

---

# FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN SCHOOL EDUCATION: EUROPEAN AND UKRAINIAN TRENDS

---



Oksana Maksymenko, PhD, Assoc. Prof.  
Research Fellow,  
Comparative Education Department  
Institute of Pedagogy  
National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine  
Kyiv, Ukraine  
[osmaksku@ukr.net](mailto:osmaksku@ukr.net)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3951-7923>

**To cite this article:**

Maksymenko, O. (2021). Foreign languages in school education: European and Ukrainian trends. *Education: Modern Discourses*, (4), 50-65.  
<https://doi.org/10.37472/2617-3107-2021-4-06>

**Abstract.** *The paper deals with the trends in foreign languages teaching in school education of Europe and Ukraine. The methods of description, comparison, analysis are used in order to specify the features of the issue. The international surveys of Eurydice, Eurostat, the OECD's PISA and TALIS with the participation of the European Commission developed the main indicators that ensure the systemic nature of language training in the school sector. They encompass foreign languages in the curriculum, the range of languages studied, Content and Language Integrated Learning, expected levels for the foreign languages, qualification of foreign language teachers, transnational mobility of foreign language teachers, language support for newly arrived migrant students. The level of knowledge of modern foreign languages is determined in accordance with the Common European Framework of References. Taking into consideration the European policy of the development of the multilingual society through the individual competence in two foreign languages the European countries introduced the suggested approaches at the school level and created a comparable language-learning environment. It has determined similar and different trends in language education in schools. Ukraine has started introducing the common indicators to develop its own environment for language learning in school education withing the New Ukrainian school reform. It needs further studying and improving law, and education sectors under the conditions of current situation.*

**Keywords:** *foreign language; school; education; organization; general secondary education.*

## INTRODUCTION, PROBLEM STATEMENT

The cultural and linguistic diversity are the reality and driving force for the development of the future European community, open to profound globalization. The environment for multilingual communication and multidimensional interaction covers not only the list of official languages of the community (66 languages have official status, 26 languages are official state languages, 24 languages are official EU working languages), but also regional and less used languages in Europe. Languages that appear in the community with migration waves, need special attention and the issue was developed into the separate EU policy.

The aim of the school level in the education systems of the European countries is to

prepare young people of the appropriate age for the competitive functioning in a multilingually transformed and multiculturally globalized social environment. Within the framework, learning languages in this level of education provides practical training through active interaction in the environment for the realization of social functions in the European and global space based on numerous cultural and linguistic contacts.

Analysing the European experience in the study of foreign languages at school will help reveal the conditions of the national foreign language sector and find the measures to be taken for its improvement in Ukraine.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The language learning ranks the main positions in the moder education and research, data and surveys covering the theoretical and practical aspects as well. M. Stoicheva (2021), G. Domilescu and C. Lungoci (2019), M. Jones (2013) examine the issue of the development of the European multilingual identity. The researchers support the view of the development of the multilingual European society throught the education as one of the main ways in the realization of the European multicultural social idea.

The studies of the Ukrainian comparative education scholars highlight the development of the educational area in Europe and the world (V. Kremen et al., 2020; O. Topuzov, 2015; O. Lokshyna, 2019; A. Dzhurilo et al., 2018; O. Lokshyna et al., 2021).

The writings of Ukrainian comparative researchers investigate more closely European experience in language learning at schools (A. Dzhurylo et al., 2016; N. Nikolska, 2019; O. Maksymenko, 2015). Ukrainian practitioners work out European experience in teaching foreign languages for the national school education (A. Horobets, 2021; D. Ozernyi, 2018; K. Smirnova, 2021).

The goal of the paper is the presentation of the indicators of the foreign language education in schools of Europe and a try to correlate it with the current situation in school of Ukraine.

## METHODOLOGY

The research deals with the theoretical issue of the current language situation in Europe and its connection with the contemporary situation of learning modern foreign languages in schools, and dynamic changes in language education in European countries during 2002–2016. To specify the peculiarities of the issue we use the scientific methods of analysis, comparison, and description.

To conduct the research we employ the statistical databases of international organisations, such as European Commission (European Commission, 2012; European Commission, EACEA, & Eurydice, 2017a) and OECD (2017).

The thematic databases of international organisations cover the documents on the education development strategies in the EU (Commission of the European Communities, 2011; European Union, 2018; European Commission & Directorate-General for Education and Culture, 2016; European Commission and OECD, 2018).

The information resources and the official documents of the international organisations on strategies for the development of school language education in the EU are used in the article (OECD, 2021; European Commission, n.d.; EACEA / Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency et al., 2017; OECD et al., 2020; Directorate-General for Education et al., 2017; le Pichon-Vorstman et al., 2020; European Commission and Eurydice, 2017).

The the legislative documents and regulations and the language surveys of the Ukranian society represent the Ukrainian database of the paper, among them The Constitution of Ukraine (Konstytutsiia Ukrainy, 1996), Law of Ukraine “On Education” (Zakon Ukrainy “Pro osvitu”,

2017), Law of Ukraine “On complete general secondary education” (Zakon Ukrainy “Pro povnu zahalnu seredniu osvitu”, 2020), Presidential Decree. The Concept of national language policy (Prezydent Ukrainy Pro Kontseptsiiu derzhavnoi movnoi polityky, 2010), The Law of Ukraine “On the provision of functioning of the Ukrainian language as the national language” (Zakon Ukrainy “Pro zabezpechennia funktsionuvannia ukrainskoi movy yak derzhavnoi”, 2019).

In the context of the language research, the international surveys of Eurydice, Eurostat, the OECD’s PISA and TALIS (Teaching and Learning International Survey) with the participation of the European Commission developed the main trends in indicators that ensure the systemic nature of youth training in the school sector. They encompass Context, Organization, Participation, Teachers and Teaching Processes. This list is monitored and summarized by the European Commission in the systematic surveys for the further development of the gradual implementation of the coherent policy towards and improvement of the development of foreign language education in European schools. The trends cover the range of indicators used to compare the state of foreign language education in the countries and their achievements. Multifaceted statistical research in Europe helps identify the success of the implementation of policies, features and processes of language learning at school.

