Every language matters

An evaluation of the extent and impact of initial training to teach a wider range of world languages

The report evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of initial teacher training in languages other than French, German, Irish, Spanish and Welsh. The report has been produced at a time when numbers of pupils taking languages at GCSE level are falling but schools are being encouraged to take on a wider range of world languages. It describes good practice in training and teaching.

Contents

Executive summary

The initial purpose of this survey was to evaluate the provision and impact of postgraduate certificate in education (PGCE) courses for intending teachers of languages other than French, German, Irish, Spanish, and Welsh. The survey was extended to examine the reasons behind the lack of provision and uptake of PGCE courses and alternative training routes. The survey is set against a background of inspection which shows consistently high results at GCSE level in community languages and yet a wide variety in the quality of teaching. The Government's review of languages in 2006, chaired by Lord Dearing, described community languages as a 'national asset.'

During the academic year 2006/07, inspectors visited eight providers of initial teacher training, interviewed current and former trainees and observed teaching in schools. Discussions were held with staff in 20 schools and colleges with high numbers of GCSE entries in community languages. The term 'community languages' is used in the report where the majority of the learners have an affinity with the language through their ethnic background. However, they may not be able to speak or read it fluently.[1]

Senior staff in schools were positive about the impact of PGCE training on the quality of the teaching of their community languages teachers. This was particularly because of their skills in information and communication technology (ICT), teaching methods, assessment and ability to manage behaviour. Despite these advantages, just over one in five of these teachers had a PGCE. Over half of the 134 teachers in the survey who were teaching community languages did not have qualified teacher status. Of those who did, half had gained it in a subject other than languages. Not all the languages teachers interviewed were convinced of the importance of training, especially if the language they taught was their first language.

There are few PGCE courses to teach community languages. In parts of England where community languages are widely taught in schools, no such courses are available. In 2006/07, there were only 35 trainees nationally studying to teach Arabic, Bengali, Japanese, Mandarin, Panjabi, Turkish, or Urdu with one of five initial teacher training providers. No courses exist for training to teach Gujarati, although 1,025 pupils studied this at GCSE level in 2006. Trainees have little or no choice over the location of courses and this reduces the number of applicants. The requirement that potential trainees should be able to teach a European language also deters applicants. Although extension courses in French and German are available, few community languages teachers have taken these.

Providers of initial teacher training that offered full-time PGCE courses found it more difficult to recruit trainees than those that offered flexible courses. All the initial

---

[1] Further definitions of 'community languages' are given in the notes. The survey sought users' views on the use of the term and its merits or disadvantages.

teacher training providers inspected found it hard to find suitable school placements. Half the community languages teachers in the survey with qualified teacher status had trained to teach another subject, usually the subject of their degree. Few suitable degree courses for potential language teachers are available, particularly in Bengali, Gujarati, Panjabi and Urdu.

The graduate teacher programme offers a successful alternative employment-based training route. However, over a quarter of the teachers surveyed who had trained through this route had done so in a subject other than the language they were teaching.

The *Languages review* chaired by Lord Dearing for the former Department of Education and Skills (DfES) referred to the need to respond to the growing economies of India and China.[2] The survey revealed that although a field of potential trainees appears to exist, not all of them can take initial teacher training until more placements are found in schools. Schools, in turn, may not provide additional courses in community languages if they are not confident that they can recruit staff to teach them.

The report makes a number of recommendations in order to stem the decline in the number of entries for GCSE community languages and to promote them up to and beyond GCSE level. In particular, it recommends that all community languages teachers should be given the opportunity to achieve qualified teacher status by the most appropriate route. Providers should extend the range of available PGCE courses and languages and review their admissions criteria and course structures to make sure unintentional barriers do not deter potential applicants. The report recommends that training institutions should be well informed about which languages are taught in schools. They will then be better able to identify schools they can work with in partnership to train languages teachers.

Key findings

- The number of PGCE courses in community languages is limited. Only eight providers of initial teacher training offer PGCE courses in community languages and take up on such courses was low. Three providers had no trainees on their courses in 2006/07.

- The majority of community languages teachers surveyed did not have qualified teacher status. Just over a quarter of them were qualified in the UK to teach languages. Barely a fifth had a PGCE in any subject.

- Flexible courses that offered training in a trainee's chosen language were more successful than full-time courses in attracting applicants.

---

[2] *Languages review* (00212-2007/ISBN 978-1-84478-907-8), DfES, 2007.

- The most effective PGCE courses provided each trainee with additional training in the languages they were intending to teach by skilled tutors who were specialists in those languages.

- Prospective PGCE trainees wishing to follow courses in community languages faced significant barriers. These included the limited range of languages, the location of training and the requirement that they should also be able to teach a European language to at least Key Stage 3.

- Information about languages taught in schools was not easily available to providers, adding to the difficulties of finding suitable placements for prospective trainees. One provider had to turn down applicants who met all the criteria for admission to the course. Information about PGCE courses for community languages was not widely known or was conflicting.

- The quality of teaching by teachers who had a PGCE in community languages was consistently good. Detailed planning, good provision for different groups, good knowledge of ICT and stimulating activities that engaged and enthused learners characterised this teaching.

- The graduate teacher programme provided a successful employment-based route into teaching. However, five of the 16 teachers in the survey who trained via this route had to qualify to teach in a subject other than a community language because no one was available to assess them.

- In six of the 17 schools in the survey that taught both European languages and community languages, community languages were not given equal status with the European languages in terms of curriculum provision and resources allocated to them.

Recommendations

The Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) should:

- provide a wider range of national web-based resources for languages beyond French, German and Spanish.

The Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) should:

- ensure that all community languages teachers have the opportunity to achieve qualified teacher status
- provide clear guidance to initial teacher training institutions on how to make flexible courses available to PGCE languages applicants
- consider how PGCE language courses might offer a wider range of languages than French, German and Spanish and how to accord them equal status
- review how PGCE courses are advertised and ensure that communities are better informed about the courses offered.

Providers of initial teacher training should:

- review admissions criteria so that PGCE language courses admit applicants without a European language
- ensure that PGCE courses provide specific language skills training alongside generic training
- ensure that they are well informed about which languages are taught in schools, so that a wider range of languages can be offered in placements by partner schools.

Background and context

1. The survey aimed to find out whether training through a PGCE route, which is rarely accessible for potential teachers of community languages, has a positive impact on the quality of teaching. It also aimed to assess the quality of provision when alternative or no training programmes exist for teachers.

2. The Nuffield Languages Inquiry (1998–2000) was set up to review the UK's capability in languages. At that time, it was asked to consider the following questions and to make recommendations.

