Foreign Language Education Policy in the UK and the EU

Riina Riihiniitty
University of Tampere
School of Language, Translation and Literary
Studies
English Language and Literature
Second Subject Thesis
May 2016

Tampereen yliopisto
Kieli-, käännös- ja kirjallisuustieteiden yksikkö
Englannin kielen ja kirjallisuuden maisteriopinnot

RIIHINIITTY, RIINA: Foreign Language Education Policy in the UK and the EU

Tässä tutkielmassa tutkitaan Yhdistyneen kuningaskunnan koulutuspolitiikkaa vieraiden kielten osalta. Vieraalla kielellä tarkoitetaan tässä yhteydessä kieltä, joka ei ole oppilaan äidinkieli. Tutkimuksen tavoitteena on selvittää, miten Englannin koulutuspolitiikka ottaa vieraiden kielten osalta huomioon Euroopan unionin (EU) koulutuspolitiikan. Tutkimus on ajankohtainen, koska Yhdistyneessä kuningaskunnassa äänestetään EU:ssa pysymisestä tämän vuoden kesäkuussa. Tutkimuksessa selvitetään lisäksi, miten Yhdistyneiden kuningaskuntien eri maiden vieraiden kielten opetussuunnitelmat eroavat toisistaan EU:n politiikkaan liittyen. Ensimmäinen tutkimuskysymys käsittelee sitä, miten Englannin kielikoulutuspolitiikka ottaa huomioon EU:n tavoitteen siitä, että jokaisen EU:n kansalaisen tulisi osata vähintään kahta vierasta kieltä. Toinen kysymys selvittää, miten Englannin kielikoulutuspolitiikkaa perustellaan. Kolmas kysymys käsittelee mahdollisia parannuksia kielten opetuksessa Englannissa. Neljäs kysymys selvittää alueellisia eroja Yhdistyneessä kuningaskunnassa.

Tutkimuksen aineisto koostuu Yhdistyneen kuningaskunnan eri maiden vieraiden kielten opetussuunnitelmista, jotka on julkaistu vuosien 2007 ja 2013 välillä, ja kahdesta vieraiden kielten opetusta käsittelevästä EU-dokumentista. EU-dokumentit ovat *Barcelona Objective* (2002) ja *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004 – 2006* (2003). Tutkimuksessa tarkastellaan opetussuunnitelmia ikävuosien 11 ja 14 välillä (ns. Key Stage 3).

Opetussuunnitelmia tarkastellaan Raymondin ja Oliven (2009) diskurssianalyysin periaatteilla. Käsitteet idea, diskurssi ja retoriikka ovat keskeisiä analyysissa. *Ideat* ovat käsityksiä maailmasta, kun taas *diskurssi* kokoaa yhteen liittyvät ideat. *Retoriikka* puolestaan on tapa ilmaista ideoita. Analysoitavat diskurssit muodostuvat tässä tutkimuksessa kahden EU-dokumentin perusteella. Yhdistyneen kuningaskunnan opetussuunnitelmia eli niiden sisältämiä ideoita ja retoriikkaa analysoidaan näiden EU:n diskurssien puitteissa.

Tutkimuksessa selviää, että Englannin vieraiden kielten opetussuunnitelma ottaa huomioon EU:n kahden vieraan kielen osaamistavoitteen sekä sisältää parannusehdotuksia opetuksen parantamiseksi. Muutkin opetussuunnitelmat Yhdistyneessä kuningaskunnassa ottavat huomioon EU:n kielipolitiikan. Kuitenkin on hyvä huomata, että vaikka tässä tutkimuksessa yhtäläisyyksiä EU:n ja Yhdistyneen kuningaskunnan maiden välillä löytyi, ei se välttämättä tarkoita, että maat olisivat huomioineet kyseiset EU-dokumentit opetussuunnitelmia laatiessaan. EU-aineisto on kuitenkin valittu julkaisuvuosien perusteella siten, että maiden olisi ollut mahdollista ne huomioida.

Avainsanat: kielipolitiikka, opetussuunnitelma, diskurssianalyysi, Yhdistynyt kuningaskunta, EU

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

The United Kingdom (UK) is to vote over their membership of the European Union (EU) on June 23, 2016 (Wheeler and Hunt (2016)). The EU is a partnership of economic and political nature between 28 countries in Europe. The UK has been a member of the EU since 1973, but some believe that the EU holds the UK back with its rules and fees (The EU member countries, 28/11/2015). However, it is reported in the *Eurobarometer 82* (2014) that 49% of the people in the UK are optimistic about the EU's future. In 2014 42% are pessimistic. In the *Eurobarometer 83* (2015) the numbers are relatively similar: 49% and 43% respectively. In regards to the upcoming referendum in the UK, it is interesting to find out how the language policies in the UK relate to the EU's policy.

In an article called *Policy needs to change to address the US and UK's language deficits* (2013) Helmore reports the results of a seminar. The seminar was held at the University of Maryland's Center For Advanced Study of Language and the British Academy on September 30 and there were professors, researchers, policymakers, and government representatives discussing what could be done to improve the low number of competent foreign language speakers in the UK and the USA. It was concluded "that without significant changes in policy, the loss of facility in language will continue to erase the competence of English-speaking societies to engage culturally with the rest of the world and compound problems competing in the international market for jobs and services".

Another, more recent, article called *The seven big language learning issues facing the UK* (2015) concerns the language situation in the UK. In the article Williams writes about the *Case for Language Learning* which is a project launched by *The Guardian* and the *British Academy* that investigates why the UK has a shortage of foreign language skills. The *Case* discusses how

important it is to learn foreign languages. The key findings of the project are according to Williams that (1) *lack of language skills is not good for the economy* and (2*) young people put off language learning*. The third key finding that Williams presents is that (3) *languages are about more than boosting one's CV*. The fourth key finding concerns minority languages: (4) *minority languages have a complex relationship with communities* (which refers to the finding by a Guardian/ICM poll that people do not embrace minority languages fully since "only around a third of people whose native language isn't English take a qualification in their mother tongue"). The fifth key finding, (5) *6,000 languages are facing extinction*, refers to Unesco's suggestion that by the end of the century half the world's 6,000 languages face being extinct. This includes 150 languages in Europe. In this section of the article there seems to a mistake in the number of the languages facing extinction. If the world has 6,000 languages, then the half of them does not make 6,000 in total but 3,000. In fact, there are around 7,100 living languages in the world (Ethnologue, 18/2/2016). The sixth and seventh finding concern language education: *(6) technology is a good match for languages* (referring to how technology can be used in teaching languages) and (7) *learning languages is an enriching experience*.

1.1 The UK, the EU, and language policy

The articles described above offer examples of the issues that the UK faces with foreign languages and language education policies. There have been recommendations about the need to change and improve the language education in the UK (in England, Scotland, and Wales, all individually) (Language policy strategies in education in the UK, 3/11/2015). The language strategy for England is presented in *Languages for All; Languages for Life A Strategy for England* (2002). A document called *Language Review* (2007) suggests ways to increase population's interest in languages in England. The document is a review of the government's language policy. Scotland and Wales both

have similar, individual documents. There is *Citizens of a Multilingual World* (2000, though updated in 2006) in Scotland and *Languages Count* (2002, updated in 2009) in Wales. There is however a document that the different parts of the UK (England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland) share: *International Strategy* (2004). The main goals of this strategy are to equip people (children, young people and adults) "for life in a global society and work in a global economy", to engage "with international partners to achieve (shared) goals", and to maximize "the continuation of [their] education and training sector and university research."

The EU wants to see that English is not the only language used internationally. Jonsson reports this goal in her article *Språkpolitik – från EU till klassrummet* (2008). According to her (2008, 222) the EU's goal is that people in the member states would know two languages in addition to their mother tongue. The same goal is described in Ataç (2012) (see chapter 2).

The European Council's task is to define the overall political direction and priorities of the EU (The European Council, 25/1/2016). In practice, it sets the policy agenda of the EU, for instance by gathering conclusions from the Council's meetings. The meetings identify issues and actions. However, the Council is not one of the legislating institutions of the EU.

The European Commission is the representative of the EU's interests as a whole (The European Commission, 25/1/2016). The Commission's task is to propose new legislation to the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. The Commission also ensures that the member countries apply the EU law correctly.

The Council of the EU's task is to negotiate and adopt laws of the EU, coordinate the policies of the member states, and develop foreign and security policy (The Council of the European Union, 25/1/2016). It is also to conclude international agreements and adopt the budget of the EU.

1.2 Research goal and questions

In this study I am interested in the UK's language education policy concerning foreign languages. I look more closely into how England's language education policy is related to the EU's language policy. The goal of this study is to find out how England's language education policy is related to the EU's language education policy and the possible differences between the national curricula in the UK in reference to the EU. The research questions I endeavour to answer are:

1) How (if at all) does England's language education policy take into account the EU's language policy of each EU citizen being able to speak at least two languages in addition to their mother tongue?

2) How is England's language education policy justified in reference to the EU?

3) What concrete means (if any) are presented in England's language education policy to improve the language education in England in reference to the EU?

4) What differences (if any) are there around the UK (England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland) in foreign language education policies in reference to the EU?

In order to answer these questions I analyze language policy documents from the UK and from the EU. From the EU I analyze the European Council's the *Barcelona Objective* (2002) and the European Commission's *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004 – 2006* (2003). The documents I analyze from the UK are *National Curriculum* (2013) for England, *The Curriculum for Excellence* (2010) for Scotland, *National Curriculum* (2008) for

Wales, and *National Curriculum* for Northern Ireland (NI) (2007). The *Barcelona Objective* (2002) which presents presidency conclusions from the Barcelona European Council, 15 and 16 March 2002, describes the goal of each EU-citizen being able to speak at least two foreign languages. *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004 - 2006* (2003) from the Commission includes this goal, too. I will come back to these documents when I describe my material in more detail in chapter 4.

The reason why I in this study focus on England's language policy in comparing a language policy document from the UK with the above mentioned documents from the EU is that the population in England is higher than in the other countries in the UK. This means that the English language policy affects most of the people in the UK. The amount of people living in England compared to other countries in the UK is the following: in England there are 53.9 million people, in Wales 3.1 million, in Scotland 5.3 million and in NI 1.8 million, total population of the UK being 64.1 million (Population in the UK, June 2014, 9/5/2016). Here I also consider the importance of London for the UK's politics. London is the capital of the UK and the main political institution, the Parliament, is situated there.

