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ACRONYMS AND TERMINOLOGY USED IN THIS REPORT

ALS       Access to Languages via Satellite
CALL      Computer-assisted language learning
ESL       English as a second language
FLES      Foreign languages in the elementary school
IL        International Language
ILE       International Languages Education
ILS       International Languages Series (of the Ministry of Education), materials for
teachers of international languages, which include:
  ▪ Hai    An Introduction to Japanese
  ▪ Si     An Introduction to Spanish
  ▪ Oui    An Introduction to French, and
  ▪ Ja     An Introduction to German.
LAD       Language acquisition device
L2        Second language
LOTE      Languages other than English
MOE       Ministry of Education
MLPS      Modern languages at primary school
PALS      Primary Access to Languages via Satellite
PD        Professional development
RLA       Regional Language Adviser
SD        Standard deviation
SLA       Second language acquisition
SLL       Second Language Learning
SLLPP     Second Language Learning Proposals Pool
UG        Universal grammar
Year 7/8  This refers to the seventh and eight year within the schooling system. It equates
with the traditional levels of Form 1 and Form 2.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Research Brief

Learning languages other than English is of educational concern in Aotearoa-New Zealand\(^1\). The brief for the present investigation, given by the Ministry of Education (MOE) in August 2002, consisted of three broad tasks:

a. identification of the effective delivery characteristics of International Languages Education (ILE) from relevant national and international literature

b. analysis of the effectiveness of MOE ILE resources and support with regard to:
   (i) meeting the learning needs of students, particularly with reference to the development of four skills areas:
       - communication and information
       - social and co-operative
       - self-management, and
       - work and study
   (ii) supporting teachers in delivering quality International Languages (IL) programmes
   (iii) supporting diversity of provision
   (iv) supporting school and cluster planning (including the management and evaluation of programmes), and

c. recommendations on how MOE resources and support can be strengthened.

This report, then, provides a qualitative and quantitative assessment of ILE in Aotearoa-New Zealand, and provides suggestions for the advancement of such education especially for Years 7 and 8.

---

\(^1\) The significance for providing ILE is highlighted by the fact that just 25 per cent of New Zealand’s 450,000 primary and secondary students learn a language other than English – a statistic that places New Zealand well behind Britain and Australia. Cited in ‘Students tongue-tied in learning foreign languages, say advocates’, New Zealand Herald, 16 July 2002.
1.2 Organisation of the Report

To address the questions and tasks mentioned above, and working within quite stringent time constraints, three main empirical methods of data gathering were used:

a. a literature search
b. interviews with Regional Language Advisers (RLAs), and
c. questionnaires of IL teachers and Principals of schools of Years 7 and 8 offering ILs.

The general structure of the report is as follows. This first introductory section conceptualises the research brief in relation to MOE initiatives of the past decade or so to increase access to pre-secondary IL study.

Section 2 summarises relevant literature for purposes of later comparison with findings and conclusions.

Section 3 describes the study’s methodology.

Section 4 reports on interviews with the four current RLAs.

Section 5 discusses findings related to surveys of relevant IL teachers and Principals.

Section 6 consists of a summary discussion of results and draws some general conclusions.

Section 7 ends the report with some recommendations based on the study’s findings and comparable research elsewhere.

Each section ends with a summary which relates prior discussion to the general research brief.

1.3 Contextualising the Present Study

1.3.1 A Brief Note on Terminology

For readers outside the New Zealand context, the reference to the term ‘second language’, which is the preferred usage in relevant MOE documentation, relates to languages used in the school system which are not the usual language of instruction.