- What capability in languages will the UK need in the next 20 years if it is to fulfil its economic, strategic, social and cultural aims and responsibilities, and the aspirations of its citizens?
- To what extent do present policies and arrangements meet these needs?
- What strategic planning and initiatives will be required in the light of the present position?

3. In its final report, the Nuffield Inquiry wrote that schools and colleges:

    '... do not provide an adequate range of languages... we teach a narrowing range of languages at a time when we should be doing the opposite... university departments which train language teachers are threatened with closure.'[3]

4. The report recommended that the minister responsible for the recruitment of teachers should carry out a series of radical short-term measures to attract more language teachers.

5. The response of the DfES in 2002 was *Languages for all, languages for life: a strategy for England*.[4] It proposed a national strategy for languages which led

---

[3] *Languages: the next generation* (ISBN 1902985028), Final report of the Nuffield Languages Inquiry, 2000.
[4] *Languages for all, languages for life: a strategy for England* (0748-2002), DfES, 2002.

Every language matters

to establishing the Key Stage 3 framework for teaching modern foreign languages and the Key Stage 2 framework for languages.

6.   In 2003, prompted, among other things, by the need to find time for vocational education, the DfES announced that, from September 2004 languages became an entitlement rather than a compulsory subject at Key Stage 4. This decision was taken because it was felt the large number of compulsory subjects at Key Stage 4, including modern foreign languages, left too little flexibility for work-related and vocational learning. This entitlement means that all schools must provide the opportunity to study a modern foreign language to all pupils who wish to do so:

> 'Schools must provide the opportunity for all students at Key Stage 4 to take a minimum of one course in a language that leads to a qualification approved under Section 96 of the Learning and Skills Act 2000. Schools must provide access to at least one such course in an official working language of the European Union but may in addition offer courses in any other language that leads to an approved qualification.'[5]

7.   In 2006, the Government ordered a further review of languages, chaired by Lord Dearing. His report, published in 2007, as with the Nuffield Inquiry six years earlier, recommended widening the range of languages that schools could offer, although they would be 'predominantly French, German and Spanish'. [6] As a result, the new secondary curriculum has removed the requirement to offer a working language of the European Union at Key Stage 3.[7] This will be replaced by guidance which states that the study of languages 'may include major European or world languages, such as Arabic, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Mandarin, Russian, Spanish and Urdu'. The report described community languages as 'a national asset'.

Impact of initial teacher training on languages provision in schools

Languages in secondary schools

8.   In addition to French, German, Irish, Spanish and Welsh, it is possible to study any one of 16 other languages at GCSE and A level: Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Dutch, Gujarati, Italian, Japanese, Modern Greek, Modern Hebrew, Panjabi, Persian, Portuguese, Polish, Russian, Turkish and Urdu (Appendix 1).[8] After

---

[5] Languages in key Stage 4, DfES, 2004.
[6] *Languages review* (00212-2007/ISBN 978-1-84478-907-8), DfES, 2007.
[7] The current requirement that schools must offer at least one European Union language at Key Stage 4 will be removed from September 2008 in line with the changes at Key Stage 3.
[8] Examination boards do not distinguish between modern foreign languages and community languages.

French, German and Spanish, the most popular languages in terms of the number of GCSE entries are Urdu, Italian and Chinese (Appendix 2). However, most of the GCSE entries for Chinese come from independent rather than maintained schools (Appendix 3). In terms of the number of GCSE entries, seven of the 10 least popular subjects are languages (Appendix 4).

9.   With this range of languages potentially available for study in secondary schools, it is important to consider the nature and extent of staffing and teachers' qualifications to teach these languages.

Qualifications of teachers

10.   Only one quarter of the teachers surveyed had a teaching qualification in languages. Just 63 of the 134 teachers of Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Hebrew, Japanese, Panjabi, Turkish and Urdu had qualified teacher status. Of these 63, 33 had qualified to teach in languages; the rest had qualified in another subject. The reasons for this are discussed below.

11.   Of the 63 teachers in the survey who had qualified teacher status, 29 had a PGCE. The majority of these were in languages; the remainder were in other subjects, including ICT, science and mathematics. Sixteen of the 63 qualified through the graduate teacher programme.

Schools' views

12.   Schools' views of the importance of qualifications were mixed. Nationally, GCSE results in community languages are very high compared with French, German, Spanish and other subjects, especially where pupils have previous knowledge of the languages they are studying. Schools in the survey did not all agree on the importance of training. Three people interviewed were not persuaded. One head of department said of her unqualified community language teachers: 'They can pick it up as they go along.' An unqualified teacher of Arabic said:

> 'It's not necessary to get a qualification. The level at GCSE is easy for me to teach. I can read the Arabic script – I don't need to learn how to teach it.'

13.   Most of the schools, however, recognised the value of initial teacher training. Nine of the 20 schools in the telephone survey employed one or more community language teachers who had a PGCE. Senior managers in schools with PGCE-qualified teachers were especially positive about the benefits of PGCE courses for their staff. They raised the status of the languages in the school, realised the full potential of advanced learners, and developed teaching methodology that engaged pupils and encouraged beginners from other ethnic backgrounds to learn. Qualified teachers had a good knowledge of ICT and effective classroom management skills. Their qualifications also provided potential career progression. In supporting the case for training, one head of

department said: 'Just because you speak the lingo, [it] doesn't make you a good language teacher.'

14. Six school managers interviewed during the survey had both PGCE- and graduate teacher programme-trained staff teaching languages in their schools. Three of these managers did not feel that the graduate teacher route was as rigorous as a PGCE and did not give trainees enough background knowledge. The other three preferred the graduate teacher programme because the school could tailor the training. They liked its practical nature which they saw as more relevant to the needs of the school and the trainee. There was also flexibility in the length of the training programme: depending on the trainee's previous experience, the training could take from three months to longer than a school year.

15. Six of the 20 schools expressed concerns about the quality of their unqualified teachers or teachers whose qualifications were not recognised in the United Kingdom. This survey did not examine pupils' achievement in detail, although school managers in these six schools felt that pupils had not made as much progress as they could have done, given their starting points. Too many pupils had been put off studying the language beyond GCSE because of their experience of inadequate provision – hence the very low uptake at A level. Senior managers noted that the most common weaknesses were:

   ■ teachers' lack of ICT skills and confidence
   ■ approaches to teaching which were too formal and relied too heavily on reading and writing
   ■ inadequate resources
   ■ teachers' unfamiliarity with UK assessment procedures
   ■ poor management of pupils' behaviour.

