had at that point.

7.45 Where school staff commented on a lack of tracking processes or progression planning they most frequently referred to problems with incomplete clusters. Where the pilot was run by a full cluster, monitoring the long-term impact is straight forward. There were, however, some examples of secondary schools seeking to track pupils involved in the pilot where they made up a relatively small proportion of the intake. One school, for example, had set up a colour coded system to identify pilot project pupils.

Table 7.10: MFL tracking systems in Schools

	Put into Sets before Secondary %	Want a system %	System in place no feedback %	Making plans for one %	Informal system in place %	Did not mention any tracking system %
Staff	15	6	6	2	8	63

7.46 Staff were asked to identify what they saw as the basic requirements for tracking the impact of the project. 15% identified the need for a solid

progression system to be put in place. However, most schools did not mention any requirement for tracking progression, perhaps due to the fact that the subject was not part of the national curriculum, or because the secondary teacher was teaching MFL and therefore already controlled the progression level.

8. Assessment of the lessons from developments in Scotland, England and Ireland

- 8.1 The failure of the Nuffield Primary French project in England (1964-1974) (see Burstall, et al, 1974) and a similar project in Scotland (HMI, 1969), effectively killed off plans for the widespread introduction of Modern Foreign Language teaching at key stage 2 in the UK. In the late 1980s, with increasing European integration, there was renewed interest in MFL teaching, and Scotland introduced the Modern Languages at Primary School pilot in 1989. In England and Wales, interest was rekindled by *The Nuffield Languages Inquiry* which argued that unless the UK enhanced language learning, the UK's competitive position in the world would decline (Nuffield Foundation, 2000).
- 8.2 The renewed interest in teaching MFL was accompanied by a reassessment of Nuffield Primary French project, and in particular, the reasons for its failure. For example, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) argues they have "learnt from previous failures"⁶ and are now working methodically to put the foundations in place first (i.e. "building infrastructure, teacher capacity and best practice").

8.3 Scottish Developments

- 8.3.1 The MLPS (Modern Languages at Primary School) pilot ran from 1989 to 1995. It was initially introduced in year 7 (Primary 7: aged 11+) in two phases, with 6 projects in 1989 and 6 in 1990. However, the number of composite classes at primary school meant that from the very start pupils as young as 8 were being exposed to MFL teaching. In response, in 1991, MFL was introduced at P4 and P5 levels as a single pilot.
- 8.3.2 In 1993 it was announced that foreign language provision was to be extended to all primary schools (the "generalisation" phase). Whereas, in the pilot, teaching had been mainly delivered by visiting teachers, in the generalisation phase, the task fell upon primary teachers. In preparation, the teachers received in-service training amounting to 27 days distributed over four terms (Martin, 2000; Johnstone et al, 2000).
- 8.3.3 The decision to further expand MFL in primary education incited a heated debate in the mid 1990s about the support needed to enable primary school teachers to effectively deliver it. This was fuelled by a critical HMI report (discussed below) that suggested that there was little hard evidence on what pupils could actually do with the language that they had learnt (Johnstone, et al, 2000). Following further studies the Ministerial Action Group for Languages (AGL), recommended that there be an "entitlement" to a minimum of 6 years study with a MFL in their report *Citizens of a Multilingual World*, (Ministerial Action Group, 2000). The broad thrust was in line with the Nuffield enquiry's conclusions and was broadly endorsed by the Scottish Executive (Scottish Executive, 2001). Since then there has been a substantial increase in MFL in primary education and all pupils are entitled to learn a

⁶ DfES Website http://www.dfes.gov.uk/languages/DSP_faqs.cfm [Accessed, 16th August 2004]

modern European language - French, German, Italian or Spanish - from P6 to S4.

8.3.4 *Results of evaluations*

The independent evaluation of the Scottish Pilot (Low, et al, 1993) found that:

There was evidence that project pupils had an advantage in pronunciation and intonation, the ability to initiate and respond in conversation, and the use of more phrases and sentences rather than single words. There was no evidence of an increase in grammatical accuracy. These gains were evident at all three levels of ability in the pupil sample, but were particularly marked among those of middle and lower ability (ibid, p. 6).

