Durham University

Durham E-Theses

The grass is greener.....a comparison of two distinct pathways to Qualified Teacher Status with particular reference to the expectations and experiences of secondary physical education trainees

Jackie Moses

How to cite:

Moses, Jackie (2009) The grass is greener.....a comparison of two distinct pathways to Qualified Teacher Status with particular reference to the expectations and experiences of secondary physical education trainees. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/1935/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

The grass is greener.....a comparison of two distinct pathways to Qualified Teacher Status with particular reference to the expectations and experiences of secondary physical education trainees.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author or the university to which it was submitted. No quotation from it, or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author or university, and any information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Jackie Moses

Submission for Doctor of Education

2009

16 MAR 2009

Acknowledgements

The journey has certainly been long but without the constant support of so many, family, friends and colleagues it would never have been completed, there were many times when I needed a willingly mind to bounce ideas off, a motivational pep talk or simply an ear to listen to my moans! The path was certainly testing with many wrong turns, full circles and dead ends (but my navigation never was that good!) that at times I did wonder if I would ever reach the destination. In guiding me along the way has been one real constant, encouraging, challenging and listening, Mike I can't thank you enough, without your guidance I would have thrown in the towel long ago.

CONTENTS

Pg No.

a. Abstract **5**

1. Introduction **6**

a. Research questions 7

2. Review of Literature **9**

a. Historical Developments 9
b. Employment based routes for teacher training 16
c. The Graduate Teacher programme 18
d. Partnership 26
e. Teaching as a profession 28
f. Standards or competencies 35
g. Mentors and mentoring 38
h. Motivation and attitudes of trainees to their chosen pathways 51
i. Trainees' perceptions of the relevance of theory 55
j. The Physical Education Context: The issues with Secondary PE 59

3. Methodology **63**

a. Overview of the study 63
b. Case Study 64
c. Validity, reliability and generalisability 66
d. Pilot work 68
e. Procedures 69
f. Research Tools 69
g. Questionnaire design 70
h. Interviews 71
i. Data analysis 72
j. Ethical considerations 73

	Pg No.
4. Findings	**76**
a. Recruitment and selection/trainees previous experiences	76
b. Programme structure	84
i. Teaching and observation periods	91
c. Evidencing the QTS Standards	94
d. The role of the subject mentor, professional tutor and link tutor from the HEI and DRB	100
i. School subject mentor	100
ii. Training for subject mentor and professional tutor in School	101
iii. Regularity and structure of mentor meetings and professional tutor sessions	103
iv. Perceptions of trainees towards support offered by HEI and DRB	104
e. Development of subject knowledge	107
f. Other issues/concerns	113
5. Discussion of findings	**117**
a. Recruitment and selection of trainees/ previous experiences	117
b. Programme structure	123
c. Teaching and observation periods	128
d. Evidencing the standards	130
e. Training for subject mentors and professional tutors in school	135
f. Developing subject knowledge	137
g. Quality Assurance	140
6. Conclusions	**146**
7. References	**155**
8. Appendices	**169**

Abstract

There are many routes to attaining qualified teacher status within the UK. Set within an interpretative paradigm this research considers two distinct routes to QTS, namely those of the Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) and that of the Graduate Teaching Programme (GTP). The empirical work in this research explores, through an in depth and longitudinal approach, the expectations and experiences of trainees on these two routes. By tracking six trainees during their training year (3 PGCE and 3 GTP) using questionnaires and interview techniques, in addition to reviewing programme of materials and considering inspection findings, an analysis of these two pathways to QTS was conducted. The findings clearly highlight that the experiences of the trainees on the respective programmes are very different; one approach is highly structured, prescriptive and demands both academic understanding as well as practical application whereas the other is highly practical, steeped in experience and tends to lack a coherent structure. All trainees in this research attained qualified teacher status although the means and methods by which this was achieved varied and in some respects could be challenged, raising questions about the robustness and equity of the approaches adopted. Neither is without fault and both could learn from a review of the other.

1. Introduction

According to Dunne (1994) there are seventeen different routes into teaching that are intended, by the government, to provide a flexible approach to the profession. In the Green Paper 'Teachers Meeting the Challenge of Change' it is stated that,

> *"Training routes should be diverse and flexible so that training can be matched to the needs and circumstances of all those with the potential to succeed as teachers. Teaching must attract high quality candidates from every section of society, bringing strengths and qualities which ensure that teaching is a vibrant and diverse profession." (DFEE, 1998, p46)*

In addition, the Green Paper sets out the government's commitment and determination that "employment based routes into teaching should be recognised as providing high quality preparation for entry into the profession open to those who may not be able to pursue a more traditional teacher training course." (DFEE, 1998, p47)

Over the years there have been many influences of a philosophical, economic and political nature on teacher education programmes; although these could be viewed as 'complementary and mutually relevant' (Calderhead and Shorrock, 1997), they are often seen as being in direct competition. The philosophical debate about what teacher education should include is a difficult one to answer and may well depend on one's fundamental stance, is teaching an art or a science? How we conceptualise the work of the teacher will inevitably have a significant and profound effect on how we prepare individuals for the profession.

Unfortunately teacher education programmes are not just influenced by philosophical values. Recent years in particular have seen a growing influence from economic and political debates. From an economic stance, education accounts for a significant portion of public funding (behind defence, health and social services). Therefore when cuts are needed public accountable areas come under greater scrutiny in a drive for value for money. In this drive for economic effectiveness, quality and efficiency are often forgotten.

Concerning the political debate, decisions on what to include in the curriculum for initial teacher education have often been based on intuition or craft wisdom (Calderhead and Shorrock, 1997) that has been accumulated over several years. There are few ideological

frameworks that can be used and there has been a lack of a common language amongst those in teacher education and beyond. There have, over the years been a number of attempts to reform teacher education programmes but rarely have these been properly and thoroughly evaluated through large-scale studies in terms of impact and, therefore, there is insufficient concrete evidence on what is effective. There have been a limited number of small –scale studies (e.g. Smith & McLay 2007). More recently attempts to change teacher education have been largely motivated by political concerns rather than attempting to understand the nature of teachers' work and the process that one undergoes in becoming a teacher (Furlong 2000). Perhaps now is timely in terms of attempting to define a conceptual framework that is based on evidence of trainee teachers' experiences of professional development. This research will attempt to examine some of the experiences, and expectations of teacher trainees on two distinct pathways to gaining qualified teacher status; the full time PGCE and the GTP. In doing so, it will attempt to specifically answer the following questions;

1. What are the differences in the experience and expectation of secondary trainee physical education teachers on the PGCE and the GTP pathways?
2. What impact do these differences have on the trainees' throughout their training year?
3. Can conclusions be drawn as to which is the preferred or most appropriate way to train teachers?

In order to answer these questions I followed the progress of three PGCE PE trainees and three GTP PE trainees throughout their training year. All trainees were interviewed at three points during the year, at the beginning, mid way and the end of their training and in addition each trainee completed a short questionnaire every half term. All of the data collected throughout this period as well as documentary evidence from the two respective training pathways and the reports from Ofsted inspection have been used in attempting to answer the questions posed above.

The thesis is presented in addition to the introductory section here, in five further chapters. Chapter 2 gives the reader an overview of the developments in teacher education and training up to the present day; chapter three outlines in some detail the methodological approaches used throughout this research; chapter four is a presentation

of the results; chapter five provides a more detailed discussion of these results and where appropriate links the findings here to other research and chapter six offers by way of a conclusion, a summary of the findings and some suggestions for a way forward.

2. Review of Literature

a. Historical Development

In order to fully appreciate the complex nature of teacher education and training it is important to understand the political context within which this now operates. In order to achieve this it is essential to look at the historical development of this profession, in particular over the last twenty-five years.

According to Furlong et al (2000) one way of influencing the skills, knowledge and values of teachers is to change the form and content of initial teacher training. As a result initial teacher training has been a site for political debate and struggle over recent years. This though, has not always been the case. Until the 1980s the content and structure of initial teacher training programmes was a matter for the providers of such programmes and indeed until the late 1980s the vast majority, if not all, initial teacher training was under the guidance of institutions of higher education.

In the 1960s the post war government parties subscribed to an ideology of 'social democracy' that can be clearly seen through the publication of the Robbins Report (1963); *"The good society desires equality of opportunity for its citizens to become not merely good producers but also good men and women."* (in Furlong et al, 2000, p19). As a result of this, higher education was to be made available for all those who qualified by ability and attainment. The view of a good teacher was of one that had a strong personal education therefore this push towards a good education took precedence over practical training. As a result teacher training colleges rapidly developed their programmes to meet these new demands and for most this lead to the introduction of a degree pathway for all those wishing to enter the teaching profession.

The 1970s appeared to be a very confused decade (Wilkin, 1996); there did not appear to be any consistent ideology that influenced or guided development in initial teacher training. The James Committee was established in 1972 to examine teacher education; the proposals resulting from here were fairly radical and included the right for teacher educators to have one term's study leave every seven years. Not surprisingly the report

was not followed up in any significant way. The involvement of Central Government in controlling entry to teacher education was first demonstrated during this period. Close looks at demographic changes resulted in a severe reduction in numbers on teacher training courses and this led to the closure of some providers.

This decade though, did see attempts by the profession itself to take a lead in shaping practice (Hargreaves, 1994, Bell, 1981). There were several variations in courses and a number of tensions existed around the practical versus academic approach to initial teacher training (e.g. Patrick et al, 1982, Drever & Cope, 1999). Throughout the 1970s a move towards a more practical approach to training emerged which started to involve the use of competency statements although these did not officially come into play until the 1990s. In addition the notion of partnerships started to develop although this seemed to stall somewhat as teacher and teacher trainers appeared in conflict over the degree of academic content of training programmes at the expense of practical, hands on experience out in schools. When the Thatcher government took power in the late 1970s it was agreed that a more flexible system was needed and three different types of provider existed: Universities, Polytechnics and Colleges, all with different approaches and emphases on the training process but all courses still remained distant from schools themselves, apart from periods of teaching practice.

The 1980s saw the second term of office for the conservative government and greater involvement in teacher education started to emerge. In 1982 Sir Keith Joseph, the Secretary of State for Education, commissioned Cambridge University to conduct research into school based teacher education. This project was given a high profile and was mentioned in the White Paper *Teaching Quality* (DES 1983) clearly indicating the government's new approach to teacher education. The government perceived that opening up the training of teachers to schools was a positive move and they felt that this would improve the quality of initial teacher training. It was hoped that by commissioning the research at Cambridge University the profession would buy into this new approach. This proved not to be the case and the Secretary of State had to increase his own powers so that he could intervene directly to establish this new idea. This began with the publication of circular 3/84 (DES 1984) and the establishment of the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) again in 1984. CATE were charged with the responsibility of overseeing all initial teacher education on behalf of the Secretary of

State. Changes that occurred included the return of a period of school based work for those involved with teacher education in Higher Education Institutions, the involvement of current, practising teachers in the process of interviewing students and the minimum time to be spent in schools during the training period was defined. The main driver from the government perspective was to open up the market for initial teacher training. Consequently this marked a major change as it allowed the Secretary of State to have a direct say in the content and structure of courses, thus marking an end to the autonomy experienced by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

In 1989 there was a second round of government initiatives linked to initial teacher training. Circular 24/89 (DES1989) took steps to strengthen the power of central government to control courses; this further diminished the autonomy of HEIs. They established this by, firstly, extending the powers of CATE and added a new system of bureaucracy for accreditation of courses. Local CATEs were set up to oversee, monitor and review courses; these committees were made up of a number of local individuals including representation from business and industry, HEIs now found themselves in the minority. This also confirmed the government's stance on the importance of practical work in teacher training as it was compulsory for all lecturers to return to the classroom for one term every 5 years. In addition, the amount of time students spent in schools increased and the beginnings of closer collaborations and partnerships with schools was being established. For example, experienced teachers had to be involved with course planning and evaluations and they had to be given the opportunity to make contributions to lectures. This circular also dictated the range of topics that must be covered in the training programmes and hence could be viewed as the start of the production of a *'national curriculum'* for teacher education. The government now started to experiment with more heavily biased school-based routes, thus heralding the beginning of the articled and licensed teacher schemes. (see later)

The economic downturn of the early 1990s appeared to have a positive effect on recruitment into teaching. January 1992 saw further reforms in teacher education; including a stipulation that secondary students had to spend a minimum of 80% of their time in training in schools (this was later modified to 66%) but the result was a curtailment in the role of the HEIs in the training process. Major restructuring of courses followed, this included both organisation and curriculum content and for many (e.g. Furlong et al, 2000)

1992 is seen as a major watershed in terms of teacher education in England and Wales. These new proposals marked the beginning of a very different and according to some (e.g. Furlong et al 2000) a more confrontational period of reform. Most of the confrontation was between those working in HEIs and the government. Between 1992 and 1995 a number of new policies were introduced including the establishment of the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) in 1992; the transfer of funding from Higher Education Funding Council to the recently established Teacher Training Agency (1994) (this replaced the CATE); the establishment of school centred initial teacher training (SCITT) and a distance learning Postgraduate Certificate in Education through the Open University.

All this occurred at a time when the HEIs were making radical structural changes, in particular a move to semesterisation and a modular approach to degree structures. Two new circulars 9/92 and 14/93 (covering secondary and primary initial teacher training provision respectively) came into force. Amongst other things, these insisted on greater involvement of schools in the training process, all schools were to be given the opportunity to become partners in ITT and if HEIs refused then there was the threat of withdrawal of accreditation. The partnership that was proposed included, joint responsibility in the planning and management of courses, interviewing and assessing the trainees (as they now became known). Circular 9/92, DES (1992, para14) stated

> *"HEIs were to be responsible for ensuring that courses met the requirements for academic validation, presenting courses for accreditation, awarding qualifications for successful students and arranging student placements in more than one school."*

As a consequence there was a significant shift in resources from the HEI to the schools that were to be paid for these additional roles and responsibilities. In secondary provision this equated to approximately 25% of the fee income. Fear abounded as potential job security for some lecturers in HEI's was felt to be under threat.

Training by now explicitly involved two aspects,

1. Subject knowledge (which was seen as predominately the responsibility of the HEI)

2. Practical teaching skills which were increasingly seen to be largely the schools' responsibility

In an attempt for the government to get control, a set of standards for newly qualified teachers were written and expressed in the form of competency statements. Under these terms it was anticipated that the role of HEIs would become narrowly focused, functional and technical (Furlong et al 2000). This loss of autonomy for teacher education by the HEIs was publicly stated and according to circular 14/93 'courses had to be explicitly designed to serve the Government's policy objectives for schools.' (DfE 1993)

A further challenge to the autonomy of HEIs for teacher training was presented in 1993 with the introduction of two new routes into teaching. Firstly a one year non graduate training scheme for early years teachers commonly referred to as the 'mums' army'. The government appeared to regard parental common sense as equal to that of the expert teacher but due to overwhelming opposition from a number of quarters (including that of parents) this proposal was quickly dropped; the other new route was seen as politically more significant by those in HEI in particular. The launching of the School Centred Initial Teacher Training programme allowed schools to opt out of any links with HEI and receive funding for training new teachers direct from the government (in other words the schools could run their own versions of a post graduate scheme). According to the Government the aim of the scheme was to give the teaching profession the opportunity to control the training of new recruits but HEIs viewed this very differently. Some (e.g. Anderson 1994) saw it as an attempt by the government to undermine the perceived over-theoretical and 'producer' dominant role of HEIs.

The Education Act 1994 was the beginning of further changes and developments in ITT. By September 1994 the Education Act had established the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) that was formed to take over most of the functions of CATE and all the funding of ITT courses. For some (e.g. Furlong et al 2000) the 1994 Act was seen as highly controversial, especially as it included a heavy focus on ITT and the role of HEIs within this process.

The TTA was given 3 core responsibilities,

1. recruitment and supply of teachers

2. funding
3. accreditation of courses

The Board for the TTA included two prominent right wing activists (Furlong 2000), Professor Anthony O'Hear and Baroness Caroline Cox both of whom were very critical of ITT. This was seen as significant and added to the perception of marginalisation of the HEI

The TTA was set up as a separate body, distinct from the DfE and as a result it formulated its own policies. By 1995 the TTA had broadened its area of responsibility; it promoted SCITT's, despite criticism via Ofsted reports and continued to enjoy official government support. At about this time the TTA attempted to launch a set of detailed competency statements linking into a career entry profiling system for teachers. Many believe (e.g. Wilkin, 1996) that if this had been successful it could well have lead to a national curriculum for initial teacher training but at the time the strategy proved unworkable and the approach had to be drastically modified. The TTA at this time also adopted a strategy for linking funding arrangements to the quality of the Ofsted reports. In addition further competition was introduced as the Open University launched a distance learning PGCE, where students arranged their own placements in schools and mentors supported them with distance learning materials. The potential implications of these changes were complex and a number of individuals involved in the process were deeply alarmed.

> *"The first thing to remember about government plans for teacher training is that there is a plot and a sub plot. The plot is straightforward. Give practising teachers a bigger part to play in the professional preparation of future colleagues. This is a good idea. The sub plot is more sinister. It is to take teacher training out of universities and colleges and ultimately to sever the connection between the study of education in higher education and its practice in schools. This is deeply damaging idea and must be fought tooth and nail. The [proposals] must be examined closely for insidious attempts to dismantle the traditional defences of teaching as a profession." (Maclure 1993, in Furlong 2000 Pg75)*

From the student perspective, reforms to teacher education in the 1980s and 90s were successful (HMI, 1988a, 1991). Students felt they were well equipped for teaching and their employing head teachers confirmed this. By the mid - late 1990s ITT had become a largely practical affair. Students looked to the HEI to provide a vision for teaching; the fact that many schools failed to live up to the vision did not appear significant. In addition

HEIs gave students time to develop a critical perspective on educational practice, but the student voice stopped being critical and Furlong (2000) believes that the introduction of national standards for ITT and the new inspection framework were responsible here.

A lot of Government policy from the mid 1990s onwards was formed with the intent of changing the nature of teacher professionalism (the notion of teaching as a profession and teacher professionalism will be explored later). The traditional models of ITT were challenged, in particular by the introduction of new pathways for teacher training, namely school based routes. The introduction of circulars 9/92 and 14/93 severely curtailed the freedom of HEIs in terms of how their programmes were set up and managed. The government's aspirations of the 1990s with regard to teacher training were largely achieved, the student feedback was positive, especially concerning the practical nature of their courses. The introduction of a definition of competencies, prescription as to how partnerships should operate and new funding arrangements all added to this feeling of achievement.

The late 1990s saw a period of real change in teacher training. The TTA and Ofsted became increasingly controlling and ensured that teacher training conformed to the patterns that had been centrally defined. The government defined the content for the new professionalism and students would learn through 'enculturation' in practice in schools.

Although Ofsted had been first established back in 1992 (under the leadership of the HMI by the Education Schools Act 1992), by the late 1990s the process of inspection of ITT in HEIs had become increasing controversial and probably more politicised than in schools. The revised Ofsted framework published in 1996 & 1998 saw a much tighter focus that in turn led to major concerns and a lot of anger over the process. The general response by teacher education to the Ofsted process was negative as it was seen as heavy handed and invasive (e.g. Graham 1997, Sutherland 1997). Inspectors could choose which institution and which schools within the partnership they would visit; one flawed grade had a significant and damaging effect on the overall grade given to the institution. HEIs were resentful of the process especially as they were held accountable for the schools and threatened with reduced numbers and withdrawal of accreditation but no equivalent sanction was dealt to the schools.

In addition the TTA used the Ofsted information produced by their reports to publish ITT league tables and to make decisions as to future numbers and funding. The league tables were published using a four-point scale, a low point score could have dire consequences leading to withdrawal of the provision, HEIs with higher scores could make bids to the TTA to increase their numbers and those with lower scores often endured a cut to numbers. This in some cases led to almost impossible situations within HEIs who were left with the unenviable position of either continuing with teacher education but with the low numbers making the financial viability for this impossible (teacher education was already expensive in HEIs when compared to other non QTS programmes, in particular the undergraduate pathways) or closing down courses with in some cases the inevitable job insecurities that this leaves.

By the end of the 1990s the government with the support of the TTA and Ofsted had produced a system for ITT that was highly responsive to policy change, a significant move in just 15 years – a move *from 'diversity and autonomy to homogeneity and central control'* (Furlong et al 2000, Pg. 149). The government wanted a common system with common standards and this they had achieved. The competencies that had been introduced in the early 1990s had now become standards (see circular 10/97) that students had to meet in order to gain qualified teacher status. These standards were later extended to other aspects of a teacher's career, e.g. SEN Coordinator, Advanced Skills Teacher, Excellent Teacher, Subject Leader, Head Teacher and so on. In summary we had an increasingly use of central control over teacher education which led to an increase in the practical aspects of teacher development and greater transparency but the place of theory appears to have been diminished.

b. **Employment Based Routes for Teacher Training**

These began with the introduction of the Articled Teacher Scheme (ATS) which ran from 1989-1994 and was an entirely new form of school based PGCE. To take part in the scheme students had to be graduates with at least two years experience of working in schools. These schemes were established and administered by the Local Education authority who worked in partnership with the HEIs. The scheme initially proved popular as its funding relatively speaking was generous; the trainee teacher was awarded a bursary and in addition the school mentor was paid for their work.

This scheme was announced at the same time as the licensed teacher scheme (LTS) and (according to the more cynical) it was primarily designed as a recruitment strategy. The government's objective was to support a variety of pathways to qualified teacher status but it appears those schemes that had a direct impact on the teacher shortage were given priority (DES 1989). In secondary schools the LTS was confined to subjects that were defined as shortage (Maths, Science and Modern Foreign Language). The superior funding enabled these schemes to attract a wider range of students especially those who would otherwise find it financially impossible to change career. The involvement of the LEA enabled areas to be targeted where there was very little or no provision or where the shortages were most severe.

At an ideological level these schemes presented a real challenge to the conventional methods of teacher training. The ATS scheme officially began in 1990 with 16 consortia on board and involving 410 trainees (Furlong et al, 2000). The schemes (ATS and LTS) at first appeared successful as they were targeting 'non standard' entrants to teaching but not so successful in addressing the issue of teacher supply for the shortage subjects.

In 1992, Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) conducted an evaluation of the ATS. They visited five of the consortia and concluded that in the majority of cases the trainee teachers' progress was satisfactory and 50% were judged to be good or very good. Interestingly the overall majority were not considered to be significantly better than the traditional PGCE route, although they did score strongly in their understanding of whole school life.

The weaknesses that were reported evolved around the ability in terms of the quality of training between the different consortia; this was considered to be far higher than in the more traditional routes. In addition there were a number of primary trainees who at the end of the course had insufficient subject knowledge and in some secondary consortia the trainees were ignorant of some parts of the National Curriculum. In conclusion HMI felt that the additional time spent in school was something of a lost opportunity, as this was not making them significantly better teachers, although they cost almost twice as much as a traditional student to train. Once HMI made these judgements it was evident that the scheme would come to an end, which it did in 1994. Despite the short life of this

version of school-based training they were none the less significant in establishing a more practical and potentially professional orientated form of training and it was demonstrated that schools could successfully become more involved in the training of their own profession.

The LTS was again very different from the ATS in that it allowed mature students (minimum age of 24 years) who had two years of higher education to be employed directly by schools who would then provide them with the appropriate 'on the job' training. Initially this scheme proved popular and in just two years, 1,500 teachers had received licenses this way and 500 had qualified via this route (Furlong et al, 2000). The issue was that many LEAs saw this route as one way of helping with teacher shortages so often these individuals found themselves placed in schools who were not equipped to deal with their training needs. In addition anxiety was expressed from within the profession and in particular from the two main teaching unions (Furlong et al, 2000) about the perceived devaluing of an all graduate profession by allowing non graduates to train in this way. It was at this juncture that the Modes of Teacher Education Project (MOTE) project team (Furlong et al, 1992) decided to investigate. The results of the survey revealed two very different types of scheme in operation, firstly those started and run by the LEA and secondly those run by the LEA but not initially set up by them. Interestingly overseas qualified teachers accounted for over one third of all those involved in the survey and enabling these individuals to achieve a full teaching qualification. This was cited as one of the main reasons for setting up and operating such a scheme. The first Ofsted report on the LTS noted that most licensed teachers were appointed to LEAs who had recruitment difficulties and the appointments were nearly always made to cover a teaching vacancy. Ofsted (1993) concluded a significant number of the training placements were problematic and the degree to which they were able to provide training raised serious cause for concern. The cessation of the scheme hardly came as a surprise but the notion of school-based training did not disappear.

c. **Graduate Training Programme**

Following the AST and LTS was the introduction of the Graduate Training Programme (GTP) in 1997. The GTP was announced as being,

> *" ...designed to offer a high quality and cost effective route into the teaching profession for suitable graduates who do not want to follow a traditional pre-service route, such as the Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE), but would prefer a tailor made training route coupled with employment as a teacher. It is also seen as meeting the needs of schools who wish to be directly involved in the training of their own teachers but do not want to develop a School-Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT) scheme." (DfEE 1996, p.1 in Foster 2000)*

In the Green Paper "Teachers: Meeting the Challenges of Change" (1998), the government repeated its claim that education was a top priority. Blair stated in the introduction *"we need to raise teaching to the front rank of professions."* (DfEE 1998, p4). Blair continued and referred to *'decades of drift'* (DfEE 1998 p4) for which he blamed previous governments (both from the right and left). His main criticism centred on the fact that he believed teacher training was too heavily influenced by individual HEIs who were too theoretical in their approach. Lawlor (1990) agued that the shortage of teachers that Blair referred to, stemmed from the fact that the type of training discouraged good candidates from entering the profession and undermined the standards of those that do, her views are clearly reflected in the many reforms that were witnessed throughout the nineties and early twenty first century. She claimed that *"the skills of teaching are essentially practical ones.....they can only be acquired through experience, trial and error and careful individual supervision* (Lawlor 1990, p8). She firmly believed that the licensed and articled teacher schemes enabled individuals to learn the 'tricks of the trade' (p12). Lawlor continued and was scathing of the PGCE courses, which she claimed forced trainees to acquire *'a dubious set of theoretical assumptions to be applied at every possible instance' (p32)* at the expense of subject knowledge which she claimed was inadequate in a large number of trainees. These views were damming for the HEIs involved in teacher training as she was a prominent and influential figure in advising the Government on teacher education reform. In contrast researchers such as Wragg (1991) were disparaging about wholly school-based routes to teacher training. None the less the government introduced a new pathway for gaining qualified teacher status and in 1997 the Graduate Training Programme (GTP) was born.

The Government had two main aims in setting up this new programme. Firstly to attract mature entrants to the profession (candidates initially had to be over 24 years old) and in particular those who were changing careers and secondly to help address a national shortage of teachers (Griffiths 2003). The GTP allowed schools to employ unqualified

teachers whilst training them to meet national standards for qualified teacher status (DfEE 1998, DfES 2002). Individual schools and HEIs were invited to apply to the Teacher Training Agency for Designated Recommending Body status (DRB) which then gave them full responsibility for managing the training programme. Individuals on the programme were to be assessed by either an external assessor (if the school was the DRB) or by the HEI working in partnership with the schools.

Figures from the TTA in 1999 suggested that the combined numbers of SCITT and GTP only represented about 4-5% of the national total of teacher trainees. Current figures suggest that this will rise to nearer approximately 14% of all training in2008/09 and more significantly for this study to 17% of all secondary teaching training placements and is set to remain at about that percentage until 2010/11 (TDA 2008). (For summary figures see Appendix 4)

According to work conducted by Foster (2000) the reaction of schools and the teaching profession in general to the GTP was not one of *'unequivocal welcome'*. Anxiety was expressed over the speed at which one could potentially achieve QTS and the NAHT stated their concern over the move to grant QTS more *'quickly than is justified in order to overcome a specific staff shortage.'* In response to this apparent lack of enthusiasm by the schools, the TTA suggested that some schools were either unfamiliar with the scheme, unconvinced that the GTP was an acceptable training model or felt that the burden of training someone on the job was too complex and demanding.

Foster's (2000) research was conducted in a number of secondary schools (including special schools) in the North West of England. The research had two elements. Firstly samples of 20 schools known to be involved in GTP were selected and secondly a random sample of 60 schools was selected that were felt to be a good representation of the area under investigation. The research consisted of both questionnaires and follow up interviews.

Foster found that in the majority of cases those involved in the GTP felt that it was as rigorous in ensuring that the trainee met the standards for QTS as those on other routes. The schools felt strongly that their trainee was a highly competent individual. In most cases a demanding training programme had been implemented, detailed and

comprehensive portfolios, teaching files had been produced and were comparable in quality to those produced by a PGCE. Despite this it was felt that in some ways the trainee did not have to meet the standards in the same way as a PGCE trainee. For example there was no requirement for the GTP to have experience in two schools (unlike that of a PGCE trainee) and in addition the quality assurance processes were not as rigorous as those for a PGCE trainee in HEI.

Foster found that amongst his respondents, a strong view was held that the GTP was best suited to those who already had *'significant experience and expertise in teaching'*, for example oversees trained teachers or those who had taught in Further Education Colleges and now wanted to transfer to schools. The schools involved with the GTP felt strongly that it best served those individuals who were already working within the system. In Foster's research he did not have any examples of trainees who had been taken on to be specifically trained as a teacher, all his respondents had been taken on to meet a short-term staffing need and were as a result deemed to be a worthwhile training investment. Interestingly, Foster found that in all cases the schools that had been involved in the GTP had done so for pragmatic reasons rather than from a commitment to the principle of training their own teachers. He found that most schools involved felt that *'on the job training'* was a difficult model to mange successfully and the school felt strongly that their main purpose was to teach pupils and not train teachers

Foster concluded that the GTP had achieved some success and was viewed as making a positive contribution to teacher training in certain circumstances, particularly where a flexible and highly individual designed programme is used which meets the individual trainee's needs. It should be noted that all schools within the research had only taken on a trainee where they were deemed to be a worthwhile investment. It should be noted that Foster's research was conducted in a period were super numeracy funding of GTP had not been introduced so the impact of this dimension will need further investigation.

Following Foster's work, Dunne (2005) conducted research with secondary English trainees in the West Midlands area. Dunne adopted a case study approach focussing on two small groups of newly qualified teachers; one group followed the traditional PGCE route to QTS whilst the other was on a GTP. The methodology made use of questionnaires as well as focus group and individual interviews. Supplementary data was

used from documentation contained on the trainees prior to and throughout the training period, for example, individual needs analysis, prior experience etc. The data was analysed taking into account the trainees' perceptions of their strengths and shortcomings of the training pathway: a specific emphasis was placed on the role of the school-based tutor throughout the process and the extent to which their training was underpinned by relevant and appropriate theory.

Dunne found that although there were, unexpectedly for her, many similarities in the experiences of the two groups some significant differences in terms of perceptions were noted. She also noted that there were also significant differences emerging within the two routes that raised issues concerned with consistency and equality of experience.

Evidence from Dunne's research showed that the GTP pathway was being undertaken by people without significant experience in schools and this had increased since the restriction on age had been introduced. Where best practice was evident, Dunne found that there was very little difference between the PGCE and GTP routes except that the GTP seemed to have a less developed sense of educational theory. Dunne felt that this could have significant implications for their future development as teachers. She did however note that there appeared to be a greater variability amongst the GTP route than the PGCE, which she attributed to the close monitoring of the training by the HEI in the case of the PGCE pathway.

Interestingly, Dunne notes that GTP trainees often referred to *'being thrown in at the deep end'* and *'surviving'* when talking about their training; this could be partly attributed to the fact that overall they seemed to be placed in more challenging schools but also the quality of the support offered by school based tutors must play a crucial role. Dunne felt that the fact that GTP trainees often went straight into teaching, sometimes with very little support and the fact that they had to be self-reliant often meant that they were reluctant to be self critical and more complacent about their achievement of the standards. The majority of the GTP trainees were judged to be 'satisfactory' or 'good' by their assessors unlike the PGCE trainees where half of them were deemed to be 'very good'. Interestingly the GTP group though, rated their achievement against the standards more highly than their PGCE counterparts. The PGCE group had a lot more time to develop their ability to theorise which some feel is essential (e.g. Eraut 1994, Drever and Cope, 1999) if they are

not to become so heavily reliant on early training experiences and therefore have problems in developing their teaching skills to a higher level.

Dunne makes some important and challenging recommendations as a result of her research not least of which is the fact that schools involved in the GTP must take on board the responsibility for the training of that individual and acknowledge that this requires a far higher commitment than working in partnership with a HEI through the PGCE route. In addition schools that participate in the GTP must have established and recognised good practice in the subject area for which they are offering the training.

Foster's (2000) work, previously referred to, sought the views of eighty schools, twenty of which had been involved in school-based teacher training in the early days. He found that most schools were not interested in taking full responsibility for training their own teachers (p297). He did, however, discover that schools felt that this was an appropriate route for individuals who had already had a sustained period of teaching experience, for example within the further education sector or had moved from oversees were they had been previously trained.

This was further supported by research by Griffiths (2003) who agues strongly that if "*Yvonne, who started work as a dinner lady'"* could progress to a qualified teacher, *" then I would argue that it is providing an important route into the profession."* (p15)

Foster's (2000) research again supports the argument that the GTP route is a valuable way for some more mature individuals to gain access to the teaching profession but he also argues that GTP would *"not be a suitable training model; for applicants without an education track record"* (Foster 2000, p304). Foster discovered through his research that all the schools who trained a graduate teacher had done so for pragmatic reasons, rather than out of a commitment to a principle of training their own teachers (p 307). The school recognised that training while teaching placed a very heavy burden on both the trainee and the trainers even with good support from the HEI's (also Smith and McLay 2007).

In the last few years the introduction of training grants for the GTP has enabled those on this pathway to be counted as supernumerary and therefore the pressure of training while teaching has been somewhat alleviated.

Despite the Government and representatives from the TTA praising the new scheme and claiming that it was a high quality route into teaching, which had already trained over 6,000 individuals (TTA, 2002 p2), the first Ofsted Inspection published in 2002, was far more critical (Ofsted, 2002). The report by the HMI stated that based on evidence from 62 DRBs in 2000-01 there was considerable variance in practice which included weaknesses in the training programmes, the school based trainers, monitoring of trainees progress, management and quality assurance, thus painting a very different and far from rosy picture. Interestingly Ofsted found the secondary trainees were better teachers than their primary counterparts half of whom demonstrated significant weaknesses in key areas of the DfEE Standards for QTS (i.e. English and maths subject knowledge, planning, teaching and class management and assessment of pupils). Ofsted concluded that at the time of the report too many trainees were failing to achieve the high standards of which they were capable but the report also noted that from the evidence of a minority of examples of good practice that , " *the Graduate Teacher Programme can be an effective route for training teachers"* (Ofsted 2002 pg.10)

Following this, Ofsted began a three-year inspection programme of Designated Recommending Bodies, responsible for the Graduate Teacher Programme in 2002. The first year report, published in January 2005 highlighted the following concerns

- DRBs have found the management of GTP training in a diverse range of schools more demanding than they anticipated.
- By the end of the training approximately 90% of trainees achieve the standards and about half at a good level. Although the proportion of GTP trainees teaching good or satisfactory lessons is similar to trainees on other routes fewer achieve very good lessons and more teach lessons that are unsatisfactory.
- Most common weakness of GTP trainees' teaching is the lack of challenge for the higher attaining pupils, poor evaluation of the impact of teaching strategies on learning and insufficient linkage between assessment and planning.

- Half of DRBs do not implement effective systems to identify and meet individual trainee needs and the auditing and development of subject knowledge is particularly weak in secondary training.
- The design, review and updating of individual training plans needs improvement in many DRBs
- A lot of GTP training lacks a clear structure and the second school experience is often used ineffectively
- 4 in 10 mentors are inadequately prepared to undertake training and assessment roles
- 25% of DRBs do not monitor trainees' progress effectively and do not identify early enough those that are making unsatisfactory progress.
- Approximately half the DRBs do not have secure arrangements to monitor and evaluate their provision systematically.

The strengths and weaknesses of DRBs in the second year of inspection are similar to those found in previous year. The areas most in need of improvement include subject specific knowledge for secondary specialists (approximately a third had weakness here), the identification and provision of individual student training needs and relevant and appropriate experience. Also about a third of DRBs showed significant weaknesses in the rigour and accuracy by which they assed trainees. Interestingly Ofsted noted that despite the GTPs high level of commitment they did not attain the high standards in their teaching. The inspection report also noted the wide variation in experience across the DRBs. That said the report also found that the GTP trainees were confident in their use of class and behaviour management strategies. They concluded that the overall management of DRB partnerships was improving, most had quality assurances processes in place but about half did not monitor and evaluate all aspects of the provision well enough to ensure high standards and consistency, inferring perhaps that there were inconsistencies across this programme and thereby concerns over the quality of the training being provided.

Ofsted reports of PGCE courses of course vary from institution to institution but the latest Ofsted report (www.ofsted.gov.uk) from the HEI in which the PGCE trainees for this research were based outlined the following points for consideration: -

- How to ensure that the quality of cross-marking of assignments is improved
- How to ensure that all school-based staff have a good awareness of trainees' individual needs.

The inspection team found that the selection criteria used for the interviews of the trainees were appropriate, applied consistently and made clear to interviewees. The interviews were effective in identifying suitable trainees, who were chosen from a strong field of applicants. In addition the postgraduate entrants had suitable degree backgrounds. Individual strengths and areas for development were identified as part of the interview process and accepted trainees were assigned developmental activities that they need to undertake to help them prepare for the training. In contrast to the GTP mentors it was noted that all school-based staff had been successfully trained for their roles although, a small minority did not have a good awareness of trainees' needs. The report noted that the schools were suitable venues for training, with well-informed and enthusiastic school-based tutors who provide good professional role models.

With regard to quality assurance process the Ofsted team noted that the quality of the assessment of trainees is monitored in a number of ways and cross-moderation was achieved through shared lesson observations by link and school-based tutors. Other methods to ensure consistency in assessment of trainees include school-based tutors carrying out moderation visits to other schools. In addition a range of monitoring processes adopted provided sound evaluation of the quality of provision. For example, feedback from interviewees is used to improve the selection process. Written reviews following regular management meetings, trainee evaluations, external examiners' and Ofsted inspection reports are all used in the quality assurance process.

d. Partnership

According to an occasional paper presented by Wilkin (1999) on behalf of the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET), *'the government and its agencies and the teacher training community must work as partners in the preparation of students for teaching.'* (Pg1). Wilkin went on to explain that a partnership must consist of a number of elements, in particular shared commitment to a single task and a balance of power, influence and trust. She argued that this is not the case as only the commitment to a

single task is adhered to with reference to the TTA (now TDA) and HEIs. She stated that there is little doubt that those working in ITT in the HEIs are as committed as the government to training teachers but with regard to the other aspects of partnership she saw little evidence. Wilkin felt that in the government's eagerness to achieve their educational vision they have done so by tipping the balance of power in their favour, suggesting that the HEIs had just become tools that have been manipulated by the government in order to achieve their agenda. The government had not given any credence to the HEI's position in terms of their experience and capability within this area. This diminishment of power for the HEI coupled with the compulsion of HEIs to work in partnership with other agencies, mainly schools, had led to distrust and suspicion of further government involvement in policy with regard to teacher education. Wilkin's paper is not arguing, as she says, '*a situation in which individual institutions plough their own independent furrows, but one in which the TTA's hand on the plough steadies rather than determines direction.*' (Pg. 2)

Wilkin (1999) conducted a survey of 16 schools in 4 partnerships and discovered the following reasons why school staff wanted to work in partnership with HEIs:

i. they provided emotional and intellectual support for staff and students,
ii. they monitored standards,
iii. they provided educational and subject theory,
iv. they offered opportunities to both students and mentors to discuss and reflect on their experience,
v. they administered and coordinated the course, and
vi. association with them bought status to the school and to the teaching. (Wilkin, 1999, Pg 2)

Wilkin pointed out that although it is rewarding to have the multi faceted nature of the HEI's contribution to training it was recognised and appreciated that the presence in ITT has to be more that just providing effective and efficient monitoring of the programme. It is vital that HEIs demonstrate that their involvement in the training process is essential and unique and without such a contribution the students' professional preparation would be severely compromised. (Pg 13)

According to Wilkin, schools teach the 'craft' of teaching and can show what is meant by teaching but there is now firm evidence that shows that despite the growth of SCITT's (and other forms of school based training) the majority of schools prefer a partnership model of training (e.g. Barker et al 1996 in Wilkin 1999). Schools have acknowledged that they show students the right way to perform but the HEIs enable them to understand why that idea is the correct way, in other words HEIs provide the theoretical underpinning for the good practice that is demonstrated in the schools. They provide trainees with the opportunity to reflect on practice, consider political and ideological pressures that are being applied and to come to their own informed decisions about conduct in the future. *'The university represents a tradition of critical enquiry and research' (Pg13) w*hich is used proactively to serve the needs of the next generation of teachers.

e. Teaching as a Profession

Another area that needs attention is that of definition and terminology. There has been and indeed there still is an ideological debate being rehearsed concerning the two notions of 'teacher education' and 'teacher training'. According to Calderhead and Shorrock (1997), teacher education refers to the *'all around development of teachers emphasising teaching as a profession involving well formed judgements'* whereas teacher training refers to the *'mechanistic approach to a teacher's preparation. This is more akin to a craft apprenticeship involving mastery of well defined routines'*. Is such a definition helpful or indeed is a distinction necessary? Over the past decade terminology associated with teacher training has become a lot more prominent in the UK. It now appears fashionable to describe teaching in terms of the knowledge base required, or via competency statements (DfE 1992) or via a repertoire of knowledge and skills (HMI 1988). Although statements on what teachers need to know make things clearer for those involved in teacher education/training as they can use these definitions to form professional development programmes which will then meet the explicit needs of teachers at all levels of training, there are, according to Calderhead and Shorrock (1997) a number of drawbacks.

The past three decades have seen a dramatic transformation across the public sector, not only in the UK but also internationally. A variety of reasons have been suggested for

this. Exworthy and Halford (1999) suggest two reasons. The first is based around economic and political factors and the immense pressure that western governments are experiencing to deliver prosperity and security, a position that is being undermined by a world recession, falling profits and the need to constantly look for new markets. There is an explicit concern expressed here that if education is included as a part of this political and economic agenda then unfair competition will emerge in particular amongst the newer HEIs. Secondly, with changes in accessibility due to improved travel and technology, industry is now locating where its cost are lowest. As a result there is a pressure to decrease public expenditure in a number of areas, including education. The following two quotes aptly reflect these views.

> *"As the world is characterised by increasing interpretation and crystallisation of transnational markets and structures, the state itself is having to act more and more like a market player, that shapes its policies to promote, control and maximise returns from market forces in an international setting." (Cerny, 1990, pg.230)*

> *" …entrepreneurial governments promote competition between service providers. They empower citizens by pushing control out of bureaucracy into the community. They measure the performance of their agencies, focusing not on inputs but outcomes. They are driven by goals – their missions – not by their rules and regulations. They define their clients as customers and offer them choices – between schools - …They prevent problems before they emerge, rather then simply offering services afterwards. They put their energies into earning money, not simply spending it. They decentralise authority, embracing participatory management. They prefer market mechanisms to bureaucratic mechanisms." (Osborne and Gaebler 1992 pg.19-20, emphasis in original.)*

The introduction of this new way of managing professionals in the 1980s was justified by questioning the motivation and efficacy of public service workers. Education was seen as epitomising a lot of what was perceived as wrong within the public sector, which was defined as *'expensive, non productive, not accountable, monopolistic, producer dominated, resistant to consumer demand, self serving and a bastion of an entrenched professional elite'* (Mahony 2006). There were increasing demands placed on the public sector to become more accountable and to measure performance in terms of outputs (which in turn can be attributed to the individual). As a result to be 'competitive' in a global market, UK teacher leaders were expected to respond to such demands by improving school effectiveness in measurable terms. Part of this resulted in the production of a framework which defines what a teacher should be able to do. Interestingly this

competitive approach was not adopted worldwide. For example the Danish Minister for Education at the time questioned whether education is a service or a business, he said

> *" A democratic challenge to education is the way to go if we want to develop our democracy. If an education must prepare for democracy it must be democratically organised. Our educational system shall not be a product of a global educational race without thinking of the goals and ideals we want in Denmark. We don't postulate a connection between democracy and education. We insist on it."*
> (Jensen 1997)

However, the UK government believed that ,

> *"To prosper in the 21st century competitive global economy, Britain must transform the knowledge and skills of its population. Every child, whatever the circumstances, requires an education that equips them for work and prepares them to succeed in the wider economy and society. We must harness to the full the commitment of teachers, parents, employers, the voluntary sector and government – national and local- for our educational mission". (DfES 2001, Pg 1)*

The UK, therefore adopted a strategy which resulted in an articulation in the form of competence statements, what teachers at the onset and throughout their career should be able to do. Sets of standards or competence statements were written which defined the teacher at various career stages. For some this is seen as a clear devaluation of their professional status as if teaching no longer involving *'multi-dimensional'* approaches which are *'not susceptible to simple minded analysis or prescription'* (Hegarty 2000, p.451) is it a profession? This debate has been prevalent amongst educationalists over recent years e.g. Hegarty (2000), Sachs (2003), Mahony and Hextall (2000) but with the recent government reforms in education have we sufficiently taken account the impact that these structures have had and undoubtedly will continue to have on teachers' lives? For some e.g. Helsby (1999) teachers are an *'occupational group that has somehow failed'*, they appear no longer to be an autonomous and responsible group of professionals. This raises another important point of debate, that of the difference between an occupation and a profession. Freidson (1994) helps with this; he maintains that although the term profession is synonymous with occupation, a profession refers to specialist work. The kind of work they do is

> *"esoteric, complex and discretionary in character: it requires theoretical knowledge, skills and judgment that ordinary people do not possess, may not wholly comprehend, and cannot readily evaluate." (Pg.200)*

In England and Wales the teacher is increasingly being defined and rewarded by virtue of measuring up to these externally imposed 'professional' standards over which they have little control. Whereas, interestingly Australia, although they have developed professional standards, have adopted a very different approach,

> *"…we've just developed professional standards…we have been quite insistent that this document – instead of being used to measure people would be for people to diagnose their own professional needs, and then it would be a matter of the school helping them to get the right PD. …The Education Department with the Union, has been developing this…they're not to be used for performance assessment and access to promotion – they're to be used for the persons' individual PD plan….. there's no intention that the Principal will be monitoring the teacher. It will be the teachers monitoring themselves, for personal professional development. There's been a national push on standards but the Union turned it into something that we think is worthwhile. We've been quite insistent that it can't be used to give people promotion…because…if you really wanted to pull the rug out under someone's feet. You could find something that they weren't doing. It's your stuff about standards being used for developmental purposes and for regulatory purposes, and slippage between those two can happen. This is why we have been very careful to make sure that the purpose is very clear and it's developmental." Australian Union Officer (Mahony, 2006)*

Defining 'profession' is complex and is a task that has occupied many researchers over a number of years. Many approaches have been adopted but despite so much interest and attention, the concept still remains hotly debated. Two areas that consistently appear in the literature (Keay 2004, Mahoney & Hextall 2000, Bacon et al 2000 for example) are autonomy and specialist knowledge/expertise. In addition Day (1999), suggests that 'extended professionality' is what is now required of teachers in relation to the role and their continuous professional development. For other writers e.g. Furlong (2000), believe that central to the term professionalism is the notion of a specific body of knowledge, autonomy and responsibility influenced by teachers' values (Keay, 2004).

In addition to the problems associated with defining 'professionalism' there is another added complication as writers (e.g. Day, 1999) refer to many different types of professionalism, including, classical, practical, extended, complex and so on. That said,

so many government reforms and changes in teachers' working lives over the last 20 years has led a number of researchers to use the term 'new professionalism'.

Teachers' professionalism is taken to indicate an attempt by the government to exert greater central control over teachers and teaching. The dismantling of the classical definition of professionalism therefore refers to a deprofessionalistion and reprofessionalisation. There is a lot of literature on the topic (see above) but one debate appears to be central and that is, can you remain professional if your autonomy has been eroded or replaced with a body of knowledge which is represented in standards resulting in training being introduced to enable you to meet these?

Mahony and Hextall, (2000) identify two versions as a result of the changes, *'de-professionalisation and re-professionalisation'*. Deprofessionalisation claims that the professional status of teachers is being eroded by the removal of bargaining rights, changes in working conditions, increasing regimes of control and surveillance and decline in respect and trust. Reprofessionalisation claims that changes in social, economic and political contexts are leading to a redefinition of the nature of contemporary professionalism through the changing nature of institutional structures and the internal reshaping of those structures (Mahony and Hextall, 2000). But as always there is disagreement amongst educationalists concerning the nature of these changes. Whitty (1996) is very clear that the changes in teaching reflect deprofessionalisation

> *"....a move away from the notion that the teaching profession should have a professional mandate to act on behalf of the state in the best interests of its citizens to a view that teachers need to be subjected to the rigours of the market and / or greater control and surveillance on the part of the re-formed state..."* (pg.12)

On the other hand, Hargreaves and Goodson (1996) see some aspects of teachers' work being reprofessionalised and other areas they acknowledge have been deprofesisonalised. Interestingly, some writers, such as McCulloch, Helsby and Knight (2000) argue that due to changes in teachers' working lives they are becoming more professional,

> *"....new skills are required, achieving good relationships with client and other stakeholders becomes more important, a more extensive knowledge base has to be mastered and more complex decisions need to be made. Rather than being de-professionalised it could be argued that teaching is being re-professionalised although, the new professionalism is different from the mythical professionalism of 40 years ago."* (pg.110)

This debate is important as it has an impact on initial teacher preparation. The UK Government's continued focus on changes to the teaching profession has highlighted 'new professionalism' (DfEE, 1998a) which implies that prior versions of professionalism are unacceptable or no longer appropriate. A speech in 1999 about 'new professionalism' from the Chief Executive of the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) promised much for teachers but emphasised a discourse of control (Millett, 1999).

Within the context of the present discussion it is significant that current policy documents explicitly promote teaching as a profession (for example in, The Code of Professional Values and Practice, GTC, 2002 and Qualifying to Teach, DfES/ TTA, 2002). Professionalism and those desirable components of teaching as practice (Eglund, 1996) were initially referred to as 'other professional requirements' in the Standards for the Award of QTS and Induction Standards (DfEE, 1998; DfEE, 1999). However, this aspect of teaching appears to have been elevated as in the revised Standards for the Award of QTS (DfES/ TTA, 2002); requirements relating to 'Professional Values and Practice' are listed in the first section[1]. It is interesting to note that in the draft version of the Standards (TTA, 2001) it was stated that teaching was one of the most 'influential and responsible' professions in society, but in the final version, the term responsible has been removed. This would suggest that the Government sees teaching as a profession, but that the professionalism of teachers obviously requires guidance.

Central government control focused its attention on this notion of professional knowledge and, as mentioned earlier, the results of this were expressed via identification of teaching 'competences' required by those entering the teaching profession. From 1992 (DfE, 9/92, DfE, 14/ 93) these requirements have become more extensively articulated (DfEE, 4/98, DfES/ TTA, 2002) and subject to rigorous inspection with far reaching consequences. The requirements were extended to include numeracy, literacy and information and

---

[1] This research was carried out prior to the introduction in 2007 of new standards for qualifies teacher status

communications technology tests and the demands placed on training establishments and new teachers have grown. Furlong and colleagues (2000) suggested that professional standards were introduced to standardise and therefore control practice. The Green Paper (DfEE, 1998) suggests that 'isolated unaccountable professionals' and teacher autonomy had led to unacceptable outcomes. Ball (2001) coins the term 'political folk devil' to describe how governments in the UK have blamed teachers for the ills in society. To some, teachers have become the scapegoats for the perceived failure of the education system and measures have been introduced to deal with the situation.

