



Review of Languages Education Policies Internationally

Report commissioned by
The Multicultural Education and Languages Committee (MELC)

Prepared by: Dr Michelle Kohler
Flinders University

September 2017



Government of
South Australia

Review of languages education policies internationally

Report commissioned by
The Multicultural Education and Languages Committee (MELC)

Prepared by:

Dr Michelle Kohler
Senior Lecturer, Languages Education and Indonesian
School of Education, and School of Humanities and Creative Arts
Faculty of Education, Humanities and Law
Flinders University

September 2017



Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Methodology.....	1
3. International language education policies	2
3.1 United States of America	2
3.2 Canada.....	4
Ontario.....	4
British Columbia	5
Québec.....	6
3.3 Europe.....	6
France	7
Italy.....	8
3.4 United Kingdom.....	9
England	9
Scotland	10
Northern Ireland	10
Wales	11
3.5 China and Hong Kong.....	12
China.....	12
Hong Kong.....	12
3.6 Japan	13
3.7 Singapore.....	14
4. Overall findings	15
5. Implications and conclusion	16
References	18
United States.....	18
Canada	19
Europe.....	19
France	19
Italy.....	20
United Kingdom.....	20
England	20

Scotland	21
Northern Ireland	21
Wales	21
China	21
Hong Kong.....	22
Japan	22
Singapore	23



1. Introduction

This paper was commissioned by the Multicultural Education and Languages Committee to inform the work of that committee in providing advice to the South Australian Minister for Education and Child Development.

The purpose of the paper is to review the current state of languages education policy in the international arena. The discussion focuses on a selection of countries, some with similar features to the Australian policy context and others that are divergent.

The international snapshot is then considered in terms of its relevance to and possible implications for languages education in the South Australian context.

The paper aims, therefore, to provide a broad sense of the current and changing landscape of languages education policy internationally as a resource for considering the local languages education policy environment and possible directions.

2. Methodology

The methodology used to develop this paper was document analysis. Key publicly available documents related to languages education policy in a range of countries were gathered and analysed individually and then as overall sets. The policies relate to the compulsory years of schooling and any forms of certification. In addition, some supplementary material in the form of academic articles or newspaper reports was used, particularly where the available information was scant.

The countries were selected based on criteria related to both similarity to and difference from the South Australian context. Those deemed similar are the United States, United Kingdom and Canada, which share many cultural and linguistic similarities. English is a dominant language in these societies and the primary language of instruction in education. Second language learners in these countries learn a range of languages, as heritage or background learners and learners for whom the language is their first language. Another group of countries were chosen for their cultural and linguistic differences to South Australia. In these countries – China (including Hong Kong), Singapore, Japan and a number of European countries – English is not the national language or primary medium of instruction in schools, but is the principal ‘foreign’ language taught in schools in addition to national and sometimes local or regional languages. As a set, therefore, these countries offer potential both for comparing likeness with the South Australian context, as well as points of difference that may be worthy of consideration.

Once the relevant documents were gathered, they were analysed for key characteristics of the following features:

- policy context
- stated purpose/aims
- requirements and/or targets, e.g. compulsion/choice
- strategies
- curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment
- accountability, monitoring and evaluation.

The analysis of all individual national policies were then considered collectively to indicate any overall trends or themes internationally that may have relevance and implications for the South Australian context.

3. International language education policies

This section presents overviews of language policies in each of the countries selected. The discussion is presented through a brief outline of the policy and its key features as outlined above, followed by an analysis of any significant issues and points of interest.

3.1 United States of America

Languages education in the United States is complex and needs to be understood against a social, cultural and political context that is changing quite significantly. Recent statistics from the U.S. Census Bureau indicate that more than 65 million residents speak a language other than English at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). While this represents approximately 21% of the total population, it is a figure that has been rising steadily over recent decades. This means that while English remains the dominant and, for the majority, sole language for communication, bilingualism in general is increasing. In relation to language learning in schools, this presents a significant challenge: while numbers of bilinguals in the general population are increasing, numbers of students studying languages (other than English) are decreasing (particularly in public elementary and middle schools) (Commission on Language Learning, 2016). Languages education typically includes the study of ‘foreign’ or ‘world’ languages, English (particularly for immigrants) and Native American languages (particularly for heritage learners).

Language policy in the United States is complicated as the authority for education policy rests with each of the states and there is no single national policy. In the past, a number of federal laws, particularly related to citizenship and immigration, have indirectly influenced foreign language learning in schools and universities. In 1994 foreign language study was included in the core curriculum offered in 50 states for all students in grades 4, 8 and 12 as required by the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* (2000). The learning of Indigenous languages is governed by separate legislation, the *Native American Languages Preservation Act* (2006) and its focus is on reclamation and retention of Native American languages, particularly in schools with large numbers of Native American students.

In recent decades, particularly since the events of September 11, 2001, policies have aligned language learning with national security. These include the *National Security Education Program* (National Security Education Program, 1991) and the 2006 *National Security Language Initiative* (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). Despite these initiatives, a recent report (Commission on Language Learning, 2017) on the state of languages education in the US indicated a decline in language learning at every level of education between 1996/7 and 2007/8. The number of elementary schools offering languages other than English fell by 6% to 25% of all schools (with only 15% of public schools having programs compared to 50% of private schools) and the number of secondary (middle) schools offering world languages fell from 75% to 58% in the same period (Commission on Language Learning, 2017:8–9).

According to the Commission’s report, Congress and the Office of Management and Budget claim that

America's lack of language proficiency in world languages poses a threat not only to national security but also to international relations and economic competitiveness (Commission on Language Learning, 2017). In fact, in 2012 the US Department of State raised its quota of 'language designated' elected positions by 15% and the Department of Defense advocated for more language learning in the early years in schools (Commission on Language Learning, 2017). The federal government has designated a small number of languages as having strategic and security 'critical need' and hence provides incentives to study them, such as through the State Department's National Security Language Initiative for Youth and the Critical Language Scholarship Program that funds in-country study.

Furthermore, the US Department of Education states that it is committed to biliteracy and multi-literacy for all students and supports this through the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA). This body performs functions such as giving policy advice, offering grants for preparing teachers, and commissioning and disseminating research. Their most recent report provides a comprehensive overview of the policies and practices related to 'dual language programs' (OELA, 2015). It includes a number of detailed findings, but the main one relevant here is that the majority of states across the US offered at least one 'dual language program' in elementary schools, with Spanish and Chinese as the main 'partner' languages (i.e. dual language would mean English-Spanish, or English-Chinese). The program conditions and operational definition of 'dual language' varies, but generally it is understood as 50% instruction in the partner language in elementary school. The program may be whole-school or one or two designated classes. Programs may be 'two-way', with groups of learners sharing common language backgrounds (Chinese, Spanish, English), or 'one-way', where a majority of students have the same non-English language background (e.g. Spanish) (OELA, 2015:10). In 2016, in a move designed to further support the program in elementary schools, the Departments of Health and Human Services, and Education announced a new policy, Dual Language Learners (DLLs) in Early Childhood, designed to encourage all early childhood programs to be 'welcoming and linguistically accessible to families of DLLs' and to 'foster children's emerging bilingualism' (U.S. Department of Education, 2016).