When comparing the English curriculum with the documents from the EU, I want to find out whether they are in accordance in regards to the EU's language goal. I analyze the language education policies in the UK concerning foreign languages and also concerning national minority languages in those parts that minority languages appear in the curriculum sections I analyze. The term *foreign language* from the EU's point of view refers to a language that is not the speaker's mother tongue (The EU's Strategic Framework Concerning Languages, 25/1/2016). This definition differs from, for instance Finland's case, where Swedish is an official national language which is not defined as a foreign language in the national curriculum, but as the second national language in Finland (and, actually, Finnish as well, vice versa). I focus on foreign and minority languages because England (as the UK in general as well) has struggled to meet the goals the EU has set

concerning them (see above and Lanvers (2011)). In regards to the fourth research question, my goal is to see whether the fact that a country has national minority languages affects the country's foreign language policy and thus cause it to differ from the language policy in other areas. If this was the case, it would mean that the language policies from Scotland, Wales, and NI which have national minority languages, differ from the policy in England.

2 Earlier studies

Language education policies have been studied earlier by Lanvers (2011) and Ataç (2012) among others. Lanvers (2011) has studied language education policies and language education in England during the decade 2000–2010. She analyzes two inquires made to find ways to stimulate language learning in England: the Nuffield Inquiry (2000) and the Dearing Report (2007). Lanvers (2011) reviews some campaigns and initiatives, too. Ataç (2012) has focused on assessing the EU's language policy in regards to incorporating Turkish into Europe and Europe's linguistic family. Ataç analyzes the EU's laws, norms, and values. Ataç also looks into NGOs' (non-governmental organizations') reports and opinion papers.

Jonsson (2008, 226–227) describes what kind of a concrete effect language policy has on an individual's life. For instance, the language policy of the school one goes to has a concrete effect on one's life. According to Jonsson a school's status as a mono- or bilingual school has an influence: the school can for instance be bilingual with both Swedish and Spanish used or monolingual with only Swedish used in teaching.

Differences between the EU's and Sweden's language policy are described in Jonsson (2008), too. By discussing the differences between the EU and Sweden, she offers a previous study concerning the language policy of the EU and a member state. More specifically, Jonsson has been interested in how the language policy can be seen in Swedish schools and their language policy. As a difference between the Swedish language policy and the schools' activity and policy, she (2008, 228) mentions that in the multilingual schools in her study the teaching of mother tongue was not emphasized as much as it is emphasized in the EU's and Sweden's language policies.

Jonsson has also interviewed teachers and leaders of the schools. She (2008, 228) notes that they did not mention the EU's or Sweden's language policies when they talked about their school's language policy. She deduces from this that the EU's and Sweden's language policies have not

quite got through to individual school's language policy. As the biggest difference between

language policies in the EU and Sweden Jonsson (2008, 224) describes the fact that the EU's goal

of knowledge of foreign languages is not mentioned in the *Sveriges språklagsförslag* (2008) which

is a proposition for the language law in Sweden. As a curious detail, it is not found in the Swedish

language law, *Sveriges språklag* (2009), either. Jonsson was able to predict this in her article in

2008.

Johnson conducts in her article *Rhetorical positioning of US policy statements about

multilingual education – with reference to the EU* (2012) a critical discourse analysis focusing on

specific language management moves since the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) of 1968. She

focuses on the rhetorical positioning of language policy. She also looks into how major policy

initiatives imply language ideology through different components. According to Johnson (2012, 74)

language ideology could be expected to be apparent "when language policies are explicitly

articulated" but that is not always the case. Certain language management moves can, according to

Johnson (2012, 74), rely on unstated norms and values of language which are "deeper levels of

ideology upon which policies are built". Johnson (2012, 79) finds out in her analysis that the USA

has monolingual language ideology in language education which comes clear from the recent

language policy of the USA. When comparing the USA's and EU's language policies Johnson

(2012, 84) comes to the conclusion that the EU's language policy is more developed than the

USA's. The policy in the EU favours multilingualism whereas in the USA monolingualism is

highlighted.

Guliyeva assesses "the right to access education in the EU" (2013, 219) in her article

Education, Languages, and Linguistic Minorities in the EU: Challenges and Perspectives. She

emphasizes the education in minority languages because according to her education is essential to a

minority group in order to protect their identity. She writes (2013, 220) that "because the choice of

national language is a political act, if [the EU] States do not offer additional protection, minority

languages are likely to lack protection through institutional and political structures, and have reduced value". Guliyeva (2013, 220) argues however that the laws of the EU have "a strong potential to impact educational rights of linguistic minorities in Member States". As an example of this Guliyeva (2013, 227) mentions that the EU citizenship rights are one of the driving forces for educational rights. According to her this is the case particularly when ensuring education associated financial assistance and that the access to education is based on nondiscriminatory treatment. Guliyeva (2013, 222) reminds however that the recommendations made by the EU institutions concerning education are not legally binding which is why they influence the member countries' actions only indirectly.

Above I have introduced the topic of my study and clarified its background through earlier studies conducted in the field of study concerning language policies. In the third chapter of the thesis I present relevant theory of language policy in the EU and language situation in the UK. In the fourth chapter I clarify the material and methods of this study. The fifth chapter covers my analysis of the material. In the sixth chapter I present and discuss my findings and in the final seventh chapter I conclude my study and suggest possible future research.

3 Language policy

In this chapter I present language policies in general and in detail in the cases of the EU and the UK. I begin by describing language policy in general and continue by presenting the language policy in the EU and the language situation in the UK. After this chapter I describe the material and methods I use in my analysis.

According to Spolsky and Shohamy (2000, 1) the term *language policy* refers to "an effort by someone with or claiming authority to change the language practice (or ideology) of someone else". They (2000, 2) define *policy* as an explicit statement that can be but does not have to be contained in a formal document. *Language ideology*, however, is language policy when the policy maker is left out and *language practice* is "what people actually do" (Spolsky and Shohamy (2000, 4)). The aspect of changing or, more generally, affecting, someone's language practice is particularly relevant in the case of curricula because in them are determined for instance which languages are taught at school as obligatory. The curricula are *language education policies* since they contain information about how many languages should be taught (Spolsky and Shohamy (2000, 14)). However, a school's foreign language policy is more like a *language acquisition policy* which according to Spolsky and Shohamy (2000, 13–14) refers to a statement that specifies which part of the population should spend a certain amount of time acquiring certain competence levels in certain languages.

Ammon writes about the role language choice plays in language policy in *Language planning and language policy for the EU and for international institutions* (2008). He writes (2008, 14):

> Institutional language planning and language policy is often about language choices. These choices are made by certain authorities, individuals or collectives of individuals, on one hand and, once made, limit the same or other individuals' language choices on the other hand.

According to Kristiansen in *The potency and impotence of official language policy* (2008, 177) subconscious attitudes towards language influence language use itself whereas language policy affects strongly the consciously offered attitudes. Kristiansen emphasizes the effect that language policy has on conscious attitudes. However, according to him language policy does not influence the subconscious attitudes that affect language use.

Language care is close to language policy. According to Josephson (2009) language policy takes place in official institutions and concerns relationships between languages whereas language care's goal is to direct the evolvement of language. Josephson (2009, 11) describes the paradox between language policy and language care: the more people can express themselves by different languages in similar conditions, "the more complex the language situation becomes and the more difficult it is to interfere with the evolvement of language" also concerning language choice.

3.1 The EU's language policy

Here I present the EU's language situation and policy in general as well as concerning foreign language education. The main value of the EU regarding linguistic diversity is to respect the existing diversity and to enhance citizens' multilingual competences (Rindler Schjerve and Vetter (2012, 10)).

In the EU there are 24 official languages and English is one them (Official languages, 23/2/2016). There are also 79 minority and regional languages in the EU. All the seven regional languages in the UK that are mentioned below (in 3.2) are stated in the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* (2015) (Languages covered by the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, 23/2/2016).

The European Commission and the European Council's roles in the EU's language policy are relevant for this study in regards to the choice of material (see 4.1 below). The European

Commission's role in the language policy is to work with national governments and pursue the objectives of the EU's language strategy (Languages in education, 23/2/2016).

The European Council publishes conclusions on multilingualism, for instance (Discover EU's Role, 26/4/2016). When it comes to language policy and foreign language education in member countries it is each member country themselves that sets their own language and education policies (Regional and minority languages, 23/2/2016).

3.2 Language situation in the UK

The language education situation in the UK is somewhat mixed since each country has its own policy which can be seen in each country having their own curriculum. A factor in the need for own policies might be that the countries have different national languages in addition to English. Isle of Man is not part of the UK as such but it can be noted here that the national language there is Manx Gaelic (About the Isle of Man and Manx, 24/4/2016). In this section I present general information about the language situation in England (3.2.1), Wales (3.2.2), Scotland (3.2.3), and Northern Ireland (3.2.4). I begin with England.

3.2.1 England

In England the main language is English. There is also a regional native language in England which is Cornish in the county of Cornwall (Cornwall Council Cornish Language Policy (2009), 23/2/2016). Cornish does not have an official status in England. In regards to foreign languages taught at school in England the *National Curriculum in England* (*Languages programmes of study: key stage 3*) (2013, 2) tells that schools choose the languages they teach. Most popular languages in English secondary schools are French, German, and Spanish (Board and Tinsley (2014, 8)).

3.2.2 Wales

The language situation in Wales is different from that in England. There are two official languages,

Welsh and English, in Wales (Languages in Wales, 23/2/2016). The languages taught at school are

according to the *Modern Foreign Languages in the National Curriculum for Wales* (2008, 2)

English, Welsh, and a modern foreign language. The schools choose which foreign languages they

offer which can be for instance Arabic, French, German, Japanese, Russian, or Spanish (*Modern*

Foreign Languages in the National Curriculum for Wales (2008, 11)).

3.2.3 Scotland

In Scotland the language situation is even more diverse than in Wales. There are two official

languages: English and (Scottish) Gaelic (Strategy for Scotland's languages, 24/4/2016). Of these

two English is the main language. In addition to the two official languages there is also another

regional native language, Scots, in Scotland (Scots language, 24/4/2016). When it comes to the

foreign languages that schools offer it is again the schools' choice according to the *Modern*

Languages Principles and practice -section of *Curriculum for Excellence* (2010) since the

document does not specify which foreign languages should be taught. The foreign languages

schools choose from can be for instance French, German, Italian, and Chinese languages (National

Qualifications, 24/4/2016).

3.2.4 Northern Ireland

In Northern Ireland the main language is English and the official minority language is called Irish or

Irish Gaelic (Irish-Gaelic, 23/2/2016). There is another regional native language in NI, too: Ulster-

Scots (Ulster-Scots, 23/2/2016). In line with the other UK curricula, the schools in NI choose which foreign languages they teach. *The Northern Ireland Curriculum* (2007) does not specify which foreign languages should be taught at school. The schools in NI can though choose languages such as French, German, and Spanish (Primary school, 23/2/2016).