Conversely, the introduction of teaching standards could be seen as a reason to view teachers as professionals and give them the resulting autonomy. They face complex, unpredictable situations and need a specialist body of knowledge and the autonomy to apply that knowledge (Furlong et al, 2000). The increased demands on teachers to meet specified standards requires them to be 'knowledge workers' and as such they have earned their professional status (Sachs, 2000). In recent government policy there appears to have been an upsurge in interest, even demand, for teachers to be seen as professionals, albeit 'new professionals' (DfEE, 1998). The move from autonomy to control in teaching, and more recently the encouragement to see teachers as professionals, may be seen as a deliberate process further supported by the more recent introduction of standards which need to be met by teachers at various stages of their career.

Changes in ITT, in the form of knowledge, skills and professional values may eventually construct a new generation of teachers with resulting changes in teacher professionalism (Furlong et al, 2000). The 'new' Standards for the Award of QTS (DfES, 2002) revised again in 2007 bring professional values to the forefront of the requirements, highlighting the professional knowledge teachers must gain and the general expectations in terms of the role to be demonstrated prior to qualification. Perhaps we are moving towards a new, and possibly very different, generation of teachers who have different expectations of the role and who are being trained to accept autonomy and control without question.

For many, the introduction of standards (or competencies) at nominated career stages has reduced the role of the teacher to a purely technical one. For Sachs (2003), this development coupled with the moves towards school-based ITT gives *'rise to accusations*

that the government is attempting to reduce teaching to a technician role as a controlling mechanism' . The decision to move ITT into school provides mixed messages; it is seen by some (Hargreaves, D. 1994) as the profession coming of age and being allowed to take responsibility for the training of their profession. However by others, (e.g. Mahony and Hextall, 2000) it is seen as confirmation that a restricted version of professionality is being promoted. HE based input has been reduced to a minimum and the opportunity for theoretical debate and consideration almost eradicated in many cases, particularly on the shorter one year PGCE courses.

f. Standards or Competencies

Introducing specific standards runs the serious risk that teaching becomes overly prescriptive as to what is acceptable practice that may in turn, stifle individuality and creativity. Teachers can be effective in a number of different ways, often this is dependent on their approach and personality and standards don't necessarily, by the very way they are written, allow for this individuality. It is thought that a list of competence statements may devalue the profession and make teaching appear easy once the stated skills are learnt. In addition to this a competency approach to teacher training/education leaves out a number of aspects of the work that are not easy to define, e.g. attitudes of teachers towards pupils and the nature of those relationships (Hyland, 1994).

It has been suggested (Wilkin, 1996) that if lists of competencies are used to define an end product but they omit the detail of the process that has to be gone through in order to arrive at the destination then the level of commitment undertaken is undermined. Teaching competence is a complex and for some traumatic issue and is not just a process of stepping stones that need to be crossed in order to achieve; development needs to be designed to met the individual needs of that person; people will have different starting points, different experiences backgrounds knowledge and so on. Defining just an 'end state' does not account for these. Teaching is not just a matter of 'doing', the most effective teachers fully immerse themselves in the role and it becomes part of them – a personal investment – this is difficult if not impossible to define in competency terms but is an essential element of being an effective teacher. Judging teachers on competency statements alone also fails to take into account the contribution

that the wider community plays and differences in context - for example, for those already established in teaching the school community and for those in training the community that exists around the provider and the differences in placement schools. The role of others in the professional development of the individual, whether at QTS or NPQH stage in their career is always going to be problematic to assess especially as not all communities are positive and supporting; some can be destructive and constraining but have a huge impact on everyday activities in which that individual engages. This in turn will affect their ability and degree to which they are able to meet the competency statements.

One fundamental question that needs to be asked is why was/is there a need for a competence based approach to initial teacher training and ongoing professional development?

> *'The 1980s & 1990s have been characterised by increasing government interference in, and control over all aspects of education.' (Turner-Bisset, 1999, Pg. 39)*

Three trends have been identified during the last decade that became policy in circulars 14/93 and 10/97 (that is the introduction of a competence based approach to gaining QTS). The first is the importance of student teachers' subject knowledge for teaching. This theme can be traced through the White Paper 'Teaching Quality' (DES 1983) and through government circulars 3/84 and 24/89 which established and constituted the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. The second has been the move towards increasing involvement by teachers and schools in initial teacher training. The third, and in this context most far reaching, has been called the competence movement which has its origins in wider vocational training; the identification of various competencies deemed necessary for teaching. For some this is seen as a somewhat instrumentalist if not reductive approach to teachers' education, this approach, taken to its extreme, views teachers as technicians who 'simply apply what educational research has discovered' (Fish, 1989, Turner-Bisset, 1999. Pg 40). The activity of teaching is seen as a collection of skills, it can be described, analysed and mastered. These three themes were made explicit as policy in the DES circular 14/93 (The initial training of primary schools teachers: new criteria for courses (DES 1983). This circular set out a 'strict new criteria' (pg 40) which training courses must meet focusing on the subject knowledge and teaching skills new teachers require to be effective in the classroom.

These competencies have since been surpassed by teaching standards issued by the Teacher Training Agency. This agency set up in 1994 had a remit to: improve the quality of teaching, raise standards of teacher education and training and to promote teaching as a profession. Its programme for reform involved tighter regulation of all aspects of teacher development resulting in standards to be met not just by QTS but also throughout the teaching profession by NQTs, ASTs and AHT. In Feb 1997 the TTA launched a consultation period for a series of new measures for teacher training, including a new national curriculum for teaching maths and English in primary schools. Some viewed this as effectively a national curriculum for teacher training (Turner-Bisset, 1999 and Furlong 2000) and circular 10/97 put these changes into place. The new standards were used to form the basis for planning initial teacher training and assessing its trainees.

Turner-Bisset feels that although the standards can be useful criteria for judging the abilities and attainments of beginning teachers, she would contend that to do so leaves teacher education with a very much-impoverished model to work within. The main criticism here concerns both the content and nature of the list of criteria offered. She feels that the criteria are too general in nature especially when considering subject knowledge (she uses item 2.f as a specific example) and asks 'what precisely is meant by subject knowledge? Is it the same as knowledge required for teaching?' Another strange omission that she quotes is the absence to any reference to an understanding of how children learn. The other criticism offered by Turner-Bisset is the fact that the standards are either met or not met, the beginner teacher can either do what is required or not, there is no graduation of ability or performance. Perhaps a sophisticated system to adopt would be one that incorporates a rising scale of competence such as those developed by Turner-Bisset (1997) or Dunne & Harward (1990). Turner-Bisset, however feels that the most serious criticism is that the list is only a partial representation of what it means to teach, she feels that in describing the standards the substantial knowledge base that is required to do the job well has been ignored. There are, though, significant and complex problems in trying to determine and define this knowledge base, it is a bit like shifting sands, as developments within subjects occur. The individual teacher and the context within which they find themselves working leaves a definition of the knowledge base required to open interpretation. This in itself is problematic, as we can't define what we don't know.

That said some have tried to coin such a definition. The term 'pedagogical content knowledge' originated from Shulman in 1985. He felt this was an amalgamation of content and pedagogy. Many educationists have adopted this approach (e.g. Ormrod & Cole, 1996; Askew et al 1997); some would claim that a teacher's pedagogical content knowledge would affect their qualities as a teacher (Peterson et al, 1989). If one accepts that pedagogic content knowledge is fundamental to high quality teaching as it encompasses not just subject knowledge but also includes understanding of the curriculum, strategies for instruction and purposes of teaching, then defining teaching by a set of minimal standards has to be seen as reductive

> *'It is clear that teaching is a deeply complex, intellectual and practical activity. It is a creative act in which the expert teacher selects from the store of experience and repertoire of teaching strategies and representations the most appropriate ones for his or her purposes. The danger in focusing only on teaching skills and competencies or standards is that it ignores the complex reasoning, thinking and synthesis which underpins the best teaching.' (Turner-Bisset, 1999 Pg 52)*

g. Mentors and Mentoring

The legislative changes in England, especially the circular 9/92 issued by the Department for Education concerning the secondary phase of training resulted in the reorganisation of ITE throughout all HEIs. The most notable difference was the specific requirement that HEIs work more closely in partnership with the schools in which the trainees complete their placements; therefore the mentoring role of the teacher in the school has heightened significance in terms of the trainees' development. According to Shenton and Murdoch (1996) it is imperative that these changes are made whilst taking into account the relative merits and in particular expertise and resources of those involved. As a result HEIs moved to a position where they provided the theoretical perspectives, the approaches to practice, appropriate pedagogies and covered safety issues. The schools on the other hand addressed what was termed the more 'practical' elements of the trainee teachers' development; they assisted with lesson preparation and planning, development of subject knowledge, class management and assessment of pupils, which are the practical teaching competencies. Many studies have focused on the effectiveness of mentoring (e.g. Hobson, 2002) and nearly all agree that from the student perspective the role of their mentor is the most crucial in their development into a competent and effective

teacher. Unfortunately the quality of the mentoring experiences in schools differs considerably (see Hayes 2001, Dunne 2005 & Jones M 2005)

For over a decade mentoring has been used as a strategy in ITT programmes. Jones and Straker (2006) attempted to draw up a typology of mentors' professional knowledge in relation to Shulman's (1985) model of teacher knowledge and link this to the framework of standards that is statutory for all in ITT to achieve. Interestingly Jones and Starker found that the majority of mentors draw on their teacher knowledge without sufficient reference to important principals of the adult learner and any generic principals that underpin mentoring.

Perhaps it would be useful at this stage to attempt to provide a definition of mentoring. This though is not straight forward. The term mentoring, according to (Malderez (2001) describes *the 'support given by one (usually more experienced) person for the growth and learning of another, and for their integration into and acceptance by a specific community'* (Malderez p57 in Hobson 2002, Pg.5)

According to Brown et al (2002) the last 10 years have seen the position of the role of the mentor become increasingly acknowledged as a key strategy in professional training and development programmes not just in education but in health care, business and industry. Yet again definition proves difficult to reach agreement on. For example, Caruso (1990) describes it as 'a helping process'; Ardery (1990) 'a teaching-learning process'; Roberts (2000) as 'an intentional structural, nurturing, insightful process either developing along stages or rhythms, but not in series of events'; or Bennetts (1996) defines it as 'learner centred and progresses at a rate determined by the mentor and mentee' .

So mentoring can cover a variety of activities ranging from helper functions to those of assessment,

> *'Within the context of professional training and development a shift away from the personal to the professional is evident –it now bears little resemblance to original Greek model, where the mentor was the older, trusted and loyal friend who had responsibility for the growth and development of their protégée and whose characteristics were integrity, wisdom and personal involvement. The relationship was personal and mutually respectful' (see Plato and Aristotle, personal correspondence, Mahony 2006)*

It is now evident that the assessment frameworks within which professional development and training operates places an additional demand (or burden) on the mentor, that of assessment and this is one that some would argue can produce conflicting loyalties.

In terms of ITT, Tomlinson (1995), defines mentoring as assisting student teachers to learn how to teach in school-based settings. If this definition is accepted then it follows that it is not just the designated individual who is the trainees' mentor but the role falls to a number of others within the school (and in some cases beyond) who actually work alongside the trainee i.e. all teachers, community nurses, social worker and so on. A number of theories of learning support the notion that effective professional learning takes place when the trainee is able to work closely alongside a more experienced practitioner (Sloboda (1986) Tharp & Gallimnore (1988) Rogoff (1995).

In Hobson's (2002) work on perceptions of students prior to school placement he found that 92.4% of PGCE students indicated that they thought it would be very valuable or essential to plan lessons with their school mentor and 95.3% stated that it would be valuable or essential to have their school mentor watch them teach and give them feedback. After the placement, further evidence showed that 92% of respondents thought their school mentors were very or quite effective which further highlights the importance that those in training place on the school mentor for their personal development and effectiveness. Interestingly often students found that their first mentor in their first placement was more effective than their second (86% down to 76% or 65% and 50% when considering the very effective range). This may be attributed to the fact that students need a lot more overt support and help with more substantial pedagogical areas in the first placement and it is during their second placements that the finer skills of the teacher are addressed. Some mentors may present a challenge to trainees who are happy to plateau, feeling that they are doing well, whilst other mentors may not have sufficient skills themselves in order to move the student on to next level. Alternatively this may relate to the students' perception of need and their growing independence within a school setting (some of this may be misplaced) or it could be attributed to a change in mentoring style. In addition the student may have problems adapting to a different approach to that which they had previously experienced.

During the last 50 years teacher training in Britain reflects a number of stages of development each of which represents a distinct view of school-based experience and preparation. In the 1950s there was the 'apprenticeship model'; here the practising teacher was given the role of master-teacher and they were expected to convey the rules and values of their craft to their 'apprentice'. According to Furlong and Maynard (1995) one major downfall of this model is the fear that it becomes no more than a 'tips for teachers' approach to professional development. After the mid 1980's ITT started to focus on the link between forms of training and approaches to teaching and from this a 'competency model' emerged. Here the teacher in the role as mentor was expected to prepare trainees towards achieving a list of pre-determined standards. This lead to a very technical approach to training and development and for some this lead to a very reductionist approach, where professional development was undertaken with particular standards in mind and rarely considered within the wider teaching and learning context in which individual operated. An alternative model appeared at about the same time, the 'reflective model'. In this approach the mentor becomes the impersonator of wisdom and they are positioned to guide the trainee through their experience and develop them into reflective practitioners. The final model, presented by Butters (1997) which is in contrast to the previous ones is one that is less definitive but is a combination of some of the original mentoring traits alongside the a role of the mentor where feedback given allows the mentee to assert their values and negotiate their own learning targets in a more open way.

The results from Jones et al (2005) research shows that teachers perceive themselves predominately in the 'advisor' role, they stress the importance of acting as model teachers, which matches the views of the trainees who in addition would like to see mentors in a supportive role. This role is not seen by the mentor as having the same level of priority. Trainees were asked what characteristics, qualities and skills would they look for in their mentors, they stated in order of priority; supportive, approachable, advisor, friendly. Although we can see areas of significant overlap there are also areas of divergence. Interestingly the role of assessor was not seen as important by either mentor or mentee.

Hobson & Malderez (2005) considered factors that influence the professional development of beginning teachers and mapped out the key players in this process. From the trainees' perspective the most influential is the college tutor and mentor in school. The influence of the college tutor is seen to diminish over time whereas the opposite is generally felt of the school mentor. But according to Grossman (1992) the impact of the HEI tutor may be more substantial than at first thought.

Griffith's (2003) evaluated throughout her paper, the GTP in relation to a partnership for primary provision set up in the south of England between a University and a LEA. She explored factors affecting the trainee's progression e.g. prior work experience, expectation of the trainee, levels of support provided b y school. She argued that for most trainees the GTP 'offers a positive way into teaching that would otherwise be unavailable to some mature career changers.'

Griffith's research into a nominated GTP programme adopted a case study approach and three main methods of data collection were employed. Firstly, observations were carried out in the school and discussion took place with the mentors and head teachers; secondly, the trainees completed questionnaires as a part of the end of programme evaluation and thirdly follow up interviews were conducted on a representative sample (n=10). In addition feedback from the schools and trainees via the programme steering group was also drawn on.

According to Griffith the effects of prior experience contributed to the trainees feeling of preparedness at the start of their training and they all indicated that they felt ready to 'cope with the transition to teaching'. These trainees were able to draw on their previous experiences in order to understand the new situation and to begin to transform previous knowledge and adapt to their current situation. For some trainees though, this transference of skills did prove problematic, especially for those who had transferred onto a GTP with no prior experience of working in schools. Interestingly, Griffith found that these trainees who had had previous experience working in schools had to deal with 'unrealistically high expectations on the part of the school'. For example one trainee was expected to teach a full class within 4 weeks of starting the programme. These '*exploitive'* situations often arose as a result of staffing problems within the schools and also partly

as a lack of appreciation by the schools of the GTP and their role within the training process.

In terms of preparedness, Griffith's found that most of the trainees felt well prepared in their core and specialist subjects and in classroom management but felt decidedly unprepared in the non-core subjects especially music and PE. These finding match those of others from the late 1990s onwards (e.g. Furlong et al 2000, Griffith 2003). Other areas of unpreparedness included planning for special needs, dealing with parents, reports writing and assessment, all issues cited in other research.

The trainees, especially with regard to the professional development aspects of their programme, reported inconsistencies in terms of school–based training. In a number of schools the professional development programme was led by the head teacher and included sessions on policies and practices, planning and behaviour management but this was not consistent for all trainees (Ofsted, 2002). As trainees in the majority of cases were placed in well organised schools that were able to provide models of good practice, the necessity for a developed course in professional issues was not always understood and valued, and trainees were left to enhance their own professional practice through observation rather than debate and discussion. For many trainees they only really realised the extent of what they had learnt as they embarked on their induction year in a new setting. The converse was also true in that for some they weren't aware of what they needed to know until starting in their new schools.

In terms of the quality of mentor support, trainees cited this as variable. Some trainees received very good support from experienced teachers whereas others had a less positive experience and felt that problems arose because the mentor was new to the role and uncertain what their role involved. This meant that they were often reactive in terms of their support rather than proactive which in turn put additional pressure on the trainee. Some trainees were allocated mentors who were already over-worked and the trainee then felt that they were an additional burden and tried to avoid bothering the mentor or asking for help. In the course of the study, Griffith noted that several mentors went off 'long term sick' or left the school.

Griffith found that all those she interviewed could evaluate the quality of the training they received and found that the GT had a mature outlook on their first term of teaching in terms of making sure that they were well prepared and had sufficient resources. Having said that, some of the experiences of the GTs were not altogether positive mainly due to unclear expectations on the part of the schools and some inconsistencies in the quality of mentoring they received. These finding were echoed by HMI inspection in 2002. That said, Griffith did find some evidence of strong support from the school and excellent examples of mentoring, most trainees felt well prepared in their core subjects and had a mature outlook on their first year of teaching. Those who had prior school experience found that they could draw on this to further develop their skills in order to make a positive transition to teaching, those with other professional skills could eventually transfer these skills but this did take longer. Griffith stresses that problems with inconsistency and challenges exist for all training routes not just the GT and despite the demanding nature of the programme most trainees within the sample felt extremely positive about their experience.

Griffith concluded that the GTP gives access to teaching for those from non-traditional backgrounds and mature entrants and therefore is providing a vital route into the profession

Whitehead and Fitzgerald (2006) explored the development of a generative research-based approach to mentoring in ITT, in particular within one Training School where extra funding was provided by DfEE to try out new approaches to training teachers. Previous research evidence (e.g. Edwards and Protheroe 2003) indicated that mentoring practices currently prevailing in schools were essentially similar to those that were current prior to the reforms in ITT. Whitehead and Fitzgerald explored ways of moving this practice forward in order to be of greater benefit to the trainee and the mentor within the school whilst still addressing the government's demand for school-based professional development and training. Previously the work of the mentor in school had been to 'induct and help trainees acquire what had been identified as a body of professional knowledge linked to the externally prescribed standards' – they were to train and support trainees so that they could become 'part of the existing culture of teaching' (Wang 2002 in Whitehead and Fitzgerald, 2006, p39). This defined what the practice of mentoring should be and this they did under the guise of 'achieving consistency and trainee entitlement', which

was a demand made on them by the Ofsted inspection regime. The purpose of this research was to consider a more school-based process and to be able to move beyond the initial and restrictive approach offered by HEIs to a more 'generative' approach. Here the specific knowledge of the mentors was taken into account as were the insights of the trainees and in later stages of the research the voice of the pupils were also considered. The idea was that professional knowledge would emerge from reflective dialogue between the mentor and the trainee as they planned and analysed lessons for which each took responsibility.

The results of the research indicated that there were direct benefits not only for the trainee but also for the mentor and in fact the whole school. The whole approach to reflection had to be based on an environment of trust and respect for each other as well as open mindedness and an active desire to listen to what others had to contribute as a result it was seen that staff became far more collaborative. They started to respect each others' differences and recognise each others' strengths. They had developed an ethos within the school where it was safe to speak the truth, ask hard questions as they had established a firm climate of openness and trust. It is also worth noting that the leadership within the school was significant to the success seen – the head teacher openly welcomed professional discourse and was supportive of the risk taking that individuals were making in the name of professional development. The project was so successful in the school that the head teacher went on to employ a number of learning coaches with a view to building on the work within ITT to offer opportunities for all staff for professional development and discourse.

Dunne (2005) presented research which focused on the graduate training programme, in particular the role of the mentor. The research attempted to explore the additional expectations and responsibilities of the mentor in supporting the trainee on their chosen employment based route to qualified teacher status. Dunne also attempted to compare the role of the mentor in employment based routes, namely the GTP with mentors in the other more traditional routes, namely the full time PGCE pathways. Various areas of significance have emerged, firstly that often mentors for the GTP have developed their mentor programmes largely on their own initiative and at a heavy cost to them personally in terms of their own time. The reason she gives for this appears to be linked to the

nature of the relationship that the GTP has with the HEI, often a far more distant one than those mentors who are associated with the PGCE programme.

As Dunne (2005) points out *'there are significant issues arising from employment based training both in terms of quality and management of the initial teacher training programme'* (Pg2), this is further supported by Ofsted reports in 2005 and 2006. Dunne poses an initial question for her research, 'Is mentoring an adequate term for the skills and knowledge that is needed for school based tutors' who are training GTs given that they are training beginning teachers within the school with minimal input from the HEI?' Her original research (2004) revealed that the GTs viewed their training as far less systematic than previous *'rhetoric had suggested it would be' (Pg 2)* compared to the PGCE trainees who felt they had been well prepared. This revealed a need for good practice to be shared and disseminated to all schools regardless of the training pathway they supported in order to avoid comments such as

> *" We feel we're alright because we survived; they feel alright because they know what they are doing." (GTP respondent from Dunne's research Pg 2)*

Dunne discovered that many in the GTP group had been used to cover for absent colleagues, even when the school was in receipt of a training grant. This situation is further addressed by Foster (2002) (albeit in the early days of the programme) and more recently Brookes (2005, p45 in Dunne 2005 pg3) who talks of the *'abuse of the spirit if not the letter of GTP'*. When interviewing GTP trainees Dunne unravelled the following issues which need addressing if the government is to achieve its aim that employment based routes into teaching should be viewed in the same high regard as other more traditional pathways.

1. A planned programme of development that would include information and help with lesson planning etc
2. A phased introduction to teaching a class, including observation working with small groups, taking parts of the lesson and so on
3. A planned programme of professional development that will address issue of classroom management, positive behaviour management and so on and a time appropriate for the trainee
4. Being seen as a trainee and not viewed on as an additional pair of hands

It appears for many trainees that they experienced a *'sink or swim'* approach to their professional development, many felt that they had inadequate support and monitoring, infrequent lesson observation and feedback and little chance to observe other more experienced teachers. Interestingly often the GTP trainees were very protective of their mentors and felt that they had been let down by the system and not given adequate time in order for them to carry out their role effectively. The other issue that arose was the lack of theory and pedagogical work, often their development was based around subject knowledge enhancement with tips on managing the learning environments.

Dunne also found that GT students recorded higher levels of confidence in meeting the standards than their PGCE counterparts despite rating their training less highly; sometimes there was conflict between their perceptions of ability and that of their assessors. Ofsted (2002) pointed out that fewer GTP trainees teach very good lessons and more teach lessons with unsatisfactory in some features. Dunne noted that when reviewing the GT responses there was a far higher dependence on self concerns rather than concerns for pupil learning, in contrast to the responses of the PGCE group. The GT success criteria focused on their own performance and on *'cracking'* classroom management. It was also interesting to note that the

1. GTP trainees had a good experience of SEN but this was attributed to the fact that they were often placed in challenging schools.
2. They were judged against all standards from the offset of training
3. Most had irregular observations
4. They had reasonably regular meetings with their mentor but these often focused on management issues
5. They had little opportunity to observe other teachers
6. Any theoretical underpinning was focused on practical tips
7. They seemed to be more interested in what to do rather than why
8. They saw the HEI involvement as a strength and some saw it as the only 'training' they received

In contrast the PGCE group felt they had benefited from a gradual immersion into whole class work. They had regular opportunities to observe more experienced teachers, they were observed regularly and given detailed and systematic feedback and their weekly

meeting with the mentors were used to assess progress to date and set further targets. Other areas included

1. They felt able to develop sound planning skills
2. They saw the links between management of behaviours, pupils' learning and assessment
3. They were given opportunities to make mistakes and move on
4. They experienced a gradual increase in expectation on the part of the mentor with regard to achieving the standards
5. They were given a theoretical underpinning of their practice.

According to Dunne, issues of quality came to light and these were highlighted in the Ofsted Inspection of GTP in 2004 – here it is stated that *'half of designated recommending bodies do not implement effective systems to identify and meet trainees' individual training needs.'* (p3) In addition they identified that a lot of GTPs lacked a distinct structure and perhaps one of the most significant findings was that although schools based tutors had previous experience of ITT, four in ten were inadequately prepared to undertake the training and assessment required by them of an employment based route. That said Dunne does acknowledge that two of the GTs in her study (n=10) did receive excellent mentoring but of the other eight in the study, four had no consistent mentoring and the quality of the mentoring varied. This was often dependent on other roles that the individual had within the school which limited the time available to them to act as mentor or it could be attributed to their lack of experience in teaching themselves or the fact that they were very new to the school.

Both sets of trainees (PGCE and GT) agreed that effective mentoring was paramount to their professional learning, both groups recognised that an effective mentor is someone who is willing to work beyond the mentoring hours they are given. However, five of the GT respondents had only spent 30 minutes a week or less with their mentor. The entire group reported that they were observed on average once a fortnight although for one this did not happen at all in the final term. The remaining half reported that they were rarely observed – one reported having about four observations by the same person in a three week period in order to fulfil the requirement for the assessment. These reporting are in sharp contrast to the PGCE group.

The GTs that reported receiving feedback had further concerns as often the written report was vague and unhelpful, on occasions highly critical and negative but with no pointers as to where or crucially how to develop.

Dunne also worked with school-based tutors who had been identified by their trainees as offering high quality mentoring. She discovered all but one would describe themselves as *'self-selected'* for the role (the one was invited to apply for the role on basis of previous work with PGCE trainees). The others put themselves forward for various reasons including: they were HOD, 'there are only two of us', 'I like the work', and 'I was asked'.

The Ofsted inspection of 2003-04 stated that final assessments were reliable. However 25% of mentors did not monitor trainees' progress effectively and therefore were unable to identify those who were struggling early enough.

Only two out of seven SBTs felt they were formally monitored in the role and had written school policies in place although they did feel they were informally monitored. They all felt that the role of the professional tutor (PT) was very important in checking they were completing all documentation. The PT was also seem as important in terms of support for observations and as a means of standardisation, that said, Dunne only found one school where joint observations with SBT and PT took place.

Dunne found that time for the role of subject mentor was a key issue among the SBTs she interviewed. Only one was allocated time as part of their contact hours and even this was fortnightly. Issues that came to the fore from the group included time taken as they had to cover for staff shortage/absence or were asked to complete other additional tasks, all of which detracted from their '*protected time'*. All SBTs indicated that the actual time they had spent with trainees was in excess of timetabled time, they felt that they typically spent at least 3 hours per week with their trainees and in addition there was also input from other staff members. All the administrative tasks that were required were in addition to this time and often completed at home. All the SBTs agreed that a GT was far more time-consuming than a PGCE especially if they were a weak trainee.

The Ofsted Inspection Report (2004) highlighted that most mentors on the GTP had previous experience in ITT but found 40% were inadequately prepared for the additional

assessment and monitoring role. For most SBTs the training they had received was to mentor PGCE trainees, most SBTs saw the DRB sessions they attended as 'briefing ' sessions and not as training. All the SBTs in the study noted a difference in expectation of the DRB and paperwork. All SBTs interviewed felt they lacked a rationale to underpin the training (pg9) and specific focus for points in training or clear expectations about likely stages of development.

The SBTs recorded a wide difference in the input that trainees received from DRB, some attended weekly sessions, some just once a term. Induction into the schools varied as well, some SBTs admitted that for practical reasons the trainee was teaching from the start, mainly due to staff shortages (although closely monitored). Most SBT moved the trainees on by instinct or as a response to an articulated need by the trainee. The trainees' experiences often fell in line with the school year rather than their need for development – i.e. SAT marking, parents' evening report writing. Only one school had a specific professional development programme for GTs which took account of individual needs, all others had generic sessions which often included other trainees and on occasions NQTs or could be a whole school inset.

Dunne asked SBTs & PTs about the perceived strengths of the GTP. They felt that it probably was a good route for those who wanted to train on the job. But the calibre of GT is important and the time allocated and subsequent level of support that they are able to give is also vital. All SBTs saw the GTP as a very good route for more mature trainees – especially those who wanted to teach but could not do a PGCE for financial reasons but all SBTs expressed concern about the lowering of the age limit from 24 to 21. All SBTs felt the GTP was a high pressure route into teaching and success depended a lot on the characteristics of the trainee, the need to be resourceful, independent, extremely hard working, confident and willing were mentioned. Several felt that GT developed better relationships with pupils than PGCE. The GT were considered to be more realistic about their school context with greater depth of experience to draw upon than the PGCEs. One PT gave the following reflection,

> *"the opportunity for real life experience and unrelenting hands on as opposed to the more protected experience of the PGCEs; the opportunity to experience greater breadth and depth; a greater sense of responsibility and accountability and more realistic relationships with colleagues." (Dunne, 2005, Pg. 11)*

Several SBT & PT felt that the GTs were good for the pupils and kept staff on their toes. One respondent felt that the GTs were far more committed to the school and saw it as a great opportunity to take unqualified teachers through to gaining QTS.

Dunne however, highlighted the following issues and concerns;

1. The route could only be effective as a training route if numbers were super numeracy
2. The GTs need an induction period, time to work alongside an experienced teacher and joint planning and assessment
3. The GTP is very dependent on quality of applicant – some felt short changed – teacher quality may decline over time if not addressed
4. The GTs need more time to study pedagogy
5. The SBTs in particular need to be given sufficient time to train the GTs
6. There needs to be a systematic review of processes, stronger links to DRB and good supporting resources.

h. Motivation and attitudes of trainees to their chosen pathways

One of the most substantial and certainly most recent longitudinal research projects into teacher training and ongoing teacher professional development is being undertaken by a team of researchers from Nottingham University, lead by Hobson & Malderez. This research, which is sponsored by DfES, GTCE & TTA (now TDA), began in 2005 and is a six year project focusing on the experiences of beginner teachers in England. Currently available are the finding from year one of the project which report on 'the nature and impact of teachers'' experiences of initial teacher training, induction and early professional development'.

The aim for year one of the project was

> *"To examine extent to which the experiences of people entering the teaching profession via different ITT pathways may vary, and the extent to which such experiences might also be shaped by other factors, including teachers' prior conceptions and expectations of teaching and teacher training". (Hobson, Malderez et al, 2005, Pg. 1)*

In order to address this a number of key questions were posed,

1. Why did individuals decide to become teachers and was there variation between those taking different routes?
2. How did individuals decide on which route to follow?
3. What were the individuals' prior beliefs and expectations of teaching and ITT?
4. What were the individuals' initial conceptions and early experiences of 'theory' in ITT?
5. What were the individuals' early experiences in school?

The research methodology adopted included the use of self completion questionnaires and in depth interviews at start of final (only) year of programme. Although the sample was designed to be representative of all routes into teaching, for some of the smaller pathways it was necessary to enhance the percentage that took part in the research so that statistically reliable information could be obtained. It is acknowledged that this may be problematic for the interpretation of some results but it was felt that the benefit of being able to compare all pathways in this manner outweighed the possibility of skewed results. In total seventy four ITT providers took part in the survey which included 4, 790[2] trainees completing the initial questionnaire and 85 trainees taking part in follow up interviews across 19 different providers.

The summary findings clearly show that the three most influential reasons why people were attracted to teacher training were: the challenging nature of the job (being a teacher); the perceived benefits (long holidays) and altruistic motives (helping young people learn) with the later being the single most important reason identified. Other reasons included, working with young people, giving something back, professional status of teaching, fallback position, pay and conditions and staying involved with the subject.

The research also asked participants to cite the perceived drawbacks or reservation to entering the teaching profession. Those cited included, teachers' morale (22%), salary

---

[2] Made up of 1, 756 University PGCE; 1, 385 BA/ BSc with QTS; 707 GTP; 413 Bed; 342 SCITT; 187 Flexi PGCE.

(20%), public perception (15%), speaking to other teachers (14%), spending more time in HE (13%) and TV drama programmes (11%). That said, the last reason stated, TV programmes, was the only item to have deterred more people than it attracted (only 8% saw this as an attraction), other drawbacks worth mentioning included, workload, pupil behaviours and management and the public perception of teachers. For most, although they were able to articulate a range of concerns, they interestingly did not apply them to their own personal circumstances and felt strongly that the benefits outweighed the drawbacks.

The results also highlighted that at the point of application most people were aware of the university based routes to teaching, whereas more people in the older age group (i.e. the over 25yrs) were aware of the employment-based and flexible routes. For example only 25% of the PGCE trainees were aware of the employment based routes. Interestingly, of those that took part in the study overall, 90% indicated that they were following their first choice of study (92% of PGCE's and 82% of GTPs) and the main influences on that choice were the balance of in-school and out-of-school training, geographical availability, financial viability, length/duration of programme and the reputation of the provider. As one would expect, the differing routes available, resulted in differing reasons for the choices made. For example, 81% of those on the GTP routes opted for that pathway as they felt it was the best option financially compared to 50% on PGCE routes and 14% on the BEd route. The PGCE pathway appeared to be most influenced by the balance of in-school and out-of-school training (54%). Of those not following their first choice route, the top reasons for this were: their application was rejected; courses were oversubscribed; they applied too late; they didn't achieve standard/qualification required.

A number of reasons were given for the trainee's choice of route but the most popular responses involved financial considerations; a desire to be trained by teachers in school; a belief that prospective employers may prefer graduates; and a desire to train alongside peers in the same situation. When considering just the PGCE and GTP trainees, 54% of PGCE felt the balance of in-school and out-of-school training was important; 50% cited financial reasons and 43% wanted to train with a peer group; whereas the 81% of GTPs gave financial reasons for their choice, 65% cited being trained by teachers in school as influential, 62% gave the fact that it was entirely school based as the reason and 42%

cited the availability in their local area. In addition to this, for many trainees, the length and duration of the study was also an important consideration

> " I *wanted to go back to.....where I did my degree but I couldn't really afford it so this was second best...It would have been a PGCE but I've done a SCITT because of the locality and finance (i.e. the programme is based close to the trainees family home allowing him to live with his parents while training)...GTP would have been my first option but I couldn't do it because of my age (Mark 20-24, SCITT Secondary PE, in Hobson et al 2005, Pg. 54)*

The majority of trainees (75%) had not considered the programme content when making their choices. Of those that had, 92% of the GTP trainees felt that a classroom orientated perspective was essential, whereas 91% on the PGCE route felt that how to bring about pupil learning was most important. Almost half trusted that the programme they had signed up to would provide them with the necessary skills for the job. Where knowledge and skill had been considered the top five essential were: learning subject knowledge, developing creative/ inspiring teaching styles, learning behaviour management strategies, learning about legal issues and learning about how children learn/ different learning styles.

The participants were questioned about what they were most looking forward to in terms of their training. The responses from the PGCE and GTP trainees were fairly similar. Being in the classroom was top of the list (80% of PGCE and 85% of GTP trainees) followed by developing an understanding of teaching and learning (73% PGCE; 76% GTP). However, learning to teach the subject ((70% PGCE and 59% GTP) and learning from practising teachers (47% PGCE and 72% GTP) elicited the greatest differences in anticipation.

The trainees were also asked about the importance of learning different skills and knowledge and here discernable differences can be seen between the PGCE and the GTP pathways. The ability to maintain discipline was a priority for 86% of PGCEs and 92% of GTP trainees; time management rated at 66% for PGCE trainees and 61% for the GTPs; the principles of assessment for learning rated 41% for PGCEs and 46% for GTPs; dealing with pastoral issues was a key for 35% of PGCEs and 41% of GTP trainees; staff supervision/management skills scored 38% for PGCEs and 27% for GTPs; understanding educational policy was important for 32% of PGCEs and 28% for GTP

trainees; research on effective teaching methods - 25% of PGCEs saw this as important compared to 21% of GTPs; philosophy of education was rated lower with just 11% of PGCEs and 8% of GTP trainees rating this and finally history of education was seen as least important as only acknowledged by 6% of PGCE and 3% of GTP trainees as of any importance. The noticeable differences between the two pathways tend to appear when considering the theoretical aspects of the training.

When the trainees were questioned about their preferred and expected learning styles the item that was of highest importance across all ITT routes was 'having mentors observe lessons and give feedback' (75%). Only 60% thought it important to have HEI colleagues do the same. 75% felt it was very important that they experienced another activity in school, namely 'watching teachers teach'. Only 48% felt the same about 'studying ideas about how children learn' and only 22% thought it was very important to study current research on teaching methods.

When comparing the two pathways under question, both sets of feelings were fairly similar and getting help with lessons plans rated highly amongst the trainees (73% of PGCE & 67% of GTP). This was followed by having University tutors observe and give feedback (PGCE 68%, GTP 61%[3]), receiving ideas about how pupils learn (PGCE 50%, GTP 43%), sharing with other trainees (PGCE 35%, GTP 24%) and current research on teaching methods (PGCE 24%, GTP 18%)

i. Trainees' perceptions of the relevance of theory

One of major contrasts between training routes is the degree of HEI involvement in the training. A lot of debate has centred on the involvement of the HEI and the kind of knowledge beginner teachers need to learn / develop. As a result one of aims of the research was to explore trainees' conceptions of theory and its relevance to practice. Interestingly trainees utilise the terms 'theory and practice' to refer to distinct elements of their training. Trainees used the term theory to refer to a broad range of knowledge ranging from the work of developmental psychologists to knowledge of the NC and sometimes to more 'practical 'considerations such as lesson planning and assessment

[3] Although this appears to be a contradiction to the claims of the previous paragraph, it should be noted that this claim refers to just PGCE and GTP trainees and not to all routes to ITT

> *"well the essay writing and the reading and that sort of, I guess that sort of research type side of it, about teaching and learning styles and you know....having people come in and talk to you about how to do your assessment and recording and reporting." (Female, 25-29, SCITT, secondary MFL, in Hobson et al, 2005, Pg. 86)*

The aspects of ITT that trainees most frequently referred to when talking about theory are: knowledge which supports classroom teaching and assessment of pupils' work; knowledge about how children learn; subject content knowledge and legal issues which teachers need to be aware of e.g. child protection. Literature suggests that trainees' perception of whether they see aspects of the ITT training as theory is dependent on the site of the learning, normally with those aspects experienced in HEI as 'theory' and those in schools as 'practice'. (Furlong et al 2000)

> *"All I could focus on was the classroom side of things...That's what I thought for being a teacher that was the bit I needed to learn.... Because I've opted to do it solely in school and I haven't done any of the day releases at (my HEI) that I could have done, I think I've missed out on things like learning styles and different teaching methods and I think but obviously I've got a lot of that from the training, but the theoretical side of teaching I think I've probably missed out on doing it this way." (female 35-39, RTP, secondary D&T, in Hobson et al, 2005, Pg. 88)*

The above quote raises an interesting issue and suggests that one of roles of the HEI in teacher training is to teach theory but how does this sit within the programme design of the employment based routes? In addition there appears to be a noticeable contrast between those who have either substantial previous experience in schools or who are predominately training in schools. These individuals are now looking for theoretical input to help them expand and explain their practice and see the HEI as the place where they get this theoretical knowledge to help them become successful practitioners.

There appears to be a perception among PGCE trainees that theory and practice are largely divorced from each other, some felt that greater emphasis had been put on theory at start of the course and for some theory was separate from and irrelevant to the development of teaching skills. Others thought that theory was only relevant when presented explicitly within the context of their own subject specialism. For example a PE trainee commented on professional studies and said it,

> *"seems to be completely irrelevant quite often. Take for example this week…they had us anglicising science written work, and we were all PE students saying 'hang on a second'...on Tuesday .. the lecturer tried to adapt what has gone on to PE which just seems a complete repetition really because you might as well have PE and not professional studies (female, 20-24, PGCE secondary PE, in Hobson et al, 2005 Pg.91)*

The GTP trainee on the other hand acknowledged that one of the central reasons why they chose their particular pathways was that it was almost exclusively based in schools. It would therefore appear that they have already made a judgement about what they thought valuable – i.e. a desire for a hands on approach and not a return to study. That said a number of GTPs did comment on the helpfulness of the HEI sessions to expand their knowledge and skills base and highlighted ways theory enhanced their understanding and gave them a more' holistic' understanding of policy and strategy. Nonetheless others saw the HEI input as introducing them to issues that they might not encounter in their training schools, whilst others felt it provided them with a broader understanding of issues and a range of alternative approaches to those adopted in their training schools.

> *" My ideal programme would be……to have three or four days in uni……to reflect and develop what we're thinking about….its not a PGCE so ….the aim of the course I guess is for it to be done in school but I think there could be a bit of input from the uni……on how to do it" (Male, 30-34, GTP, primary in Hobson et al 2005, Pg. 95)*
>
> *"The university need to teach us more about child psychology and pedagogy…why do children behave the way they do" " (Male, 40-44, GTP, secondary ICT in Hobson et al 2005, Pg. 95)*

In summary it appears that the views of the GTP and PGCE trainees are quite similar and often dependent on the amount of prior experience that they have had in schools, those with more experience are more confident to go into classroom whereas those with little really want lots of 'tips' for survival. It appears that those who enter training with 'implicit experiential learning associated with prior experiences in schools as adults may have created an ability to see a relevance and value for 'theory' when it is encountered, without any conscious process of deliberation or reflection or action'(P102).

For both sets of trainees the school mentors and attitudes of staff were highlighted as important factors in shaping their early experiences. Mentors were helpful in providing a range of assistance e.g. provision of ideas and techniques, providing encouragement and

boosting confidence, direct intervention in relationship with pupils, being there and allowing trainee input. However, not all trainee experiences were positive and some of the issues raised concerned the relationship between the school and the HEI, for example, some felt unwelcome and a burden. Those trainees who had undertaken the role of support staff in schools prior to embarking on training (particularly in the GTP programme) expressed concern over the transition in role from working for a teacher to actually being a teacher, especially if they were training in the same school. Some preferred to move and have a 'fresh' start. Those that stayed voiced concern over how they would be viewed by pupils and how others would perceive their new role/ status. In addition there was some concern expressed as to how other support staff in the school would view their new role, although on this point, on the whole, experiences were positive

One of the biggest concerns that was expressed by all trainees (although in particular those under 25 years of age), was how they would manage the change from a student to a 'professional lifestyle' and cope with all the responsibilities associated with this. One reason that mature students gave for opting for employment based courses was that they didn't want to return to being a student; having made the transition to a professional, working alongside less mature individuals was not seen as particularly appealing. Most trainees expressed concerns as to how they would mange to develop their image as a teacher

> *"I'm not really as strict as I thought I would be, but it's all about respect and setting boundaries which I didn't even think of doing before. I do find I can talk to children, they're a lot more grown up than I thought they would be and you can talk, actually have a good laugh with them…I was obviously worried about the control of the children but that's not really a problem." (male 20-24, BA QTS secondary PE, in Hobson et al 2005, Pg 117)*

How trainees were introduced to pupils had a bearing on how they were able to establish themselves with the pupils; if they were introduced as a trainee, associate or student it often made it difficult for them to establish a teaching role. Those who were not introduced as such or whose status was not made clear reported mixed experiences whereas others said that a lack of an introduction caused confusion, with pupils being unsure how to act towards them.

Support from staff within the school was thought to be significant in the early stages and fortunately the majority of trainees reported positive experiences. Specific ways they needed help included being supportive, help maintain status/ intervention, providing strategies, offering guidance, help establish good practice and help with activities. On the converse those that had negative experiences talked of feelings of being misused by the school, too busy to help, reluctant to let them take responsibility for class and bad relationships.

j. The PE Context - The issues with Secondary Physical Education

As this research has been carried out with secondary trainees in physical education, it is important to highlight some of the concerns and issues in teaching this subject in this age phase.

Firstly the National Curriculum Physical Education requirements are demanding in that they cover six different activity areas (Athletic Activities, Dance activities, Games Activities, Gymnastic Activities, Outdoor and Adventurous Activities and Swimming and lifesaving activities) that need to be taught across both Key Stage three and Key stage four. Unlike other Foundation subjects, Physical Education is compulsory for all pupils in Key Stage 4 and examination Physical Education at GCSE should be taught separately from the requirements of the National Curriculum.

For trainees on a one-year programme for QTS the subject specific knowledge demands are very high. Most PGCE courses, and certainly the one used for the purpose of this research, demand that trainees have a sound knowledge of the six areas of activity prior to beginning the course. Other course requirements would include evidence of sustained experience of working with young people and would also ensure that the trainee had an appropriate undergraduate degree (normally at 2:1 level or above) which would help them cope with the subject knowledge requirements of the examination based work, certainly at GCSE level and for many trainees at advanced level as well. Ofsted evidence (2001) to date suggests that the recruitment and selection of trainees on the GTP pathway has not been as rigorous.

Ofsted (1999) were very critical of a number of aspects of trainee teachers' preparation including subject knowledge. They stated that,

> *"Students' subject knowledge is good in only four out of ten providers, but in more than half of the courses inspected, a substantial minority of the students have significant weaknesses. This profile is below all other subjects and is a cause for concern."* (Ofsted, 1999, Pg 43)

Gower and Capel (2004) acknowledge that this lack of subject knowledge is partly due to the undergraduate experiences (as a number of entrants to secondary PGCE do so with a Sports Science first degree) and also to their limited experiences in their secondary physical education curriculum. Gower and Capel go on to remark that,

> *"..in England there is an educational climate in which government initiatives support the PGCE route to gaining QTS in preference to the undergraduate route, whilst Ofsted are critical of the PGCE physical education courses because of gaps in developing subject knowledge" (2004, Pg 166)*

There has been little research into the development of subject knowledge for PE teachers in England. One report (Capel and Katene, 2000) administered questionnaires to PGCE PE trainees twice during their training year in order to record their perceived level of knowledge and confidence across all six areas of activity in the PE National Curriculum. Their results showed that the majority of trainees felt they had knowledge and confidence in the games areas whereas they lacked this when teaching dance and outdoor and adventurous activity. This is hardly surprising as for most trainees their own experiences would be stronger within the games area as they would have had far more exposure to these during their own secondary schooling as traditionally the majority of secondary school PE curriculum time is dedicated to games (Moses, 1996) and as a result they would have been more likely to developed outside interests in these areas. As Ofsted commented,

> *"Trainees are selected who are suitable for teaching; and many are enthusiastic and committed games players. However, most applicants have first degrees whose content is not related closely to the Physical Education National Curriculum. (1999, Pg 42)*

This is a concern as a lack of subject knowledge can have a significant impact on pupil learning (Siedentop, 2002). If trainees (and indeed teachers) lack subject knowledge then they are not able to develop the pupils beyond the introductory level hence activities get taught repeatedly rather than being extended. Additionally other researchers (e.g. Dodds 1994 and Graber 1995) found that effective teaching was able to link content (subject) knowledge with pedagogical strategies thus demonstrating a need for a theoretical

underpinning and time for reflection throughout the training period and beyond. As Rossi and Cassidy emphasise in Gower and Capel (2004),

> *" in order to reach a level of conceptual awareness to evaluate critically the conventions and routines that they absorbed during their own education and while on school placement as part of their professional preparation, student teachers need to understand for example, the unique experiences each area of activity in the NCPE can offer a pupil. They also need to have considered what they overall aims of physical education are and how the subject can contribute to a pupils' personal, social, moral, spiritual and cultural development." Pg 170)*

One key finding from Gower and Capel's research was the need to consider trainees' previous experiences prior to them commencing the PGCE programme. They felt it essential that the undergraduate degree was carefully considered in terms of the practical experiences that it was able to give the student. In addition it became obvious that in addition to acquiring subject knowledge they needed to have this contextualised if it were to be of any real value. In many cases the gap between acquiring the knowledge and being able to apply it to a teaching episode was too great (Pg. 178). This calls into question the appropriateness of the subject knowledge booster courses which are offered by the TDA and are designed to only give knowledge and not deliver any associated pedagogical content. Often trainees will take these courses in the summer prior to starting their PGCE year and in many cases won't have the opportunity to apply this new found knowledge until their first (and in some cases second) teaching placement which in most cases is 3-4 months later. It doesn't necessarily follow that having the knowledge means that one is able to teach it. As Reeves (1993) says, "even when students have appropriate subject knowledge there remains the problem of practical application (Pg. 54). Trainee teachers, therefore, need to have the opportunity to understand experience and reflect on how effective they are.

To further support the work of Gower and Capel (2004) and Capel and Katene (2000), research by Stidder and Hayes (2007) considered PE trainee teachers' experiences in teaching across the full range of National Curriculum activity areas. What is interesting here is that when considering what opportunities trainees had to teach full units of work (which they defined as a minimum of 6 hours input) they discovered that over 40% of trainees between 2000-2004 had no experience of teaching key stage 3 outdoor and adventurous activities or swimming and at key stage 4 they had no experience of

swimming, outdoor and adventurous activities, dance or gymnastics (games was excluded from this aspect of their research).

To conclude, what is evident here is the lack of physical education specific research into the training and preparation of secondary physical education specialists. From the limited research available it appears there is a dichotomy between government policy, which appears to largely support the one year PGCE route and the lack of available time during this pathway to ensure adequate and complete coverage of subject knowledge and contextualisation across all six areas of activity within the physical education national curriculum. This combined with the entry background of most trainees (i.e. very biased towards games activities) leads to issues surrounding not only the ability of trainees to develop suitable levels of competence to teach high quality physical education across a number of the activity areas, in particular outdoor and adventurous activities and swimming but also the abilities of their mentors to develop these skills within the trainees.

3. Methodology

a. Overview of the study

The aim of the study was to compare experiences and expectations of trainees for secondary Physical Education whilst on their respective training pathways. The two routes to qualified teacher status concerned throughout this study are the one-year full time Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), which is University led and the one-year Graduate Training Programme (GTP), which is entirely a school based route. Specifically this research attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are the differences in the experience and expectation of secondary trainee physical education teachers on the PGCE and the GTP pathways?
2. What impact do these differences have on the trainees' throughout their training year?
4. Can conclusion be drawn as to which is the preferred way to train teachers?

The study attempts to draw contrasts and comparisons between the experiences of the trainees on their respective pathways and will be conducted within an interpretative framework, utilising a combination of techniques, mainly of a qualitative nature, including questionnaires, interviews and analysis of documentation.

Research in education often tends to be descriptive in nature therefore qualitative approaches to data collection are frequently adopted. According to Cohen and Manion (1994) qualitative research is relevant to the study to social relations, in this context the experiences of a group of trainee teachers throughout their respective training pathways and was gathered predominantly, through interviews.

Some, for example Burns (2000), describe quantitative research as that which involves large quantities of data that can be formulated in such a way to produce meaning. This study did decide to adopt, via the questionnaire, some very basic quantitative data collection from a range of questions designed around a Likert Scale. The main reason for this was to aid in data comparison between the two sets of trainees in terms of their experiences and perceptions. This data needs to be treated with caution as firstly it has been gathered on a very small scale (n=6) and therefore external generalisations are

impossible and secondly the ratings reflect individual perceptions of experience and not given facts. Quantitative data collection when dealing with perceptions and feelings can be problematic for a number of reasons not least the fact that responses are based on individual perceptions.

b. Case Study

According to Yin (1981, 1994) in Robson 1993, a case study is,

> *"a strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence." (p.178)*

When considering a case study approach to research it is worth stating that the case can be in a variety of things. Often people associate case study as focusing on an individual but it can also include work that considers a specific situation, group, organisation or 'whatever is of interest' (Robson 1993, p177). The case study being undertaken here is focussing on two specific routes for gaining qualified teacher status.