### MAIN RESULTS

Analyzing the foreign language situation in Europe as a prerequisite for the development of a multilingual and multicultural society through education, we should emphasize the long-term and gradual implementation of the targeted community policy during the second half of the 20th and the first quarter of the 21st century (Stoicheva, 2015; Domilescu & Lungoci, 2019; Jones, 2013).

Unlike Europe, in Ukraine the floating importance of the language issue because of political changes in the foreign policy did not contribute to its solution. The European step in policymaking launched a great start in 2014 in the realization of the value of the native language and the crucial importance of foreign languages other than Russian and their appreciation in all fields of life of the Ukrainian society. The further changes in cultural national restoration were brought by the implementation of the laws, such as The Concept of national language policy (2010), The Law of Ukraine “On the provision of functioning of the Ukrainian language as the national language” (2019).

In order to demonstrate the different language situations in Europe and Ukraine we should take a closer look and compare the data provided below (Table 1).

Table 1

#### The language situation in Europe and Ukraine

<i>Features</i>	<i>EU (2005–2012)</i>	<i>Ukraine (2016–2020)</i>
The most widely spoken mother tongue	- For the majority of Europeans their mother tongue is one of the official languages of the country in which they reside. - German (16%), Italian and English (13% each), French (12%), then Spanish and Polish (8% each).	- The Ukrainian language is the official language of the country. - Ukrainian 69%, Russian 27%, other 2%.
The ability to hold a conversation	- Over half of Europeans (54%) are able to hold a conversation in at least one additional language, a quarter (25%) are able to speak at least two additional languages and one in ten (10%) are conversant in at least three, and 46 % - none.	The self-assessment of language level: 1) English: 1% – very good, 10% – good, 35% – beginner;

	<p>I. The ability to hold a conversation in at least one additional language: Luxembourg (98%), Latvia (95%), the Netherlands (94%), Malta (93%), Slovenia and Lithuania (92% each), and Sweden (91%).</p> <p>II. The ability to hold a conversation in two languages: Luxembourg (84%), the Netherlands (77%), Slovenia (67%), Malta (59%), Denmark (58%), Latvia (54%), Lithuania (52%) and Estonia (52%).</p> <p>III. The ability to hold a conversation in two languages: Luxembourg (61%), the Netherlands (37%), Slovenia (34%).</p>	<p>2) German: about 1% – very good and good, 13% – beginner;</p> <p>3) French: less 1% – good, 3% – beginner.</p>
The inability to hold a conversation	The respondents are least likely to be able to speak any foreign language: Hungary (65%), Italy (62%), the UK and Portugal (61% in each), and Ireland (60%).	
The most widely spoken foreign languages and attitude	<p>I. English (38%), French (12%), German (11%), Spanish (7%) and Russian (5%).</p> <p>II. The majority of Europeans who speak English, German, Spanish and Russian as a foreign language believe that they have better than basic skills.</p>	
The most useful languages for learning	<p>- English (67%), German (17%), French (16%), Spanish (14%) and Chinese (6%).</p> <p>- There has been a decrease in the proportion thinking that French is important (-9 percentage points), and in those thinking German is an important language for personal development (-5 points). Europeans are more likely now than they were in 2005 to think that Chinese is an important language (+ 4 points).</p> <p>- 88% of Europeans think that knowing languages other than their mother tongue is very useful.</p> <p>- 98% of Europeans consider mastering other foreign languages as useful for the future of their children.</p> <p>- Everyone in the EU should be able to speak at least one foreign language (84%).</p> <p>- 72% agree that people in the EU should be able to speak more than one language in addition to their mother tongue.</p>	<p>- English (66%), German (17%), Russian (14%), Polish (10%), French (7%), and Italian (4%).</p> <p>- Living in Ukraine, 70% Ukrainian native speakers and 57% Russian native speakers preferred English for self-development.</p> <p>- There are regional differences in foreign language usefulness, such as English is useful in the West (78%), Center (68%), South (62%) and East (52%). German and Polish are believed to be important in the West; Russian is in the South. (The number of Russian speaking population in the South and East explains this fact.)</p>
Motivation of language learning	<p>1) working in another country (61%); 2) using the language at work (53%) (including travelling abroad);</p> <p>3) studying abroad (46%);</p> <p>4) using the language on holidays abroad (47%).</p>	<p>1) to work abroad (57%);</p> <p>2) to get a better job in Ukraine (49%);</p> <p>3) to study abroad (47%);</p> <p>4) to use languages at work (37%);</p> <p>5) to travel abroad (31%).</p>



Source: Designed by author based on: European Commission (2012), pp. 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19; Razumkov.Org.Ua. (2016); “Ukrainska mova v Ukraini” (2020); RATING Pro. (2016).

The Table 1 shows that Europeans use the national languages in their countries and have significant achievements in mastering foreign languages, especially multilingual and some post-Soviet countries. The results of the assessment of one’s own knowledge come from three languages, but with a colossal gap compared to the results of Ukraine. In terms of necessity in modern conditions, the European view focuses on the Chinese language but the Ukrainian view is concerned with regionalism, influenced by the current political situation and employment opportunities. The motivational list is almost identical, reflecting the needs and demands in nowadays communities. Foreign language survey in Ukraine revealed the ongoing process of the issue being widely recognized by the Ukrainians. As the survey proves, the situation calls for the urgent changes. Ukraine ranks very low positions among European countries in quality and quantity in the command of foreign languages (Social Group “REITING” Survey, 2016).

