

# The National Strategy for KS3 and its application to modern foreign language teaching

Ruth Heilbronn

Institute of Education, University of London

This article critically examines the KS3 Framework of Objectives for FL, placing it in the context of the National Strategy for FL at KS3 (DfES, 2003b), and other policies, and relating it to a theoretical and research perspective on FL acquisition. The idea that FL teachers should be entitled to continuing professional development based on principles rather than to the specific promotion of one view of teaching and learning FL is explored. FL professional development is advocated which relates to critical reflection on theory and practice.

## INTRODUCTION

There has been much focus of late on key stage 3 (KS3), and several different government documents relating to raising achievement at this key stage have been published. It is therefore important to take stock of this significant policy initiative and to examine and discuss its implications for foreign language (FL) teaching at 11-14 (and beyond). The author of this article is a London-based FL teacher trainer and the article is based on experience of working with trainee FL teachers and staff in schools, as well as lesson observations and discussions in schools and with consultants and advisers. The article critically examines one of the key documents of the National Strategy for FL at KS3 (DfES, 2003b).

Government concern with levels of mother tongue literacy led to the publication of the National Literacy Strategy (NLS) for KS2 in 1998, followed by its extension to KS3 in 2001. Karen Turner (2001: 4) discussed the implications of this strategy for FL teachers and learners and broadly welcomed "its explicit talk about language as a way of re-focusing on grammar as a tool for learning in secondary foreign language teaching". DfES have subsequently produced a Key Stage 3 National Strategy (NS KS3) in order to address problems at KS3, identified in KS3 results and OFSTED inspection evidence. This National Strategy was designed to create a coherent programme of training and development to raise achievement and represents a large investment in training. All secondary teachers were initially entitled to receive training, accompanied by

teaching and learning materials for the classroom. Training was also offered to ITT providers, and there is a programme for schools of continuing professional development and materials.

The NS KS3 started in September 2001 for the core subjects of the National Curriculum (NC) and ICT, and extended to the NC foundation subjects in 2002. Many of the concepts underpinning these strategies, such as assessment for learning, explicit objectives, use of starters and plenaries and modelling, are now familiar fare for FL teachers. Further, the NS KS3 promotes many elements of good practice that are not new to FL, such as: starting lessons with a focusing activity; the use of effective questioning strategies; and an articulation and sharing of learning objectives, related to assessment opportunities. There is an emphasis on accurate and targeted feedback and regular checks on learning and on task variety and pupil interaction.

FL has a special status among the foundation subjects in the form of a framework – the Framework of Objectives for FL in Key Stage 3 (FOM) (DfES, 2003b) and a training 'delivery' programme (DfES, 2003: a, c and d). This may be because of repeated OFSTED concerns with achievement in FL, although, as Mitchell has pointed out "in a context where "languages for all" were a relatively recent and incomplete development there was uncertainty about standards and expectations for FL' (Mitchell, 2003). The FOM is built on the model of the English framework, which developed from the NLS (DfEE, 2001a; 2001b). This raises an opportunity for some useful collaboration between English and FL departments (Turner, 2001: 4; Pomphrey, 2004).

## THE FRAMEWORK OF OBJECTIVES FOR FL (FOM)

The FOM was developed around the same time as the National Languages Strategy, published in December 2002, in which it is mentioned as a major

**"It is ... important to take stock of this significant policy initiative and to examine ... its implications for foreign language teaching"**

**Address for correspondence:**  
Ruth Heilbronn  
Institute of Education  
University of London  
20 Bedford Way  
London  
WC1H 0AL  
email:  
r.heilbronn@ioe.ac.uk

component. It was piloted in around 130 schools in sixteen LEAs during 2002-3. Jeff Lee and David Buckland, working in Barking and Dagenham, one of the sixteen pilot LEAs, were seconded during 2002 to the Centre for School Standards, a division of the Schools Effectiveness Unit of the DfES, to produce the FOM and to deliver the associated training programme to the Pilot LEAs<sup>1</sup>. On the evaluation of the pilot the FOM was disseminated nationally from September 2003, with the training programme beginning the previous term. Lee and Buckland's work on the FOM is largely based on local research into pupil motivation in FL with Year 9 pupils of average ability in the borough's schools (Lee *et al.*, 1998). This suggested that typical Year 9 pupils were usually convinced and confident about the value of languages, but often unclear about the purpose of their lessons. They felt they were making insufficient progress in fundamental aspects of FL learning such as pronunciation, spelling and grammar. This contributed to their lack of motivation.