This is not an ethnographic study as that would require the researcher to focus on a description and interpretation of the culture and social structure of a social group, whereas this research is focusing on the experiences and motivations of two sets of trainees on their respective pathways to qualified teacher status.

It is important when embarking on a case study that the same rigorous principles for research are applied, including attention to research design, data collection, analysis, interpretation and reporting of results.

In designing this case study a number of aspects were considered. First, strategy: what approach would be the most effective bearing in mind the timescale and other constraints that had to be considered. To this end a multiple case study approach was adopted which considered two distinct sets of trainees whilst following their distinctive paths to QTS. Secondly, as a case study needs to utilise a number of different approaches, in addition to the particular data collection, this research considers other more general evidence and evaluations in particular OFSTED reports and details of the respective training pathways.

Thirdly, there needs to be an empirical element to the research, evidence needs to be gathered about what is actually happening. Here predominately qualitative methods were adopted via the administration of questionnaires and the conducting of interviews. Finally the case study must focus on a specific area, in this instance initial teacher training pathways. The central feature to all case studies according to Robson (1993) is the concentration on a particular case (or small set of cases)

According to Cohen et al (2000) the strengths of the case study approach allows the researcher to have the ability to observe effects of occurrences in a real context noting the 'powerful determinants of both cause and effect'. More specifically a case study investigation offers an insight into complex unfolding interactions of unique events and relationships (Burns 2000).

In the past case studies have often been viewed as a 'soft option' and it was sometimes thought that they had dubious value when used in isolation from other research designs. Cook & Campbell (1979), in Robson 1993, though, see case studies 'as a fully legitimate alternative to experimentation in appropriate circumstances.'

> *"A case study is not a flawed experimental design; it is a fundamentally different research strategy with its own design." (Robson 1993, Pg.180)*

Bromley (1986) states that,

> *"case studies have sometimes been carried out in a sloppy, perfunctory and incompetent manner and sometimes even in a corrupt, dishonest way.' (Pxiii.).*

Even with every good faith and intention, bias and selective accounts can emerge but we do have to ask is this any different to any other form of research? What perhaps is of greater importance is that the researcher designs appropriate checks to demonstrate and ensure improved reliability and validity of the findings. Case studies have however been criticised for lacking generalisation as it is impossible to tell whether the individuals are representative of the whole population (Hayes 2001). Bell (1993) inferred *"generalisation is not usually possible which questions the value of the study of single events." (p. 9).*

The case study approach also allows for triangulation (Burns 2002) which is an important aspect and strength of such research approaches, especially when looking at social

phenomena, as they are by nature more complex than a single dimension study. Cohen et al (2001) stated, *"Triangulation between methods involves the use of more than one method in the pursuit of a given objective." (Pg.114)*. However Fielding and Fielding (1986 quoted in Cohen et al 2000 pg. 115) hold that despite the strengths of methodological triangulation, the researcher cannot assume the validity of the results is increased. That said the greater the range of data collection tools employed the higher chance of improving on reliability and validity (Burns 200)). Nonetheless the case study does enable a rich insight into the phenomenon under scrutiny – Bryman (2001) and Bassey (1981 in Bell 1993) see reliability as more significant/important than generalisability, therefore there is worth in carrying, out case study research.

Another question that is often asked by those who oppose case study as a research design is that of its scientific basis, i.e. can case studies be scientific? According to Carr and Kemmis (1986),

> *"what distinguishes scientific knowledge is not so much its logical status, as the fact that it is the outcome of a process of enquiry which is governed by critical norms and standards of rationality." (Pg. 121)*

In this instance the research undertaken was conducted in a logical and comprehensive manner, applying the same principles of data collection to both sets of individuals so that comparisons and similarities could be identified and discussed.

c. Validity, reliability and generalisability

According to Robson (1993), validity refers to the extent to which the findings are about what they claim to be about; generalisability is the extent to which the findings are applicable to a wider population and reliability refers to the consistency or stability of the findings - would they be the same if the research were to be repeated? Clearly all three concepts here are important to any piece of research but for research of a largely qualitative nature this can prove problematic. In qualitative data collection in many cases the research design emerges and changes over time. That said there still needs to be rigorous data collection methods and all collection and analysis needs to be informed by an understanding of what has gone before.

"Flexible or qualitative methods have traditionally involved the researcher and the relationship with the researched within the boundary of what is examined. Because all any study can do is to approximate knowledge of the phenomena as they exist in the real world (fallibilism) the process of study itself must be an object of study. Because all methods of study can produce only approximations of reality and incomplete understanding of the phenomena of interest as they exist in the real world, the findings of flexible method research can be seen as more of less legitimate than those of any other type of study. (Anastas and MacDonald, in Robson 1993 p.167)

Threats to validity need to be acknowledged and as far as possible avoided. For the purpose of this study, the researcher tried as far as possible to ensure that the data collected was complete and accurate, that the reporting of the data was as unbiased as was possible and that considerations were given to alternative options that the researcher may not have wished to acknowledge.

Integral to validity is reliability – that is the extent to which the study remains consistent and repeatable. An experiment outcome is worthless if there is not a significant degree of certainty that the results are reliable (Cohen and Manion 1994). The questionnaire that was designed for the purpose of this study could be used in its current format for repeated work. In addition the interview outline and schedules could also be repeated. To this end there is potential to test reliability. Unfortunately it is extremely difficult to claim that the results produced would be consistent with those here as the research would be conducted with entirely new participants who presumably would be placed in different schools, attached to a different University or a different DRB in different parts of the country. The difference in any one of these variables could in itself lead to the production of quite different results. The use of triangulation may help to improve reliability by rephrasing or repeating the true intended outcomes within other approaches (Burns 2002)

Finally the issue of generalisability needs to be considered. It is normally accepted that there are two types of generalisability; internal and external. Internal refers to the conclusions within the study itself whereas external refers to conclusion beyond the scope of the original study. As far as possible every attempt has been made to ensure that the internal generalisability of the study is high, in particular care has been taken over the selection of the participants and the design and structure of the research. External generalisability cannot be claimed and in fact the researcher does not feel that it

would be appropriate to consider this as this study is considering in detail the experiences and motivations of a particular set of participants. That said there might be some interesting questions that can inform discussion of the two routes that may arise from the research and go on to form the basis of further investigation.

d. Pilot Work

Cohen et al (2000) believes that the area of piloting is of paramount importance to the study's success. In contrast Silverman (2000) believes that the preliminary test can actually be unreliable as they often are not able to truly replicate the full test situation, particularly as it is not possible to conduct a pilot on the actual group under investigation therefore a true replication of conditions in the main study can not be guaranteed. With this in mind, this study piloted the use of the questions on other trainees not involved in the study purely to check ease of access to answers and to ensure that the results provided the researcher with data that would be of use for the project

> *"A pilot study is a preliminary study done to validate the research methodology." (Thomas and Nelson 2001 Pg.318)*

The pilot study was undertaken to check the feasibility of the research tools, in this sense to consider the appropriateness of questionnaire design, terminology and instruments used. One issue that had not been considered by the researcher in carrying out the pilot study was that the questionnaire was completed whilst the researcher was present; this was not the case in the actual study. It was discovered that the participants involved in the pilot study completed the questionnaire far more carefully and fully under the gaze of the researcher than actual participants who completed the questionnaire without the researcher present. In the original pilot the latter question concerning competencies involved the participants listing all competencies that they have been working towards over a six-week period, feedback was that this was too difficult and took too long. The researcher therefore changed this in the final version and asked participates to highlight the key competencies they were working towards and the level at which they had achieved these.

e. Procedure

Six secondary physical education trainees were selected for this study, three that were beginning the Graduate Training Programme associated with one Designated Recommending Body. This constituted the entire number of secondary physical education teacher trainees for that entry point. To mirror this experience three full time Post Graduate Secondary Physical Education trainees were also selected from a nearby Higher Education Institution. As the pool available here was larger, the researcher asked for volunteers and selected trainees who had placement in a similar catchments area to the GTP trainees. By locating all trainees within the same geographical area it was hoped to have greater control over a number of variables, for example type of school, socio-economic make up of the population etc. Although it is impossible to totally control these external variables the researcher did feel that these were minimised by adopting this approach. All trainees began their training programme at the start of the autumn term and completed (and passed) their training at the end of the summer term of the same academic year.

f. Research Tools

This study took place over one academic year, which coincided with the duration of the training programme for the participants concerned. Two approaches to data collection were utilised,

1. Questionnaires
2. Interviews

In addition course documentation, Ofsted reports and other evaluation studies were considered (e.g. TDA, DfES documentation).

The same questionnaire (see Appendix 2) was distributed by email on a half termly basis, namely October, December, February, April and May. In addition interviews were conducted on a one to one basis with each of the six trainees involved in the study at three strategic points, the beginning, mid point and end of their training programme. The aim of the interview differed for each of these contacts. The initial interview was conducted to gather data on pre course experience, motives for doing the course and expectations of the training. The mid point interview was carried out to discuss perceived

progress toward gaining qualified teacher status, to ascertain levels of support currently available via the respective pathways, to consider if expectations were being met and to discuss any training concerns that the individual may have had. The final interview at the completion of training was used to guide the trainee through a reflection of their respective pathway. Questions were asked focusing on the highs and the lows, in order to try and ascertain whether expectations were met and to gather some feeling for how satisfied the trainee was with their respective routes to qualified teacher status.

g. Questionnaire Design

According to Cohen and Manion (1994) the questionnaire is a popular method of gathering information. Questionnaires that have been used by previous researchers are often thought to be more appropriate as they have a built in level of validity. Unfortunately this avenue was not available for this particular study due to the uniqueness of the research topic. The design of the questionnaire did though consider a number of important areas including the ease for applicant to respond, speed of completion, usefulness of results to the researcher, appropriateness of responses to the aims of the study.

The questionnaire used for this study combined two distinct styles. The first set of questions was designed using a Likert Scale approach; these questions remained the same each time the questionnaire was completed which enabled the researcher to draw comparison not only across all responses but also to consider responses by an individual over time. The second set of questions allowed for an open ended response which was designed to ascertain how the trainee was feeling towards their pathway at that moment in time and the final section was based on the standards that the trainees had to meet for qualified teacher status. This section asked the trainee to consider which standards in particular they had been working towards over the given period of time and to provide a judgement as to how well they thought they were doing. This final section enabled the researcher to compare the structure of the training programmes and to consider progress that had been made.

h. Interviews

The interview was used in this study in order to supplement and add to the data that was available via the questionnaire. It was anticipated that as the study was longitudinal in nature and that the interviews took place over the course of an academic year, the researcher would be able to establish a strong rapport with the trainees so much so that by the end of the training programme the trainees would feel more able to offer true and honest feelings with regard to the course which in turn would provide the researcher with invaluable data from which to base comparison.

To this end the first interview was conducted on relatively safe grounds. The questions focused around the trainees previous experiences; in particular the emphasis was on modules that may have been of relevance to teacher training in their undergraduate degree alongside the opportunities that the individual had managed to gain in working with young people. In addition to this background information, the interviewer attempted to draw out from the trainee their main motive for embarking on their particular pathway and what their expectations were of that route. By doing this the researcher could compare and contrast the previous experiences, motivations and expectations of all six trainees on their two separate training programmes.

The second interview took place between the February half term and the Easter holidays. By this time the researcher had established a stronger relationship with the trainees and was therefore able to explore questions around their training programme, level of support offered and the perceptions of progress and have some confidence in the honesty of the responses. Again comparisons could be made between trainees and across their respective programmes. The final interview was conducted in June, towards the very end of the training programme and after all final assessments had taken place and the trainees were aware of the outcomes of these. The purpose of the final interview was to ascertain from the trainees a reflection of the training pathway, to try and tease out how and where it had met expectations and where perhaps these had not been met. The researcher also explored with the trainee whether they felt in hindsight they had selected the right course for QTS for them as an individual and how strongly they would or would not recommend their option to others.

i. Data Analysis

"Data analysis is the process of bringing together order, structure and meaning to the mass of data collected." (Marshall and Rossman, 1995 Pg.11)

The questionnaire produced a mixture of quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative date from the Likert Scale section of the questionnaire was analysed and where appropriate the information is presented in a visual format in the next section. This is also the case for the data that has been extracted from the final section of the questionnaire that considered the training in relation to the QTS standards.

The open ended questions and responses to the interview are largely used in the discussion section of this study and are used to support or question evidence that has been provided in this area thus far. The exception to this is some of the data gathered from the first round of interviews. Data that is relevant to the trainees' background and previous experiences has been collated and presented in tabular format that is contained in the next section. The data contained within this will also be used to form part of the debate in the discussion part of this study.

All the interviews were transcribed and then carefully analysed. In order to do this the researcher fully immersed themselves in their content, reading and rereading the transcripts until a number of themes emerged. These were identified as follows:-

1. Programme structure
2. Support and mentoring
3. Standards
4. Subject knowledge
5. Partnership
6. Background information and experience

These grouping also naturally emerged as themes from the review of literature. One other theme that was not initially identified but upon closer analysis emerged was that of quality assurance so this was added to the presentation of the findings and discussion sections.

j. Ethical considerations

Ethics and morals are often confused and at times used interchangeably. According to Robson (1993),

> *'although both are concerned with what is good or bad, right or wrong, ethics are usually taken as referring to general principles of what we ought to do, where morals are usually taken as concerned with whether or not a specific act is consistent with accepted notions of right and wrong.'(Pg 66)*

If we accept this definition then we need to accept the fact that it would be possible to follow ethical guidelines but to act immorally, as morals are individual and/or society view on an issue, which are formed by experiences and contacts that people have had. Research cannot be 'value free'. To protect the researcher, it is important that ethical principles are adhered to and for the purposes of this research the guidelines laid out by Durham University were followed in full.

Any experimental research that involves people poses a number of ethical problems, including

1. How open is the researcher with the participants as to the purpose of the study?
2. Are the individuals given the option to opt out?
3. Are the individuals guaranteed anonymity, confidentiality?
4. What control, does the researcher have over what people say and do? What is the relationship of the researcher to the participants?
5. How truthfully are the individuals able to be? Each individual will have their own reality and it is important to remember that two individuals may participate in the same experience but interpret it very differently depending on their own perceptions.

In addition to this the researcher needs to consider a range of risks which involvement in the study may entail. Based on the work of Craig et al (2000) in Robson (1993) these have been considered below:-

RISK	CONSIDERATION FOR THIS STUDY
Physical threat or abuse	Not relevant
Psychological trauma	Low relevance – participants may be concerned about their chosen course and its appropriateness for them
Compromising position	Some relevance – participants may feel compromised when asked to make judgements on the quality of their course and the level of support they are given. In addition some of the participants are students located at the University where they researcher was at one time based – these individuals many feel compelled to answer/cooperate in a given way Highly relevant – the researcher as a teacher educator may find that certain responses contradict their beliefs and values systems with reference to teacher education and therefore feel compromised with maintaining confidentiality
Increased exposure to general risks of everyday life	Not relevant

In addition to these concerns we also have to consider the role that the researcher plays within the research, for example how objective are they able to be. They again will have their own reality that will be based on their previous experiences and background. It is very important that the researcher acknowledges this and is aware of their (maybe covert) ability to influence what the participants report.

When discussing participation in this research with the individuals, the researcher attempted to make them fully aware of the research aim, the full extent of the study, the purpose of the study and the intended audience. The issue of anonymity and confidentiality was discussed and the researcher assured individuals that neither their

names nor their schools would be used in the study and that as far as possible they would try and ensure both anonymity and confidentially.

The researcher believes that they have both an ethical and moral duty to report the findings honestly and fully. That said, for any case study work this could be problematic as in doing so it may result in the anonymity of the individuals and schools being exposed. All reasonable precautions to prevent this happening will be taken but it is important that the accuracy of the presentation is not compromised.

In addition the place of values and value judgements needs to be considered. The researcher has acknowledged their own stance and recognised that research is 'found on presuppositions' but in presenting the results the researcher will endeavour to avoid sweeping statement and judgements that can not be backed up by facts gathered from the research.

To conclude: the purpose of this research is to explore the experiences and expectations of two sets of trainees as they progress on the chosen pathways to obtaining qualified teacher status. In particular answers to the following questions will be sought:

1. What are the differences in the experience and expectation of secondary trainee physical education teachers on the PGCE and the GTP pathways?
2. What impact do these differences have on the trainees throughout their training year?
3. Is there a difference in the quality of the two programmes? If so, what is the difference and what effect does it have on the trainee?
4. Can conclusion be drawn as to which is the preferred way to train teachers?

4. **FINDINGS**

The findings presented in this chapter are the result of a number of approaches to data collection namely, half termly questionnaire returns from the trainees, beginning, mid and end of training programme interviews with the trainees and analysis of documentation associated with the two training pathways (for example, trainee and subject tutor handbooks, partnership arrangements and Ofsted inspection findings). I have drawn on these various data sources to address each of the themes identified.

a. Recruitment and Selection/Trainees previous experiences

Recruitment to the full time PGCE programme associated with this research follows the normal process for all PGCE programmes, which is application via the Graduate Teacher Training Registry (GTTR) system. This starts for the HEI in question very early in the preceding academic year and normally the course is closed by the February before the academic year of entry. The programme in question is very popular, attracting more than 150 applications for its 18 places (this actual recruitment quota is determined by the TDA and although the HEI in question could attract a greater number of high quality applications, and has the capacity to expand, it is not allowed to do so). The HEI runs a very strong undergraduate degree programme in Physical Education (without QTS) that addresses a number of important areas associated with teaching PE in secondary schools; in particular it equips its students with a good grounding in the subject knowledge required for success on a PGCE PE programme. Due to the high level of demand for places on the PGCE, the HEI does not have to consider applications from any individual who does not highlight the institution as their first choice or who does not meet the entry requirements set. Over 50% of those on the course progress from the HEIs own undergraduate physical education programmes; the advantage of this is that the PGCE course can build on and supplement knowledge already acquired via the undergraduate pathway.

The GTP has a different approach to recruitment that is not done via a central system (such as GTTR). The individual who is interested in pursuing this route to QTS applies to their chosen Designated Recommending Body (DRB) (although initial enquiries and advice can be sought from the TDA). Each of these has developed their own system for

dealing with applications. The DRB in question has a central point where all applications are received and reviewed; those applicants who meet all the generic entry criteria are then passed onto the schools that have requested a trainee in a specific subject area. Once the applications arrive in the school, those who would be involved in the training consider them and then if appropriate the individual applicant is called for an interview at the school. Nationally, the numbers of places for GT pathways are far fewer than for the PGCE pathway (TDA, 2008) therefore there are a smaller number of schools involved with fewer applicants. That said, although the level of choice for schools offering a place is lower, it does not necessarily follow that the quality of the applicant is not as good.

Once the applicant, on either route, is offered a place, the process of mapping their knowledge and experience begins. For the PGCE trainee this starts at the interview stage where an initial needs analysis is conducted and shortfalls in knowledge and or experience are highlighted. Where these shortfalls represent a lack of subject knowledge (across the six specific activity areas within the physical education national curriculum, 2005) the individual is offered a place with conditions dependent on them addressing some or the entire shortfall. This they could do in a number of ways, for example, by attending subject knowledge booster courses that are run throughout England and funded by the TDA usually in the summer prior to starting the course or attending National Governing Body coaching qualification courses. Likewise, if it is felt that they need additional experience in working with young people then this stipulation is made as a condition of their offer. Failure to address these requirements will lead to the withdrawal of an offer for a place. This process of mapping individual needs at the point of interview is not replicated by the DRB when offering places to the GTP trainees and none of the GTs associated with this research were given conditions that had to be met prior to starting. As a result the GTP applicants were not offered (in fact not aware of) the subject knowledge booster courses prior to beginning the course or encouraged to enhance their subject knowledge in areas of weakness by obtaining coaching qualifications before beginning their training year. The DRB does not begin to address individual needs until they meet with the trainees in the June/July prior to the commencement of their training year and even at this point ways in which they can address some of their deficiencies prior to starting the programme are not discussed.

In terms of the basic entry requirements the HEI in question would only consider interviewing applicants who had the following:-

- Normally a 2:1 degree classification
- Evidence of subject knowledge in the major activities in question
- Considerable experience in working with young people, preferably in a physical activity setting
- Evidence of at least one work experience placement in a secondary school
- GCSE English, Maths and Science
- Meeting the requirements set via the needs analysis at interview

(Information obtained through the PGCE Course booklets and the HEI Website, accessed 23/4/07)

Whereas the GTP entry requirements for the secondary subject areas are

- A first degree or equivalent (at least 40% of the degree must be in the subject area)
- GCSE English and Maths at grade C or above
- Experience of working with young people (although not necessarily in a school setting)
- 5 days in a school prior to starting the course but post interview

(Information obtained from the DRB Website, accessed 23/4/07)

It is interesting to note that now that the Government have relaxed the mature entry requirements for the GT programme, all the PGCE trainees in this research would have been eligible for the GTP, whereas only one of the GTs would have met the normal PGCE entry requirements. When interviewing the GTs, GTP1 suggested he didn't feel he would be accepted on a PGCE programme mainly due to his degree classification (and probably his lack of subject knowledge) but having spent the past year working part-time in special needs support in a secondary school he was in a good position to apply to the GTP. Interestingly he suggests that despite the time spent in schools he still did not think that he had sufficient experience or qualifications to apply for a PGCE place.

> *"…….. they told me about the GTP and suggested I look into it. I did and was really lucky as the school agreed that I could do it here and I was accepted by the DRB, and here I am. I don't know if I would have got a place on a PGCE, certainly*

not back at my old Uni. Maybe having sent some time in schools I would be in a better position but I am happy on the GTP" (GTP 1 (S)1 Pg 178)

Also of interest is that GTP 3 had been offered a place on a PGCE but declined it once she secured a GTP place, as this was her preferred option, which she attributes to her level of maturity, her undergraduate degree programme and previous experiences within the education environment.

"I was training in xxxx…….and then when I was looking into teaching I have like an athlete career advisor within the lottery within the sport and she looked at all the teaching routes and said there's this one which I don't really know a lot about and originally I did research and found out more about it and thought it was more suited to me because I'm older and I have worked…" (GTP 3 (J)1 Pg.216)
"and I've got experience and the thought of having to go back to university and start studying again, to me I just thought I've spent so many years out of a working environment…… you know you just feel like you just want to get into it as opposed to feeling like a student, so for me personally it seemed more appropriate to go on this route if I was able and I was". (GTP 3 (J)1 Pg. 216)

There is an implication from the GT comments above that this individual saw her training programme as a means to learn the 'skills' of teaching. It may be that she did not really see or appreciate the importance of theoretical underpinning to support and enhance her development. She felt that being on a GTP would mean that she would not have to engage with 'study' which she felt would be the case on a HEI based programme. That said, this GT had done an education undergraduate degree and therefore had already considered a significant amount of theory.

The final GT(GTP 2) spent the year prior to the GTP working as a coach with a scheme run by the local authority predominantly for post 16 year olds. He had studied a sport and recreation degree and had very little experience in working in schools and within other areas of activity other than football; he therefore had a weak background in terms of subject knowledge compared to other applicants.

"I have done some coaching when I was working with the local authority, football coaching mainly and helping with coaching courses……I know I have a lot to learn for the other areas so I will be doing some coaching courses." (GTP 2 (A)1 Pg. 193)

Of all the trainees within this study, this individual had the weakest subject knowledge audit on entry to the programme and would have benefited most from subject knowledge

booster courses and national governing body coaching awards prior to beginning his training year.

Of the three PGCE trainees taking part in the research, one of them did originally apply for a GTP place and was accepted but he was given a placement in a school that was in 'special measures' and he felt that this would not result in a positive developmental experience. Having lost faith with the GTP system he decided not to apply elsewhere for a different school but to return to the HEI where he did his first degree. He was fortunate in that the HEI lowered their normal academic entry requirements for him as he had extensive experience in teaching PE in an international school overseas.

> *"I did originally think of doing a GTP and I was offered a place in a local secondary school but when I went to the school and realised that it was a failing school I didn't think that it would be the best place to train, I then decided to come back to xxxx and do a PGCE, at least I knew the set up and some of the staff there so I knew what I would be getting into". (PG 2, (P)1 Pg. 244)*
>
> *"……. it wasn't ideal but for me the main reason for coming back was to get my teaching qualification and to learn and develop as best I could. I was really put off the GTP by the first school I was offered and was really concerned about the quality of training that I would get, I wasn't convinced that other applications would lead to anything better so I decided to opt for what I knew would meet my needs even though I would loose out financially". (PG 2 (P)1 Pg. 244)*

The trainee above has a very definite idea as to what he wants to obtain from returning to the UK, firstly to get a teaching qualification and secondly, whilst here, to ensure that he develops his knowledge and understanding of teaching as best he can.

The other two PGCE trainees had not considered a GTP pathway. They were both graduates from the HEIs undergraduate degree programmes and had been very careful in their module choices throughout their degree in order to give them the best opportunity of securing a place on the PGCE programme.

> *I knew I wanted to do a PGCE and I knew I wanted to stay at xxxx and the competition is so tough so I was aware, especially in the last 18 months that all this experience would help with my application (PG 3 (C)1 Pg.256)*
>
> *"I always knew I wanted to teach and all my choices throughout my degree have been geared towards me getting a place on the PGCE. I have loved my time at*

xxxx and it seemed logical to stay on here and complete my studies, I guess it was the natural thing to do. (PG 1 (B)1 Pg. 257)

Both theses trainees had made decisions very early on in their undergraduate studies that they wanted to train as teachers, a pattern that is fairly typical of most PGCE PE programmes as these are heavily over subscribed and individuals know very early on that pressure on places will be immense. Certainly with the HEI in question in this research, undergraduate trainees are informed from entry that competition onto their PGCE programme is extremely tough and they are advised how best to strengthen their chances of a successful application.

Although these two PGs were not particularly aware of the alternate school based route neither expressed a strong desire to find out more, as they were certain that the PGCE was right for them.

"I always knew I wanted to teach, right from when I started at Uni. I didn't really consider any other route, I was happy at xxxx, knew the staff etc so applied here and kept my fingers crossed that I had done enough to get a place".
I: "Did you consider other options?
No, I really wanted to stay in xxxx and to be honest I don't know that much about the other routes but I am happy with my decision to stay on here, it's a hard year and it is really good to know the staff and the area, have a feel for the schools and know you're way around the Uni. It takes some of the pressure off. (PG 1 (B)1 Pg. 235)

Table 1 below is a summary of each of the trainee's qualifications, experience in working with young people and coaching awards gained prior to starting their selected training pathways. It is clear from this table that the PGCE trainees had far more exposure and experience across a broader range of activity areas and within schools than their GTP counterparts.

Table 1

Summary of Trainees' Qualifications and Experiences Prior to starting their Training Pathway

GTP	**GTP1 (S)**	**GTP 2 (A)**	**GTP 3 (J)**
Degree	Sports Science - 2:2	Sports and Recreation Degree – 3rd	1997 BSc in PE & Education, (2:2) (was with QTS but opted out of this element) 1999 – Sports Therapy Course; C & G Microteaching course
Work Placement	Primary work placement as part of degree		2 extended periods of school placement on degree programme.
Coaching qualifications	No coaching qualifications	No coaching qualifications	Trampoline Instructor Aerobic and diving coach
Work Experience	1yr (5hrs/week) SEN support in secondary school	1year year in sports coaching working with LEA going into schools and working as sport coach – mainly football	FE lecturing experiences Aerobic coaching experience
Personal Background	General games player, football bias	Football, rugby & tennis	Springboard diving *GTP preferred route – declined PGCE place*
PGCE	**PG 1 (B)**	**PG 2 (P)**	**PG 3 (C)**
Degree	BA PE - 2:1	1998 BA PE - 2:2 RSA teaching English award	BA Sport and Recreation Development – 1st class
Work placement	4 weeks work experiences in yr 2 in secondary school		Included 6 weeks work experience in secondary school
Coaching qualifications	CSAL, netball, baseball & softball FA coaching certificate,	Volleyball, cricket and weigh lifting (BAWLA) qualifications	JSLA/CSLA, National Pool lifeguard, emergency aid, tennis & athletics
Work experience	Work at weight loss residential camp – 6 weeks Soccer coaching – USA – I summer	Health and Fitness manager – 3 years Overseas teaching – PE and English (upper primary and secondary) – 2 years	Yr 3 = 2 days per week in two sec schools
Personal Background	Soccer Coach–UK– 2yr Football, general games player	rugby, tennis, swimming and cricket *GTP preferred route – declined as failing school was allocated*	swimming and netball

To conclude

- Of the six trainees participating in this research not all of them would meet the selection criteria for both the PGCE and GTP pathways; those on the PGCE pathway would all be eligible for the GTP route but not vice versa - of the three GTP trainees only one would, and indeed did, qualify for entry onto a PGCE programme;
- Overall the degree classifications of the GTP trainees was lower than that of the PGCE trainees
- Overall the breadth and experience across all areas of national curriculum PE was more extensive prior to entry for the PGCE trainees than the GTP trainees;
- Entry to the PGCE programme was offered on condition that areas that were identified as 'needing development' were addressed prior to commencement - this was not the case with the GTP trainees, despite the fact that generally their subject knowledge and experience was less than the PGCE trainees;
- PGCE trainees applied for their course due to familiarity with the environment and their knowledge of the course they were going to undertake;
- GTs opted for an employment based route as they didn't want to return to a formal education setting and/or their level of qualifications and experience were not sufficient to gain entry to a PGCE.

b. Programme structure

From reviewing the documents provided to the GTs it would appear that the GTP has a less formal structure than that of the PGCE route. Whereas the PGCE trainees have a central programme that they all follow, the GT trainees rely heavily for their subject specific, pedagogical and wider professional development on the programme that is provided by the schools in which they are placed. In addition, they have three days a year when they meet with other GTs for a generic professional development session organised by the DRB. For the trainees in this research the school programme was combined with other sessions that were being held for either other trainees on different pathways (e.g. PGCE, BEd) and/or sessions for newly qualified teachers (NQT). These generic sessions were in most instances led by the professional tutor in the school who, when appropriate, would use specialist expertise, e.g. the special needs coordinator. As GTP 3 says,

> *"I have like an ITT or GTP co-ordinator, she arranges internal tutorials about school-based issues.*
> ***I: And how often are they held?***
> *They are usually every Wednesday, so I've got one today, weekly roughly.*
> ***I: Is that just for you on your own or do you join up with other people.***
> *They're for GTPs, NQTs, ITTs, whatever is in the school". (GTP 3 (J)2 Pg. 224)*

In two out of the three schools (GTP 1 & 2) the GT was the only one on that particular programme and as a result the professional tutor sessions were planned around the needs of a different set of recipients, in both cases the needs of the BEd trainees on placement and the NQTs already in the school. Although this combined approach may well work in some instances, it is unlikely to meet the needs of the GT on every occasion as the demands and needs of these different groups will alter depending on their level of development and experience. For example if the programme is driven by the needs of NQTs then the particular needs of the GT may well not be met as they are not at such a developed stage in their teaching development, experience or understanding. In addition to the training that is provided to the GTs in their schools the DRB also hold regular sessions for all those on the GTP. These sessions are designed to address the more generic aspects of a teacher's professional development and include topics such as classroom management, controlling behaviour, lesson planning, applying for jobs,

gathering evidence for the final assessment and so on. Although the GTs could see the benefit of meeting away from the school environment with other trainees in similar circumstances, they did comment on the perceived lack of thought with regard to how and when certain sessions were delivered. For example, GTP 2 said,

> *"The downside I would say is actually by the training providers, a lot of courses that we've done have been like four months too late. I think it was March we had a course on planning and a lot of us had been teaching since at least December, so they decided to give us a course in March on how to plan, which was late, and that just sums up a lot of the courses that we've been on, they've not been well thought out on when they should have been put in place in terms of timescale over the year." GTP 2 (A)2 Pg. 196)*

Both sets of trainees (PGCE and GTP) acknowledge the immense support they receive within their subject areas for the planning, delivery and assessment of their subject. The subject specific knowledge is enhanced for the PGCE trainees by additional structured sessions held at the HEI. The programme of subject specific development for the GTs is not as structured and is often as a result of demand by the trainee due to an issue they have encountered. The knowledge that GTs gained on wider educational issues is far more variable in that these are addressed as a result of 'chance' situations that occur naturally within the school environment.

The PGCE trainees spend the first eight weeks in the University following a predetermined programme of lectures, seminars and practical activities in order to prepare them for their school experience, to give knowledge of a number of educational issues and to supplement their subject knowledge. Towards the end of this eight weeks the trainees go into their placement schools for two days a week in order to get to know the school and their department, see how procedures are followed, familiarise themselves with their teaching groups and to finalise a teaching timetable. From comments made by the trainees (see quotes below) those on the PGCE pathways feel well prepared for their first placement, they know exactly what the expectations are of them, how much teaching they should be doing and which of the standards should be their initial priority. They are shown how to gather evidence that they have met these standards, how to plan and evaluate a lesson and a series of lessons and have been given ideas on how to manage the teaching and learning environment. They were also made aware of the support structures that are available to them and are clear about the

expectations that they should have of the school and those that the school will have of them. As PG 1 said when asked about the University preparation prior to beginning the first placement,

> *"Well we spent a lot of time going over the paperwork, being told you need to do this, get this signed, make sure this happens and so on. It was a bit like being on you know, a production line. We were constantly told you must do this, make sure this is on your timetable, if not let us know. We knew about the standards, they were drummed into us as well, which I guess was a good thing but maybe a bit over the top". (PG 1 (B)1 Pg. 239)*

In addition whilst the PGCEs were in school, not only would they develop their teaching skills under the constant guidance of their subject mentor or another nominated experienced teacher within the department but they would also be expected to attend professional development sessions held by the school's professional tutor, where wider school and professional issues would be discussed. PGCEs 1 and 3 comment on these sessions below,

> *".....the professional tutor was very good. Like child protection, brilliant session, clear and informative, it was brilliant." (PG1 (B)2 Pg. 238)*

> *"It was again quite regimented and the lady who ran it was quite loopy but quite.....she filled the needs of what we needed. We sort of read to her what we wanted and that's what she did. So it was ideal.*
> ***I: So the programme was designed for just for the two of you?***
> *Yes. We did have some others but they came round us really. Yeah it was quite odd, it was....*
> ***I: So there was a professional mentor programme but you had to decide what you wanted, it wasn't actually structured when you arrived.***
> *Yeah well it was structured when we arrived but she sort of said to us "which bits of it do you want? "So that was quite helpful in a way. (PG 3 (C 2 Pg.259)*

This latter comment from PG 3 suggests that although there was a structured programme run by the professional tutor within the school, what was actually delivered depended on the perceived needs of the trainee. Meeting individual needs is an essential element of this type of training but asking a trainee which aspects of development they think they need may be fraught with danger as it is very difficult for any individual to articulate what they don't know or aren't aware of.

The GTP trainees on the other hand do not appear to have such a structured approach as most of the training needs are left to their schools to address and based on the individual needs of the trainee. The DRB does have sessions planned for all GTs that run termly. These sessions address very generic educational issues and the trainees have expressed concern as to their relevance. As GTP 2 stated,

> *"….. I mean me, XX and XXX, have often said we feel as though we don't get as much out of these courses, they should be maybe more specific to PE because a lot of it is dealing with classroom issues and more inside school as opposed to outside school in terms of safety, assessment and things like that outside we could probably do with a bit more training on. A lot of it is very general which is obviously …… I mean I don't know how they can get round it because they can't do specific subjects." GTP 2 (A)2 Pg. 196)*

Or GTP 3 more generously says,

> *"…. well we have a set-up for the graduate teacher programme where we've had network meetings about once a term, we had one at the start of May which was all about our end of assessment, what to expect, career development portfolio that we have to do now in QTS year. The one prior to that was all about interviews and what to expect, it was all geared up….. some are about behaviour management, some are about health and safety, elements in there but they're all about the bigger picture as well. (GTP 3 (J) 2 Pg. 224)*

It appears that the GT receive explanations, usually from their subject mentors, on pedagogical practice as a direct result of problems or issues that have occurred as a consequence of their teaching or towards the end of their training period when files need to be prepared and evidence of meeting the standards has to be collected. GTP 2 stated that,

> *"I collected stuff together and just put it all in a plastic wallet which meant I had loads of pieces of paper which then needed sorting, about twenty pieces of paper for each standard but I did make the effort to be organised, and I know people who didn't bother doing that. So I did make the effort but if I'm honest I wasn't really sure what I should do with it other than put it in a file" GTP 3 (A) 3 Pg.209)*

In addition unlike the PGCE trainees, areas of specific relevance to the teaching of physical education did not form part of these training sessions. A good example of this is the Physical Education School Sport and Club Links Strategy (2002) (PESSCL), arguably the most important government initiative concerning physical education in recent years and yet when all three GTP trainees were asked about this two of them were not aware of

its existence or impact and the third had only a vague idea. GTP 3, who had heard of the document, commented,

> ***I: "What about some of the Government initiatives like the PESSCL strategy for instance, I mean, do you get information about that? The PE, School Sport and Club Links Strategy?***
> *Right, we do our own sort of research on that, we had some tutorials at HXX University about gifted and talented and that was actually subject based that we got information on that, so it's more your own reading around, you know, your awareness of it. We do a lot with the school sports co-ordinators, now within the partnerships, and I've been involved in that so it's really your own research into surrounding issues as opposed to subject based, we don't get as much on that." GTP 3 (J)2 Pg. 225)*

Again, although the individual trainee needs to take some responsibility for their own training and development, it is almost impossible for them to research into an area about which they have no awareness.

In addition to the structured programme that the University provides for the PGCE trainees, in order to prepare them for their school placements, all the PGCE trainees have to complete three pieces of academic work throughout their training year. These pieces of work focus very much on pedagogical and subject knowledge concerns but also include aspects of theoretical underpinning which enables the trainee to understand not only what happens and how, but also to begin to appreciate why. In comparison, the GT trainees complete one piece of written work that is embedded in their practice and requires very little reading and research beyond that which is occurring within the school environment. In other words the PGCE trainees are forced to consider a range of pedagogical and subject related ideas that are then critiqued in relation to aspects of theory whereas the GTs trainees produce work that is highly practical in nature and firmly embedded within the school environment. As GTP 1 states,

> *"The only main assignments set by the GTP is one where we are looking at teaching, at student work and looking at how the pupils develop, six thousand word set essay and that is the only kind of essay that is set."* (GTP1 (S)2, Pg. 181)

The other difference between the types of school experiences for the two sets of trainees is that the GT predominantly stay in the one training school for the whole of the academic year and spend six weeks in another secondary school by way of a contrast and one week in a feeder primary school. The PGCE experience two different secondary school

placements, the first for the equivalent of 8 weeks and the second for 16 weeks and a one-week primary placement *which is a part of the final placement).

Table 2 below outlines summarises the key features of both training pathways.

PGCE	GTP
6 weeks University based; pedagogy, subject knowledge work and preparation for first school placement 4 weeks University based; review of first placement, further pedagogy, subject knowledge work and preparation for second school placement Two weeks in University; final reflection, agreeing career entry profiles, completing course work, some subject knowledge enhancement. The first school placement involves two visits from the link tutor the second demands three with the last being to discuss recommendations for QRS with the school	Full time in host school; weekly meeting with subject mentor, sessions with professional tutor and termly session with DRB. DRB tutor visit termly for assessment purposes. External assessor toward end of training year to verify standards have been met
2 days per week serial placement; meeting school, staff, arranging timetable, meeting teaching groups, observation 6 weeks full time school placement; Includes weekly sessions with subject mentor and professional tutor (set programme) At least one observation by University link tutor. 16 weeks full time school placement to include one week in a primary school; includes weekly session with subject mentor and professional tutor (set programme). Further observations by University link tutor (minimum of 3(Final assessment completed jointly by subject mentor and University link tutor	6 week placement in alternative secondary school One week placement in feeder primary school
3 pieces of academic work	1 piece of 'academic' work – practically based
Weekly subject mentor meetings Distinct professional studies programme run by professional tutor	Weekly subject mentor meetings Professional studies programme managed by school professional tutor DRB sessions for more generic educational issues with all GTs

i. Teaching and observation periods

From evidence gathered from interviewing the trainees, it became apparent that the two training programmes had differing approaches to how much observation should be undertaken prior to the trainees beginning to teach and how to build up to teaching the whole class and/or whole lessons. The PGCE programme had very definite and clear guidelines as to how much observation should be undertaken and how soon trainees should be teaching whole class and whole lessons, whereas the GTP seemed to have a variable approach to this which was dependent on the individual schools and the trainees involved. Two of the GTs were teaching early on in the year and one from the start, as GTP 2 says,

> *"I started teaching literally normal from day one virtually, but looking back it's not been such a bad thing really 'cos I've got such rapport with some of the kids I've been with all the way through the year now so there's no problem with class management in most of my classes now". (GTP 2 (A)1 Pg.196)*

It is worth noting that GTP 3 who didn't do any formal teaching until after the first half term felt that she was getting behind as she knew other GTs were teaching, she said,

> *"it was getting to a point where I felt like a glorified classroom assistant but I knew I was learning but I felt like – now I've built up this reserve of knowledge I want to try and apply it a bit more – then talking to other GTPs 'Oh no, I've been teaching ten lessons, they just left me to it' and I'm like 'Really' whereas this school they haven't. 'You go off and take a lesson' I've taken odd lessons but not on a regular basis and I think it's probably better that way because at least when you do take over you're going to have the confidence to do it well." GTP 3 (J)1 Pg.218)*

GTP 3 spent the first half term observing her groups, getting to know names, taking small groups for individual help or taking small parts of the lesson (e.g. the warm up) with the whole group but at no point was she left unsupervised. Interestingly, GTP 3 was in a stronger position to begin teaching early on as she had previously spent two years on a BEd degree programme before opting out of the QTS element due to the pressures of her international sporting career.

The PGCE trainees had a similar experience to GTP 3, in that they spent the first four weeks of their initial serial placement observing and taking small groups or small parts of lessons, this lead to a six week block of practice just prior to the Christmas break. After this the PGCE trainees were back in the HEI for a further 4 weeks prior to starting their

second block practice in a different school. This time back in the HEI was used to further develop subject and pedagogic knowledge and to enable the trainees to reflect on their first experience, share ideas and concerns and prepare for the final placement. One of the PGCE trainees found this time difficult, as he was desperate to get back into school and develop further. Interestingly this was the trainee who had already had considerable experience teaching in a school abroad and did try and get a place on a GTP.

> *"Well, for me it was quite awkward going back to full-time mode of study again. Because even when we were on placement it felt like it was just working, I guess as that was what I had been doing previously. So it was quite difficult, yeah." PG 2 (P)2 Pg. 247)*

When interviewing the GTs on the second occasion, two of the three felt that some time out of school would have been welcome at the mid point as they felt they had a need to reflect, develop knowledge and 'regroup'. It was only the more mature GTP who didn't feel she needed this but then she was probably the most suited to her chosen pathways due to her previous BEd degree experiences, her subject and pedagogic knowledge would be reasonable. She had also spent some time teaching in a FE college prior to her GTP programme.

In summary

- The PGCE programme is more highly structured with clear guidelines for the trainees and mentors to follow, including guidance concerning their school placement explaining the expectations of the placement and what they need to achieve in order to pass
- The PGCE trainees are given three pieces of academic assessed coursework as part of the training programme that requires a theoretical understanding of the topic plus the ability to offer critique. The GTP trainees only complete one assessed task that is purely grounded within the school context.
- The GTP programme relies heavily on the structures for professional development established within the placement school that are frequently shared with other trainees or NQTs.
- The GTs attend meetings organised with the DRB, these have a generic focus and a set content across both the primary and secondary phases

- The PG trainees all had the opportunity to observe teaching and get familiar with their groups and the learning environment before taking on whole classes and complete lessons, this was not the case for all the GTs

c. Evidencing the QTS standards

The PGCE programme in this research has adopted a very structured approach to meeting and collecting evidence against the QTS standards. The programme itself is divided into three phases and in each phase a booklet is issued to the trainee and a copy is given to the school mentors. This clearly identifies which standards they need to work towards within that placement. For example in the first school placement the trainees work towards achieving identified standards in Professional Values and Practice, Classroom Management and Planning whereas in the second school placement they work towards higher level standards such as differentiation, assessment of and for learning and so on. This approach is not evident within the GTP, here a far more holistic attitude is adopted, allowing trainees to gather evidence against standards as opportunities arise. This approach though, has resulted in what appears to be a relatively rushed approach to meeting standards towards the latter part of the training year. This is reflected in a comment made by GTP 3,

> *"I collected stuff together and just put it all in a plastic wallet which meant I had loads of pieces of paper which then needed sorting, about twenty pieces of paper for each standard but I did make the effort to be organised, and I know people who didn't bother doing that. So I did make the effort but if I'm honest I wasn't really sure what I should do with it other than put it in a file" GTP 3 (A)3 Pg. 209)*

Table 3 (over) is a summary of information gathered from the half termly questionnaires and indicates which standards the trainees were working towards at set intervals throughout the training year. As can be seen, there appears to be a far more structured style to the PGCE trainees' approach to meeting the standards than the GTs'. Section 1 of the QTS standards which refer to professional values and practice, are generally met by the PGCE trainees in the first two terms of their school placements whereas the GTP trainees are still trying to meet these in the final terms. Likewise Section 3 which contains the majority of what are considered the higher level skills (e.g. differentiation, assessment) are predominantly tackled by the PGCE trainees in the later half of their training whereas there does not appear to be any pattern to this with the GTP trainees and indeed two of the GTs indicating addressing these standards in the first half term of their training year. The other interesting point to emerge from this exercise is that the PGs seem more able to identify which standards they are working towards at a given point than the GTs, a conclusion reached by comparing the level of detail provided by the trainees in completing the return.

Standard Reference	GTP				PG		
	1	2	3		1	2	3
1.1	*2*		*1, 2*		*1*	*2, 3*	*1*
1.2			*1, 2*		*1,2*	*1, 2, 3*	*1, 2*
1.3	*1*		*1, 2*		*2*	*2*	*2*
1.4		*2, 3*			*1*		
1.5			*1, 2*		*2*	*4*	*3*
1.6					*1*		*2*
1.7	*1*				*1,2*	*1, 2, 5*	*2,3*
1.8		*3*			*1*	*1, 2*	*1*
2.1		*1, 4*			*2*	*2*	*5*
2.1c			*2*		*2*	*2*	*5*
2.1d			*2*		*2*		*5*
2.2		*3*				*1, 2*	
2.3							
2.4		*3*				*1, 2*	
2.5		*1, 2*	*4*				*5*
2.6							
2.7	*1*		*2*			*2, 3, 4*	*4*
2.8			*2*				
3.1.1	*1, 2*	*1*	*3*		*2*	*2, 3*	
3.1.2	*1, 2*				*2*	*4*	
3.1.3					*2*	*3*	
3.1.4					*2*	*4*	
3.1.5	*4*	*1, 2*			*2*		
3.2.1			*3, 5*			*2, 4, 5*	*5, 6*
3.2.2			*3, 5*			*2, 4, 5*	
3.2.3			*5, 6*				*5*
3.2.4			*5*				*5, 6*
3.2.5			*3, 5*				
3.2.6	*4*		*3, 5*				*6*
3.2.7			*4, 5*				*6*
3.3.1	*1*		*4*		*2*	*2, 5*	*4*
3.3.2	*4, 5*	*1, 4*			*2*	*2*	
3.3.3		*4*			*2*	*2*	*1*
3.3.4	*1, 2*	*5*			*3*	*2*	*6*
3.3.5			*6*		*3,4*		
3.3.6		*5*			*4*		
3.3.7					*2*	*2, 3*	*1, 4*
3.3.8	*4, 5*				*2,3*	*2*	*1, 4*
3.3.9			*4*		*2*		*1, 4*
3.3.10	*5*	*1, 2, 5*			*3,4*		
3.3.11		*5*			*2*		
3.3.12	*5*	*4*			*3*	*2*	*4*
3.3.13					*2*		
3.3.14					*2, 4*	*1, 2, 5*	

Table 3

When the QTS standards were met by trainees

Numbers in italics refer to the half term in which the standard was addressed, as identified by the trainee on the questionnaire

The PGCEs have a placement booklet that allows the trainee to indicate how the evidence for the QTS standards has been obtained; it is then dated and signed by the subject mentor. Structured weekly meetings take place between the subject mentor and the trainee, here targets for the previous week are discussed and signed off if met, new targets are set and any issues, questions or concerns that either party have are discussed and noted on a proforma which is held as evidence of the meeting in the trainee's file. The PGCE trainees are all allocated a subject specialist link tutor from the University who will visit them (at least twice in the first placement and a minimum of 3 times in the final placement), observe and give written feedback on their teaching, review their teaching files, check the evidence log for meeting the professional standards and ensure that all paperwork is completed and logged as appropriate. It is evident that there is a highly structured and carefully monitored approach to the school placement aspect of the training programme by the HEI and as a result of this any trainee who is considered to be 'failing' is quickly noticed and specific measures are then put in place to further support them.

This highly structured approach however, was not noticed when visiting and talking to the GTs. Although they all indicated that they had a weekly session timetabled with their mentor, they did acknowledge that this sometimes didn't take place due to other pressures within the departments.

> *"we have a set time every Tuesday afternoon where you sit down for two hours and discuss what needs to be done, the amount of support is fair. On occasions we have to cancel these meeting as xxx has to attend a meeting elsewhere or is called on for cover but we usually manage to grab a bit of time to have some sort of discussion." GTP 1 (S)2 Pg.180).*

From discussion with the GTs it appears that their approach to meeting and evidencing the standards is more individual, in that they use experiences that occur throughout their teaching episodes to illustrate competence. These instances are not planned or targeted in the same way that the PG trainees approach their evidence gathering but are rather a result of what is naturally occurring within the teaching environment. Two of the three trainees stated that they hadn't really thought about the evidence needed until they were approaching the Easter holiday and then they spent two weeks trying to find the evidence as they needed to show their files on return to school.

> *"I guess from about Christmas I started to think about this, I have been gathering bits of paper, feedback from lessons and anything else that might help and putting them in a box file. Then during the Easter hols I tried to organise the information, see what evidence I had and also work out where the gaps were so I could talk to xxx about it and we could make sure I got some evidence for those standards." (GTP 1 (S)3 Pg 180)*

They also acknowledged that, as the end of the programme was approaching, often situations were staged so that they could show they had experienced a situation and therefore gather the evidence against the standards. This they felt did put extra pressure on them towards the end of the training period.

> *"I think I would try and find out a lot more about it and be more organised etc. I had quiet a lot of stress at the end trying to pull everything together" (GTP 1 (S)3 Pg.183)*

Even the GT who had started collecting evidence from the beginning experienced this increase in pressure. The DRB did not give specific guidance on this aspect of the training and it was left to the GT and the school mentor to ensure standards were met. For two of the three GTs this was a challenge as they had no previous experience of working with this sort of data (unlike GTP 3 who had previous experience as a result of completing and teaching on NVQ programmes that are portfolio based).