Although states are responsible for policy and program implementation and the details vary, guidelines have been developed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), the national professional association for language teaching. These have been widely adopted. The World-Readiness Standards (ACTFL, 2011) is a set of standards to guide the development of curricula, assessment and language programs. Since 2013, these standards have been adopted in at least 40 states (Commission on Language Learning, 2017).

One further recent development worth noting is the passing of Proposition 58 in California in late 2016. The passing of this legislation means that schools are now free to offer bilingual programs to all learners, where under previous legislation they were required to offer English-only programs to students of non-English-speaking backgrounds. Bilingual education was enshrined in federal law in 1968 with the *Bilingual Education Act*, however, a slump in interest, combined with restrictions for English-only instruction for English language learners, resulted in a decline in these programs. With one in five students in California now English language learners and a growing interest in bilingual advantages from families of English-background learners, there is a renewed interest in bilingual education (Sanchez, 2016). It remains to be seen how schools will respond to this legislative change in their provision of language programs from 2017 onwards.

Thus, the United States languages education scene is varied and dynamic. Participation rates, particularly in the public school sector, remain a challenge. The growing numbers of bilingual students and learners for whom English is not a first language, particularly in some states, is prompting legislative and programmatic changes to improve the responsiveness to learners' needs.

3.2 Canada

Since the introduction of the *Official Languages Act* (1969), Canada has officially been a bilingual country with two nationally recognised languages, French and English. Both languages have differing statuses in different provinces. Three examples that reflect the range of policies are discussed here: in Ontario, English is the majority language, but there are significant numbers of French-speakers; in British Columbia, English is the majority language; and in Québec, French is the majority language. While responsibility for education is held at the province level, the federal government makes funding available to support languages education in the provinces.

In the early 2000s, at the national level, Canada had an ambitious plan for languages education, the *Action Plan for Official Languages* (Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, 2003). The aim was to increase by 50% the number of high school graduates who were bilingual in French and English. An interim report found, however, that the policy was not meeting its target and in fact numbers of bilingual youth had actually declined (by 2%) (Conrick & Donovan, 2010). Despite attention to immersion programs in Canada, the majority of programs are second language learning-oriented with daily 'drip feed' lessons of 20-50 minutes (Early, 2008:201). These programs have been criticised for producing poor learning outcomes and alternatives with increased time allocations, such as the Intensive French (IF) program, have since been developed. Starting typically in upper primary, the IF program involves an initial period of intensive exposure (60%–70% of the school day in the target language) for half of the school year (or up to 345 hours). The intensive period is then replaced by a more moderate period of exposure of 80 minutes of French twice a week (Netten & Germain, 2009). This notion of varied intensity features in the policies of the provinces.

Ontario

The Ontario province has a dual language policy in that there are both English-only and bilingual (English and French) areas. In language education policy this means that there are both English medium of instruction schools and French medium of instruction schools, with the former being by far the majority.

The most recent policy development in Ontario is a joint provincial–national arrangement known as the *Canada–Ontario Agreement for Minority Language Education and Second Official Language Instruction 2013–2014 to 2017–2018*. This agreement includes two focus areas, minority language and second language, in elementary, secondary and post-secondary education. The actions relate to improving aspects such as student participation and performance, program provision, 'enriched' school environment, access to post-secondary options and support for staff and research.

Alongside this inter-provincial agreement is the Ministry of Education's policy known as *A Framework for French as a Second Language in Ontario Schools, Kindergarten to Grade 12* (Ministry of Education, 2013). The framework is a ten-year plan (2013–2023) with six focus areas to guide school boards in improving the provision of language programs. School boards are required to develop and submit

plans that indicate how they will make progress in relation to: Heightening awareness of FSL programs and benefits; Enhancing leadership and accountability; Strengthening programming to improve achievement in FSL; Supporting all students; Implementing effective practices in planning, teaching, and assessment; Expanding student learning opportunities and heightening engagement (Ministry of Education, 2013:7).

For the majority English medium of instruction schools, there are three program types with differing degrees of intensity for learning French:

- Core French: French as a second language (FSL) subject, *mandated* for Years 4–8 (offered in 60 English language districts)
- Extended French: French as a subject and French partial-immersion (using French to learn at least one other subject), *optional*. Expectations are:
 - elementary level – 25% of all instruction in French
 - secondary level – minimum 7 credits (1 credit = 110 hours), with 4 credits FSL and 3 credits from other subjects with French as language of instruction
- French immersion: French as a subject and French as language of instruction (using French to learn at least two other subjects), *optional*. Expectations are:
 - elementary level – 50% of all instruction in French
 - secondary level – minimum 10 credits (1 credit = 110 hours), with 4 credits FSL and 6 from other subjects with French as language of instruction.

(Ministry of Education, 2017)

At a minimum, students must study French as a second language in years 4–8, and they must earn at least one credit in FSL in order to complete the Ontario Secondary School Diploma. They can count a further two credits towards the compulsory credits needed to obtain the diploma.

The ministry has provided funding over five years to develop professional learning and teaching resources for these programs and to focus on principals' networks to inform resource development and the sharing of strategies. Hence, Ontario is currently quite active in strengthening its language education provision.

British Columbia

The current language policy in the province of British Columbia (introduced in 1997 by the Ministry of Education and revised in 2004) requires that all Boards of Education offer a second language in years 5–8 to all students (Ministry of Education, British Columbia, 2004). There are two exempt groups, those who have special needs or are in intensive English Language Learner (ELL) programs, and those in year 6 undertaking French immersion. The policy does not state a required time allocation. It focuses on developing students' proficiency in English and giving Francophone children access to French language of instruction programs. English and French are taught as first languages, and 'other' languages are taught as second languages, with French the default second language if no other second language is offered. Boards may apply to the ministry to have a locally developed second language curriculum approved for teaching.

Furthermore, the policy states that students, especially those with Aboriginal ancestry, should be given opportunities to learn an Aboriginal language. Boards are expected to provide programs that

support ELL students and ‘value the students’ first language and diverse cultural backgrounds’. In order for Francophone students to graduate, they must complete *Français Langue première* 10, 11 and 12 and English Language Arts 10, 11 and 12 (i.e. both languages through to senior secondary). Thus, the current situation remains focused on limited exposure in upper primary-junior secondary programs, and access to French for those for whom English is not their first language.

Québec

According to the Ministry of Education and Higher Education in Québec, French is the first language of more than 80% of the population (Ministère de l’Éducation et de l’Enseignement supérieur, Gouvernement du Québec, 2017). Interestingly, while Québec is officially bilingual according to its constitution, French is the official language to be used in institutional contexts, including education.