According to the survey (European Commission, 2012), the most common way of learning foreign languages in Europe is at school. 68% of Europeans have learnt foreign languages at school. Other methods are much less adopted depending on the categories of the population, among them talking informally to a native speaker (16%), with a teacher outside school in-group language lessons (15%), and going on frequent or long trips to the country in which the language is spoken (15%). Europeans are most likely to think that school language lessons are the most effective way they have learnt a foreign language (European Commission, 2012, p. 100). Table 2 shows the data on three languages spoken by different age groups.

Table 2

**Three languages spoken by different age groups in the EU**

	At least 1	At least 2	At least 3	None
EU27	54%	25%	10%	46%
 Age				
15-24	74%	37%	12%	26%
25-39	64%	31%	12%	36%
40-54	55%	25%	10%	45%
55 +	38%	17%	7%	62%
 Education (End of)				
15-	22%	6%	2%	78%
16-19	48%	20%	7%	52%
20+	76%	42%	17%	24%
Still studying	85%	45%	16%	14%

Source: European Commission (2012), p. 18.

As demonstrated above, the results of youth are much higher than other groups. Thus, language learning at schools realizes the multilingual policy in school education of the EU.

Foreign languages in school education are a priority in Europe. In the field of education, the term “foreign languages” means languages defined as foreign ones in the curricula approved by the leading educational institutions of the higher level. Since the essence of the concept is concerned with the education, it is not related to the political status of the language in Europe. Accordingly, languages that are considered regional or less used from the political perspective can be included in the curriculum as foreign ones. As for the term “classical languages”, there are two approaches in European practice, namely: they can be considered as foreign in certain curricula, while in other curricula, the term “modern languages” is used to distinguish “living languages” from “classical languages”.

In the context of learning, the term “first language” can be used to describe the language of instruction, and other languages are referred to as second and third ones, especially in the countries with more than one official language (European Commission, EACEA, & Eurydice, 2017a, pp. 141–142; EACEA, Baidak, Balcon, Motiejunaite, 2017, p. 4).

The other key clusters are organization, student participation, teachers and teaching. For the language research, they cover the indicators developed in the international surveys of Eurydice, Eurostat, the OECD’s PISA and TALIS with the participation of the European Commission. The indicators of language teaching in school education in Europe (ISCED levels 1, 2 and 3) encompass:

- Foreign languages in the curriculum as compulsory subjects;
- The range of languages studied;
- Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL);
- Expected levels for the first and second foreign languages;
- Profile and qualification of foreign language teachers;
- Transnational mobility of foreign language teachers;
- Language support for newly arrived migrant students (European Commission, EACEA, & Eurydice, 2017a, p. 11).

Table 3 contains the summarised information on the organization of teaching foreign languages at the levels of school education in Europe (Table 3).

Table 3

### Foreign languages at school education in Europe

Levels	Organization of teaching foreign languages
Primary education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– studying two foreign languages from an early age (Barcelona European Council, 2002);</li> <li>– 67.3% in 2005 and 83.8% in 2014 studied at least one foreign language;</li> <li>– learning the first foreign language at an early age by almost all students (12 countries: Spain, France, Croatia, Italy, Cyprus, Luxembourg, Malta, Austria, Poland, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Norway) and the half (Belgium (Flemish Community), Portugal, Slovenia) because of different official mandatory age for the beginning to study foreign languages.</li> <li>– the compulsory study of the second language has been introduced in primary education (Denmark, Greece, Iceland).</li> </ul>
Lower secondary education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– an increase in learning two foreign languages;</li> <li>– 59.7% in 2014 compared to 46.7% in 2000, which is the result of a policy of increasing the number of students learning a second language and lowering the age of the beginning of language learning;</li> <li>– the compulsory study of the second language has been introduced at the beginning of lower secondary education (Czech Republic, France, Italy, Malta, Poland);</li> <li>– more than 90% of students learn two or more foreign languages (11 countries: Estonia, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Romania, Finland, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Macedonia). This figure is below 20% in some countries: Belgium (French Community has no second language at this level, in Ireland and Hungary a second language is not compulsory, in Bulgaria and Austria a second language is compulsory in upper secondary education).</li> </ul>



Upper secondary education (general and vocational)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– the students in vocational and general upper secondary education have no equal opportunities of learning two foreign languages;</li> <li>– the rate of studying two or more languages by students in vocational upper secondary education was 34.5% (2014), which is 20% less than students in general upper secondary education. In the general education of 11 EU countries (French Community of Belgium, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Croatia, Luxembourg, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Liechtenstein) at least 90% learn two or more languages. Only Romania achieved this figure in vocational education. The United Kingdom and Norway have a third or more students who do not learn a foreign language in general education, as opposed to the vocational education of seven countries (Belgium (French Community), Denmark, Germany, Greece, Spain, Iceland, Norway). In 16 education systems, at the end of the vocational secondary education, students will have studied two compulsory foreign languages as compulsory subjects for fewer years than students in general education.</li> </ul>
Share of instruction time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 5–10% in most countries (2016) with a slow increase;</li> <li>– countries with the highest rates are Belgium (German-speaking community) – 11.9%, Greece (Unified Revised Curriculum) – 11.4%, Spain – 10.8%, Croatia – 11.1%, Latvia – 10.1%, Malta – 14.9%, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia – 10.4%); and Luxembourg reached 44%.</li> <li>– an increase in the instruction time in primary education as well as other countries (2011–2016, Denmark, Spain, Cyprus, Slovakia).</li> </ul>
Attainment levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– depend on the levels of education and the number of languages learnt – for the first foreign language, A2 is required at the lower secondary education and B2 at the end of upper secondary education;</li> <li>– for the second foreign language, in most countries the requirements increased from A1 to A2 at the end of lower secondary education and to B1 at the end of upper secondary education;</li> <li>– for the third foreign language, A1-A2 is at the lower secondary education and A1-A2-B1 at the end of upper secondary education.</li> </ul>

Source: Designed by author based on: European Commission et al. (2017a), pp. 11–12, 14–16; Barcelona European Council (2002); European Commission & Eurydice (2017), pp. 6–8.