In terms of the assessment process, again for the PGCE this appeared far more formal and took place at the end of each of the three stages of school placement. Although the school made the final decision on the trainee suitability for QTS, the HEI link tutor liaised with them on the decision. In addition to this the PGCE trainees had to pass an additional three pieces of assessed course work. The GTs on the other hand didn't appear to have any interim assessment points or markers. The GTs had termly visits from a DRB assessor who gave them feedback on their progress but this individual was not a PE specialist and the GTs commented on how frustrating they found this as the feedback tended to be very general and usually focussed around class management

> *"....another thing that we've all said, we're getting feedback from xxxx, who's our DRB consultant and its just so much praise and excellence and then we have to get separate feedback from our mentor which is more PE based, ...I think it would help if we did have an actual PE specialist who was actually taking PE, English taking English, Maths taking Maths, then you can give that feedback straight away." (GTP2 (A)2 Pg.197)*

The GTP trainees felt that their only real point of progress was from feedback received from their subject mentors and sometimes via the professional tutor (where it was obvious that the subject mentor and professional tutor had a strong working relationship). It wasn't until the end of the training period that the GTP trainees were visited by an external assessor who was a subject specialist that they got any external feedback. They commented on how useful they found this and how they felt they would have benefited from this earlier in the training. AS GTP 3 said,

> *I had a really good evaluation from the assessor which was a relief and it was at least that at that point, and I knew straight away that it was going to be OK, it would have been good to have that sort of feedback earlier really." (GTP 3 (A)3 Pg.209)*

This final assessment they found stressful as they felt a lot rested on the successful execution of their teaching on that one occasion whereas the PGCE trainees how a far clearer idea of their performance against the standards. In addition they had received feedback from the HEI Link Tutor, who was a subject specialist, on previous occasions.

The PGCE course has a very clear and transparent procedure for identifying individuals who were not meeting the expected level at any given point in the training and this included specific identification of the area(s) for concern and a planned schedule for how this needed to be corrected. Failure to meet this timescale would normally result in a failed placement and either an additional placement would be offered or in some cases it was suggested that they withdraw from the course. It was not possible to ascertain how the DRB dealt with failing trainees, partly as the three in question did not fall into this category and partly as those interviewed and the mentors questioned didn't appear to know.

In conclusion

- The PG's have a very structured approach to meeting and evidencing QTS standards which occurs over 3 identified phases, the GTs gather evidence against standards in a far less formal manner

- PGCE trainees are observed by external subject specialists at identified points throughout the training year, GTs only receive an external subject specialist visit at the point of the final assessment.
- The DRB assessor for the GTP is not a subject specialist whereas the HEI link tutors for the PGs are.

d. The role of subject mentors, professional tutors and link tutors from the HEI and DRB

The role of various individuals (school subject mentors, school professional tutors, HEI link tutors, DRB link tutors and assessors) is crucial to the success of the training programmes under discussion. All of the trainees in this research and that of others (e.g. Hobson et al, 2005, Dunne 2005) refer to the support and guidance they receive from a range of individuals whilst they are in the school environment. Probably the most influential person in relation to the trainee is the school subject mentor as they are the person the trainee comes into contact with most frequently and they are the one who is going to have greatest impact and influence on their development and the eventually programme outcome. Nonetheless other individuals do play an important role in the training process and these roles and responsibilities will be further explored in this section.

i. School Subject Mentors

All of the trainees commented on the degree of support they felt they received from their subject mentors and all referred to their scheduled weekly mentor meetings. GTP 2 comments that,

> *"xxxx will give me feedback, most often it's verbal, then about three or four times a week he'll give me a written critique which I can put in as evidence then, and we'll go through them when we have a mentor meeting weekly, sometimes twice a week, depends on how much we have to cover that week, then we'll go through 'yes, we did this well, we did that well, we could have done that slightly better" (GTP 2 (A)2 Pg.198)*

> *"I think the mentor in this one Mr XX he seems quite laid back. He also gave me his number and said if I was stuck to ring him on a night and we could chat things through. Lovely, very supportive and you can't really ask for much more than that."* PG 1 (B)3 Pg. 240)

Other trainees express similar views; the majority said that they had a set time each week where they met with their mentor and reviewed the week and set targets for the coming week. The exception to this was GTP 3. From her comments below it can be seen that the mentor in the school was new to this role and it appears that the necessity for a

formal weekly meeting had not been made clear to him from the start of the programme. Once he became aware of this the meeting was put into the timetable,

> *"We try to do it like that and it happened on the day that we've sort of set it and he's been out on practices or taken a group of kids off so that side of it is still .... we're trying to get into a routine, I mean XXX's never done this before so for him, he's learning that we need a structured time, talking to other GTPs they have a set time, they stick to it and that's not quite worked with us but now we're aware of that and if we don't have it on that day we rearrange it" (GTP3 (J)1 Pg.219)*

There appears to be a lack of support, training and communication by the DRB with reference to the GT mentors' expectations, roles and responsibilities (in particular for new mentors). That said both mentors in the other two GTP schools were also new to the programme but they automatically instigated a set time each week for a review meeting. This is probably due to the fact that they were very new to teaching themselves (just starting their second year) and therefore were fully aware of the requirements of a subject mentor from their experiences on their own trainee pathways (both completed four year undergraduate training programmes). In informal talks with the mentors whilst visiting the schools it became clear that the training provided by the DRB for them was very brief and mostly consisted of a start of year briefing session that covered the key milestones on the programme with only a brief input on their roles and responsibilities with regard to the trainees and the resulting paperwork and assessment. This is in direct contrast to the expectations placed on mentors by the HEI associated with the PGCE pathways. The reason for this is unclear and there is insufficient evidence to suggest that the DRB was failing in its duty to provide sufficient mentor training. That said the HEIs insistence on attendance at training sessions is good practice and should be replicated by the DRB as they have the same ability to gather all mentors together for such occasions.

ii. Training for subject mentors and professional mentors in schools

Mentor training and involvement in the process of development, as we have seen from literature (e.g. Foster, 1999, Dunne, 2005 Griffiths, 2003), is fundamental to the positive experience of the trainee. Having interviewed both sets of trainees, it was evident that the expectations by the training provider of the mentor's responsibilities, including training was given far higher importance/significance within the PGCE programme. Here the mentors were expected to attend a meeting at the start of each academic year where all processes and expectations were laid out by the HEI and questions and issues were

DURHAM UNIVERSITY

addressed. The HEI insisted on a minimum of 4 written feedback sheets a week. In addition to the annual information meeting held by the HEI, there was at least three 'cluster meetings' (these were regional grouping of schools to make attendance easier) where attendance was expected. These meetings focused on mentor training and development and would seek to address the identified training needs of the mentors within the cluster as well as provide a discussion forum where partnership or national issues of concern could be aired (e.g. these could be as a result of Ofsted inspection evidence).

These training and development opportunities were not as apparent within the DRB arrangements. The DRB appointed an assessor who would work with the trainee and the school, visiting usually once per half term. There was an annual meeting at the start of the academic year to outline the programme and update mentors on their role although it does not appear to be compulsory that mentors attend. All of the GTs in this research had new mentors (in fact two were only just starting their second year of teaching) and these mentors commented that they felt left to get on and do things 'how they saw best'. One even commented on how he had adapted and was using a lot of the materials that had been presented to him by the HEI throughout his training course (especially proformas for lesson planning and unit of work). It could be argued that the DRB felt that it was important that the GTs were 'absorbed' into the 'school culture' and therefore would be shown and work with the normal procedures and planning that the school adopted rather than dictating what format this paperwork should take.

iii. Regularity and structure of mentor meetings and professional tutor sessions

Both sets of trainees, for the most part of the training year, had weekly meetings timetabled with their subject mentors but they said that these could be cancelled if other things within the department cropped up or if the mentor felt that they didn't have anything to discuss. The timetabled sessions with the PGCE trainees generally did take place and this was documented on the appropriate forms provided by the HEI; this could be as a direct result of the explicit quality assurances processes that were in place and checked on by the HEI link tutor. On the other hand, the documenting of the meeting with the GT trainee was left to the individual mentor to decide upon. Targets for the PGCEs were clearly and purposefully set, and methods of working towards and achieving these were discussed as well as a general discussion around progress to date. The GTP, although fully immersed within the department, didn't appear to experience such a formal process, targets were discussed and set but the approach to these appeared more random and often arose as a consequence of the teaching experience. Thereby the intensity of achieving and evidencing these standards increased as they neared the end of the training year and it was realised that a number of targets had yet to be met.

> *"Well the professional mentor speaks to you very, very regularly and tells me what he would like me to do. A lot of it I take on myself and a lot I know where I am going and what I meant to achieve, XXX and I have a mentor every week that tells me what my progress looks like, although at the moment it is not that much obviously a lot of my progression aims towards getting marked on standards so to help with that I am having to set an hour every week where I am just sitting down and being given feedback. (GT 1 (S)2, Pg.179)*

As well as working closely with their subject mentors, trainees in schools also receive support, development and training from the professional tutor. This can take a number of guises and there does not appear to be any consistency in approach to this. The PGCE trainees partake in a professional studies programme that is run by the professional tutor and approved by the HEI and is purposefully designed to dovetail with the professional studies work that is undertaken at the University. The professional tutor input for the GTs appears to be designed and delivered by the individual schools without the need for reference back to the DRB, therefore is unlikely to be consistent across all participating schools. In two out of the three schools the trainees attended sessions that were also held for other trainees and NQTs in the school. Although on occasions the advantages of

such an approach can be commended as a consistent form of delivery, it is fraught with concerns, particularly as the needs of the NQTs would be very different from those of individuals in training especially in the early stages.

> *"I have like an ITT or GTP co-ordinator, she arranges internal tutorials about school-based issues.*
> ***I: And how often are they held?***
> *They are usually every Wednesday, so I've got one today, weekly roughly.*
> ***I: Is that just for you on your own or do you join up with other people.***
> *They're for GTPs, NQTs, ITTs, whatever is in the school." (GTP 3 (J)2 Pg. 224)*

iv. Perception of trainees towards support offered by HEI and or DRB

In addition to support offered from within the school, extra support is also given by the HEI or the DRB as appropriate. In the case of the PGCE programme each of the trainees are allocated a subject specialist from the HEI to act as the link tutor whilst they are on placement. The role of this individual is not just to observe and feedback on the trainees' teaching but also to check that adequate progress is being made, that the files and evidence are up to date, satisfactory progress is being made and to check the support from the school is as it should be and to step in if issues or problems arise either with the trainee and their development or with the school and the level of support. The trainee values the feedback and support they get from the link tutor particularly as they view this as an impartial evaluation from someone who has an awareness of the standards of trainees elsewhere, therefore the feedback is a levelling tool for them and they know it is judged against their counterparts in other schools. The link tutor will also work alongside the professional tutor and subject mentor to develop their understanding and their mentoring skills and will help them to ensure a consistency of judgement is applied across the partnership. Prior to the final assessment being carried out, all mentors within the partnership cluster attend a meeting where a moderation exercise is conducted.

The GTP trainees on the other hand did not value the support offered by the DRB link in quite the same way and this was particularly as they were not a subject specialist. As a result the trainees felt that the feedback wasn't as worthwhile and often they would turn to the subject mentors for additional responses.

> *"I have a person from the DRB who comes in very regularly and I speak to her quite regularly as well. She always gives us time if possible.*

I: So she observes your teaching?
She observes what I teach. She may come in twice a term. I speak to her regularly on the phone. Sometimes she might admit to something that she saw and is really complimentary, then she will come to me and say "what do you think you should do". xxxxxxxx. xxxxx xxxx xxxx I don't think she is too specialised. So she will see my pupil management or the knowledge side sometimes. She is always asking about PE, I think she is learning herself." (GT 1 (S)2 Pg.180)

The finial assessment for the GTP is however carried out by a subject specialist who comes in and spends approximately two days in the school. This GT assessor will also have visited the other subject trainees within the DRB therefore ensuring a consistency to the assessment process. During this time they will watch the trainee teach, look at the files and the evidence gathered and speak to those associated with the trainee before making a final judgement and giving feedback. It could be argued that this therefore forms a similar pattern for quality assurance to that of the PG programme, as here the external assessor has a broader picture of standards across the subject and reviews evidence against QTS standards in consultation with the subject mentor. The GTs found this quite a nerve racking experience as they were not familiar with the assessor and therefore felt it was an all or nothing event; if they didn't do well in that one lesson they may well fail. As GTP 3 says,

".....quite a bit of stress really getting everything ready, paperwork and so on for the assessment, especially as you don't know the guy and not met him before" (GTP2 (A)3 Pg 209)

In summary

- There is a more rigorous structure for feedback during the PGCE training year as they are visited and observed by a subject specialist from the HEI, this isn't the case with the GTP until the external assessor visits at the end of the training period
- The GTP has one assessor who will visit and make judgements on all GTs within the DRB in a given subject, this ensures consistency. This is more complex with the PGCE programme, although the HEI does hold moderation events prior to the final assessment point which mentors are expected to attend and the HEI link tutor does visit towards the end of the final placement to discuss outcomes with the school subject mentor.

- For the PGCE trainees the subject mentor mainly carries out the final assessment with endorsement from the HEI, the GTP trainees is judged by the external assessor on one visit.
- The PGCE trainees value the subject specific input they receive from the HEI link tutor.
- The GT trainees felt a subject specialist visit from the DRB would have had more value than that of a generalist.

e. Development of subject knowledge

In order to meet the standards for QTS for secondary PE it is important to have gained 'sustained and substantial' experience of all six activity areas within the PE national curriculum (2005). These are athletic activities, dance activities, games activities, gymnastics activities, outdoor and adventurous activities and swimming activities and water safety, across both age phases (i.e. key stage 3 and 4). The reference to 'sustained and substantial' is one that is used by Ofsted. Although there isn't any precise definition as to what is meant by this statement, for example how much is substantial and how long is sustained, most who work within HEIs in PE initial teacher education, take it to refer to a half term block of activity of 5-6 weeks consecutive experience in terms of planning, teaching and evaluation. By demanding this level of involvement, it is felt that the individual can show evidence of their ability to develop learning, plan cohesively and appropriately and assess the progress of individual pupils. For both training pathways in this investigation the development of subject knowledge is seen as an important aspect of the trainees' school placement, which obviously for the GTP is full time. There are many ways in which this subject knowledge base can be developed including working alongside and observing more experienced teachers, attending in service training events or taking a national governing body award in the relevant activity. In addition to these options either during the training year or prior to its commencement, there is also the possibility of attending subject knowledge booster courses as was discussed earlier (see Section 4.a Pg. 79). Of course the acquiring of this subject knowledge is just one aspect of this area, as trainees need not only to gain this knowledge but also need to demonstrate their ability to teach and progress pupil learning in these activities. Here it is important that the schools provide the trainees with the opportunity to experience all these activities across both key stages in order to fully meet the standards for QTS.

Table 3 below, gives an overview of the teaching experiences in relation to the PE activity areas, of each of the trainees whilst on their training year. What is immediately evident is that none of them could claim experience across all six areas of activity. Facilitating this opportunity is a problem in the majority of secondary schools as very few teach all six activity areas so providing such a broad experience for the trainees is in itself very demanding for the schools in which trainees are placed.

Table 4 Meeting QTS Subject Standards

	GTP1 (S)	GTP2 (A)	GTP3 (J)	PG1 (B)	PG2 (P)	PG3 (C)
Athletics	KS3	KS3	KS3 & KS4	KS3 & KS4	KS3 & KS4	KS3 & KS4
Dance	Minimal	Minimal	KS3 & KS4	KS3 & KS4	KS4	KS3
Games	KS3 Some KS4	KS3	KS3 & KS4	KS3 & KS4	KS3 & KS4	KS3 & KS4
Gymnastics	KS3	KS3	KS3 & KS4	KS3 & KS4	KS3 & KS4	KS3 & KS4
OAA	KS3	KS3	KS3 & KS4	KS3 & KS4 (limited)	KS4	KS3 & KS4 (support only)
Swimming	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	KS3	NONE (but evidence from other school based work)
Primary Exp	1 week	1 week	1 week	1 week	1 week	1 week
EFL	Minimal	1 day ob, INSET	For assignment	Only theory	OK	Minimal
ICT	Limited	OK	Limited	OK	OK	OK

* shown if substantial experience has been claimed. In terms of activity areas 5-6 weeks of sustained teaching

Most secondary school run a PE curriculum based on games, athletics and gymnastics (and for girls, dance). Outdoor and adventurous activities may well be experienced in some secondary schools but normally only at KS3 due to the increased offsite demands of the KS4 programme of study. Similarly swimming is only an option in those schools that have access to a pool and even then usually only occurs at KS3. Dance is an activity that is not often offered to boys within the secondary school curriculum and as a result it is very difficult for male trainees to access the required experience.

In interviewing the trainees it became apparent that there wasn't any one approach to developing subject knowledge and meeting these requirements. Those on the PGCE route were in a stronger position in this respect in that pre training requirements had been made where subject knowledge in a given area was weak (as discussed earlier this was identified by the individual needs assessment at the interview stage). In addition, the school partnership for this HEI is set up in a cluster arrangement whereby schools from similar geographical location work together with one cluster manager (appointed by the HEI). This enables schools to share resources and work to each other's strengths, for example schools with a swimming pool would offer the opportunity for other trainees in the cluster to teach at their school. Other imaginative ways of addressing shortages were also employed, for example allowing the trainee to run a lunchtime club (this was often the case for KS3 outdoor and adventurous activities or for dance activities), allowing male trainees to teach female groups that then gave them experience of dance activities, allowing trainees to go on school adventure trips, which contributed towards KS 4 OAA requirements, timetabling trainees so they could team teach where there were insufficient groups in a given activity. In addition to the measures undertaken by the schools, the HEI had a responsibility to the trainees to ensure that they had exposure to and experience of the range of activities and ensure as far as possible their two school placements would give them the best opportunity to meet these standards. Despite this the PGCE trainees still did not meet the expectations in all six areas of activity,

"No, I never got the chance to teach any swimming (PG 1(B)3, Pg.241)

"In my two places I haven't taught any swimming but I am a swimming teacher teaching I do that in the evenings so to me that wasn't a big issue. It wasn't a big issue for me (PG 3 (C)3, Pg.263)

I: "What ones haven't you covered?
Dance at stage 3 and OAA and I haven't got a swimming at key stage 4 (PG 2 (P)3, Pg. 249)

The GTP pathway on the other hand appeared to find access to all six areas of activity even more problematic which could be as a result of the trainee predominantly being placed in the one school throughout the training period. As a result, the strong collaborations between schools, as evident in the PGCE programme, had not been established. When talking to the GTP trainees, they said;

> *"there's just a question mark over the swimming, we're looking to send me to xxxx or xxxx just for a couple of weeks " GT 2 (A)2 Pg.200)*
>
> ***I: "So, in a sense, how do you manage to demonstrate that you have met those subject knowledge standards?***
> *Well I haven't have I?*
> ***I: So they have still passed you,***
> *Yes!*
> ***I: not having met those standards?***
> *And also they have said that these are areas for development".*
> *(GT 2 (A)3, Pg.212)*
>
> *"No, I've not done any swimming or dance"(GT 1 (S)2, Pg. 181)*
> *I have not had any Key Stage 4 on my timetable yet. (GT 1 (S)2, Pg.182)*
>
> *I guess I still need to do a bit more gymnastics and dance and that swimming plus a few other bits at key stage 4. (GT 1(S)2, Pg 183)*
>
> *Well the assessor seemed OK with that but I guess strictly speaking there are still some gaps but they are difficult to get experience in as the school does cover those areas, for example we don't do swimming and the boys don't really do dance. (GT (A) 3, Pg.212)*

Although it is clear that both sets of trainees failed to meet the subject knowledge standards fully, from the evidence gathered through interviews it is fair to say that the GTs had a far less rounded experience than their PGCE

counterparts. As table 4 outlines, GTP 1 & 2 experienced very little teaching in KS4 in any activity area whereas for the PGCE trainees this was more comprehensive. No trainees had any substantial experience of teaching swimming to any key stage. Even with this significant gap in their teaching experience, all trainees were passed on the subject knowledge standards. For some these gaps were acknowledged and were included in the targets for their NQT year, for example GTP 3.

There also appears to be different approaches to aiding the trainees in developing their subject knowledge. The PGCEs are encouraged to attend subject knowledge booster courses and receive some subject knowledge input from specialists at the HEI prior to their school experience and are encouraged where possible to gain national governing body awards. This they need to do in their own time and outside of their scheduled sessions for the PGCE programme. They do though get subsidised rates if they are undertaken as part of the HEI run courses. PG 1 commented that he would like to have seen the national governing body awards incorporated into the subject knowledge sessions that were run by HEI specialist,

> *"We did a practical module work with the national cricketing governing body, 48 hours doing some course and some practical but what we said would have been better and I said this to the tutor was if we had done less theoretical stuff and more sport qualification especially as when it comes to interview that it was head teachers want to see." (PG1 (B)2 Pg.239)*

The GTs all experienced different approaches to developing subject knowledge. They all used the expertise within their departments in their respective schools and all tried to gain National Governing Body Awards throughout the year. For GTP 3 this was done during school time and she was allowed as much time off timetable as needed in order to do this, she says

> *"I have applied to go on a netball course, a basketball one and you know a million and one other courses and prior to starting this year I did a badminton to try and do a few other awards just to try and build up my knowledge really, just to get back into it.*
> ***I: Are you able to do those in school time or do you have to do them outside?.***

No I can do them in school. My mentor is supportive and just said ' no, just go on them, if you leave this school with as much experience, with as much governing body awards and packs and masses of information, that's the whole point of it." (GT 3 (J)1, Pg. 217)

Whereas GTP 2 who was very aware of his deficiencies in subject knowledge was not allowed time off during the school day to complete these courses so he ended up having to do them over the weekend, he says

"It's taking your weekends up obviously but most of my weakness has been subject knowledge because managements good, my organisation's been good, it's just the actual subject knowledge knowing teaching points, exact teaching points, demonstrations, not so much tools because you can use a lot of tools and adapt them to different sports, you know when to progress, you know what set it is whether to progress them or not, whether to keep them together but the actual subject knowledge, so I've really enjoyed actually going on courses. Even sacrificing the weekends, it's not been that big a thing really." (GT 2 (A)2, Pg.197)

To conclude

- The PGCE trainees achieved greater coverage and depth in the six NC PE areas of activity
- The GT trainees had significant gaps in their subject knowledge especially in KS4
- Approaches to gaining subject knowledge varied within the GT programme; the PGCE programme incorporated subject knowledge development into the HEI input
- Obtaining sustainable and substantial experience in the activity areas is problematic in the secondary PE curriculum for both sets of trainees as schools don't teach all six areas of the NC PE.

f. Other issues/concerns

Although this was not intended at the start of this investigation, in analysing the data certain other issues came to light that need recording here, namely

- The quality assurance processes, in particular the quality and clarity of the documentation and the Ofsted inspection requirements
- The quality of the feedback given to the trainees
- The use of trainees for supply cover

i. The quality assurances processes

Whilst gathering supporting data for this investigation it became apparent that the manner in which Ofsted carry out the quality assurance and inspection role across these two training pathways is very different. The marked difference being that all HEI PGCE programmes were subject to inspection by Ofsted as individual training providers in their own right and the final report was made public via the ofsted website whereas DRBs providing GTP programmes although inspected on an individual basis received only a combined DRB report across all providers was available publicly on the website. This presents two main concerns, firstly the inequity in terms of access to information relating to the quality of provision provided by the two training pathways and secondly the issue for the public, whether that be the researcher, the potential trainee, the training providers or the general public, to access information on individual training programmes in order to compare and contrast, form opinions and make decisions as to the quality of provision on offer.

This inequity could result in a number of issues including ill feeling amongst the HEI training providers who feel that they are being subjected to harsher quality assurance measures than their DRB counterparts, including the threat of a reduction in trainee numbers or withdrawal of the provision if minimum standards are not met which doesn't appear to be the case with the DRBs; a complacency amongst DRBs as a composite report is not able to point to

individuals in terms of issues of quality and finally the potential for cohorts of trainees to pass through the various training programmes but not meeting the same standard in order to achieve the same outcome (i.e. QTS)

Coupled with this concern and to a certain extent very much interlinked are the startling differences in the quality and clarity of the two sets of paperwork associated with the two programmes being investigated. The PGCE programme had a fully comprehensive and detailed set of course booklets which clearly identified the roles and expectations of all parties (HEI, School and trainee) at various stages throughout the training year and included clear explanations of what to do if their were concerns about a placement, in particular the trainee not meeting the required standards. The Programme also had sets of proformas for use by all parties including feedback sheets, evidence sheets and planning sheets. The DRB by contrast had significantly less. What they did provide was documentation outlining the aims of the programme and the roles and responsibilities for the school in that process. What wasn't apparent was the support structures that were available for both the school and trainee should they encounter any difficulties nor was their any evidence of support with documentation either in terms of proformas or guidance materials. One could argue that this is a direct result of the different approaches of the two programmes. That said one would expect a certain minimum level of detail which I would suggest is missing from the DRB on the other hand one could argue that the degree of supporting material provided by the HEI is excessive and may result in a stifling of creativity and innovation.

Another concern that was implicit in a lot of the trainee comments, in particular from the GTPs surrounds the quality of the feedback they are given. All three GTs commented on the frustration of only receiving generic feedback when visited by the DRB assessor throughout the training year, and two out of the three trainees only appeared to receive feedback from one school based tutor (as they predominantly took over the teacher timetable of that individual). The question that must be asked here is how can the trainees judge the quality of feedback when their experiences here are limited (and when one key person is a not a subject specialist)? Although this was particularly

evident amongst the GTs that was not exclusively the case, two of the PGs commented on the negativity of the feedback they received and one PGs comments follow,

> *"I had a woman who it was her first time for mentoring and she was really the lady who caused me the most problems when I was there. The way she gave feedback was very negative and she hardly ever found …. If she did find a positive she always managed to put it as negative by the end of… you know what I mean….by the end of what you were talking about so you are like " so it wasn't really a positive at all ". So I didn't really gel with her very much. So the mentor meetings were a bit of a drag." PG (C) 3 Pg 258)*

Interestingly when looking at this further three out of the four school based mentor associated with these trainees where either new to mentoring (the case with the two PG mentors) or new to both mentoring and teaching (the case with the GT mentors). This questions the process of induction and training which is given to school based mentors prior to them undertaking this important and influential role. Although the HEI does insist that all school based mentors must be teaching for at least three years before undertaking the role (this is not the case with the DRB and as previously mentioned two of the mentors here have just begun their second year of teaching) there is still a question mark over how teachers acquire basic mentoring skills prior to undertaking the role.

One final issue that needs addressing is the place of the trainee with regard to undertaking cover duties within the school. All trainees were regarded as super numeracy and it was recognised that they were on a training pathway. That said one of the GT trainees were asked to provide cover for absent colleagues, when asked if it was happening a lot he replied,

> *R "Yes*
> *I Are you happy with that?*
> *R I am because I'm quite confident now to be able to take a class, I just worry about the legal side in case someone slips or someone falls over or someone cuts themselves." (GT2 (A) 2 Pg. 203)*

Although he stated that he was happy to do this (and in fact saw it as an honour, as it demonstrated that his mentor (and the school) trusted him and

felt he had reached a level where he would be able to cope alone) surely one must question the wisdom and legality of trainees doing this. What would be the legal and moral position if there was an accident whilst they were unaccompanied with a class especially in a subject area that is practical in nature? Something that also concerns the GT trainee.

5. Discussion of Findings

This next chapter is presented along similar lines to that of the previous section in that the main themes listed are discussed and, where appropriate, links are made to other research projects. For clarity the main themes are

- Recruitment and Selection/trainees previous experiences/qualifications
- Programme structure
    - Teaching and observation periods
- Evidencing the standards
- Training for school subject mentor and professional tutor
- Developing Subject knowledge
- Quality assurance

a. Recruitment and Selection/Trainees previous experiences/qualifications

Recruitment and selection of trainees for any pathway is of vital importance if the quality of teachers entering the profession is to be maintained (or enhanced). To this end rigorous, appropriate and demanding selection criteria are necessary to ensure that those most suited to the profession are allowed onto training pathways. From the evidence of this research and that of Dunne (1994) it appears that the recruitment and selection onto a PGCE pathway is far more testing and rigorous that that of the GT pathway. As already highlighted all of the PGCEs participating met the entry requirements for the GTP scheme but not all the GTs met the PGCE selection criteria. One could argue that it is not necessarily appropriate for all training pathways to have the same selection criteria especially those that are employment based and those that are HEI led. If it is accepted that the applicants for each pathway are different in terms of their experiences, background and reasons for wanting to enter the teaching profession it could follow that the selection criteria should be suitable to meet the demands of the training route and reflect the experience of the individual. This argument would certainly have had more standing when the GTP was first introduced and had a minimum age

requirement of 24 years as individuals would have had at least 3 years post degree experience. But this position is somewhat weakened now as the age barrier has been lifted. Indeed from the interviews of the GTs within this investigation, two out of the three stated that they did not or thought they would not get a place on a PGCE programme due to their qualifications and/or lack of experience. This is confirmed by reviewing their experiences prior to entry (see table 1, Pg.82). The question that is evident here concerns equity and one of parity across teacher training pathways. Should all pathways have the same entry criteria? If so what would this be? Or should there at least be a minimum standard that all those entering a teacher training programme should meet? This is currently the case but perhaps this should be revisited and questions asked as to whether it is rigorous enough and is it of a suitable standard for entry to teaching. It could be viewed currently that we have two distinct systems for ITT, one that is followed by the HEI which certainly placed higher academic demands on the trainee and one that is school based, with its focus around 'on the job' training. With the introduction of masters level qualifications for the teaching profession (Master in Teaching and Learning, to begin in September 2009, initially for early career teachers) and the introduction of master's level options in more institutions on the PGCE programme maybe we are starting to see a two tier system for initial teacher training emerging, especially as few GTP or employment based routes are able to offer M level accreditation. Certainly with the difference between these two programmes in their approach to the theoretical work and the development of reflective and critical thinking skills that could be seen to be the case.

If entry qualifications are considered, overall the PGCE trainees had higher first degree classifications than their GTP counterparts; this also concurs with findings from Dunne 1995, Foster 1999). Entry onto the PGCE programme in question normally requires a 2:1 degree classification and none of the GTs had achieved this. This again raises concerns in relation to the recent government's drive to introduce masters' level qualifications into the profession. Many HEIs would be wary of accepting students onto a masters level programme with a 2:2 qualification (immediately following their

undergraduate course) and this combined with the demands of the training year would increase pressure on trainees who already have achieved less academically – this increased demand, that is masters level work, as well as meeting standard for QTS could potentially lead to greater failure as the pressure becomes more intense. Indeed early evidence from the PGCE programmes offering Masters level accreditation are seeing approximately 50% of trainees not meeting the required standard (Examinations Boards summer, 2008).

PGCE trainees already speak of the high demands of their training year but are fortunate in that they do get breaks from the pressure of school placement by returning to the HEI for periods of time. In addition the PGCEs have access to experienced academic members of staff to support them in producing academic work at master's level. This is not necessarily the case for those training within schools. They are within the school environment full time and have very little opportunity to step out and reflect on their experiences, and little time to produce academic work at the required level. Without the infrastructure in terms of people and resources to support this, the goal could prove too demanding. A number of employment based routes to teaching are not able to offer masters level accreditation for the trainees, remaining instead with awarding a professional qualification. There could be two reasons for this: firstly the employment based routes don't have a HE partner who is prepared to offer masters level accreditation as there is insufficient academic rigour in the assessed work or the DRB feel that masters level work is inappropriate for the type of programme they are offering, where they are focussing on the skills of becoming a teacher. The problem here is twofold: in the coming years many of the employment based trainees are going to be entering the profession in an inferior position academically and will be behind other NQTs in working towards a full masters qualification and they will also be entering the profession without the same level of development in their critical thinking skills and ability to be reflective on practice, two crucial elements recognised for good teaching and working at masters level.

Another interesting difference between the two pathways investigated was the use of the initial needs analysis. For the PGCE trainees this was done at the interview stage and the offer of a place was conditional on the individual, if required, gathering experience and or knowledge of certain aspects of their subject prior to them starting the programme. This often was focused on subject knowledge as physical education is very demanding in this respect as the NC for PE covers 6 different activity areas (with many types of activity within each, especially so within the games activity area) and trainees are expected to teach across all six areas in the training year. Without sufficient experience and knowledge of these six areas, trainees would struggle with the teaching demands of these activities. (Evidence from this research shows that the experience of the GTs across these areas was less than the PGCE trainees – see table1, Pg. 82). Unlike the PGs, the GTs didn't complete a needs analysis until the June/July preceding their training year and gaps identified at this stage were not required to be met prior to commencement on the programme. One could argue that as the GTs were spending so much time in schools and as they were super numeracy there would be ample opportunity for them to develop their subject knowledge during the training year by observing more experienced teachers or completing national governing body awards in specific activities. As was seen in this research, this was indeed the case with one of the GTs but not the same with the other two, who interestingly, were in greater need of subject knowledge development. If this is the expectation then opportunity needs to be followed through in the schools. One GT acknowledged his lack of subject knowledge but as the school wouldn't release him to complete training courses he spent time at the weekends doing these; this adds to the pressure of the training year. He also had to finance the courses himself, whereas another GT was allowed time out of school to complete these and the school paid the cost of the course. In addition the GTs were not aware of the subject knowledge booster courses funded by the TDA which they could have had access to prior to commencement or during their training year. The PGCE trainees on the other hand were clearly signposted to these where the needs analysis showed a knowledge gap.

One of the questions asked in the first set of interviews explored the reasons why trainees had selected their particular training pathways. This question was also investigated in the 'Becoming a Teacher Project' (Hobson et al, 2005) and some of the same reasons were given here. For example, one of the GTs made a definite choice to do that particular route, she had fully investigated all of her options (with assistance from an athletes career advisor) and felt strongly that she did not want to return to a university environment; she felt that she wanted to fully immerse herself in her new profession and 'learn the skills of teaching'. She did not see the benefits of returning to university to do this, in fact she didn't see the point of undertaking academic work and failed to appreciate how this would help her in becoming a teacher; in her words she 'wanted to get on with it' and 'being full time in school was the best way for that to happen'. The other two GTP trainees admitted that they were on the programme as they wanted to become teachers but knew that they didn't have a higher enough first degree qualification or experience to get accepted onto a PGCE. One of these was also working as a special needs assistant in the school and was encouraged to accept a GT place there by his uncle who was one of the senior teachers; one questions here the extent that this decision was truly his.

The PGCE trainees however had all made conscious decisions that this was the route they wanted. Two out of the three had made this decision very early on in their undergraduate studies and had purposefully selected modules and gained experience that would give them the greatest chance of fulfilling this ambition. The other PGCE had initially wanted to complete an employment based route for QTS (mainly as he had considerable experience working in an international school and therefore thought it was the most appropriate for him). However he had a bad experience with the school that the DRB wished to place him in. This was a failing school and he felt that this would not suit his training needs. He therefore decided to go back to his undergraduate university and do the PGCE. This trainee would have been highly suited, as was the GT (3), the ex-athlete on the GT pathways as they had a lot of experience and were more mature entrants to the profession. On the other hand of the other four trainees, two on the PG and two on the GT pathway,

only the two on the PG pathway were really suited to their chosen route. It should be acknowledged that this choice, although probably the correct one, was made out of ignorance, as they were not aware of the employment based routes. (Although when questioned they did say that they probably would not have chosen them anyway! How reliable this is, is questionable as they may well have felt defensive and protective of their choice). The two GTs on the other hand were not particular suited to an employment based route as they lacked experience and maturity but did so, as they knew they would not have been accepted on a PGCE – this raises the whole question of equity and basic entry level qualifications yet again.

A number of questions have arisen from this section that could form the basis of further research. These include investigations surrounding the entry level requirements for all routes to teacher training and the feasibility and desirability of having differing requirements dependent on the route chosen. Another question is centred around the impact of master level accreditation which is currently available to some trainees and not others and whether this will have an impact on the quality of those entering the teaching profession and their ability to secure their first posts within schools.

b. Programme structure

Overall the PGCE programme is far more prescriptive than the GTP structure. As observed within this research and that of Dunne (1994), the PGCE programme had a very clear structure for the trainees, detailing length of time in the HEI, length of time in schools, what aspects of professional development were to be covered and when. In addition once on school placement there were clear guidelines as to how much teaching and observation should be undertaken, at what point in the placement and what standards the trainees should be working towards at each stage. This structure was clearly detailed in the accompanying course handbooks that were distributed to the trainees, those in the HEI involved in the training and to the schools. In addition the roles and responsibilities of each of the parties were precisely laid out in the relevant handbooks that were produced by the HEI.

The GT programme, however, had some structure in that course handbooks clearly outlined the roles and responsibilities of the various parties (trainee, DRB and school) and there was a clear structure given for the professional training that was to be provided by the DRB. The professional development aspects that were expected to be delivered via the schools was left to the individual schools to design, this included the method by which the trainees addressed and evidenced the QTS standards.

The debate here centres around which is the better approach. Much of the evidence in this research has highlighted ways in which the PGCE route has positive aspects that are either not found or are limited on the GTP route. It is important however not to jump to final judgements too quickly. For example, one could argue that what some might see as the prescriptive almost mechanistic approach adopted by the PGCE course limits the trainees and doesn't allow them to develop in their own way and at a pace with which the are comfortable, a sentiment hinted at by PG2. This highly structured approach could be seen as problematic as not all trainees will develop in the

same linear fashion and depending on their previous and current experiences they will need to address professional development issues in different ways. In the instance of this research the PGCE trainee who had been teaching for 2 years overseas commented on how difficult he found being back at university and even one of the less experienced PGCE trainees said that he felt things were 'drummed into him'. The question here is; does the PGCE programme structure really take into account the individual needs of the trainees?

On the other hand the GTP appears at least to try to address the individual needs of the trainees in that it is left to individual schools to design the professional development programme and work with the trainees in addressing the standards for QTS at a pace with which they are comfortable. The question arising here is, do the schools have a process which allows them to assess and address the individual needs of the trainees or are things left to chance and opportunity as the arise during the training year? Evidence from this research would suggest that this is probably the case. The GTs commented on what they perceived as a lack of structure not only to the DRB generic training courses (see GT 1, Pg. 93 & 200) but also from information gathered from their interviews. From the questionnaire data it is evident that their approach to meeting the QTS Standards is very ad hoc as no clear pattern across all three GTS can be seen, this leads to the point were there are comments of a 'mad rush' towards the end to ensure that all standards are met (even to the point of setting up situations where this could be accomplished). With regard to the professional training provided within the schools, this again is questionable, as it appears that it is either delivered with all trainees and any NQTs within the school (e.g. GT3) or sessions are provided as and when the trainee feels it necessary or the professional tutor feels they should have an input on certain wider educational initiatives. The question of developing subject specific knowledge is also haphazard and will be addressed in more detail later. Although subject mentors provide support for the development of subject knowledge, the wider educational themes that are also important for subject delivery are not addressed which surely will impact on the level on development achieved by the individual trainee.

The professional development programmes that are run by the managing partners (i.e. HEI and DRB) are clearly structured in both contexts. The HEI (for the PGCE) has a main input in the first five weeks of the training programme with a follow up 4 week programme between the two teaching placements and a final two week block at the end of the training year. The GTP has an initial meeting with all trainees (both Primary and Secondary) in June/July and then 3 follow up sessions, one per term where a programme of activity has been defined. The PGCE programme run by the HEI includes sessions of both a generic and subject specific focus whereas the sessions hosted by the DRB are of a generic nature and cross all phases of teaching. Subject specific development, in particular for the GTs, as mentioned previously is expected to take place within the schools, as is considered to be phase specific professional development work.

The issue that arises here is that of monitoring what is happening across the training programmes in order to ensure that all trainees receive, as a minimum, adequate, but striving towards high quality, professional development so that they can receive the best possible introduction to their chosen career. The HEI has decided not to leave things to chance and has therefore taken on board the planning of both the HEI delivered professional development activity and requires the partnership schools to submit their programmes to them so that they can ensure all aspects of professional need are met. The DRB on the other hand has taken aspects that are generic for all teachers no matter what phase of teaching and has set up a programme to deliver these and left the other aspects of training for individual school to address. This system doesn't appear to have any direct monitoring from the DRB and when trainees were asked about their professional development activity the responses indicated some problems. Firstly sessions were run with all trainees no matter what stage of development, this also included NQTs which is problematic in that the demand of these differing sets of trainees and beginner teacher will be different and therefore meeting their individual needs could be compromised. Secondly sessions were put on if a trainee indicated a need in this area. This in itself is difficult as a trainee

cannot be expected to appreciate and know the extent or the expectation that is required of them, i.e. they can't ask questions of areas that they have no knowledge. On the other hand the set programme and level of control exerted by the HEI could cause concern as it doesn't allow a lot of scope for individual needs and concerns to be addressed as issues arise within the training cycle. What we have here is a difference in style and ethos towards professional development, one side offering perhaps a more scientific, cause and effect approach to the programme where predetermined outcomes are built in around a set formula for progress and the other is offering a more organic approach where subjectivity and individualism is recognised and catered for. The old debate is teaching and art or a science resurfaces.

Finally the PGCE trainees are expected to carry out three pieces of academic work throughout their training year (and as from 2007/08 this work may be assessed at master's level) whereas the GTs are given one piece of professional based work. If the aim of any ITE programme is to develop critical and reflective practitioners, one would have to question how this is possible if trainees are not given any or very little underpinning theoretical knowledge or guidance in developing their critical thinking and reflective skills. If trainees aren't introduced to a range of perspectives, it is almost impossible for them to reflect and make decisions on what suits the needs and purposes of their pupils and the learning environment best.

The academic work set for the PGCEs regardless of level requires them to consider issues of theory and an ability to critically reflect on educational issues whereas the GTP piece of work, being professionally based doesn't appear to require the same level of reflective practice or theoretical knowledge. As can be seen (GT 3) one of the GTs saw her training programme as a means to learn 'the skills of teaching' and didn't appear to appreciate the importance of any theoretical underpinning to support and enhance this development. The issue here is how is it possible to produce reflective practitioners if they are not introduced to the tools that will enable them to evaluate and critique their practice, which seems to be the case for the GTP pathways? If a professional development programme is structured

around issues and concerns that are highlighted by the trainee, what would happen if problems didn't get identified or emerge from the teaching scenarios or weren't identified as essential to show the standards were met? We are perhaps left with a much impoverished training programme that although meeting individual needs may not be developing trainees into excellent all round teachers who are aware of how to further develop their pedagogical approaches. Some guidance for the school from the DRB is essential. They are the managing agents and they must ensure that important aspects of generic and subject specific professional development areas are addressed, if this were in place maybe the GTP trainees would have been more aware of specific government policy (e.g. PESSCL Strategy) that was having significant impact on the subject teaching and pedagogy at the time.

Perhaps neither pathway has it exactly right, I would suggest that the PGCE structure needs to allow for more analysis and work with individuals and their training needs which will, require a greater level of flexibility; on the other hand, the GTP needs to introduce more structure, certainly with regard to the role and responsibility of the schools. The DRB needs to consider what the minimum requirements would be for a generic and subject specific professional development programme. The GTs also needs to be given support in developing their evaluative and critical skills in order to help them become far more reflective practitioners.

Further research here might include a consideration of two areas; firstly, what level of prescription is necessary for a training pathway in order to ensure that all aspects of development are met but allow for individual need throughout? Secondly, how can all pathways, but in particular the employment based ones, ensure that the trainees receive the necessary hep and guidance to become truly reflective and critical practitioners?

c. Teaching and observation periods

An effective and appropriate induction period is crucial to any job and the role that induction plays for those learning to teach is no less important (see also Dunne 2005 and Hobson et al 2005). Part of this process needs to involve the trainee in the opportunity to meet other key members of staff not just within their immediate teaching area but also across the school and to have the opportunity to see more experienced teachers at work, both within and beyond their immediate subject area. Trainees both here and within the Becoming a Teacher Project (Hobson et al, 2005) have identified this as an important element of their training and one that can have a significant impact on their own practice and how they develop as fully competent teachers. Access to this experience across the two training pathways was variable. Generally within this research the PGCE trainees had more opportunity for observation of other teachers especially within their subject area than the GTs. This is despite the fact that the GTs spent the whole of their training year in schools. The main reason for this appears to be the fact that the PG trainees had observation periods built into the beginning of their school placement whereas two of the three GT trainees found themselves teaching from the start and the only opportunity they had to observe others was when they used their 'free periods'. This they were reluctant to do as they felt this was valuable time to evaluate and prepare for future lessons.

Further observations across the school were more problematic for both pathways and neither set of trainees appeared to have a great deal of opportunity to do this. The PGs spend the first five weeks of their initial placement in schools for just 2 days a week and in the early stages this was used as an opportunity to 'induct' them into school life. Opportunity was given to meet individuals across the school, meet with the professional tutor, other trainees and to observe subject specialist teaching classes that they were going to adopt later in the placement. The GTs on the other hand appeared not to be as fortunate (apart from GT 3). Two of the three within this research started teaching immediately, which by implication would allow little time for observation and familiarisation with their classes, also they would have limited

time throughout the week to observe other more experienced teachers in action. The other GT though, did get a long induction period in that she did very little teaching within the first six weeks and was gradually introduced to her class, taking on responsibility for aspects of their lesson as she and her mentor felt she was ready. Although in hindsight she felt that this was a valuable experience at the time she did express concern as she felt she was getting behind the other GTs who were all teaching, an indication that her experience was perhaps not a common one.

d. Evidencing the QTS standards

As was evident, and has previously been mentioned, the PGCE programme had a very structured approach to the manner in which the trainees were expected to evidence their achievements against the QTS standards. For this cohort the standards were split into three sections each of which corresponded to a particular phase in their teaching placement experience. During these phases the trainees were expected as a minimum to work towards and achieve the sets of standards given. This was a minimum requirement and used as a means to assess how well the trainee was progressing towards achieving all standards by the end of the training period. That said the HEI acknowledged that trainees would progress at different rates and meet the standards stated in many different ways. Those trainees that had already achieved the minimum required for their placement were encouraged to start to address standards from the next level. Those trainees who had towards the end of their placement already met all the QTS standards, were moved onto the NQT standards and given targets to work towards based on their needs as identified in their career entry and professional development profile (CEPD).

The other consideration for the PG trainees in addressing the standards was the type of school. Some standards especially those relating to aspects of subject knowledge were easier to meet in some schools than in others; trainees (and the mentors) were encouraged to consider this when setting targets and where appropriate to ensure that these standards were addressed. For example not all schools were able to offer all key stage 3 & 4 activity areas, especially in swimming and outdoor and adventurous activity. Where these curriculum areas were a part of the timetable, trainees were encouraged to take the opportunity to gain the relevant experience. This may also apply to those standards associated with working with pupils with English as a Second Language or in some cases particular areas of special need.

The GTs on the other hand, again mentioned previously, did not seem to have a structured approach to evidencing standards. As can be seen from Table 3, Pg. 95, there was a far more random approach to considering standards, even to the point of suggesting that in the early stages of their training year the GT trainees appeared to be working on standards that were considered to be of a higher level especially those relating to assessment and differentiation (e.g. 3.2.1, 3.2.23.3.4 (DES, 2002). It was evident when talking to these trainees that the evidence for standards depended on the experience they gathered from teaching their respective class groups. This is a very ad hoc approach, as mentioned in the earlier section, and does seem to lead to increased pressure towards the end of the training year where the trainees are frantically trying to prove their proficiency against standards that have been omitted to that point as the 'situation didn't arise' earlier in the training year. That said it is interesting to note that all the GT trainees, although they had regular meetings with their mentors and during these meeting reviewed progress and agreed targets for the coming period, did not appear to link these directly into the standards.

When considering the role of extended support, that is support for the trainees beyond the school environment, both sets of trainees are visited by externals that spend time with them, observe teaching and give feedback to the trainees. Again there is a difference between the two sets of trainees as to how this process is set up and monitored. In the case of the GTs their external visitor is a representative from the DRB but is not a subject specialist. The GTs highlighted that they felt this was a fault in the system as they were disappointed with the level of subject specific feedback they were getting. Comments made reflect their desire to gain another view on the subject related nature of teaching physical education but as the trainees commented, the main focus of the lesson feedback largely centred on class control and behaviour management or whether the pupils were kept 'busy'. More often than not the quality of the interaction in terms of the learning that was taking place was not considered or discussed. Towards the end of the training period this must have been frustrating as they would have been working at a level beyond basic and would have welcomed feedback on pedagogical concerns

other than classroom management and organisation. The GTs found this disappointing and felt it was a significant flaw in the DRB support structure, especially as in only receiving feedback from the school subject mentor that had little idea of how they compared to other trainees across the programme but in other schools. The final assessment for the GT trainees, which they felt was quite stressful, was undertaken by a subject specialist. The GTs commented on the positive nature of this but stated that the stress of this situation could have been reduced had the other external assessments undertaken by the DRB been from a subject specialist. They felt that they would then have been more comfortable with the level of development as they could see that it was being compared to others external to the school. Prior to the subject specific final assessment, they had no gauge by which to judge their development in comparison to others as the only subject specific feedback they had received was from their subject mentor who they felt could be biased or not appreciative or fully understand the standards that was required of them in order to adhere to the standards.

The PGCE trainees on the other hand were appointed a subject specialist from the HEI who would visit on a designated number of occasions and provide written and verbal feedback to the trainees. These observations were normally carried out with the normal class teacher present so that they could be discussed and used as a quality assurance measure and a means of teacher development. Prior to the lesson observation, the HEI tutor would discuss the proposed lesson with the trainee, talk about specific targets they were working on at that time as well as any targets specifically for the lesson and the HEI tutor would offer feedback in relation to these. This provided trainees with not only highly focused and very subject specific development but also gave them a source of evidence to use against attaining the standards. The PGs welcomed these visits and felt that it gave equity to the process as the link tutor would also visit other trainees on the course and therefore could ensure that all were judged equally.

Another important aspect of how the trainees evidence the standards relates to the type of feedback they receive from subject, professional and external

mentors/support. The PGCE trainees all receive a minimum of six written feedback sheets a week from the regular class teachers whose lesson they are taking; these are targeted specifically at the standards. In addition the weekly mentor meetings are documented and verified and any professional development sessions/meetings are also noted, these all provide valuable sources of evidence. The GTs on the other hand don't appear to receive as much written feedback and what they do receive is often lesson focused rather than standards driven and therefore isn't such a rich source of evidence. Likewise the quality of feedback from mentor and professional tutor sessions isn't as rich as it is not documented in a rigorous manner. One could argue that if all written feedback is standards driven then other aspects of the teaching and learning process may well be overlooked as only those areas that relate directly to the standards are observed. If that were the case then it would logically follow that the PG, who are driven by standards receive a much impoverished developmental programme but it is probably more pertinent to suggest that these elements of rigour in addressing the standards need to be balanced against the development of the whole teacher.

Another interesting aspect of the training cycle that needs mentioning is the way in which the evidence for QTS is presented, verified and passed. The PGCE trainees have a log which is a working document and forms part of their weekly meetings with their school mentor. At these meetings discussion takes place as to which standards have been met, an entry is made in the log and this is then signed/verified by the school mentor. All evidence that is presented to the mentor/professional tutor (or HEI tutor) is then collected and appropriately referenced within a training portfolio. The type of evidence that the trainee may present to the mentor, professional tutor or HEI support tutor ranges from lesson observation feedback forms, pupil comments, attendance at department or school events and other written sources (e.g. reports, letters, assignments etc).

There doesn't appear to be such a structured approach for the trainees on the GT pathway. From comments made by two of the trainees the impression is formed that a lot of the verification process is left until the end of the training

programme and the DRBs session in May of the training year was focussed on how to present the portfolio of evidence (See GT 2, Pg. 203 & 205). As GT2 trainee said there was 'a bit of a mad rush towards the end' and scenarios were set up so that the trainee can demonstrate meeting certain standards. What is particularly concerning is that one of the trainees (inadvertently) acknowledged that some of the evidence was 'false'. He mentioned the fact that he had used the minutes of department meetings as evidence towards one of the standards although he openly admitted to not attending the meeting as he was asked to run an after school club. This then brings into doubt the authenticity of the process.