The *Charter of the French language*, introduced in the 1970s, states that French will be the medium of instruction for all students in all schools. It is possible, however, for students to apply to study in English at English language public schools or at subsidised private schools (Ministère de l’Éducation et de l’Enseignement supérieur, Gouvernement du Québec, 2017). Hence, French is the primary medium of instruction for the vast majority of children throughout their schooling. In addition, depending on students’ first language, they study either French (English-speaking students) or English (French-speaking students) as part of the curriculum. French as an additional language commences from grade 1 and English (English Language Arts) as an additional language starts in grade 3.

French is compulsory for all until the completion of grade 12. In the upper secondary level, students follow one of two types of programs for learning French (as a second language): basic (language as subject) or enriched (language as medium of instruction or immersion). Furthermore, students can choose to study an additional language, with (introductory) Spanish emerging as a popular ‘third language’ option in senior secondary.

Overall, Canada is a bilingual country, however, it does not have a uniform approach to languages education. Provision differs according to the status granted to each language, and the nature of the community and its linguistic needs. Efforts are being made in some provinces to improve the quality of language learning in schools through combinations of moderate and intensive programs targeted at different levels of schooling.

3.3 Europe

As there are 28 countries in the European Union (EU) it is not possible within the scope of this paper to canvass all of the language education policies for ‘Europe’. Instead, a brief overview of the state of language learning in Europe is provided, followed by two cases with recent developments in this area: France and Italy.

Language learning and language education policy throughout Europe is largely determined by EU membership. The EU regards multilingualism as critical to realising a vision for Europe that includes greater mobility, intercultural understanding and economic prosperity. In 2002, this led to the Barcelona Objectives. All heads of state agreed to the ambitious objective that all member countries would work towards implementing a one plus two (one first language, plus two foreign languages) approach to its education for all young people (European Commission, n.d.). In effect, over the past decade or more, this has created a transition across Europe from primarily learning a second/foreign

language at secondary school, to widespread teaching of at least one foreign language (in addition to the ‘mother tongue’ or first language) in primary schools, and the teaching of two foreign languages in secondary schools.

There are 24 official languages recognised throughout Europe as well as many minority and immigrant languages. The most recent European Commission report indicates that 98.6% of all students in junior secondary school were learning a ‘foreign’ language (Eurostat, 2017). Of this figure, a further 58.8% of students were learning two foreign languages (or more). According to the 2015 data, in junior secondary school the percentages of all EU students studying languages (as one or more foreign languages) were as follows: English 93%; French 33.8%; German 23.1%; Spanish 13.6%; Russian 2.7%, Italian 1.1%. In a number of countries, nearly all junior secondary students were learning at least two foreign languages: Luxembourg (100%), Finland (98.4%), Italy (95.8%), Estonia (95.4%) and Romania (95.2%).

France

The teaching of foreign languages in schools (particularly secondary schools) has been a long-standing tradition in France. In recent times, France has followed the objective of the EU that each citizen will be able to communicate and understand at least two foreign languages. Currently, the teaching of modern languages is compulsory for all students aged 6–18 years, commencing with one language in primary school through to two in secondary school until completion of the senior secondary certificate, the French Baccalaureate. Students are assessed against the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR), with 11-year-olds expected to reach A1, 14–15-year-olds A2, 16-year-olds B1 and 18-year-olds B2.

There are multiple languages that can be studied and varied courses or program types, known as ‘sections’, are offered. The international sections focus on ‘foreign’ languages including English, Chinese, Spanish, Swedish, Italian, Japanese and German. Bi-national sections provide an award that is offered jointly with a foreign government (Germany, Italy, Spain) and accredited to the national education certificates of both countries. The European or oriental languages sections are intensive courses focused on the culture of a country. These are offered at junior secondary and at the age of 16, they become general, technological or vocational in their focus. Since 2009, a second foreign language has been compulsory for students in the vocational baccalaureate service sector (e.g. hospitality). Immigrants or students of immigrant origin may also learn a heritage language, which is typically taught by teachers from the country of origin and offered for three hours a week.

In 2016, a new strategy for languages education was announced by the French Minister for Education (Vallaud-Belkacem, 2016). The minister pointed out not only the importance of learning English but also the need to diversify the range of languages being learned, including languages of the region. The *Strategie Langues Vivantes* or Renovation Plan for Modern Language Teaching includes a number of key strategies and actions. It aims to increase the number of students studying languages other than English and in particular emphasises the need for more students to learn German.

The strategy continues to emphasise developing skills in children’s first languages in kindergarten. A ‘living’ (also known as a ‘modern’) language is then taught at elementary schools for one and a half hours a week until grade 6. From 2016, students may also choose to study a ‘language and culture of origin’ for one and a half hours a week. Elementary schools are also being encouraged to diversify the

languages being taught, with some 1200 more schools to offer languages other than English in 2016–17. In fifth grade, students are introduced to a second living language (up to 2 hours a week) and a foreign or regional language may be introduced at grade 6 (up to 2 hours a week). The study of at least two foreign languages continues into the college (secondary school) level to the completion of the Baccalaureate certificate. Under the new strategy, the European or oriental languages sections offer a kind of integrated or interdisciplinary focus, with the teaching of a discipline (e.g. maths) through the language as part of the timetable for that discipline. Further, the ‘Mediterranean languages and cultures section’ offers Arabic and the languages of antiquity (Latin and Greek), enabling students to ‘discover the richness of the scientific and cultural projects and projects of the Mediterranean basin (archaeology, museography, agronomy)’ (Vallaud-Belkacem, 2016). Finally, the strategy proposes free courses in English for students who volunteer to study a language in their holidays.

The new languages strategy for France has many specific actions, including increasing the number of language assistants (from 48 countries); the use of (videoconference) technology for interaction with native speakers (particularly for vocational students); increased exchange and partner school programs (real and virtual); increased availability of Latin and Greek study; greater continuity between levels of schooling; and more travel and mobility opportunities, with students studying German spending their second year in Germany while gaining recognition in France. The emphasis of the new strategy is on offering a greater diversity of languages, emphasising both communication skills and knowledge obtained through languages, and greater experiential learning that is related to programs in schools.

Italy

As a member of the EU, Italy has a commitment to its citizens learning one (mother tongue) plus two (foreign) languages as part of their school education. Learning foreign languages has been a requirement for all students from age 6 to the completion of secondary school and the requirements vary at different year levels.

At primary school (*scuola primaria*), students learn Italian (as a first language/language of instruction) and English (as the first foreign language), commencing with one hour a week in first grade, two hours in second grade and three hours for the remaining grades (total of 396 hours). Students then progress to one of two types of secondary school, academic (*liceo*) or vocational (*istituto*). In the junior secondary school (*scuola secondaria di primo grado*), the curriculum is the same for all students in the first two compulsory years, including English (first foreign language, 3 hours per week) and a second foreign language (2 hours per week). In the last three (non-compulsory) years of secondary school, students begin to specialise by taking a particular course – academic (*liceo*), technical (*istituto tecnico*) or vocational (*istituto professionale*). Irrespective of the stream, in order to complete the secondary school diploma students undertake three written tests and an oral: the first tests proficiency in Italian (or the language of instruction), the second tests knowledge of one of the main subjects, and the third test is multidisciplinary and includes testing of students’ knowledge of the foreign language studied (Ministero dell’istruzione, dell’Università e della Ricerca, n.d.).