Strictly speaking, ‘second language’ learning or teaching has traditionally been contrasted with the term ‘foreign language’. The distinction has been based on context, with the latter term referring to the learning of an additional language in an essentially mono-cultural environment, such as a school classroom or a self-instructional situation and the former to the learning of the additional language in its authentic, monolingual milieu or in a bi- or multi-cultural setting (Gass, 1994: 3715). Thus, second language learning in the formal educational setting has been thought to involve at least some authentic, communicative use of the language outside the classroom – although the distinction tends to become somewhat blurred once the student achieves more than a basic level of proficiency, when ‘second language’ has tended to be more commonly used.
 Whereas the term ‘foreign language’, along with ‘modern languages’, sits comfortably with European and American language educators and legislators, in New Zealand and Australian discussions it apparently seems to imply negative, ethnocentric connotations, so that the original distinction now appears to have been lost.

In recent years, too, the term ‘community language’ (Clyne, 1992) has gained currency, particularly in the context of education in multicultural communities. This denotes languages used by sizeable immigrant groups in naturalistic or real-life social settings.

1.3.2 Recent Initiatives to Encourage Second Language Learning

The past decade or so in New Zealand has seen a number of governmental initiatives to broaden pre-secondary school access to the learning of community and especially ILs. These include:

- the Telecom Distance Learning Project (1996-97)
- the International Language Series (ILS) (1998-)
- the Advisory Support for IL Teachers Project (1998-), and
- the Second Language Learning Proposals Pool (SLLPP) (1999-).

These resources and services have been provided by the MOE in the form of targeted allocations of funds to further ILE. This reflects the favourable ethos towards the learning of languages as expressed in The New Zealand Curriculum Framework (1993) and in the 1994 MOE vision statement for New Zealand education generally, Education for the Twenty-first Century. The latter report, for example, identified an increase in the number of second-language learners as the third of five targets and proposed (somewhat optimistically as it has turned out) a considerable increase in expenditure to extend the then current proportion of students in Years 7-10 learning “a language other than the language of instruction” (MOE, 1994: 44) from 34 per cent to 100 per cent by the year 2001, with 50 per cent of these studying the second language for at least two years (Watts, 1997: 192).

1.3.3 Brief Review of the Five Initiatives

1.3.3.1 The Second Language Learning (SLL) Project (1995-98)

The Project’s aim was to foster the extension of the teaching of languages downwards into Years 7 and 8, using a variety of methods. These included 29 self-evaluating school clusters which implemented a variety of delivery techniques, such as: the deployment of secondary school language teachers in primary and intermediate schools as visiting specialists; distance technology; and the use of part-time tutors, including native speakers. Languages offered were (in order of cluster numbers): Japanese, German, French, Māori, Spanish, Modern Standard Chinese, Samoan, and English as a Second Language (ESL).

An evaluation study of the Project found that the participants (IL class teachers, Principals, students and parents) were “overwhelmingly positive” in their appraisals of its success, with some three-quarters of the schools involved asserting that languages should...
be an “essential part of the primary school curriculum” (Peddie et al., 1999: 5f). Notwithstanding such enthusiasm, the study located a number of problems associated with the Project’s implementation, including:

- too limited learning time
- ineffective teaching (associated with the fact that ‘tutors’ were untrained and that opportunities for professional development [PD] were few and far between)
- relatively infrequent use of technology (associated in turn with a lack of technical support and of teacher familiarity with the relevant equipment)
- ambiguities about school language programmes’ goals and hence about their general organisation
- uncertainty about teacher supply and continuity, and
- poor articulation of programmes between primary and local secondary schools.

In particular, apart from having demonstrated strong receptivity for the downwards extension of IL education, the evaluation study’s conclusions highlighted the quality of the language teacher and teaching, irrespective of delivery mode, as a key issue. This, in turn, was viewed as a function of “excellent, extensive pre- and in-service professional development” (Peddie et al., 1999: 7). Additionally, the related question of the value of the learning produced by programmes subscribing to a ‘taster’, or relatively superficial language learning ‘experience’ or familiarisation approach was raised.

1.3.3.2 Interactive Satellite Television Project

This Project – also known as the The Telecom Distance Learning Project (1996-97) – addressed the area of learning technology, identified in the SLL Project as generally problematical, and also aimed at extending language learning opportunities downwards into Years 7 and 8. This time three languages (Māori, Japanese and Spanish) were targeted via live, half-hour, weekly Sky TV satellite broadcasts from the New Zealand Correspondence School to some 1500 students in a variety of school types (primary, intermediate, secondary and area). Also included in the Project was provision for some PD by the broadcaster-specialist, with some two-thirds of participating classroom teachers not having previously taught (or possibly studied) the relevant language.

