



## ESCalate Themed Funding: Work Based Learning Grant Project Interim Report

---

<b>Date submitted</b>	31 August 2011
<b>Project Title</b>	An investigation into the impact and effectiveness of beginning and early career primary teachers, trained on a work-based learning route, in the delivery of primary languages at Key Stage 2
<b>Project Leader</b>	Prof Vivienne Griffiths
<b>Institution</b>	Canterbury Christ Church University
<b>Partners</b>	1. Sally Dudley, Department of Education, University of Sussex
<b>Project Start date</b>	1 December 2010
<b>Project End date</b>	31 December 2011

---



## **ESCalate Themed Funding: Work Based Learning Grant Project Interim Report**

**Project title** An investigation into the impact and effectiveness of beginning and early career primary teachers, trained on a work-based learning route, in the delivery of primary languages at Key Stage 2

### **1. Project detail**

Project leader: Professor Vivienne Griffiths

Project manager: Dr Carol Tingey

Research Fellow: Dr Manuela Thomae

Consultants: Dr Patricia Driscoll and Kerry Jordan-Daus

Institution: Canterbury Christ Church University

Partners: Sally Dudley, University of Sussex

Project start date: 1 December 2010

Project end date: 31 December 2011

Project aims:

- To investigate the effectiveness of beginning and early career primary teachers, trained on the Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP), in delivering primary languages at Key Stage 2, including impact on the primary curriculum, classroom delivery, teaching resources and pupil assessment.
- To identify what factors affect the successful delivery of primary languages, such as GTP institution, training in primary languages, school context, leadership and support, existing languages provision, further professional development opportunities in schools and local authorities, links to local Pathfinder projects.
- To highlight ways in which GTP provision in primary languages can be enhanced, and how employing schools can best build on this in primary teachers' early careers.

### **2. Outline of progress to date**

#### **2.1 Pilot study**

A pilot study was carried out with a small, highly rated, local authority-led primary GTP in order to try out the questionnaire with trainee teachers (N = 21) and conduct focus group interviews. Following the pilot study, the wording of some of the questionnaire questions was altered slightly to avoid ambiguity.

#### **2.2 Contacting GTP providers**

Ten university-led primary GTP providers, highly rated by Ofsted, were contacted by the project team to invite their participation in the project. An information sheet was sent to each institution and follow up emails or telephone calls were also made. Five providers agreed to participate. The final sample

represents a geographical spread (2 south, 2 Midlands, 1 outer London). The providers in the north of England who were contacted declined to take part. The size of the GTP primary provision varied from 25 trainees to over 100. See also section 4 for details of the impact of this stage of the research on the original project plan.

## 2.3 Online survey

An online survey was set up on Bristol Online (the preferred online site of the host institution). The participating providers agreed to disseminate the links to the online surveys to their GTP trainee teachers and GTP-trained early career teachers. With three of the providers, direct visits were made by one of the project team, in order to administer the questionnaires directly to GTP trainees; the responses were then uploaded online. Although time-consuming, this enabled a greater number of responses to be collected, because the project team member was able to explain the project directly to the trainee teachers, meet course leaders or tutors in person and carry out focus group interviews. It was not possible to arrange direct visits to all the providers or to meet the early career teachers at this stage.

The responses so far, excluding the pilot study, are: 160 trainee teachers (72% f, 28% m); and 46 early career teachers (94% f, 6% m). Of the teachers, 23 (50%) are NQTs and 21 (46%) in their 2<sup>nd</sup> year of teaching, with one each in their 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> years of teaching. Details by provider are shown in Table 1 and by age in Table 2.

Table 1 Survey responses

<b>GTP provider</b>	<b>No. of trainees</b>	<b>No. of teachers</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Pilot provider	21	-	21
Provider 1	74	10	84
Provider 2	22	0	22
Provider 3	48	0	48
Provider 4	15	32	47
Provider 5	1	4	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	160 (78%)	46 (22%)	206

Table 2 Ages of survey respondents

<b>Age</b>	<b>Trainees</b>	<b>Teachers</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
20-30	70 (44%)	14 (30%)	84 (41%)
30-40	45 (28%)	9 (20%)	54 (26%)
40-50	29 (18%)	11 (24%)	40 (20%)
50-60	2 (1%)	7 (15%)	9 (4%)
Unknown	14 (9%)	5 (11%)	19 (9%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	160	46	206

There are some interesting differences between the age profiles of the two groups. Even allowing for the number of years in teaching, the age profile of those who trained 1-4 years ago is older than those currently training, perhaps reflecting the fact that the minimum age for entry to a GTP, previously 24, has now been removed. The lowest age of a trainee is 22 and the highest 55.

## 2.4 Initial analysis of trainee teacher survey findings

### 2.4.1 Language knowledge and competence

If we look at language knowledge across the sample (Table 3), just under three quarters (73%) of the total sample can speak two or more languages, with one third (34%) knowing three or more languages. However, looked at another way, over one quarter (27%) of the trainees and teachers only know one language; in 99% cases this first language is English (Table 4).