4 Material and methods

In this chapter I present the material and methods in this study. I begin with the material from the EU and the UK in 4.1. After that I continue with the methods in 4.2. In the methods-section I describe the critical discourse analysis in general first and then continue with the method employed in this study.

4.1 Material

As material in my study I use language education policy documents from the UK and documents that offer information about the EU's language policy. From the EU I use the *Barcelona Objective* (2002) set by the European Council and *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004 - 2006* (2003) from the European Commission since they contain the goal of learning at least two foreign languages. The *Action Plan* contains further information about language education as well. The *Eurobarometer* surveys by the European Commission serve as background information for my study (see chapter 1).

The documents from the UK are (as listed above in 1.2) *National Curriculum* (2013) for England, *The Curriculum for Excellence* (2010) for Scotland, *National Curriculum* (2008) for Wales, and *National Curriculum* for Northern Ireland (2007). I focus on modern (foreign) language education-sections of each curriculum since those sections are the main area of interest in this study. The term *foreign* is in brackets here because some of the curricula use the term *modern language* in the sections I analyze. The term *modern foreign language* is used in England and Wales, and the term *modern language* used in Northern Ireland and Scotland (the respective curricula and Boyd 2001, 10). I will refer to other languages besides mother tongue (or first language) as *foreign languages* in this study. This is how the EU defines foreign languages as well (see 1.2).

The Curriculum for Excellence (2010) for Scotland has different sections and the one covering modern languages is called *Curriculum for Excellence: Modern languages: Principles and practice*. The document is six pages long. It differs slightly from the other documents I analyze because it is not clearly divided according to the different *Key Stages* (see below).

The section in the *Welsh National Curriculum* that covers the foreign language education is called *Modern Foreign Languages in the National Curriculum for Wales* (2008). The document is 33 pages in length and it presents the legally binding requirements for foreign languages in the national curriculum for Wales as set by the Welsh Assembly Government. The document I analyze presents the structure of teaching foreign languages in the so called *Key Stages 2* and *3* which include learners from 7 to 14 years of age and year groups 3 to 9. The Key Stage 2 covers ages 7–11 and groups 3–6 whereas Key Stage 3 covers 11–14 and 7–9 respectively. There is also a *Key Stage 4* which includes ages 14 to 16 and groups 10 to 11 but this document does not focus on that Key Stage even though it mentions the Stage 4 on occasion. I have chosen to analyze only the parts of this document which concern Key Stage 3 because that is the Stage which is included in the other documents in the UK, too.

National Curriculum for Northern Ireland which is also called *The Northern Ireland Curriculum* has the statutory requirements for modern languages presented in a table of two pages and a non-statutory guidance (2007) for modern languages on a separate document of 37 pages. The guidance is to explain the requirements for modern languages. These two documents I analyze cover the Key Stage 3. The term *modern language* in the two documents refers to an official language in the EU (apart from English and, in the case of IM schools, Irish) (Modern Language in Northern Ireland, 23/1/2016).

National Curriculum (2013) for England (also called *National Curriculum in England*) has different sections (statutory programmes of study) which include descriptions of foreign language education and I have chosen to analyze the part that describes foreign language education in the

Key Stage 3 because this Stage is covered in the other documents I analyze, too. The document that covers Key Stage 3 in England is three pages in length. When compared to the length of the other UK curricula, the English one is the shortest. The Scottish document is six pages long, the one from Wales has 33 pages and the ones from Northern Ireland cover 39 pages altogether (see above). The differences in the length of the foreign language education documents around the UK show how the different countries have different emphasis on foreign language education. It should be noted here however, that it is difficult (if not impossible) to find matching documents between each country since they each have their own education policies.

Since I am in this study interested in how the UK curricula relate to the EU's language policy, the documents I analyze from the EU should be such documents that might have been used as background for the foreign language education policies in the UK. The *Barcelona Objective* (2002) set by the European Council is such a document because it was published before any of the national curricula for different regions in the UK and it contains the EU's goal for language education: the goal of people being able to speak at least two foreign languages. This document is 73 pages long but I am only interested in the part that mentions the goal for the language education.

The European Commission publishes so called communications, one of which *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004 - 2006* (2003) is. This document from the European Commission suits for my study because even though the Commission is a legislative institution in the EU, the policies it creates are advises for the member countries on matters the countries have their own control over (Johnson (2012, 84) and Gulieyva (2013)). This means that the UK is not forced to follow the Commission policies in its curricula.

4.2 Methods

I begin this section by describing discourse analysis in general. Kress (1985, 27) defines the term *discourse* as "a category that belongs to and derives from the social domain" whereas he considers *text* as "a category that belongs to and derives from the linguistic domain". This means that according to Kress (1985, 27) discourse is emphasized in a study when the study concerns "the content, function, and social significance of language". A study is textual when the emphasis is on the form and structure of language. Kress (1985, 27) reminds however that discourse and text are related because "discourse finds its expression in text".

According to Kress (1985, 28) discourse correlates with language as well. There are syntactic forms that correlate with certain discourses. For instance, sexist discourse displays some characteristic linguistic features like those that express agency or power. Kress (1985, 30) even points out that discourse and ideology are connected. He (1985, 30) writes that "the defined and delimited set of statements that constitute a discourse are themselves expressive of and organized by a specific ideology". This means that ideology is present in linguistic features that form a text that expresses one or several discourses.

My study does not focus on language and ideology but the relation between discourse, text and ideology serves as an introduction to the political discourse analysis I will conduct. Especially because according to Seidel (1985, 44) political discourse analysis also has a focus point on the ideological meaning of a text. Rahimi and Sharififar (2015b, 504) write that the goal of critical discourse analysis is "to disclose the hidden ideological and power relations which are embedded in text". They (2015, 505) also point out that there are certain text types, or "genres" as they call them, that have the role of fulfilling conventional social uses and functions.

For the purpose of this study, a somewhat simplified discourse analysis model will be enough. In my study it is not of a particular interest to analyze, for instance, the agents (someone who does

something) of the texts. According to Fairclough (2013, 7) the *critical* part of critical discourse

analysis (CDA) has a focus on what is wrong in a society and how these wrongs can be righted.

This is what Fairclough (2013, 7) calls *positive critique* since it focuses on how the wrongs could be

remedied. There is also *negative critique* that analyzes how social wrongs are produced and

perpetuated in a society. Fairclough (2013, 10–11) also sets characteristics for CDA and they

include systematic transdisciplinary analysis of relations between discourse and other elements of

the social process, systematic analysis of texts, and normativity. This normative character of CDA

refers to CDA addressing social wrongs and possible ways to right them. Since my goal in this

study is not to suggest ways to improve the language education in the UK (in a longer study those

could possibly be suggested) my study is not as such (as Fairclough characterizes it) CDA. But, as

Fairclough (2013, 11) states, I can still make use of certain CDA categories in my study.

Fairclough (2013, 19–20) states that "the struggle between different strategies for

transforming society in different directions" can be investigated "through a *rhetorically oriented*

analysis of how strategic differences are fought out in dialogue, debate, polemic etc. [my

emphasis]" In general, rhetoric concerns "influencing people by means of communication – in the

case of argumentative discourse, by argumentative means" (Van Eemeren 2010, 51).

The model for my analysis comes somewhat unexpectedly from the study of environmental

politics. Raymond and Olive (2009) studied how a specific discourse of risk works in a politic

controversy (the regulation of Brominated Flame Retardants (BFRs)) in order to clarify the

distinction between ideas and discourse. They conclude that the effect specific ideas in politics have

depends on their exact rhetorical presentation (Raymond and Olive (2009, 189)). In addition,

Raymond and Olive (2009, 208) suggest that "a discourse should be conceived primarily as a family

or ensemble of related ideas linked together by a common narrative. This would suggest that

specific discourses or discourse elements might be expressed in different rhetorical forms, with

different political consequences."

According to Raymond and Olive (2009, 195–196) the concept of *ideas* refers to "a range of beliefs, attitudes, views, and conceptions about the world". Hence, ideas are the broadest category of the three. Ideas could include virtually anything whereas a *discourse* is a "coherent subset of related ideas" (Raymond and Olive (2009, 196)). This entails that a certain discourse can include a variable, yet finite, range of ideas. Raymond and Olive (2009, 196) point out that if there are just any ideas within a discourse, the coherence is lost. The third concept here is *rhetoric* which according to Raymond and Olive (2009, 196) refers to the specific linguistic forms that are used to express various types of ideas that also include discourses. The range of possible rhetoric for a certain idea or discourse can vary but it is not unlimited: Raymond and Olive (2009, 196) point that in a certain context some words cannot convey an idea.

The analysis model by Raymond and Olive (2009, 208–209) leads in its essence to the following: "one could see our argument as encouraging the 'unpacking' of discourses into their component parts — specific norms and ideas, specific rhetorical incarnations — in order to test their empirical role in political decision making more precisely and with greater conceptual clarity".

The Barcelona Objective (2002, 18–19) states in its *Education* -subsection of *A competitive economy based on knowledge* that the European Council calls "to improve the mastery of basic skills, in particular by teaching at least two foreign languages from a very early age". This competitive economy -section is part of a section called *Maintaining the momentum behind our long-term strategy* (2002, 4–21) in the *Barcelona Objective*. The subsection *Education* also calls for the "establishment of a linguistic competence indicator in 2003; development of digital literacy; [and] generalisation of an Internet and computer user's certificate for secondary school pupils" (2002, 19). The discourse of language education here (from the European Council's perspective) seems to relate to economy. The coherent subset of ideas (discourse) here is that *teaching at least two foreign languages is a basic skill from the point of view of a competitive economy that is based on knowledge*. I will refer to this discourse as *The EU's language goal* forthwith (in italics for

clearance). The *ideas* here are that (1) *knowing (by the teaching of) at least two foreign languages is a basic skill* and that (2) *the (citizens' having) knowledge of at least two foreign languages is valuable to the economy*.

The following passage presents background to the *Action Plan* (2003, 4):

> A European Parliament Resolution of 13 December 2001 called for measures to promote language learning and linguistic diversity. On 14 February 2002 the Education Council invited Member States to take concrete steps to promote linguistic diversity and language learning, and invited the European Commission to draw up proposals in these fields. This Action Plan is the European Commission's response to that request.