Results of an evaluation study (Harris, 1997) proved also in this case to be somewhat ambivalent, in the sense that whilst there was strong, general recognition of the advantages of the course delivery mode (83% of teachers), there was at the same time almost an equally strong indication of its serious shortcomings (77%), such as:

- low interaction with the broadcast teacher
- poor-quality support materials
- technical problems with broadcast quality, and
- low teacher awareness of course details and low language teaching ability (Harris, 1997: 65, xiiif).

As the evaluation study pointed out, however, part of this ambivalence seems attributable to the relative experience and expertise of teachers, with primary and intermediate school teachers being most likely to endorse the course’s value, and area school and secondary teachers being less and least likely in their endorsement, respectively. This may also have
been further compounded by a locality factor, in that 37 per cent of teachers in urban locations had previously taught the relevant language, compared with 24 per cent of rural teachers (Harris, 1997: 63, 61).

1.3.3.3 The International Language Series (ILS) (1998-)

This initiative, in response to shortcomings noted in relation to the aforementioned Interactive Satellite Television Project Project, concerned the production by the MOE of an integrated package of materials designed to offer a resource for the flexible introduction in Years 7 and 8 of any of four languages: Spanish (1998), Japanese (1998), French (2000), and German (2000). The courses in Spanish and Japanese were developed in the first phase of the project, followed more recently by the French and German materials. A course in Modern Standard Chinese is currently under development (forthcoming 2004).

In particular, the design of the courses (which include printed, audio, video and website materials) “acknowledges the fact that for many teachers this may be the first association they have had with an international language”, so that the teacher’s role is construed as that of “classroom facilitator” and “co-learner” (MOE, 2002a).

1.3.3.4 The Advisory Support for IL Teachers Project (1998-)

Arising from shortcomings associated with the first two projects mentioned above, this initiative aimed to facilitate the delivery of PD programmes to assist primary and secondary schools in the implementation of IL programmes. It began in 1998 with the appointment of five Regional Language Advisers and the organisation around the country of a series of workshops for key secondary and primary language teaching staff, under the title of ‘Leading Languages’. These workshops dealt with a variety of topics under the broad headings of ‘management strategies and systems’ and ‘professional leadership’ (Spence, 1999).

In addition, Advisors were responsible in the primary school sector for:

- facilitating and developing the use of the initial ILS materials for Spanish and Japanese
- enhancing teachers’ own use and knowledge of the target language and methodology generally, and
- establishing regional supportive networks (or ‘clusters’).

A case study investigation (Spence, 1999) generally evaluated the outcomes of the Project as positive in terms of empowering teachers in charge of IL programmes to improve their subjects’ image and organisation.

In 1999 the Project was modified using four Regional Language Advisers (RLAs) (located in Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch and Hamilton) to focus on five objectives, namely:

a. to provide PD support for schools/teachers using the ILS materials
b. to provide support for other schools in receipt of funding as part of the SLLPP
c. to improve co-operation across the primary-secondary sectors
d. to promote general professional leadership amongst Principals and language teachers, and
e. to facilitate the use of information and communication technologies to expand teaching and learning options for languages.

For the following three years (2000-2002), these objectives remained the focus of the four RLAs.

An evaluation study of the Project (Association of Colleges of Education in New Zealand [ACENZ], 2002) was based on:

- survey data from some 600 schools visited by the Advisers
- Advisors’ assessments
- case studies by Advisers, and
- four independent case studies.

This study concluded broadly that ILS materials had had a major positive impact on the teaching of languages and that this had been further enhanced through the establishment of the funding pool for the development of second language learning. Referring specifically to the RLAs, it was noted that they had “added great value” to these investments through:

- fostering and linking the cluster and Advisers’ systems
- enhancing teacher skills, and
- assisting schools in the integration of language learning with their general curriculum planning (ACENZ, 2002: 33).