Learners' difficulties with FLs have come to light in OFSTED reports. For instance, OFSTED have recently found that teaching is good in 60% of schools in FL at KS3 and 4 but that over the last six years the rate of improvement in teaching and achievement has been slow in comparison with other subjects. Further findings are that the content of the FL curriculum fails to engage the interest of a significant proportion of pupils. ('In key stage 4, the quality and range of learning opportunities are good in only four in ten schools, and there is unsatisfactory intellectual and creative challenge for pupils in one school in seven.') Significantly OFSTED state that 'as a consequence of inadequate long-term planning and insufficient emphasis on grammar, many pupils make slow or erratic progress'. Other reported findings are that pupils lack confidence in independent, spontaneous use of the target language and in extended speaking and writing, and that pupils with special educational needs, and gifted and talented pupils, make insufficient progress. The report notes that there have been 'positive signs' from the key stage 3 FL pilot, that it can 'contribute effectively to raising achievement and standards, especially when well incorporated into departmental planning and with sufficient guidance and support' (OFSTED, 2004). The FOM may be thought of, to some extent, as an attempt to address some of these problems.

The FOM is an integral part of the Key Stage 3 National Strategy (KS3 NS), via its extension into the foundation subjects, focusing mainly on Section 1 of the National Curriculum Programme of Study, 'Acquiring knowledge and understanding of the target language' (DfEE, 1999). It also relates to the QCA model schemes of work for FL (QCA, 2000). The FOM is an extremely detailed document containing 103 objectives, grouped in five 'strands', namely:

1. Words
2. Sentences
3. Texts: reading and writing
4. Listening and speaking
5. Cultural knowledge and contact.

It contains examples in French, German and Spanish of 'points of language, ideas for content, ways of working, and illustrations. (DfES, 2003b)

DfES introduce the FOM by stating that:

there are between five and nine objectives per strand in each year, applying to the languages most likely to be taught as main languages at key stage 3. They reflect the requirements of the National Curriculum Programme of Study for FL but stage those requirements over time. The framework seeks to identify those objectives most likely to help language learners progress regardless of which language they study – in other words, it seeks to create language learners. (*op. cit.*)

Some questions come to mind about FOM. What view of language acquisition does it promote? On what research evidence is it built? Does it alleviate some of the difficulties in the NC, particularly the 'fuzziness' of the level descriptors (Mitchell, 2003)? How is progression managed or achieved? In the scope of this article it is not possible to look in detail at all the strands and at all the objectives, across the three years of KS3. I have chosen to focus on the objectives for Year 7, for the first three strands, word level, sentence level and text level – reading and writing, to be found in Table 2. The sample is representative of the whole FOM in the sense that it is similar to the other two strands and to the formulation in the other two years, i.e. the objectives are all formulated and presented in a similar manner, which represents the mode of discourse of the whole FOM.

We are informed that the objectives vary in scale and that:

some may be handled through single bursts of focused teaching while others require revisiting over time. All the objectives except one are taken through and developed in successive years to show progression. Grammar is not a strand or a separate heading: it is woven into word, sentence, and text-level work. The framework as a whole is designed to give a mental map of language learning over key stage 3. (*op. cit.*)

Further:

The aim is that the objectives for words and sentences identify learning points which if addressed should help pupils to understand how the language works. This should then further help them to re-apply the language they meet, adapting and modifying it as necessary to match different contexts. (DfES, 2003d)

---

**“What view of language acquisition does it promote? On what research evidence is it built? ... How is progression managed or achieved?”**