16. One head of a languages department said, 'Unqualified teachers from China were placed in the school for eight months only, but were unfamiliar with the UK curriculum and struggled with behaviour management.' A headteacher said:

   'It is more difficult for teachers trained overseas to establish themselves. It can be a barrier. There are very good practitioners who are overseas trained but they need the opportunity to practise their skills before studying for a PGCE.'

17. Seventeen of the 20 schools in the survey offered both community languages and European languages.[9] Senior managers, teachers, tutors and trainees in 11 of these schools thought the term 'community languages' was divisive and compared the subject unfavourably with modern foreign languages. It was

---

[9] Three of the schools taught only community languages and a comparison could not be made with European languages.

associated with languages of low status. According to one headteacher, 'Mandarin has high currency, Urdu has low currency.' Most interviewees thought that all languages should have equal value and status in terms of provision. According to one senior teacher:

> 'Community languages are seen as only for the community, not for anyone else. It confines language to a ghetto, to a particular speech community. There should be no distinction between modern foreign languages and community languages.'

18. A university tutor supported this view. His opinion was that the continued use of the term 'community languages' would ensure that these languages would remain marginalised:

> 'There is a linguistic hierarchy determined by economic and political priorities whereby economically viable languages are promoted but community languages are valued. We need to get rid of the term 'community languages' to make it more mainstream. 'Community languages' has marginality around it. The learning and teaching of community languages rests on the power and status of minorities and majorities. Why is it that we don't have resources, training, courses, and accreditation?'

19. Two thirds of senior managers in the schools surveyed thought that community languages should have equal status with European languages in one languages department or faculty. However, only four of the 17 schools were genuinely equal in terms of teachers' qualifications, curriculum time and resources. In the remaining 13 schools which offered both European and community languages, provision was different for the two groups of languages. Time for community languages was either more limited or was provided after the school day had ended. The schools' own judgement was that the quality of teaching and learning was not as good as for European languages. There were fewer available resources, including ICT. Teachers of community languages were not as well qualified as those for European languages. In two of the schools, a community language was offered to lower-attaining pupils only. One school which offered a carousel of languages as tasters to all pupils in Year 7 omitted community languages from this experience.

Impact of postgraduate certificate in education training on teaching in schools

20. The survey evaluated the impact of training on the trainees' ability to teach classes, plan lessons, produce and use resources and reflect on their practice. It also evaluated the impact of training on former trainees who were teaching languages in schools.

21. Four of the five trainees who were observed teaching during the survey spoke the language they were teaching as a first language but none had a degree in languages. The fifth had a degree in European languages. The lack of opportunities for trainees themselves to study their first language to a higher level than GCSE caused problems. One trainee struggled to explain grammatical concepts to pupils and another did not feel confident to teach beyond GCSE level.

22. Inspectors, senior managers and mentors judged the quality of trainees' teaching to be at least satisfactory in each case. Strengths included:

   ■ the use of the target language
   ■ knowledge and (where possible) use of ICT
   ■ planning that took account of different learners' needs,
   ■ clear lesson objectives shared with pupils
   ■ good questioning skills
   ■ good relationships established with pupils, including use of humour.

23. Lessons were hampered when the school's own accommodation and ICT facilities were inadequate for community languages. In one instance, the trainee had no opportunity to teach the language in lessons because there was no provision in the school. Planning and assessment were weaker when the school itself did not provide a good role model.

> **Case study: an outstanding Urdu lesson taught by a current PGCE trainee on final teaching practice**
>
> The lesson was characterised by very effective use of ICT to produce the lesson plan in English and Urdu and to engage pupils' interest through imaginative use of the interactive whiteboard. The lesson's objectives, which were clearly communicated to pupils, had separate learning outcomes for the three groups working at different levels. Worksheets were of a very high quality, both in their content and presentation. Pupils wanted to participate. They were excited about their learning. Included in the lesson plan were plans for evaluating the lesson.

24. In two instances trainees had the opportunity and support from schools to introduce new languages to pupils. In one school, this was a one-off and there were no plans to take the language further after the trainee left. The other school was so impressed by the impact of the trainee's and pupils' responses to learning Mandarin that it planned to continue with the language.

Case study: teacher with PGCE in Panjabi

The Panjabi teacher was an advocate for Panjabi, and highly regarded by the school. It was taught throughout the school at Key Stages 3, 4 and 5. She had established links with the local complementary school which ran Saturday classes.10 She had organised trips to the local temple and links with India and other schools teaching Panjabi, having established links with personal, social and health education (PSHE), geography and religious education. To promote community cohesion, Panjabi was offered to white pupils as beginners and a small number had taken this up. This had also raised the profile of Panjabi in the school, as had promoting the language in assemblies. Panjabi was part of the school and had status. Lesson plans were excellent in terms of their objectives, the success criteria and the match of work to pupils' different needs. Lessons promoted the use of ICT, including the interactive whiteboard, and used high quality resources. Pupils' aspirations had been raised.

Case study: teacher with a PGCE in Arabic

'I had no experience of teaching languages when I was appointed. I had no idea of the English curriculum. I hadn't heard of differentiation. The PGCE has brought me professional development, qualified teacher status, skills and knowledge, a bridge to a career, a gateway to higher education. I learnt about differentiation. I became skilled in writing schemes of work and lesson plans. I am now doing a master's degree. I can create e-learning Arabic materials on the website. The PGCE has created in us lifelong learners.'

25. The majority of trainees who overcame barriers to gain a PGCE in community languages were able to gain teaching posts where they could use their language skills (see paragraph 51). However, this was by no means guaranteed as one recently qualified PGCE student observed:

'I am amused by reports of a big Mandarin language revolution about Mandarin lessons in schools and a shortage of teachers such that hundreds may need to be brought in from China. I am a newly graduated Mandarin teacher and have been looking for a job for the past six months: fewer than 10 posts have been advertised in *The Times Educational Supplement*, only three in London and only one for a full-time teacher. I

[10] This term was first introduced in 2003 by PW Martin et al. For full reference see further information.

Every language matters

have enjoyed my teaching practice, but I am disappointed by the demand. But I will keep looking.'[11]

Provision for training in languages

Postgraduate certificate in education

26. The survey evaluated the provision for PGCE study in languages other than French, German, Irish, Spanish, or Welsh) in order to:

   ■ identify the range and location of courses and languages available
   ■ report on the reasons for the success of courses or otherwise in recruiting trainees
   ■ evaluate the structure and content of courses
   ■ identify effective provision for training
   ■ check the impact of PGCE courses on the quality of teaching in schools.