Much of the policy governing language education in Italy, particularly since the economic crisis of 2008, has been influenced by rhetoric and guidance from the EU. Reports such as *Europe 2020* (European Commission, 2010) and *Rethinking Education* (European Commission, 2012) set out the

economic, employment and mobility imperatives for European nations to invest in languages education (Leone, 2015:50).

In 2010, Italy became the first European country to mandate a particular pedagogical approach or program type, content and language integrated learning (CLIL). The Ministry of Instruction, University, and Research announced that from 2013–14, CLIL would be adopted in academic lyceums and technical institutes. Under this policy, students in the specialist languages stream are required to study one academic discipline in a foreign language from the third year of secondary school, and one non-linguistic discipline in another (different) language from the fourth year of secondary school. Students in all other streams are also required to study a subject through a foreign language but not until the fifth and final year of secondary school (Ministero dell'istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca, n.d.:45).

This policy has now been in place for several years, however, there are few reports on how effective it is in practice. There appear to be two types of CLIL programs, those teaching a regional minority language alongside Italian and those teaching a foreign European language alongside Italian (Eurydice, 2012). Concerns about the policy include the lack of clarity around standards for CLIL programs, whether the policy promotes English rather than foreign languages in general, the status of Italy's minority and immigrant languages, the quality of teachers and the requirements for accreditation (Leone, 2015:52).

3.4 United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has different requirements for language study in schools in different parts of the country. This section will briefly canvass the current policies and requirements in England, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales, all of which have undergone substantial changes in recent times.

England

For some time, the Department for Education in England has been concerned about the decline in the number of students studying a language in schools. In 2002, the National Languages Strategy reduced the compulsory requirement for foreign language learning from ages 11–16, to ages 11–14 (Department for Education and Skills, 2002). This change significantly negatively impacted student participation in foreign language study at GCSE O-level, prompting the government to introduce a new policy lowering the age range to 7–14 on the assumption that this would lead to an increase in participation in upper levels.

With the introduction of the National Curriculum, language learning became one of the foundation subjects (the core subjects are English, mathematics and science), which are mandated for all students at particular year levels. The curriculum states that 'Learning a foreign language is a liberation from insularity and provides an opening to other cultures' (Department for Education, 2013:194). Primary schools must teach a modern foreign or ancient language for students aged 7–11 and secondary schools must teach a modern foreign language of their choosing for students aged 11–14.

The government has also introduced a number of strategies to increase the number of students continuing with language study at higher levels. Between 2014 and 2016, the government provided £1.8 million to train primary and secondary school teachers of languages. At the senior secondary

level, the EBacc (English Baccalaureate) was introduced. This is viewed as having stemmed the decline in participation, with a 20% increase (2010–14) in students studying a language at GCSE and 5% increase in students taking languages at A level (the highest level) (Morgan, 2016). Furthermore, in 2015, the government committed to protecting a number of community languages (such as Panjabi, Portuguese and Japanese) at GCSE and A levels from being withdrawn by the examination board, thereby encouraging students to continue to the most senior level in these languages (Morgan, 2016).

Scotland

According to the 2011 Scottish Census, there are more than 150 languages other than English spoken in Scotland (Scottish Government, n.d.). In schools, the language in education policies relate to a specific number of languages: Gaelic, Scots, English (for speakers of other languages) and British Sign Language (with a National Plan to be published in October 2017).

For some years there has been growing concern about the negative economic impact of poor rates of language learning, with one estimate suggesting that £48bn or 3.5% of the UK GDP is lost per year owing to this 'skills deficit' (Scottish Government, 2017). The Scottish Government acted on these concerns and developed a new language policy, 'Language learning in Scotland: A 1+2 approach' (Scottish Government, 2017). From April 2017 the government is providing £21.2m funding to support local authorities to implement the policy.

The stated aim of the policy is to improve language learning to the point where it is a 'normal, expected part of school education for all children in Scotland by 2021' (Scottish Government, n.d.). The policy of one plus two refers to encouraging young people to learn two languages in addition to their first language. This means that within the framework *Curriculum for Excellence* (Education Scotland, 2010) from 2021 every child will be entitled to learn a language (other than their first language) from 'primary 1' (ages 4–5) and a further (second) language by 'primary 5' (ages 8–9). They are entitled to continue to learn these languages until the end of S3 (ages 14–15).

One recent interim implementation study (Christie, Robertson & Stodter, 2016) reports quite significant progress towards achieving the goals of the policy. The study found that primary schools were on track to reach the first additional language (L2) by 2020 and plans were in place for meeting the second additional language (L3) target as well by 2020. The situation in secondary schools is more mixed. Almost all secondary schools provide a first additional language (L2) to middle secondary, but they are experiencing some difficulty providing the second additional language (and experimenting with models of provision to do so). There are some concerns that this part of the policy may not be fully met.

Northern Ireland

Northern Ireland has two official languages, English and Irish, with English the dominant medium of instruction and Irish taught from age 4 as a second language. The position on languages has undergone substantial change with the announcement of a new ten-year strategy for languages. In a press release in 2017, the Minister for Education and Skills announced that Northern Ireland would aim to match its performance with that 'of the best English-speaking country in the world for foreign languages ...within a decade' (Bruton, 2017). He notes that the strategy will require 'a very significant

change of mind set about language learning. It will also take time, commitment and additional resources. However this area must be a major priority' (Bruton, 2017). The strategy includes a detailed set of targets and actions across a number of areas including the following:

- All Junior Cycle students will study a foreign language by 2021
- A 10% increase in the number of Leaving Certificate students taking foreign language subjects, with a particular focus on diversifying the number of languages studied in addition to French ... the most popular language
- Increase of at least 50% in the number of students doing Erasmus [European Region Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students], with further targets for improvement in the language proficiency of those coming back from Erasmus, and reductions in the numbers doing Erasmus course through English
- ... aim to support 20% of the entire higher education cohort to study a foreign language, as part of their course. And ... put a particular focus on increasing the uptake of those studying courses relevant to international business and ICT.

(Bruton, 2017)

These are ambitious aims and it remains to be seen how effective the implementation of the policy will be.

Wales

While Wales has previously had a requirement for students at primary school to study a second language (primarily Welsh), this did not translate into students taking languages at higher levels. In fact, according to the British Council (Tinsley & Board, 2016), between 2002 and 2015 there was a 44% reduction in the number of students in Wales studying a foreign language to GCSE level. This alarming decline led the Minister for Education and Skills to commission an independent review of curriculum and assessment (Donaldson, 2015) and to release a new languages education plan, *Global futures* (Welsh Government, 2015), to improve the study of modern foreign languages.

The new plan aims to increase the participation rates of secondary school students and increase teacher supply to meet the aim of teaching languages from year 5. A number of centres of excellence were established to provide training and resources for other schools.