In the following I present the discourse of the *Action Plan* (2003) by the European Commission. I set my focus on the general ideas (cf. discourse as a "coherent subset of related ideas") that are relevant from the perspective of a member country's (for instance, the UK's) language education policy. The *Action Plan* also offers rather precise suggestions for actions that the member countries can use to improve language learning and teaching in their country, for instance Comenius school language projects, but the overall discourse of that the document offers on language education policy is of interest in this study. The first section of the document deals with such issues. The precise actions are mainly given in the Section 2 of the document that focuses on concrete proposals for improvements in the short term.

The *Action Plan* (2003, 3) by the Commission includes the economy and knowledge aspect as does the *Barcelona Objective* (2002). Language skills are also mentioned to be a basic skill of European citizens (2003, 3). The openness towards other cultures through language learning and skills is stated as well (2003, 3). The language goal of at least two other languages is mentioned, too (2003, 4). Local responsibility of language education of each member country is also stated in the *Action Plan* (2003, 5). The three broad areas of language policy objectives offered in the *Action Plan*'s Section 1 (2003, 7–13) are: *life-long language learning*, *better language teaching*, and *building a language-friendly environment*. These areas provide the discourse of the *Action Plan* on

general principles of language education in the member countries. This leads to the discourse of the

Action Plan (2003) from the perspective of a member country's language education to be that the

main objectives of language education in the EU are life-long language learning, improvement of

language teaching, and building an environment that is language-friendly. I will refer to this

discourse as *The main objectives of language education in the EU* (in italics for clarity).

In Table 1 are presented the ideas within *The main objectives of language education in the*

EU. The ideas are set in three different categories which are the broad categories of the objectives

themselves for clarity. Some the ideas also have further specifications to clarify what they include.

Table 1. Ideas within *The main objectives of language education in the EU*

Idea category	Ideas	Specifications
Life-long learning	(1) Early start with the aim of mother tongue plus two languages (2) Language learning in secondary education and training (3) Language learning in higher education (4) Adult language learning (5) Language learners with special needs (6) Range of languages	
Better language teaching	(7) The language friendly-school (8) The languages classroom (9) Language teacher training (10) Supply of language teachers (11) Training teachers of other subjects (12) Testing language skills	(7) Connections between all the languages of the school (8) Contact between pupils in other language communities; EU programmes (12) CEFR
Building a language-friendly environment	(13) An inclusive approach to linguistic diversity (14) Building language-friendly communities (15) Improving supply and take-up of language learning	(13) Respect for diversity; EU programmes; attention to national and regional language communities (14) Improving language awareness; internet; cross-border projects (15) Raising awareness of the benefits of language learning; national, regional or local projects; provision of language learning facilities and courses by local authorities; appropriate structures in language education

I will look for the ideas and rhetoric within the discourse presented in the two EU documents in the UK curricula. I do not however expect to find all them since not all of these are relevant for the modern foreign language sections of the curricula I will analyze. For instance, language learning in secondary education and training, language learning in higher education, language teacher training, and adult language learning would not expected to be presented in the curricula sections concerning Key Stage 3 in foreign language learning.

5 The EU's language education policy in the UK curricula

In this chapter I analyze my material qualitatively. I look for every instance of an idea and its rhetoric (see the details of these concepts above in 4.2) in the four curricula from the UK that relates to the discourses from the EU: *The EU's language goal* and *The main objectives of language education in the EU*. After listing the ideas and rhetoric I will analyze them qualitatively, that is, describe these instances. In my analysis the discourses are set by the two EU documents (the *Barcelona Objective* and the *Action Plan*). I will look for the ideas and rhetoric within these discourses in the UK curricula. The ideas I analyze are within the EU discourse and listed as they are in those documents. I begin the analysis with the *National Curriculum in England* (2013) (in 5.1) and continue with curricula for Wales (5.2), Scotland (5.3), and Northern Ireland (5.4).

5.1 England

In this section I present and analyze the ideas and rhetoric in the *National Curriculum in England* (2013) in the statutory programmes of study of modern foreign language education at Key Stage 3. I analyze the ideas and rhetoric within the discourses of *The EU's language goal* and *The main objectives of language education in the EU*. I begin with the discourse *The EU's language goal*.

5.1.1 Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The EU's language goal* in England

As is shown in Table 2 (see below), the two ideas within *The EU's language goal* in the *National Curriculum in England* are that (1) knowing at least two foreign languages is a basic skill and that (2) knowing languages has economic value.

Table 2. Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The EU's language goal* in the *National Curriculum in England* (Languages programmes of study: key stage 3)

Idea	Rhetoric
(1) Knowing at least two foreign languages is a basic skill	(A) Learning any (one or two) modern foreign languages (C) Openness to other cultures (D) Practical communication (E) New ways of thinking (F) Preparation for further study (G) Great literature (H) Understanding the world
(2) The knowledge of at least two foreign languages is valuable to the economy	(A) Learning any (one or two) modern foreign languages (B) Work and study opportunities through language knowledge

The first idea is expressed, even though vaguely, by rhetoric (A) that pupils should learn any (one or two) modern foreign languages. The exact wording in the languages programmes of study at Key Stage 3 (2013, 2) is: "Teaching may be of any modern foreign language and should build in the foundations of language learning at key stage 2, whether pupils continue with the same language or take up a new one". It is possible to interpret from this passage that foreign language education revolves around any "modern foreign" language and pupils can be taught one or two foreign languages in England. Should the case be that a pupil learns two foreign languages, the pupil fulfills the EU's goal of learning at least two other languages in addition to one's mother tongue.

In addition to the first rhetoric of the language goal idea the English curriculum (2013, 1–2) also lists several purposes of studying foreign languages: (C) openness to other cultures, (D) practical communication, (E) new ways of thinking, (F) preparation for further study, (G) great literature, and (H) understanding of the world. According to the curriculum learning foreign languages provides openness towards other cultures (C) and deepens one's understanding of the world (H). Learning foreign languages should also provide chances for communication for practical purposes (D), for learning new ways of thinking (E), and for reading "great literature in the original language" (G) according to the English curriculum. It should prepare the pupils for further study (F) as well.

The second idea's rhetoric in the curriculum (see Table 2) is that knowledge of languages offers work and study opportunities (B). This relates to the part of the discourse of *The EU's language goal* that states the economic value of language knowledge, even though idea in the English curriculum refers rather to an individual's personal gain of their skills than to a nation's benefits of their skills. In (A) is expressed the goal of learning two foreign languages.

5.1.2 Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The main objectives of language education in the EU* in England

Table 3 shows the ideas and rhetoric within *The main objectives of language education in the EU* in the English curriculum. The first idea relates to element of life-long learning of the discourse from the perspective of pupils possibly learning two foreign languages (see above 4.1). The second idea revolves around life-long learning as well since it entails the range of languages. This idea is embodied in that the curriculum states that any foreign language can be taught in English schools at Key Stage 3. This embodiment entails rhetoric (B): learning any (one or two) modern foreign languages.

Table 3. Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The main objectives of language education in the EU* in the *National Curriculum in England* (Languages programmes of study: key stage 3)

Idea	Rhetoric
(1) Life-long learning: At least two foreign languages	(B) Learning any (one or two) modern foreign languages
(2) Life-long learning: Range of languages	(B) Learning any (one or two) modern foreign languages
(3) Better language teaching: Testing language skills	(A) List of the benefits of language learning ("Purpose of study") (C) Preparation for further study
(4) Building a language-friendly environment: Improving supply and take-up of language learning	(A) List of the benefits of language learning ("Purpose of study") (C) Preparation for further study (D) Building on the foundations of earlier language learning (at Key Stage 2)

The English curriculum includes all the main objectives of language education set by the *Action Plan* since it, in addition to life-long learning, includes the ideas of better language teaching and building a language-friendly environment. The idea of improving language teaching is somewhat vague in the curriculum because it does not mention the testing of language skills (3) but lists skills that should be achieved in learning languages (A). The building of environments that are language-friendly is presented more clearly in the English curriculum. The curriculum lists some benefits of language learning and raising awareness of the benefits of language learning is part of the improvement of supply and take-up of language learning which is part of building language-friendly environment (see Table 1 in 4.2).

Rhetoric of building a language-friendly environment (raising awareness of the benefits of language learning) is listing the benefits there are in learning languages (A) in the section called "Purpose of study" in the curriculum. The idea of specific language skills in the curriculum relates to rhetoric that language learning prepares pupils for further study since studying language(s) further (C) would entail that certain skills are achieved. Language skills for further study also involves (D) building on the foundations of earlier language learning (at Key Stage 2).

5.2 Wales

In this section I present and analyze the ideas and rhetoric in the *Modern Foreign Languages in the National Curriculum for Wales* (2008). I analyze the ideas and rhetoric within the discourses of *The EU's language goal* and *The main objectives of language education in the EU*. As in the case of the English curriculum above, I begin with the discourse *The EU's language goal*.

5.2.1 Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The EU's language goal* in Wales

The Welsh curriculum includes both of the ideas within *The EU's language goal*. Table 4 shows the rhetoric behind the two ideas in the curriculum for Wales.

Table 4. Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The EU's language goal* in *Modern Foreign Languages in the National Curriculum for Wales*

Idea	Rhetoric
(1) Knowing at least two foreign languages is a basic skill	(A) Key Stage 3: English, Welsh, and "a modern foreign language" (B) Thinking skills connected to foreign language learning (C) Contribution to personal and social education (D) Basic skills in other languages (E) Modern foreign languages only statutory at Key Stage 3 (F) Legal requirements
(2) The knowledge of at least two foreign languages is valuable to the economy	(A) Key Stage 3: English, Welsh, and "a modern foreign language" (G) World of work and careers (H) Economic characteristics of Wales (I) Global economy (J) Local business links (K) Employment "in this country"

The first idea, knowing at least two foreign languages is a basic skill, has rhetoric (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), and (F) behind it. Rhetoric (A) refers to languages taught at Key Stage 3. The languages are English, Welsh, and "a modern foreign language" (*Modern Foreign Languages in the National*

Curriculum for Wales (2008, 2)). The number of languages taught in Welsh schools fulfills the goal of two foreign languages. The Welsh curriculum also connects foreign language learning to other skills in (B), (C), and (D). (B) states that thinking skills are connected to foreign language learning whereas (C) takes up contribution to personal and social education and (D) refers to basic skills in other languages. (E) and (F) show that the foreign language skills are required in the curriculum which suggests that language skills are considered basic skills in Wales. Modern foreign languages are only statutory at Key Stage 3 in Wales (E) and the programmes of study and attainment targets for modern languages are legal requirements (F).