1.3.3.5 The Second Language Learning Proposals Pool (SLLPP) (1999-)

This contestable fund provides schools or clusters with students in any year from 7 to 10 with financial support for second language learning. The aims of the Pool are to:

- develop teacher capabilities (in either second language proficiency or methodology)
- promote the value of IL education in both the school and the community generally, and
- improve student access to and persistence with IL learning, programme resources and PD at cluster level (MOE, 2002b).

The generally positive outcomes of this initiative have been alluded to immediately above, in connection with the 2002 evaluation study of the Advisory Support for IL Teachers Project (see Section 1.3.3.4).

1.4 Summary

A major MOE aim in ILE has been its extension to the pre-secondary level, particularly Years 7 and 8. This is evident from five major, overlapping initiatives commencing in the period 1995-2000. The present study is concerned with an evaluation of the last three of these.

- The impetus for such targeted funding initiatives by government stemmed from major curriculum and vision documents in 1993 and 1994 which sought by 2001, respectively, to achieve basic second language (L2) proficiency for 50 per cent, and two years’ L2 learning experience for 100 per cent, of students by Year 10. A more realistic estimate of actual numbers in 2001, however, was around 25 per cent.
Evaluations of five MOE initiatives discussed above were generally very positive in terms of programmes, delivery modes, empowerment of teachers in leadership or managerial IL roles and funding incentives. At the same time, however, significant disquiet was expressed concerning:

a. teacher effectiveness  
b. lack of adequate learning time  
c. insufficient PD opportunities or time  
d. programme goal and organisation ambiguity  
e. poor continuity between the primary and secondary school sectors, and  
f. the value of so-called ‘taster’ courses.

The Telecom Distance Learning Project also threw up interesting relationships between school sector and locality, with secondary specialist language teachers being less positive about IL programmes in Years 7 and 8 than their generalist primary school colleagues. Urban teachers were also found to be generally more experienced in teaching IL than their rural counterparts. Further, it is important to note that the evaluations of the various initiatives were based on self-reports.
2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Given the aim of the present evaluative study, namely identification of effective delivery characteristics of ILE and three recent MOE funding strategies for broadening access to pre-secondary IL learning, materials production, teacher support and special projects funding, the following review of relevant literature focuses on the following:

- when in pre-secondary education should ILE be focused, or is there an optimal starting age for L2 learning in instructional settings?
- what is the actual rationale for language learning and what type of L2 programme should be taught?
- is it more important to provide for ‘depth’ or ‘breadth’ of IL learning?
- what systemic support is effective for ILE?
- how can continuity of IL education, which is integral to all the above questions, be best promoted?
- how can quality of IL teaching be enhanced?

2.1 Optimal Starting Age

Since the main thrust of the initiatives under discussion has been to encourage more second language learning in Years 7 and 8, or at ages 12 and 13 years (viewed in New Zealand as ‘intermediate’ between primary and secondary school education), the justification for this approach – as opposed to, say, targeting older, secondary students, or much younger primary school students – is worthy of some discussion.

Historically, the 1960s and the 1980s in both North America and Europe were periods marked by great enthusiasm for an ‘earlier-the-better’ start to second language learning (Trim, 1999). The 1960s were associated with the so-called ‘FLES (foreign languages in the elementary school) Movement’ (Purves, 1971)⁴. It was influenced by a number of factors, including: a post-war appreciation of the need for improved international communication; dissatisfaction with the results of formal secondary school instruction; and the fashionable, neurophysiological ‘critical period hypothesis’ (Lenneberg, 1967) – which, in retrospect, seems to have been conflated with Chomsky’s theory of an innate LAD (language acquisition device), later called UG (universal grammar) (Chomsky, 1965).