A recent review of the state of languages education in Wales includes a number of findings that show there is a substantial way to go to realise the goals of the policy. Firstly, just over one quarter of primary schools (in the survey) provide access to language learning, typically as an extra-curricular activity and most commonly offered to upper level primary students (Tinsley & Board, 2016:8). In secondary schools, language learning is compulsory to S3 (year 9) however about 40% of schools provide less than two hours per week for language learning and less than one quarter of students at S4 (year 10) are studying a language. One of the main obstacles to retention to the GCSE years is the reduction of option units.

Overall, the countries of the United Kingdom have in recent times announced ambitious commitments to improving levels of participation in language learning at all levels of schooling. There

are varied degrees of success in implementing the policy aims, in part depending on the state of language education to begin with, however, the policies indicate increasing interest, the perceived advantage of languages education and a desire to improve its provision.

3.5 China and Hong Kong

China

In recent decades, China has embraced an internationalisation of education focus while also maintaining a firm commitment to education in the national language, Putonghua Mandarin. Putonghua Mandarin, the national lingua franca, is the medium of instruction in schools, with English being the preferred first foreign language.

In 2001, China introduced compulsory language study in primary schools, commencing in grade 3 with approximately 80 minutes a week. English as a foreign language is also mandatory in secondary schools, with approximately four hours required each week (Liddicoat et al., 2008). Furthermore, English is a pre-requisite for university entry.

Despite the dominance of EFL programs there have been some attempts to introduce alternatives, such as bilingual and trilingual programs. In Shanghai, for example, bilingual programs were introduced in 2001 with the aim of teaching 50% of instruction time in English. Within three years, more than 300 primary and secondary schools had joined the project and there were plans to expand the program to 30% of all students (Fernandez & Gearon, 2011). There are major concerns, however, about the quality and genuine outcomes achieved by these bilingual programs. Problems include teachers' lack of qualifications and proficiency, poor resourcing, limited student proficiency and lack of quality control.

As well, there have been some attempts to introduce trilingual approaches aimed particularly at ethnic minorities. There are various models offered in primary schools in which the different languages may be used as language of instruction or as a subject. These programs have had mixed results and remain fragile, possibly with the exception of those with economic value such as Korean and Mongolian. These minority languages are in fact under real threat of being lost, as essentially the National Law of China prevents languages other than Chinese being used as the language of education (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017:160).

Hong Kong

The learning of languages in Hong Kong has changed substantially in the past two decades. Under British rule, English was the official language of Hong Kong until Chinese (that is, Modern Standard Chinese for writing and Cantonese for speaking) was recognised in 1974 (Lee & Leung, 2012). After the handover in 1997, the new Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region introduced the bi-literacy and tri-lingualism policy in which Modern Standard Chinese and English were used for writing, and English, Putonghua and Cantonese were used for speaking. Putonghua was a core subject for primary and secondary schools. Students in primary school were taught in Mandarin and Putonghua, with English as a foreign language commencing in Primary 1 (Lam, 2008).

At the same time, in line with the policy *Medium of Instruction: Guidance for Secondary Schools* (Education Bureau, 1997), secondary schools were required to adopt students' mother tongue as the

medium of instruction (MOI). This effectively meant a division into English MOI and Chinese MOI schools, with the clear majority (80%) of schools being the latter (Garcia, 2009). This clear delineation attracted criticism that the system did not adequately cater for the needs of students and in particular, that English MOI schools were not adequately preparing students for higher level subjects. In response, the government introduced a series of ‘refinements’ from 2010–11 to enable schools to be more responsive to the needs of their students. Based on a set of criteria, including teachers’ capabilities and readiness, and 85% of students in the highest 40% achievement for their age group, schools could apply to become English MOI schools. The separation of schools by MOI is therefore no longer clear-cut and schools may choose to teach some non-language subjects in Chinese. Despite this flexibility, as reported in the *South China Morning Post*, some schools are persisting with English as the MOI even where the threshold has not been met, due to the community’s preference for English-medium schools (Hong Kong’s policy on language of instruction..., 2015).

In addition, the time allocated at primary school for ‘Extended Learning Activities’ (ELA) in English has been increased to 25% of the total lesson time for each level as a means of ‘enhancing motivation’ and ‘facilitating transition to secondary school’, where English may be the MOI. In preparing students for secondary school, schools may also now teach up to two subjects in primary school (in the ELA time) in English as the MOI. The government of Hong Kong is performing a balancing act, in effect (for the majority of students), enabling Chinese (Putonghua) to be the primary MOI, while also signaling the importance of English by increasing time for learning English (25% in primary schools) and encouraging more English learning in junior secondary schools (where it may become a MOI) as students prepare for higher level studies and work. To achieve its goals, the government has committed \$1,100 million to a language fund (Education Bureau, 2009:1).

A further issue for languages education in Hong Kong is the increasing number of students (mostly second- or third-generation Hong Kong-born) without Chinese (Putonghua) as their first language. In 2014, there were 151 primary and secondary schools with ten or more non-Chinese speaking students, and this trend is viewed as creating a problem for their ‘integration’ into society (Tse, 2014). The government has responded to this growing cohort framework’ (Education Bureau, 2016) for learning and concerns about their possible disadvantage by developing a ‘progressive curriculum Chinese. The *Chinese Language Curriculum Second Language Learning Framework* has been developed for second language learners to enable them to ‘bridge over’ to mainstream Chinese language classes (Tse, 2014). It remains to be seen how well the new framework will cater for the needs of this growing cohort of learners and whether further differentiation of the curriculum and assessment will be required in future.

3.6 Japan

The expectations for learning a foreign language in Japanese education have undergone substantial change in the past two decades. In 2002, learning a foreign language in schools was considered desirable but not compulsory, however, as many as 88% of government primary schools chose to offer English in some way (Ito, 2005). In 2004, the ‘Japan! Rise Again!’ reform of the Education Act was announced in order to revitalise and strengthen education in light of increasing global (and Asian) competitiveness (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, MEXT, 2004). The reform of the Act in 2006 was followed in 2008/09 by revision of courses of study at elementary and junior secondary levels for implementation by 2013. The revisions were aimed at increasing language

learning classes by 10% in middle school and making a foreign language a required subject in high school (MEXT, n.d.).

In the meantime, another initiative was introduced, which was specifically focused on learning English. After lobbying from the business sector, MEXT announced that from 2011 English classes (1 per week of 45 minutes) would be compulsory for all primary students from grade 5 (McCurry, 2011).

Further to this development, there has been another change to the policy as Japan prepares to host the 2020 Olympics. The 'English Education Reform Plan corresponding to Globalization' plan is designed to be implemented incrementally from 2014 with the aim of increasing the learning of English at every level, that is: grades 3 and 4, 1–2 times a week; grades 5 and 6, 3 times a week; lower secondary classes to be taught in English, and upper secondary students to have classes in English with high-level linguistic demands (e.g. debates) (MEXT, n.d.).

These changes represent a substantial increase in the provision of foreign language (English) programs in Japan and concerns about the resourcing and supply of teachers to meet these new requirements (McCurry, 2011).