The knowledge of at least two foreign languages having economic value (2) is referred to in (A), (G), (H), (I), (J), and (K) (see Table 4). The languages at Key Stage 3 that are listed in (A) fulfill the EU's goal (see above). The economic value of language skills is referred to through work in (G) and (K) as well as economy in (H), (I), and (J). In (G) is mentioned the importance of language skills in the world of work and careers and in (K) for employment in the country. Rhetoric (H) mentions understanding economic characteristics of Wales as one of the general goals of school education in Wales, part of which modern languages are. The curriculum also lists global economy (I) and local business links (J) as relevant aspects in foreign language education.

5.2.2 Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The main objectives of language education in the EU* in Wales

As Table 5 shows, the Welsh curriculum section analyzed here includes all the same ideas within *The main objectives of language education in the EU* as do the other UK curricula. In addition, it includes two other ideas: in life-long learning language learners with special needs (2) and in better language teaching language teacher training (6). Language teacher training is referred to on the first page of document where the curriculum's audience is described (J). Language learners with special

needs (2) is the other idea only expressed in the Welsh curriculum. These learners are taken into

account in referring to all children and young people having right to education (B) and providing

possibilities to special arrangements (C) for learners with disabilities, for instance (2008, 4).

Table 5. Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The main objectives of language education in the EU* in the *Modern Foreign Languages in the National Curriculum for Wales*

Idea	Rhetoric
(1) Life-long learning: Early start and at least two foreign languages	(A) At Key Stage 2: English and Welsh; at Key Stage 3: those and "a modern foreign language"
(2) Life-long learning: Language learners with special needs	(B) All children and young people (C) Special arrangements
(3) Life-long learning: Range of languages	(A) At Key Stage 2: English and Welsh; at Key Stage 3: those and "a modern foreign language" (D) Learners whose first language is not English or Welsh (E) Schools choose which languages they teach (F) Level descriptions for a range of languages
(4) Better language teaching: Language-friendly school	(G) Learner's home languages (H) Links between languages
(5) Better language teaching: Languages classroom	(I) Interaction with native speakers and language learners through cross-border projects
(6) Better language teaching: Language teacher training	(J) Curriculum's audience
(7) Better language teaching: Testing language skills	(K) Standards for pupils' performance (level descriptions) (L) Appropriate assessment
(8) Building a language-friendly environment: An inclusive approach to linguistic diversity	(M) Cultural identity that respects others (N) Understanding own and other cultures (O) Appreciation of the importance of languages globally (P) Knowledge and understanding of Wales (Q) Using names for department and government in a national language
(9) Building a language-friendly environment: Language-friendly communities	(H) Links between languages (I) Interaction with native speakers and language learners through cross-border projects (R) Global citizenship (S) Cultural awareness (T) Internet and ICT
(10) Building a language-friendly environment: Improving supply and take-up of language learning	(E) Schools choose which languages they teach (J) Curriculum's audience (U) Lists of benefits (V) Local business links (X) Prior (language) learning (at Key Stage 2)

The first idea, early start and at least two foreign languages (life-long learning), is expressed in the

Welsh curriculum through stating that (A) the languages taught at Key Stage 2 are English and

Welsh and that at Key Stage 3 the pupils are introduced with "a modern foreign language". The early start is established at Key Stage 2 and the number of foreign (other than mother tongue) languages at Key Stage 3.

The range of languages in life-long learning (3) is also expressed in (A) since two languages are listed and "a modern foreign language" is an open category. (D) calls for showing attention to learners whose first language is not English or Welsh which means that the Welsh curriculum takes into account learners' different first languages. The Welsh curriculum also enables schools to offer a range of languages since schools choose which languages they teach (E). The curriculum includes level descriptions for a range of languages (F), too.

Better language teaching is also called for in the Welsh curriculum. Language-friendly school (4) which refers to connections between all the languages of the school is expressed through mentioning learner's home languages (G) and links between languages (H). Languages classroom (5) entails contact between pupils in other language communities in the Welsh document (see also 4.2). This idea (5) is expressed in mentioning interaction with native speakers and language learners through cross-border projects (I). Testing language skills (7) is shown in having standards for pupils' performance (level descriptions) (K) and appropriate assessment (L) including self-evaluation.

In order to build a language-friendly environment the Welsh curriculum employs an inclusive approach to linguistic diversity (8) through showing respect for linguistic diversity in aiming at the learners having a cultural identity that respects others (M) and appreciation of the importance of languages in the global perspective (O). The learners should also understand their own and other cultures (N). This cultural understanding is also important in regards to showing attention to national language communities. This attention is shown through aiming at knowledge and understanding of Wales (P) and through using names for department and government in a national language (Welsh) (Q), too.

Language-friendly communities (9) are mentioned in building a language-friendly environment as well. The aim to improve language awareness is expressed in mentioning global citizenship (R), links between languages (H) and language learning's contribution to the learners' cultural awareness (S). The Welsh curriculum establishes the idea of internet's contribution to language learning, too, in listing possibilities that the internet and ICT (T) can offer. Cross-border projects entail interaction with native speakers and language learners through cross-border projects (I) such as partner school projects in the curriculum.

In improving supply and take-up of language learning (10) the Welsh curriculum raises awareness of the benefits of language learning by listing such benefits (U) as enhancement of learning Welsh (2008, 9). Local business links (V) are the local projects mentioned in the curriculum. Provision of language learning facilities and courses by local authorities is taken into account in that schools choose which languages they teach (E) and in listing them as part of the curriculum's audience (J) (see also Table 1 in 4.2). The Welsh curriculum encourages to using appropriate structures in language education, too. According to the document language teaching should be based on prior (language) learning (at Key Stage 2) (X) by appropriate material, for instance.

5.3 Scotland

In this section I present and analyze the ideas and rhetoric in the Scottish *Curriculum for Excellence: Modern languages: Principles and practices* (2010). I analyze the ideas and rhetoric within the discourses of *The EU's language goal* and *The main objectives of language education in the EU*. I begin with the discourse *The EU's language goal*.

5.3.1 Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The EU's language goal* in Scotland

Table 6 shows that the *Curriculum for Excellence: Modern languages: Principles and practice* (2010) includes both of the ideas within *The EU's language goal*: (a) that it is a basic skill to know at least two foreign languages and (2) that the knowledge of languages has economic value.

Table 6. Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The EU's language goal* in the *Curriculum for Excellence: Modern languages: Principles and practice*

Idea	Rhetoric
(1) Knowing at least two foreign languages is a basic skill	(A) Language skills are essential for learning, work, and life (B) A certain level for the skills (C) Language skills are connected to other skills (E) Benefits of language learning (F) Home language(s), English and a new language (G) "A 1+2 Approach" (H) L2 and L3
(2) The knowledge of at least two foreign languages is valuable to the economy	(A) Language skills are essential for learning, work, and life (B) A certain level for the skills (C) Language skills are connected to other skills (D) National need for language skills (E) Benefits of language learning (F) Home language(s), English and a new language (G) "A 1+2 Approach" (H) L2 and L3

The idea of *The EU's language goal* that (1) it is a basic skill to know at least two foreign languages is presented in the *Curriculum for Excellence* (2010, 1) by the rhetoric that language skills are essential for learning and life (A). The goal of two languages is expressed through (F) home language(s), English and a new language, (G) "A 1+2 Approach", and (H) L2 and L3. Also, rhetoric (B), that there is a certain level to be obtained in regards to language learning, refers to the importance of language skills. The level to be achieved by the end of Key Stage 3 is linked to the Basic User Level of the CEFR (the Common European Framework of Reference) (*Curriculum for Excellence* 2010, 4–5). What adds more to the idea of foreign language skills being basic skills is

that they are connected to other skills in rhetoric (C). It is stated in the *Curriculum for Excellence* (2010, 1) that language skills lie "at the centre of thinking and learning" and that studying modern languages are central for the development of literacy skills (2010, 6).

As rhetoric (E) for the first idea the *Curriculum for Excellence* (2010, 1; 2; 6) lists several benefits in learning languages which add to the notion of language skills being basic skills. Those benefits are, for instance, developing one's abilities to communicate, level of skills in listening and talking, and understanding other cultures. Learners can also reflect on their first language through learning other languages.

As to the idea of the economic value of knowing languages (2) in the *Curriculum for Excellence*, all the rhetoric (A–H) in the document present it. Rhetoric (F–H) present the idea of knowing at least two languages (see Table 6). Rhetoric (A) states the essential role of language skills for work. Even though rhetoric (B) expresses the economic value indirectly, it can be stated that establishing level for language skills adds to their economic value. Rhetoric (C) connects other skills and even thinking to language skills (see above) which expresses their value to economy. In (D) it is explicitly stated that there is a national need for language skills and it is based on economy. The *Curriculum for Excellence* (2010, 1) states that young people's attraction to learning modern languages is important for the nation's prosperity as well as are the language skills in the global markets and the new Europe. The benefits (E) stated in the curriculum relate to the economic value of language skills as well, for instance the communication competence is needed in the work environments amongst other environments.

5.3.2 Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The main objectives of language education in the EU* in Scotland

Here I continue my analysis of the *Curriculum for Excellence*. In Table 7 are shown the ideas and rhetoric in the document within the discourse *The main objectives of language education in the EU*.

Table 7. Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The main objectives of language education in the EU* in the *Curriculum for Excellence: Modern languages: Principles and practice*

Idea	Rhetoric
(1) Life-long learning: Early start and at least two foreign languages	(A) Home language(s), English and a new language (B) "A 1+2 Approach" (C) L2 and L3 (D) L2 from primary 1; L3 no later than primary 5
(2) Life-long learning: Range of languages	(A) Home language(s), English and a new language (B) "A 1+2 Approach" (C) L2 and L3 (E) English, Gaelic, Gàidhlig and modern languages
(3) Better language teaching: Language friendly-school	(F) Reflection on the first language (G) The interconnected nature of languages (1st Key aim) (H) Prior learning of modern language(s) (I) Understanding one's language learning (J) Wider links to curriculum (K) Links to other languages (in school or English, Gàidhlig or others)
(4) Better language teaching: Languages classroom	(L) ICT
(5) Better language teaching: Testing language skills	(M) SCQF level 4 and Basic User Level (CEFR): European wide equivalence (N) "Assessment for Learning" and other ways to assess
(6) Building a language-friendly environment: An inclusive approach to linguistic diversity	(E) English, Gaelic, Gàidhlig and modern languages (K) Links to other languages (in school or English, Gàidhlig or others) (O) Understanding own and other cultures (P) Responsibility, awareness and appreciation of culture
(7) Building a language-friendly environment: Language-friendly communities	(G) The interconnected nature of languages (1st Key aim) (L) ICT (O) Understanding own and other cultures (Q) A global citizen (2nd Key aim) (R) Communicative competence (3rd Key aim) (S) Social, cultural, and geographical awareness
(8) Building a language-friendly environment: Improving supply and take-up of language learning	(H) Prior learning of modern language(s) (T) Benefits of language learning (U) Interdisciplinary projects (V) L3 in addition to L2 (X) Professional autonomy and flexibility (Y) Goals of language learning

The idea of life-long learning and its parts concerning early start in language learning and learning at least two foreign languages (1) are expressed in the language education part of the Scottish curriculum through rhetoric (A), (B), (C), and (D) (see Table 7). (A) states the different languages pupils know in Scotland. It mentions pupils' possible home language(s) and English as well as learning a new language at school. The curriculum (2010, 2) refers to another document called *Language Learning in Scotland: A 1+2 Approach* that most likely explicitly handles issues concerning the goal of teaching two foreign languages in addition to one's first language (B). Rhetoric (C) mentions the first additional language (L2) and the second additional language (L3) taught at school. Rhetoric (D) is more about the earlier stages before Key Stage 3 which is of interest in this study but (D) is still worth mentioning here since it expresses that the early start for language learning is taken into account in the Scottish curriculum. The modern language section of the Scottish curriculum which is analyzed here concerns the general principles and practice of language education in Scotland which means that it concerns all the Key Stages.