Table 3 Numbers of languages spoken

<b>Nos. languages</b>	<b>Trainee</b>	<b>Teacher</b>	<b>TOTAL (%)</b>
-----------------------	----------------	----------------	------------------

spoken incl. 1 <sup>st</sup>			
1 <sup>st</sup> lang. only	45 (28%)	10 (22%)	55 (27%)
2	60 (38%)	21 (46%)	81 (39%)
3	39 (24%)	13 (28%)	52 (25%)
4	13 (8%)	2 (4%)	15 (7%)
5	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	3 (2%)
TOTAL	160	46	206

Table 4 Diversity and level of language competence:

Language	Fluent		Good		Basic		Totals (%)
	Trainee	Teacher	Trainee	Teacher	Trainee	Teacher	
1st lang English	160	44	-	-	-	-	204 (99%)
1st lang other	0	2	-	-	-	-	2 (1%)
French	1	1	14	5	64	21	106 (51%)
German	0	0	2	2	30	8	42 (20%)
Spanish	0	0	2	2	21	2	27 (13%)
Other, incl. Urdu, Punjabi	9	3	12	3	16	1	44 (21%)

Table 4 also shows that, while just over half (51%) have some knowledge of French, on self-rating, 81% of those consider their knowledge to be basic, with only 19% self-rating good or fluent. Overall, 26 languages are known at some level across the sample. If we look within the 'other' category, there is a range of community languages, including most commonly Urdu and Punjabi, and people who speak these often self-identify as bilingual. World languages such as Arabic, Japanese and Chinese also feature in this category, but with only very small numbers. Thus, we can see on an initial analysis that the range of languages spoken represent a good resource for the primary classroom, but the level of competence in languages is generally at a basic level. Only 4 (2%) people in the sample have language degrees, therefore specialist language knowledge is rare within this generalist sample.

#### 2.4.2 Languages on GTP

All the providers have university sessions on languages as part of their GTP, often joining with primary PGCEs for this; three have whole day sessions and two have half day. However, at the time of completing the questionnaire, one of the providers had not yet had their session, which skewed the results. Sessions consist largely of brief background on primary languages, practical ideas to use in schools and introduction to useful materials and online resources. The focus language is usually French, though two providers cover several languages. The two language tutors interviewed so far commented that the session length was far too short to do justice to the topic. Most trainees and teachers found the sessions useful and enjoyable, although two trainees commented that they had missed the languages input because of going to an interview and three teachers said they had little memory of the session. 16% (16% trainees, 17% teachers) have had school session on languages (e.g. MFL school inset) and have generally found these valuable.

#### 2.4.3 Primary languages observed in schools

It can be seen from Table 5 that three quarters (76%) of the sample have observed languages being taught as a separate subject in schools, while half (50%) have observed an integrated approach. Smaller numbers have observed a cross-curricular, thematic approach (20%), after school clubs (16%) and other approaches (10%), such as day trips to France.

Table 5 Observing and teaching languages in school

Mode	Observing language teaching			Teaching languages		
	Trainees	Teachers	Total %	Teachers		Trainees
Separate	118 (74%)	39 (85%)	76%	13 (28%)	Yes	86 (54%)
Cross-Curricular	30 (19%)	12 (26%)	20%	5 (11%)	No	72 (45%)

<b>Integrated</b>	83 (52%)	20 (43%)	50%	22 (48%)	<b>N/a</b>	2 (1%)
<b>After school</b>	22 (14%)	11 (24%)	16%	2 (4%)		
<b>Other</b>	11 (7%)	10 (22%)	10%	10 (22%)		

It could be argued that the predominance of separate subject teaching, usually French, could be limiting to multi-ethnic schools. However, the integrated and thematic approaches reported by trainees and teachers often involve several languages, including community languages. Much of the separate teaching is done by visiting specialists.

#### **2.4.4. Teaching primary languages**

It is encouraging that over half (54%) of trainees have had the opportunity to teach some languages, mostly using an integrated approach, such as the register, counting or songs: e.g. 'Have taken register myself in French, Russian & Latin', or thematic approaches. Some have helped other teachers with this, while a few have taken specialist lessons on their own: e.g. 'I use French instruction on a daily basis and I always take the register in a wide range of languages.' Just under half (48%) of teachers have used integrated approaches, with 28% teaching languages as a separate subject. Problems cited include lack of relevant resources or lack of adequate support.

#### **2.5 Interviews and case studies**

The research fellow has started to carry out interviews with trainee teachers: so far she has completed seven by telephone or email, with others lined up over the next few weeks. She will also try to contact GTP-trained teachers. Two case studies are already lined up for next term and it is hoped to identify three more from the forthcoming interviews. See also Section 4.

#### **2.6 Dissemination activities**

Dissemination of initial findings was carried out by the project director at the TEAN conference in May 2011. She will present further findings at the BERA conference in September 2011.

#### **3. Future stages/developments toward completion of the project**

The main activities to follow are case study visits to schools to see teachers teaching languages and interview headteachers and other staff about language teaching approaches. See 2.5.

#### **4. Any impacts on the original project plan, content and/or time-scale**

It took longer than anticipated (three months) contacting GTP providers and obtaining their agreement to participate in the project, which delayed the start of the online survey. Once we had agreement, the collection of data was relatively quick. Likewise, it has taken us longer than we anticipated to set up interviews. Although a quarter of the sample expressed initial agreement to take part in an interview, most were unavailable when first contacted, probably because of the intensity of GTP timetables.