Lenneberg’s theory postulated that early, pre-pubertal language learning was superior to later language learning ability. This was founded on the vague notion that there existed greater brain plasticity during the first decade or so of life, after which the brain’s language functions became lateralised in the left hemisphere. Chomsky’s theory, which initially was an adversarial response to behaviourist theories of language learning (e.g. Skinner, 1957), was essentially based on two observations. First, virtually all children learn language at a time in their cognitive development when they experience difficulty in grasping other kinds of knowledge which appear to be far less complex than language. And secondly, children are capable of occasional creative, original usage from an early age. These led to the conclusion that the brain must contain “an innate language faculty” – the voracious ‘LAD/UG’ construct.

This in turn was described as “a specialised module… pre-programmed to process language… (containing) general principles underlying all languages”, the child’s task being unconsciously to “discover how the language of his or her environment made use of those principles” (Spada & Lightbown, 2002: 116).

Without discussing the theoretical difficulties associated with both hypotheses5, it is clear that the high expectations associated with FLES were not borne out by experience, at least in ordinary instructional settings. Two evaluative studies in the UK (HM Inspectorate, 1969; Burstall et al., 1974) estimated that early start initiatives did not confer any long-term benefits, with the latter study noting that “by the age of 14 pupils starting (French) at 8 showed no significant superiority to those starting at 11 except in respect of accent” (Trim, 1999: 676). With similar conclusions reached in a comparative study of French in eight countries (Carroll, 1975) and more tentatively in a Swedish study (Holmstrand, 1982), FLES declined in the US, while in Europe attention shifted to achieving specifiable communicative proficiency for all students aged between 11 and 16 years (based on a notional-functional needs analysis approach) (van Ek, 1976).

Early start enthusiasm surged again in the late 1980s and continues to the present, this time not only in Europe with the ‘modern languages at primary school’ (MLPS) movement (Edelenbos & Johnstone, 1996: 1) and North America (e.g. with the federally funded National Standards Project), but also in New Zealand and Australia (Lo Bianco, 1987; MOE, 1993: 10; Quinn & McNamara, 1988). The impetus this time, however, has perhaps been less related to language learning theory than to “acts of political will” (Kubanek-German, 1996: 3) associated with increasing European integration (with the primary education sector being highlighted, for example, in the Council of Europe Project: “Languages for European Citizenship”) (1991-5; Trim, 1999: 676) and elsewhere with socio-political considerations, such as globalisation, the communications revolution, ‘national capabilities’ and ‘competitive edge’ (Waite, 1992: 21), and multiculturalism (Clyne, 1992; Department of Education, Victoria, 1997).

Thus, in the context of an increasingly integrating multilingual Europe, belief in early additional language(s) learning is typically cast in terms of expanding intercultural and communicative competence, as in “early contact with the foreign language is… the first step in a lifelong undertaking” (Kubanek-German, 1996: 3) and “(the) earlier a second language is acquired, the more likely it becomes that another foreign language or more languages can be learned in the period of public education” (Radnai, 1996: 26). Aside from expressions of opinion, however, some European research studies have also supported the early start notion. A review of recent longitudinal studies in Hungary, for example, referred to evidence for strong persistence with second language study as an effect of an early start and noted that “the ability to perform certain tasks, such as carrying out instructions or reading words, develops quite early” and, after reaching a certain level did “not improve with more exposure or with an increase in age” (Radnai, 1996: 22). Some of the research implied too that “until reading and writing are introduced, the frequency of language sessions should be kept as high as possible” (Radnai, 1996: 25).

A similar review of Italian research pointed to two significant findings. The first underscored, even with socio-economically disadvantaged children, “the validity of early academic L2 experiences [compared with]… studies showing the possible assets of natural bilingualism”.

Reference was made to metalinguistic awareness, which was defined in terms of three Piagetian capabilities (the ability to separate form and meaning, segmentation ability, and the ability to distinguish between objective and subjective code usage) (Pinto et al., 1996: 40ff). The second finding concluded that “the process of learning a second language in childhood might well resemble the process of acquiring a first language at home” (Pinto et al., 1996: 40). This was based on a validation study of a psycholinguistic model for second language teaching at an early age (on which, in turn the 1985 introduction of compulsory study of one second language in State elementary schools was based).