The table demonstrates the deep change in the levels of education for the last ten years as the increase in learning the languages, common trend of inequality in general and vocational education, comparable characteristics on the levels (languages, share of instruction time and attainment levels on the Common European Framework of Reference / CEFR).

In regard to the number of languages studied, two languages is an entitlement but not a mandatory right. Instead of introducing two compulsory foreign languages for all students, national curricula ensure that all students have the opportunity to learn two or more foreign languages. For example, in Belgium (French Community), Spain, Croatia, Slovenia, Sweden, Liechtenstein and Norway, studying two foreign languages is not an obligation for students before they leave compulsory education, although the right is guaranteed. For all students in these countries, except Belgium (French Community), this opportunity is granted no later than the beginning of lower secondary education.

The students in vocational and general upper secondary education have no equal opportunities of learning two foreign languages in range and length.

As for the range of languages studied, they are English, French, German, and Spanish (Table 4).

Table 4

## Language range studied at schools in Europe

Languages	Education rates
English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– the most studied language in primary and secondary education in Europe;</li> <li>– mandatory in almost all education systems, which define a language for all students and is a half of the EU;</li> <li>– the primary education rate is 79.4%, which is slightly lower, as foreign languages are not part of the curriculum of the first years of compulsory education; the lower secondary education in the EU has 97.3% (2014); upper secondary education is 85.2% in EU. It is explained by the lower part of vocational education students at this level and the fact that a variety of languages is offered at upper secondary education;</li> <li>– an increase in English language learning by primary school students. In the EU, 18.7% more students in 2014 than in 2005 studied English in primary education, mainly due to the lower age of compulsory learning of a first foreign language. The trend is observed in education systems that specify English as a compulsory language and don't have it as a mandatory as well. The change is less noticeable in secondary education, as most students have already learned English at previous levels of education (2005).</li> </ul>
French, German, Spanish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– chosen as the second languages in Europe;</li> <li>– educational systems choose them as compulsory subjects, especially multilingual countries where these languages are one of the official languages (Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland);</li> <li>– French ranks second among the languages studied in European countries: 33.7% of students studied it at the lower secondary education and 23% of high school students did (2014);</li> <li>– German is the third in lower secondary education. At the European level, it was studied by 23.1% of students in lower secondary education and 18.9% of upper secondary education;</li> <li>– Spanish is less popular, which confirms its non-compulsory study as a foreign language (Malta and Sweden provide the opportunity to study it in lower secondary and upper secondary school). At the EU level, its rates for lower secondary education are 13.1%, for upper secondary education is 19.1%. Danish, Italian, Dutch, Russian and Swedish are studied by about 10% at the EU secondary education for historical and geographical reasons.</li> </ul>

Source: Designed by author based on: European Commission et al. (2017a), p. 13; European Commission & Eurydice (2017), p. 9–10.

English ranks first. When schools choose foreign languages, French and German are the most common choices.

The general trends in foreign languages ranking over the last decade are:

- French retains or slightly loses its position;
- German retains positions in the primary and lower secondary education, losing in the upper secondary education (a decrease of 11%);
- Spanish is becoming more popular (a slight increase is recorded in lower secondary education) (European Commission et al., 2017a, p. 13).

In terms of teaching methods, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is considered to be very important but still limited in Europe. CLIL is a method providing



additional teaching of foreign languages without increasing the instruction time or removing lessons of other subjects from the curriculum. Although almost all EU countries have schools with its approach in teaching, only a number have introduced it in all schools at a certain level (Austria and Liechtenstein in the first grades of primary education, Cyprus in one grade of primary education, Luxembourg and Malta in primary and secondary education, Italy in the last grade of upper secondary education).

The challenges in implementing CLIL are mainly related to teachers' qualifications. They must have a qualification in one or more non-language subjects and a good command of a foreign language for teaching, subject and methodological skills in teaching non-language subjects through the medium of a foreign language. In 15 education systems, teachers are required to have additional qualifications for its application, the acceptable level of languages is B2 ("vantage" or upper intermediate) or C1 ("effective operational proficiency" or advanced) according to CEFR (European Commission et al., 2017a, pp. 14, 141).

One of the main indicators of language education is the attainment level for foreign languages. Most countries use CEFR to determine the comparable levels of foreign language training: communication skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) are mostly defined in the curricula of almost all countries.

The learning outcomes on CEFR is another indicator of the language education. Achievements in foreign languages (grades, exam results etc.) are recorded on the certificates on the completion of secondary education, although often not on CEFR scale. In almost all countries, at the end of the secondary education students receive certificates of foreign language proficiency. Only a few countries (Estonia, France, Latvia, Austria, Romania, Slovakia) use CEFR levels on the documents. At the same time, in 22 educational systems, national tests in foreign languages, taken by students at the end of secondary education, are built in accordance with CERF scale (European Commission et al., 2017a, p. 14–15).

The profile and qualification of foreign language teachers is an indicator as well. Some countries recommend generalists or specialized teachers that depends on the education level and the direction of general and vocational secondary education. In primary school and lower secondary education in some countries (Iceland, Norway, Serbia), generalists teach foreign languages. In general secondary education, languages are taught by specialized teachers

The issue of teacher training is considered in terms of their qualifications and mobility. The minimum level of qualification of specialized foreign language teachers is the same for all educational levels. However, there are several approaches such as: 16 countries require a master's degree; 12 consider a bachelor's degree sufficient; in the remaining 8 – the higher the educational level of the institution, the higher the minimum level of qualification required. In Spain, Hungary and Romania, a bachelor's degree is required for teaching in primary school and a master's degree in general secondary education. In Belgium (French and Flemish communities), Denmark, the Netherlands and Norway, a master's degree is a requirement for specialized teachers in general upper secondary education.