---

Examining the FOM in detail does not reveal its underlying theory, and there is no rationale for why or how the objectives will help pupils to ‘re-apply the language they meet’. Formulating teaching as a progression from ‘word’, to ‘sentence’ to ‘text’ level implies a specific view of language acquisition not backed up by research cited in the FOM. While some research on KS3 and 4 learners tends broadly to support this progression route (Mitchell, 2003: 21) there is also evidence of progression in communicative ability being accompanied by the loss of grammatical control, which is regained later, when ‘risk taking’ for communicative leaps is factored into the notion of progression (Mitchell & Myles, 1998). The progression route through words to sentences and texts is schematically simplistic. This is to some extent acknowledged by the statement that some of the objectives ‘may need revisiting over time’. It is not at all clear how this cyclical curriculum model matches with the notion of progression expressed through the ‘ladder’ levels of the Attainment Targets of the National Curriculum. These two notions of progression seem at odds with each other, so that although tables are provided which aim to relate each of the objectives, under each of the strands, to the correspondingly numbered objective in each of the three years of KS3, it is difficult to begin to analyse how effectively the FOM tackles learner progression. Table 1, for example, shows the first two objectives of the text strand for each of the three years of the key stage, as indicative of the rest of the FOM. The formulations do not make it clear exactly what the element of progression is from year to year, and therefore how to ensure it – except for the understanding that a ‘simple’ text might be easier than a ‘complex’ one.

On the basis of the missing information about the foundations of the FOM it is possible to make only some general observations about the objectives. Each reader and teacher applying the FOM will undoubtedly develop her own interpretation and application. Indeed there are signs of how this is happening (see Osborne, 2004 for links to FL teachers’ materials on the FOM). The lack of a research base to justify the FOM is hardly surprising since applied linguistics does not have a secure evidence base on which to recommend:

- the most appropriate model of language which should underpin FL pedagogic grammar;
- the detailed selection and sequencing of grammar items to be taught;
- the usefulness of metalinguistic understanding for FL learning;
- the most useful forms of corrective feedback. (Mitchell, 2000: 297)

**Table 1.** A comparison of objectives across three years

<b>7T1</b>	How to read and understand simple texts using cues in language, layout and context to aid understanding
<b>8T1</b>	That words and phrases can have different meanings in different contexts
<b>9T1</b>	How to use their knowledge of context and grammar to understand texts involving complex language
<b>7T2</b>	How to read aloud a simple written text, attempting authentic pronunciation and some expression with regard to content
<b>8T2</b>	To recognise simple features which add authenticity, expression or emphasis to a written text
<b>9T2</b>	To notice simple features used for effect in written text

Table 2 reproduces the specific FOM objectives for three of the five ‘strands’ for Year 7. Comment follows below.

**Table 2.** Elements of the FOM for Year 7

**Words – pupils should be taught:**

<b>7W1</b>	How to build and re-apply a stock of words relating to everyday contexts and settings
<b>7W2</b>	How to learn, use and appreciate the importance of some basic high-frequency words found in many contexts
<b>7W3</b>	How to accumulate and apply a stock of words for use in language learning and classroom talk
<b>7W4</b>	That gender and plural patterns in nouns may differ from English and how other words can be affected
<b>7W5</b>	Present tense forms of high-frequency verbs, examples of past and other tense forms for set phrases
<b>7W6</b>	The alphabet, common letter strings and syllables, sound patterns, accents and other characters
<b>7W7</b>	How to find and memorise the spelling, sound, meaning and main attributes of words
<b>7W8</b>	How to find or work out and give the meaning of unfamiliar words

**“it is difficult to begin to analyse how effectively the FOM tackles learner progression”**

**Sentences – pupils should be taught:**

- 7S1** How to recognise and apply typical word order in short phrases and sentences
- 7S2** How to work out the gist of a sentence by picking out the main words and seeing how the sentence is constructed compared with English
- 7S3** How to adapt a simple sentence to change its meaning or communicate personal information
- 7S4** How to formulate a basic question
- 7S5** How to formulate a basic negative statement
- 7S6** How to formulate compound sentences by linking two main clauses with a simple connective
- 7S7** To look for time expressions and verb tense in simple sentences referring to present, past or close future events
- 7S8** Punctuation and orthographic features specific to phrases and sentences in the target language
- 7S9** How to understand and produce simple sentences containing familiar language for routine classroom or social communication