The range and location of PGCE courses and languages offered

27. In 2006/07, the academic year in which the survey took place, take up on PGCE courses was very low. Eight initial teacher training providers in England offered PGCE courses in one or more of the following languages: Arabic, Bengali, Japanese, Mandarin, Panjabi, Turkish and Urdu (Appendix 5). Three universities offering courses had no trainees during the year. The other five between them ran one course in Arabic, Panjabi and Urdu and two courses each in Chinese and Japanese. Two courses had not recruited any trainees since they were established in 2004.

28. Overall provision for PGCE in community languages since the start of the survey has declined. Four initial teacher training providers that previously offered PGCE courses in Arabic, Gujarati, Japanese, Panjabi or Urdu have discontinued their courses. Two new courses are offering Urdu from September 2007, although one of these has not been able to recruit any trainees.

29. No PGCE courses are available in England in six languages which can be studied at GCSE or A level: Dutch, Modern Greek, Gujarati, Hebrew, Persian and Polish.

30. Applicants for courses to teach community languages are restricted by choice of location. Often only one teacher training institution offers training in a particular language. It is not possible to undertake a PGCE in any community language in either the West Midlands or Greater Manchester, despite the large numbers of schools that teach the languages.

---

[11] Letter to *The Times Educational Supplement*, 1 June 2007.

31. Information about these PGCE courses is not widely known or is contradictory. The Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research and the Graduate Teacher Training Registry websites provide conflicting information about which courses are available and the languages offered.

32. Once trainees have taken an A level in Bengali, Gujarati, Panjabi or Urdu, it is not possible to go on to study for a degree in these languages in the UK (Appendix 9). Having taken a degree in an unrelated subject, trainees are less likely to take a PGCE in languages if they have not studied the language to a higher academic level. The survey found that institutions had not widely advertised or publicised PGCE courses within the communities where the languages were spoken or taught (in maintained and complementary schools).

Recruitment

33. Reasons for the low take up of places on PGCE courses include:

   ■ a limited choice of languages and locations
   ■ a lack of degree courses in community languages; trainees are more likely to take a PGCE in a subject other than languages
   ■ poor knowledge of currently available PGCE courses or contradictory information
   ■ restrictive admissions criteria, particularly the requirement to speak a European language
   ■ lack of flexibility in training
   ■ a shortage of suitable placements in schools for trainees
   ■ a high proportion of unsuitable applicants.

34. During the year of the survey, only 35 trainees were studying for a PGCE in Arabic, Bengali, Japanese, Mandarin, Panjabi, Turkish, or Urdu (Appendix 6). The most popular languages were Mandarin with 12 trainees and Urdu with 11. By 30 September 2007, 33 new trainees had registered for a PGCE for 2007/2008. Mandarin was again the most popular language with 12 trainees (see Appendix 8).

35. One training provider interviewed 10 applicants who met all the admissions criteria, suggesting that demand exists for such courses. However, the provider could offer places to only three of them as it could not find suitable school placements with the relevant languages for the other seven. One tutor said, 'It was difficult to get placements in schools and there was little interest from them.' So, although a field of potential trainees exists, not all of them can take up initial teacher training until more placements are found in schools. Schools, in turn, may not provide more courses in community languages if they are not confident that they can attract staff to teach them.

36. Admissions criteria for PGCE courses in community languages are restrictive. Two training providers in the survey required applicants to be able to teach a

European language up to at least Key Stage 3 so that they could be placed more easily in schools for their experience of practical teaching. These courses found it particularly difficult to attract applicants. One institution reported interest in the course from many potential applicants, but only one met the university requirements to offer French as well as Urdu. Applicants who were fully fluent in the language they wished to teach but had studied another subject at degree level could not combine a language with another subject such as mathematics.

37. A high proportion of applicants did not meet the general PGCE requirements.[12] One tutor considered 10 applications but reported that, 'none were suitable. Applications reflected weak literacy skills. Applicants were going into community languages because of weak English.'

Course structure and content

38. The most effective training providers were those which were flexible in overcoming barriers and recruiting trainees without diluting standards. The three courses which offered a flexible route were more successful than the others in recruiting trainees. Of the five PGCE courses that ran in 2006/07 two were full time, two flexible, and one was either a flexible or full-time route. All four of the courses that did not run were full-time courses.

39. In 2006/07, over two thirds of the trainees were on flexible pathways (Appendix 6) and over half of all trainees were based with one training provider. This provider offered a flexible, modular course which, over five years, had successfully trained 28 trainees in Arabic, Mandarin, Panjabi and Urdu.[13]

40. All these PGCE courses were in the secondary phase, except one which offered experience at Key Stages 2 and 3. Two courses were titled 'community languages' courses and were taught alongside modern foreign languages. The most effective training model offered tutors who were proficient in each language and who were able to provide tutorials aimed at a specific language.

41. Effective strategies used by training providers included:

■ developing individual programmes to suit trainees, including flexible course structures to allow trainees to study part time over a longer period
■ modern language extension courses (in French and German only)
■ the use of complementary schools to supplement teaching practice in schools

---

[12] Initial teacher training institutions reported that a common reason for applicants not meeting the admissions criteria was the lack of a qualification in English at GCSE level or the equivalent.
[13] One of the other flexible courses which had trained 75 teachers in 15 years is not admitting trainees after September 2007.

■ arranging for trainees to teach English as an additional language on teaching practice.

42. Modern language extension courses in French and German only were available to develop language skills to a level where trainees could teach at Key Stage 3. One former trainee who took the course said:

> 'I realised the benefits of the course almost immediately… I was able to participate in any French-based activities and share resources and ideas. The course has strengthened my prospects for finding a better job.'

43. One training provider tried to pair up two trainees who were teaching European languages in the same school. However, it could not do the same for its community language trainees because there were not enough classes in any school to accommodate two in the same language. This meant that trainees were isolated. There were no opportunities for networking because of the distance between schools. Community languages trainees also experienced a shortage of resources and materials in the language they were teaching.

44. Two training providers overcame the shortage of schools for teaching practice by drawing on complementary schools for part of the trainees' placements. One tutor explained:

> 'Due to the limited amount of community language teaching taking place in mainstream schools, it is impossible in some cases to provide an adequate timetable for trainees in their main teaching subject. It is not suggested that placement in a community-based school could replace mainstream school experience, but rather that it could complement and indeed enhance it… There are significant benefits to be gained both by mainstream and community-based schools from collaboration based on mutual respect and understanding.'

Quality of training

45. The most effective training gave trainees a mix of generic language skills combined with tutorials in the target language, for example learning non-roman scripts or teaching pupils who already had well-developed listening and speaking skills. Where Urdu was integrated with French, German and Spanish this enabled a good crossover between trainees, languages and teaching methodologies. However, on generic courses for modern foreign languages, trainees intending to teach community languages were not given access to as much information, resources and specialist language support as trainees in European languages.