Concerning life-long learning the Scottish document states the idea of range of languages (2). Rhetoric showing the range of languages are (A), (B), (C), and (E) (see Table 7). Rhetoric (A) mentions the different languages pupils know whereas (E) lists some of them. (B) and (C) state that two foreign languages should be taught at school.

There are three ideas of better of language teaching expressed in the Scottish curriculum: language friendly-school (3), languages classroom (4), and testing language skills (5) (see Table 7). Language friendly-school is expressed in (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), and (K). Language-friendly school is about making connections between all the languages of the school (see Table 1 in 4.2). Rhetoric (F) expresses the importance of reflecting one's first language while learning foreign languages. The first key aim of learning modern languages in the *Curriculum for Excellence* (2010, 2) is the interconnected nature of languages (G) which highlights the connections between languages (at

school as well). To take into account prior learning of modern language(s) (H) that the pupils might have is also encouraged in the Scottish curriculum. Understanding one's language learning (I) might also help the pupils realize the connections between languages. The curriculum (2010, 2) also mentions that links can be made to other languages (in the school community) (K). Some languages are listed there as well: English, Gàidhlig and modern languages. The call for wider links to other parts of the curriculum (J) can vaguely refer to connections between languages as well.

The idea of languages classroom (4) in the Scottish curriculum is about the contact between pupils in other language communities. No EU programmes are mentioned (see 4.2). There is one expression of this idea in rhetoric (L) about ICT (information and communications technology). The curriculum (2010, 4) states that ICT can offer learners contact with people around the world. The idea of testing language skills (5) is expressed through (M) and (N). The SCQF (Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework) level 4 that should be achieved by most learners by the end of Key Stage 3 according to the curriculum (2010, 4) is stated to be linked (as well as the other SCQF levels) to the levels in CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) (2010, 6), more specifically the Basic User Level (2010, 4). This link enables learners to have a European wide equivalence in their level of competence (2010, 6). The curriculum also lists ways to assess language learning through which the idea of testing is expressed (N). The ways listed are self-assessment and feedback, skill organizers, day-to-day learning and specific assessment tasks (2010, 2; 4; 5). The curriculum refers to an approach called "Assessment for Learning" in reference to assessment of language skills (2010, 3).

The ideas to building a language-friendly environment in the *Curriculum for Excellence* include (see Table 7) an inclusive approach to linguistic diversity (6), language-friendly communities (7), and improving supply and take-up of language learning (8). The parts of an inclusive approach to linguistic diversity (6) in the Scottish curriculum are respect for diversity and attention to national and regional communities. No EU programmes are mentioned (see 4.2).

Respect towards diversity is expressed through (O) and (P). Understanding own and other cultures (O) clearly refers to respect. Even more clearly respect is expressed in responsibility, awareness and appreciation of culture (P). The curriculum (2010, 1) calls for young people to become responsible citizens with "growing awareness of life in another society and of the issues facing citizens in the countries where their new language is spoken". Attention to national communities is shown in (E), (O), and (K). In (O) both understanding own and other cultures are called for. The pronoun "own" can be used here with the noun "culture" to refer to national and regional cultures which is a way of showing attention to national and regional communities. The call for links to other languages (K) in the curriculum and listing national languages in (E) and (K) also express attention to national communities.

The idea of language-friendly communities (7) in the Scottish curriculum consists of improving language awareness and internet. No projects are mentioned (see 4.2). Internet is part of ICT (L). Improving language awareness is expressed in (G), (O), (Q), (R), and (S) (see Table 7 above). Language awareness is almost explicitly expressed the aim of social, cultural, and geographical awareness (S). The interconnected nature of languages as the first key aim of language learning (G) in the curriculum also expresses language awareness. Communicative competence (R) that is gained through language learning and is the third key aim in the curriculum can improve language awareness. Learners realizing their role as global citizens (Q) that is the second key aim of language learning in the curriculum also refers to language awareness. In the case of understanding own and other cultures (O) and it expressing language awareness as well as respect for linguistic diversity (see above) it could be argued that there is a link between awareness and respect: one has to be aware of something in order to respect it.

Improving supply and take-up of language learning (8) includes raising awareness of the benefits of language learning, local projects, provision of language learning facilities and courses by the local authorities, as well as appropriate structures. The Scottish curriculum (2010, 1; 2; 6) lists

benefits of language learning (T) some of which are: ability to reflect how one learns languages, understanding cultures, and communicative competence.

Local projects are mentioned in the curriculum (2010, 4) through interdisciplinary projects (U) which should build on collaborative learning. Provision of language learning facilities and courses by the local authorities is expressed in (V) and (X). The fact that the curriculum (2010, 5) states that L3 should be taught in addition to and not at expense of L2 (V) and yet states that "there are no specific input requirements in terms of the time allocated to languages over S1 [Key Stage 1] to S3 [Key Stage 3]" offers room for the interpretation that the local authorities or even schools themselves design the time devoted to specific courses. This view is explicitly expressed when stating professional autonomy and flexibility (X) (2010, 6). Rhetoric (V), L3 in addition to L2, is essential for appropriate structures as well. Appropriate structures are expressed, too, in prior learning of modern language(s) (H) and goals of language learning (Y).

5.4 Northern Ireland

In this section I present and analyze the ideas and rhetoric in the *The Northern Ireland Curriculum* (statutory requirements for modern languages and a non-statutory guidance for modern languages) (2007). I analyze the ideas and rhetoric within the discourses of *The EU's language goal* and *The main objectives of language education in the EU*. In line with the sections above, I begin with the discourse of *The EU's language goal* and continue with *The main objectives of language education in the EU*.

5.4.1 Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The EU's language goal* in NI

I discuss here both of the ideas within *The EU's language goal* even though the curriculum does not state the number of foreign languages taught at school being two or more. In fact, the idea of knowing at least two foreign languages being a basic skill (1) is included in Table 8 with (*) because even though the NI curriculum mentions foreign language skills being a basic skill, it does not mention the number of foreign languages to be taught. The curriculum mentions first language and target language or second language but does not state explicitly the number of foreign languages. The fact that the number of foreign languages (in this study, languages other than one's mother tongue) is not mentioned in the NI curriculum is slightly unexpected since there is an official minority language (Irish Gaelic) and a native language (Ulster-Scots) in Northern Ireland (see 3.2.4)

Table 8. Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The EU's language goal* in the *The Northern Ireland Curriculum* (statutory requirements for modern languages and a non-statutory guidance for modern languages)

Idea	Rhetoric
(1) Knowing at least two foreign languages is a basic skill*	(A) Minimum requirement (B) Preparing for life and work (C) "Learning for Life and Work" (D) Link to thinking skills and personal capabilities
(2) The knowledge of at least two foreign languages is valuable to the economy*	(B) Preparing for life and work (C) "Learning for Life and Work" (E) Awareness of and contribution to local and global economy (F) Employability (G) Enhancement of career options

The idea of foreign language skills being basic is expressed through (A), (B), (C) and (D) only in the non-statutory guidance for modern languages. The non-statutory guidance states on its first page that "Modern Languages are part of the minimum requirement for every pupil at Key Stage 3" (A). The guidance also mentions the curriculum's aim to be preparing pupils for life and work (B) which

expresses how basic language skills are: they are needed in life. "Learning for Life and Work" (C) is an area of learning in the NI curriculum which also expresses the need of language skills in life. The guidance links language skills to thinking skills and personal capabilities as well (D).

The idea of knowing at least two foreign languages having economic value (2) is also vague (*) in the NI curriculum since the documents do not mention the number of foreign languages to be taught. Yet, both the guidance and the statutory requirements state that language skills are valuable to the economy through (B), (C), (E), (F) and (G). The need of language skills for work (as well as life) is expressed in (B) and (C) (see Table 8). The guidance states as some objectives of the curriculum awareness of local and global economy as well as one's contribution to those (E). Foreign languages skills and learning skills are stated to enhance one's career options (G) in the statutory requirements. This links to employability (F) that both the documents state in regards to foreign language skills.

5.4.2 Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The main objectives of language education in the EU* in NI

As is shown in Table 9, the idea of having an early start in language learning (1) is expressed by stating its priority status as a means to improve linguistic skills for the member states of the European Community (A). The early start of language learning is only mentioned in the guidance.

Table 9. Ideas and rhetoric within the discourse of *The main objectives of language education in the EU* in the *The Northern Ireland Curriculum* (statutory requirements for modern languages and a non-statutory guidance for modern languages)

Idea	Rhetoric
(1) Life-long learning: Early start	(A) Early language learning as a priority for European states
(2) Life-long learning: Range of languages	(B) Functioning in a range of languages
(3) Better language teaching: Language-friendly school	(C) Links between first and target language (D) Cross-curricular skills and links across subjects
(4) Better language teaching: Languages classroom	(E) Partner school projects (F) Experiences with young people from the target language country
(5) Better language teaching: Testing language skills	(G) "Assessment for Learning" and ways to assess
(6) Building a language-friendly environment: An inclusive approach to linguistic diversity	(H) Flexibility between cultural environments (I) Understanding cultures (J) Valuing diversity (K) Local and global environmental issues (L) Own locality
(7) Building a language-friendly environment: Language-friendly communities	(C) Links between first and target language (E) Partner school projects (M) Cultural awareness (N) ICT and Internet
(8) Building a language-friendly environment: Improving supply and take-up of language learning	(E) Partner school projects (O) Benefits of language learning (P) Local authorities decision power (Q) Prior learning and the recursive nature of languages

The idea of range of languages in language learning is also only mentioned in the guidance and even there it is expressed with stating how pupils should be able to function in a range of languages (B) without mentioning any languages this idea might entail. The ideas of life-long learning (1 and 2) are also mentioned in the NI guidance alone. However, ideas of better language teaching are present in both of the NI documents. Language-friendly school (connections between all the languages of the school) (3) is expressed by stating links between first and target language (C) and cross-curricular skills and links across subjects (D). Links across the curriculum can express connections between languages at school since all the subjects are taught in some language.