**Texts – pupils should be taught:**

- 7T1** How to read and understand simple texts using cues in language, layout and context to aid understanding
- 7T2** How to read aloud a simple written text, attempting authentic pronunciation and some expression with regard to content
- 7T3** How to assess simple texts for gist, purpose, intended audience and degree of difficulty as a preliminary to reading
- 7T4** How to use a dictionary and other resources appropriately when working on text
- 7T5** How to assemble a short text using familiar sentence structure and known vocabulary
- 7T6** How to use simple texts as models or prompts for their own writing
- 7T7** How to evaluate and improve the quality of their written work

**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS**

Taking these three strands for Year 7 as an example of the FOM approach, it can be seen that it consists of a mixture of strategy training and an outline

grammar syllabus. The learning strategy training element is apparent in the use of words such as ‘how to find and memorise’ (7W7), ‘how to work out’ (7W8). This is familiar from the NLS and relates to a view of experiential learning and strategy instruction which is not new to FL (e.g. Kohonen, 1990). There is no mention in the FOM of the research which Vee Harris has disseminated in a practical form, and which teachers in classes I have seen have found useful (Harris, 1997). Her work situates the learning strategy approach in a direct way, embedding it in the context of the classroom.

The third strand of the FOM puts more emphasis on reading than is customary in many FL lessons I have observed (e.g. 7T1), and clearly shows its origin in the National Literacy Strategy. If this aspect of the NLS is implemented more generally so that pupils develop their language in context and at text level, this is to be welcomed, as Turner has pointed out (Turner, 2001).

Some ‘authoritative suggestions’ (Mitchell, 2000: 297) arise from current international research. One is that ‘grammar teaching should be planned and systematic, driven by a strategic vision of eventual desired outcomes’ (*op.cit.*). This does not readily appear to be the case with the FOM. However, six of the other seven suggestions offered by Mitchell could be applied to the FOM. These are that:

- grammar teaching should nonetheless be “rough-tuned”, offering learners at slightly different stages a range of opportunities to add increments to their grammar understanding (“teachability” research);
- grammar teaching should be ‘little and often’ with much redundancy and revisiting of issues (“language flood research”);
- text-based, problem-solving grammar activities may be needed to develop learners’ active, articulated knowledge about grammar (sociocultural research);
- active corrective feedback and elicitation will promote learners’ active control of grammar (research on corrective feedback, recasts, etc.);
- grammar teaching needs to be supported and embedded in meaning-oriented activities and tasks, which give immediate opportunities for practice and use (task-based learning research). (*op. cit.*)

According to the FOM’s terms of reference, the DfES mean it to support pupil learning, to be measured by test and exam results, and to some extent OFSTED observations. Within these terms of reference, how helpful are the formulations of the objectives in developing teachers’ ability to ‘deliver’ the NC? The objectives are not organised according to any transparent principle and so range across the general areas of strategy training, literacy and grammar teaching, in no particular order. While this might arguably appeal to some teachers’ lateral learning styles, many others will find it confusing. There are two serious flaws in

**“the FOM approach ... consists of a mixture of strategy training and an outline grammar syllabus”**

the formulations, which are impediments to comprehension. First, there are examples of objectives which are imprecisely formulated e.g. reference to a ‘stock of words’ (7W3). Second, some beg large questions, or ‘dodge the issue’, e.g. pupils should learn ‘how to assess simple texts for gist, purpose, intended audience and degree of difficulty as a preliminary to reading’ (7T3). This is not a straightforward application of a syllabus objective, such as 7T2 in the same strand, which clearly refers to the limited area of reading aloud, with correct pronunciation. Instead, 7T3 covers a vast area of reading comprehension, for which a considerable body of research exists. It is not evident what kind of knowledge and understanding the pupil needs to have to cover this objective. This needs considerable explication. As with the comment on strategy training above, it is arguable that INSET training on reading development, using the expertise and material available could have been promoted. Perhaps the detailed framing of the FOM is not necessarily the best way to proceed because of the complex nature of teaching as a practice and the way in which teachers develop in this practice. Before discussing this issue further it will be useful to reflect on the context in which the FOM was developed.

“the detailed framing of the FOM is not necessarily the best way to proceed because of the complex nature of teaching”

## PRINCIPLES OF THE KS3 NS

How far does the FOM match with the principles underlying the NS KS3, of which it is a part? Progression from KS2 and across KS3 is a fundamental aim of the NS KS3, as is engaging pupils and supporting teachers. Performance indicators for the success of all the various strategies are linked to the KS test results.