In addition to this if we look at the spread of experience across both key phases and all six activity areas it is evident that none of the trainees truly met all of the standards and this omission appears even more serious for the GT trainees who have significant gaps in a number of areas (see Table 4, Pg.108). That said all trainees across both pathways were 'signed off' as having met and demonstrated sufficient evidence to meet the subject knowledge standards, yet again bringing the integrity of the system into question.

From this discussion on how the respective training pathways address and evidence achievement of the QTS standards two areas for further investigation have arisen, namely, what is the best way for trainees to gather evidence to show that they have met all the standards for QTS, how should this process be monitored, by whom, what type of evidence is appropriate and how should it be verified? Secondly, how can the training providers ensure sufficient rigour in the evidence that is presented? What sort of quality assurances process should be implemented to ensure the process retains authenticity, rigour and integrity?

e. Training for subject mentors and professional mentors in schools

For any training programme to be effective there must be good quality trainers within the structure (see also Foster 2002, Dune 1994). In this case high quality, experienced and trained mentors are needed who are able to work alongside, supporting and developing the trainee and helping them to achieve the most that they can from their training pathways. The managing body whether that is the HEI or the DRB have a responsibility to ensure that the school based subject and professional mentors are correctly trained and inducted into their roles within the particular programmes of study and that there is sufficient structure in place to not only support the development of the trainee but to also meet the needs of the subject and professional mentors.

In the course of conducting this research it became evident that there were differences in practice in this respect between the HEI and the DRB. The DRB invites all its subject mentors to a series of network mentor meetings. Three of these are half day sessions in the June/July prior to the trainee starting the programme in the September. The first session is a morning induction for all new mentors and this is followed in the afternoon by a session for all mentors, the final half day is a session where the mentors meet with their trainees. From informal discussions with two of the mentors for the GTPs it became evident that although these sessions were held, attendance at them wasn't compulsory. They in fact did attend as they were new to mentoring, and relatively new to teaching having just come to the end of their NQT year. The third mentor who was a far more experienced teacher and had worked with trainees previously (although not on a GTP) was not able to attend. Two concerns immediately arise here, first how appropriate is it for two mentors who have only had one year's teaching experience themselves to be mentoring a trainee teacher (in particular a GT who is school based throughout the training period) and secondly what processes are in place to follow up those mentors (especially if they are new to the programme) and ensure that they fully appreciate their roles and responsibilities with regard to

the trainee and the DRB, in addition checking that they have the skills to mentor effectively. These are surely serious concerns for quality assurance.

The PGCE programme does have a more thorough approach to mentor training. At the start of the new academic year all subject mentor (and professional mentors if they wish to attend) are invited into the HEI where a full briefing is given on the expectations, roles and responsibilities throughout the year, key dates are given and handbooks and other appropriate paperwork is distributed. At this time the mentors also meet with their trainees and arrange a convenient time for them to visit the school. The HEI clearly states in its documentation on partnership that attendance at this meeting is a pre- requisite for having a trainee placed in the school. In instances where attendance really isn't possible the HEI will make alternative arrangements for a meeting. If this meeting doesn't take place then a trainee will not be placed in the school. Obviously this is a policy statement as expressed in the partnership handbook and reality may well be different especially when HEIs are under pressure to find appropriate placements for their trainees. Of the three PGCE trainees in this study, one of them found themselves in a position where they felt that the subject mentor was not fully aware of the role and the expectations they should have of the HEI and the trainee, this unfortunately led to a difficult placement and resulted in the HEI link tutor having to go out to the school for additional visits and further training. What this research isn't able to identify is whether this was as a direct result of non attendance at the preliminary meeting or due to the fact the subject mentor was new to the role or indeed a misplaced trainee perception as a result of what they felt was a difficult placement.

In addition to the preliminary meeting in September, the HEI has an expectation that subject mentors will attend cluster meetings and training sessions throughout the academic year; these are purposefully designed to be a conduit of information giving and sharing but also to address training needs that may be generic to all mentors or specific to that cluster. The cluster arrangements appear to work well as the HEI works in a large geographical area thereby arranging schools in this manner; appointing a HEI

cluster manager to oversee these suits the needs of individual mentors and cuts down on the amount of time and distance individuals have to travel.

f. Development of subject knowledge

As explained in an earlier chapter, the development of subject knowledge in secondary physical education presents a number of challenges mainly due to the diverse nature of the activities within the National Curriculum Physical Education (NCPE) across both Key stage 3 and key stage 4 and not forgetting the need for an understanding of NCPE at Key Stage 2. In summary, trainees need to demonstrate their ability to teach across all six activity areas and across both key stage 3 and 4. As we saw previously none of the trainees associated with this research managed to achieve this in a sustained and substantial fashion, indeed some trainees did not get any experience in a particular activity across either key stage. This must raise concerns about the ability of these individual to meet the QTS standards and the methods by which these standards have been 'signed off' which ultimately must impact on the trainees' readiness to teach secondary PE. These issues will be explored further both within this section and the following one on quality assurance.

When comparing the two sets of trainees is it evident that the PGCE trainees achieved a far greater coverage and depth in the six areas of activity than their GT counterparts. Only one of the PG trainees did not get any experience in one of the six areas and that was swimming. Whereas if we consider the GT trainees (refer to Table 4, Pg. 108) it is evident that there were significant gaps in their subject knowledge, in fact none of the three had any experience of teaching swimming at either key stage and in a number of other activity areas they only had experienced teaching in key stage 3. Not only is it clear that subject knowledge standards had not been fully addressed, there is also another issue here, that is that all trainees had been 'signed off' as meeting the subject knowledge standards for QTS, which as can be seen is not the case.

It is acknowledged that the meeting of these standards is a particular challenge especially those for swimming and outdoor and adventurous activity as not all schools offer a physical education curriculum in these areas. It is though the duty of the HEI and the DRB to ensure that trainees have as many opportunities as possible to teach in all areas. The HEI appears to have taken this into consideration and they offer a number of possible scenarios to help address this, (although some only enable trainees to increase knowledge but don't give them sufficient experience of planning, teaching and evaluating) these include:-

1. Addressing identified shortfalls in subject knowledge prior to starting the training programme as a result of the initial needs analysis.
2. Attendance at subject knowledge booster courses, usually prior to training, where this is identified as beneficial.
3. Encouraging movement between nearby schools whilst trainees are on placement enabling them to experience and teach a wider range of activities, this is particularly the case with respect to swimming (as not all schools have access to a pool).
4. Attendance on national governing body awards in relevant area
5. Encouraging trainees to run lunchtime and after school clubs in the activity, for which they fully plan and evaluate.
6. Encouraging schools to allow trainees to teach opposite sexes (if in single sex lessons) to give them a breadth of experience, this is especially so for males teaching dance activities.

There doesn't though, appear to be any contingency arrangements made by either the school or DRB to address these deficiencies in experience in the GTs profile, other than allowing the trainees to attend national governing body awards. For one trainee this was encouraged in school time and paid for by the school out of the training budget that they received for the DRB but for the other trainees these had to be completed in their own time and paid for themselves. In addition, for the GTs, the selection of the second school placement appears to have been done on a convenience basis rather than based on training needs. Two of the trainees just swapped schools, the two schools were very similar in terms of pupil catchment areas (in fact were

neighbouring schools drawing on the same cohorts) and with regard to the type of curriculum they offered.

Having highlighted the shortfall in the training processes from both training partners I do feel it is important to mention the it is almost impossible and a somewhat unrealistic expectation of Ofsted in insisting that trainees cover all six activity areas in both key stages, bearing in mind that most secondary schools will only deliver a curriculum of maybe four activity areas in key stage 3 and probably just two in key stage 4. In fact there is an inconsistency between secondary subjects in this regard. For example science and design and technology trainees are not expected to cover all the curriculum areas as specified within their NC documents in the training year in order to meet subject knowledge standards.

That said, this shortfall in meeting subject knowledge standards is concerning as it may potentially place the trainee in a difficult situation once they start their first appointment where they may well be expected to teach across an activity area in which they have had no previous experience. This may not only place them in a compromised position but also jeopardise the pupil learning and development. Further investigation needs to take place to consider how PE teacher training pathways address subject knowledge requirements. To consider whether the demands for subject knowledge in PE are appropriate and if not what they should be? In addition the sharing of good practice which shows how trainees are meeting the current demands for subject knowledge in PE would be helpful.

g. Quality Assurance

Although quality assurance was not a prior category when starting to analyse the data, inevitably a number of issues and concerns did occur whilst collecting the data and interviewing the trainees.

The first point of discussion should centre on the selection of placement schools, both for the GT and PGCE trainees. It appears that GT trainees are placed in schools as a result of the department within the school requesting a placement student. It is not clear if these schools have to demonstrate that they meet minimum criteria as none could be found. For example do the schools selected have to attain a specified standard as a result of an Ofsted Inspection, do they have to have experience in training students (perhaps through other pathways) do the subject mentors have to have a certain amount of experience in mentoring or teaching, does the department have to deliver a diverse and broad NCPE, how much does the school have to commit to the DRB in terms of subject and professional tutor time.?

If we consider a number of these questions it becomes evident that they do not feature in the DRBs consideration in placing a trainee. For example, two out of the three trainees were placed with subject mentors who had just completed their NQT year, thereby claiming neither extensive teaching nor mentoring experience. None of the three GT schools displayed a particularly diverse curriculum for physical education, none of these schools could offer swimming as an activity area and two of the three schools had a limited key stage 4 curriculum that is reflected in the lack of experience the GTs had at this level.

These issues are important, in particular the fact that two of the three trainees were mentored by relatively inexperienced teachers who were still developing into their teaching role themselves (both just starting their second year). It is difficult to see how these mentors could offer significant help and guidance in a number of aspects of the trainees' professional and personal development

as they would have very little actual experience and example to draw upon. The one aspect were they would be able to offer significant help and support would be around the expectations of meeting the standards and the pressures of the training year as this would be very fresh still in their minds. In addition they were able to adapt paperwork that they had used in their training for the GT, lesson planning, evaluations, units of work in particular, as the DRB were slow in addressing this aspect.

The PGCE programme was also not without concerns. Although there is an expectation that schools will adhere to principles and practices laid down by the HEI in the partnership document, in practice this may not necessarily be the case. The HEI is far more rigorous in terms of the roles and responsibilities of both the subject and professional mentor and oversees and monitors their involvement in the training process very carefully but that doesn't mean that the placement passes without issue. As we saw with PG3, there was a concern with the subject mentor in her training school; it appears that the HEI did visit the school, speak with the trainee and subject mentor about concerns raised but nonetheless as PG 3 says it had no impact on how the subject mentor conducted herself and it was not a very productive experience for the trainee (Interestingly this was the first time that this individual had taken on the role of mentor which makes one question their readiness for the responsibility). It has to be acknowledged though, that sometimes the hand of the HEI is tied, in that depending on what the issue is it may be more problematic and disruptive to the trainees to be placed in another school as they may not have sufficient time to settle, build up a good relationship with their new mentor or perhaps more significantly there may well not be another 'more' suitable schools within the partnership.

Linked to this perceived lack of suitable placement schools is another issue, that of the unequal relationship between the HEI and the school. Ofsted (and government requirements) demand that HEIs work in partnership with schools but this relationship is not equal and reciprocal, i.e. schools do not have to work with HEIs and accept trainees. For those that do, they do so without a great risk to themselves (except one could argue that by having a trainee

pupil learning may be disrupted which, could have a knock on effect in terms of end of year SATs scores) as the training process is not part of the Ofsted inspection regime but rather the full responsibility for the training and thereby the inspection process rests with the HEI, hardly an equal relationship. Without this aspect of accountability in the schools it is very difficult for the HEI to dictate what must happen with regard to the training process and insist on full engagement by the placement school. The same argument would also apply to the DRB and their relationship with the school although this could be considered less problematic as the number of trainees involved is fewer.

Another aspect that can be raised here but will need to be a topic of further research is how schools account for the money they receive from the DRB or HEI for the training process. The disparity in practice was highlighted when interviewing one of the GTs who readily acknowledged his lack of subject knowledge in certain activity areas. This trainee was willing to attend national governing body award courses in order to partially correct this but was not allowed to do this in school time and the courses had to be financed by the trainee. On the other hand another GT in a different school was encouraged to attend as many of these as possible and they were all paid for by the school. Is this fair practice?

In addition, HEIs, as part of the Ofsted inspection process are asked to identify how schools who are in receipt of money for these placements, allocate this money. The notion is that the money received be used for the benefit of the trainee, for example by paying for resources or releasing subject/ professional mentors to work with the trainees. It is interesting that obtaining this information from schools is complex (and certainly was not the focus of this research) and often the money that goes into the schools does not get passed onto the department working with the trainee. Guidance is perhaps needed to ensure a quality and equity of practice that is accepted and recognised by all schools.

As was discussed earlier, both training pathways have documentation which is available for schools and the trainees, although it is acknowledged that the

PGCE documentation is far more detailed and has greater clarity in identifying various roles and responsibilities. The reality of how these processes are implemented in schools appears to be somewhat different from that stated. On the PGCE programme checks are made on processes in place in schools by the HEI link tutor when they visit and there is a strong commitment by the HEI to ensure a consistency and adherence to the training guidelines. This is not as evident in the GT pathway. Trainees here appear to receive very different levels of support and the schools' commitment to professional development and subject specific development as was seen earlier is very diverse. This research would suggest that tighter measures need to be adopted by both parties but in particular the DRB to ensure that documentation is adhered to and that trainees receive equitable experiences across the whole training pathways.

Perhaps though the greatest inconsistency across the two training pathways results from the manner in which Ofsted inspect. Although the process adopted for inspection is consistent, the reporting and publishing of results are not. All HEI PGCE inspections are conducted with individual HEIs and the results are published via the Ofsted Website. The DRBs although inspected and reported on individually, these reports do not appear on the Ofsted website rather a composite report is published which summarises findings across all DRBs. It is therefore, very difficult, in fact almost impossible, to compare individual pathways within the GT Programme or to compare a DRB and an HEI lead training programme. The implications here are also potentially serious and difficult to unpack. For a HEI a poor inspection result, i.e. a grade of satisfactory or less will result in a reduction in the number of training places and maybe even closure. Since the DRB inspections are not reported in the same way it is difficult to ascertain how the results from individual inspections impact on the DRB numbers. From September 2008 this system is set to change and individual DRB reports will be published for all to access.

Two other concerns came to light whilst interviewing the trainees and this concerned the approach of the school to the trainee with respect to being asked to cover for absent teachers and the issue of 'loco parentis' with respect to the trainee.

In the first instance one of the GTs (GT2) when questioned said that they had been asked to cover classes for absent colleagues. They indicated that they were happy to do so and did not see it as an imposition, more as an honour and being accepted by the department. When questioned further the issue of 'in loco parentis' was raised and the trainee was asked who they saw as being responsible should an accident/incident occur whilst they were teaching. It appears that this had not been considered either by the trainee or the subject mentor and when discussed a degree of discomfort was evident. The trainee was not aware and had not considered who would be responsible if such an incident were to occur. In addition the subject mentor had not realised that the assigned class teacher still had responsibility for the class whether they were present or not or, in the case of covering for an absent colleague, the school would be responsible if an incident were to occur whilst a trainee was in the class unsupervised. It is not clear what guidance had been given by the DRB and in reviewing the documentation no guidance for this issue is evident. When considering this issue on the PGCE programme, although there is no guarantee that a trainee is not left unsupervised with a class or asked to cover there is a clear statement in the course documentation which advises against this.

One area of information that was requested from the trainees, at regular intervals throughout the training year, was how they rated their mentor. This was done on a Likert Scale and covered a number of key aspects of mentor support. What is interesting is that there is very little variation in responses across both GT and PGCE trainees (see Appendix 2). As was evident from the Becoming a Teacher Survey (Hobson and Malderez 2005) mentor support was seen as one of the most important aspects for the trainee during their training period. All but one of the trainees rated the level of support from their mentor (and the school) as high. Yet when you look closely at the responses

to questions in this area during the interviews there appears to be some inconsistency. Maybe this can be attributed to a discrepancy in what is seen as important for the trainees with regards to a good mentor and what is expected of the training providers for good mentoring. Also it could be argued that the trainees, especially the GT trainee, would have limited experience of working with a mentor and therefore their ability to judge good mentoring would be somewhat limited. It would be very interesting to develop this line of thinking and investigate trainee and training provider perceptions of good mentoring.

The final aspect that needs to be mentioned links closely to the mechanisms in place to quality assure the training programme. None of the six trainees associated with this research were considered to be failing trainees but it is unclear from the GT documentation what procedures would be adopted should this situation arise. The PGCE programme has clear procedures outlined which include raising the concern with the trainees and the HEI link tutor, target setting to help the trainee address their deficiencies and procedures that need to be adopted should this first stage fail, that is the consideration of extra placement time, changing placement or repeating the placement in another school. Such procedures are not outlined within the GT documentation and therefore one must question whether these processes are actually in existence. If not then this raises concerns as one could argue that the trainees are not being given sufficient support and additional time (if necessary) to meet the standards for QTS that trainees on other programmes appear to get as a mater of right.

This research has considered the different experiences of two sets of trainees, PGCE and GTP, throughout their training year. The issues that have been discussed have arisen as a result of interviews and ongoing dialogue via a questionnaire with these trainees. In addition though to the issues raised in the discussion above a number of other peripheral concerns have arisen and these cover the following;

a. Whose responsibility is it and how can develop GTs develop their 'reflective practice' skills?
b. Can HEIs reduce the mechanistic, bureaucratic appearance of courses yet still meet programme requirements for large cohorts of trainees and the flip side can GTs tighten up on the procedures and practices and yet still retain their attention to individualised development?

6. Conclusions

The results from this research have presented a number of challenges in a number of guises. As a teacher educator researching teacher education there was the challenge of setting aside my own ethical and philosophical beliefs on teacher education and training in order to carry out the investigation with an open and critical mind and avoid bias. This was particularly relevant as my preliminary reading had led me to expect some negative features of the GTP programmes and it was important that this did not influence the way I sought and selected data to report. In the event some of the findings relating to the GTP route were negative but the overall conclusions and recommendations take into account strengths and weaknesses of both routes.

The trainees who willingly took part where challenged by my questioning and they over time put a great deal of trust in me and opened up tremendously to their perceptions of teacher education. This helped to strengthen the validity of their responses. The results of this research do pose some serious questions for the profession (and Government) in that there is a need to review openly and honestly, without fear of reprisal, our teacher education programmes and by doing so strengthen and enhance the experiences of future teacher trainees who wish to join the profession.

A number of key themes emerged throughout this research and those are loosely grouped around five areas namely,

1. Qualifications and experience prior to entry
2. Programme structure
3. Developing subject knowledge
4. Meeting the QTS standards
5. Quality assurance

Before proceeding, the suggestions given here are admittedly based on a small case study and only consider two out of the many routes to initial teacher training. To suggest that these findings are immediately generalisable and true of all teacher education would be inaccurate and misleading. On the

other hand, this investigation did spend considerable time with the individual trainees throughout the duration of their training year and as a result there could well be a degree of transferability in these findings to other providers and other pathways. I have also sought to link the findings here to other research thus strengthening aspects of the generalisability. Irrespective of this, an overview of our system for entry into teaching is long overdue especially as we have introduced a number of new pathways over the previous 10 years and by doing so a level of consistency and equity is perhaps now missing.

Throughout this investigation direct comparisons have been made by the researcher of two teacher training pathways (GTP and PGCE) as a direct result of information and conversations either directly with the trainees or from reading documentation associated with the respective programmes (e.g. programme handbooks, Ofsted reports, website information). Although every effort has been made to retain impartiality and to encourage the trainees to be as open and honest in their responses inevitable some bias may be inherent and not necessarily acknowledged and therefore this needs to be borne in mind when interpreting and analysing the findings contained here. With this health warning in mind I have provided in the table below a brief summary of the main differences and issues within the two training pathways in particular making reference to the 5 key themes as mentioned above.

	PGCE	**GTP**
1	Clear entry academic requirements, including degree classification and subject area. Experience of working with young people in appropriate setting and appropriate level of subject knowledge prior to commencing.	Minimum academic requirements given, class and subject area not specified. Level of experience of working with young people not specified although appears implicit in some of the documentation. Subject knowledge not considered prior to commencing.

2	Highly structured programme Clearly laid out with HEI and school based work. Academic work with theoretical underpinning given by HEI. Opportunity built into programme to develop critical thinking and reflection skills	Very individualised approach to training. Programme left to discretion of school to mange Key dates for meeting with DRB given at start of year Assessed work is practice based. Very little opportunity to undertake and develop reflection and critical thinking skills
3	Initial needs audit conducted at interview, deficiencies in subject knowledge and or experience identified and targets set for achievement prior to start	Initial needs audit carried out just before start of year, no pre requisite for commencement Subject booster courses not promoted/accessed by trainees
4	Identification of which QTS standards are important for each placement to ensure coverage throughout training year Booklets and proformas provided to guide trainee and school mentor through evidence process. Evidence is checked by HEI link tutor. Regular meeting with school subject mentor (targets set based on standards) and professional programme delivered by school professional tutor	Standards met through experience encountered whilst teaching. Regular meetings with subject mentor and targets are discussed Some meeting with school professional tutor but often with other trainees and or NQTs DRB tutor visits on regular basis but not subject specialist and don't check evidence Final assessment by DRB is by specialist and all evidence is presented and checked at this stage
5	Procedures in place for guiding and supporting trainees including those who are not meeting required standards. Moderation takes place across the	Some procedures are explained in handbooks, unclear about guidance for those trainees not meeting standards. No apparent moderation of training except by

	partnership both by HEI and within schools Partners schools are expected to attend information meeting and cluster meetings, follow up procedures in place for occasions when this doesn't happen All trainees are super numeracy and not used for supply cover	external assessor who will visit all schools within that subject School mentors are invited to DRB meeting but attendance doesn't appear compulsory and procedure for follow up unclear Trainees are super numeracy but are used to cover lessons within the department

So in summary what appears to have developed is two approaches to teacher training which in some respects are almost diametrically opposed. One that is highly prescriptive with a strong programme structure that caters globally for the needs of trainees and sits within a rigorous quality assurance framework and the other which is far more loosely construed and is designed around the identified needs of the individual trainee based on the experiences that the school(s) can offer. Perhaps neither approach can be considered ideal in being able to meet all the needs and demands of an initial teacher training year.

If we consider for a moment the PGCE programme, although it has many things to commend it, including its attention to detail, strong and structured programme and rigorous quality assurance mechanisms, all of which are recognised by Ofsted, we have to consider how this best meets the individual training needs of the beginner teacher. As was evident from the interview, two of the trainees commented on what they perceived as the over prescriptive approach and one suggested that he felt restricted and held back by the design of the programme. One could argue that the prescriptive almost mechanistic approach adopted by the PGCE course is in danger of limiting the trainees and might not allow them to develop in their own way and at a pace with which they are comfortable.

The PGCE programme places a lot of emphasis on the initial needs analysis conducted at interview, which is taken into account in offering places and the result from this dictate what additional qualifications and experiences the potential trainee needs to attain prior to commencing the course. This is good practice and is very much based on the individual development of the trainee. However it appears that once the trainee begins their programme with the HEI this level of individuality is lost to a greater extent as the individual becomes subsumed within a larger structured training programme.

The GTP on the other hand does not have anywhere near the same degree of structure as the PGCE. The initial needs analysis is carried out just prior to beginning the training programme and therefore opportunity to gain further experience and or subject knowledge is curtailed. These trainees were not informed and therefore encouraged to attend any subject knowledge booster courses which are free and funded by the TDA nor were they, prior to staring, encouraged to gain any national governing body awards. One of the three GTs was encouraged to gain national governing body awards during the training year but as was seen in this research this was not the same with the other two, who were in greater need of subject knowledge development. If this is the expectation then opportunity needs to be followed through in the schools.

The loose structure of the GT programme did allow the trainees some degree of freedom in how they went about meeting the standards for QTS and they felt that they were able to evidence meeting the standards as situations arose naturally from within the teaching/learning environment. Although this has a lot to commend it there is one important concern, what happens when situations haven't arisen and therefore the trainee hasn't been able to gather the required evidence? For these trainees this did occur and as one said the period after Easter and prior to the final assessment was 'a bit manic' as they were having to work hard in ensuring all the evidence against standards had been gathered, this included setting up situations so that evidence could be gathered and in the case of one trainee falsifying evidence!

The other concern with such an approach to training is around the 'bigger picture' (that is the input on wider educational issues and policy etc). On the PGCE programme the school professional tutors have a responsibility to design a series of training sessions that will challenge trainees beyond their own subject and enable them to develop their knowledge and understanding of wider education and professional issues, including those within the school and beyond. This didn't appear to be the case for the GTP trainees. Where they did attend professional development sessions these sessions were not designed specifically for them and other trainees and NQTs were often in attendance making it very difficult to address their needs at their level of development. The GTs were told that they could 'ask questions' but it is very difficult to know what questions to ask when you don't have the necessary knowledge and understanding in the first instance and it is impossible to ask question or request information on things for which they have no knowledge.

This approach is therefore problematic. It could be argued that this 'individual' approach to training delivered within the school, is better as each person would have their own uniquely designed programme which would then take into account the relative past experience and current stage of development of the trainee in question. That said it appears from the evidence in this research that although the opportunity for individual programmes of professional and personal development were presented, the three GTs in question didn't feel that the training programme as designed for them was best meeting their needs, especially as the DRB sessions were so generic and the professional sessions within the school were either combined with others on a training programme or those in the first year of teaching. Although the individual trainee needs to take some responsibility for their own training and development, it is almost impossible for them to research into an area about which they have no awareness. The other concern that emerged from the research was the apparent lack of appreciation by the trainees on the GT pathway for the need to develop a broad theoretical understanding and to develop reflective and critical thinking skills. As can be seen from the comments, one GT didn't see the point of undertaking academic work and

failed to appreciate how this would help her in becoming a teacher, in her words she 'wanted to get on with it' and being full time in school was the best way for that to happen'.

What is emerging here is a sense of two very different approaches to initial teacher training that are trying to achieve the same outcome, i.e. enable the individual to gain qualified teacher status. The two approaches appear to be have different tendencies in the philosophy and approach to developing the individual trainees. What appears to have developed is summarised below:-

HEI led programme lean towards		**School based lean towards**
Education	V	Training
Theory	V	Practice
Viewed as trainee	V	Immersed in Dept
Refection	V	Hands on
Academic	V	Doing
Bigger Picture	V	Embedded in School
Highly Structured	V	Random/irregular
Generic Programme	V	Individualised Programme
Critical thinking	V	Acceptance
Inflexible	V	Highly flexible

From a careful look at these contrasting approaches to education and training you can see distinct advantages to certain aspects that appear on both sides of the line. For example not many would argue against an individualised programme for development and from this research this is certainly a strength of the GTP. Other aspects though have caused and will more than likely continue to cause debate, for example how much theory should be included in the training year, how should this be delivered, how important is it to look at wider educational issues for beginner teachers, how reflection and critical thinking skills can be best developed and so on. Many of these aspects are currently better addressed through the PGCE route but the pay off for this increase in theoretical underpinning and the opportunity to develop reflection

and critical thinking skills is a more structured and less individualised approach but need this be the case.

What we therefore appear to have is opposing approaches to training, however most differences seems to stem from a theory versus practice approach and a structured versus individualised approach to training programmes. I would suggest that the advantages and positives in both approaches need to be considered and adapted in a restructured approach to teacher education and training. We need to think carefully about how it may be possible to cater far better for individual training needs when undertaking a HEI based programme with the inevitable challenges that this will entail and at the same time consider how the school based routes can include more structured approaches to developmental needs especially in terms of developing effective and critical thinking skills and in light of the new government move to make teaching a masters level profession over the coming years. If these considerations were made we might reach a point where a more balanced mix of theory/practice and individual needs /programme structure is evident. This in turn will produce a more robust and coherent programme for all trainees irrespective of the distinct nature of the pathways chosen.

In returning to the original research questions it is clear that the experiences of the trainees on the two pathways do differ. What is important is that the right trainees are recruited for the appropriate training programmes and this must be based on the previous experiences, levels of maturity and ability to cope with the different demands of the pathways. From my research I feel that only one of the three GTP trainees was suited to this pathway the other two, by their own admission, were there as they didn't think they could get a place on a PGCE and neither had sufficient experience or maturity to cope with the particular demands of a GTP; this was particularly evident in their work/life experiences to date. Likewise on the PGCE pathway, two of the trainees were highly appropriate for that route but one would have been more suited to a GTP route as he had considerable work experience in a highly relevant environment. He had recognised this fact but was forced to opt for a PGCE

place when he assigned a failing school for his GTP and he didn't feel that this would best serves his developmental needs. This in turn raises serious questions around quality of provision.

As can be seen both routes, if they are properly managed with the appropriate structures and quality assurance processes in place, could be appropriate for preparing individuals for teaching physical education in secondary schools. What is probably more important is that the experiences and maturity of the trainees are taken into account when being assigned a place on a GTP as this route has particularly high demands on the trainee, tends to be a more isolated experience and can be a very intensive. In addition if it is accepted that the profession needs reflective practitioners who are constantly challenging their own approaches as well as those of others, in order to bring about improvements to teaching and learning then the place of theory needs to be considered on the GTP as reflective practitioners can not be developed unless the are given the requisite skills in terms of critical enquiry and analysis.

7. References

Anderson L (1994) School-centered initial teacher training: a difference of emphasis rather than degree? *Mentoring and Tutoring Vol 2. No 2 Pg 19-24*

Ardery G (1990) Mentors and protégés: from ideology to Knowledge. In J. McCloskey & H. Grace (Eds) *Current Issues in Nursing.* St Louise:Mosby

Askew M, Brown M, Rhodes V, Johnson D & William D (1997) Effective teachers of numeracy. Final report of a study carried out for the Teacher training Agency, 1995-96 by the School of Education (London King's College) in Turner- Bisset R (1999) The Knowledge Base of Expert Teachers. *British Educational Research Journal Vol. 25, No. 1 Pg 39 - 55*

Askins, J & Imwold C (1994) The Existence of Conflicting Perceptions in Secondary Physical Education Student Teaching Experience. *Physical Educator Winter 1994, Vol. 51, Issue 1Pgp35-47*

Bacon W, Groundwater –Smith S, Nash C & Sach J (2000) Legitimising Professionalism? *BERA Paper, Cardiff University 6-9 Sept*

Ball S (2001) "Better Read: Theorising the Teacher" in J. Dillon & M Maguire (eds) *Becoming a Teacher, 2nd Edition*. Buckingham: Open University Press

Basit T, Roberts L, McNamara O, Carrington B, Maguire M & Woodrow D (2006) Did they Jump or Where They Pushed? Reasons Why Minority Ethnic Trainees Withdraw from Initial Teacher Training Courses. *British Educational Research Journal June 2006, Vol. 32, Issue 3, Pg 387-410*

Behets D (1993) Systematic Observation Training for Pre-Service Physical Education Teachers. *The Physical Educator spring 1993, Vol. 50, Issue 2, Pg 87 -93*

Bennetts C (1996) Interpersonal aspects of informal mentor/learner relationships: a research perspective. *Proceedings of the Fifth National Mentoring Conference. Manchester April 30th, 1996*

Bell A (1981) Structure, knowledge and relationships in teacher education. *British Journal of sociology of Education Vol. 2, No. 1 Pg 3-23*

Bell D (2003) Speech at the National Association of School Based Teacher Trainers. London
http://ofsted.gov.uk/news/index.cfm?fuseaction+news.deatils&id+1406
accessed 01/08/2005

Bell J (1993) *Doing your Research Project: a first time guide for researchers in education and social science.* Buckingham: Oxford University Press

Bromley D. B (1986) *The case study method in psychology and related disciplines.* Chichester: John Wiley

Brookes W (2005) The Graduate Teacher Programme in England; Mentor Training Quality Assurance and the Finding of Inspection. *Journal of In-Service Education, Vol.31, No.1, 2005, Pg 43-61*

Brooks V (2000) School-Based Initial Teacher Training: Squeezing a Quart into a Pint Pot or a Square Peg into a Round Hole? *Mentoring and Tutoring Vol. 8, No. 2, 2000, Pg 99-112*

Brown S, Edwards S & Lee B (2002) CPD: *LEA and School Support for Teachers*. Slough: NFER

Bryman A (2001) *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Open University Press

Burgess H (2000) What future for initial teacher education? New curriculum and new direction. *The Curriculum Journal Vol. 11 No. 3 Autumn 2000 Pg 405 – 417*

Burgess R. G (Ed) (1989) *The Ethics of Educational Research.* London: Falmer Press

Burn, K (2000) Beyond concerns with self: the sophisticated thinking of beginning student teachers. Jo*urnal of Education for Teaching. 25(3) Pg. 259-278*

Burns R (2000) Introduction to Research Methods. London: Sage Publication

Burton D (2000) *Research Training for Social Scientists*. London: Sage Publications

Butcher J (2005) Mentoring the Mentors: Quality Assurance or Professional Development? *BERA Paper Sept 2005*

Butters S (1997) Authority and Power in mentoring: some comparisons between teaching, engineering, design and social work. In J. Stephenson (Ed) *Mentoring – the New Panacea.* Norfolk: Peter Francis

Calderhead J & Shorrock S (1997) *Understanding Teacher Education*. Falmer Press: London

Calderhead, J & Shorrock, S (1997) *Understanding Teacher Education: Case Studies in the Professional Development of Beginner Teachers*, London: Falmer Press

Capel S & Katene w (2000) Secondary PGCE PE Students' Perceptions of their Subject Knowledge. *European Physical Education Review Vol. 6, 2000, Pg 46-67*

Capel, S (2001) Secondary Students' Development over the course of a PGCE year. *Educational Research 43 93) Pg. 247 – 261*

Capel S (2003) Responsibilities of Subject Mentors, Professional Mentors and Link Tutors in Secondary Physical Education Initial Teacher Education. *Mentoring and Tutoring Vol 11, No 2 August 2002 Pg 131-151*

Capel S & Gower C (2004) Newly Qualified Physical Education Teachers' Experiencing of Developing Subject Knowledge Prior to, During and After a Postgraduate Certificate in Education Curse. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy Vol.9, No.2, November 2004, Pg 165-183*

Carr W & Kemmis S (1986) *Becoming critical: Knowing through action research*. London: Flamer Press

Caruso J E (1990) An *Examination of Organised Mentoring: The Case of Motorola*. British Thesis Service, DX 147810

Cerny P (1990*) The Changing Architecture of Politics: Structure, Aging and the Future of the State*. London: Sage Publications

Cohen L & Manion L (1994) *Research Methods in Education. Fourth Edition.* London: Routledge

Cohen L, Manion L & Morrison K (2000) *Research Methods in Education. Fifth Edition.* London: Routledge Falmer

Day C (1999) *Developing Teachers: The Challenges to Lifelong Learning.* London:Falmer Press

Department for Educating and Science (DES) (1983) Teacher Quality (White Paper) London: DES

Department for Education and Science (DES) (1984) *Initial Teacher Training: Approval of Courses (Circular 3/84),* London DES

Department for Education and Science (DES) (1989) *Initial Teacher Training: Approval of Courses (Circular 24/89),* London DES

Department for Education and Science (DES) (1992) *Initial Teacher Training (secondary phrase) (Circular 9/92),* London DES

Department for Education (DfE) (1993) The *Initial Training of Primary School Teachers: New Criteria for Courses (Circular143/93),* London DfE

Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1997) *Teaching: High Status, High Standards (Circular 10/97),* London DfEE

Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1998) *Teachers: Meeting the Challenge of Change (Green Paper)* London: DfEE

Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1998) *Teaching: High Status, High Standards (Circular 4/98),* London DfEE

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2001) *Schools Achieving Success.* London:DfES

Department for Education and Skills (2002) *Qualifying to teach: Professional Standards for Qualified Teacher Status and Requirements for Initial Teacher training* (Circular 02/02). London: HMSO

Department for Education and Skills (2002) The Physical Education, School Sport and Club Links Strategy. London: HMSO

Dodds P (1994) Cognitive and behavioural components of expertise in teaching physical education. *Quest* Vol 46, Pg. 153-163

Drever E & Cope P (1999) Students' Use of Theory in an Initial Teacher Education Programme. Journal *of Education for Teaching Vol 25, No 2 Pg 97-109*

Dunne R &Harward G (1990) Teaching Practice Criteria, mimeo (Exeter, University of Exeter) in Turner- Bisset R (1999) The Knowledge Base of Expert Teachers. *British Educational Research Journal Vol. 25, No. 1 Pg 39 - 55*

Dunne, M (1994) *Anyone can teach: a case study of newly qualified teachers" perceptions of their training following the PGCE route compared to the GTP route.* Unpublished dissertation towards Masters degree University of Wolverhampton

Dunne M (2005) Beyond Mentoring? School-based Tutors' Perceptions of the Graduate Teacher Programme. *BERA Paper Sept 2005*

Eglund T (1996) "Are Professional Teachers a Good Thing?" in I Goodson & A Hargreaves (eds*) Teachers' Professional Lives*. London: Falmer Press

Edwards A & Protheroe L (2003) Learning to see in classrooms: what are student teachers learning about teaching and learning while learning in schools? *British Educational Research Journal Vol. 29, No. 2 Pg 227-242*

Eraut, M (1994) *Developing Professional Knowledge ad Competence.* London: Falmer Press

Exworth M and Halford S (Eds) (1999) *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence.* London: Routledge

Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. & Morris, L. L (1987) *How to Analyse Data, 2nd edition.* London: Sage Publications

Fish D. (1989) Learning *through practice in initial teacher education: a challenge for the partner*. London: Kogan Page

Foster, R (1999) School based initial teacher training in England and France: trainee teachers' perspectives compared. *Mentoring & Tutoring, 7 (2),Pg 131-143*

Foster R (2000) The Graduate Teacher Programme: Just the Job. *Journal of In-Service Education 26 (2) Pg 297-309*

Foster, R (2002) 'The carrot at the end of the tunnel': appointment and retention rates of teachers trained on the graduate teacher programme and a full-time PGCE compared*. BERA Paper, University of Exeter 12-14 Sept.*

Freidson E (1994) *Professionalism Reborn: Theory, Prophecy and Policy*. Cambridge: Policy Press

Furlong J (992)Reconstructing professionalism: ideological struggle in initial teacher education, in M Arnot and L Barton (eds) Voicing concerns: sociological perspectives on contemporary education reforms. Wallingford: Triangle books

Furlong, J & Maynard T (1995) *Mentoring Student Teachers: The Growth of Professional Knowledge*. London: Routledge

Furlong J (2000) Higher *Education and the New Professionalism for Teachers: Realising the potential of Partnership* London: CVCP/SCOP

Furlong J, Barton L, Miles S, Whiting C, Whitty G (2000) *Teacher Education in Transition, Reforming Professionalism?* Open University Press: Buckingham

General Teaching Council (2002) *Code of Practice for Recognised Teachers*. London:GTC

Gilroy P (1999) Inspecting the Inspecting of Teacher Education in England and Wales. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy Vol. 25, No.3 Pg 215-219*

Goodson I F & Hargreaves A (1996) *Teachers' Professional Lives*. London:Falmer Press

Gower C & Capel S (2004) Newly qualified physical education teachers' experiences of developing subject knowledge prior to, during and after a Postgraduate Certificate in Education course*. Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy Vol 9, No. 2 Nov 2004, Pg 165-183*

Graber K. C (1995) The influence of teacher education programs on the beliefs of students: general pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical contact knowledge and teachers'' education coursework. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* Vol. 14, No. 2 Pg.157-178

Graham J (1997) *Initial Teacher Education :TTA/OfSTED Quality Framework*, UCET Occasional Paper 9. London: UCET

Green J (2002) Physical Education Teachers in their Figurations: A Sociological Analysis of Everyday 'Philosophies'. *Sport, Education and Society 2002, Vol. 7, No. 1,Pg 65-83*

Griffith V (2003) *Access or Exploitation? A Case Study of an Employment Based Route into Teaching*. Presented at ICET/ATEA Conference Australia 2003

Grossman P (1992) Why models matter: An alternative view on professional growth in teaching. *Review of Educational Research Vol. 62 No." Pg 171-180*

Hargreaves A & Goodson I (1996) "Teachers' Professional Lives: aspirations and actualities in I Godson & A Hargreaves (Eds) Teacher's Professional Lives. London: Falmer Press

Hargreaves, D (1994) Another radical approach to the reform of initial teacher training. *Westminster Studies in Education,* 13, Pg 5-11

Harrison J, Lawson T & Wortley A (2005) Facilitating the Professional Learning of New Teachers Through Critical Reflection in Practice During Mentoring Meetings. *European Journal of Teacher Education Vol. 28, No. 3, Oct 2005 Pg 267-292*

Hayes, N (2001) *Doing Psychological Research*. Philadelphia: Open University Press

Hegarty S (2000) Teaching as a Knowledge Based Activity. *Oxford Review of Education No 26(3/4) Pg 451-465*

Helsby G (1999) *Changing Teachers' Work: The Reform of Secondary Schooling.* Buckingham: Open University Press

Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) (1982) *The New Teacher in School.* London:HMSO

Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) (1987) *Quality in Schools: The Initial training of Teachers*. London: DES

Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) (1988a) *The New Teacher in School.* London:HMSO

Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) (1988b) *Initial Teacher Training in Universities in England, Northern Ireland and Wales*. London: HMSO

Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) (1991) *School based Initial Training in England and Wales*: *Report by HM Inspectorate.* London: HMSO

HMSO (1992) *Education (Schools) Act* London:HMSO Publications

HMSO (1994) *Education Act*. London:HMSO Publications

Hitchcock, G & Hughes, D (1995) *Research and the Teacher: A Qualitative Introduction to School Based Research*. Second Edition. London: Routledge

Hobson A (2002) Student Teachers' Perceptions of School-Based Mentoring in Initial Teacher Training (ITT*) Mentoring and Tutoring Vol 10, No 1, Pg 5-20*

Hobson A (2003) Student Teachers' Conceptions and Evaluations of 'Theory' in Initial |Teacher training (ITT) *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 11 (3), Pg 245-261

Hobson A, Tracey L, Kerr K. Malderez A, Pell G, Simm C & Johnson Fl (2004) *Why people chose to become teachers and the factors influencing their choice of initial teacher training route: early findings from the Becoming a teacher (BaT) project*. Research Brief (RBX08-04) London: DfES

Hobson & Malderez (Eds) (2005) Becoming a Teacher: Student Teachers' Motives and Preconceptions, and Early School Based Experiences During Initial Teacher Training (ITT) University of Nottingham 2005, *Research Report No 673*

Hobson A, Malderez A, Tracey L, Kerr K. (2005) Teachers' experiences of initial teacher preparation, induction and early professional development in England n- does route matter? *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy Vol. 31, No. 2 Pg 133-135*

Hodge S. R (1997) Mentoring: Perspectives of Physical Education Graduate Students from Diverse Cultural Backgrounds. *Physical Educator Winter 1997, Vol. 54. Issue 4, Pg 181-196*

Holligan C (1997) Theory in Initial Teacher Education: Students' Perspectives on its Utility. A Case Study. *British Educational Research Journal, 23 (3), Pg 533-551*

Hyland T (1994) *Competence, Education and NVQs: Dissenting Perspectives*. London: Cassell

Jensen Ole Vig, Danish Minister of Education (1997), personal communication with Pat Mahony (2006)

Jones, L & Moore, R (1993) Education, Competence and the control of expertise. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 14: Pg 385 – 97

Jones R (1992) Student Teachers: Incidents that Lead Them to Confirm or Question their Career Choice. *The Physical Educator Winter 1992, Vol. 49, Issue 4 Pg 205-213*

Jones M (2005) Developing reflective practice in the classroom: A case study of ten newly qualified teachers during their induction year. *Journal of Teacher Education and Training. Pg. 16-27*

Jones M, Chapman T & Morgan J (2005) The Mentoring Chameleon – a Critical Analysis of Mentors' ad Mentees' Perceptions of the Mentoring role in Professional Education and Training Programmes for Teachers, Nurses and Doctors. *BERA Paper Sept 2005*

Jones, M & Straker, K (2006) What Informs Mentors' Practice When Working with Trainees and Newly Qualified Teachers? An Investigation into Mentors' Professional Knowledge Base. *Journal of Education for Teaching, May 2006, Vol 32 Issue 2 Pg 165-184*

Keay, J. (2004) 'The Impact of Continuing Professional Development on Practice: examining the induction experiences of newly qualified teachers of physical education.' *Unpublished PhD Thesis, Canterbury Christchurch College, University of Kent.*

Kydd L & Weir D (1992) Initial Teacher Training: The Professional Route to Technician Status. *British Journal of Education Studies, Vol. XXXX, No.4 November 1992, Pg 400-411*

Lawlor S (1990) *Teachers mistaught: Training theories or education in subjects?* London Centre for Policy Studies

Lock R, Soars A & Foster J (2006) Mentors' Written Lesson Appraisals: Do Pre-Service Teachers Perceptions of Content Match With Reality? *BERA Paper Sept 2006*

Mahony P & Hextall I (2000) *Reconstructing Teaching: Standards Performance and Accountability.* London: Routledge

Mahoney P (2006) Personal Communication, EdD Lecture

Malderez A (2001) New ELT Professionals, *English Teaching Professional Vol. 19, Pg 57-58*

Marshall C & Rossman G (1995) *Designing Qualitative Research. Second Edition.* London: Sage Publications

Maynard T & Furlong J (1993) Learning to teach and models of mentoring, in J.J Loughran, M.L. Hamilton, V.K. Laboskey & T. Russell (Eds) *Mentoring. Perspectives on schools based teacher education*. London: Kogan Press

Mead N (2007) How effectively does the Graduate Teaching Programme contribute to the development of trainee teachers' professional values? *Journal of Education for Teaching Vol 33, No.3,Pg 309-321*

McCulloch G, Helsby G & Knight P (2000) *The Politics of Professionalism.* London: Continuum

Millett, A (1999) *The Implications for Teacher Training of the Government's Green Paper- Teachers: Meeting the Challenge of Change*. London: TTA

Moses J (1996) PE, Sport or What? Issues surrounding the implementation of the National Curriculum for Physical Education. Unpublished MA dissertation, Surrey University.

Mullen C (2007) Exploring New and Established Perspectives on Mentoring. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnerships in Learning, Feb 2007, Vol. 15, issue1, Pg 1-3*

NAHT (1997) *Initial Teacher Education in England and Wales*, Paper EM007. Haywads Heath: NAHT

Ormord J. E & Cole D. B. (1996) Teaching content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge: a model from geographic education. Journal of Teacher Education Vol. 47 Pg 37-42 in Turner- Bisset R (1999) The Knowledge Base of Expert Teachers. *British Educational Research Journal Vol. 25, No. 1 Pg 39 - 55*

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (1992) *The new teacher in school: a survey by HM Inspectors in England and Wales,* 1992. London: HMSO

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (1993) *The Articled Teacher scheme.* London: HMSO

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (1993) *Licensed Teacher scheme: September 1990 – July 1992* London: HMSO

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (1996) *Framework for the Assessment of Quality and Standards in Initial teacher Education* 1997/98. London: Ofsted

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (1998) *Framework for the Assessment of Quality and Standards in Initial teacher Education* 1998. London: Ofsted

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (1999) The Annual Report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools: Standards and Quality in Education 1998/9 London: HMSO

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2001) *The Graduate Teacher Programme.* London: Ofsted

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2002) *The Graduate Teacher Programme* London: Ofsted

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2002) *Secondary subject reports.* London: Ofsted

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2005*) An employment based route into teaching: An overview of the first year of the Inspection of Designated Recommending Bodies for the Graduate Teacher Programme 2003/04.* London: Ofsted

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2006*) An employment based route into teaching: An overview of the first year of the Inspection of Designated Recommending Bodies for the Graduate Teacher Programme 200/05.* London: Ofsted

Osborne A & Gaebler T (1992) *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial spirit is Transforming the Public Sector.* Reading MA: Addison Wesley

Patrick H, Bernbaum G & Reid K (1982*) The Structure and Process of Initial Teacher Education within Universities in England and Wales*. Leicester: Leicester Schools of Education

Peterson P.L, Fennema, E. Carpenter T. F. & Loef M (1989) Teachers pedagogical content beliefs in mathematics. *Cognition and instruction No. 6 Pg 1-40* in Turner- Bisset R (1999) The Knowledge Base of Expert Teachers. *British Educational Research Journal Vol. 25, No. 1 Pg 39 - 55*

Ponte, P, Beijard, D & Ax, J (2004) Don't wait till the cows come home: action research and initial teacher education in three different countries. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, Vol. 10, No. 6 December 2004*

Reid D & Slinger P (2006) A 'Flexible' Approach to Initial Teacher Training: Challenges to Mentors and Tutors. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnerships in Learning May 2006, Vol.14, Issue 2, Pg 187-205*

Relf S & Hobbs D (1999) The Recruitment and Selection of New Teachers of Mathematics: the Needs of Secondary Schools Versus the Teacher Training Agenda. *Research Papers in Education Vol. 14 No 2, 1999, Pg 165-180*

Reeves S (1993) National Curriculum Council in association with CATE and SEAC subject specific conferences on the National Curriculum and initial teacher training (secondary) *Bulletin of Physical Education* Vol. 29, No. 2 Pg 53-58

Roberts A (2000) Mentoring revisited: a phenomenological reading of literature. *Mentoring and Tutoring No. 8 Vol 2 Pg 143-170*

Robson C (1993) *Real World Research*. Oxford: Blackwell

Roberts A (2000) Mentoring revisited; a phenomenological reading of the literature. *Mentoring and Tutoring, Vol. 8, No. 2 Pg 145-170*

Rogoff B (1995) Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: participatory appropriation, guided participation and apprenticeship, in J V Wertsch P, Del Rio & A Alvarez (eds) Sociocultural studies of Mind Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Reid D & Slinger P (2006) A 'Flexible' Approach to Initial Teacher Training: Challenges to Mentors and Tutors. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnerships in Learning May 2006, Vol.14, Issue 2, Pg 187-205*

Relf S & Hobbs D (1999) The Recruitment and Selection of New Teachers of Mathematics: the Needs of Secondary Schools Versus the Teacher Training Agenda. *Research Papers in Education Vol. 14 No 2, 1999, Pg 165-180*

Sachs J (2000) The Activist Professional. *Journal of Educational Change Vol. 1 No. 1, Pg 77-94*

Sachs J (2003) *The Activist Teaching Profession*. Buckingham: Open University Press

Shaw R (1995) *Teacher Training in Secondary Schools*. London: Kogan Page

Shenton P & Murdoch E (1996) Partnerships in school based training: The implications for physical education, in M. Mawer (Ed) *Mentoring in PE: issues and insights.* London: Falmer Press

Shulman L. S. (1985) in Turner- Bisset R (1999) The Knowledge Base of Expert Teachers. *British Educational Research Journal Vol. 25, No. 1 Pg 39 - 55*

Shulman L. S. (1997) Knowledge and teaching: foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review.* No. 57 Pg 1-222

Siedentop D (2002) Content knowledge for physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* Vol 21 Pg 368-377

Silverman D (2000) *Doing Qualitative Research – A Practical Handbook.* London: Sage Publications

Sloboda J (1986) Acquiring Skill, in A Gellatly (ed) *The Skilful Mind: an introduction to cognitive psychology* Milton Keynes: Oxford University Press

Smith J (2005) Understanding the Benefits, Concerns and Priorities of Trainee Teachers: a Multi-disciplinary Approach. *Mentoring and Tutoring Aug 2005, Vol. 13, No. 2, Pg 205-219*

Smith K & McLay M (2007) Curates' eggs? Secondary trainee teachers' experiences of the Graduate Teacher Programme and the Post graduate Certificate in Education. *Journal of Education for Teaching Vol. 33, No.1, Pg 25-54*

Stidder G & Hayes S (2007) Trainee teachers" experiences of teaching national curriculum physical education during school-based placements at key stages three and four in the south-east of England (1994-2004) *Physical Education Matters* Spring 2007

Sutherland S (1997) *Teacher Education and Training: A Study, Report 10 of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (The Dearing Report)* London: HMSO

Tang S (2004) The Dynamics of School-based Learning in *Initial Teacher Education Research Paper in Education. Vol.19, No. 2. June 2004*

Teacher Training Agency (TTA) (2001) *Standards for the award of QTS and the requirements for initial teacher training* . London:TTA

Training and Development Agency (TDA) (2007) *Professional Standards for Teachers.* London:TDA

www.tda.gov.uk/partners/funding/allocations/allocations0809

Tharp R G & Gallimore R (1988) Rousing Minds to Life: teaching, learning and schooling in social context Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Thomas J & Nelson J (2001) *Research Methods in Physical Activity. Fourth Edition*. Leeds: Human Kinetics

Tomlinson P (1995) *Understanding Mentoring: Reflective Strategies for School-Based Teacher Preparation*. Buckingham: Open University Press

Turner- Bisset R (1997) subject mater knowledge and teaching competence, unpublished doctoral thesis, university of Exeter in Turner- Bisset R (1999) The Knowledge Base of Expert Teachers. *British Educational Research Journal Vol. 25, No. 1 Pg 39 - 55*

Turner- Bisset R (1999) The Knowledge Base of Expert Teachers. *British Educational Research Journal Vol. 25, No. 1 Pg 39 - 55*

Whitty G (1996) *Professional Competencies and Professional characteristics: The Northern Ireland approach to the Reform of Teacher education* In Hustler D & McIntyre D (eds) Developing Competent Teachers. London: David Fulton

Whitehead J & Fitzgerald B (2006) Professional Learning through a Generative Approach to Mentoring: Lessons from a Training School Partnership and their Wider Implications. *Journal of Education for Teaching Vol 32 No 1 Feb 2006 Pg 37-52*

Wilkin M (1996) *Initial teacher Training. The Dialogue of Ideology and Culture. London:* Falmer Press

Wilkin, M (1999) *The Role Of Higher Education in Initial Teacher Education.* UCET: Occasional Paper, No.12

Wragg E (1991) Two routes into teaching in Booth M Furlong J & Wilkin M (Eds) *Partnerships in Initial Teacher Training*. London: Cassell

Yee Fan Tang, S (2004) The Dynamics of school-based learning in initial teacher education. *Research Papers in Education, Vol. 19, No. 2, June 2004* (NOTE. Hong Kong Based)

Yin R (1981) *The Case Study as a Serious Research Strategy*. Beverley Hills: Sage Publications

Yin R (1994) C*ase Study Research: Design and Methods*. London: Sage Publications

APPENDICIES

		Pg. No.
1.	Appendix 1	170
	Example of consent form completed by participants	171
	Project outline for participants	172
2.	Appendix 2	173
	Copy of the half termly questionnaire	174
	Summary questionnaire results – Questions 1-5	176
3.	Appendix 3	177
	Transcripts	
	GTP 1	178
	GTP2	192
	GTP3	215
	PGCE1	235
	PGCE2	244
	PGCE3	256
4.	Appendix 4	270
	TDA Funding allocations 2008-11	271

Appendix 1

TITLE OF PROJECT:

A comparison of trainee teachers motives and experiences whilst completing their initial teacher education (full time PGCE & graduate training route)

(The participant should complete the whole of this sheet himself/herself)

	Please cross out as necessary
Have you read the Participant Information Sheet?	YES / NO
Have you had an opportunity to ask questions and to discuss the study?	YES / NO
Have you received satisfactory answers to all of your questions?	YES / NO
Have you received enough information about the study?	YES / NO
Who have you spoken to?	Ms. Jackie Moses
Do you consent to participate in the study?	YES/NO
Do you consent for interviews to be taped?	YES/NO
Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from the study: * at any time and * without having to give a reason for withdrawing and * without affecting your position in the University?	YES / NO

Signed ..... **Date** .....