Languages classroom (4) idea includes contact between pupils in other language communities in the NI curriculum. No EU programmes are mentioned. The contact between pupils is expressed

through partner school projects (E) and experiences with young people from the target language country (F) such as e-mail exchanges. Testing language skills (5) is only present in the guidance in listing ways to assess language learning and the approach "Assessment for Learning" (G) (see also 5.3.2 above).

The idea of an inclusive approach to linguistic diversity in building a language-friendly environment (6) includes respect for diversity and attention to national and regional language communities in both the NI documents. Respect for diversity is expressed in flexibility between cultural environments (H) and understanding cultures (I) as well as in valuing diversity (J) in general. There is a connection to respecting diversity in taking into account local and global environmental issues (K), too. Attention to national and regional language communities is shown in paying attention to own locality (L) and in understanding cultures (I) as well as in taking into account local and global environmental issues (K).

To build a language-friendly environment the NI curriculum shows the views of language-friendly communities (7) and improving supply and take-up of language learning (8) (see Table 9). Language-friendly communities are expressed in rhetoric cultural awareness (M) and links between first and target language (C). They express that there is thrive to improve language awareness in Northern Ireland. The aspects of internet (in ICT and Internet (N)) and cross-border projects (in partner school projects (E)) are also shown in the NI curriculum.

Improving supply and take-up of language learning to build language-friendly communities (8) include raising awareness of the benefits of language learning, projects, provision of language learning by local authorities, and appropriate structures. There are lists of the benefits of language learning (O) in both of the NI documents where the benefits are for instance effective and creative communication skills (statutory requirements, 1) and cultural awareness (the guidance, 3). Local projects include partner school projects (E) and the provision of language learning by local authorities is referred to in expressing the local authorities decision power (P) for instance by

having questions for departments after each section and leaving space for them to plan their actions.

Attention towards appropriate structures is shown in the guidance by taking into account prior

learning and the recursive nature of languages (Q).

6 Discussion of findings

Here I present the results of my study and answer my research questions. I discuss my findings in this chapter, too. It should be noted here that what might affect the results of this study that it is difficult (if not impossible) to find matching documents on language education around the UK. The sections on language education in the curricula vary both in length and contents which however is part of why it is interesting to study and compare them.

My research questions were:

1) How (if at all) does England's language education policy take into account the EU's language policy of each EU citizen being able to speak at least two languages in addition to their mother tongue?

2) How is England's language education policy justified in reference to the EU?

3) What concrete means (if any) are presented in England's language education policy to improve the language education in England in reference to the EU?

4) What differences (if any) are there around the UK (England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland) in foreign language education policies in reference to the EU?

In regards to the first question on England's language education policy, it does take into account the EU's language goal of each EU citizen being able to speak at least two languages in addition to their mother tongue. The goal is taken into account by showing that knowing at least two foreign languages is a basic skill and that it has economic value. However, the English curriculum only mentions the number of foreign languages taught at school as one or two which means that the goal

of two languages (or more) might not be fulfilled in England. It should also be taken into account here when looking at results of this study that the English curriculum-section *Languages programmes of study – key stage 3* is statutory which means that its contents are issued by law and therefore it is obligatory to follow them. Yet, the curriculum offers room for schools to not fulfill the goal of at least two foreign languages. The reality in foreign language education can also differ from the ideas presented in the curriculum. Board and Tinsley (2014, 12) report that there has been a strong decline in language learning in England between 2001 and 2011. In 2001 78 % of the cohort sat a GCSE (General Certificate of Secondary Education) in languages whereas in 2011 the number was only 40 %. Board and Tinsley (2014, 9) name other issues in language education in England, too, such as "the lack of cohesion at the transition from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 3" and "the growing exclusion of certain groups of pupils from language study at Key Stages 3 and 4".

The second question looks into the justifications behind the England's language policy in reference to the EU. The English curriculum analyzed here shows that the EU's goal of two foreign languages is justified by it offering study and work opportunities as well as openness to other cultures. Foreign language skills are also stated to help develop communication, ways to think and understand the world, and read great literature. The skills prepare one for further studies, too.

The main objectives of language education in reference to the EU stated in the English curriculum are learning at least two foreign languages, taking into account the range of languages in language education, testing languages skills and improving the supply and take up of language learning. These are justified by listing benefits of language, mentioning the number of foreign languages (one or two) to be taught and that language learning prepares one for further study, and showing that language learning at Key Stage 3 should be built on earlier language learning (at Key Stage 2).

The method chosen for this study does not offer specific ways to analyze further the rhetoric behind each idea which means that there would be a lot more to cover on the justifications that the

analyzed documents offer that this study does not cover. The method in this study is not linguistically particularly accurate but it has adapted well to the goal of the study and provided answers to the research questions. However, in the case of the second question a further analysis would be needed. Yet, it would not have been relevant for this study to analyze agents in the documents, for instance (see 4.2). In further study it might be worthwhile to use a more linguistic approach to study the language education policies in the UK.

The third question is interested in the concrete means that are or may be presented in England's language education policy to improve the language education in England in reference to the EU. The analysis shows that no concrete means of improving the language education are presented in the English curriculum. Yet, the curriculum section analyzed offers some ideas of improving the language education. The aspects for improvement in the curriculum are better language teaching and building a language-friendly environment. The language teaching-improvement given attention to in the document focuses on testing language skills whereas a language-friendly environment could be built by improving the supply and take-up language learning.

The fourth question revolves around the possible differences around the UK (England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland) in foreign language education policies in reference to the EU. Above in the analysis (chapter 5) the tables show the ideas within the two EU discourses in each UK curriculum but here are tables (Table 10 and Table 11) that show each idea of the two EU discourses and which of the ideas are found in which of the UK curriculum. Table 10 shows the ideas within *The EU's language goal* in each UK document.

Table 10. Ideas within *The EU's language goal* in each UK document

Idea	England	Scotland	Wales	NI
(1) Knowing at least two foreign languages is a basic skill	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*
(2) The knowledge of at least two foreign languages is valuable to the economy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*

(*=In the case of NI, the goal of learning two foreign languages is not stated. See 5.4.1 for more.)

As is shown in Table 10, all the UK curricula share the EU's goal of knowing languages being a basic skill and having economic value. Yet, not all of the documents analyzed in this study state the goal of learning at least two foreign languages. Here the Northern Ireland curriculum is the exception as it does not mention the foreign language goal. This is especially interesting given the fact that Northern Ireland has a national minority language (Irish) and a regional language (Ulster-Scots) which would imply that language skills are acknowledged in Northern Ireland (see 3.2.4). The English curriculum is also somewhat exceptional in comparison to the others in the number of foreign languages taught at school since it states that schools can teach one or two foreign languages. This means that there can be pupils in England who only study one foreign language and therefore do not fulfill the goal of learning at least two foreign languages.

In Table 11 are presented the ideas within *The main objectives of language education in the EU* in each of the UK documents.

Table 11. Ideas within *The main objectives of language education in the EU* in each UK document

Idea	England	Wales	Scotland	NI
life-long language learning: early start with the aim of mother tongue plus two languages	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*
life-long language learning: language learning in secondary education and training	No	No	No	No
life-long language learning: language learning in higher education	No	No	No	No
life-long language learning: adult language learning	No	No	No	No
life-long language learning: language learners with special needs	No	Yes	No	No
life-long language learning: range of languages	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
better language teaching: the language friendly-school	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
better language teaching: the languages classroom	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
better language teaching: language teacher training	No	Yes	No	No
better language teaching: supply of language teachers	No	No	No	No
better language teaching: training teachers of other subjects	No	No	No	No
better language teaching: testing language skills	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
building a language-friendly environment: an inclusive approach to linguistic diversity	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
building a language-friendly environment: building language-friendly communities	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
building a language-friendly environment: improving supply and take-up of language learning	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

(*=In the case of NI, the goal of learning two foreign languages is not stated. See 5.4.1 for more.)

All the UK curricula include the three idea-categories of this discourse: life-long learning, better language teaching, and building a language-friendly environment (see 4.2). The ideas of life-long learning presented in all the curricula are early start with the aim of mother tongue plus two languages and a range of languages. Here the *Northern Ireland Curriculum* differs though from the others as it does not mention the number of foreign languages taught at school (see 5.4.1 for more). The English curriculum is also vague in this regard (see 5.1.1 for more). The better language

teaching is claimed in testing language skills in all the documents whereas a language-friendly environment is built by improving the supply and take-up of language learning.

There is one curriculum that restricts the ideas found in all the documents and that is the English curriculum. The other three curricula (for Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland) express, in addition to the ones listed above, the language friendly-school and the languages classroom in regards to better language teaching. They also build language-friendly environments through the ideas of an inclusive approach to linguistic diversity and building language-friendly communities. The Welsh curriculum takes into account language learners with special needs (in reference to the EU's idea of life-long learning) and language teacher training (better language teaching), too.

One factor explaining the differences between the English curriculum and the other UK curricula in the main objectives for language learning could be that the other countries have official national languages which England does not (see 3.2.1). Yet, England does have a regional language. However, the lack of official national languages alone might not explain the differences since the NI curriculum is different from the others, too, in regards to not mentioning the number of foreign languages taught and there are national languages in Northern Ireland.

It should be noted here that even if a UK curriculum includes ideas within the two EU's language education discourses, that it not say that the curriculum is based on the EU documents. Also, the fact that not all the ideas within the EU discourses are found in the UK documents can be due to those ideas being somewhere else in the curricula than in the foreign language (Key Stage 3) sections studied here. It is even interesting from the point of view foreign language education in the UK that not all the EU ideas are presented in connection to that. Of course, the UK curricula include other ideas in addition to the ones within the EU discourses but those are not within the scope of this study or even of interest to this study. However, given that the UK votes over their EU membership it is fascinating to see in this study that the UK curricula show the EU's language

education policies. The UK curricula show those policies even though the policies are not legally binding to the EU member countries.