**Figure 1.** Principles of the National Strategy for KS3

1. Focusing teaching (using clear teaching objectives)
2. Providing challenge
3. Making concepts and conventions explicit
4. Structuring learning
5. Making learning active
6. Making learning engaging and motivating
7. Developing well paced lessons with high levels of interaction
8. Supporting pupils’ application and independent learning
9. Building reflection

The principles in Figure 1 embody a concept of ‘deep’ as opposed to shallow or strategic learning, as is evident from No.3 on the articulation of concepts to pupils. The focus in Nos. 5 and 7 is on experiential, interactive learning (Eraut, 1994; Stoll, 2003; Watkins, 2002). The principles allow respect for pupils’ varying learning styles, e.g. Nos. 6 and 8 (see Drew and Ottewill, 2002 on learning styles as a factor for FL teaching and learning). So if FL teachers are really to understand how to make pupils’ learning ‘deep’ they must themselves have a ‘deep’ and not a surface understanding of the principles underpinning the NS KS3. How are FL teachers to gain this understanding? The next section considers the training materials provided for FL teachers.

## PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT – CHANGING TEACHERS’ PRACTICE

We have seen that there are two distinct elements of the NS KS3 as it applies to FL teachers. The first is the set of core principles (Figure 2). The second is the FOM which aims to link the core principles with the NC Programme of Study for FL. It creates a form of grid which needs to be ‘placed over’, or ‘inserted into’ a scheme of work (SOW), so as to audit that SOW and to interpret how and where to apply the objectives<sup>2</sup>. However, it is worth noting that the FOM is a model and is evidently not the only way of approaching the challenges of teaching and learning FL at KS3 in the current contexts.

Given that the framework was developed under the umbrella of the NS KS3 to address the issue of progression, it seems evident that teachers need to engage in ‘deep’ learning, i.e. first and foremost to understand the principles of this original strategy. Further, auditing the SOW to see how the FOM model can be fitted on to it requires a level of analysis, involving understanding principles. Yet the FL core training materials (DfES, 2003d) do not relate to the principles in a broad way but provide guidance for using the FOM. It is therefore possible that, given the known pressures on time and resources, FL departments will use the limited time available for INSET to work on the core training only, i.e. will work at making sense of the model provided by the FOM and trying to adapt it to their existing SOW. Evidence from some FL departments in around ten schools using the framework has shown a tendency for this to be the case<sup>3</sup>.

The problem with making the FOM the primary focus of FL INSET lies in its technicist view of practice. The FOM is like a technical manual, with the teacher as a delivery technician. The structuring of the core training for FL to get the framework objectives into place, rather than to gain a deep understanding of the principles behind it, suggests that being an FL teacher is merely a matter of competency, of having competent command of a FL and of following a strategy, or a plan to ‘deliver’ it to others. On the other hand,

the optional training materials (DfES, 2003c) have some good staff development opportunities that enable teachers to understand and work with some ideas underlying the FOM, including useful material on target language and creativity, and some articles for reading at the INSET sessions<sup>4</sup>. Trainers are enjoined to ‘do more than simply acknowledge an individual response. When a response begins to contribute a key idea, draw out that idea by inviting further detail and by probing questioning. Try to summarise the key features of a response, link one response to another and draw out generalisations’ (*op. cit.* 5). Yet there is a contradiction between this and the prescriptiveness of the FOM. The DfES strategy for professional development which is quoted in the optional training materials, makes clear the importance of teachers ‘learning from each other... learning from what works’ and quotes some research base for this statement. Collaborative enquiry, observation and sharing of good practice, taking part in coaching or mentoring, are among the ways teachers have reported on ‘the development activities that have had most impact on their classroom practice’ (DfES, 2003c: 12). These principles relate to a developmental model of teacher learning, whereas the prescriptiveness of the FOM relates to a training model. There appears to be a major contradiction present. The NS KS3 for FLs embodies a central inconsistency, pointing one way down the path of teacher reflection and the other down the narrow route of technicism.