46. Course documentation was thorough and supportive to trainees in three of the five courses surveyed. One university produced web-based curriculum guides for each of the languages it offered. These were an invaluable resource for

trainees and teachers and provided a flexible framework to assist trainees in designing and teaching courses in mainstream and complementary schools. They were very well received by teachers and trainees looking for ways to develop ICT and create or update schemes of work.

47. Training was successful when matched to trainees' individual needs, and universities put considerable time and effort into making sure community languages teachers had individual support programmes. One arranged an intensive Chinese course in Beijing for a trainee.

48. The courses which could not give trainees direct support from tutors in the language they were teaching gave links to other agencies and schools that could. However, PGCE courses which depended on individual specialists or enthusiasts were fragile. One course finished because the coordinator left and there was no one else to be an advocate for the course. According to a modern foreign languages tutor: 'The lack of an Asian languages specialist was a key reason for the course's demise... the community languages element was too onerous for the university.'

49. Mentors were usually able to offer more effective support in school when they spoke and taught the same language as the trainee. This was not always the case, and in the secondary schools visited, it was difficult to find mentors to provide this level of support. In one school, a deputy headteacher who was a linguist with a specific interest in community languages had left and his successor did not have a similar background in languages. The shortage of available schools offering the relevant languages for teaching practice meant that providers could not guarantee how good the support or provision in the partner school would be. Three trainees complained during the survey about the quality of teaching and learning of community languages in the schools where they were placed. Training providers also had difficult finding suitably qualified mentors in complementary schools.

50. Tutors and mentors who lacked subject knowledge in the trainees' language found it more difficult to assess the quality of the trainees' teaching and provide language-specific support. Where there was only one tutor for the trainees' language it was not possible for the tutor to moderate the marking of any coursework that was specific to the target language.

51. Although a few trainees in community languages followed an extension course in French or German they did not always have the opportunity to teach their second language on teaching practice. One teacher who had learnt Spanish before starting the course taught no Spanish on either teaching practice. Similarly, although training institutions generally prepared trainees well for incorporating ICT into their lessons, three were placed in schools where they had no ICT facilities to use. In one school, a trainee had to teach in a teaching hut that was not part of the modern foreign languages department and was not linked to the school's intranet.

Destinations

52. Two of the most successful training institutions in terms of the numbers trained held a detailed database of the destination of all former trainees and had tracked their careers. This showed that a high proportion of trainees had gone on to gain teaching posts and the courses had provided career progression for those who went on to become heads of department or directors of languages colleges. On one PGCE course, almost all the trainees had secured teaching posts, but mostly as primary teachers rather than as specialist language teachers. One had gone on to be an advisory teacher, but for English as an additional language rather than languages. From another course, nearly half the former trainees had to settle for part-time or peripatetic language teaching posts or teaching other subjects to make up a full timetable. One PGCE tutor explained:

> 'Graduates with vocational qualifications and a community language are more employable. It is rare that vacancies just want the community language... community languages are undervalued by trainees and employers. Trainees don't consider being bilingual as an employability factor... There is no incentive for trainees to learn community languages at a higher level.'

Trainees' and former trainees' experience of training

53. Trainees on the flexible courses did not necessarily have access to the same range of training opportunities as full-time trainees. Four trainees interviewed during the survey said they missed out when they attended only part or none of the modern foreign languages PGCE provision. In part, this was due to the location of trainees. Although they had access to web-based resources, these resources were not as good for community languages as they were for European languages. Two trainees who attended a full-time, generic modern foreign languages PGCE course also said they would have benefited from having tutorial sessions or examples in the language they were training to teach.

54. The experience of former PGCE trainees in their first year of teaching varied according to the level of support they received and the extent to which they had opportunities to teach the language. One newly qualified teacher was the only teacher of Japanese in the school and had no one in the school to turn to for guidance specific to teaching and assessing Japanese. Another former trainee had trained to teach French but had obtained a post teaching Urdu. He was able to apply the good practice he had learnt from his French training sessions to his Urdu lessons. When he took up his teaching post, he discovered he was using more advanced techniques in Urdu than his more experienced colleagues.

20   **Every language matters**

Graduate training programme

55. The graduate teacher programme route for trainees teaching community languages offers advantages:

   - It provides a route into teaching where there is no PGCE course available locally in the relevant language(s) or where the trainee does not meet the admissions criteria of having a relevant languages degree and fluency in a European language.

   - It allows trainees to pursue the subject of their degree (for example, ICT) alongside the language in which they are training to teach, in a way that would not be possible on a PGCE course.

   - It allows the trainee to gain experience of teaching larger classes when community language classes are all small.

   - It provides flexibility for trainees who already have a teaching post or who prefer a work-based model which provides on-the-job training.

56. The disadvantages of the graduate teacher programme route found during the survey were that:

   - trainees were not necessarily able to train in the language they wanted to teach
   - access to specialist tutors in the language was a problem
   - trainees were working alone and did not meet any other trainees teaching the same language
   - high quality of support from schools could not be guaranteed.

57. There were particular problems with assessing trainees on the graduate teacher programme training route. Five of the 16 qualified community language teachers who had taken the graduate teacher programme had done so in a subject unrelated to the language they were teaching, because the awarding body could not assess it. A further three unqualified teachers had been unable to pursue the graduate teacher programme at all because the employment-based initial teacher training provider could not assess the language. An unqualified teacher of Chinese said, 'I considered the graduate teacher programme but was told it would not be possible in my local authority.'

58. Trainees who were the only teachers of a particular language in school felt isolated. They lacked opportunities for networking in their language, although they did value the chance to work with trainees teaching French, German or Spanish. The second school placement, required as part of the training, was in a less familiar school. Trainees did not always receive the same degree of support as they did in the school where they were already employed. First, there was the difficulty of finding a second school with a suitable breadth of provision in the language, and second, the quality of the support they received from the second school varied. Half of the senior managers interviewed for the

survey who had graduate teacher programme-trained staff teaching languages in their schools said these teachers had not received as much training in theory or pedagogy as teachers who had trained through a PGCE route.

59. However, trainees who were able to follow the graduate teacher programme route in the language they were teaching and who received effective support from their schools were able to teach community languages effectively. Trainees who had to train in another subject or who did not receive as effective support from their mentor in school lacked the necessary language teaching skills and the quality of their teaching was weaker.

Notes

Evidence base

Initially, the survey was planned to establish the extent and effectiveness of provision for PGCE in languages other than French, German, Irish, Spanish, and Welsh, how widely the courses were taken up and the qualifications of current community language teachers. When it became apparent that provision and take up for community languages were very limited, the survey was extended to take in the graduate teacher programme in community languages, as well as a telephone survey of secondary schools which taught community languages.