(NAME IN BLOCK LETTERS) .....

Signature of witness ..... **Date** .....

(NAME IN BLOCK LETTERS) .....

CONSENT FORM

NOTES:

1) **If you intend to make tape recordings or video recordings of participants, your consent form should also include a section indicating that participants are aware of, and consent to, any use you intend to make of the recordings after the end of the project.**
2) **The 'signature of a witness' section of the consent form is optional; if, however, you include this in your consent form, then the signature of each volunteer must be witnessed by someone other than the researcher.**
3) **The information sheet should contain the statement 'Approved by Durham University's Ethics Advisory Committee' when approval has been given.**

Project Outline for Participants

Project Title

A comparison of trainee teachers motives and experiences whilst completing their initial teacher education (full time PGCE & graduate training route)

Aims and Objectives

1. What are the motives and expectations of trainees on full time PGCE and GTP pathways?
2. Are these motives/expectations met?
3. Is there a difference in motives and expectations of ITT trainees on a full time Postgraduate pathway to those on a GTP pathway?
4. How do the respective trainees experience their courses/pathways?
5. Is there a difference in terms of meeting the teaching standards between the two pathways?

Project Design

To track 6 initial teacher trainees on their respective pathways to qualified teacher status.
Motives, experiences and expectations will be plotted and contrasted through a beginning, mid and completion semi-structured interview with each trainee. In addition the trainees will complete a series of short questionnaires on a monthly basis to track their experience of the course. These will from a basis for the final interview.

Information will also be gathered concerning the structure of their course.

Confidentiality will be maintained at all times throughout the project. All participants in the project will be offered a copy of the final results.

Benefits to Education

Teacher Educators could gain insight into what motivates individuals to select various pathways to qualified teacher status. In addition they would begin to develop an understanding of expectations and experiences on these pathways – this would enable teacher educators to improve the preparation and training of individuals entering the teaching profession.

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this project. If you have any questions or concerns at any stage please feel free to contact me.

Jackie Moses

Appendix 2

Questionnaire

Please indicate……

(1 = low, 6 = high)

1. Your perceived rate of progress in your teaching this month

1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Your current level of satisfaction with your training pathway

1 2 3 4 5 6

3. The degree to which your expectations for your teacher development are being met

1 2 3 4 5 6

4. The level of support that you have received from your subject mentor

1 2 3 4 5 6

5. The level of support you have received from your professional mentor/university tutors

1 2 3 4 5 6

Can you indicate:-

a.. What has gone particularly well this month?

b. What have been the main low points for you this month?

c. Could you please give a brief overview of how you have felt this month. (If there have been any significant moments please indicate those below).

d. Could you indicate below which QTS standards you have been manly working towards this month and the extent to which these have been met.

QTS Standard	Working Towards	Achieved	Working Beyond

Questionnaire – No 1-5

	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5	
S1	4	5	5	6	6	5	6	6	5	5
	5	5	6	6	5	5	5	6	4	4
	4		6		5		6		5	
S2	4	6	6	6	5	5	5	5	5	5
	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	4
	5		5		5		5		6	
S3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5
	5	5	5	5	5	5	5/6	5	5	5
S4	3	2	4	3	4	3	6	5	3	3
	2		3		2				2	
S5	3	5	3	5	4	4	¾	¾	5	5
	5	6	5	6	5	4	4	5	5	6
	6	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	6	6
S6	3	5	3	4	3	5	5	6	5	6
	3	4	5	2	4	4	1	5	5	5
	5	6	5	6	5	5	6	6	6	6

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
S1	5	6	5	6	5
S2	5	5	5	5	5
S3	4/5	4/5	4/5	4	4/5
S4	2	3	3	5/6	3
S5	5	5	4/5	4	5/6
S6	4	4	4/5	5	5/6

Summary Results

Appendix 3

Interview 1 with GT 1(S)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
…….. - pause or change in conversation mid sentence.

I If you could just start by telling us a little bit about your background, what your first degree was, what qualification you got and where you studied.

R Sports Science with xxxx xxxx xxxx. Main modules were physiology, psychology, sociology, a little biomechanics and some practical work

I So, were the core modules linked into the national curriculum PE?

R The actual practical modules were linked into the national curriculum and so xxx xxxx. And we went into the local primary school in Dxxx

I In terms of your work with the children at the Dxxxx primary school, did you have an opportunity for other work placements as part of your degree?

R Work placement stuff …. There was a lot of work from our course and just the one placement however I did do some additional work in local primary schools, I worked with individual teachers I also had a job in a retail park for the holidays

I So part of xxxxx xxxx you did some, xxxxx and also you went straight from your degree into the GTP?

R No, I had a year out. I worked at this school, I worked for about five hours a week with the special needs team and that was right through until July.

I Was it a conscious decision by you to go into special needs support in schools?

R Not really, my uncle is a senior teacher here and he helped me get the job. I knew that I wanted to get into teaching and this seemed like a good opportunity to get some experience.

I When did you decide to apply for the GTP?

R Once I had been here a while a few others were talking in the staff room and asking me what I was going to do, I wasn't sure but they told me about the GTP and suggested I look into it. I did and was really lucky as the school agreed that I could do it here and I was accepted by the DRB, and here I am. I don't know if I would have got a place on a PGCE, certainly not back at my old Uni. Maybe having sent some time in schools I would be in a better position but I am happy on the GTP

Interview 2 with GT 1 (S)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
..... - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

I This is your second interview SXX, and what I want to sort of tease out this time around, I mean last time we looked at what your expectations were for the year and why you chose the GTP course as opposed to the PGCE etc, etc. I want to sort of just have a review if you like of the training to date, and just see how things are progressing. So just kick off, how do you feel the year has progressed? What have been the highest and lowest points so far?

R I think I can see my progression as a whole for example for teaching through to everything really right from the start and to also look back to where I have come from, being a teacher, I have a lot more confidence mainly with what I am doing and especially in this school if you have confidence then you're more than half way there, there are a lot of confident teachers around and you can see what a difference that makes.

I Have there been any particularly high points, any times that have been really good?

R I think you know it was quite hard at first, difficult at times I felt that when I started I had a lot of time to sort things out really the majority of time I was teaching but even when I was in and out of schools trying different things I have loved every minute of teaching xxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxx one of the main adaptations xxxxxx a lot of changes xxxxxx xxxxx especially xxxxxx xxxxxx I am realistic about it all, it was tough a little bit a the start and I feel like they are my class.

I You have had them right through the year?

R Yes right from the start, so I have taught them all the way through and they see me as their teacher which I think is a real bonus

I What about low points, are there any?

R Not really, there aren't any low points at all. I have never really gone around and thought 'oh my God, what am I doing here' I think I am really comfortable within a school and I have heard that there is a full time post hopefully coming up and it is quite nice that straight away I got myself a job in a school, so I'll go for that.

I Okay, just in terms of levels of Mentor support and that sort of thing, take me through that process, how does that work?

R Well the professional mentor speaks to you very, very regularly and tells me what he would like me to do. A lot of it I take on myself and a lot I know where I am going and what I meant to achieve, GXX and I have a mentor every week that tells me what my progress looks like, although at the moment it is not that much obviously a lot of my

progression aims towards getting marked on standards so to help with that I am having to set an hour every week where I am just sitting down and being given feedback.

I But you do have a time every week where you sit down.....?

R Oh yes, we have a set time every Tuesday afternoon where you sit down for two hours and discuss what needs to be done, the amount of support is fair. On occasions we have to cancel these meeting as xxx has to attend a meeting elsewhere or is called on for cover but we usually manage to grab a bit of time to have some sort of discussion

I Do you get targets for the following week?

R Yes, I had targets set for my weekly mark in my last place GXX and I discuss what I need to work on and set targets from there. Sometimes targets that are set are very specific to a class or an area that needs working on, sometimes the weekly targets look at other wider areas for example to establish my self around the department more, to get a bit more involved so it is not all teaching targets .

I What sort of feedback are you getting after your lessons from anybody?

R I am getting exactly the same as what I was getting at the start, as long as I am here and prepared, know hat I'm doing, I am getting really positive comments and feedback as well as being given something that I have taken on board, especially that following week, they are very good at saying 'this is what I really need look at a, b, or c'. Myself and GXX look at the targets for the week, as well as Individual lessons. I don't think I have moved from one week to the next where I have had a target set that I have not met. .

I Are the written scripts focused on the targets that are set at these weekly meetings?

R It is set out according to my general last result, I write comments on the general last result and a few targets at the bottom and we then look at what targets would be best to set from there.

I Right, okay. What about support other than GXX as you subject member, perhaps the professional mentor or someone from the DRB?

R I have a person from the DRB who comes in very regularly and I speak to her quite regularly as well. She always given us time if possible.

I So she observes your teaching?

R She observes what I teach. She may come in twice a term. I speak to her regularly on the phone. Sometimes she might admit to something that she saw and is really complimentary, then she will come to me and say "what do you think you should do". Xxxxxxxxx. xxxxx xxxx xxxx I don't think she is too specialised. So she will see my pupil management, or the knowledge side sometimes. She is always asking about PE,

I think she is learning herself, very difficult to understand what is being said from this point.

I So because he has been promoted, nobody has actually filled his shoes at the moment?

R xxxxxxxx organising that xxxxxxx xxxxxxxxx.

I What about sort of things like the government initiatives, you know for instance the PE, School Sport and Club Links strategy? How does that get into sort of fed into your training?

R To be honest it is not really a massive theme in my training, we are doing like other things such as form tutor, admin duties and things like that, but this strategy, I don't really have a set time to look at that, it's not a massive thing in my training as far as I can see.

I so the sort of School Sport Co-ordinator programme, you have not been involved, and obviously Sarah is here so you can get to know what she does, but you haven't been involved?

R I get to do some primary school sessions with Sarah helping her and looking at the resources that are around basically for teaching I will ask them what they think and how they do things, so I am getting involved a little bit on that side of it. So I am getting to know little bits obviously, like the fact that some of the conditions in primary schools for PE are not very good so I am getting to know little bits, but I don't know, it is not really set down for us that we have to do this or that.

I You have got assignments haven't you as part of the course? What are those assignments based on?

R The only main assignments set by the GTP is one where we are looking at teaching, at student work and looking at how the pupils develop, six thousand word set essay and that is the only kind of essay that is set.

I Okay, I got the impression that there were sort of more tasks than that.

R It is at this stage I have got to fulfil certain tasks, these are about really at key stage 2 and 4, performance and stuff mainly this is what has been set by GXX for me.

I So that is focused pretty much on where GXX perceives your need rather than anything else? Okay..... Just changing track a little bit, in terms of you know just say OFSTED were coming in, you know the sort's of things they might be asking you about your training could involve, you know, have you covered all six areas, activity areas of the National Curriculum? So have you?

R No, I've not done any swimming or dance

I And that is at key stage three and key stage 4.

R Yes, but swimming not at all.

I You don't get much at key stage 4?

R I have not had any Key Stage 4 on my timetable yet. At key stage 3 I have done everything, at key stage 4 I have not really looked at much at all not at key stage 4. So... there are again areas that need to be looked at, but at key stage three, I have done the whole lot.

I You said earlier that you haven't done your Primary experience yet?

R Not in this school as part of the GTP

I that is just one week?

R Just one week, but I because they have been coming in as well and I help out here I did a little bit more on this

I And obviously your course is eleven to sixteen, so post sixteen work hasn't really come in, has it?

R My second placement was where I taught some A level and I got into that straight away in the first week, just straight into it. It was something that I had got really into by the end I think I really enjoying it and doing well..

I Well it is good that you have had the experience as well. You know. Just going back to the activity areas, you said that at key stage 3 you had covered all five, you just needed to do swimming. When you covered them was that sort of five/six weeks plus of sustained teaching.

R I had got given blocks of teaching in those areas, mostly about 5 weeks I guess, weather dependent

I Right, and then in key stage 4 was it the same areas that you covered, or was it a bit sort of pick and mix?

R It was more the case of doing it with five or six options given to me, and then I just had to see what was opted for and take that, the pupils were allowed to do certain modules, I have done a fair bit of various things .

I And that would be for about five or six weeks, that you take modules?

R Yes that was for the full term

I Full term! Right okay.

R So, I guess I still need to do a bit more gymnastics and dance and that swimming plus a few other bits at key stage 4.

I Yes, okay! What about English as an additional language, have you had any experience there?

R The only experience I have had is that I went into a school, and worked with a pupil there again it is not really something I have covered in standards, I am not really into it yet.

I Would that be the same as working with Teaching Assistants or Coaches?

R I have not had any teaching assistants in my classes but most Teaching Assistants don't come into PE but I was a SEN assistant last year so I have done that as well as working as the teacher.

I But have you had the opportunity to be the teacher, and have the Teaching Assistants.....

R And have the Teaching Assistants work with me , well yes, but there are no teaching assistants here anyway in the PE department.

I And the other areas that are quite often looked at is ICT. Have you had many opportunities to use ICT in your teaching.

R I have got a fair bit of experience, we use PowerPoint in classroom lessons unable to understand what is being said Things like that, usually we are being told to use ICT where we can as it makes it interesting for the kids and they can get more involved.

I What about digital cameras, have the school got digital cameras.

R Yes they have got digital cameras in every department, so.....So it gives the chance to use them and they can analyse their own performances in dance or gymnastics.

I Yes, so it is something you feel reasonably confident with.....The final sort of area in a sense that will be looked at, and I guess you will be starting to do this fairly soon if you haven't already started, is evidence that you have gathered all of these standards, how is that going?

R We had a session on this right back at the start of the year I was told that the best way to do it was to get a big box and put it all in as you go through and then at the end find out what I haven't got. So I have started basically with that sort of idea in mind. The evidence is there but it now needs sorting and checking to se which bits I haven't got. I don't know, I guess this is a bit tedious in a way. It's looking back and seeing that I have met these standards and I have realised how much work I have to do to make sure that I get the evidence together for all of them. If I were starting again, I think I would try and find out a lot more about it and be more organised etc. I had quiet a lot of stress at the end trying to pull everything together.

I Would you have benefited from starting the process perhaps a bit earlier?

R No! People said that when we first started the course, the GTP was a good route it was better training, you are in school all the time and they pay for all your courses,

everything. My concern at the start was about the paperwork side of things, at various times I have tried to get things up to date and it is hopefully up to the standard that is needed.

I Do the standards have to be verified by someone in the school?

R Yes? I'm not sure I know that someone from the DRB comes in and looks through all of the evidence

I So it is quite a strong process once you have everything set up

R Checked by the DRB and should imagine that GXX will look at it and probably the professional mentor here

I Do you feel that there are any areas perhaps where a lot of it is that the school has actually been involved for the first time in the programme? Is there any areas where the school could perhaps offer more support, or could tighten up on the processes?

R Not really, but looking back at the staff I have spoken to about everything I have put in front of them, everything is fine. So.....xxxxxx xxxxxxx come back and do bits and be told what happens xxxxxxx the bottom line is that they can xxxxxx xxxxxx for example when I went away xxxxxxx xxxxxx. I spoke to xxxxxxx then realised what I got out of xxxxxxx then I came back xxxxxxxx then there was a mentor there, xxxxxx I had spoken to George about xxxxxxx xxxxxx and that is what I feel about it xxxxxxx, from when I started it, it is a little bit different xxxxxx that xxxxxx inside the school I think xxxxx one hundred percent training, so I didn't realise that xxxxxxx.

I What about training beyond the school? I mean have you been able to go off on courses?

R We have been able to go off on courses, but it has been something, I think that has been a downside of the course that we could have had a lot more, I feel as though things haven't been properly planned and that there has been a lot of arguments going on, we were told that they were sorting out some training up at the University and we didn't get that training. So we were basically pushed about a bit. What we did get we got a lot out of but some of it could have come earlier. We did get a lesson planning session but that wasn't until after Christmas, so it was lucky that I got GXX to go through this with me and let me use the proformas that he was given at his University. So that is something that they could think about, this is something that is needed at the start of training.

I It is a bit obvious ..

R Well that is what a few of us have been talking. I think the school training has been OK and I think the training from outside the school could go really well if they just looked at the planning of it a bit better.

I Let's look at within the school, I mean obviously you are extra within the department, have you ever been expected to act in supply roles, or cover lessons or be left on your own to teach.

R I have never been expected to, but people have let me especially as I have said that I would like the opportunity to do things on my own, but I have never been left on my own, but I have never been shoved out of the way, I have never been obsolete.

I So you have covered some lessons when people have been absent? Because you have wanted to?

R But it has not ever been that when I should have been taking my own lessons, it is when I have been free and when I have wanted to do it. It has never been expected that I would do the cover or anything like that.

I So the school haven't used you as back-up, it is just the odd lesson in PE, rather than just sit in a classroom. I heard from Jane just earlier actually that the last meeting you had it would be to discuss the Career Entry Profiles . Do you feel fairly up to date with what is going to happen there, do you know what you have got to do.

R To be honest I wont know that until the interview that day, it is something that I hope to be a bit more informed about they are supposed to be sending all of the information over, so I don't know much about it.

I It would interesting perhaps to follow this up in the next interview, to see how that is followed through, because obviously that is quite important document for you, and having to outline what you hope to do in that transition.

R I have spoken to GXX quite a little bit and spoken to the professional mentor and he spoke to me about it, but I guess we'll just have to wait and see

I And in terms of employment, you obviously have got a job out of it and are obviously delighted with it.

R Yes.

I Excellent. Thanks a lot

Interview 3 with GT 1 (S)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
..... - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

I Basically, first time round we looked at your background, what your motivation was for doing the course. For this interview we are trying to look at whether your expectations are being xxx xxxx if you like, whether you are getting a lot from the course and also to tease out some of the key developments and issues and concerns. So, have you any regrets xxxxxx ?

R No, everything has been fine. In terms of my expectations, at this half-way stage I have to say that xxxxxxxxx . It's also about familiarity of teaching.

I And also you have had so much experience.

R xxx xxxx it couldn't fail to live up to expectations xxxx xxxx

I How is the training going so far? Phase 1, which school were you in xxxx? How was the training there, was that ....

R In terms of mental support and so on?

I In terms of mental support, observations, all the systems that are supposed to be in place, and I know they are not all in place.

R Yes, well they certainly were at xxxxxx. Excellent organisation and support and xxx training and xxx. Really, really well structured and regular feedbacks and most of the staff xxxx xxxx xxxx. Because we didn't have anything to compare it with xxxx xxx we thought that we were getting too much negative feedback and ...

I A bit more constructive might have been rather .....

R Yes, constructive criticism would have been nice rather than, we had a lot of lesson observations where at the end the people who were observing us would just say well we would prefer it if you didn't do it like that but there wasn't anything constructive to actually improve ourselves. So I found it was xx xx to go away and think about it and it would have been nice to have xxx xxxx

I So essentially – OK you have done it like this but have you considered doing like you know. So in a sense the negativity and the lack of structure or constructive feedback was a bit of a low point. And the high points then were your support from xxxxxx

R Yes, in particular, xxx xxxx mentor, and as I say it was very well structured. Xxx xxx xxx xxx it was just the individual lesson observations that were quite hard to xxxxx.

I What about professional mentor training support, was there a programme there you could link into?

R Yes there were ITC workshops, professional mentor, a full-time xxxx xxxx

I Yes, sure.

R xxx xxxx and xxxx workshops xxxx xxxx xxxx

I What sort of things do you remember?

R xxx xxxx xxxxx and child protection and I didn't realise at the time that xxx xxxx working towards a standard xxxx xxxxx so they all seemed to fit in when I was filling in xxx xxxx reference them xxx xxxx.

I And was that structured from a generic point of view or was it structured from a team perspective?

R Yes, structured from a generic point of view and .....

I Who else was xxx xxxxx

R There were five or six other ITC xxxx xxxxx but they were xxxx xxxx

I Any XXX or not?

R Yes there were a couple of XXX as well which, strangely enough, I don't know how effective it would be xxx xxx same workshops xx xxxxx would have these workshops as part of their xx xxx I just wondered whether xxxxx xx

I It might be, I suppose, an opportunity to xxx or maybe xxxx but still they want it. It might be in their career entry development programme they've identified xxxxxxx

R Yes

I So once you finished phase 1 you then came back into University for a period of time. How did that work?

R Well, for me it was quite awkward to go back to a full-time mode of study again because even when we were on placement it felt like it was work xxx xxxx. So it was quite difficult, yes.

I Was it worthwhile?

R Yes, on the whole I would say yes. The only thing that I found xxxx xxxx xxx was that xxx xxx within the University, was really, really good in theory but at the end of the month I think everybody felt really well equipped to face xxxxx xxxxx. And then when we tried using that theory xxxx xxxx xxxxx it didn't seem to work. I don't know whether it was maybe deliberate in terms of how xxx xxxx

I Oh yeah, OK. That may be worth reflecting on xxxx xxx

R Or whether it was that certain individuals had been away from a school environment for a long time xxx xxxx xxx

I Yes, whether what was suggested back at Uni was appropriate xxx for school xxxx xxxx. I guess though with time that will become more obvious because obviously different schools xxx xxxx xxxxx xxxx what you think of that.

R Yes, xxx xxxx but I personally felt that a lot of time was not wasted but could have been more efficiently used and xx xxxx delivering larger chunks of knowledge xxx xxxxx rather than reflecting on other people's experiences. I didn't find that as useful as maybe some other people did, reflecting on other training experiences xxx xx

I Its interesting, it might come down to style ..

R It might well do, I'm sure other people do learn xxx xxxx but, myself, I didn't particularly xxx xxxx xxx discussion xxxxx xx ....

I Mm, reflective

R Yes, there was that one and then there was xxxx special education studies course xx xxxxxx I came away from xxxx whatsoever and I don't really think xxxxxxx ideas and skills xxxx

I So in terms of your xxx year 11 that wasn't really addressed?

R xxxxxx xxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxx

I But also xxxx xxxx xxxxx

I So, up until you started your phase 2 placement what would you say was the highest point. Can you identify one point xxxx xxxx for you?

R I would say increasing my knowledge of xxx xxx was the high point which was one of my purposes, I think that was one of my expectations.

I I think it was, yes.

R xxxx so that I got

I And you managed to achieve that within phase 1.

R Yes that was catered for really. It is an ongoing development xxxx xxxxx and certainly gave a good grounding in those areas. I have looked at xxx xxx and to be honest I have lots of support xxx xxxx and I think that's xxxx xxx

I xxx xxx relationship as standard to trying to xxxx at stage 1, I am assuming xxxxxx for more, was there any that were more difficult than others xxxx xxxx?

R I think that every one was xxx xxx xxxx just working xxx xxx xxxx

I Has that changed in phase 2?

R Luckily for me it has. There are two EAL students and I have xxx xxxxx in a group but I guess other xxxx may well not have done.

I Nationally I think that is a problem.

R Yes, xxxx xxxxxx reflects xxx have to achieve better and better standards. To be honest the school with the lowest xxx xxxx xxxxxxx. A lot of the class management ones had xxxxx xxxx and then the ones that more specific to xxxxx xxxxx

I And the xxx

R xxxxx xxx

I What about the usefulness of the way your mentor xxx xxx xxx

R Brilliant

I Clearly xxx xxx to standard xxxx

R And they were identified as standard numbers. So Lxxx would say, for example, xxx xxx discussion xxx xxx xxx and she would say xxxxx xxxx xxx based on xxx xxx xxx xxx what you need to do to achieve this xxxx xxxx and incorporate that xxx xxxx xx not too xxxxx xxx xxx and that was great, yes.

I In terms of coverage, and we will tape both places now xxxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxxxx could you say you have actually managed to cover all activity areas xxxx xxxxxxxxx? What ones haven't you covered?

R xxx xxxx xxxx xxx xxxx xxxxx

I xxx xxx not really structured, unit of work.

R Yes, unit of work xxx xxx. I think that was probably it actually. I have been quite fortunate in having two schools at each end of the spectrum who offered very different xx xxxx xxxx

I And you covered xxx xxxx xxx?

R Yes, xxx A level xxx xxx

I But just A level? You've not had the chance to xxx xxxx xxx

R No xxx xxxx xxxxx xxx

I And in terms of key stage 2, what have you done there to address xxx xxx standards?

R Well, we have had our final school experience xxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxxx xxxxx

I And those are feeder schools from there xxx?

R Yes, so xxx xxxx xxx we haven't had much chance to explore the xxxx xxxx xxxxx

I That's interesting, that would have been nice xxxx to have a look at actually.

I And then in terms of you know you have done most xxxx xxxx xxxxx xxx and xxxxx xxx would you say your experience has been in terms and standards xxx xxx xxx substantial, has it been over a period of say five to six weeks and you have actually been xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx development xxx ?

R I think in phase 1 a definite yes, even though that was more of an introductory xxx xxxxx not so much of a xxx xxxxx take control of xxx, I would say yes. Phase 2a xxx xxx xxx sports facilities xxx xxxx xxxx xx there wasn't much opportunity to take responsibility for the xxx xxx xxxx. Phase 2b was obviously xxx xxxxx xxxx

I But leading up to each school's problem xxx xxxx and they tried to xxxx xxxxx haven't they?

R xxx xxx after Easter xxxxx the only xxxx xxxxx xxx. On the whole, yes.

I Yes, OK. You have already spoken briefly about year 11 that you had got a student in your class who had xxxxx xxx language did you actually manage to work alongside them quite well?

R xxx xxx xxx

I xxxxxxxxx

R Very very brief xxxx xxxxx and tried to incorporate that xxxxx

I What about ICT, use of ICT?

R Sort of used it xxx xxx my own teaching practice for year 11xxx xxx xxx and the year 11 revision xxx and then with student development xxxx

I And both schools had decent ICT facilities?

R Yes xxx xxx and there was no sort of xxx analysis xxxx xxxxx but

I xxxx xxxx schools and xxx. So, actually, you've come to the end of your placement, you've met all your standards, how is that evidenced? You know, if I was the Ofsted Inspector, where would I see evidence.

R The evidence is in the xxxxx file which has formwork, standards for phase 1 xxx xxx and then cross-referenced on standards xxxx xxxx date xxx xxx and xxx. So cross-referenced xxx xxxx

I What about stuff that can't be evidenced through teaching xxx. From the legal framework xxx for instance or xxx xxx

R It's a bit of a grey area in terms of evidence but I think xxx fortunately in phase 2 xxxx xxx xxx xxxx xxxx xxx x x xxxx

I So you've got notes from those workshops?

R Yes I have got notes from the workshops which I have actually

Interview 1 with GT2 (A)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
..... - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

It is almost impossible to make out what the respondent is saying in this interview for much of the time.

I This is the first interview, so can we just have a brief chat about your background is in terms of your degree classification, about where you did your degree that sort of thing?

R At the University of xxxxxxx I did Sports Science basically.....

I And that was in 2000?

R Yes, it was called Sports Therapy, but really it was a Sports Science degree. I did that from 2000 to 2003, and I got a third.

I So the actual degree title was Sports Therapy

R Yes, Sports Therapy, where you did anatomy, physiology etc but you did one module in Sports Therapy, so it was more Sports Science.

I And then in terms of practical content, was there any?

R Yes, there is some coaching and some coaching science. They practical modules were based on various games mainly.

I But In terms of you know like the national curriculum areas, you didn't really get any education or pedagogy input at all. So you graduated in 2003 with a first, then you had a year off?

R Yes, a year off doing a bit of supply teaching here and there.

I What was the main emphasis here

R Coaching really

I Did you supply in schools ?

R No working with the local authority as a sports teacher in clubs helping out in schools

I So, you have got some experience there with GCSE work as well as some post-sixteen work?

R No, post-sixteen only.

I Then in terms of your background, I am just wondering, you know you are obviously starting on your course of training for P E Teacher and normally trainees would have experience of working with young people. What is your experience in this area?

R I have done some coaching when I was working with the local authority, football coaching mainly and helping with coaching courses.

I What about all the other activities associated with teaching PE?

R Me and GXX have spoken about that and we know I have a lot to learn for the other areas so I will be doing some coaching courses.

I Good, so right throughout the year you are going to have to spend a lot of time developing your subject knowledge

R To keep on going, just keep on going grabbing at whatever is available, in-house induction.

I Is that likely to cause you problems do you think in terms of passing those standards

R Yes! Definitely. Well I may have to go away and do some courses outside of the school as well as inside help.

I You did a bit of work in that gap year with post-sixteen's, did you do any work with children at any time?

R Yes, I went on work experience, I spent two weeks in a secondary school.

I And then during your degree did you do anything?

R A little bit of coaching, football coaching really

I No Holiday job then?

R No, the only thing that I have ever done really is coaching post-sixteen's

I So quite a big challenge for you then?

R Yes.

I Your personal sporting background, is that in football?

R Tennis and football and then Yorkshire and North of England and national rugby

I So, you are coming in with several strengths in those areas, you've got your coaching qualifications and also your personal background.

R Yes, but I am hoping that I will know enough and don't need to do an awful lot with it

I It will be useful but playing and teaching are very different as I am sure you will find out. But are you still playing?

R Yes, still playing and coaching the under sixteen's.

I What was your main motive for doing the GTP course as opposed to a full time Postgraduate one?

R Largely, I didn't like the university atmosphere and thought that on the job training would suit me better, I can learn by my mistakes and I thought that might be a better route for me than a more academic one.

I Had you applied for Postgraduate Teacher Training?

R No.

I It never really crossed your mind? How did you apply for the GTP?

R I applied a few times to various places but as soon as I found out about it I thought I would apply to Wakefield.

I And in terms of the year, I mean obviously you want to get qualified, but have you got any thoughts on how the year might go?

R I know it will be hard work but at the moment I'm really learning fast, Everyone is really helpful and tell me to ask if I'm not sure but I just go out and give it a go.....there is always plenty to talk about after the lesson.

I So in terms of embarking on your training what do you think the challenges are going to be?

R Probably being told what I'm doing wrong I suppose I don't imagine things will be perfect. Obviously I need to get on with the teaching and to get feedback and take things from there.

I Just how you might cope with criticism and that sort of thing?

R Yes, for the time being, lots and lots and lots of benefits from being told what I'm doing wrong.

I You are happy with the programme that has been set up?

R Yes, I'll see how things go

I You have been in school a few weeks now, what have you being doing, for example observing or teaching?

R Well mostly what I have been doing is observing a lot of the time and I have just started teaching some lessons and GXX my mentor has been giving me feedback and things I did a couple of lessons on football.

I In terms of how you prepare lessons, you know you go away and write your lesson plans, I mean what sort of input did you get from your mentor?

R I am mainly observing the lesson, evaluations of how I think they have gone are done but evaluations and lesson planning for the GTP programme isn't until March. I will be teaching my own classes from about November.

I So you would think that would be one of the first things that would happen in your GTP programme?

R Yes seems a bit odd and we all get put together

I So you are talking about all the trainees, primary and secondary?

R Yes, Primary and Secondary.

I Primary and Secondary? I wonder, you know I am just thinking of the issues you might have with assignments? That is how they will support you here. GXX is obviously mentor here, now does he get time allocated to do that job?

R Yes, one period a week

I And that is a set time on the timetable and won't be taken from him?

R Yes the same thing, period three on a Friday, that said though he does help me out at other times, he is really good and very approachable. He knows what needs to be done in terms of the standards probably because he hasn't been long qualified himself and he can remember what it was like

I Now does that come from the work he did whilst he was at Uni?

R Yes....he has shown me a lot of what he did, the forms, portfolios and assignments and we have talked about all of the teaching standards.

Interview 2 with GT2 (A)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
..... - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

I This is Andy Interview 2 – just really a progress report if you like, so if you could just start off perhaps briefly explain how you think the training has gone so far, what have been the high points and the low points? Have there been any?

R The high points have been when you have obviously been seeing your teaching progress, your mentor and your professional tutor have given you positive feedback as opposed at the start a lot of it is negative, you did this wrong, this wrong, you've got to take this at first.

I You're thrown in at the deep end at the start really weren't you?

R Yes, yes

I Teaching from……

R Yes, I started teaching literally normal from day one virtually, but looking back it's not been such a bad thing really 'cos I've got such rapport with some of the kids I've been with all the way through the year now so there's no problem with class management in most of my classes now. The downside I would say is actually by the training providers, a lot of courses that we've done have been like four months too late. I think it was March we had a course on planning and a lot of us had been teaching since December, so they decided to give us a course in March on how to plan, which was late, and that just sums up a lot of the courses that we've been on, they've not been well thought out on when they should have been put in place in terms of timescale over the year.

I Have the courses been very generic, so that's been all GTPs together?

R Yes, I mean me, Sxxx and Jxxx, have often said we feel as though we don't get as much out of these courses, they should be maybe more specific to PE because a lot of it is dealing with classroom issues and more inside school as opposed to outside school in terms of safety, assessment and things like that outside we could probably do with a bit more training on. A lot of it is very general which is obviously …… I mean I don't know how they can get round it because they can't do specific subjects.

I I mean what sort of communication is there then between the person who does that sort of training and Gxx who is your mentor here…….

R No, No

I because if there was that .... If that communication was stronger then perhaps they could put that into context where you.....

R There isn't any, there isn't any. We took this course up, we literally we don't know whose taking them, they take them, we never see them again. Usually often our DRB comes in, has a chat with us, but she don't even come into the sessions, just asks how we're going in terms of standards, have we met all standards, how we are coming on in terms of the course, nothing to do with the actual course that day.

I Is she a PE person?

R No, I think she's English.

I Right.

R So again, I mean, another thing that we've all said, we're getting feedback from Mxx, who's our DRB consultant and its just so much praise and excellence and then we have to get separate feedback from our mentor which is more PE based, that's how we get round it, so we're still meeting our standards by that but he'll give us like your positioning mats could have been slightly better, you've got kids not facing towards us or not facing the girls bench, you could progress that quicker, that slower, you should have differentiated a bit more there, blah, blah, blah, which is good. I mean but I think it would help if we did have an actual PE specialist who was actually taking PE, English taking English, Maths taking Maths, then you can give that feedback straight away. The coaching course has been a real help for me, learnt a lot from them, that's where a lot of subject knowledge has come from.

I So have you been able to get onto a lot of coaching courses?

R Yes, well that's paid for by the course.

I Right

R Hockey, athletics, cricket, tennis, rugby union, I think I've got another couple coming up in the summer.

I Is that during school time?

R Weekends, they're all weekends I come up at Carnegie, the schools happy because they don't have to cover or anything like that.

I But you don't get time back in lieu?

R No. It's taking your weekends up obviously but most of my weakness has been subject knowledge because managements good, my organisation's been good, it's just the actual subject knowledge knowing teaching points, exact teaching points, demonstrations, not so much tools because you can use a lot of tools and adapt them to different sports, you know when to progress, you know what set it is whether to progress them or not, whether to keep them together but the actual subject knowledge,

so I've really enjoyed actually going on courses. Even sacrificing the weekends, it's not been that big a thing really.

I You had a sport 'rec' background didn't you?

R Yes, sport science studies, so.....getting onto another high without doing 'A' levels as well at college. I really enjoyed doing the sports science and sports studies aspect at a higher level.

I How often have you been going there?

R Well when I went to Cxxxxx, I went there for seven weeks in the afternoons, so I taught Year twelve or thirteen

I Right

R For five or six weeks, so I really really did enjoy it.

I That's almost an addition to your GTP because your GTP is only 11 to 16 isn't it? So that's really good to get that experience.

R If you're appointed to a job that's got a sixth form or you've got plans to become a sixth form teacher in the future, obviously they'd be more interested in a sixth form. That's an area I would really like to get into, as well as teaching lower school maybe get into a school where there is a sixth form and do A levels or B Tec or what have you.

I In terms of mentor support, and Gxxx is your main mentor here, and I'm assuming that you have a professional mentor in the school, and you've got Mxxx, so you've got three sort of different forces with a feedback connection there, how does that work, start with Gxxx first.

R. Gxxx will give me feedback, most often it's verbal, then about three or four times a week he'll give me written critique which I can put in as evidence then, and we'll go through them we have a mentor meeting weekly, sometimes twice a week, depends on how much we have to cover that week, then we'll go through 'yes, we did this well, we did that well, we could have done that slightly better'. In terms of Mxxx, Mxxx will probably come in once a month, once every six weeks, I like her to come in as much as possible because obviously it's getting more evidence for me and she'll give me feedback on rapport with the kids, management, organisation, it's not PE. She will go through it at the end, she'll look at my standards, which one's I've got to meet and say 'look next time I come in we're going to look at this standard so focus the lesson towards EAL or ICT something that gives you good evidence. In terms of the school mentor, she will come once a day, look at a session, say that's fine, write me a critique sheet again looking at class management, organisation..

I But not PE?

R No, not PE, so Gxxx is the main one, Nx Sxx has to split the lesson between Gxx and him, he gives me a lot of very good feedback, a lot of very good ideas for drills, he'll give it verbally and then he'll give it written feedback as well.

I So you have a weekly meeting with Gxx?

R Yes, sometimes two a week.

I There are targets set at those meetings?

R Yes, Targets are set, objectives for the next week, not just in terms of teaching, stuff like assignments, I've got to do assignments for this GTP, standards, coaching courses, skills testing, it can be anything. It's not always PE specific because feedback should be given straight after the lesson so then I can go away and write my evaluation and take on board what Gxx said and what I think and then next week we'll target, that's how I can improve my teaching by obviously looking, like last week I did that wrong, that wrong and that wrong so this week I'm going to make a big push to make sure that these three are covered to obviously progress me further.

I What about other aspects of PE, sort of wider aspects if you like, perhaps Government initiatives, for instance, have you had any input on the PE, School Sport and Club Links Strategy?

R No

I Have you heard of it, do you know what it is?

R No

I Okay, I won't explain it now.

R See a lot of them, PE departments, I've been to one or two, but I don't get included in it because I'm not a full time member, so if it's that night when there's a cricket club on, I'll go out and do the cricket club.

I So the department will have a meeting.

R The department will just give me the minutes to make standards so I don't get these national strategies.

I So in actual fact you're meeting the standards without attending the meetings?

R Yes

I So you're not actually meeting the standard really?

R No. But as I said I have been to a couple and the last two, Head of PE said you don't really need to come to this one, it's about GCSE PE day, so do you mind taking cricket. I said well I don't mind but I still need minutes of the meeting. Like you said I'm not meeting the standard really.

I Well you're not getting the information really...

R No I'm not.

I And you can't get that sort of information from the minutes.

R No, I mean Gxxx has been good because he's just started getting me the PE journals to read through for this kind of knowledge and so I'm going to have to subscribe to that I think to know what is going on in terms of regional, national, global....

I Have you got an application form?

R No I haven't no.

I Make sure you get one.

R Yes

I It is worth it.

R Yes, yes. Gxxx does read them quite a lot.

I Just in terms of exploring a bit about what coverage you've had across the activity areas, I mean obviously your qualifications are going to be Key Stage 3 and 4, what six activity areas have you managed to cover or will you manage to cover all six in both key stages?

R Yes, there's just a question mark over the swimming, we're looking to send me to outward or St. Wxx just for a couple of weeks, I've done some swimming but not enough, there's not a pool here, kids don't get the opportunity to go swimming, obviously it's one of the six areas, that's the only one which I really need to cover. Outdoor I've done quite a lot at Cxxx, I've done some here as well.

I At Key Stage 3 and 4?

R Key Stage 3 mainly, so obviously Key Stage 4 could be another one to look at. Games 3 and 4.

I Gym and Dance?

R Gym I've done three, you see the problem at this school is Key Stage 4... I don't really understand why they are doing it but it seems to be.... and Cxxx.... It's where the kids just basically do their own lessons, cos it's sports education you have like a referee, a coach, a fitness warm-up, a drill and that, so the teacher is basically there, not teaching, so you don't get the chance to actually cover these aspects which obviously I need to do, because of the structure of that school, they don't do it like that, and that was the same at Cas and here. So if there is a down part, it's Key Stage 4 for me, I mean I've taught a lot of Key Stage 3 but Key Stage 4 I've taught some but probably not as much as I should have done.

I Maybe that's the same with athletics as well?

R Yes, athletics again. I mean Year 11s aren't here for athletics, Gateshead and Sporthead. So someone will come, I'll say what equipment I want to get you, get the equipment out, some will do warm up, some will do a couple of drills, I'll get in and say well maybe you shouldn't do that yet, maybe you should just break the skills down furthermore, so I'm not just sat there going.....I'm trying to put some input in, where they are going wrong, try and correct them. But I don't really understand why there's a big push to give year 10 and 11 this free reign to just do what.....

I I think it depends on how the sport ed is probably managed and set up and organised. I mean a lot of teaching can go on, on the periphery if the sport ed is actually managed correctly.

R The last time it was oh we forgot our drills or we forgot to do warm up and then it's all a bit up in the air, like you say it has got to be managed. Kids should be handing a lesson plan the day before, teacher can overlook it just a little scribble down, there's none of that here so.

I So Key Stage 4 to you is perhaps a weak area at the moment. What about Key Stage 2, have you done primary studies?

R Yes I've been to primary, I did a week at primary school. It's not enough but when I was there I taught PE lessons at the school, I took them down to the baths as well swimming, and giving them xxxxx I did football, I did rugby, I did a bit of tennis, I did basketball, just basically key skills really, catching and throwing, basic things. When kids come to secondary they are a lot weaker, even stuff like holding racquets, just getting a correct grip and body positions, just really basic things.

I It helped you understand...

R It helped with the learning yes, and how much slower kids learn at that age and how distracted they get and how they struggle to get motivated, and they get tired and they don't feel well. There's all these excuses come out and then when the go to secondary school it's a massive jump from that and I think that's why ... at this school I mean I've done assessment against national curriculum levels and they come in year 7 and they're a lot lower than what they should be. I don't know what the main reason is but I found that at primary school as soon as I came all the women just went 'right great, you can do all this then' and apparently half of them if it even looks like it's going to rain they don't even go outside, so kids aren't.... is it two hours a week they should be getting.....they are definitely not getting that two hours a week.

I Interesting. Just going back to your Key Stage 3 stuff, because that's the area where you've done most of your teaching...

R That's where I'm most confident on, yes.

I ....you've done, maybe not swimming as much on Key Stage 3, but you've done all five other activity areas, yes?

R Yes

I Would you say you've had five or six weeks in each of those areas at least? Have you done a half-term block?

R Most of them yes. Obviously one or two lessons have been missed for certain reasons, the teachers not been there, double booked, weather's poor, exams in the sport's hall, whatever but I would say at least four or five weeks I've done basketball, hockey, football, rugby, badminton. I've just done four weeks of tennis, four weeks of cricket, four weeks athletics.

I Gym, dance?

R Gym, I've done five weeks of year 7 gym, I've done dance as well, four weeks, so I have had quite a long time with the same class and been able to progress them. As I said before there has been a lot of gaps in my file because I've had..... and you think God why have I not got a evaluation form for that day or why have I not got anything... cos so and so wasn't here so we had to double up or we went to Thorns Park that day or whatever. There is a lot of disruption to PE, more so than any other thing I think in terms of the school.

I Do you find that when staff are away in the PE department, you're stepping in as the supply teacher?

R Yes, yes.

I Is that happening a lot?

R Yes

I Are you happy with that?

R I am because I'm quite confident now to be able to take a class, I just worry about the legal side in case someone slips or someone falls over or someone cuts themselves.

I Have the school not considered the legal side?

R Gxxx has, he discussed it with me. I mean like this morning, I took two lessons on my own in the sports hall and basically got all the exam tables out, so we had to take the chairs out, we had to take the two end rows out and stack them down the side and get xxxx boxing all the way up there together and then work it slightly down here, now I had to do two hours of that, Gxxx was there for the first half of it which was fine, Nick the second one just wasn't there at all, all the way through and I was wondering .... kids backing into desks obviously doing the xxxx and I was make sure you stay away from the desks, stay in the middle, constantly having to reinforce these kinds of things which, if I was a normal teacher I wouldn't mind because I would be covered so I have to just ..look..sitting down, safety, chairs, walls, whatever, told you. You've got to think about it all the time but get on with it but obviously I'm shouting by myself bellowing, panicking thinking is something going to happen.

I Have you been asked to do supply cover elsewhere in the school?

R No

I So it's only ever been within PE

R Yes

I What about English as an additional language, have you had much experience with that?

R Yes I've had a day observing two children who struggle with the English language, I had a day teaching three classes and I got observed and was given feedback from that. I went to Cxx High School on a training day with the others and went round the school, met some children

I At Sheffield

R No Wakefield, Quite a rough inner-city school, quite a high ethnic minority there, so I've had quite a lot of training with that, and this is quite a multi-cultural school as well, it's not like Cxxx or other ones where they are really

I Majority white?

R Yes, majority white at Cxxx.

I What about working or directing the work of teaching assistants or coaches, any experience there?

R No not really, I've done a little bit with a guy who is called Tom, who is in a wheelchair. So he has a teaching assistant who has this game set up so he can play hitting the ball and then he moves down these ramps into these halls and things, so I have to tell his assistant but again they're all women and they don't come outside, so if there is anyone who needs any special help we do try and include them into the lesson, we do try and bring them in either by scoring, refereeing or give them a couple of points on coaching, you know, I want you to look at this guy, is he doing this right, is he doing that right, stop him, tell him…

I That's when you go outside you have to do that, because the teacher won't come out?

R The teacher won't come out, they're all women again, I'm not having a go at women all the time.

I I was going to say, you're not sexist by any chance?

R No, No, I'm not, my mum's a primary school teacher so she tells me all this anyway.

I ICT?

R Yes, we've done photographing children, we've done shot put, photographing them, badminton, gone through spatial awareness, printed all the sheets off and they had to watch `where their partner hit and mark a cross down to see where about they were

hitting. Feedback about basically hitting down the middle of the page and what about there, there and there, try and increase learning. Gymnastics, year 7 at the end of the five or six week block I gave them a sheet, what sort of sequence, roll, balance sheet, these are what I'm looking for, get your partner and do it.

I Heart rate monitors?

R Heart rate monitor we've done, we've done the kids that are taking the photos of one another and we are thinking about what me and Gxxx discussed, video cameraing some kind of event in athletics and then the next lesson get all the kids inside and going through it on the video and going through mechanical feedback analysis.

I So you've had some experience of....

R Not a lot but I've done...

I Do they have whiteboards around the school or PowerPoint?

R They have PowerPoint yes, but I've not used PowerPoint but I have used PowerPoint before. Some of the maths have got whiteboards but there's not that many.

I The other thing is that you've got all these standards which is fine, you have to show evidence of reaching them, so how are you getting on with gathering the evidence?

R Well I've nearly gathered all the evidence.

I Right, so how are you doing it?

R Well, first standard professional values, I am a form teacher. The form teacher I was with left to have a baby so I came back from Cxxx and I took a form on, okay, I had the supply teacher with me sometimes but it's my form and I've had them all the way through now except for Cxxx, so a lot of professional values I get through that through speaking to parents, detentions, parent's evenings, speaking to children, organising quizzes...

I So how are you actually... 'cos that's quite a verbal thing.....how are you actually evidencing it, so you put it in a file?

R Detention slips - getting them signed, phone calls – getting them signed to say that I spoke to so-and-so, quiz sheets which I have prepared for them, get them to fill them in. In terms of xxxxx understanding coaching courses, any training I've had, observations, any lesson plans, just anything to show knowledge again is signed by Gxxx. I've done statements for Nick Simpson to sign to say what I've done in extra curricula, what I've done during the year. I've had every year 9 statement signed in terms of pastoral care, I've had a woman in charge of EAL to sign a document saying that I've looked at EAL, I've thought about EAL, I've incorporated it into my lessons. George has done me a feedback sheet on how I got on at Cxxx, signed.

I So there's quite a lot gathering there.

R Yes there is a lot, and I don't like to but some of that you can use for more than one standard but at the moment I've got two or three – I've not used the same piece for every standard, you can do, but I think I can get enough evidence to be able to do it without. Obviously the teaching bit, lesson plan evaluation for most of those standards.