They concluded that:

All those involved in the pilot projects in Scotland have found them to be a very demanding but worthwhile development.... The research showed that both staffing models in the national pilot projects, one of which did not directly involve secondary teachers, were effective. It was the commitment of all the teachers and tutors involved, and the quality of the support they received, that were the key factors in determining the success of the scheme. (ibid., p. 10).

8.3.5 The evaluation and a follow up in 1997 (Low and Johnstone 1997) were challenged by a critical HMI report in 1998, which argued that to date, the debate had focused upon processes not outcomes. In particular, it suggested that there was little hard evidence on what pupils could actually do with the language that they had learnt (Johnstone, et al, 2000). In response to the problems identified by the HMI report, an Action group for languages was established and the SOEID commissioned an 'Initial Assessment of Achievement' in MFL in 2001 (SEED, 2001). The evaluation focused upon testing a sample of pupils (Johnstone, et al, 2000) and concluded that, subject to the limitation so the study, most notably the small sample size and the fact that it was cross-sectional rather than longitudinal:

there were tentative pointers towards progression in their [pupil's] foreign language development from P7 to S2, as documented in the range statements for those skill areas (particularly Listening and Speaking) that featured in the assessments at both P7 and S2 and which show that S2 pupils were able to operate with more complex language than were pupils at P7. (ibid.)

8.3.6 The Scottish pilot highlighted a number of potential challenges including:

- The longstanding problem of transition. For example, some secondary MFL teachers deliberately started from the beginning again, while others were reluctant to change their teaching style⁷. These problems were reinforced by the more rigid curriculum at secondary level⁸ focused upon 'subject teaching'

⁷ This may be because they did not perceive primary lessons as "real" learning (Martin, 2000, p. 39 citing Low, et al, 1995).

⁸ Some of which was designed before the MLPS pilot was initiated (Martin, 2000, p. 39).

rather than ‘embedding’ (Martin, 2000).⁹ Similarly the lack of agreed curriculum meant that, “there was a fair degree of uncertainty across schools as to what it was reasonable to expect pupils to achieve and how these achievements might be assessed.” This uncertainty in turn created problems for the evaluation, with teachers asking ““What will be assessed: pupils or their teachers?”” (Johnstone, et al, 2000, p. 3 in chp1); and

- The problems secondary schools experienced trying to “develop differentiated teaching” (for different skill levels), particularly when dealing with pupils from both project and non-project schools. Responses included “catch up” packs for pupils (sent out in the school holidays); separate classes and/or additional support for beginners and more creative use of course books¹⁰ (Martin, 2000, pp. 42-43).

8.3.7 Despite the challenges, and in contrast to the disappointing pilots in the 1960, the Scottish project was considered a success. Much of this success, has been attributed to the emphasis placed upon putting the “infrastructure of support” in place from the very start in Scotland (ibid, p. 62). This support has included:

- A national committee for the projects as a whole;
- Support and advice from HMIs;
- ‘National Development Officers’;
- ‘Regional advisers’ and steering committees who have supported all aspects of development, including the curriculum, staffing, resources, management, pedagogy, and evaluation;
- The establishment of clusters (considered the “bedrock of the Scottish primary MFL development”);
- Specialist language teaching, principally through teachers from pilot secondary schools, visiting primaries in order to work with primary school class teachers and Language training for primary class teachers;
- Guidelines and Newsletters (ibid.; Parsons, et al, N.D.).

8.4 English developments

8.4.1 In England the first “foundations” were laid by *The Early Language Learning* (ELL) Initiative co-ordinated by CILT, working with bodies like the QCA on behalf of the DfES. The three key objectives of this pilot initiative were:

- “to provide advice and support for institutions involved in or considering early language learning;
- to offer greater support and coherence for existing initiatives;
- to establish a basis for future developments.” (CILT, N.D.a, p. 3).

⁹ <http://www.scre.ac.uk/rie/nl54/nl54johnstone.html>, [Accessed, 16th August 2004]

¹⁰ E.g. Changing to a new course book in secondary school; Starting secondary course books at a later unit; Starting the course book at the beginning but extending and recycling language; Using the course book more selectively.