Her Majesty's Inspectors visited 11 providers of initial teacher training that offered a PGCE for community languages. The institutions were selected because they were the only known providers of these courses. Only five of the 11 were actually running courses in 2006/07, the year of the survey. One had closed its course, three had no trainees in that year and two were new courses which were to start in September 2007.

Inspectors observed centrally based training days in four of the five institutions. Ten current PGCE trainees from the five institutions were interviewed, as well as their mentors and senior managers. Five trainees were observed teaching on their final teaching practice. Eight former PGCE trainees who had become qualified teachers were also interviewed and four of these were observed teaching. Their senior managers and former mentors were also interviewed.

Inspectors conducted a telephone survey of senior managers in a further 20 schools to obtain information on the qualifications of community languages teachers in those schools. These schools were selected because of their high number of GCSE entries in community languages. Three of the 20 taught only community languages; the remaining 17 taught both community and European languages. Data on GCSE examinations entries and results by language were analysed.

Three schools visited had teachers who had qualified or were training through the graduate teacher programme and, in each school, a teacher was observed teaching.

A further two graduate teacher programme-qualified teachers were interviewed by telephone, as well as their senior managers.

Other training routes

In addition to the PGCE and graduate teacher programme, there are other routes to achieve qualified teacher status. 'Refugees into teaching' is a project to provide support and training for suitably qualified refugees to become teachers with qualified teacher status. None of the teachers included in this survey had trained via this route. Eight teachers had become qualified teachers by having their overseas qualifications recognised, while a further two qualified through the Licensed Teacher Scheme. One teacher took a bachelor of education course and another a certificate of education.

Defining 'community languages'

Schools, local authorities, government agencies, professional organisations and two of the training providers whose PGCE courses are included in this survey use the term 'community languages' widely. According to one definition:

> 'Community languages are languages spoken by members of minority groups or communities within a majority language context. Some of these are languages which have been used for hundreds of years in Britain; others are of more recent origin. There is, in fact, no precise information available about how many such languages are currently in use in the country as a whole. However, a recent survey carried out in London has identified some 307 languages, 20 of which have over 2,000 speakers... the term community languages is interpreted loosely to include languages such as Japanese which for a majority of students may, in fact, be second rather than first languages.'[14]

There have been attempts to define which languages are community languages:

> 'Community languages are defined as all languages in use in a society, other than the dominant or national language. In England, where the dominant national language is English, community languages include Urdu, Panjabi, Somali, Chinese, Polish, Italian and British sign language.'[15]

The Key Stage 2 framework for languages distinguishes between modern foreign languages and community languages.[16] However, the revised programme of study at Key Stage 3 is entitled 'modern foreign languages' and does not make this distinction. Under 'the study of languages', it states:

---

[14] The Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research website, 2007, available at www.cilt.org.uk,.
[15] Scottish Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research, 2006.
[16] *Key Stage 2 framework* (1721-2005), DfES, 2005.

'This [the study of languages] may include major European or world languages such as Arabic, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Mandarin, Russian, Spanish and Urdu. This list is not exhaustive. Schools may teach other languages in addition to, or instead of, the languages featured in this list.'[17]

The *Languages review report* by the DfES in 2007 introduced another term, distinct from community languages, referring to 'an increasing interest in other world languages, particularly eastern languages' and adding that, 'We should also value community languages.'

---

[17] Qualification and Curriculum Authority (QCA), 2007 (http://curriculum.qca.org.uk/subjects/modern-foreign-languages/MFL__languages_that_schools_may_teach.aspx)

Every language matters

Further information

Publications

Modern foreign languages in the National Curriculum, DES and Welsh Office, 1991.

Languages: the next generation (ISBN 1902985028), Nuffield Foundation, 2000.

Languages for all, languages for life: a strategy for England (0748-2002), DfES, 2002.

PW Martin, A Bhatt, N Bhojani, A Creese, *A preliminary report on complementary schools and their communities in Leicester* (ESRC R000223949), University of Leicester/University of Birmingham, 2003.

Primary modern foreign languages in initial teacher training (HMI 1768), Ofsted, 2003

Languages in Key Stage 4, DfES, 2004.

Modern foreign languages in the Key Stage 4 curriculum (QCA/04/1300), QCA, 2004.

Language trends 2005, CILT, 2005, available at http://www.scilt.stir.ac.uk/Research/documents/Communitylanguagelearning.pdf.

Key Stage 3 National Strategy, DfES, 2005 available at http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/secondary/keystage3/.

The Key Stage 2 Framework for Languages, (1721-2005), DfES, 2005.

News Release, 21 June 2005, TDA, 2005 available at http://www.tda.gov.uk/about/mediarelations/2005/20050621.aspx.

Provision for community language learning in the north-east of England: final report, SCILT, 2006, available at http://www.rln-northeast.com/LMI/Latest/NorthEastFinal.pdf.

Languages review: final report (00212-2007/ISBN 978-1-84478-907-8), DfES, 2007.

Secondary curriculum review statutory consultation (QCA/07/3123) QCA, 2007.

Modern foreign languages programme of study: Key Stage 3, QCA, 2007.

Schemes of work for Key Stage 2 French, German and Spanish, QCA, 2007 available at http://www.qca.org.uk/qca_11752.aspx.

Routes into languages: community languages in higher education, University of Stirling (Scottish CILT) and University of London School of Oriental and African Studies, 2007.

Primary languages in initial teacher training, (070031), Ofsted, 2008

Websites

www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/schemes/
This is the website for the DCSF strategies and schemes of work in modern foreign languages.

www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/primary
This is the website for the DCSF Primary National Strategy.

www.qca.org.uk/curriculum
This is the website for the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority revised Key Stage 3 curriculum.

www.cilt.org.uk
This is the website for The Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research..

www.britishcouncil.org
This is the website for The British Council.

www.ncaction.org.uk/subjects/mfl
This is the website for The National Curriculum in Action.

www.assetlanguages.org.uk
This is the website for Asset Languages.

www.nacell.org.uk/resources/resources.htm
This is the website for National Advisory Centre on Early Language Learning.

www.schoolsnetwork.org.uk
This is the website for the Arabic, Chinese and Russian and community languages networks run by the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust.

www.arabica.org.uk
This is the website for Arabica, the association for teachers of Arabic.

www.londonconfuciusinstitute.org.uk
This is the website for Confucius Institute promoting Chinese.

www.ukgta.org
This is the website for the UK Association of Gujarati teachers.

www.icilondon.esteri.it
This is the website for the Italian Cultural Institute, London.

www.jpf.org.uk/language/index.php
This is the website for the Japan Foundation London Language Centre.

www.jlcweb.org.uk
This is the website for the Japanese language committee of the Association of Language Learning.

www.batj.org.uk
This is the website for the British Association for Teaching Japanese as a Foreign Language.

www.ncdu.org.uk
This is the website for the National Council for the Development of Urdu.

www.naldic.org.uk
This is the website for the National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum.

www.elanguages.org
This is the website for e-languages.