## TEACHING AS EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE

Concentration on the purely technical aspects of the FOM also goes against the grain of government initiatives to promote teaching as an evidence-based practice, along the lines of medical practice, with the setting up of the Centre for Evidence for Policy and Practice Information Co-ordination in 2000 ([www.eppi.ioe.ac.uk](http://www.eppi.ioe.ac.uk)) and other initiatives such as the promotion of the TTA Teacher Researcher Panel. In a detailed discussion of FL teaching as an evidence-based profession Norbert Pachler concludes that ‘the current policy aim of evidence-informed practice can only be achieved by the breaking up of the dichotomy of researcher versus practitioner’ (Pachler, 2003: 4). This would imply teachers thoroughly understanding the theoretical basis of their work. In relation to the NS KS3 teachers would learn how to manage the issue of progression across the key stage, including the teaching of ‘grammar’, which requires some time for teachers to develop methods, through actively investigating their own practice, within teams, and with guidance.

This understanding of what learning is fits more comfortably with the notion of the teacher as a ‘reflective practitioner’ than as a technical applier of a specific teaching model. There is a strong body of literature on what best constitutes teacher

development and the nature of teaching itself. See for example (Schön, 1983, 1987; Rose, 1992; Whitty & Wilmott, 1991; Burbules, 1997). This view is underpinned by a notion of teaching as a ‘practice’ (MacIntyre & Dunne, 2002; Noddings, 2003). Views about the reflective practitioner which criticise the idea of ‘technical rationality’ (Schön, 1983) emphasise the importance of experience as a basis for reflection and follow in the tradition of writers on the relationship between theory and practice and what constitutes practical knowledge (Dewey, 1929, 1958; Dunne, 1993). The teaching situation is a highly complex one and teachers need to be able to react flexibly and to have professional expertise. On the other hand, however, there is a real risk with pressures of time that the FOM will become reified, a model to comply with, rather than helping teachers to understand what constitutes good practice in FL and why. For all these reasons any improvement in FL teaching, in terms of ensuring pupil progression and achievement overall cannot be sustained by a ‘quick fix’. It is better to teach the NS KS3 principles and ensure that these are understood than it is to rely merely on auditing schemes of work and introducing the FOM in a manner which risks being piecemeal. Pachler and Allford have pointed out that ‘government policy-making often exhibits an impatience with the nuances and caution that necessarily characterise much research and theoretical work, and a lack of trust in classroom teachers’ (Pachler & Allford, 2003: 3). A salutary tale from another curriculum area comes from the writing of Lawrence Kohlberg, a noted researcher and theoretician of children’s development in the field of moral values. He set up an isolated programme of intervention, which was not deeply integrated into the participating teachers’ practice. It too was based on a highly structured, interventionist model of learning. He evaluated the success of the programme by stating that ‘while the intervention operation was a success, the patient died. When we went back a year later, we found not a single teacher had continued to engage in moral discussion after the commitment to the research had ended’ (Kohlberg, 1985: 80).

## CONCLUSION

The FOM has been developed within a historical context, namely the movement from an acquisition model of FL, through the route of the first NC, to an emphasis on grammar, in the revised NC, supported by the NLS. Given that this is where we are starting from, the FOM can seem like an attempt to ‘rescue’ the situation, by creating a framework to ‘fit over’ the present variety of practice – of text books, of resources and approaches. The FOM does give some guidance to support a refocus of attention on the notion of pupil progression and might be helpful to an FL department reviewing scheme of work (SOW) objectives. The strands on text and cultural awareness are particularly to be welcomed. Providing that the ambiguity in the

---

**“These principles relate to a developmental model of teacher learning, whereas the prescriptiveness of the FOM relates to a training model. There appears to be a major contradiction”**

---

formulations of the FOM can be accepted, some FL departments might find it useful as it outlines a set of broad objectives to cope with development over KS3.

The question remains of whether it will make a difference to FL teaching. OFSTED have evaluated the second year of the NS KS3 but this has no individual focus on FL (OFSTED, 2003). OFSTED will be able to use the KS3 results and inspection evidence, but this will not necessarily reflect the effectiveness of the implementation of the FOM, which would require a more sophisticated research design that is able to account for a variety of practice and contexts.