The teachers of lower secondary education from 19 European countries have been abroad for professional purposes while studying or working. 56.9% said that they had already been abroad for professional purposes. For non-language teachers, this figure is 19.6% (2013). The reasons for "immobility" are the lack of opportunities for short-term replacement and funding. The EU funding is the main support for foreign language teachers who went on professional trips abroad (EU Erasmus + program, 26.1%, 2013). Only 11.5% have been abroad on the account of national or regional programs. The international mobility of every fourth foreign language teacher is supported by the EU program.

Half of the teachers went abroad while receiving specialized language education. 60.4% (2013) of the teachers of lower secondary education who indicated their stay abroad for

professional purposes, mastered the language. More than half indicated staying abroad while studying. Only four countries (Ireland, France, the United Kingdom, Switzerland) recommend and require future language teachers visiting the country the language they specialize in. Other professional reasons for teachers of lower secondary education are accompanying students (46.3%), establishing contacts with schools (31.5%), teaching abroad (23.0%) (European Commission et al., 2017a, p. 15–16).

Language support for newly arrived migrant students to enter the education system is provided in several ways. One third of EU countries have basic guidelines for language testing for migrant students. Some countries (Greece, Cyprus, Latvia, Sweden, Norway) conduct language assessments (at least at certain educational levels). Belgium (Flemish Community), Croatia, Austria assess the language skills of all students, including migrants, at certain stages in order to identify the necessary assistance. In other countries, this is at the discretion of the autonomous activities of schools and institutions authorized to conduct the evaluation procedure.

The other ways of language support are to provide some intensive language classes for migrant students and, in some cases, adapted curricula from other disciplines to accelerate students' involvement in shared flows. Less than half of European countries practice intensive language training (1–2 years). The common practice of the countries is the integration of migrant students into the appropriate age classes, additional classes in the language of instruction, which students usually attend instead of other school hours. One third of European systems work through personalized teaching and an individualized curriculum; some educational systems provide the assistance directly in the classroom. Nine countries (Czech Republic, Germany, Austria, Slovenia, Finland, Sweden, Switzerland, Norway, Turkey) practise native language teaching and bilingual teaching.

Teacher training for migrant students takes place in several countries, although such classes require special skills. A quarter of the European countries have certain recommendations and requirements for teachers who work with migrant students who do not speak the language of instruction. Special qualifications in teaching a foreign language are considered extremely necessary. Only Denmark and Austria have started training teachers to integrate migrant students (European Commission et al., 2017a, p. 16; European Commission & Eurydice, 2017, p. 4).

The summarized results of the European Commission survey are the following:

- 1) inequality of access to mastering two foreign languages in vocational and general upper secondary education;
- 2) decisive factors in mastering foreign languages are the duration of studying and the quality of the language resource, the use of innovative pedagogical technologies and school organization, the employment of CLIL in addition to learning foreign languages;
- 3) the lack of research on the quality of foreign language teaching and students' achievement of the expected level; the problem of overcoming discrepancies between the actual achievement of the level of foreign languages and the expected level of achievement set by the educational institution;
- 4) the increase in migrants leads to an increase in the level of school multilingualism, which emphasizes the issues of diversity and inclusiveness; there is a question of inclusion in educational policy to address needs and promote inclusiveness and respect, and if impossible, attention to linguistic diversity.

The European Commission proposed the measures of solving these issues in terms of a holistic view of mastering foreign languages:

- recognizing the special needs of each student and responding to them to provide a significantly diverse cultural, linguistic and educational basis for newly arrived migrant students. Schools have to develop individualized curricula according to the learning and psychological

needs of each student so that they can learn and develop at their own pace, given their propensity in contrast to the standard trajectory of development;

– building a language-friendly school, as schools and classrooms are now multilingual. This linguistic capital is ignored and devalued in favor of other languages, especially the language of instruction. It is seen that a favorable climate for languages – all languages – can help improve traditional foreign language learning at school and encourage students to learn less common languages;

– building bridges between all languages in the curriculum. At present, all language groups (ancient languages, languages of instruction, other state languages, foreign languages, regional / lesser-used languages) are endowed with teaching time and curriculum, and accordingly qualified teachers work independently. A more comprehensive approach to language teaching – all languages – can contribute to the development of stronger meta-linguistic skills, which in turn can be useful for mastering foreign languages in general and foreign languages in particular;

– supporting teachers in their efforts to achieve the highest level of competence to meet the needs of each student, to seek innovative ways of teaching, flexibility in approaches. Encouraging teachers to continue their education and training, for foreign language teachers – helping them spend more time abroad to practice their language skills and expand their knowledge of the life and culture of the country the language is taught. The usefulness of increasing the number of such teachers is to help them build a language-friendly school and raise cultural awareness within the school community;

– in a globalized interconnected and rapidly evolving world, a growing number of people need to learn languages. Education authorities should encourage the transformation of schools into language-friendly environments where students can master at least two languages and develop a propensity to learn other languages in the future. Democratic and open societies cannot develop without fostering respect for diversity and inclusiveness in education. In this regard, teaching and learning the list of languages can be a powerful tool for integration and free movement for Europeans (EACEA et al., 2017, pp. 20–21; European Commission & Eurydice, 2017).

Taking into consideration all above, there is a table summerising the main trends in the language learning at schools in Ukraine (ISCED levels 1, 2 and 3) (Table 5).

Table 5

### Foreign language learning at schools in Ukraine

Indicators	Description
Foreign languages in the curriculum as compulsory subjects	Primary education – 2, lower secondary education – 2, upper secondary education – 2 (data is not available).
The range of languages studied	First language: English, German, French, Second language: German, French, Czech, Korean (depending on type of educational establishment) (data is not available).
CLIL	Ongoing process of introducing into education. (data is not available)
Expected levels for the first and second foreign languages	First language: primary education – A1, lower secondary education A1–B1, upper secondary education – B1–B2 (for advanced school programs); Second language: primary education – A1, lower secondary education A1, upper secondary education – A1–A2+. (data is not available).