It might affect the results of this study that it is difficult (if not impossible) to find matching documents on language education around the UK. The sections on language education in the curricula vary both in length and contents which however is part of why it is interesting to study and compare them. I have chosen the EU documents as material for this study on the basis that they might have been used as background for the UK curricula. However, as mentioned above, that a UK curriculum includes ideas within the EU's language education discourses does not mean that the curriculum is based on the EU documents.

The curricula are documents that present the goals and ideology of education in the different countries. The ideas presented in them might not however be reflected in reality. For instance, the Languages Programmes of study: Key Stage 3-section in the *National Curriculum in England* analyzed here presents the idea of teaching (any or) two foreign languages at school, yet statistics of foreign languages studied in England tell their own story (see Board and Tinsley (2014) above).

7 Conclusions

Here I conclude my study and suggest possible further research. The research goal was to find out how England's language education policy is related to the EU's language policy and the possible differences between national curricula in the UK in reference to the EU. In conclusion it can be stated that the *National Curriculum in England* (2013) represents the EU's language education policy in the case of foreign languages. The same can be noted about the other UK curricula in Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland. The UK curricula show the EU's language education policies even though the UK is to vote over their EU membership and the EU policies are not legally binding. There are however differences between different curricula in the UK.

The *National Curriculum in England* contains all the ideas of the discourse *The EU's language goal* and all the idea categories in *The main objectives of language education in the EU* analyzed here. Yet, the way the English curriculum follows the EU's language education policy is the most restricted of all the countries in the UK. The widest selection of the EU ideas is found in the Welsh curriculum. One factor contributing to the restricted nature of the English curriculum could be that there are not any regional or native languages with official status besides English in England whereas the other countries have such languages. Yet, England does have a regional language. Another factor that might affect the results of this study is that it is difficult to find matching foreign language education documents around the UK. The English document is also the shortest of all the documents analyzed here.

Further study could set out to find reasons behind the differences across the UK curricula concerning foreign language education in general or in reference to the EU. The terminology in the UK curricula might be of interest for further study as well. It can be seen even in this study how the terminology varies across the curricula. For instance, the curricula use terms modern foreign languages or modern languages for languages other than English or other national languages.

References

About the Isle of Man. Accessed 24/4/2016 via http://www.isleofman.com/about-the-isle-of-man/

Ammon, Ulrich. 2008. "Language planning and language policy for the EU and for international institutions." In *Språkvård och språkpolitik. Svenska språknämndens forskningskonferens i Saltsjöbaden 2008*, ed. Andersson, L.-G; Josephson, O.; Lindberg, I.; Thelander, M., 13–38. 2010. Norstedts.

Ataç, C. Akça. 2012. "Empire of Languages: EU's Multilingualism Policy and the Turkish Language." *Turkish Studies* 13, 4: 581–598.

The Barcelona Objective. 2002. Accessed 25/1/2016 via http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/strategic-framework/index_en.htm

Kathryn Board and Tinsley, Teresa. 2014. *Language Trends 2013/14. The State of Language Learning in Primary and Secondary Schools in England*. CfBT Education Trust. Accessed 24/4/2016 via https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/language-trends-survey-2014.pdf

Boyd, Sigrid. 2001. *Teaching Modern Languages. Policy and Practice in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*. Berkshire: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Cornwall Council Cornish Language Policy. 2009. Accessed 23/2/2016 via http://www.magakernow.org.uk/default.aspx?page=374

The Council of the European Union. Accessed 25/1/2016 via http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/council-eu/

Van Eemeren, Frans H. 2010. *Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse: Extending the Pragma-Dialectical Theory of Argumentation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company

The European Council. Accessed 25/1/2016 via http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/european-council/

The Curriculum for Excellence. 2010. Accessed 23/1/2016 via

http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/learningandteaching/curriculumareas/languages/modernlangu

ages/principlesandpractice/index.asp

Discover EU's Role. Accessed 26/4/2016 via http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/index_en.htm

Ethnologue. Languages of the World. Accessed 18/2/2016 via https://www.ethnologue.com/

The EU member countries. Accessed 28/11/2015 via http://europa.eu/about-eu/countries/member-
countries/

The Eurobarometer 83. Accessed 28/11/2015 via
http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb83/eb83_en.htm

The Eurobarometer 82. Accessed 28/11/2015 via
http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb82/eb82_en.htm

The European Commission. Accessed 25/1/2016 via http://ec.europa.eu/atwork/index_en.htm

The EU's Strategic Framework Concerning Languages. Accessed 25/1/2016 via
http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/strategic-framework/index_en.htm

Fairclough, Norman. 2013. *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language*. New
York: Routledge.

Guliyeva, Gulara. 2013. "Education, Languages, and Linguistic Minorities in the EU: Challenges
and Perspectives." *European Law Journal* 19, 2: 219–236.

Helmore, Edward. 2013. "Policy needs to change to address the US and UK's language deficits."
The Guardian. Accessed 2/11/2015 via http://www.theguardian.com/education/2013/oct/11/global-
citizens-language-skills

Irish-Gaelic. 2015. Accessed 23/2/2016 via http://aboutworldlanguages.com/irish-gaelic

Johnson, Fern L. 2012. "Rhetorical Positioning of US Policy Statements about Multilingual Education – With Reference to the EU." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 25, 1: 73–87.

Jonsson, Carla. 2008. "Språkpolitik – från EU till klassrummet." In *Språkvård och språkpolitik. Svenska språknämndens forskningskonferens i Saltsjöbaden 2008*, ed. Andersson, L.-G; Josephson, O.; Lindberg, I.; Thelander, M., 213–233. 2010. Norstedts.

Josephson, Olle. 2009. *Att styra språk. Om språkpolitikens möjligheter och begränsningar.* Accessed 21/2/2016 via http://swepub.kb.se/bib/swepub:oai:DiVA.org:su-34316

Kress, Gunther. 1985. "Ideological Structures in Discourse." In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Volume 4. Discourse Analysis in Society*, ed. Van Dijk, Teun A., 27–42. London: Academic Press.

Kristiansen, Tore. 2008. "The potency and impotence of official language policy." In *Språkvård och språkpolitik. Svenska språknämndens forskningskonferens i Saltsjöbaden 2008*, ed. Andersson, L.-G; Josephson, O.; Lindberg, I.; Thelander, M., 163–179. 2010. Norstedts.

Languages covered by the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. 2015. Accessed 23/2/2016 via http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/minlang/AboutCharter/LanguagesCovered.pdf

Language policy strategies in education in the UK. The Languages Company. Accessed 3/11/2015 via http://www.languagescompany.com/policy/basic-documentation-on-english-and-uk-policy.html

Languages in education. Accessed 23/2/2016 via http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/learning-languages/languages-in-education_en.htm

Languages in Wales. 2010. Accessed 23/2/2016 via https://www.museumwales.ac.uk/articles/2010-02-01/Wales-other-languages/?id=49

Lanvers, Ursula. 2011. "Language Education Policy in England: Is English the elephant in the room?" *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies* 5, 3: 63–78.

Leigh Raymond and Olive, Andrea. 2009. "Ideas, Discourse, and Rhetoric in Political Choice."
Polity 41, 2: 189–210.

Manx. Accessed 24/4/2016 via http://www.omniglot.com/writing/manx.htm

Modern Language in Northern Ireland. Accessed 23/1/2016 via
http://ccea.org.uk/curriculum/key_stage_3/areas_learning

National Curriculum for Wales. 2008. Accessed 28/11/2015 via
http://learning.gov.wales/resources/browse-all/foreign-languages-in-the-curriculum/?lang=en
and
http://learning.gov.wales/resources/improvementareas/curriculum/programmes-of-study/?lang=en

National Curriculum in England. 2013. Accessed 25/4/2016 via
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-languages-
progammes-of-study

National Qualifications. Accessed 23/2/2016 via
http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/learningandteaching/curriculumareas/languages/modernlangu
ages/nqs/index.asp

The Northern Ireland Curriculum. 2007. Accessed 23/1/2016 via
http://ccea.org.uk/curriculum/key_stage_3/areas_learning/modern_languages

Official languages. Accessed 23/2/2016 via http://europa.eu/about-eu/facts-
figures/administration/index_en.htm

Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004 – 2006. Accessed
25/1/2016 via http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/RO/TXT/?uri=celex:52003DC0449#text

Population in the UK, June 2014. Accessed 9/5/2016 via http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-
method/compendiums/compendium-of-uk-statistics/population-and-migration/index.html

Primary school. 2009. Accessed 23/2/2016 via
http://www.nicurriculum.org.uk/microsite/pl/index.asp

Elahe Rahimi and Sharififar, Masoud. 2015b. "Critical Discourse Analysis and Its Implication in English Language Teaching: A Case Study of Political Text." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 5, 3. March 2015: 504–511.

Regional and minority languages. Accessed 23/2/2016 via
http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/linguistic-diversity/regional-minority-languages_en.htm

Rosita Rindler Schjerve and Vetter, Eva. 2012. *European Multilingualism: Current Perspectives and Challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Scots language. 2016. Accessed 24/4/2016 via http://www.scotslanguage.com/pages/view/id/6

Seidel, Gill. 1985. "Political Discourse Analysis." In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Volume 4. Discourse Analysis in Society*, ed. Van Dijk, Teun A., 43–60. London: Academic Press.

Masoud Sharififar and Rahimi, Elahe. 2015a. "Critical Discourse Analysis of Political Speeches: A Case Study of Obama's and Rouhani's Speeches at UN." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 5, 2. February 2015: 343–349.

Bernard Spolsky and Shohamy, Elena. 2000. "Language Practice, Language Ideology, and Language Policy." In *Language Policy and Pedagogy: Essays in Honor of A. Ronald Walton*, ed. Richard D. Lambert and Shohamy, Elana, 1–42. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Strategy for Scotland's languages. 2007. Accessed 24/4/2016 via
http://www.gov.scot/resource/doc/163888/0044602.pdf

Sveriges språklag (Swedish Language Law). 2009. Accessed 21/2/2016 via
http://www.riksdagen.se/sv/Dokument-Lagar/Lagar/Svenskforfattningssamling/Spraklag-2009600_sfs-2009-600/

Ulster-Scots. Accessed 23/2/2016 via http://www.ulsterscotsagency.com/what-is-ulster-scots/

Brian Wheeler and Hunt, Alex. 2016. "The UK's EU Referendum: All You Need to Know." *BBC News*. Accessed 25/4/2016 via http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-32810887

Williams, Martin. 2015. "The seven big language learning issues facing the UK." *The Guardian*. Accessed 24/1/2016 via http://www.theguardian.com/education/2015/apr/14/seven-language-learning-uk-multilinguilism