3.7 Singapore

Singapore has officially been a bilingual country since its independence in 1965. According to the Ministry of Education, 'bilingualism [is] a cornerstone of our education system, [it] has been a valuable asset to our students, enabling them to tap the opportunities that can be found in the global environment' (Ministry of Education, 2017:5).

There are four official languages (English, Malay, Mandarin and Tamil) enshrined in the Singaporean Constitution. The learning of English as the MOI has been a minimum requirement of all students at primary and secondary school level. Students must sit national examinations at primary and secondary level in English and at least one other language.

The curriculum is divided into three categories: languages; humanities and the arts; mathematics and sciences. Within languages, students in primary school must study English as a first language and their mother tongue (Chinese, Malay or Tamil) as a second language. This expectation continues into the secondary school curriculum but is extended with a range of further differentiated course options. These include higher level courses (in Chinese and Malay) and the four-year (out-of-hours) Foreign Language Programme (French, German, Japanese) that leads to an O-level examination. Both of these 'electives' have competitive entry conditions, requiring students' examination results to be ranked in the top 10% to be accepted. More recently, Singapore has extended its opportunities for learning languages with the Third Language courses, available in eight languages: Malay, Chinese, Indonesian, Arabic, French, German, Japanese and Spanish.

Although the bilingual policy is well-resourced and supported, it is not without its difficulties. In 2015, English was the most common language spoken in Singaporean homes and is increasingly a first language (particularly amongst the ethnic Chinese community) (Lee, 2016). This trend has amplified concerns about the potential disadvantage in examinations caused to students who may be ethnically aligned to a language but not first language users of it. It is increasingly the case that students are learning English both at home and school, and therefore do not have a strong background in the language associated with their ethnic origin. These concerns have already resulted in curriculum

reform in the 2000s, where in order to cater for students' needs it was necessary to introduce differentiation of courses at secondary level (i.e. Language B and Higher Level) and new modules for Mandarin in primary school. The Third Language project was also introduced to cater for students gifted in languages. The courses have gone some way to allay concerns, however, the changing dynamic of languages in the Singaporean community may exert pressure on the mother tongue model and further reform might be expected in future.

4. Overall findings

The following section draws together common threads across the individual country reports and attempts to highlight key issues, themes and trends that emerge about the current state of languages education policy internationally.

Firstly, in every country there is a strong and clear statement about the value and importance of language learning for both the individual and the state. Statements typically focus on language learning as a crucial 21st century capability – needing to be able to communicate with others who do not share the same language – as well as the cognitive and intercultural benefits of developing new linguistic and cultural repertoires. Almost all of the policies mention the potential economic advantages to the individual and the nation of having a linguistically and culturally capable citizenry, in readiness for the ongoing challenges of globalisation and technological development. Some (e.g. the United States) also link language learning to a national security agenda. In short, language learning is framed primarily as having various kinds of utility and more recently also as having economic value.

Secondly, major efforts are underway in almost all the international contexts presented to strengthen and improve the experience and effectiveness of language learning amongst young people at all levels of education. The nature of the innovation varies between countries depending on their starting point, however, there is a general trend towards bilingualism (at least) and increasing participation and retention into the senior secondary levels of schooling (in those contexts where it is not already mandatory). Even in the United States, which has experienced significant overall decline in the number of students studying foreign languages (despite increasing bilingualism in the general population), there are moves in some states (e.g. California) to increase bilingual education. In the majority of cases, language learning is compulsory for primary and junior secondary school, with an increasing number of countries also requiring language learning for senior secondary and university entrance. The countries that are most concerned with participation are those where language study is not compulsory and where English is the dominant language. In these contexts, choice is a dominant framing and rather than mandate language learning, efforts focus on incentives such as the new certification regime in England. In countries where language study is mandatory to senior levels, efforts focus on improvements in quality, particularly in achievement levels, supply of highly qualified teachers (a particular concern for CLIL approaches, e.g. Italy) and resourcing.

Thirdly, the policies are ideologically influenced, reflecting varying hierarchies and the perceived value of different languages. In general, where English is not the dominant language, it has become the preferred first foreign language. This is particularly marked in countries in Asia, which typically use the national language as the MOI and English as a mandated first foreign language. The emphasis on the importance of English in these contexts has been strengthened even further in recent years with substantial efforts to improve the quality of English language learning at all levels of education.

Indeed, this trend is so strong that some scholars (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat 2017) predict that in the coming years, Asia will lose some of its linguistic diversity due to the lack of educational opportunity to learn languages other than the national language and English. Indeed, in some cases already (e.g. Singapore), young people are reporting English as their first language and the public pressure for learning English heavily outweighs the desire to learn other languages, including community/minority languages (e.g. China).

The trend towards English as the preferred first foreign language is also evident in the European context, however, there are signs that this may be changing. The EU's one plus two policy (i.e. one first language plus two foreign languages) has meant that typically English is the first foreign language and one other (often European but increasingly Asian) is the second foreign language. Although internationalisation (and learning languages that are associated with it) continues to be a priority, there is growing attention to regional priorities and relationships, and a sense that although the importance of English remains, regional languages also need priority (e.g. France with German) and that plurilingualism is essential, particularly for economic and security reasons.

There are some common aspects that impact on the effective implementation of the policies in all of the contexts. One major area is the issue of teacher supply and the quality of teacher training, particularly linguistic proficiency and pedagogy, but also for CLIL programs – knowledge of other learning areas. Many countries offer intensive training programs and particularly in Europe, in-country study experiences ranging in duration. The emphasis on improving the quality of language learning has resulted in many cases in innovation around models of provision, particularly through intensive or content-based approaches. Such programs are increasing in popularity internationally, however, their implementation varies widely, from one or two CLIL units through to full immersion. There are also significant resourcing implications for such programs and concerns that without high-level teacher expertise, these approaches may not be as effective as claimed.

In summary, the language in education policy landscape (based on the cases outlined) shows renewed efforts to increase the participation and quality of language learning in schools. In education systems where language study is optional beyond junior secondary school (typically English-majority countries), efforts are underway to increase participation and retention. In systems where language study is compulsory to senior secondary school (typically non-English-majority countries), efforts are focusing on improving levels of achievement. Although bilingualism may be gaining increasing recognition in general, it is associated mostly with languages that have perceived utility or economic value, and this leaves minority languages in a precarious state. Linguistic diversity is increasingly at risk in countries in Asia, and while in some countries in Europe there is a renewed interest in regional languages, these remain within a narrow range of 'powerful' international and economic languages. Across these cases, it is clear that language education policies are being designed to respond to globalisation and increased diversity, with strong commitments to bilingualism and improving program provision, and language learning is viewed as central to effective citizenship

5. Implications and conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been to provide an overview of language education policies of a number of contexts in the international arena. The discussion and overall findings represents a touchstone for considering language education policy in South Australia.