Profile and qualification of foreign language teachers	Bachelor's degree, Master's degree (not available).
Transnational mobility of foreign language teachers	(not available).
Language support for newly arrived migrant students	Insured by the Laws of Ukraine (not available).

Source: Designed by author based on: Ministerstvo osvity i nauky Ukrainy, 2018; Ministerstvo osvity i nauky Ukrainy, 2020; Nikolska, 2019; Dzhurylo et al, 2016; Smirnova, 2021; Ozernyi, 2018; Topol, 2018; Horobets, 2021; Goethe Institut, 2017.

Ukraine, which has embarked on a path of changes in the education system and in the foreign language education, introduced New Ukrainian School reforms. Studying several languages in primary school (from an early age) has been introduced as well. The range of languages covers the most widely spoken, such as: English, German, French, Spanish, and others (depending on type of school).

CLIL has not been employed so far and is used selectively depending on opportunities, teaching and learning resources (subjects in the curricula, level of language skills, availability of teachers etc.).

The introduction of CEFR ensures synchronization of the national language standards for the first and second languages with the European ones, compliance with existing language tests (internal and external), application of teaching aids and development of national educational publishing sector. The expected levels of achievement for the first foreign language and the second foreign language are not indicated on the certificate for the secondary education. Inequality in mastering foreign languages of general and vocational students is still the problem to be dealt with.

The issue of profile and qualification of foreign language teachers is gradually gaining priority, although it has not been solved so far. The international mobility of foreign language teachers remains a problem since it requires significant funding, which is not always available; but the cooperation and trainings of different cultural centers for foreign language teachers were introduced as the most effective way to improve the situation.

A special feature of the range is the language support for newly arrived migrant students. Although with the existing legislation for the rights and freedoms in education of Ukraine, there is a gradual but insufficient introduction of the foreign languages in laws and practice.

The analysis of available sources allows us to summarize that many of the issues mentioned above in the national context require more research and statistical generalizations for the further development of analytical and strategic conclusions.

## CONCLUSIONS

Thus, based on the above we have to admit that Europe goes on developing and implementing the policy for multicultural and multilingual society through the educational system where schools are the main tool for the further social transformation.

The main trends in language mastering in schools in Europe are as follows:

1. Two or three foreign languages in the curriculum but VET students learn fewer foreign languages than their counterparts in general education;
2. The range of languages studied is influenced by the language situation and encompasses the widely spoken ones (English, French, German, Spanish);
3. CLIL is used but not well enough to employ its potential in teaching;

4. The expected levels for the first and second foreign languages are B2 and A1–A2–B1 accordingly, for the third foreign language A1–A2–B1; the results are determined on CEFR but rarely indicated on the certificates;

5. The goals for foreign language teachers are further training and transnational mobility;  
6. To provide language support for newly arrived migrant students.

Among the further exploration, the European Commission suggested the following issues, among them:

- acknowledging each learner's specific needs and responding to them;
- building language friendly schools;
- building bridges between all languages in the curriculum;
- supporting teachers in their efforts to reach the highest level of competence.

The main data of the research provide a basis for generalizing the following positions:

1) inequality of access to mastering two foreign languages in vocational and general secondary education in favor of the latter;

2) decisive factors in mastering foreign languages are the duration of mastering and the quality of the implemented language resource, the use of innovative pedagogical technologies and school organization, the use of CLIL in addition to learning foreign languages to help overcome the problem;

3) lack of research on the quality of foreign language teaching and students' achievement of the expected level; the problem of overcoming discrepancies between the actual achievement of the level of foreign languages and the expected level of achievement set by the educational institution;

4) the increase in migrants leads to an increase in the level of school multilingualism, which emphasizes the issues of diversity / diversification and inclusiveness; there is a question of inclusion in educational policy to address needs and promote inclusiveness and respect, and if impossible, attention to linguistic diversity.

As to the situation in Ukraine, we must admit that the political changes in national foreign policy turned the attention of the community to the importance of language learning. The national educational policy worked out according to the European values has been introduced and gave a good start with the New Ukrainian School Reform.

The school language policy supported by the national laws has been introduced in accordance with the European requirements such as:

- two languages in school education including the early start of the first language;
- the range of languages: English, German, French and others if available;
- CLIL is rarely introduced;
- the expected levels for the first and second foreign languages – B1 (B2) and A1 (A2+);
- qualification and transnational mobility of foreign language teachers has been increased through training and webinars:
  - language support for newly arrived migrant students in the national laws and within the state education system needs improvements.

To sum up, language learning in Ukraine has started its development and improvement in schools but it needs further studying and analysing as data is not available.

## REFERENCES

Barcelona European Council. (2002). Presidency Conclusions. SN 100/1/02 REV 1 (March 15 and 16, 2002), §44. December 12, 2021 from [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/71025.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/71025.pdf)

Commission of the European Communities. (2011). *Progress towards the common European*