The NS KS3 is based on principles relating to research on learning theory. Many of its elements are what good FL teachers have always done. A good FL teacher needs to be a good linguist who shows the qualities of all good teachers of any subject. Some of these qualities, not in any order, are rigour, imagination, ability to enthuse and to show rather than tell. The optional training materials have some very good examples of what we should be doing to develop these qualities. However, the detailed exemplification of how planning should be done implies that there is one best way to do things. It is to be hoped that the FOM is not seen as a definitive model and that the objectives are not taken as ends in themselves. They are only one model of how to embody the principles of the NS KS3 and not necessarily the best way of ensuring that FL teachers are exposed to and develop best practice. There is already evidence from a quick trawl on the internet that teachers are spending their creative energies focusing on the objectives in the FOM and how to 'bring them' to their children, rather than to understanding the rationale behind the objectives. The fear is that teachers may feel pressurised to implement the FOM because they perceive OFSTED as high-stakes assessment and are told that the FOM contains the blueprint for good teaching. If teachers also lack the space and time for a trial-and-error way of learning, e.g. absorbing the good principles on which the FOM has been developed, they risk trying to implement the FOM without deep understanding, not being able to see the wood for the trees.

The NS KS3 principles might not be implemented unless funding for training within individual subjects is continued for several years to come. It is to be hoped that the optional training material is widely available and time to absorb it and develop it into FL teaching is funded. HODs of FL need to be able to reflect on the materials and have time for quality departmental INSET. This means research and theory based FL INSET and not only INSET which fits in with an overall school developmental agenda. Some of this time could be spent working with the English department to develop a common language learning experience so that teachers can work collaboratively. Individual FL teachers need time, resources and encouragement to experiment, possibly using

action research, if there is to be substantial development of teacher capacity to engage deeply with the NS KS3 principles as they relate to FL.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> See [www.barking-dagenham.gov.uk/9-cias/mfl-team/mfl-team-menu.html](http://www.barking-dagenham.gov.uk/9-cias/mfl-team/mfl-team-menu.html)
- <sup>2</sup> Heinemann for example have published a *Métro 1* Framework Pack, for 'teaching the framework alongside other *Métro 1* materials. It provides lesson starters and plenaries, thinking skills activities and writing activities as well as assessment for learning sheets to help you set individual targets for your pupils.' (*Metro* minisite at [www.heinemann.co.uk/secondary/series/book](http://www.heinemann.co.uk/secondary/series/book))
- <sup>3</sup> Schools visited as part of the PGCE partnership with the Institute of Education, University of London.
- <sup>4</sup> These are:
  - *The Invisible Child: The responses and attitudes to the learning of modern foreign languages shown by Year 9 pupils of average ability* by Jeff Lee, David Buckland and Glenis Shaw
  - *Working with course books* by Martine Pillette
  - *Framework for Teaching Modern Foreign Languages: Years 7, 8 and 9: its value for newly qualified teachers* by Michael Grenfell
  - *The Place for Creativity in Foreign Language Learning in Key Stage 3* by Steven Fawkes
  - *Teaching Culture as Part of the Framework for Teaching Modern Foreign Languages: Years 7, 8 and 9* by Ros Walker.

## REFERENCES

- Burbules, N. (1997) "Why practice doesn't make perfect." *Australian Teacher Education Conference, Proceedings*, Summer 1997. Available at: <http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/facstaff/burbules/ncb/papers/perfect.html>.
- Dewey, J. (1929) *The Sources of a Science of Education*. New York: Liveright
- Dewey, J. (1958) *Experience and Nature*. New York: Dover
- DfEE, (1999) *National Curriculum for Modern Foreign Languages, Key Stage 3-4*. London: DfEE and QCA
- DfEE (2001a) *Key Stage 3 National Strategy: Framework for Teaching English: Years 7, 8 and 9*. London: DfEE
- DfEE, (2001b) *Key Stage 3 National Strategy: Literacy Across the Curriculum*. London: DfEE
- DfES (2003a) *Key Stage 3 National Strategy Improving Modern Foreign Languages in Key Stage 3: Support and guidance from the National Strategy*. DfES. London: DfES
- DfES (2003b) *Key Stage 3 National Strategy: Framework for Teaching Modern Foreign Languages: Years 7, 8 and 9*. London: DfES.
- DfES (2003c) *Key Stage 3 National Strategy: Foundation subjects FL: optional training materials*. London: DfES
- DfES (2003d) *Key Stage 3 National Strategy Planning to Teach to the Framework of Objectives. Notes for use during the delivery of module 3 of the Foundation Subjects FL Core Training Programme*. London: DfES
- Drew, F. and Ottewill, R. (2002) "Learning styles and the potential for learning on institution-wide language programmes." *Language Learning Journal* (26, Winter).11-8
- Dunne, J. (1993) *Back to the Rough Ground*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press
- Eraut, M. (1994) *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence*. Falmer, Sussex: Falmer Press

