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Scotland’s 1+2 Languages strategy

- Launched in 2012 and created the context for Scottish pupils to learn two additional languages in addition to their first language in primary education:
  - First additional language (Language 2, L2) from Primary 1 (age 5)
  - Second additional language (L3) no later than Primary 5 (age 9)

- Pupils continue their L2 for ten years of education, after which they can choose subjects for national examinations.

- The 1+2 Languages policy marked a move:
  - to early-start modern language education, and
  - to a multilingual & multicultural turn in Scottish education, with the learning of 2 additional languages & their cultures as the norm.
Structure of the presentation

• Aims of the 1+2 policy

• Processes of policy ‘creation’  (Cassels Johnson, 2013, p.72)

• Case study: how the 1+2 languages policy has been ‘interpreted, negotiated, resisted & recreated’ in primary schools  (Menken & Garcia, 2010, p.2.)

• Beyond policy ‘implementation’ to:
  • Evaluation – e.g. of pupil experiences and outcomes
  • Institutionalization – support for sustainability of primary languages
  • Social practice - relationship between educational language policy & society in Scotland’s being & becoming a ‘multicultural and multilingual nation.’
2011 Scottish National Party Manifesto commitment:

‘We will introduce a norm for language learning based on the European Union 1+2 model – that is we will create the conditions in which every child will learn two languages in addition to their own mother tongue. This will … create a new model for language acquisition in Scotland.’

Key aims of the Scottish 1+2 Languages Strategy - relating to learners:

• To make language learning a ‘norm’ or ‘entitlement’ for all pupils in Scotland – giving equity of opportunity to the benefits of language learning

• To enable pupils to benefit from an early-start model of language learning - with its perceived benefits in terms of language acquisition, intercultural competence, learning and employment (Scottish Government, 2012a, 2012b; Edelenbos et al. 2006).

• To create a new model of language acquisition – embedding language learning in relevant and meaningful learning contexts in addition to discrete learning (Edelenbos et al. 2006 Murphy et al. 2020).
Societal aims of the 1+2 policy

Language in education policy relates to the political & social ideologies of its national context (Spolsky, 2009).

(i) Scotland in Europe and the world

• That the 1+2 languages policy increase multilingual and multicultural skills to boost the Scottish economy
• The focus in the 1+2 is both on:
  • ‘modern European languages’ and
  • languages of the ‘rising economies of the future’ (2012b)

• This reflects political-economic move from a European to an International focus in the Scottish economy from the mid-2000s.

E.g. Scotland-China strategy (2006)
Creation of National Qualifications in Chinese.
Scotland as a multicultural & multilingual nation

‘The adoption of a 1+2 approach to language learning is in line with Scotland’s increasing development as a diverse, multicultural and multilingual nation. This diversity includes Scotland’s own languages: Gaelic and Scots.’ (2012b)

(i) Community languages
- Support for immigration since devolution in 1999
- Civic, inclusive national identity (McCollum et al. 2014)
- 150% 5-year increase in the number of EAL pupils between 2006 & 2011 (Scottish Govt. 2007, 2011)

(ii) Scotland’s languages
- Promotion of Gaelic & Scots in society e.g. European Charter for Regional or Minority languages (2001), Gaelic Language Act (2005), support for Gaelic-medium education
Policy ‘creation’ – at local authority level

• ‘Local authorities and schools [should] develop a 1+2 strategy for language learning … taking account of local circumstances and priorities.’
  (2012b, p.18)

• There is no ‘hierarchy of languages’ (2012a) but ‘as part of this strategy consideration should be given to the teaching of:
  - European languages
  - Languages of the strong economies of the future,
  - Gaelic and
  - Community languages of pupils in schools.’
  (2012b, p.18)
The L2 choices by school (2020-21)

No. of primary schools providing an L2 by language

- French: 1452
- Spanish: 174
- Gaelic (learners): 46
- German: 23
- Cantonese: 10
- Mandarin: 6
- Urdu: 0
- Italian: 0

(Education Scotland, 2021)
The local authority choices: L2

-Why these languages?
- L2 is introduced at Primary 1 and continues to the the end of Secondary 3.
- The L2 thus has to have National Qualification status at S3:
  - French, Spanish, Gaelic [learners], German, Cantonese, Mandarin, Urdu, Italian.
- Raises critical questions about there being no hierarchy of languages
The L3 choices by school (2020-21)

No. of primary schools providing an L3 by language

- Spanish: 523
- French: 202
- German: 177
- Mandarin: 150
- Gaelic (learners): 138
- BSL: 113
- Scots: 100
- Italian: 31
- Makaton: 25

(Education Scotland, 2021)
The L3 choices by school (2020-21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>No. of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugese</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-Why this range of languages?

- L3 as more flexible in terms of curricular requirements for outcomes
- L3 as more flexible in terms of curricular requirements for delivery model.
- Reflecting local linguistic and cultural diversity and/or broader societal development (e.g. Scots Language Strategy, BSL Language Act)

(Education Scotland, 2021)
Case study: 1+2 policy in practice in primary schools

Menken and Garcia (2010, p.1) note:

‘At each level of an educational system, from the national ministry or department of education to the classroom, language education policies are interpreted, negotiated, and ultimately (re)constructed in the process of implementation … classroom teachers are at the epicenter of this dynamic process, acting on their agency to change the various language education policies they must translate into practice.’