- 8.4.2 Phase 1 ran from April 1999 to March 2001 and was considered a success (CILT, N.D.a). The evaluation of phase 2 was published in 2005.
- 8.4.3 In 2002 the Languages Strategy for England was published and included a commitment that every child would have the opportunity to study a foreign language at KS2 by 2010. In October 2005 a Key Stage 2 Framework for Languages was launched. Non-statutory guidelines have been developed for KS2 MFL and the OCA have developed KS2 schemes of work for French, German and Spanish.
- 8.4.4 The *Development of Early Language Learning* (DELL) projects explored MFL in the primary schools in phase 2 of the ELL initiative. The results of this project led to the publication of the NACELL Best Practice Guide.¹¹
- 8.4.5 In addition to the DELL projects, Schools in 19 LEAs were chosen to take part in the *Primary Pathfinders Project*. The project was similar in some respects to developments in Wales, with a mix of delivery through teachers and Foreign Language Assistants from secondary schools and non-specialist class teacher. Although there are potentially significant differences with some schools beginning to introduce provision in year 3 and stronger focus upon training and enabling primary school teachers to take responsibility for MFL provision.
- 8.4.6 The pilot was intended to: “develop strategies that will”:
- “introduce language learning for seven to eleven year olds”;
 - “share good practice both within and outside their LEA”;
 - “share resources such as experienced staff and specialist equipment”;
 - “foster professional development”; and
 - “develop local, regional, national and international partnerships.”¹²
- 8.4.7 The Primary Pathfinders Project ran from 2003-2005 and were evaluated by Warwick University in order to help inform decisions about how MFL should be taught in primary schools.¹³

8.4.8 *Results of Evaluation*

As noted, the evaluation of phase 1 of the project was positive. For example, in relation to objective 3: “establishing a basis for future developments”, the evaluation concluded that:

- Parents, teachers and learners were all enthusiastic;
- There is evidence of effectiveness (e.g. “There are signs of linguistic progression making use of the enthusiasm and capabilities of young learners”); and

¹¹ <http://www.nacell.org.uk/bestpractice/index.htm> [Accessed November 2006]

¹² http://www.nacell.org.uk/home/whats_new.htm [Accessed November 2006]; see also <http://www.nacell.org.uk/happening/pathfinder/index.htm> [Accessed November 2006]

¹³ http://www.dfes.gov.uk/languages/whatson_primary_ks2.cfm [Accessed, 11th August 2004]

- Some potential barriers (e.g. primary-secondary transitions) were successfully addressed (e.g. through the European Languages Portfolio).

Nevertheless, the phase 1 evaluation suggested that a number of problems still need to be addressed, these included:

- Time constraints;
- The lack of an agreed curriculum, which complicated transitions and training, and which in some cases caused a lack of focus;
- A shortage of trained teachers (CILT, N.D.a, p. 6).

The Phase 2 evaluation (Mujis, et al, 2005) was also positive and their findings broadly reflected our own, for example they found:

- “Languages were generally received enthusiastically by pupils, parents and teachers and there was a perceived positive impact on pupils’ wider learning.”
- “Collaborative ‘clusters’ of schools were....very beneficial [for empowering class teachers]”
- “Training was crucial for both primary and secondary staff to enable primary languages to achieve success.”
- “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 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.”
- “Generally assessment was underdeveloped in many Pathfinders.... A range of assessment strategies was used across the case study schools which mainly involved informal monitoring.”
- “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.” (ibid.)

Nevertheless, there were some significant differences. For example, they found, as in Wales, that “Where liaison between sectors had taken place, in particular mutual observation, this had been beneficial in encouraging teachers to evaluate their own practice.” However, unlike Wales, “In many schools no meetings had taken place between primary and secondary staff.” This in turn meant that “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.” (ibid.)

8.5 Irish developments

8.5.1 A National Pilot project for trialing Modern Languages in Irish Primary Schools was launched in 1998. Like Wales, Ireland's education system is already bilingual it therefore potentially makes an interesting comparator. Unfortunately, of the published material, there is little analysis of the impact of bi-lingualism on MFL teaching and learning.