Annex

Training providers and schools visited for this survey

Edge Hill University

Goldsmiths, University of London

Keele University

London Metropolitan University

Middlesex University

Trinity and All Saints University College, Leeds

University of East London

University of Exeter

University of Manchester

University of Nottingham

University of Sheffield

The Ashcombe School, Surrey

Blakewater College, Blackburn with Darwen

Bohunt School, Hampshire

Downsell Primary School, Waltham Forest

Highdown School, Reading

King Edward VII School, Sheffield

King Fahad Academy, Ealing

Moseley School, Birmingham

Pleckgate High School, Blackburn with Darwen

Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Primary School, Islington

Saint Peter's Church of England Aided School, Devon

Sir John Thursby Community College, Burnley

Small Heath School, Birmingham

Tavistock College, Devon

Twenty schools participated in a telephone survey

Belle Vue Boys' School, Bradford

Bolton Muslim Girls School, Bolton

Broadway School, Birmingham

Carlton Bolling College, Bradford

Cranford Community College, Hounslow

Feversham College, Bradford

Fir Vale School, Sheffield

Grange Technology College, Bradford

Holte School, Birmingham

Jaamiatul Imaam Muhammad Zakaria School, Bradford

Joseph Chamberlain Sixth Form College, Birmingham

The King David High School, Manchester

Leyton Sixth Form College, Waltham Forest

Mulberry School for Girls, Tower Hamlets

Park View Academy, Haringey

Slough and Eton CE Business and Enterprise College, Slough

Small Heath School, Birmingham

Southgate School, Enfield

Washwood Heath Technology College, Birmingham

The following schools also provided information during the course of the survey

Aldercar School, Derbyshire

Grey Coat Hospital Church of England School for Girls, Westminster

Highfields School, Derbyshire

Saint Peters High School, Stoke

Shireland Collegiate Academy, Smethwick

Appendices

Appendix 1: Summary of GCSE and A level examinations available in all languages

Table 1. Summary of GCSE examinations.

Language	Board	Full course linear	Full course modular	Short course	Tiered	Coursework option
Arabic *	Edexcel	Yes	No	No	No	No
Bengali	AQA	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Chinese * (Mandarin/Cantonese)	Edexcel	Yes	No	No	No	No
Dutch	OCR	Yes	No	No	No	No
French	AQA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Edexcel	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	CCEA	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
	WJEC	No	Yes	No	No	No
German	AQA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Edexcel	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	CCEA	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
	WJEC	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
(Modern) Greek	Edexcel	Yes	No	No	No	No
Gujarati	OCR	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
(Modern) Hebrew	AQA	Yes	No	No	No	No
Irish	CCEA	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Italian	AQA	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
	Edexcel	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Japanese *	Edexcel	Yes	No	No	No	No
Persian	OCR	Yes	No	No	No	No
Panjabi	AQA	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Polish	AQA	Yes	No	No	No	No
Portuguese	OCR	Yes	No	No	No	No
Russian	Edexcel	Yes	No	No	No	No
Spanish	AQA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Edexcel	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	CCEA	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
	WJEC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Turkish	OCR	Yes	No	No	No	No
Urdu	AQA	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
	Edexcel	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Welsh (second language)	WJEC	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

* also available in 4 skill or 3 skill (no speaking) options.

Table 2. Summary of A level examinations.

Language	Board	AS level	Advanced GCE	Coursework option
Arabic	Edexcel	Yes	Yes	No
Bengali	AQA	Yes	Yes	No
Chinese (Mandarin/Cantonese)	Edexcel	Yes	Yes	No
Dutch	OCR	Yes	Yes	No
French	All boards	Yes	Yes	Yes
German	All boards	Yes	Yes	Yes
(Modern) Greek	Edexcel	Yes	Yes	No
Gujarati	OCR	Yes	Yes	No
(Modern) Hebrew	AQA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Irish	CCEA	No	Yes	Yes
Italian	Edexcel	Yes	Yes	Yes
Japanese	Edexcel	Yes	Yes	No
Panjabi	AQA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Persian	OCR	Yes	Yes	No
Polish	AQA	Yes	Yes	No
Portuguese	OCR	Yes	Yes	No
Russian	Edexcel	Yes	Yes	Yes

Spanish	All boards	Yes	Yes	Yes
Turkish	OCR	Yes	Yes	No
Urdu	Edexcel	Yes	Yes	No
Welsh	WJEC	Yes	Yes	Yes

Appendix 2: GCSE entries for languages

Table 3. Number of GCSE entries for languages (excluding French, German, Irish, Spanish and Welsh) , 2001 to 2006.

Language	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	*% change in entries 2000 /01 to 2005 /06*
Urdu	6,897	6,807	6,144	6,069	5,479	5,322	*-23%*
Italian	5,176	3,780	3,076	3,466	3,108	3,056	*-41%*
Chinese	2,124	2,289	1,686	1,865	1,973	1,827	*-14%*
Arabic	1,387	1,589	1,297	1,284	1,448	1,597	*15%*
Bengali	2,279	2,160	2,110	1,793	1,696	1,590	*-30%*
Russian	1,801	1,525	1,381	1,351	1,464	1,396	*-22%*
Gujarati	1,287	1,175	1,149	1,159	986	1,025	*-20%*
Turkish	1,049	1,206	1,068	1,034	946	996	*-5%*
Panjabi	1,522	1,218	1,277	1,292	1,027	928	*-39%*
Japanese	671	696	557	653	833	839	*25%*
Portuguese	643	604	534	607	617	728	*13%*
Modern Greek	457	427	533	519	463	432	*-5%*
Modern Hebrew	357	347	405	413	372	412	*15%*
Persian	237	283	264	312	286	338	*43%*
Polish	184	159	216	245	205	325	*77%*

| Dutch | 195 | 277 | 201 | 206 | 267 | 315 | *62%* |

| **Total** | 26,266 | 24,542 | 21,898 | 22,268 | 21,170 | 21,126 | |

Ordered in descending order on 2005/06 figures.

Data supplied by the Data Outputs Unit at the DCSF.
mailbox.dataoutputsunit@dcsf.gsi.gov.uk
(15-year-old pupils in maintained and independent schools in England only).

Appendix 3: GCSE entries by language by maintained or independent sector.