I When did you start gathering the evidence?

R Probably about December, the first thing I did – I'm not the most organised, my teaching file can look a bit messy at times but my standard in my portfolio are spot on. First all I did was get a load of plastic wallets and I just wrote every standard in it from 1.1, 1.2,1.3 and any time over the year I thought, right I've just covered that standard I just chucked it in. I thought I'll chuck it in and forget about it and then about 8 weeks ago, I went through it all, it took about a week, I went through and got a checklist of what targets I still needed to make and for the last 6-8 weeks I've been working through. I think I've got about 2 to meet now.

I Right. Obviously someone's signing all of these?

R Yes Gxxxs signs it, whoever witnesses it, say if I've refereed a basketball match just get him to sign it, if I've gone to athletics, just sign to say I've been there building up knowledge.

I Cool, in terms of support throughout your training so far and we've talked about the different people who might have supported you, do you think there's any areas where better support could have been given? I mean you mentioned for instance that the planning needs to come earlier….

R Yes, yes.

I ..as one example, any others?

R I mean support… it can mean many different ways, but we've just had an instance there in that room up there – that's not being co-operative or being supportive – knowing that you've got someone coming to interview you about something obviously important, and just because there's a senior member of staff there who's just got his work out, and he hadn't even booked it himself, so he's probably got the same right as me or you to be in there. I mean that can be called support but in terms of training support, I think in terms of Gxxx, Gxxx has been really good all year but I think he's a bit critical of the actual GBT course, so he just comes across – 'cos obviously he's done the four year course at Leeds – a bit negative sometimes. I mean it's not my fault I'm doing the course, I'm doing the course because I'm doing PE I want to be a PE teacher and it's just the way I've got in to do it, ideally I would have probably been better off on a four year course in terms of knowledge and understanding definitely. Maybe tools I don't know because I've always had a rugby background and I've always with football been able to think and I've had quite a lot of experience with girls and things, I've done them myself – so he can come across a bit negative at times but I think that negativity towards the course as opposed to me, which doesn't really instil you with confidence to go on and really push yourself further.

I What about the DRB, how organised has that been in terms of paperwork, support?

R No really organised either.

I No. What are the issues there?

R Basically Marge will ring me and say ' right I need to come and see you this half term' and I'll just say 'right, what are you going to come and see, you've got xxxxx cricket, tennis or book theory lesson, it's up to you' She'll ring me – I mean last time she came – every time she comes we're meant to fill a sheet out, how we do meetings standard, how we progress it, are we working towards it, all of this – and we had to fill three in 'cos she forgot to fill them in, so we had to fill these three in and I couldn't really remember whether we'd been meeting them at that point or whether we'd.....so she .. progress, progressing and we just signed it and that was that. Obviously that could have been done probably a bit more efficiently. As I said to you before, it would be nice to have a few specialists coming in and telling you... it gets a bit like....I mean we get on really well with Marge, she's been great for us but you get a bit fed up with being told that your class environment is good, you get good reports, positive values and you're comfortable and you look well and that's not your teaching is it really?

I No.

R It's just how you come across as a person.

I It has an effect on your teaching, I know what you mean, it's not the nitty gritty stuff.

R It's not going to make you any better as a PE teacher really.

I Okay, what about preparation for the career entry development profile?

R Me and Gxxx have just looked at it and I've just wrote out a statement basically looking at what I've done, what my strengths are, what my weaknesses are, what I need to work on, like a general thing, but we went to a course two weeks ago and we only got told about that, and a lot of us were 'what's all this about' we knew we had NQT coming.

I So at the beginning of the year you didn't know this was going to be....

R No, No. No–one said anything about that, it wasn't a big shock 'cos it's not like the paperwork we're doing now so it's like there's only six or seven standards to meet not thirty or forty standards. But no we didn't get any prior knowledge, we knew we had NQT and you had to meet so many standards but not that there were three transition points before you actually become a fully qualified teacher.

I But you are looking at that now?

R Yes we are looking at that yes.

I Then just in terms of employment, you are looking for jobs at the moment and you hopefully have got a few interviews coming up?

R Hopefully, it's quite annoyed me this because I had a shocking letter of application so I didn't really know where to start with a letter of application. No-one in the department even offered to help me.

I Right.

R Then Sxxx used a lot of George's application form and got four interviews straight away, so I was applying for the same jobs and getting nothing and thinking, so I started to get a bit worried and I had to raise it with Gxxx and Gxxx said 'oh well I haven't even got an application form 'cos I didn't apply for it' so he just got straight in. So I was well what do I do now then, so I've had to ask our sports co-ordinator who's the xxxxx of Carlton High School to bring some letters in of what she thinks is a good application, so it's took me a lot longer, so it's took me till about last week to get a decent letter of application in. I'm in a position where I feel confident in sending that off and thinking I probably will get an interview with that now, as opposed to before when I look at the one I had before there's no comparison, there's no guidance you see.

I So again coming back perhaps to the DRB and the generic training.....

R Yes, they did have a day on ....they did have a day on ... Mr Txx our Head teacher came in and said what to do when you're applying for jobs but there was nothing about what you should actually put in your letter, it was all about when you ring up be nice on the phone, when you go in make sure your shirt is tucked in, you've got a shirt and tie on, you're pleasant. Nothing about right, when you do your letter you start with this, put what you trained in, put what you can offer, put what knowledge you've got, put what areas you've taught, put your pastoral side, put why you want the job and that's a good letter.

I Yes

R In whatever order. There was nothing like that which obviously for me personally it would have been very beneficial.

I So you feel you've missed out on that?

R I have missed out yes on a few opportunities. I thought If I'd got the chance to have an interview I would have probably impressed I would have thought but it's actually getting the interview and getting the foot in the door isn't it?

I Did you apply for Cxxx?

R No. That was strange because basically they told me don't apply 'cos Sxxx is going to get it and then Sxxx didn't get it.

I Oh right.

R Then Sxxx actually had two interviews that week and Cas told him don't go for the interviews 'cos you're going to get this one, so he got down a bit really, so he missed his two interviews and then he didn't get the job either. I like Cxxx but I mean I'm applying for Airedale just out of the fact that it is in the local area but I would rather

work in a school like this in terms of ..... Castle has got good facilities obviously but the kids are totally different to what they are here. So I made a decision... I didn't want to be seeing kids like that, xxxxxx and Pontefract, on a weekend, I don't want to be seen even shopping in town on a Saturday afternoon kids coming up to me. It's just a personal choice if you want to be close to your work or far away.

I Will you not have the same problem at Airedale?

R Well that's obviously.....I want to get a job now, it's getting to a point now I think well I might have to sacrifice... I've missed out on a few good opportunities, I need to just apply for as many jobs as I can and see what happens.

I Good Luck anyway.

Interview 3 with GT2 (A)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
..... - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

I Right this is the third interview Andy, so end of the course, are you ready to go? Looking forward to the summer? How was the day last week when you were being assessed.

R Quite a bit of stress really getting everything ready, paperwork and so on for the assessment. It involved a lot of paperwork but all of that aside the actual lessons were quite good, and I had a really good evaluation from the assessor which was a relief and it was at least that at that point, and I knew straight away that it was going to be OK, , it would have been good to have that sort of feedback earlier really."

I Good, and you are happy with it overall. When did you start collating all of that paperwork?

R Straight away.

I So you were actually quite good at keeping on top of it throughout the year.

R Not really, I collected stuff together and just put it all in a plastic wallet which meant I had loads of pieces of paper which then needed sorting, about twenty pieces of paper for each standard but I did make the effort to be organised, and I know people who didn't bother doing that. So I did make the effort.

I And you felt that the evidence you presented was the best you could present really.

R Yes, I mean he said you could go to a school and anyone in the world could get all the standards but that doesn't mean that you are going to be a good teacher. All he wanted to know was about the teaching itself and all the questions at the end was about the my teaching and how that was fitting into the national curriculum and certain areas of the strengths, he also asked me about general school life and the support I had had and so on.

I Was he a PE specialist?

R Yes, he is a specialist

I So just for the assessment? Oh right, okay!

R Yes.

I Oh right, okay! has the training met with your expectations at the start, other than the fact that you passed, has it lived up to what you expected it to be?

R Yes, I think I have improved so much, I think that being constantly watched by a number of people in terms of all sorts of feedback all the time, makes you go away and think right next time I do that I am not going to do it that way and then the next time you notice that you start to iron out four or five bigger areas and you start to get a lot of good lessons, and then it is time to push it on to another level and the last couple of weeks in terms of really starting to get to grips and teach year nine's, or year ten or elevens. I have started to make use of a lot more ICT, and I found that very useful, very interesting, and it's not one of those things I would think now that I have passed my standards so I would never use it, I would use it again, it's got a bit role for me, the fact that it can be really useful as it helps the kids find ways to look at and analyse their performance and helps me to monitor their progress.

I As long as it balances out?

R Yes, there is no point in doing it if it is not going to be of benefit to me.

I If you had to identify a high point, could you name one maybe two?

R Probably after my second placement, because there I had a really good couple of weeks taking the lessons and I had a lot of good feedback and then I started to think right, for example, in my hockey sessions I need to make sure that I do this drill or that drill

I But they are transferable skills surely?

R Yeh, but it just took me a while to make the connections but now it's there it makes a whole load of difference.

I So the fact that you are doing well here, woke you up to the fact that you are still doing well, and really boosted your confidence and you thought that actually it is not a bad state of events.

R Yes it could have gone either way really, but the feedback has been great, and everyone was very supportive and I came back here on a real high, obviously and I new I could do it then when I came back here.

I What about low points?

R Low points, I think mainly poor lessons and safety issues and little things like that, they kind of make you think about giving up, but again that is a weakness of the actual GTP, there is nothing about safety issues within the course, especially with the DRB, all that we pick up is a bit by chance really.

I So what did they do early on in your training?

R Just basically talking about your needs analysis and training analysis, but they didn't put us through university until the end of April, for the sessions on learning and teaching standards, and so we increased our knowledge on our own, out in the school and then we just learnt about teaching standards and how kids learn, it was all higgledy piggledy and wrong way round.

I So if you were given a pen and paper now and asked you to design your own support programme what changes would you make?

R What we needed to do for the first six weeks is we needed to have a meeting every week, so that we could sort everybody's planning, past management, health and safety, and just iron out all of these issues while we were still doing a lot of observation and therefore only had to fulfil the minimum timetable and things, warm-ups and things, and use that, then I think the teaching would be a lot more acceptable across the board.

I So do you feel that you may have done better if things had been done differently?

R Not yet, I totally agree it was poor getting half way through the course and no planning and so on, it was just a bit up and down, for the first few days. I felt I didn't know what was going on and we had to constantly phone the DRB support woman and she didn't know what was going on we were told we would cover it all at that meeting but that didn't really happen as there wasn't enough time.

I Then the other issue you were saying about not having any specialist PE!

R Yes, that was a bit annoying for me as when she came in to observe me teach every lesson you would come out of you think well that was alright, then she would give a whole load of feedback about pupil management, or your organisation, but nothing on the PE, you could have been doing anything really!

I If you had mentioned that to the DRB, would they have helped you as well?

R Yes, they said they would have needed to get a PE specialist, they explained to me, explained it in all of these forms I mean in some way it left a nasty feeling that you put all that effort in and you learn all of these new games and you have to teach them and then they want to know how you are in teaching dance, well I've not been able to do any.

I You could do a specialist dance course.....and just teach that.

R Yes and just teach that.....But if you look at the role of the sports teacher, or the curriculum you can see that it is mainly sport, it is a lot of games and that is what boys want.

I Unfortunately dance is part of the national curriculum so you really need to experience teaching it to meet the standards. Was there any key disappointments, rather than low points where you actually kind of thought you could throw in the towel, you never actually got to the point where you thought I can't handle this anymore?

R No, I am quite good at getting over negative feedback, I am not one of those sorts of people who sits there and thinks I'm never going to gets this, what's the point. I would rather be composed and get in straight away with the kids and try and sort it out one of the good things about the GTP I think is the fact that I have been here all year and so the kids know me and that helps a lot.

I But then you went to your second placement school and you still managed to establish a relationship there?

R Yes, and it helped with my confidence being able to do that but it wasn't easy.

I Now can we focus just on the standards, you already said that you didn't have swimming at all, did you?

R No it's been a problem, well the assessor seemed OK with that but I guess strictly speaking there are still some gaps but they are difficult to get experience in as the school doesn't cover those areas, for example, we don't do swimming here and my other school didn't have a pool either and the boys don't really do dance

I Then key stage 4, dance was a bit patchy?

R Yes, dance was bit patchy?

I And then was it gymnastics this was only done at Key Stage 3,

R Yes, but not at key stage 4

I So onto OAA only at Key Stage 3 but not at Key Stage 4.

I So, in a sense, how do you manage to demonstrate that you have met those subject knowledge standards?

R Well I haven't have I?

I So they have still passed you,

R Yes!

I not having met those standards?

R And also they have said that these are areas for development.

I Right! so they have transferred that across for you in your NQT year.

R Yes, it will be a main focus in my next school Could not make out what was being said at this point.

I Now that will be interesting to see how AXX cope with that, because obviously just across the road in the same authority you are going to have the same issues.

R I mean I don't know what they will do in the case of swimming, maybe they will arrange for me to go somewhere else

I But you will have a chance to do dance over there?

R Yes, there probably will be dance on the year timetable and maybe a bit more OAA, but I mean we went on a residential, where we did lot of outdoor things, I don't know if that counts or not.

I I think the standard has been partially met, the question is whether there is substantial teaching experience, including planning, teaching and evaluating with the same group, and whether on a residential you could lead is questionable. Do you have any OAA experience?

R Yes, do a bit of walking and such like.

I It is unlikely that will enable you to lead groups in an OAA setting.....it is a concern that they have passed you through on the standards with so many gaps but that isn't for me. For your own development I would ask AXX to help you with this

R Yes, I'll mention it to AXX.

I It might be worth seeing if you could do something else that would help you meet some of this gaps before starting at AXX. It might be worth talking to your mentor and see if something could be sorted out in these last few weeks

R Will they do that? I mean that that it is all over and I've passed?

I Worth asking, it is unfortunate actually, because it shouldn't compare, but it does and you know if you were on a PGCE course you wouldn't have been able to get through with so many gaps

R No, and at the same time having been in the department for a year, I guess it should have been sorted

I So is there a tension there between your role as the trainee and what the school are asking of you?

R I kind of knew that I should mention this and try and sort something to address the gaps but I felt that there is loads of time and then when I got back and they just said 'oh well' they were not bothered, so I thought take your time.

I So that is one thing in fact that the school needs to look at in terms of the GTP next year, because you know.....

R Well the assessor seemed OK with that but I guess strictly speaking there are still some gaps but they are difficult to get experience in as the school does cover those areas, for example we don't do swimming and the boys don't really do dance

I Would you make the same choice again ....the GTP?

R Yes definitely and my brother is on the GTP and he is going through the same sorts of things as I am but yes, I would do it again definitely.

I would you recommend the pathway to others?

R Yes.....

I Knowing what you know now, would you have been in the same position as you were at the beginning for example is there anything you would do differently in terms of your preparation and experience prior to starting the course?

R Yes, definitely get more experience of kids, do some coaching or something similar, at times I did find that a big hurdle, not having the experience and not knowing a lot of the subject knowledge, some of the non games teaching were difficult areas, so constantly you are having to ask for help or look in books etc.

I In terms of your subject knowledge gaps like your gymnastics for example, would you say you would able to pick it up say at degree level?

R Oh yes, I mean I have done loads of coaching courses and one of those was that I did gymnastics, I also did rugby and football, so I have increased my knowledge in those areas.

I Right thank you very much and all the very best for next year at AXX, you should enjoy it there.

Interview 1 with GT3 (J)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxx – cannot make out words
..... - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

R I did a BSc Honours in Physical Education with Education and QTS Standard. It was a new course, we were the first year, we were like the guinea pigs to do it.

I That was a three-year course?

R That was a three year course starting in 1994 graduating in 1997 with the last year predominantly school based, the PGCE sort of route, but obviously outside of that I was taking part in Springboard Diving, so a lot of the time I was away competing and I felt that I wouldn't be able to fulfil the time requirement that you needed to in school and also my main goal at that time was to get as far as I could in diving, and I didn't want to miss that opportunity so I chose to opt out of the QTS route but to complete my degree but just not do the teaching.

I So you did all the PE modules and the education modules based at university but just didn't do the school placement work.

R Yes, so I graduated from that with a 2.2 in 1997 and then from then till about 1999 I was trampolining instructor, aerobics, diving coach as well as training..

I Just to supplement....

R Yes my training side and then in 1999 I did a sports therapy course at CXX College. So it was a years basic and then the second year was advanced. Then towards the end of that course they were struggling for lecturers so I was actually approached to ask if I would be interested in doing some teaching on the next year, halfway through that year, so I did a City & Guilds Microteaching course in the evening at SXX College. In 2001 I started at Sheffield College just teaching on a Sports Therapy Course, teaching the element like fitness which I've done a lot with aerobics, gait analysis and certain elements of the course and then other teachers picked up the other side, so I was doing that for a couple of years. Then looking to what my future would hold for me leading up to Athens, a year ago everything I'd done was coaching, teaching or based around that, and I knew I didn't want to go into the coaching side within my sport of diving because it's a 200% increase on commitment and after doing sport for 15 years and being so involved in it, I didn't want to have that level of commitment so I thought of giving something back at a younger scale and getting involved back into the PE teaching which I'd originally gone to college for and hopefully try and find another little Jane Smith somewhere or just try to help kids like my PE teachers helped and supported me so I did apply for the PGCE at SXX HXX because you can't apply for GTP route till the April every year, so I was advised by the TTA to apply for both routes and if you were successful then obviously you were lucky to be able to take the choice.

I But the GTP was your preferred route was it?

R Yes

I So the post grad was always a back-up?

R Yes, I did a back up just in case. I did get on at SXX HXX to do my PGCE and then obviously in the May time I found I was successful and had got on this route so I then had to make a phone call to SXX HXX to say that I wouldn't be coming. So this was my original choice.

I So in terms of getting onto this particular GTP route did you apply to WXX direct?

R Yes because about three years ago I moved from Sheffield to Wakefield, my partner he works in Leeds, and I was training in Sheffield so it was like a halfway house for us to buy here and then when I was looking into teaching I have like an athlete career advisor within the lottery within the sport and she looked at all the teaching routes and said there's this one which I don't really know a lot about and originally I did research and found out more about it and thought it was more suited to me because I'm older and I have worked…

I And you have quite a lot of experience really.

R Yes, and I've got experience and the thought of having to go back to university and start studying again, to me I just thought I've spent so many years out of a working environment, I know I've done but.. you know you just feel like you just want to get into it as opposed to feeling like a student, so for me personally it seemed more appropriate to go on this route if I was able and I was.

I I guess in a sense if your original degree was PE and Education but you didn't do the placement work, you did all the theoretical stuff that was needed in order to survive in school anyway so it wasn't probably quite as crucial to go back and do full time PGCE where you would get that theoretical…..

R No, you would get that again. I mean with this course throughout the year we have training days and sessions on certain elements and for me the biggest concern about doing this route is that even though at university I studied and we did all the different sports and different drills, since 1997 to 2004 I've watched sports but I haven't been actively involved so my confidence was less and I was thinking well how would I structure lessons in hockey. Last time I did it was when I was at uni but the teaching side of it – my confidence and standing up in front of the class it doesn't bother me as long as I know what I'm teaching them so almost the first half term for me it was lucky the ways in which teachers have structured lessons and building up basically a bank of drills that I can take away with me and just sort of build up my confidence on those sides of it, you know refereeing netball matches and stuff that a lot of other people perhaps if they do take part in sport, apart from netball and hockey and football teams, whereas diving is not on the national curriculum and you know is not part of it so that was the fall down on my side but I have picked that up and the conferences ……

I Well most people who enter PE teaching tend to come from a games background so they are actually quite strong in those sorts of things so actually the autumn term for them is not as daunting.

R No

I I mean what they find difficult is the gymnastics and dance whereas that for you would be quite straightforward.

R Yes, it is easier and it's just try and structure the lessons appropriate to the level etcetera, teaching it and the analysing of performance of anything, I've got quite a good eye for that but it's just having the bank of drills and the correct knowledge and building from that.

I What about national governing body awards, I mean I am assuming you have done some diving constructor awards.

R Yes, (laughter) I have them, not that they're much good. I might try and arrange a trip to the Leeds International Pool for some of the kids but again it's all the risk assessments and getting them out so I've done my trampolining, the aerobics, my diving ones and then this year for me it's obviously my training year so I have applied to go on a netball course, a basketball one and you know a million and one other courses and prior to starting this year I did a badminton to try and do a few other awards just to try and build up my knowledge really, just to get back into it.

I Are you able to do those in school time or do you have to do them outside.

R No I can do them in school. My mentor is supportive and just said ' no, just go on them, if you leave this school with as much experience, with as much governing body awards and packs and masses of information, that's the whole point of it and you're a confident teacher and you fulfil that', that's what he wants me to leave this school with as opposed to me being a supply teacher and just really helping them out because you're always working with a host teacher, I don't have to arrange the cover and it's an ideal opportunity and the courses are one day here and quite spread out so he's really pro me doing the courses.

I That's actually good to hear because quite often you get the impression – outsiders – the impression that GTP trainees can be actually abused – that's not the correct word but....

R Yes but...

I You can actually be used as an extra member of staff and you can be left to do things and I think if you speak to some of the others they're getting a lot more put on them than perhaps you are.

R Yes, I mean talking to the other GTPs, - probably just after half term actually, I mean I taught half a dozen lessons up until that point – then talking to them they were like 'Oh I'm doing ten lessons a week' and I was 'oh, I'm really behind here' because a lot of the time I was going into lessons and a teacher would set a drill and I would just go

round and coach the kids and pick up on what she had said and look at what's happening and do my bank of drills but it was getting to a point where I felt like a glorified classroom assistant but I knew I was learning but I felt like – now I've built up this reserve of knowledge I want to try and apply it a bit more – then talking to other GTPs 'Oh no, I've been teaching ten lessons, they just left me to it' and I'm like 'Really' whereas this school they haven't. 'You go off and take a lesson' I've taken odd lessons but not on a regular basis and I think it's probably better that way because at least when you do take over you're going to have the confidence to do it well.

I Yes, rather than just muddle through and you're surviving and so…

R Well it was good for the first eight weeks because I'd perhaps look at a unit of hockey and I could see clear progressions and it's just like we did that with that, we're going to move on to this element now with this group and it's not like what do I do now, I feel like I have got some confidence. I would say I saw you doing this, would that be appropriate with this group? I think I have done it slightly differently to others but it's not….. it was getting to a point where right, I'm itching now I want to get stuck into it but it was probably a better way just to have them the first four weeks ….

I Yes I think so, there's nothing worse that actually being confronted with a class or given a class to teach and come away thinking 'God that was awful and I've got to face them again next week' that knocks your confidence far more, even if your progress might be a bit slower at least you are going to have that bank of knowledge behind you so that you are not going to make…..

R Yes but looking at the PGCE's that have come into this school, I mean they have been in for the last five weeks on a Wednesday so they've seen their kids on five days which I did, but I did that in my first week here and they're expected to take a full lesson, so their weeks worth of experience in school and then they take a lesson. I mean I didn't do that at all but I got to meet the kids and seen them, you know after the first ten days you get to build up their names. I wasn't teaching as such I was helping out and that built my confidence up whereas if someone said after the first five days 'right you take this lesson I'd have been like 'what' and really put upon it so it's been good to build in and build a rapport with the kids and the kids get to know that you are here for the year and you're not here twelve weeks.

I You're not dipping in and out.

R Yes

I There's a lot of advantages in that way.

R So that's been good, the kids are like' Oh are you off soon miss' and I went 'No, I'm here for the year'. They see that as you're like a full time member of staff really as opposed to somebody who just dips in and out.

I What's the support like? You've got a professional mentor in the school.

R Yes I've got a professional mentor in the PE department and that's the Head of Department, I don't work with him a lot as in like when he's teaching I'm with him

because after Year 8 we do single sex so I've been with a lot of the host teachers, the female side, who will help me with my lessons and then JXX will ... I'll show him a lesson plan, he'll look over it and we'll have mentor meetings so I've actually got about five but it's good because everyone has different ideas about drills and stuff like that.

I Do you have a set time where you'll meet every week with JXX who's Head of PE?

R We try to do it like that and it happened on the day that we've sort of set it and he's been out on practices or taken a group of kids off so that side of it is still .... we're trying to get into a routine, I mean JXX's never done this before so for him, he's learning that we need a structured time, talking to other GTPs they have a set time, they stick to it and that's not quite worked with us but now we're aware of that and if we don't have it on that day we rearrange it or we make up with it but then we might have 15 minutes and I'll say 'Oh what do you think about this drill JXX or what would you do here' so we have a lot of informal meetings or things related to it throughout the day.

I I think the advantage of having that set period every week is that it's really a dedicated time for you to sit with your mentor and reflect on what's happening and also to set your targets for the following week to look at, you can't quite do that in the fifteen minutes grabbed here and there.

R No, so that's still a work in progress, but you know it's getting better and I'm getting more to grips with all the standards and making it right and I understand this.

I They weren't around were they when you did your degree in Sheffield?

R No, I mean even all the curriculums, it's curriculum 2000 now, it's all changed from when I did it, which I'm probably quite glad at not having to relearn it as it's changed over the years.

I That's true, there are some advantages.

R Then also I have HXX within the school, she's the ITT mentor.

I And do you meet regularly with her?

R Yes, we're meeting on a Wednesday with her after school, now she's set up three till four. We had like an SCM talk, all that Cap test talk, so now we've got one with additional adults using them, and next week it's assessments so doing in-house training with the NQTs that are here and the GTPs and the ITTs.

I How many GTPS are there within the school?

R There are four of us who are September to September and another who started January and finishes in about a month's time.

I Wow, that's a lot for one school isn't it?

R Yes, then they take on the PGCE students and they've got a couple of NQTs but they have been doing this for a while so they used the protocols and they are quite pro-active in knowing what we need really which has been quite good.

I How are the links with WXX as your designated body?

R Well I have a DRB consultant who comes in at least every half-term, maybe a couple of times to observe me taking.... initially before half term it was for me to take a starter activity or plenary which ever I was happy to do. Then she came to see me a couple of weeks ago at a full lesson and she's coming to see me in another week to take another full lesson but I'm going to take a GCSE so she sees me in different backgrounds or environments so I'm covering different standards. So she comes in on a regular basis and we had a training mentor day yesterday so she was there and looked at our portfolios and she's a good person to talk to 'cos any problems you can run them by her and she gives....

I She has not directly involved but...

R Yes because she knows what's happening elsewhere and if you've got a problem she's quite good at suggesting ways in which to help you or what areas you need to work on etcetera because she obviously knows what they are looking for in the portfolio, so we have that sort of link....

I The you have your sessions down at WXX Hall?

R Yes we have three of those throughout the year, we had one yesterday and we've got two more, and they've arranged some sessions up at HXX University for some talks and stuff down there and supplement ours because the primary GTPs get to go to BXX College on a Friday and that's every week.

I Every week throughout the whole year?

R Yes, I'm not sure if its for the whole day or just the afternoon but they go to BXX College and they have all their theoretical delivery and they meet every single week and they were trying to arrange something similar to that with HXX which they have done a few session but not a regular thing. It's to sort of try and mimic a bit the PGCE where you've got your academic..

I pedagogy?

R ...background sort of thing. But we've got numerous training days and we had one about behaviour management that we were all sent on and stuff throughout the year. There's quite a lot of support, there's a lot of input, the guidance is all there. I mean it's different to say the PGCE I suppose, you get the main theoretical in the first six weeks about behaviour management, health and safety at work, and all that, and when you're on your placement that's when you implement them, I guess that's how it works, whereas ours are spread out so we might not do... I don't know, say we hadn't done behaviour management, we might not actually do that till February time which is a bit I suppose.. the other way round to do it but then you're seeing and observing lessons

every single day so you're seeing behaviour management taking place. If you can address that and try that in your lessons...

I Yes, one of the criticisms of the PG is the fact that you get all your theory up front but you don't; actually get a chance to apply it while you're learning it.

R Yes

I Whereas with you, you've got all your application all the time but the theory doesn't necessarily come with it at the right stage so it's just trying to find which suits best really.

R Yes, it's good to go on the behaviour management because some strategies came up and I'm like.... right I'll try that with that group tomorrow, you know when I've been working with them and something hasn't quite gone I'm like ..okay I'll go for this tack...

I See if that works?

R Not every time no.

I I think that's probably all I need to ask you actually because you gave us such a good description at the start in terms of how much PE, sport you'd done and that sort of thing so.. actually ... obviously diving is your thing, anything else that you did take part in?

R Well I started diving when I was 15 so it was relatively late from a diving point of view.

I You started, I'd given up at that stage.

R So you could say that before that I was a 'sport billy' I was in the school hockey team, trampolining, horse riding, ice-skating...

I Whatever you could basically...

R Yes, not necessarily part of the school sports but I did a lot of stuff independent of that through friends that were going ice-skating and horse riding, I went with them, and not so much the national curriculum but ....

I But in a sense your sporting background up to when you decided to commit yourself to diving was varied and broad?

R Yes, oh yes, lots of different areas of sport and fitness side of it. I wasn't one to walk down a street, I used to run, skip, hop, cartwheel and gymnastics. That was my original background gymnastics.

I Which makes sense actually in terms of the transfer across.

R Yes, a failed gymnast, so we tend to take up diving because it's a very similar link.

I Okay than you very much.

Interview 2 with GT 3 (J)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
..... - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

I This is interview 2, just to start with really, and it's a long time since we've spoken and a lots happened since then, could you just give us a brief overview of how things have been going so far and highlight some of the highs and some of the lows perhaps of what's been happening.

R Yes, I mean I think the last part of this training, initially it was all very new and a big change and it was how am I going to cope with teaching this many lessons sort of thing, but now I feel that I've found my feet almost. I'm a lot more confident in the classroom and did my planning, I mean there is a lot of extra planning to do outside of your teaching but I feel more confident in the lessons that I'm delivering now in subject areas and how to put together a lesson, so I feel a lot more confident in that sense.

I Was there any particular turning point, you know, could you sort of ....

R I think probably after the Christmas holidays, coming back in January and carrying on with the same units of work, still the same hockey, netball, but I'd obviously taught two or three units prior to Christmas and was just finding my feet then so I came back and I'd got the ideas and I almost could see the direction of how to put them

I So the fact that the activities didn't change at that point was quite useful for you?

R Yes, it was just a turning point then of how to organise my days and do my lesson plans, and what works for me, things like that. Then at the start of February I went on a second placement so a different catchment area, a bigger school, different children to what I'm used to dealing with here, so that was good in the sense of my teaching because I was putting my ideas together for them and perhaps they were working better at XX and I was picking up other ideas from the teachers there because they were a lot more experienced.

I How long was that placement for?

R Six weeks. Six weeks I was there so it was good for me to observe more experienced teachers, you know, got 20, 25 years experience of how they teach the lessons and pick up tips from here. Here at XX the department's a lot younger, so it was just good to see that difference between the two.

I Was there any difference in mentoring support in the two places?

R The mentor PE who was at XX was a male so again it's a male mentor there, I mean here I've got sort of two mentors because I teach generally female, girls PE – you have got generally a female mentor and obviously JXX, my main mentor. At XXX I had GXX and he's not long since qualified really so he's used to all the standards and quite on the ball with all paperwork so it was good to have a different side to it from him and work with some of the other staff there.

I Did you work with any of the female staff there?

R Yes, I was obviously in a lot with the lessons, the two older PE teachers I was forever talking to them about different ways to approach lessons and what they'd do, just look at the way they'd set up the lessons really so they've had a big influence on me and I have picked up little tips from them which I think I can take on board.

I What about low points, any low points?

R I think it's just like a learning curve really, sometimes in lessons you feel frustrated because the pupils don't understand what you're trying to get them to do or a drill's not quite worked to plan or the kids have come a bit 'off the wall' or something like that. You think is that a reflection on my teaching or what's gone wrong here and that's frustrating during a lesson but then you reflect on it and you think oh well maybe I should do it like this and this, so they're all just learning curves. There's nothing that's really been a low point, I think frustration more – sometimes I feel like I can't always teach this – sometimes lessons are more behaviour management lessons, you know with certain groups, but then my behaviour management skills have come on in leaps and bounds over the year, so you know there's always a plus for it.

I What do you do when you have a bad lesson or a difficult lesson, a challenging lesson. You say you reflect on it, do you do that on your own or do you do that.....

R I usually talk to the host teacher, I would say I wasn't happy about this and this. We'll sit down and we'll plan for the next lesson and they'll say 'oh it wasn't you but we'll look into that more' and they will look at trying to correct it for the next lesson. So I use the outside people as well as my own thoughts.

I What I'm trying to tease out if you like is the level of mentor support that you've had, do you have for instance regular meetings?

R Yes I have weekly meetings with both my mentors for CXX, I think they probably take place more every day, I mean with the host teachers, three female PE staff here so I take a mixture of their lessons and afterwards they will be like ' oh that was good I liked that' or maybe do it slightly differently so it's continual really, it's hard to sit down and say let's reflect on your lessons because you can't pinpoint it whereas if it's taking place at the end of every lesson.

I So in that weekly meeting, what's the structure of that meeting.

R We have a discussion on various areas and targets, so depending on what... I mean more recently it's all been about my portfolio and looking at my assignments to

complete for my end of term assessment, but it might be looking at assessment, perhaps the year nine reports have to come in for the next couple of weeks or if I'm struggling on a particular sport or something I want some more ideas on, we would discuss that so it's probably me coming to the table and just saying what we want to discuss but I find that there are a lot of informal chats with my head of department when we are sat around ...we're trying to get B Tec at the minute for the school, so there a those conversations and they in a sense are mentor meetings even though it's not our official time, it's realising that they are still part of my development.

I Do you get targets set at those meetings?

R Yes, I'll look at ways in which to address them, things that I've got to look at, suggest those for support.

I What sort of targets might be set?

R In terms of assessment, it might be just highlight two or three pupils you give them a grade or an attainment of a lesser grade and we'll look together and see if we can agree with them sort of thing. I mean that was initially but now I'm getting to the point with my group I can actually grade them all and then the host teacher will look and they're not far off there, so it's more advanced really now.

I What about other support within the school and within the DRB, is there any other meetings that you've attended?

R I have, well we have a set-up for the graduate teacher programme where we've had network meetings about once a term, we had one at the start of May which was all about our end of assessment, what to expect, career development portfolio that we have to do now in QTS year. The one prior to that was all about interviews and what to expect, it was all geared up..... some are about behaviour management, some are about health and safety, elements in there but they're all about the bigger picture as well.

I So they're general pedagogical issues really as opposed to school based?

R Yes, it's very generic, it's not just purely PE and then within those meetings are DRB consultants who come and observe me, a man comes in every half term and I usually meet with them in the afternoons to discuss anything, how I am progressing, within school I have like an ITT or GTP co-ordinator, she arranges internal tutorials about school-based issues.

I And how often are they held?

R They are usually every Wednesday, so I've got one today, weekly roughly.

I Is that just for you on your own or do you join up with other people.

R They're for GTPs, NQTs, ITTs, whatever is in the school.

I Anybody in training or early teaching?

R Yes, so everyone is together for that.

I So you do feel quite supported?

R Yes, yes. There is a lot of help, if you do anything within school that's not working I can contact maybe the DRB or within the WXX authority we've got people to contact and if we've got problems they really try to make contact and deal with them sooner rather than later which is good.

I What about some of the Government initiatives like the PESSCL strategy for instance, I mean, do you get information about that? The PE, School Sport and Club Links Strategy?

R Right, we do our own sort of research on that, we had some tutorials at HXX University about gifted and talented and that was actually subject based that we got information on that, so it's more your own reading around, you know, your awareness of it. We do a lot with the school sports co-ordinators, now within the partnerships, and I've been involved in that so it's really your own research into surrounding issues as opposed to subject based, we don't get as much on that.

I So that's one area that they might want to strengthen in a sense?

R Yes

I I just think it's very difficult for you to research something if you don't actually know about it in the first place, so you need some input for you to actually go off and....

R Yes to look at it.

I Because that's quite a driving edge piece of strategy in a sense that's dominating all of our teaching isn't it?

R I'll have to look at that one.

I I would (laughter). Just moving on a little bit in terms of .... If I put my Ofsted hat on if you like and I came as an Ofsted Inspector which I'm not....the sorts of things I'd be looking at are have you actually been able to cover all six of the activity areas, have you had experience across all six?

R The only one that I haven't is swimming within schools, all the others.. outdoor..yes I've had experience in.

I In Key Stage 3 and 4?

R Yes

I Right, so can the school do anything to help you get some swimming?

R They don't have any links within CXX with the swimming unit at GCSE, they don't sort of tap into that within this school. My future school, HXX, they do use swimming within the GCSE curriculum.

I So that would be something you would identify very much that you needed to address in the first year?

R Yes, and look at it that way, they just have got no links here at CXX.

I What about Key Stage 2 experience?

R We went prior to Christmas into a primary school for a week, observed, we taught some PE with different year groups... and again I work with the school sports partnership, I'm involved with a netball after school club, sort of year 5 and 6, teaching them, and you can see such a difference in the pupils responses, so I have had quite a lot of links in the primary sector which has been good... interesting.

I What about post 16?

R Post 16, I've gone to MXX and we've had a talk and saw round the school and what's involved there obviously being a community college. Prior to starting this I taught at Sheffield College on a post 16/18 course in sports therapy, so I've had experience...

I with that age group.

R Yes, the older end. Again this qualification is just 11 to 16.

I When you go to Hxxxxx are you going to be teaching post 16 there?

R No, they're 11 to 16 as well so ...

I So actually it doesn't really matter in a sense?

R No

I Okay, in terms of going back to the activity areas, you've had coverage of five of those activity areas, what sort of length of time have you taught them, are we talking about five or six weeks on each one?

R Almost like a term and a half really, sort of games, activities and gymnastics and the dance I taught a little bit at KXX.

I So that was five or six weeks of dance?

R Yes.

I In a block?

R Yes, then sort of outdoor ed was a term, then athletics, rounders, you know summer sports, net and ball games, they're all taking place over a full term.

I So you've had some quite sustained teaching in terms of those five activity areas? What about English as an additional language, that's a standard that a lot of trainees have difficulty with. Have you had the opportunity to work with.....

R Yes, in the gymnastics unit that I've looked at with my assignment, I had a pupil in there so I developed an ICT sheet on certain activities for her to look at and use, and she was a bit reluctant to use it so I placed her with friends because her language was very basic to begin with and it's come on now leaps and bounds, she's picked up so I put them all with a friendship group who worked well with her and I think that was more beneficial for her. I prepared the sheets but I think she felt a bit more segregated and it was better for her to work with her friends group. Also they have a unit within CXX, an AO unit, so I've gone in and worked, they've got some people from Czech and I've worked with them and observed and looked at ways in which they assess levels of attainment in English and how they support in different ways to help.

I So you've had quite good experience really.

R Yes

I What about working with teaching assistants if you like or any one else in the lesson

R We have some that come in to PE, I think they're more geared towards classroom based settings but we do have some who come in and support some of our SEN pupils, and again that works well because in a class of 30 you can have a real diverse group of pupils, from the top end to the bottom end in social... you know, lots of different areas to address. That's been good that they're quite happy to work with them and you'll explain tasks and they'll spend more time and you can oversee what they're doing and give them 'how to do it correctly' teaching points and they're very willing to get involved really and help that pupil and just give them that extra attention which I think is important, in a class of 30 it's so hard to go round everyone, and they're very good at perhaps working with 3 or 4 pupils as well, which is good for me that I can ensure they get a full input as well.

I What about opportunities for ICT, you mentioned some worksheets you did for the EAL students, have you had opportunities to use a digital camera or that sort of thing?

R We don't use video within teaching here, obviously OHTs and things like that, there's access to a PowerPoint presentation but unfortunately there are no facilities for us to use that as such within a classroom based here but there are resources that I've got on board to take with me.

I Limited ICT then within this school?

R Yes, you know, it is progressing and it's more use of OHTs really as a means for ICT but then in lessons the pupils use stop watches and times and things like that to gauge.

I Heart rate monitors?

R We haven't got access to those but at KXXX they have got a stack so I did a GCSE lesson about heart rate, pupils used the heart rate monitors for that, so again it's just resources within the school and each one is different really but I have had experience using them, just in different settings.

I Just the final question with my Ofsted hat on if you like, how is all of this evidence.... I mean obviously you've got a set of teaching standards that you have to meet and you need to prove that you've met them, the evidence needs to be gathered in some way.... How is that being done and monitored?

R I've got three standards' files and behind each of them I've got a range of evidence from lesson plans, and I've highlighted the standards, from DRB observations, from host teachers' observations that I've had, and I've highlighted the standard as stated on that. If I've gone to tutorials I make my own notes and again that's put against the standard and I have my assessment after Spring Bank Holiday so I'm actually quite far through doing all that and bringing everything together, it's amazing how much evidence you have actually gained throughout the year of all the different standards, seeing it and isolating it all and seeing what you've covered.

I Have you actually managed to do that progressively as you've gone through the year?

R Yes, I'm like that, I started that very early on, the sports therapy course I did was a portfolio evidence based so I had experience of doing that. If you leave it to the last minute it's just too much so I've done that throughout the year or if we've done workshops or tutorials with that evidence behind them. I'm now just fine tuning all my lesson plans and DRB and just place them in the best place..

I Has anybody checked that as you've gone through?

R Yes the ITT co-ordinator had a look at all our portfolios after Easter and she had given us guidance of how to put them together and we've had tutorials through the graduate teacher programme about putting them together so I've done that throughout the year, and the DRB consultant came in yesterday with a mentor and we've gone through it all and she's checked it all and suggested areas to develop it or tweak it slightly so it is closely monitored.

I But not until Easter?

R Yes, they....

I They gave you the info of how to put it together but they didn't actually look at it?

R No, we'd had a tutorial prior to that and this is how we suggest you put it together but it's a very individual base and I'd taken what I'd got together and she said 'yes, just like these' not fine tuning going through all the evidence that I'd got because xxxxxxxxxxxxxx with papers but we were always pushed throughout the year to gather our evidence and keep it all...

I I can see from the way I'm asking the questions, you're highly organised.

R Yes

I The other two GTPs I suspect won't be as highly organised as you are, I could be wrong and I'll find out later today and I have a little concern if nothing is checked until Easter and then suddenly it's not right or it's not there, it doesn't leave a lot of time, half a term if the assessments are happening after Spring Bank to....

R Yes, I am very early I think, I think there's a lot later towards the end of the year, you know it's ..... I'm just that way inclined.

I It might be worth looking at, JXX SXX was asking me to give some feedback once I've finished the interviews on what I've found out so ....

R It's quite hard to ..... I mean you see teaching and things like that..... it's quite hard sometimes to get your head around the standards....

I I probably wouldn't start to look till Christmas but look at it from Christmas onwards.

R I took my files into KXX for them to have a look at, at what I'd done and it was 'yes, they seem to be on the right lines, keep going, keep collecting evidence' sort of thing. So there was never a red flag thrown up for me really.

I As you've gone through the year and we're what... two thirds of the way through, slightly more.... are there any particular points when you felt like you wanted a bit more support, do you ever feel that you were thrown in at the deep end?

R No I don't think so. Initially here I didn't do a lot of teaching the first three or four weeks, it was observation, building up my own subject knowledge on the various areas and then speaking to other people on the course. They were like 'oh I'm doing loads of teaching' and I was a bit panicky almost so it was maybe I'm really behind but on reflection now that was a good way for me because I wasn't really thrown in at the deep end and expected to sink or swim and at the time it felt very negative that I wouldn't be able to cope and I've left it too late and how am I going to pick things up, but then it was good for me just to see how it's run within a school and policies and things like that so in terms of support with regards to the mentor initially, we addressed that quite early on and got a female mentor involved as well so any problems that I've had I've spoke to people and it's been dealt with very efficiently.

I Preparation for the career entry development profile, you said at the last meeting that at the DRB they went through that with you, who actually signs that off for you, is that the DRB or is it the school?

R What do you mean signs it off?

I Well you have to complete your...

R Transition 1

I Yes Transition 1 but it has to be checked and signed by someone.

R Right, I've completed that but they didn't go through who actually signs it off at the time.

I But you have to hand it in do you to follow it up?

R We got the folder on what to do, that's something I'm going to take tonight when my assessor comes in because they have said they might well want to see that and I'll take that with me. When they come in to assess me they'll look through that. That's not gone into very clearly as to what we do with that.

I And obviously you have a job which you're really delighted with I'm sure. Does it feel weird not carrying on here, I mean, would you have wanted to carry on here if you could have done?

R It wasn't the school for me to stay here. I've learned a lot and I've got a lot of skills I can take on board and use elsewhere but I knew it's not the sort of school that I want to be based at. Talking to other people you either teach in a really challenging school or you get... you know...you give that sort of teaching and with my background I'm used to coaching at a more higher level and that's something that I want to go into and with my career profession I want to look at gifted and talented areas and use the skills that I've got in that area and I felt that In this school I wouldn't be completing that. Nothing against the school it's just not right for me, when I was looking for jobs I was looking for that when I was looking at different schools.

I Has there been any point throughout the time you've been here where you felt you had been used as a supply teacher or if someone's been out of the department you've been left to teach a lesson on your own?

R No

I So you've never been put in that position?

R No, I've talked to other GTPs and I know sometimes that has happened but I've always had a host teacher there, also now they'll come out and I'll be setting up a lesson and they'll go and help another lesson that's going off there but they'll check that's fine with me and they've said it's important for me to be on my own with a group but they're just round the corner or I have a radio I can get help or there's someone there but they check that's fine with me and it's not pushed upon me, they're very supportive and I'm not used as a supply teacher at all. I've been very lucky talking to other people.

I Clearly you are a student, a trainee in the school.

R Yes and they're very supportive of that and ensure that I am not left so I'm very lucky talking to other people.

I Okay, thanks for that.

Interview 3 with GT3 (J)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
…….. - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

I Have had your final GTP assessment, were you pleased with it?

R Mine was in June …I was early because I went away on holiday so…. I had mine on 8th of June.

I How did that go?

R Very well! Yes, I mean the teaching was looked at for both key stages and then XX the DRB person and then HXX and we then sat and had an informal chat, but yes, always positive and made to feel at ease with all of my evidence.

I Who was the guy who came in?

R XXXXX.

I Is he external to it all?

R He is external to it all…….

I He is a private consultant sort of thing…….?

R Yes he is not an inspector, he does various things based around that, but he came in…..as the DRB Assessor

I Oh right…….I know right back in October when you had that first interview, I thought about what your expectations were for the year, and aside from passing the course, you had certainly had other things that you wanted to ask me. Has this course throughout the year met your expectations or exceeded them or …….

R Yes, it has definitely met my expectations, I mean when you start in September it is so daunting, you think of all the things you have got to learn and get to know the school policy, teaching lessons and subject areas, you know it just seems sort of how will I find the information I need, I think probably the fact that each thing just really clicks into place and confidence is there and you come across different situations and develop your subject knowledge, so……I think sort of developing as a teacher and you can see the progress you are making.

I You had quite a slow start didn't you? in the sense that in the first half term you didn't do a lot of teaching……..

R It was observing lots rather than teaching and helping out, but then that was good because I could really stand back and take a look at things and even now I struggle with the content so I am still learning now.

I I just sense that maybe a little frustration or concern, when you spoke to others that they were sort of leaping ahead and doing the teaching and you still hadn't arranged your timetable but in hindsight that's.....**talking over each other, cannot transcribe.**

R Yes, but that's not turned out badly for me you need to think quite positively and are really thrown in at the deep end and being quite overwhelmed, you know I was really ready for getting some teaching done and was getting good, almost.....

I Could you identify one high from the year, one high point?

R What in terms of .....?

I What was, you know the point that.....you know we talked about critical points where perhaps you thought you'd cracked it.... but there might have been a point throughout the year where you thought, 'yes, I am really enjoying this', I know I have made the right decision, you know, was there some point where everything clicked into place and you thought 'yes it is all working for me'.

R No, not as such, I mean my planning that I did for the course, was actually a gymnastics group, they were a challenging group, and you know making headway with some pupils who didn't want to take part. I mean I knew the subject areas in gymnastics was one of my strengths, so putting all my teaching experience into the lessons was fine but you know a few weeks later my teaching was in the area of football, and that wasn't one of my strengths and again it is subject knowledge and building on that. You know you think, yes I can do this and that's brilliant, then you are still struggling to get things you know perfect, this is what you are delivering and the confidence and such.

I You felt you had a fairly steady year... I was going to ask the next question was there any lows but I get the impression that maybe it was quite .....?

R Yes it has been very steady, I have not ..... you I think for me, even putting together my portfolio, I have always been highly organised and making sure that everything is in place, so that I don't feel at any one point that I was struggling in terms of trying to get things done at ..... in the morning, you know I just feel that it has been really steady for me.

I Unlike the lads?

R Yes.....

I In terms of standards, I mean obviously swimming standards, subject knowledge standards you couldn't meet, because you didn't have any opportunity to teach in this area, are there any other standards that perhaps have been problematic for you to meet, that you may have had to carry over and look at in your NQT year?

R Could you just repeat that again?

I In a sense you haven't met those swimming subject knowledge standards, my guess is that these are going to be in your curriculum profile for next year?

R Yes they are, and they most definitely do teach them at GCSE, but my background was diving, I have done quite a fair bit of aquatics so it doesn't seem as bad as this is sort of a normal strength.

I Are there any other standards that perhaps you have not quite met....you know through lack of opportunity, not necessarily to do with your ability.

R I mean one of the areas that is evidence based is quality of planning at key stage 5, based on assessment, but I have been without able to carry out assessment on the third and sixth form pupils I mean I taught it at post sixteen, and a number of years at college as well, so that is possibly one area that you know that needs a bit more evidence on. But everything else .....

I What about ICT?

R Yes, I mean the assessor came in and I have working knowledge of various mechanical software through my diving, that I use, but they just don't have the facilities in place here, so you know the evidence for that is not something that can be applied and used in schools, but I do have a lot of experience, although you could say really, I have got the knowledge there, but .....not the opportunity to use it.

I But hopefully you will at some point.

R Yes.

I Okay...would you make the same choice again?

R Yes, definitely!

I Would you recommend the GTP route for teaching?

R Yes I would, for me it was the right route, I mean I was experienced and been to university and graduated in 1997 and for me to go back to university just did not seem right, and with me retiring from sport, I wanted to get working, I didn't want to be still studying again really, you know when I saw the GTP route, it just seemed ideal and it has worked for me. I've done some teaching, got confidence with planning for some of the class, I got experience of teaching lessons and things like that. So for me it is right, but then for other people it can be very daunting if they come with different life experiences, different confidences, different capabilities it wouldn't be the right route. But for me it ticked all of the boxes and it was good for me.

I What are the main points for development on your CEP so far?

R I want to sort of look into different ethnic groups and that sort of black areas that were my background and work with them and just really maintain the teaching for the first year or two, find my feet and .....

I But no regrets?

R No.

I Thank you for all your help and I hope the Wedding goes well

Interview 1 with PG1 (B)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
..... - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

It is almost impossible to make out what the respondent is saying in this interview for much of the time.