- objectives in education and training indicators and benchmarks 2010/2011. [https://www.academia.edu/22600999/PROGRESS\\_TOWARDS\\_THE\\_COMMON\\_EUROPEAN\\_OBJECTIVES\\_IN\\_EDUCATION\\_AND\\_TRAINING\\_Indicators\\_and\\_benchmarks](https://www.academia.edu/22600999/PROGRESS_TOWARDS_THE_COMMON_EUROPEAN_OBJECTIVES_IN_EDUCATION_AND_TRAINING_Indicators_and_benchmarks)
- Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture (European Commission), ECORYS, Day, L., & Meierkord, A. (2017). *Rethinking language education and linguistic diversity in schools Thematic report from a programme of expert workshops and peer learning activities (2016–17)*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2766/584023>
- Domilescu, G., & Lungoci, C. S. (2019). Strengthening European Identity by promoting multilingualism in education. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 40(2), 57–65. <https://doi.org/10.35923/jes.2019.2.05>
- Dzhurylo, A. P., Hlushko, O. Z., & Lokshyna, O. I., Mariuts, I. O., Tymenko, M. M., and Shparyk, O. M. (2018). *Transformatsiini protsesy u shkilnii osviti krain Yevropeiskoho Soiuzu ta SSHa: monohrafiia*. TOV «KONVI PRINT». <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/163088295.pdf>
- Dzhurylo, A. P., Mariuts, I. O., & Shparyk, O. M. (2016). Pro navchannia anhliiskoi movy v krainakh YeS. *Ukrainskyi Pedahohichnyi Zhurnal*, 1, 6–15. <http://uej.undip.org.ua/upload/iblock/d03/d033eff40517cc1645fd0b1d251c48b3.pdf>
- EACEA, Baidak, N., Balcon, M.-P., & Motiejunaite, A. (2017). *Eurydice brief. Key data on teaching languages at school in Europe – 2017 edition*. Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency. <https://doi.org/10.2797/828497>
- European Commission & Directorate-General for Education and Culture. (2016, December). *PISA 2015: EU performance and initial conclusions regarding education policies in Europe*. [https://www.academia.edu/30853632/PISA\\_2015\\_EU\\_performance\\_and\\_initial\\_conclusions\\_regarding\\_education\\_policies\\_in\\_Europe](https://www.academia.edu/30853632/PISA_2015_EU_performance_and_initial_conclusions_regarding_education_policies_in_Europe)
- European Commission & Eurydice. (2017). *Eurydice Highlights. Key data on teaching languages at school in Europe – 2017 edition*. EACEA. <https://doi.org/10.2797/62028>
- European Commission and OECD, Ainley, J., & Carstens, R. (2018, November). *Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) 2018 Conceptual Framework*. OECD [https://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=EDU/WKP\(2018\)23&docLanguage=En](https://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=EDU/WKP(2018)23&docLanguage=En)
- European Commission, EACEA, & Eurydice. (2017a). *Key data on teaching languages at school in Europe – 2017 Edition. Eurydice Report*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2797/839825>
- European Commission. (2012, June). *Europeans and their languages. Special Eurobarometer (386 / Wave EB 77.1)*. TNS Option & Social. <https://europa.eu/eurobarometer/surveys/detail/1049>
- European commission. (n.d.). *Multilingual classrooms*. An Official Website of the European Union. Retrieved December 22, 2021, from <https://education.ec.europa.eu/levels/school/multilingual-classrooms>
- European Union. (2018). Council recommendation of 22 May 2018 on key competences for lifelong learning. *Official Journal of the European Union*, C 189/1. [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018H0604\(01\)&from=EN](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018H0604(01)&from=EN)
- Goethe Institut. (2017, October 30). *Predmetno-movne intehrovane navchannia nimetskoi movy*. Retrieved December 14, 2021, from <https://www.goethe.de/ins/ua/uk/spr/unt/kum/ciu.html>
- Horobets, A. (2021, May 15). *Metodyka CLIL yak zasib realizatsii intehrovanoho pidkhodu Novoi ukrainskoi shkoly. NUSH: osoblyvosti orhanizatsii navchalnogo protsesu*. Na Urok. Retrieved December 14, 2021, from <https://naurok.com.ua/post/metodika-clil-yak-zasib-realizacii-integrovanogo-pidkhodu-novo-ukra-nsko-shkoli>