In this case study we will explore how the 1+2 language education policy was ’interpreted, negotiated, resisted, and (re)created’ in primary classrooms.  (Menken & Garcia, 2010, p.1)
L2 in Scotland’s schools – before and after

Modern Languages in the Primary School (MLPS):
• National training scheme
• Limited funding
• Only some teachers did the training and could teach across the school. They became the school’s ‘languages teacher’

1+2 Languages:
• LA-based training scheme
• Substantial funding (£35.6m)
• Every primary teacher is a language teacher and has to engage in associated upskilling in the language skills and pedagogy of modern language learning
L2 - Interpretation/negotiation of policy (Menken & Garcia, 2010)

- The expectations for language level in the L2 by the end of P7 are no different than they were pre 1+2 policy
- The language learning experience is very different
- Progression in language acquisition, in accuracy, in knowledge of grammar, deepening of the 4 skills
- Integration of learning about the culture that lies behind the language(s) studied
- Integration of language learning within other areas of the curriculum, where possible/ feasible.
What to expect in classrooms:

**PRIMARY:**

- Target language (TL) embedded and used for class routines e.g. greetings, register, lunch checks etc. Increase in complexity of response.

- Discrete lessons (from about P3/P4 onwards) e.g. role play practice, looking at a grammar point etc within a theme.

- All four skills + grammar

**SECONDARY:**

Building from the Primary Language Learning experience …

- TL used by teacher and pupils majority of the time.

- Lessons focussed around particular themes e.g. free time, healthy living, education, future plans etc. (themes increase in complexity as pupils mature)

- Progression in grammar
L3 – ‘resistance and recreation’ of policy (Menken & Garcia, 2010)

1. L3 introduced by P5 at the latest. Is taught continuously, P5, P6, P7. Learners are ‘on the approach’ to the second curriculum level (= A1 on CEFR). Is one of the 8 languages available as a National Qualification. Can be taken into the secondary as the L2, if preferred to the P1-P7 L2.

2. October 2017 – alteration to the parameters of this part of the policy. L3 can be a different language in P5, then in P6, then in P7. Does not have to be a language for National Qualification. Cannot be taken into secondary as the preferred L2.

3. October 2019 – alteration to the parameters of L3 in the secondary school.
Where next for 1+2 Languages?
Moving from implementation to evaluation

Pupil experiences and outcomes:

• Indications of learner enthusiasm for language learning, and positive attitudes to learning about other languages and cultures, c.f benefits of early language learning (Myles 2017, Edelenbos et al. (2006)).

• Evidence of strong intercultural competence - in PISA 2018, Scottish pupils (aged 15-16) performed very well on tests of ‘global competence’. (OECD, 2020, p.5)

• Intentions for uptake: 35% of 1800 S1 to S5 pupils in a 2017 survey (Scottish Govt, 2017) noted an intention to continue with foreign language learning because they enjoy it, are good at it or see benefits for a future career.

• Evaluation of linguistic outcomes will be part of the forthcoming HMI Curricular Area Review on 1+2.
Moving from implementation to institutionalization

- Evidence of institutionalization at the local authority and school levels, with 69% of primary schools P1-P7 for L2, and 64% for L3 (2020-21).
- Moving towards a normalized, sustainable part of the curriculum in schools.
- **However**, there has not been the same progress in relation to institutionalization in initial teacher education in relation to the 1+2 languages strategy
  - no national requirement for ITE primary teachers to have a languages qualification on entry or on exit to their programmes
  - variation across ITE providers in relation to input on pedagogy and language
- Evidence that new teachers feel less competent to teach languages in terms of both linguistic proficiency and pedagogical skill as compared with other areas of the curriculum.
  (Valdera-Gil & Crichton 2020, Birnie, 2021)
Moving from education to society: the 1+2 and Scotland as ‘a multicultural & multilingual nation’

‘The adoption of a 1+2 approach to language learning is in line with Scotland’s increasing development as a diverse, multicultural and multilingual nation.’

(2012b, p.5)

• 1+2 as a reflection of societal linguistic and cultural diversity, but also a contributor to it, directly and indirectly.

• Such sharing of languages and cultures in educational policy is now also being seen in social policy, with Phipps (2018, p.103) noting that

  ‘Between 2014 and 2017 a paradigmatic shift in understandings of languages can be traced through the policy documentation on refugee and migrant integration in Scotland’, with migrants’ multilingualism, rather than English being framed as ‘central ...for integration’ and there being ‘mutual benefit’ in Scots learning New Scots’ languages and cultures.
Looking forwards

‘In a context of global mobility, with changing patterns of asylum and immigration, climate refugees, economic refugees, and in a small country with a big reputation for tourism, language diversity is at the heart of symbolic and ideological questions about the way Scotland wishes to position and represent itself.’

(Phipps and Fassetta, 2015, p.17)

In societal and educational policy – as a ‘multicultural and multilingual nation’, where Scotland’s languages are nurtured in a multilingual context.

(Scottish Government 2012, SNP Manifesto 2021)
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