I	This is the first interview, so can we just have a brief chat about your background is in terms of your degree classification, about where you did your degree that sort of thing?
R	I did a BA (Hons) in Physical Education at LMU
I	And that was in 2001?
R	Yes, I did that from 2000 to 2004, and then I applied for a place on their PGCE programme.
I	So the actual degree title was Physical Education
R	Yes, and it covered all the theoretical aspects of PE, from physiology to psychology to biomechanics and so on.
I	And then in terms of practical content were there any practical modules?
R	Yes, there was a range of options, although in the first year we had to cover all six areas of the National Curriculum PE
I	So in terms of you know like the national curriculum areas you feel that you got a god grounding?
R	Yes, although it only covered basic knowledge. I have done a number of National Governing Body coaching awards to increase my knowledge of individual sports.
I	What were they in?
R	FA Coaching certificate, AENA Netball level 1, Baseball/softball level 1 and CSLA
I	Did you have any experience of working with young people, perhaps in term time or in the holidays?
R	All my work experience from school and university has been in secondary schools, I always knew I wanted to teach PE so that was logical for me. I also worked on T Carnegie International Weight Loss Schools, working with obese young people on a 6 week residential camp and finally I have worked for Premier Soccer since starting Uni and here I have been coaching 5-14 year olds.

I So you have got some experience here with coaching, when you were in secondary schools how much of an opportunity did you get to work with the PE teacher?

R I was really lucky as I had hands on experience with both of them, the Uni work experience gave me more opportunity but I guess I was older then but the staff in the school were very good and very encouraging.

I So how would you describe your PE background from a personal perspective?,

R I am really a games player although I did try and choose practical modules in my degree that would help with me weaker areas, for example I opted for aquatics and gymnastics in year 3 as I knew they were weak.

I Why did you decide to do a PGCE rather than any other route to teaching?

R I always knew I wanted to teach and all my choices throughout my degree have been geared towards me getting a place on the PGCE. I have loved my time at Leeds and it seemed logical to stay on here and complete my studies, I guess it was the natural thing to do.

I Did you consider other options?

R No, I really wanted to stay in Leeds and to be honest I don't know that much about the other routes but I am happy with my decision to stay on here, it's a hard year and it is really god to know the staff and the area, have feel for the schools and know you're way around d the Uni. It takes some of the pressure off.

I What do you think will be the main challenges for you this year?

R I am really excited about the whole thing, I have always wanted to teach, I want to do the best I can but I know that I some activity areas that I am still going to need help with, such as Dance.

Interview 2 with PG1(B)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
…….. - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

(this tape was very unclear and difficult to transcribe in many places)

I Can you tell me a little about where you are placed?

R There were 17 members of the PE department at xxxxx school

I Sports College?

R Yes, Sports College, so it was a wide range of activities especially in comparison to my old school

I Did you have any school induction during that period? What type of training did they offer?

R Yes, I had a couple sessions but really the criticism of how it worked, how some of it was set up and managed etc. I am not expected to be a Grade 1 now and I think it's very difficult to take it and remain positive, they have been supportive. And that's great but it was difficult at first to pick yourself up and carry on

I So in a sense the sort of feed-back you were getting both from the mentor and other members of staff was predominantly mechanical, saying you did this what you should have done with this type of stuff, rather than OK, you have experimented with this and this has worked really well but on another occasion you may want to consider this, this and this

R Because some times it just was get out there and survive, we had nothing to back us up. The teachers to be fair to them are dedicated and focused on their classes etc. I think I did well and I think I managed to get my head round a whole load of things

I When you were teaching and did something that was wrong, would he also give you the advice of how to put it right?

R Erm, I think he was just being negative …….. and there was an instance where I asked him how did you think I should do xxxxxx? I could live with that lesson and so that's the way it goes you know at the end of the day. But, yeah, it was difficult to get him to consider other ways. I think I imagined it would be a lot easier but it's very hard, especially when there are so many teachers, six or seven staff around most of the time.

I So you started feeling a sense of there is no right or wrong way of doing anything and you felt as though you weren't allowed to develop your own style if you didn't actually follow what the mentor wanted it would be heavily criticised

R Yes

I What about strengths? Were there any high points?

R Erm, I started to accept what I was able to deliver. I didn't do any football while I was there. I played rugby so that was my strength. I was asked to do girls hockey, netball and I did lads basketball and was quite surprised how I could adapt subject knowledge and use other people's experience, some of the classes were challenging and lesson feedback could be critical but what came out of that was my organisation and class and behaviour management strategies were good

I So if you look at the support you had in the school, school-based tutoring was quite negative in some respects, did you have regular meetings with your mentor?

R Every single week. We looked at the feedback from all the teachers. Now, my subject mentor, Mr xxx he was more negative. Now all the members in the department actually said it was a bit harsh. Don't worry about feedback, just carry on with your teaching etc that I felt they were very negative. I think that made up for the fact that they were so critical even some of the younger members of staff don't worry about it they are not being nasty it's just how they compare their ideas and improve. So that's fair enough but the support is fantastic in other ways it was very hard to accept and try and become the ideal but the professional tutor was very good. Like child protection, brilliant session, clear and informative, it was brilliant.

I So your actual school-based mentor was the female PE teacher who was assistant head of the department and she was the one who meet with you weekly and so she was the one to set you targets?

R Yes

I Did she still teach?

R Yes the girls mostly but not all the time. So she was with me maybe 1, sometimes twice a week

I Do you think there was adequate provision for her to get information from other members of staff in order to actually sit down with you each week and discuss progress

R No. that was one of the weakness in terms of being such a big department because it had so many staff there was often differences of opinion and that's where I got confused, if you get credit or praise in a lesson it didn't seem to get discussed in the meetings, it seemed that all that was bought up were the bad lessons, it's just been negative and I felt she so obviously prepared for a that sort of session

I So there was a bit of tension there?

R Yeah, I think in terms of she would inform me that when I was with lads they were going to be on the ball whereas when I was with the girls they needed a lot more from me as they were not in to PE the same.

I But you needed to motivate more?

R Yeah. And you know, that was good except for the motivation but I think she didn't have any real idea of how I was with the groups.

I In terms of coming back then to my original question how did you feel about that in terms of the preparation by the University?

R Well we spent a lot of time going over the paperwork, being told you need to do this, get this signed, make sure this happens and so on. It was a bit like being on you know, a production line. We were constantly told you must do this, make sure this is on your timetable, if not let us know. We knew about the standards, they were drummed into us as well, which I guess was a good thing but maybe a bit over the top

I What about that period in Uni after Christmas, did you get a chance to reflect, what did you get back from that when you think about that?

R Yes, actually well that was a really good opportunity for us to reflect back on the placement and to see what we had got out of the situation. I think you do need that and to do it in a different space because it is very intensive, the only thing being is that you are switched off from Uni and getting back into it is hard. But I think, on reflection, and a new approach, if you were just to say if anything's going wrong and you've got no sort of support at the school, you need to go back into Uni and meet with you tutor there. I mean we just shared how we got through certain things such as lesson planning and things and I think you need that as we've got a good friendship amongst the group and could support each other more. We did a practical module work with the national cricketing governing body, 48 hours doing some course and some practical but what we said would have been better and I said this to the tutor was if we had done less theoretical stuff and more sport qualification especially as when it comes to interview that it was head teachers want to see.

Interview 3 with PG1 (B)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
..... - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

The interviewer gave a brief introduction to this part of the interview

I Looking at Phase 2, how have things developed at the your second school?

R Erm, stage 2 xxx xxxx I mean I was in sports college in stage 1, stage 2 is mixed school within real working-class area, made a difference actually. Nobody bothers you it was every man for himself but it was a very different ballgame. Started quite well, I worked hard then after maybe about four or five weeks I was finding it exhausting you had to be really switched on as it wasn't really about the teaching, especially in some areas often here but was more about getting involved with kids, you had to be on the ball the whole time, no such thing really as having an easy lesson, it was tending to get very hard and just really tiring it was really tough, but, on reflection, it was a really valuable learning experience

I So you wouldn't really complain about the experience

R No, it's a good place for school experience it's a good one in that, one its local, two it teaches you how get the kids scared of and you know just put a front on that helps you through, just seems a very very tough school, obviously. But if you can handle these sorts of characters then great, to give you an example at a guess I would say that out of 25 of them some are trouble kids and you need to sort them and about 12 to 15 are pretty OK but that is just how it goes you learn to deal with it.

I What about in terms of the level of support and mentoring at that school – was that stronger, about the same?

R Erm, it was good. I think the mentor in this one Mr XX he seems quite laid back. Whereas Ms XX in phase 1 was very thorough as a mentor, she had an opinion and it wasn't up for discussion. It's a little more laid back here - at first I was worried because it was so different, you know perhaps a bit too much laid back and not sort of on the ball, you know the sort of thing. But we got there in the end in terms of all the paperwork was done so it was more than helpful from that point of view. He also gave me his number and said if I was stuck to ring him on a night and we could chat things through. Lovely, very supportive and you can't really ask for much more than that.

I Did you get xxxx xxxx xxx first?

R Erm, I would say that out of 50 weeks xxx xxxxxx xxx xxxx xxxx and I did xxx practically every week xxx xxxx xxx xxx xxxxxx support and achievement xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

I Lovely

I If you think about the requirements of QTS, the activity areas in particular, have you experience in all of these?

R No, I never got the chance to teach any swimming

I Totally, or only taking kids to the pool but not actually taking charge?

R Totally, no swimming experience at all in either of my placement schools

I What about the other activity areas?

R Gymnastics was an area I hadn't done and I covered that a bit on my second placement

I What about post-16's?

R Yes A levels and a little bit of BTEC and the CSLA

I Have you had quite a lot of experience there?

R Yes, both my placement schools, stage 1 and stage 2 had sixth forms and so I was able to help out and teach there

I And you have had those on your own for five or six weeks

R Yes, yes

I What about activity areas, I mean the gym, the games and athletics OAA, dance etc, again have you had some sustained and substantial experience across those areas?

R Yes

I Good, and was this experience at both key stage 3 and key stage 4? It's something you need to check up on as it is important.

R Mostly at both although my key stage 3 coverage is far better, some of the activities especially OAA are hard to get at Key Stage 4.

I What about working with pupils who for them English is an additional language because that is another problem area for a number of trainees.

R Oh yes, I mean people who are in some schools would find this hard as they don't have any pupils in this category. For me personally it's not so difficult we have had discussions with the professional tutor so next year this is one of my targets. So although I have got information down for next year already I nay try and work on it this summer before starting properly. So I think its just a bit of problem but it will be sorted.

I So in a sense at the moment you are almost telling me that you haven't actually met that standard.

R No I have not really made that in practice but I have in theory.

I Absolute network xxxxxxxxx

R Yes, I am aware of issues relating to, it gets around it like that. I think that's standard to be honest with you it's a bit of a funny one xxxx xxxxxx xxxxx I know you wouldn't be able to xxxx xxxxx just how it is and so most people look at xxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx

I What about ICT.

R Yes, I have got a lot of evidence to support that, I've done presentations, video camera sessions, heart rate monitors

I Right, and you feel quite comfortable using a whole range of ICT stuff?

R Yes, I feel quite comfortable and its something I actually quite enjoy doing now and it really helps the kids in their understanding

I OK. Looking at the standards. In terms of you have got these bits and pieces and obviously they need editing in some way. How do you know if you've got all the evidence together to prove that you are ready for QTS

R I know that a lot of the evidence is here and what I have started to do is to go through it and see where the gaps are, for example I had some work on *display in the reception area* so I got the camera and just put in a picture of that to prove it. I think that with a lot of the evidence, its mainly about going through it bit by bit, its tedious but you just sit down and get on with it

I That's one way of looking at it. Obviously we are coming to the end of the year now and I would like to consider how the training programme so far has matched up to your expectations. We have identified some issues that you have had over the year perhaps before reflecting back on these, can we just consider what other aspects, aside from the EAL, you want to identify for your career entry profile. Is there anything else?

R There was loads of other areas as well as the additional language stuff and then there was some activity areas that I still need to develop, in particular gym and especially swimming.

I Are there any general teaching areas which you feel you need to continue to work on?

R I don't think so, I enjoy being with the kids getting them active, its not about being stuck in a classroom behind rows its more the case of going down to the field or into the gym and getting everyone involved. It was actually interesting to look at what people were doing with the kids , getting them involved, across the whole range so we are looking at ways of keeping it flowing. I'm going to work off that. Personally, as well, I would love to xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx. Oh and losing my voice, I shouted too much this term and ended up without a voice so i need to work on voice projection and other ways of getting the kids attention when I'm outside in particular.

I Where are you going to end up teaching?

R I've got a job already in a school with about 900 pupils so not too big.

I When did you get offered this?

R poor quality

I Just to take you back on the whole course now – has it met your expectations perhaps putting aside the difficulties you had with your mentor on your first school placement.

R It has really. I think I knew it was going to be a hard year but I was going to get a lot out of it. So to be honest I can't complain. Looking back I think it has just been the toughest year I've had in the whole four years I've been away at Uni and advice for other people would have been to go and do it but make *sure that* you prepare yourself as much as possible, think carefully about your options in your undergraduate degree and take the opportunity if you can to specialise.

I If you had to pinpoint one low point throughout your training year, what would it be?

R It would be xxx xxxx xxxx during stage 2 xxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx having decided to do it xx xxx pressure from the school and xx xxxx altogether

I You wanted to xxxxxx?

R Yes

I And what would be the highest point of it?

R I think the highest point was knowing that I had achieved the standards and I guess looking back seeing how much my teaching has improved.

I If you were going back to half way through your final year of your degree, 18 months ago and you were considering training options for teaching, knowing what you know now what would you decide?

R I'd still want to do the PGCE, I'm not going to do anything other than teach and for me it was the best course.

I So no regrets?

R No regrets whatsoever. I can't complain about the schools even though I did have difficulties with my first mentor they got me through.

I Thank you very much for taking part in this for me and I wish you all the best in the future

Interview 1 with PG2 (P)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
..... - pause or change in conversation mid sentence.

I If you could just start by telling us a little bit about your background, what your first degree was, what qualification you got and when.

R I got a BA in Physical Education from Leeds Met Uni. I got a 2:2 back in 1998

I So, what have you been doing since then?

R I worked for about a year as a Health and Fitness Manager for an insurance company but realised that it wasn't really what I wanted in terms of a career so decided to travel for a bit and then ended up teaching PE and English at a school in Thailand.

I Can you tell me a little about what you have been doing there?

R I was offered the job in April 2001, the school is a private bi-lingual school in Bangkok and since appointment I have been teaching both primary and secondary age pupils English and PE., I have had to develop the PE curriculum and I have done so based on the English National Curriculum.

I As you have a fair bit of teaching experience did you consider any of the other training routes, in particular the school based ones?

R Yes, I did originally think of doing a GTP and I was offered a place in a local secondary school but when I went to the school and realised that it was a failing school I didn't think that it would be the best place to train, I then decided to come back to Leeds and do a PGCE, at least I knew the set up and some of the staff there so I knew what I would be getting into.

I That's must have been a hard decision for you and one that will see you loose out financially, how do you feel about that? Did you not consider applying elsewhere for a GTP?

R Well, yes it wasn't ideal but for me the main reason for coming back was to get my teaching qualification and to learn and develop as best I could. I was really put off the GTP by the first school I was offered and was really concerned about the quality of training that I would get, I wasn't convinced that other applications would lead to anything better so I decided to opt for what I knew would meet my needs even though I would loose out financially.

I I'm interested in why you felt it necessary to come back to the UK and get qualified, what are you planning to do once you finish?

R I know it must see, strange as I d intend to go back to the same school, they have held my job for me, in fact they want me to go back as Head of PE. My partner is also out there and I have got used tote lifestyle. I guess I felt I needed to come back and do this now for two reasons, firstly I really wanted to make sure that I did the best job possible and it was important to me to have some training and to get a UK qualification which is highly though of in Thailand and secondly as I'm not sure what the future holds I thought it best to return and get myself a good qualification which I can fall back on should I at any point decide to return to the UK. I thought it was probably best to do this sooner rather than later.

I What do you hope to get out of this year (aside from a teaching qualification)?

R I really welcome the opportunity to develop my knowledge and skills in teaching, not just the actual teaching side but the whole area around inclusion etc. Assessment is also something that is very new to me and just the opportunity to get to grips fully with the National Curriculum so that when I go back to Thailand I can ensure that the PE Department is well run and meets the needs of all the pupils.

I What do you think will be the main challenges for you this year?

R It will be good for me to get feedback on how I am doing from a teaching point of view. Having had more experience than most on the course it will be interesting to see how I settle with the others. I am here for one purpose and it is costing me a lot so I won't be up for too much slacking, messing around etc. I am also not sure how I will adapt to being back in the classroom myself, it's been a while.

Interview 2 with PG2 (P)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
…….. - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

(this tape was very unclear and difficult to transcribe in many places)

I This is an interview with Phil. Basically, the first time around we looked at your background, and what your motivations were for doing the course. For this interview, midway through the course, we are trying to look at whether your expectations are being met, whether you are getting a lot from the course, and also to tease out some of the key developments, issues and concerns. So have you any regrets in terms of opting for the PGCE?

R No it's been fine. Certainly in terms of meeting my expectations at the half-way stage xxx xxx xxx xxx xxxx xxxx xxxx xxxxxxxxx. Some familiarity of teaching

I And obviously you have had so much experience.

R So in that respect you couldn't fail to get on Ok with the course

I How is the training going so far? Phase 1 – which school were you in?

R XX

I How is the training now is that …..?

R In terms of ?

I In terms of mentor support, observations, feedback and all the systems that are supposed to be in place and I know that they are not always in place.

R Well they certainly were at XX. Excellent organisational support. The whole placement was really well-structured and regular meeting with the mentor but both also myself and the other student were a bit concerned, we just didn't have anything to compare not having experienced this before. We thought that we were getting too much negative feedback.

I So, a bit more constructive?

R Constructive criticism would have been nice rather than, we had a lot of observations near the end people observing us would just say well we would prefer it if you wouldn't do it like that but there wasn't anything constructive to actually improve ourselves. So it was up to us to go away and think about it but it would have been nice to have some …..

I So, essentially, you have done it like this but have you considered doing it like, you know, some kind of alternative? So, in effect that sort of negativity and the lack of structure or constructive feedback was a bit of a low point. And the high points then were your support from the PE mentor

R Yes, in particular from the PE mentor, and as I say it was so well structured. The issue we had was that it was just the individual members of staff that were so negative.

I What about professional mentor training and support?

R ITC workshops, meetings with the professional mentor, they organised a variety of workshops for us and other trainees and NQT's in the school. Some were really useful others covered areas we had already looked at Uni.

I What sort of topics – do you remember?

R Yes, xxx xxxx xxxxxx people, had to deal with behaviour management. Child protection and I didn't realise at the time that its all relevant and is helpful in us working towards a standard which we need you evidence for our QTS.

I Right

R But they all seemed to fit in when I was starting to pull everything together and fit in really well

I And was that structured from a generic point of view or structured from a subject stance?

R Yes structured from a generic point of view. There were five or six other ITT trainers from other subject areas and a couple of English ones at the one time.

I Any NQT's or not?

R Yes, there were some NQT's as well which, strangely enough I don't know how effective it would be having attended the same workshops. I have seen that they have workshops as part of their induction I just wondered whether they would have gained anything from these ones.

I It might have been an opportunity to for the trainees to hear the NQT's perspective and the school may have wanted it as part of their development programme which they have identified.

I So once you finished phase 1 you came back into University for a period of time – how did that work for you?

R Well, for me it was quite awkward going back to full-time mode of study again. Because even when we were on placement it felt like it was just working, I guess as that was what I had been doing previously. So it was quite difficult, yeah.

I Was it worthwhile?

R On the whole, I would say yes. The only thing that I found difficult and a little frustrating **quality became very poor at this point**. Which really was good in theory but at the end of the month I think everyone felt really well equipped to start phase 2. Interesting was when we tried to use the various ideas in our various phase 2 for some it was difficult, I don't know whether that was our issue or the schools in terms of how we feel it was structured.

I Yes that might be worth reflecting on that a bit more.....

R Or whether it was because we were back at Uni and just being away from a school environment for a long time it took us longer to adjust back into school ways. But the time at Uni it was definitely beneficial but I personally felt that a lot of the time was not wasted but it could have been more efficiently used with delivering maybe more dedicated large chunks of knowledge rather than getting us to share on our own experiences and reflecting on other people's experiences. I didn't find that as easy to do as some other people - reflecting on other training experiences on phase 1.

I It might come down to style

R It might well be. I am sure other people did learn from this sort of activity but myself I didn't particularly enjoy the module and many of the discussions. And then I got a bit frustrated as I came away thinking that I hadn't actually picked up any ideal skills that I think I could utilise in phase 2

I So in terms of your time back in Uni that wasn't really a very positive period for you

R It was a difficult

I But also a challenging situation in a sense. So what up until you started your phase 2 placement, what would you say was the highest point? Could you identify one point where you felt really good about what you were doing?

R I would say increasing my knowledge of gymnastics and dance was the high point, which was one of my focuses in terms of the targets I had set myself.

I And you managed to achieve that in phase 1?

R Yes, that was catered for really. It is an ongoing development along with other aspects of subject knowledge. To be honest, I have had lots of support from the PE mentor. I think that was really a great benefit for me.

I If we can now talk in relation to the standards which were expected for phase 1, I am assuming that you met all those relatively easily

R I think so we had the same sort of assessment and just working really well with people, so certainly the professional standards were met

Interview 3 with PG 2 (P)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words

..... - *pause or change in conversation mid*

????????//

I Has that changed in phase 2?

R Luckily for me it has. There were xxxx xxxx students and I had them in my group. But I guess there were other trainees who may well not have done so I think ..

I Nationally I think that's a problem

R xxxx xxxx xxx reflected xxxx xxxx xxxx and you have to achieve xxxx xxxx xxxx. Xxx xx going into schools xxx xxx. A lot of the class management-wise I think I xxxxxxx and then the ones that were more specific xxx xxx xxx to the module.

I And the xxxxxxx?

R ***poor quality sound***

I What about the usefulness of the way your mentor helps you set your targets

R That was brilliant

I Clearly linked to standards?

R And they were identified by standard numbers so he would say, for example, xxx pick the discussion rather than take xxx xxx xxx and she would say xxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxx and would say what you want to do is to ensure xxx xxx xxx and incorporate that xxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxx xxxxxxxxxxx.

I In terms of coverage of activity areas , across both phases – could you save you have actually managed to cover all 6 areas of activity across both key stages?

R Yes, pretty much

I What ones haven't you covered?

R Dance at stage 3 and OAA and I haven't got a swimming at key stage 4

I poor quality sound

R xxx xxxx xxxx xxx xxxx xxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxx xxx

I Not really structured xxxxxx work

R I think that's probably it actually, I have been quite fortunate in having two schools at each end of the spectrum xxxxx xxxxxxx xxxxxxxxx

I And you have covered post 16

R poor quality sound

I But just A levels you have not had the chance to do any BTEC or CSLA ?

R poor quality sound

I And in terms of key stage 2 what have you done there to demonstrate how you have met the standards.

R Well, we have been going into a primary feeder school for an afternoon a week for about 6 weeks now

I And those feeder schools, have they had a set programme for you?

R We have been attached to various classes and helped with what is going on we have not had much time to explore the PE fully although we have got involved with some of the teaching

I And then in terms of the activity areas would you are say that your teaching has been thorough enough to met the standards, would you say your experience had been in terms and standards sustained and substantial. You know, has it been consistent teaching over a block of study where you've actually been the teacher and planned all the lessons?

R I think in phase 1 a definite yes even though that was more an introductory phases and not really a full on teaching placement, I would say yes. The problem we sometimes had was whether sports facilities were available, quite often there would be disruption due to bad weather. There wasn't much opportunity to take the lead and take responsibility at this point when classes were doubled up.

I So leading up to your second school placement was problematic and they tried to accommodate your needs as best they could.

R poor quality sound but on the whole yes.

I I mean you have had some experience in you year out in Thailand and you had got a student in your class with English as an additional language so you've actually been able to work alongside them quite well.

R Yes that was relatively easy for me, as you say I had a lot of previous experience. poor quality sound

I Have you got xxxx xxxxx

R Very very brief xxxx xxxx xxxxx and I tried to incorporate that into xxxx xxxxx xxxxx.

I What about ICT and the use of ICT

R The sort of uses I have had include some video work with 11-year olds in gymnastics and with year 11 revision I did some PowerPoint and internet work and then with student development sessions at Uni we had a look at other aspects, for example the Dartfish package.

I And those schools that you were at, had reasonable ICT facilities?

R Not bad in phase 2 poor quality sound and there was no sort of xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx

I So you've actually come to the end of your placement, you've met all your standards – how is that evident? You know if I was the OfSTED inspector where would I see evidence?

R The evidence is my teaching files and ,my PDP file, all my planning, mentor sessions and so on from Phase 1 and Phase 2 are all there and they're cross-referenced to all the standards, including all the evaluations for Phase 2 poor quality sound

I What about stuff that can't be evidenced through the teaching practice side? From the legal framework or some of the professional standards, for instance.

R It's a bit of a grey area in terms of evidence but I think, fortunately, from a lot of the professional tutor sessions in phase 2 I can evidence those.

I So you have got notes from those workshops?

R I have got notes from the workshops which I have actually typed up and included in my PDP file

I So you feel quite confident with the evidence that you have gathered to date

I Any areas that you feel you could have done more reporting, across the whole year really?

R I would say, in terms of the assessment of learning, at Uni and we did a lot of work on how the national curriculum is made up, how its developed up to its current stage now which was good but I don't think we ever, for example, watched a video of a lesson and then were told to grade students, or even grade each other perhaps. It wouldn't even matter who you watched, but to be able to give an experience, we weren't given that responsibility during phase 1 probably because the schools didn't think we were ready for it. During Phase 2 it's been quiet its quite difficult to grade students without looking at their previous form. Now I was still not that I would feel confident to carry this out on my own and I would expect perhaps by now to be able to watch a

performance and be able to accurately grade but without looking at their previous grades I still found it quite difficult.

I So what you were doing with them was look at previous grades and then give them A, B, C as there grade feeling that they must have improved or at least stayed the same as where they were previously

R And, of course, you can't really do that also I know its not ideal to grade people on one performance, which is basically what the assessor has to do poor quality sound

I No, that's right

R poor quality sound so to help you tend to look at the last grades and make at judgment on their performance ie. Was good enough.

I No, and also, their last grades xxx xxxx xxxx still grading xxxx

R They grade across the xxxx xxx so we poor quality sound xxx xxx and they grade across the xxxxxxx xxxxx xxxxx which I think is desperate.

I Still not right.

R No, still not right, still not the most efficient way to xxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxx xxxxxx and its very very easy to go on using reports xxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxx xxxx poor quality sound but the automatic assumption xxxxx have gone up in the xxxx xxxxxxx x xxxxx

I And also it's working on the premise that the previous grades were accurate

R And groups change.

I And it might just be the fact that was made up something more favourable to them or that they got more support from the teacher leading into an assessment. So you feel that you need more experience in assessing practical rather than the theory, you want more hands on experience of actually doing an assessment?

R That, for me, was more useful yes. Rather than spending a lot of time on subject knowledge which is fairly easy to pick up. What I think surprised me most of the time is the actual level of subject knowledge you needed to have to teach was a lot lower than I expected. Even at year 11 GCSE the level of subject matter you have to deal with is not as vast as I anticipated.

I I wonder whether that is based on the fact that you have been teaching for quite a while and therefore ....

R I have already got some of the knowledge.

I Which you are not even aware of. It wonder if that is the case with other areas, well it would be interesting to explore but not now.

R Yes, that has been happening for quite a while.

I What were you identifying as your areas then?

R It links into what we were saying about assessment, assessment for learning in PE. Students seem to go around self assessing and peer assessing and making students aware of the attainment levels, even though they are really sure what they are talking about they seem more than happy to this, I would guess my point is that I don't think they would even know the levels. But so what does that assessment mean in terms of my own performance and being able to assess?

I More control!

R Yes more control, that is main..... I guess that helping pupils to acquire that knowledge

I Two big areas

R Yes, two big areas.

I Now in terms of employment, you are planning to return to Thailand, is that as PE Teacher, Head of PE.

R It is Head of PE, but there is another person in the department too. But they are only part time.

I Is that you and a female?

R I don't know at the moment.

I Right, and then just sort of reflecting back a bit more, in the sense that I know you did some reflection about the first phase, but your overall experience now. Do you still think you made the right move? Is it still the right training package for you?

R I think so, yes.

I Because I know at the beginning you considered the GTP.

R Yes, I applied for the GTP, when I didn't get on the PGCE, as I applied too late, I didn't apply until after Easter and there was one place left on it. Having attended the interview and seen the school I didn't think that this was for me. I don't know if I would have learnt so much, the school was a failing school and had a lot of behavioural problems, I wasn't sure that it would help me improve my teaching. So I think on the whole yes, this was right for me. Although I think I am the kind of learner where I can quite easily do as well with less contact time, and maybe more time in school or left to develop my one subject knowledge.

I Have you considered that?

R Well I spoke to one of the group on the phone to highlight this, and she said " well people like you that have got more experience, it is probably better that you get on with

it". But she said she felt she needed the support from the Uni and was glad it was there.

I Any other concerns, observations? Was there any time in the year when you felt particularly low.

R There were plenty of lows, but I don't think they were particularly related directly to the course. Obviously the financial aspect was really difficult

I Yes, especially when you were used to earning money as well.

R Yes, I had been earning money for the last seven or eight years, as it were. In terms of the course there was a point at one stage during the first phase, at my first school were they were quiet difficult, critical and I didn't feel like I was actually a student

I And for the future is the type of school that you wouldn't recommend for a placement.

R That's right, yes. I mean it was OK there but I just thought I don't want to be a teacher if I have to behave like that, so negative.

I Yes I know what you mean. What about your overall standards, are there any standards that you don't feel you have fully met? I know all of the boxes have been ticked to say that you have actually achieved all the standards but are there any that you feel that perhaps are still a bit dodgy.

R I think section one and two are fine, and I think in terms of knowledge and understanding I think this is fine, and I have probably got all of the information I need there. Xxxxx Poor quality xxxxx.

I It is teaching then you've got varied roles, you've got class management, you've got planning, assessment of learning and so on.

R Most of those I think are fine, then in terms of the assessments.....

I That is still I guess, one of your top concerns.

R I am not concerned, I mean I think that I have the basics of what I need to know. I have got the character where I will be able to develop my own style. One thing that I would say that it would be nice to have a specific module at Uni or a core workshop, where you have the opportunity to get lots and lots of experience by watching lessons on video and having ago at assessing either these or your peers whilst they did some sort of practical.

I And also in terms of the PG year, you have been quite fortunate in that you have been observed and got good feedback on a number of occasions, but that may not necessarily always be the case, depending on how your placements are arranged Do you think that the course has made a difference to you as a teacher? The fact that you had already had a good bit of experience, you know you came here from Thailand in order to get an English qualification. Is it going to make a huge difference to you moving back to Thailand?

R It certainly will do now that I have got the qualification. I guess that it has really developed my skills and it has made me more aware of how pupils learn, how to progress learning and to develop a broad and balanced curriculum. I would like to think to myself that this whole experience really has been worthwhile and maybe more where my role within the school is concerned. Yes, I have definitely developed as an individual as well as a teacher.

I So do you feel that if has given you the time to step back to reflect and to do some actual work on your teaching style and approach

R I really thought long and hard about that and I had reflected on the importance of this course to me in my career a year ago

I Well thank you very much for your time and I wish you all the best.

Interview 1 with PG3 (C)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
..... - pause or change in conversation mid sentence.

I If you could just start by telling us a little bit about your background, what your first degree was, what qualification you got.

R I got a BA in Physical Education from Leeds Met Uni, I was really pleased as I got a first class degree.

I How relevant was your degree to helping you with a PGCE?

R It was very relevant, all the modules addressed a variety of PE contexts but the school years were the most dominant, we did consider the whole life long physical activity spectrum but I guess due to the experiences of our lecturers a lot of the examples and most of the focus was the 5-18 years.

I How much of your study was linked specifically to the national curriculum for PE?

R The actual core modules were linked into PE, and so were a number of the optional modules. Core modules included all the usual, physiology, psychology, biomechanics. sociology and some practical modules. In fact throughout the course we covered all the key practical areas of the National Curriculum.

I Did you have an opportunity for a relevant work placements whilst doing your degree?

R Yes, I did a six week placement in a secondary school, very hands on and looked at all areas of the National Curriculum

I and you went straight from your degree into the PGCE. Did you have any other experience of working with young people?

R Yes, I have worked on the Camp Carnegie sports camps as well as experience at holiday camps back home over the summer break and some time spent working in a local leisure centre. I have also sought out as much school experience as I could so in addition to my Uni placement I have spent additional time in school teaching, last year I spent one day a week in a local private school teaching PE which was a fabulous experience

I Did you feel that this was essential for a PGCE Place, If so why?

R Yes and no – I knew I wanted to do a PGCE and I knew I wanted to stay at Leeds and the competition is so tough so I was aware, especially in the last 18 months that all this

experience would help with my application but I love working with children anyways so it was natural for me to get employment in those areas.

I What about your personal sporting background, can you tell me a bit about that?

R I have a fairly broad background, I'm a keen swimmer, I love outdoor activities especially skiing but my main sport is Netball, I played for the county before coming to Uni and have represented the Uni whilst I have been here.

I So you are a strong games player.....what about your subject knowledge in the other national curriculum areas, what is that like?

R I know I have gaps but my degree course was thorough so I have a good basic knowledge. I need to do some more work in gymnastics and dance, especially dance. I have done a number of coaching awards to hep with my subject knowledge, I've got my National Pool Lifeguard award, level 1 athletics, tennis teaching certificate and my CSLA so hopefully these will all help.

I Why did you decide to do a PGCE rather than any other route to teaching?

R I always knew I wanted to teach, right from when I started at Uni. I didn't really consider any other route, I was happy at Leeds, knew the staff etc so applied here and kept my fingers crossed that I had done enough to get a place.

I What do you think will be the main challenges for you this year?

R I'm a perfectionist so I really hope I get placed in a school where I can really do well. I want to be the best teacher I can, I have always wanted this and I'm desperate to do really well

Interview 2 with PG3 (C)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
..... - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

(this tape was very unclear and difficult to transcribe in many places)

I This is the second interview with Caroline, what I will do to start with is look back at Phase 1 and then go from there.

R Right

I If you can just reflect back to Phase 1, I know it's a month or so ago. How did that actually go, did you have positive experience, were there issues, concerns?

R Yeah I didn't enjoy my Phase 1 at all.

I Right

R That opens up a whole can of worms. I didn't feel that the school wanted us there so I felt quite out of place. They made us look quite out of place. They… the department as a whole was very well run, it was a very good department, filling all the interests we needed to see. So in terms of the national curriculum and us learning how to do it properly, that was ideal. It was just the fact that we felt so … well I personally felt so out of place and not really… almost like we were a hassle to be there.

I What was the mentoring support like?

R I had a woman who it was her first time for mentoring and she was really the lady who caused me the most problems when I was there. The way she gave feedback was very negative and she hardly ever found …. If she did find a positive she always managed to put it as negative by the end of… you know what I mean….by the end of what you were talking about so you are like " so it wasn't really a positive at all ". So I didn't really gel with her very much. So the mentor meetings were a bit of a drag.

I But you have them on the regular basis though?

R Yes we have them regularly. That was good, they did it by the book, they just didn't have the sort of chatty sort of relationship. I never once had verbal feedback, she only went through what was written on the paper, literally she walked from the sports hall back to the staff room and she said nothing, absolutely nothing, she wouldn't discuss anything. So it was very much like she was my teacher. There was no welcome into the department.

I What about the overall IT Programme, what was that like?

R That was..erm..quite good. It was again quite regimented and the lady who ran it was quite loopy but quite……she filled the needs of what we needed. We sort of read to her what we wanted and that's what she did. So it was ideal.

I So the programme was designed for just for the two of you?

R Yes. We did have some others but they came round us really. Yeah it was quite odd, it was….

I So there was a professional mentor programme but you had to decide what you wanted, it wasn't actually structured when you arrived.

R Yeah well it was structured when we arrived but she sort of said to us " which bits of it do you want? " so that was quite helpful in a way.

I Did you know which bits you wanted at that point?

R Erm

I could you actually say which parts of the programme you needed bearing in mind that you'd not really had and experience at all.

R No you've got to think.. I don't know. I think there were bits on it we'd covered at uni. So maybe there were bits we thought we knew a bit more about, like sometimes she'd talk about work performance and stuff like that and you'd be like 'what?' rather than " let's talk about classroom management " or we spent hours talking about corrective teaching. Do you know what I mean? There were bits to us were things that we understood and there were other bits that…….

I So. really, in a sense, that was quite a low point for you.

R Yes. Probably my lowest about the whole time

I Was there any particular incident that you could actually sort of put a nail on it and say " That was where I didn't get a lot from?

R There was a lesson that I didn't draw from particularly well. She was just so critical and I'd done this lesson, a badminton lesson, and I'd thought it was fantastic. I'd talked well and the kids understood, they'd done what I wanted, by the end of the lesson they'd achieved what I thought ... She just went " you didn't achieve anything there". There was a point where I thought " God, I'm not even getting this, I'm not understanding this as I think they are. Then I got to a point where I had to sum it up myself I'm actually so regretful about that first placement because for her, she just kept putting me down, putting me down. So in the end I had to build myself back up and I'm not really that sort of person. And after the lesson, not with her there, I just burst into tears and I was just like " Oh God, she's just got to me". And their behaviour was good and they'd been really naughty in other lessons and things like that. Everything had been controlled and it was almost as if she was just digging for the sake of digging, she didn't know what else to say so she thought she'd give me some feedback and they

were sometimes the lessons where you thought " you're not helping this " 'cause she was knocking my confidence, she wasn't saying anything that I could act upon.

I So. It was just negative with no sort of... that's really bad, but not we can do this with your help. It was more sort of just, " that was appalling", " that wasn't right" there was nothing...

R And I was like " Go on! Why? " Well you obviously don't like me very much. There were things that I couldn't change.

I Any highs?

R In phase one? Erm....

I No?

R It's hard to think back, honestly. As a whole, looking back now, not a huge amount of highs really.

I Coming back into uni then, do you feel that was useful to you?

R Yes it was. There were things that were brought up that you maybe could discuss different things with different people. I think it would have been better if there was some time, I know we could have done it ourselves, but to share resources at that point. So instead of just having sessions on practicals or pedagogy, we could have just gone, right, this is a time when we are just going to share resources, something to do with athletics or something like that, everyone would bring in what they've got and we'd photocopy what we wanted and we'd do it that sort of way. I think sometimes that would be more beneficial. because once you've done.... I know, xxxxxxxxxx but obviously you've already done quite a lot before you get on the course, plus that placement. Then it was more stuff on effective teaching.....

I So what you're saying is you were desperate for subject knowledge, in a sense....

R Yes

I ....and you felt that you were getting more effective teaching that you've already had quite a lot of.

R I think most people, I can't speak for everyone, but I wasn't having a problem with classroom management I wasn't having problems with effective teaching I'm not having problems except maybe with assessment if wasn't teaching at my school maybe differentiation or whatever Those are the two biggest ones but those are the things now, but by the end of the course I am sure I will feel much more confident about, but even when I come to assess I'm always sort of looking to see if it's in line with someone else because at that point we were assessing blind so those things were good, the assessment was good and any discussion on differentiations were good, but we needed differentiation practice. So rather than... I know what differentiation was, I knew how to do it, but you need to do it in terms of a particular lesson so it might be better to take a lesson like tennis, so this is a skill, you know what I mean, how would

you break it down and how would you differentiate that skill, because the subjects you weren't so good at you struggle to learn more. You know your own sport is easy to do isn't it?

I It's particularly difficult to fit everything into the year as there never seems to be enough time, so you should share what resources you have got.

I In terms of, just going back, how was the target setting done, was it shared?

R Yes, she always set my targets and I didn't like that.

I So she set them?

R They were discussed but there were ones that she would bring up that I really didn't feel confident enough to say " I really don't feel that's, you know, can you explain why that is my biggest weakness and why am I working on that this week". So sometimes I was working towards targets that I felt were already strengths or..., do you know what I mean? I think targets need to be made individually.

I Were they linked directly to standards as well?

R The school wasn't actually so much doing this within a standard, which was probably a better way of doing it, they were trying to make me a better teacher all round, so in a way they were good. They were good but sometimes you needed the targets to be while you were doing it.

Interview 3 with PG3 (C)

Key: I – Interviewer

R – Respondent

Xxxxx – cannot make out words
..... - pause or change in conversation mid sentence

I Going onto Phase 2 then, different experience?

R Much.

I What was the difference?

R First they were welcoming, I've never been talked to like I was below them really. They were happy to take stuff that I knew properly, they were happy to ask me for advice like I'd be happy to ask them so it was a brilliant relationship with the staff, it was quite an old department in terms of age and they would be interested in what we had done and use our recent experiences in the department, they were quite happy for us to write there planning for them and...

I Did they not have any schemes of work, medium term plans for you to work from?

R They were doing them as well but they were quite happy for us to give them an indication of what the learning outcomes should be..... you know, that sort of thing. Even now, the learning objectives ..... they straight away confidence boost but also the fact that I wanted to be there and you know I was welcomed as a member of staff which was great. The relaxation of the mentoring team much more...

I Were they regular?

R You couldn't call them regular. They were if you needed them. If I felt the need to ask for one they would definitely give one but they weren't that set each week as in on the timetable.

I So you would have paperwork missing from you file then?

R No, I mean, I've often filled in sheets on my own after a mentor meeting.

I I know the school so I know what you mean, I just needed you to say it really.

R It's the biggest thing though. The biggest problem is the inconsistency over schools. The amount I've not got away with because I'm the sort of person that would do it myself and I'm a very conscientious sort of person but the amount that you could get away with at our school in comparison to other schools stinks really. It's the whole process, some people have got away with like....XX a colleague is off pregnant okay, she's pregnant but she gets to wipe away two weeks worth of placement, obviously not

within her control but to me it doesn't make sense. She now has completed the standards two weeks before anyone else and it's not....

I No, I don't know how that's happening actually.

R She's just been passed off and there's others that are having to do extra days at their schools just to pass the standards. It just seems a bit unfair.

I Is that the EAL standards?

R Yes and others....

I It might just be that she was fortunate in that she was in the right place at the right time and that she had those opportunities...

R Other people have had similar opportunities and schools.

I So your second school was relaxed, informal, welcoming but there wasn't the same rigour in following the processes that we needed to do, were targets set by the mentor or did you set those?

R We didn't set targets in terms of an all-round approach, we set them in terms of the standards, so I would aim to meet a standard rather than to achieve a management objective. In a way it was easier to fill off when I achieved them but you actually did that yourself rather than having to .....

I Isn't that a bit hit and miss?

R Yes, yes. It was a little bit to start with... say for the first five or six weeks don't even look at differentiation or you know that sort of guidance but to be honest it was obvious.

I How did those targets get shared?

R We had a board next to the office door and we wrote them off so every week they were up. Also everyone knew I had a clipboard that I kept for myself that had my standards on it and when they were writing my scripts they would then turn to the page to reference what I was achieving, things like that.

I That was good. So there were some positive features....

R Yes, yes, yes.

I Okay, in terms of across the whole year really, obviously the requirement is that you should cover all six areas of activity at Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4, have you managed to achieve that?

R Not in school, no. In my two places I haven't taught any swimming but I am a swimming teacher teaching I do that in the evenings so to me that wasn't a big issue. It wasn't a big issue for me. In Phase 1 I did some OAA

I In Stage 3?

R Both actually

I Oh right.

R But mostly because they were taken off site then I'd go with them, I didn't lead the session, so I haven't led..... I think I've led about 3 or 4 lessons worth of OAA.

I So it wouldn't be the classed as substantial teaching?

R No, no

I And it wouldn't be the same with you being off site, more of an ad hoc basis.....

R Yes, I guess I didn't really get the opportunity to plan those sessions

I But gymnastics, games etc.

R Gymnastics, games yes. Athletics, loads and.....,

I Dance?

R Dance, we did at the start of this Phase 2A but only for about five weeks.

I Key Stage 3 and 4?

R Just key Stage 3.

I You haven't done Key stage 4?

R I haven't done Key stage 4 dance..

I There are a few little gaps there.

R Yes there are some gaps yes.

I And what about post 16 experience?

R First place I did a little

I What about other examination work for example GCSE?

R No, no...

I Unless they did it in sixth form .....

R No no In Phase 1, nothing, in Phase 2 I've done AS and A levels.

I And you have taught that on your own?

R Yes.

I Over a period of 5 or 6 weeks or more.

R Yes.

I Yes. Okay that's good, at least you've you've got some good experience there..

R Yes.

I What about that English as an additional language standard?.

R In parts, it has in parts. I haven't to be honest, been directly involved. In phase one I did, I did have a child who, it wasn't a quite an additional language, I mean it was her second language, it wasn't fluent, so it wasn't really what I'd call an additional language.

I Yes.

R It's one of those ones that I'm going to focus on when I start at the Grange next, so it will easily come up within my first year. No doubt about it, with 38% white it's going to come up next year. I don't feel that I haven't achieved it I just haven't had the opportunity to…

I To feel fully confident?

R Yes, but it's going to come up and I'm going to have to face it but I'm not worried about facing it.

I So you've done the bare minimum, it's just the standard that you don't feel confident in.

R Yes

I What about ICT?

R ICT is quite good.

I Yes.

R Yes, In the first place we used 'dart fish', we did a bit of ……., we did some training on that actually, the head of department trained his department, and we were there when he trained them and thought it might help us. Then we used it for a bit of GCSE moderation work that was interesting and was quite easy to do mixed in with the assessment. Obviously in my own lessons, I've used ICT in terms of showing them how there sequences look etc.

I Power Point?

R Power Point, yes, for GCSE and A Level, so yes, we use quite a mixture.

I Moving onto the standards How do you evidence all of the standards that you've done or that you've started.

R I'm very organised and when we started I set up a system so that I could easily gather the evidence

I Yes.

R On the weight of evidence so far, in general, I'd like to meet some of the standards for example going to parents' evenings, I could just write down the names, dates, parents' evening and any other information. The normal ways of doing things.

I What areas do you feel at the moment have been the most supportive, and moving on to something a little different by now I am assuming you will have certainly looked at if not completed your career entry profile.

R Aaah xxxxx.

I Have you not completed it yet?

R No, that's to do at the weekend.

I Well you have to complete it this weekend so one of the questions you will be asked is where you think your relative strengths are and where you think you have areas for development.

R Yes.

I And development can be in two phases actually, if you consider the question. It can be development in terms of ..... because you haven't had enough experience, it could be development because you actually enjoy

R Right

I and it's a positive thing

R Yes

I you can take on further.

R In terms of positive, I'd want to teach on the A level in the Psychology. Hopefully when I'm at my school hopefully I'll be taking Psychology throughout, so I'd definitely want to get on a course for that for A level, because really I am going on my own experience of A level being taught it myself rather than knowing how to teach it. .

I Yes.

R I think that would be really helpful. In terms of weakness, I would say some OAA experience

I Yes

R I'm assuming that my school do quite a lot of OAA, so on the basis of this. I was asked quite a lot in my interview about OAA and made it quite clear I would need some help in that area

I Yes

R And so I OAA working in the outdoor, not that basically there's any risk assessment, I think that's alright, just how to deliver diplomatically, when I'm not qualified like canoeing and you know, that sort of thing. I feel a bit like, oh we can't, but we just, yes...., I would just go with them.

I But even things like managing 30 kids for a problem solving.

R Yes.

I How you do that, organisation etc. I mean, obviously you've mentioned Allison from your school for next year, when were you appointed?

R Early on it was after Christmas, February.... we hadn't really started Phase 2. I'd been in phase two for about 4 weeks I think.

I Congratulations.....Has the course as an overall thing, has the course met your expectations?.....

R ..... some of it. I hoped that there might be a little bit more on subject knowledge as is, a little bit more of being able to share ideas and I know that comes from experience. PXX would laugh if she heard that, because I have actually known her since year 1 , but I just feel that to teach a really good lesson, I've got to have some form of depth in it and I just feel like in some lessons if I have not had 6 or 8 weeks of it, I haven't got that yet.

I Yes.

R So maybe that's just, maybe for the first couple of years we just have to gather that and then you hope you can develop further from there, we just have to get on with and grab information when and where we can.

I It always comes over time, I know what you're saying.

R I know.

R In terms of support from Uni, I mean my link tutor XX was excellent, I have then had XX who's been amazing as well, he is absolutely amazing. The feedback that he gives us, if I can imagine that every lesson, I just think God, I could be the most amazing teacher in the world, because it just... you come out and you are like, Oh God I never

even thought of it, you know, that sort of thing, and that's what you need, that, when you come out of a lesson and the teacher has given you it, do you know what I mean, you are just doing what I can do, I'm not xxxxxxxx or bigheaded but they don't sort of bring out anything that you couldn't think of if you looked for the lesson.

I I think the problem is and its no disrespect again, to those tutors, but their experience is confined to that environment, whereas perhaps if someone outside the School, such as the Uni they flit in and out of so many different schools that we pick up so many things to understand the way it's done that we've actually got more ideas, yes, and that's why its valuable.

I Yes.

R Right, XX doesn't necessarily tell you a way to do it, and he never says that something is completely wrong unless you have had a major nightmare, but he, he just makes you think and sort of starting questions

I Yes

R Yes, and like the other day I taught a lesson and I didn't actually seek how , but the "what" and the "where" and the "why"'s and there just didn't see the how, then I hadn't really sort of, you know when you don't about it, and I always think that now when I teach a lesson, God was I actually cut in half to do it?

I Yes, it's quite crucial really. So, overall are there any standards... and I'm not going to go back to that, any standards you haven't met. I know you have mentioned a few weak ones earlier..

R Yes, hand on heart, hand on heart I would say yes, these are still not quite there.

I Yes. And some of the subject knowledge areas.

R Yes.

I Because you haven't covered all activity areas.

R Well, I have not taught any Rugby. If I don't teach rugby next year, I'm going to be stuck.

I Except, it's actually described as games.

R Yes.

I .....a bit more of the dance and the OAA in particular.

R Dance I think would be fine.

I Yes.

R Oh yes,

I I would be hesitant perhaps at key stage four.

R Oh It would not be key stage four.

I So you know that's what I'm saying, so there are some gaps there.

I Any other standards you are trying to achieve

R Other standards,.....

I Around assessments perhaps?

R No, I feel quite comfortable in that, that's quite a lot of reports I've done myself and been given briefs and just said you're assessing them and then they've looked over them at the end. They've not done their own moderating, they just let me do it and then its free, and so I've felt a lot of ownership while I've been there so I felt quite a responsible. It's a responsible role, but still a lot of people go out and be like "what's it for"? You know, like I was with XX on placement and he hadn't actually written any reports, he just looked over what others had written on the day, his mentor didn't actually say write your own report.

I No, No.

R So, just the format of doing it and using the correct language and things like that, xxxxx

I If you went back, I don't know to when you first decided to do the course, but if you went back to that point again, knowing what you know now, would you still want to do a PGCE?

R To come to XXXX and do it?

I Yes to do a PGCE

R No it's what I always wanted to do, all round, looking back now it's just the inconsistency that worries me so much, that I can go through and do a year's course and I can love it, and some one else can go through and have a hell of a time.

I So it's just the inconsistency and you in particular have had a difficult three months on that first placement

R Other than the inconsistency, the fact that it's a teaching course it's amazing to have achieved as I have, I can't believe that Graham's told me I have got a one. I have come out with what I wanted. I have generally enjoyed the year but I did find it hard to pick myself up after the first placement if I hadn't been on placement with someone, I don't know it I would have coped as well.

I OK. Thank you very much for your time and all the best in the future

Appendix 4

TDA Funding Allocations 08/09

	08/09	09/10	10/11
All Allocations	32087	31930	31509
Secondary Allocations	17239	17082	16660
Secondary *EBITT allocations	2938	2694	2470
% allocation to EBITT - all	14	13.5	13
% allocation to EBITT - Secondary	17	16	16.5

*EBITT – employment based initial teacher training