Table 4. Number of GCSE entries by language broken down by maintained or independent sector, 2006.

All courses

Language	Maintained school entries	Independent school entries	Difference maintained and independent
Arabic	1,074	624	450
Bengali	1,504	98	1406
Chinese	1,083	1,754	-671
Dutch	274	45	229
French	186,133	31,613	154,520
German	79,209	8,124	71,085
Gujarati	844	181	663
Irish	1	0	1
Italian	2,647	619	2,028
Japanese	679	270	409
Modern Greek	414	84	330
Modern Hebrew	239	196	43
Panjabi	986	62	924
Persian	318	41	277

Every language matters

Polish	337	49	288
Portuguese	680	50	630
Russian	904	615	289
Spanish	44,958	10,644	34,314
Turkish	1,122	49	1,073
Urdu	4,458	986	3,472
Welsh (second language)	5	3	2
Total	**327,869**	**56,107**	

Appendix 4: The least popular GCSE and A level subjects among England's three main examination boards, 2006

Table 5. GCSE – 10 least popular subjects.

	Subject	Exam board	Number of candidates
1	Product Design	OCR	34
2	Modern Hebrew	AQA	423
3	Dutch	OCR	464
4	Persian	OCR	465
5	Biblical Hebrew	OCR	482
6	Japanese A	Edexcel	617
7	Japanese B	Edexcel	652
8	3D Design	Edexcel	627
9	Electronics	AQA	638
10	Modern Greek	Edexcel	644

Sources: AQA, Edexcel, OCR.

Table 6. A level — 10 least popular subjects.

	Subject	Exam board	Number of candidates
1	Further Mathematics A	AQA	0
2	Statistics B	AQA	1
3	Further Mathematics B	AQA	2
4	Pure Mathematics (Mathematics in education and industry version)	OCR	6
5	Pure Mathematics	OCR	8
6	Mathematics B	AQA	11
7	Further Mathematics (additional)	Edexcel	24
8	Mathematics A	AQA	31
9	Gujarati	OCR	41
10	Biblical Hebrew	OCR	48
10	Further Mathematics (additional)	OCR	48
10	Pure Mathematics	Edexcel	48

Sources: AQA, Edexcel, OCR.

Appendix 5: PGCE courses offered in community languages for 2006/07

Table 7. PGCE courses in community languages.

Provider	Language courses offered	Course structure
Edge Hill College, Lancashire	PGCE Urdu	Full time or flexible

Every language matters

Goldsmith College London	PGCE Arabic, Mandarin Chinese, Panjabi* and Urdu	Flexible
London Metropolitan University	PGCE KS2/3 Languages in the Community**	Full time
Middlesex University	PGCE Modern Foreign Languages (inc. Turkish***)	Full time
University of East London	PGCE Bengali***	Full time
University of Exeter	PGCE Mandarin*	Full time
University of Nottingham	PGCE Japanese**	Flexible
University of Sheffield	PGCE Japanese, Mandarin and Urdu*	Full time

* did not run 2006/07.

** not running in 2007/08.

*** not advertised on GTTR website 2006/07.

(Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research June 2006).

Appendix 6: Number of trainees on PGCE courses by training provider and language, 2006/07

Table 8. Number of trainees on PGCE courses.

Provider	Number of trainees by language	Number of trainees
Goldsmith College London	6 Arabic, 9 Mandarin, 4 Urdu, 0 Panjabi	19* (flexible)
Edge Hill College, Lancashire	7 Urdu	7 (4 flexible, 3 full time)
London Metropolitan University	1 Bengali, 1 Mandarin, 1 Turkish	3 (full time)
University of Nottingham	3 Japanese	3 (flexible)
University of Sheffield	1 Japanese, 2 Mandarin, 0 Urdu	3 (full time)
University of East London	0 Bengali	0
University of Exeter	0 Mandarin	0
Middlesex University	0 Turkish	0

	6 Arabic	
	1 Bengali	
	4 Japanese	
	12 Mandarin	
	0 Panjabi	
	1 Turkish	
Total	**11 Urdu**	**35**

* 11 new in 2006/07 and 8 continuers from previous year

Appendix 7: PGCE courses offered in community languages for 2007/08

Table 9. PCGE courses offered in community languages.

Provider	Language courses offered	Course structure
Edge Hill College, Lancashire	PGCE Urdu flexible or full time	Full time or flexible
University of Exeter	PGCE Mandarin (with a European language)	Full time
Goldsmith College London	PGCE (Arabic, Mandarin, Panjabi Urdu) modular	Flexible
Keele University	PGCE Urdu and French	Full time
Leeds Trinity and All Saints	PGCE in MFL including Urdu	Full time
London Metropolitan University	PGCE secondary modern languages (inc. community languages)	Full time
Middlesex University	PGCE Turkish	Full time
University of East London	PGCE Bengali	Full time
University of Sheffield	PGCE Japanese; Mandarin; Urdu (all with a European language)	Full time

(The Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research, June 2007).

Appendix 8: Take up of PGCE courses for 2007/08 by training provider and language (as of 30 September 2007)

Table 10. Take up of PGCE courses by provider and language.

Provider	Numbers by language	Numbers by type of provision
Edge Hill College, Lancashire	2 Urdu	1 (full time); 1 (flexible)
University of Exeter	1 Mandarin	1 (full time)
Goldsmith College London*	6 Arabic, 9 Mandarin, 1 Panjabi, 0 Urdu	16*(flexible)
Keele University	0 Urdu	
Leeds Trinity and All Saints	7 Urdu	7
London Metropolitan University	1 Mandarin	1 (full time)
Middlesex University	2 Turkish	2 (full time)
University of East London	1 Bengali	1 (full time)
University of Sheffield	2 Japanese, 1 Mandarin	3 (full time)
Total	**6 Arabic** **1 Bengali** **2 Japanese** **12 Mandarin** **1 Panjabi** **2 Turkish** **9 Urdu**	**33**

* In addition, 11 students have continued from 2006/07

Appendix 9: Degree courses for languages excluding French, German, Irish, and Welsh, which are offered at GCSE and A level

Table 11. Degree courses for languages other than French, German, Irish and Welsh.

Language	Number of degree courses offered	Number of single honours courses
Arabic	130	37
Bengali	1*	0
Chinese	160	41
Dutch	24	0
Gujarati	1*	0
Hebrew	48	2
Modern Greek	19	0
Italian	677	118
Japanese	191	30
Panjabi	0	0
Persian	28	0
Polish	44	1
Portuguese	160	28
Russian	355	66
Turkish	23	0
Urdu	0	0

 * for beginners only.

(source: UCAS website on 28 June 2007).