8.5.2 At present Irish and English are taught in state primary schools. There is usually no MFL provision until secondary school.¹⁴

8.5.3 *Results of the Evaluation*

The evaluation of the project was very positive and concluded that:

- The vast majority of pupils made progress in both listening and spoken communication skills.
- The vast majority of pupils have developed positive attitudes toward both the language and culture;
- Vast majority of teachers feel they, their pupils and their school has benefited from it;
- Most teachers agree that the projects objectives have been met.
- if MFL is to be rolled out, there needs to be nationwide commitment in order to address the supply of teachers and to ensure co-ordination between primary and secondary schools. (Harris, N.D.).

¹⁴ <http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/aspla/tnp2/doc/ireland.rtf> [Accessed, 11th august 2004]

Evaluation of the Key Stage 2 Modern Foreign Languages Pilot Projects

Summary of potential lesson for Wales from the Scottish, English and Irish experiences

Question	Scotland	England	Ireland
Is the introduction of MFL is judged to be a worthwhile complement to and development of the statutory curriculum	Teachers and pupils both in favour. Are concerns (e.g. cementing French hegemony).	Teachers, pupils and parents are all in favour	Teachers in favour.
Compare and contrast different teaching methods used in pilot schools	Expertise matters, therefore issues around training	Expertise matters, therefore issues around training	Expertise matters, therefore issues around training
Interaction between MFL provision and the culture and ethos of the schools.	The Cluster model is important, but depends on partnerships. Need to “embed” into the curriculum.	Emphasis upon “embedding” into the curriculum.	Not Known
Will involvement in MFL learning at Key Stage 2 have a subsequent impact on MFL learning at Key Stage 3	Pupil’s have made progress in target language. Uptake at Scottish KS3 equivalent increased.	Pupil’s have made progress in target language.	Pupil’s have made progress in target language.
Has the introduction of MFL learning through the pilots has had any adverse effects or created additional pressure on schools?	Need to get support infrastructure in place first. Shortages of trained teachers.	Need to get support infrastructure in place first. Time pressures	Not Known
What processes are in place to facilitate and track pupil's transition in MFL to Key Stage 3 and beyond and how successful these are judged to be?	The lack of an agreed curriculum, complicated transitions. Some teachers started again, other reluctant to change teaching styles.	The lack of an agreed curriculum, complicated transitions and training.	Need unified structures/processes to facilitate transition.

9. Conclusions

9.1 The MFL pilot project was judged to be a success by the school staff, pupils and parents consulted in this evaluation. The value of teaching a foreign language at Key Stage 2 are described as being:-

- the enthusiasm and excitement of pupils in learning a new subject;
- the lack of self-consciousness of primary school pupils when participating in class;
- a perception that the younger a child is the easier it is to learn a new language; and
- the wider benefits of the project, such as the way it helped strengthen and develop school clusters and support transition.

9.2 The evaluation found a very positive attitude to MFL from both parents and pupils. For pupils, however, this did not always translate into a commitment to continue with an MFL into KS4. Estyn studies suggest that take up at KS4 is influenced by a range of different factors unrelated to enjoyment of language learning. Even though pupils nearly always said that they enjoyed MFL lessons they still tended to regard an MFL GCSE as likely to be hard. It will therefore be interesting to see what happens when the current cohort of MFL learners progresses to KS4.

9.3 The successful characteristics of MFL provision emerged as being:

- The involvement of teachers with self-belief in their ability to teach a MFL and an interest and enthusiasm in the project and languages. These were often specialist teachers from a secondary school, but there were also examples of primary class teachers who fulfilled this role.
- The participation of primary school teachers in the lessons, so enhancing the scope to reinforce learning between lessons and share ideas and experiences of teaching in primary and secondary contexts.
- A strong, complete cluster, with good links between primary and secondary teachers and schemes of work. This was often achieved through delivery by specialist teachers from a secondary school or peripatetics supported by them, but there were also a few examples where primary class teachers were leading delivery and worked closely with their secondary colleagues to share ideas and support and enable pupils progression.
- Strong cluster links and collaboration between primary and secondary schools created the potential to build on work done at KS2 in KS3 so that the learning advantage is maintained. This was most successfully achieved in a full cluster where whole schemes of work could be re-written to capitalise on work done in the primary school.
- The focus on listening and speaking which ensured the lessons felt different to usual lessons and enjoyable. This focus also allowed for mixed ability groups, including those with special needs, to benefit from the provision.