**"It is to be hoped that the FOM is not seen as a definitive model and that the objectives are not taken as ends in themselves"**

- Harris, V. (1997) *Teaching Learners How to Learn: Strategy training in the ML classroom* (Pathfinder) London: CILT
- Kohlberg, L. (1985) "Resolving moral conflicts within the just community." In Harding, C. (ed.) *Moral Dilemmas: Philosophical and psychological issues in the development of moral reasoning*. Chicago: Precedent Press
- Kohonen, V. (1990) "Towards experiential learning in elementary foreign language education." In *Learning Styles: European Cultural Foundation, proceedings of the first European Seminar*. Duda, R. and Riley, P. 21-42. Nancy: Presse Universitaires de Nancy
- Lee, J., Buckland, D. and Shaw, G. (1998) *The Invisible Child: The responses and attitudes to the learning of modern foreign languages shown by Year 9 pupils of average ability*. London: CILT
- MacIntyre, A. and Dunn, J. (2002) "Alistair MacIntyre on education: in dialogue with Joseph Dunn." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 36 (1, 1-19). 53-371
- Mitchell, R. and Myles, F. (1998) *Second Language Learning Theories*. London: Arnold
- Mitchell, R. (2000). "Applied linguistics and evidence-based classroom practice: the case of foreign language grammar pedagogy." *Applied Linguistics* 21(3). 281-303
- Mitchell, R. (2003) "Rethinking the concept of progression in the National Curriculum for Modern Foreign Languages: a research perspective." *Language Learning Journal* 27 (Summer 2003) 15-23
- Noddings, N. (2003) "Is teaching a practice?" *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 37 (2) 241-53
- OFSTED (2004) *Subject Reports 2002/03: Modern foreign languages in secondary schools*. (February 2004). London: OFSTED (<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/publications/docs/3542.doc>)
- OFSTED (2003) *The Key Stage 3 Strategy, Evaluation of the Second Year*. March 2003. London: OFSTED
- Osborne, A. (2004) *KS3 FL Framework*. Webpage links. [www.e-gfl.org/e-gfl/activities/intranet/teacher/FL/ks3FL/](http://www.e-gfl.org/e-gfl/activities/intranet/teacher/FL/ks3FL/)
- Pachler, N. and Allford, D. (2003) Editorial. *Language Learning Journal* 27 (Summer) 2-3
- Pachler, N. (2003) "Foreign language teaching as an evidence-based profession?" *Language Learning Journal* 27 (Summer): 4-14
- Pomphrey, C. (2004) "Professional development through collaborative curriculum planning in English and modern languages." *Language Learning Journal* 29 (Summer) 12-8
- QCA (2000) *Key Stage 3 Schemes of Work*. London: QCA [www.qca.org.uk](http://www.qca.org.uk)
- Rose, A. (1992) "Framing our experience: research notes on reflective practice." *Adult Learning* 3 (4 January): 5
- Schön, D. (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass
- Schön, D. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner*. London: Temple Smith
- Stoll, L., Fink, D. and Earl, L. (2003) *It's About Learning (and It's About Time)*. London: RoutledgeFalmer
- Turner, K. (2001) "The National Literacy Strategy – what's in it for modern language teachers?" *Language Learning Journal* 24 (Winter): 37-42
- Watkins, C. (2001) *Learning about Learning Enhances Performance*. NSIN Research Matters 13 (Spring)
- Whitty, G. and Willmott, E. (1991) "Competence-based teacher education: approaches and issues." *Cambridge Journal of Education* 21(3)