One key consideration for South Australia relates to the framing of language learning and the relationships between languages, including English. As Garcia (2015) notes, there is often a marked separation between languages with perceived utility and those such as regional or minority languages as being of ‘cultural’ value only. Hence, some languages are positioned within the ‘useful’ category, the most notable being English, and within this framing, languages become a skill or competence that can be brought to the marketplace. For young people who already have English or who, as migrants, are learning English, there may not be any perceived advantage or imperative to learn a language apart from English. Although some may learn other ‘valuable’ languages (e.g. French, Chinese), there is little incentive within this framing to learn other languages, such as community languages that are of cultural value (Garcia, 2015). It may be timely to consider what value is attributed to particular languages in South Australian education and what role and significance they will have in the educational landscape into the future.

Another related implication is the status of language learning in the curriculum and whether it is integral or additional. For many of the countries discussed earlier, language learning features upfront in their curriculum documents and is a core component of certification requirements. The use of certification measures to reward language learning efforts and attribute symbolic value to such learning is an important lever for bringing about improved participation and learning quality. Furthermore, the cases in this paper point to a need to reconsider the role of language learning within the curriculum as a subject and as a MOI. As a MOI, language learning is a by-product or simultaneous outcome with those of the learning area being taught. Such approaches have the benefit of removing the perceived relevance of language study *per se*, but may reduce the languages-specific content and have substantial teacher training, resourcing and learning implications. It may be desirable to explore combinations of language as subject and language as MOI in program offerings, or a blurring of the lines between them.

The cases presented in this paper reflect a dynamic and increasingly diverse linguistic and cultural landscape globally. Countries are evaluating whether they are adequately preparing their citizens for a plurilingual and pluricultural future and many are engaged in innovative planning and program provision designed to improve their outcomes. The dominant paradigm for language learning remains an economic one, with some countries attempting to gain better access to the global marketplace through learning English, and others strengthening their positions through promoting regional and other economically powerful languages in addition to English. Minority languages, including Indigenous languages, are somewhat disconnected from this phenomenon and may become even more vulnerable in the future.

Overall, the cases reveal a dynamic and increasingly nuanced approach to language in education policy. There is growing recognition that new times require new thinking, and there is an appetite for improvement and experimentation to find new ways of supporting and improving language learning in schools through a variety of models of provision, increased recognition and accreditation, and contemporary pedagogical approaches. The challenge for these countries, and for South Australia, is to imagine the society of the future and to contemplate the role and contribution of languages education in realising it.

References

Garcia, N. 2015. Tensions between cultural and utilitarian dimensions of language: a comparative analysis of ‘multilingual’ education policies in France and Germany. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 16(1–2):43–59.

United States

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). 2011. *World readiness standards for learning languages*. ACTFL, <https://www.actfl.org/publications/all/world-readiness-standards-learning-languages>

Commission on Language Learning, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2016. *The state of languages in the U.S. A statistical portrait*. Cambridge, MA, <https://www.amacad.org/content/publications/publication.aspx?d=22429>

Commission on Language Learning, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2017. *America’s languages: investing in language education for the 21st century*. American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Cambridge, MA. http://www.amacad.org/multimedia/pdfs/publications/researchpapersmonographs/language/Commission-on-Language-Learning_Americas-Languages.pdf

National Security Education Program, 1991. *History of NESP (National Security Education Program)*, US Government, <https://www.nsep.gov/content/history>

Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA), US Department of Education, 2015. *Dual language education programs: current state policies and practices*, Washington, DC, <http://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Dual-Language-Education-Programs-Current-State-Policies-April-2015.pdf>

Sanchez, C. 2016. Bilingual education returns to California. Now what?, NPRED, How Learning Happens, 25 November, <http://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2016/11/25/502904113/bilingual-education-returns-to-california-now-what>

U.S. Census Bureau, 2015. *Detailed languages spoken at home and ability to speak English for the population 5 years and over for United States: 2009–2013*, American Community Survey, October, <http://www.census.gov/data/tables/2013/demo/2009-2013-lang-tables.html>

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, 2008. *Enhancing Foreign Language Proficiency in the United States: Preliminary Results of the National Security Language Initiative*, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Education, 2016, June 2. *Supporting dual language learners in early learning settings*, [Press release] U.S. Secretary of Education John B. King Jr, U.S. Department of Education, <https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/fact-sheet-supporting-dual-language-learners-early-learning-settings>

U.S. Department of State. *Critical Language Scholarship Program*, n.d. <http://www.clscholarship.org/>

U.S. Department of State. 2006. *National Security Language Initiative for Youth*.
<http://www.nsliforyouth.org/>

Canada

Conrick, M. & Donovan, P. 2010. Immigration and language policy and planning in Québec and Canada: language learning and integration. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 31(4):331–345.

Early, M. 2008. Second and foreign language education in Canada. In N. Van Deusen-Scholl & N. Hornberger (eds), *Encyclopedia of language and education. Volume 4: Second and foreign language education* (pp 197–208). Springer Science+Business Media LLC: New York.

Ministère de l'Éducation et de l'Enseignement supérieur, Gouvernement du Québec, 2017. Instruction in English. Ministère de l'Éducation et de l'Enseignement supérieur: Montreal,
<http://www.education.gouv.qc.ca/en/parents-and-guardians/instruction-in-english/>

Ministry of Education, British Columbia, 2004. *Language education policy*. Ministry of Education: British Columbia,
<http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/education-training/administration/legislation-policy/public-schools/language-education-policy>

Ministry of Education, Ontario, *French as a second language*, retrieved 23 August 2017,
<http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/amenagement/FLS.html>

Ministry of Education, Ontario, 2013. *A Framework for French as a Second Language in Ontario Schools, Kindergarten to Grade 12*. <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/amenagement/frameworkFLS.pdf>

Netten, J. & Germain, C. 2009. The future of intensive French in Canada. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 65(5):757–786.

Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, 2003. *Action Plan for Official Languages*
<http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/en/timeline-event/the-government-of-canada-launches-the-action-plan-for-official-languages>

Europe

European Commission, n.d. *Multilingualism: What role does the EU plan in promoting languages?*
https://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/multilingualism_en

Eurostat, 2017, February 23. Foreign language learning: 60% of lower secondary level pupils studied more than one foreign language in 2015, [Press release] 33/2017, Eurostat Press Office.

France

Council of Europe, n.d. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)*.
<https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/level-descriptions>

French Ministry of National Education, Youth and Community life, 2011. *Modern foreign languages in the French school system*,

https://test.media.education.gouv.fr/file/dossiers/70/8/2011_langues_vivantes_etrangeres_depliant_anglais_pdf_196708.pdf

Vallaud-Belkacem, N, 2016. *Stratégie langues vivantes*, Ministère de l'Éducation

<http://www.education.gouv.fr/cid97827/strategie-langues-vivantes.html>

Italy

European Commission, 2010. *Europe 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth*.