- Jones, M. P. (2013). *Endangered languages and linguistic diversity in the European Union*. Directorate-General for internal policies. European Parliament. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/note/join/2013/495851/IPOL-CULT\\_NT\(2013\)495851\\_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/note/join/2013/495851/IPOL-CULT_NT(2013)495851_EN.pdf)
- Konstytutsiia Ukrainy (1996). 254к/96-VR. (2020). Baza danykh «Zakonodavstvo Ukrainy» / VR Ukrainy. Retrieved 2021 from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/main/254%D0%BA/96-%D0%B2%D1%80#Text>
- Kremen, V., Liashenko, O., & Lokshyna, O. (2020). General secondary education in Ukraine in the context of education in other European countries: duration and structure. *Education: Modern Discourses*, 3, 28–41. <https://doi.org/10.37472/2617-3107-2020-3-03>
- Le Pichon-Vorstman, E., Siarova, H., & Szönyi, E. (2020). *The future of language education in Europe Case studies of innovative practices: executive summary*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2766/81169>
- Lokshyna, O. (2019). Stratehichni oriientyry mizhnarodnykh orhanizatsii u haluzi osvity. *Ukrainskyi Pedahohichnyi Zhurnal*, 2, 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.32405/2411-1317-2019-2-5-14>
- Lokshyna, O. I., Dzhurylo, A. P., Maksymenko, O. O., & Shparyk, O. M. (2021). Yevropeiska i svitova intehtratsiia u sferi osvity – shliakh do pidvyshchennia osvitnoi yakosti. In V. H. Kremen (Ed.), *Natsionalna dopovid pro stan i perspektyvy rozvytku osvity v Ukraini* (pp. 134–141). Natsionalna akademiia pedahohichnykh nauk Ukrainy. <https://doi.org/10.37472/NAES-2021-ua>
- Maksymenko, O. (2015). Orhanizatsiia ta zmist navchannia suchasnykh inozemnykh mov u lantsi serednoi osvity Velykoi Brytanii. *Naukovi Zapysky. Seriia: Pedahohichni Nauky*, 135, 161–166. <https://www.cuspu.edu.ua/images/download-files/naukovi-zapysky/v135.pdf>
- Ministerstvo osvity i nauky Ukrainy. (2018, February 27). *Pro orhanizatsiiu ta provedennia pidhotovky vchyteliv inozemnykh mov, yaki navchatymut uchniv pershykh klasiv u 2018–2019 navchalnomu rotsi, zakladamy pislidiplomnoi pedahohichnoi osvity do vykladannia inozemnykh mov (anhliiskoi, nimetskoi ta frantsuzkoi) vidpovidno do kontseptsii «Nova ukrainska shkola»*. Retrieved December 14, 2021 from <https://mon.gov.ua/ua/npa/pro-organizaciyu-ta-provedennya-pidgotovki-vchyteliv-inozemnih-mov>
- Ministerstvo osvity i nauky Ukrainy. (2020, August). *Instruktyvno-metodychni rekomendatsii shchodo vykladannia navchalnykh predmetiv u zakladakh zahalnoi serednoi osvity u 2020/2021 navchalnomu rotsi*. Retrieved December 14, 2021 from <https://mon.gov.ua/storage/app/uploads/public/5f4/cae/d10/5f4caed10f675968632995.pdf>
- Nikolska, N. (2019). Bilinhvalna osvita shkolariv yak predmet doslidzhennia vitchyznianskykh uchenykh. *Pedahohichnyi Dyskurs*, 26, 14–18. <https://doi.org/10.31475/ped.dys.2019.26.02>
- OECD, Marconi, G., Campos Cascales, C., Covacevich, C., & Halgreen, T. (2020, October). *What matters for language learning? The questionnaire framework for the PISA 2025 foreign language assessment* (No. 234). OECD. <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/5e06e820-en.pdf?expires=1640095750&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=63E50362D898A1BF67F81A0C6CFC95C5>
- OECD. (2017). *Education at a glance 2017: OECD Indicators* (pp. 340–341). OECD Publishing. [https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2017\\_eag-2017-en](https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2017_eag-2017-en)
- OECD. (2021, November). *PISA in focus: The socio-economic gap in foreign-language learning* (No. 116). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/22260919>
- Ozernyi, D. (2018, June 20). *Yak tse – suchasno vykladaty inozemni movy*. Nova Ukrainska Shkola. Retrieved December 14, 2021, from <https://nus.org.ua/view/yak-tse-suchasno-vykladyty-inozemni-movy/>
- Prezydent Ukrainy (2010, 15 liutoho). *Pro Kontseptsiiu derzhavnoi movnoi polityky*. № 161/2010. Retrieved December 12, 2021 from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/161/2010#Text>



- RATING Pro. (2016, August 8). *Stavlennia ukrainsiv do inozemnykh mov*. Retrieved December 14, 2021 from [http://ratingpro.org/research/doslidzhennya\\_stavlennya\\_ukrainciv\\_do\\_inozemnih\\_mov.html](http://ratingpro.org/research/doslidzhennya_stavlennya_ukrainciv_do_inozemnih_mov.html)
- Razumkov.Org.Ua. (2016, December 16). *Konsolidatsiia ukrainskoho suspilstva: Shliakhy, vyklyky, perspektyvy // Informatsiino-analitychni materialy do fakhovoi diskusii 16 hrudnia 2016*. [Consolidation of Ukrainian society: ways, challenges, prospects // Information and analytical materials for the Professional Discussion December 16, 2016]. Retrieved December 14, 2021, from <http://razumkov.org.ua/upload/Identi-2016.pdf>
- Smirnova, K. (2021, February 9). *Typova osvithnia prohrama VS vyvchennia inozemnykh mov*. Osvita.Ua. Retrieved December 14, 2021, from <http://osvita.ua/school/reform/80170/>
- Stoicheva, M. (2021). What policy of multilingualism can foster European identity formation? *Politeja*, 12(5 (37)), 107–121. <https://doi.org/10.12797/politeja.12.2015.37.08>
- Topol, V. (2018, February 1). *Yak navchatymut vchyteliv inozemnykh mov, yaki vykladatymut u pershykh klasakh*. Nova Ukrainska Shkola. Retrieved December 14, 2021 from <https://nus.org.ua/articles/yak-navchatymut-vchyteliv-inozemnyh-mov-yaki-vykladatymut-u-pershyh-klasah/>
- Topuzov, O. M. (2015). Zabezpechennia yakosti zahalnoi serednoi osvity: na shliakhu do yevropeyskykh standartiv [The guarantee of the quality of the comprehensive secondary education: on the way to the European standards]. *Ukrainskyi Pedahohichnyi Zhurnal*, 1, 16–27. <http://uej.undip.org.ua/upload/iblock/ad5/ad589f5297fee780771e77d6a000f847.pdf>
- Ukrainska mova v Ukraini. (2020, July 30). In *Uk.Wikipedia*. [https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%A3%D0%BA%D1%80%D0%B0%D1%97%D0%BD%D1%81%D1%8C%D0%BA%D0%B0\\_%D0%BC%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B0\\_%D0%B2\\_%D0%A3%D0%BA%D1%80%D0%B0%D1%97%D0%BD%D1%96](https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%A3%D0%BA%D1%80%D0%B0%D1%97%D0%BD%D1%81%D1%8C%D0%BA%D0%B0_%D0%BC%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B0_%D0%B2_%D0%A3%D0%BA%D1%80%D0%B0%D1%97%D0%BD%D1%96)
- Zakon Ukrainy «Pro osvitu». (2017). 2145-VIII. (2021). Baza danykh «Zakonodavstvo Ukrainy» / VR Ukrainy. Retrieved 2021 from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19#Text>
- Zakon Ukrainy «Pro povnu zahalnu seredniu osvitu». (2020). 463-IX. (2021). Baza danykh «Zakonodavstvo Ukrainy» / VR Ukrainy. Retrieved 2021 from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/463-20#Text>
- Zakon Ukrainy «Pro zabezpechennia funktsionuvannia ukrainskoi movy yak derzhavnoi». (2019). № 2704-VIII. Retrieved December 12, 2021 from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2704-19>