- 9.4 There is clear evidence in Wales of the successful acquisition of a second language in Welsh medium schools where pupils whose first language is English have learned the language sufficiently to be taught in Welsh. Teachers and parents from these schools tended to be the most enthusiastic about MFL learning and the benefits bi-lingualism brings to the acquisition of a 3rd or 4th language.
- 9.5 Overall responses from pupils, parents and teachers were overwhelmingly positive. Nevertheless, in our judgment, because schools actively chose to participate in the pilot, we cannot assume that all schools in Wales would share this positive response.
- 9.6 These findings also broadly reflect the positive conclusions of the evaluation of the English MFL pathfinders and developments in Scotland.

Bibliography

Burstall, C., Jamieson, M., Cohen, S., & Hargreaves, M. (1974) *Primary French in the balance*. Slough: NFER

Estyn (2002). *Aiming for Excellence in Modern Foreign languages*. Estyn Guidance for Schools and Local Education Authorities Cardiff: Estyn, also available online at: <http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/AimingforExcellenceMFLE.pdf>

Estyn (2004). *Modern Foreign Languages in Welsh-Medium Schools*. Estyn Guidance for Schools and Local Education Authorities. Cardiff: Estyn, also available online at: http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/Modern_Foreign_languages.pdf

Harris, j. (undated). 'Modern Languages in Irish Primary Schools: An Evaluation of the National Pilot Project.' Unpublished Paper, available online at: <http://www.ite.ie/sicth2.htm>

HM Inspectors of Schools. (1998). *Standards and Quality. Primary and Secondary Schools. 1994-98: in Modern Languages*. Edinburgh: HMSO for the Scottish Office

Johnstone R *et al* (1999) *Pilot AAP in French and German 1998. Report to the Scottish Office Education and Industry Department*. Stirling: Scottish CILT

Johnstone, R., J., Cavani, L., Low, J., McPake (2000). 'Assessing Modern Languages Achievement: a Scottish Pilot Study of Late Primary and Early Secondary Pupils'. CILT Research Forum, December 2000. Available online at: <http://www.cilt.org.uk/research/aap.htm>

Low, L., J. Duffield, S. Brown, R. Johnstone & A. Bankowska. 1993. *Modern Foreign Languages in Primary Schools: the National Pilot Projects in Scotland*. Interchange No 19. Available online at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/edru/Pdf/ers/interchange19.pdf>

Martin, C. (2000). 'An Analysis of national and international research on the provision of modern foreign languages in primary schools', unpublished report prepared for the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. Available online at: http://www.qca.org.uk/downloads/3809_cmartin_rpt_mfl_primarieschools.pdf

Ministerial Action Group on Languages (2000) *Citizens of a Multilingual World*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.

Muijs, D., A. Barnes, M. Hunt, B. Powell, E. Arweck & G. Lindsay (2005). *Evaluation Of The Key Stage 2 Language Learning Pathfinders*. Report for the Department For Education And Skills. Available online at: <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR692.pdf>

Nuffield Languages Inquiry (2000) *Languages: the Next Generation*. London: The Nuffield Foundation. Available online at: <http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/languages/inquiry/in0000000555.asp>

Parsons, R, C. Goodwin, & C. James (undated). 'MLPSA in Scotland – A Study Visit by CILT Cymru'. Unpublished paper.

Scottish Executive Education Department (2001). 'Assessment of Achievement Programme Report of the First Survey of Modern Languages (French and German) 2001. Available online at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library5/education/fsml.pdf>

Scottish Executive (2001) *Citizens of a Multilingual World. Scottish Executive Response*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office. Available online at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library3/education/cmlw.pdf>

Scottish Executive (2005) *Citizens of a Multilingual World. Scottish Executive Response*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.