COM(2010) 2020 final, European Commission: Brussels, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:2020:FIN:EN:PDF>

European Commission, 2012. *Rethinking education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes*. COM/2012/0669 final. Strasbourg.

http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/multilingualism/rethinking-education_en

Eurydice, 2012. *Key data on teaching languages at school in Europe*. Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency: Brussels,

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/key_data_series/143en.pdf

Leone, A. 2015. Outlooks in Italy: CLIL as language education policy, *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 30(1):43–63, <https://www.gse.upenn.edu/wpel>

Ministero dell'istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricercar, n.d. The Italian education system, *I Quaderni di Eurydice*, No. 30.

http://www.indire.it/lucabas/lkmw_img/eurydice/quaderno_eurydice_30_per_web.pdf

United Kingdom

England

Department for Education, 2013. *The national curriculum in England: Key stages 1 and 2 framework document*.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-primary-curriculum>

Department for Education and Skills, 2002. *Languages for all: languages for life. A strategy for England*. <https://www.languagescompany.com/wp-content/uploads/the-national-languages-strategy-for-england-1.pdf>

Morgan, N. 2016, April 22. 'Community languages saved to ensure diverse curriculum continues'. [Press release]. Education Secretary Nicky Morgan, Department for Education.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/community-languages-saved-to-ensure-diverse-curriculum-continues>

Scotland

Christie, J., Robertson, B. & Stodter, J. 2016. *A review of progress in implementing the 1+2 language policy*. Association of Directors of Education in Scotland.

<http://www.scilt.org.uk/A12ApproachtLanguageLearning/tabid/1715/Default.aspx>

Education Scotland, 2010. What is *Curriculum for Excellence*? [https://education.gov.scot/scottish-education-system/policy-for-scottish-education/policy-drivers/cfe-\(building-from-the-statement-appendix-incl-btc1-5\)/What%20is%20Curriculum%20for%20Excellence?](https://education.gov.scot/scottish-education-system/policy-for-scottish-education/policy-drivers/cfe-(building-from-the-statement-appendix-incl-btc1-5)/What%20is%20Curriculum%20for%20Excellence?)

Scottish Government, n.d. *Policy: Languages*. <https://beta.gov.scot/policies/languages/>

Scottish Government, 2017. *Language learning*.

<http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Education/Schools/curriculum/LanguageLearning>

Northern Ireland

Bruton, R. 2017, April 19. *Minister Bruton to prioritise teaching of foreign languages*. [Press release]. Minister for Education and Skills, Department of Education and Skills,

<http://www.education.ie/en/Press-Events/Press-Releases/2017-Press-Releases/PR17-04-19.html>

Wales

Donaldson, G. 2015. *Successful futures: independent review of curriculum and assessment arrangements in Wales*. <https://www.nasuwt.org.uk/asset/A788604C-3046-4005-A1EAOEAF023E0DD/>

Tinsley, T. & Board, K. 2016. *Language trends Wales 2015/16: The state of language learning in primary and secondary schools in Wales*. Education Development Trust: Berkshire.
https://wales.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/language_trends_wales_2016_english_0.pdf

Welsh Government, 2015. *Global Futures: a plan to improve and promote foreign languages in Wales 2015–2020*. <http://gov.wales/docs/dcells/publications/151019-global-futures-en.pdf>

China

Fernandez, S. & Gearon, M. 2011. *Learning from high-performing jurisdictions to support the development of a clear rationale for languages learning*. Report for the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.

<http://www.education.vic.gov.au/Documents/school/teachers/teachingresources/discipline/languages/jurisdictions.pdf>

Kirkpatrick, A. & Liddicoat, A.J. 2017. Language education policy and practice in East and Southeast Asia. *Language Teaching* 50(2):155–188. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000027>

Liddicoat, A.J., Scarino, A., Curnow, T.J., Kohler, M., Scrimgeour, A. & Morgan, A-M. 2008 [2007]. *An investigation of the state and nature of languages in Australian schools*. Adelaide, Research Centre

for Languages and Cultures Education, University of South Australia.

<https://www.unisa.edu.au/PageFiles/34831/Liddicoat%20-%20An%20investigation%20SNfinalreport3.pdf>

Hong Kong

Education Bureau, Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, 1997. *Medium of Instruction: Guidance for Secondary Schools (Guidance)*, <http://www.edb.gov.hk/en/edu-system/primary-secondary/applicable-to-secondary/moi/guidance-index.html>

Education Bureau, Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, 2009. Fine-tuning the medium of instruction for secondary schools. *Education Bureau Circular* No. 6/2009. <http://www.edb.gov.hk/attachment/en/edu-system/primary-secondary/applicable-to-secondary/moi/support-and-resources-for-moi-policy/lsp/mfs-sch/d-sch/ow/sp/edbc09006e.pdf>

Education Bureau, Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, August 2016. Provision of school-based support in the learning of Chinese language for non-Chinese speaking (NCS) students at primary level (2014–2017). Education Bureau, Government of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. <http://www.edb.gov.hk/en/edu-system/primary-secondary/applicable-to-primary-secondary/sbss/sbps/usp/USP-NCSP1/index.html>

Garcia, O. 2009. *Bilingual education in the 21st century: a global perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell: Chichester, West Sussex.

Hong Kong's policy on language of instruction must put students first. 2015. *South China Morning Post*, 10 July. <http://www.scmp.com/comment/insight-opinion/article/1835555/hong-kongs-policy-language-instruction-must-put-students>

Lee, K.S. & Leung, W.M. 2012. The status of Cantonese in the education policy of Hong Kong. *Multilingual Education*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.1186/10.1186/2191-5059-2-2>

Lam, A. 2008. Language education policy in greater China. In S May & N Hornberger (eds), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 2nd Ed., Vol. 1: *Language policy and political issues in education* (pp 405–417). Springer Science+Business Media LLC: New York.

Tse, C. 2014. Psychological underpinnings of measures to support non-Chinese speaking students' learning of the Chinese language. Speech by Permanent Secretary for Education, 3 May. <http://www.edb.gov.hk/mobile/en/aboutedb/press/speeches/psed/2014/20140627155722.html>

Japan

Ito, Y. 2005. *English education for elementary school students: issues viewed from parent hopes, cram school attendance*. JCER Researcher Report No. 60. <https://www.jcer.or.jp/eng/pdf/kenrep050517e.pdf>

McCurry, J. 2011. Japan launches primary push to teach English. *The Guardian*, 9 March.

<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2011/mar/08/japan-launches-primary-english-push>

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), n.d. *English education reform plan corresponding to globalization*, MEXT.

<http://www.mext.go.jp/en/policy/education/elsec/title02/detail02/1373861.htm>

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), 2004. *Reform of compulsory education*. <http://www.mext.go.jp/en/policy/education/elsec/title02/detail02/1373866.htm>

Singapore

Lee, P. 2016. 'English most common home language in Singapore, bilingualism also up: Government survey'. *The Straits Times*, 10 March.

<http://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/english-most-common-home-language-in-singapore-bilingualism-also-up-government-survey>

Ministry of Education Singapore, 2016. *Secondary school education: shaping the next phase of your child's learning journey*. <https://www.moe.gov.sg/docs/default-source/document/education/secondary/files/secondary-school-education-booklet.pdf>

Ministry of Education Singapore, 2017. *Primary school education: Preparing your child for tomorrow*, Ministry of Education, Singapore.

https://www.moe.gov.sg/docs/default-source/document/education/primary/files/primary-education-booklet-2017_el.pdf