Research in The Netherlands concerning primary school foreign language instruction has not specifically focused on optimal starting age but has looked at the age period under consideration here. In various national assessment and evaluation studies of the teaching and learning of English as a second language in Dutch primary education (Edelenbos & Suhre, 1996: 54ff), mainly at Years 7 and 8, it has been reported that results were generally satisfactory, especially with regard to listening comprehension. Student performance indicators yielded no significant differences between grammar-based and communicative teaching approaches, leading to “a shift in emphasis from designing courses to improving teachers’ use of these courses” (Edelenbos & Suhre, 1996: 56).

Research in Scotland, on the other hand, has concentrated specifically on a comparison of the ‘linguistic attainments’ of student cohorts beginning second language learning in the primary school (Years 6 and/or 7) or in secondary school (Johnstone, 1994; Johnstone et al., 1996). It was found that those cohorts starting in primary school, at the end of the first year of secondary school consistently outperformed cohorts at the end of the second year of secondary school. In other words, in comparing two cohort groups that had both studied the second language for two consecutive years, those commencing in primary school revealed a higher level of attainment than those beginning at secondary school, especially in aspects such as “pronunciation and intonation, structural complexity, ability to sustain patterns of initiation and response, use of discourse techniques, communication strategies and readiness to answer in class” (Low et al., 1993). This overall difference was found to apply both between and within schools. Larger proportions of the first cohort of primary-beginners persisted with second language study after four years of secondary education. On the basis of the study and its further evaluation it was recommended that a foreign language be taught in all Scottish primary schools, and that specialist secondary language teachers used in the initial projects be replaced by the normal primary classroom teachers. However, this necessitated a national programme “to equip the primary class teachers with the necessary foreign-language knowledge and skills” (Johnstone et al., 1996: 73).

In the New Zealand and Australian context, the extension of languages education to the primary school has occurred less by specific justification than by implication and extrapolation from broad, official, educational policy documents. In Australia, for example, the so-called Hobart Declaration (1989), in which the Education Ministers of the six States agreed to acknowledge LOTE (languages other than English) as one of eight ‘key learning areas’ of the school curriculum, began the process of normalising the study of languages for all students across both the primary and secondary sectors. Likewise the ‘white paper’ entitled The Australian Language and Literacy Policy (1991), which endorsed a substantial expansion and improvement of LOTE teaching for reasons of internal ethnic integration and external international relations (particularly with economically important Asian trading partners), was interpreted as a justification for increasing pre-secondary language learning in terms of both
social equity and a beneficial prolongation of exposure to second language learning (Ingram, 1994). In 1993 for example, the Australian State of Victoria established a Ministerial Advisory Council on Languages Other Than English with the ambitious policy goal of providing “high-quality language programs for all students in Years 1-10 and to 25 per cent of students in Years 11-12 by 2000” (Ministry of Education, Victoria, 1997: 9). In the same vein, a later report by the Council for Australian Governments entitled Asian Languages and Australia’s Economic Future (1994), accepted as simply axiomatic that Year 3 (age eight years) was “the most important starting age for the study of a second language” (1994: 123).

In New Zealand, too, policy makers have accepted prima facie the case for an early start to second language learning. As the 1993 New Zealand Curriculum Framework states, “all students benefit from learning another language from the earliest practicable age” (MOE, 1993: 10). Such acceptance, however, has tended to be acknowledged in theory rather than in practice, with pre-secondary learning of languages being confined largely to Years 7 and 8, and with languages other than English being assigned to a composite ‘essential learning area’ (one of seven) called ‘Language and Languages’, which includes English, te reo Māori and LOTE (MOE, 1993: 10), therefore making ILs non-compulsory.

Returning to a more global viewpoint, however, the general issue of optimal starting age is far from resolved. Increasingly it has been overtaken by an ‘additive plurilingual’ perspective which goes beyond second language learning to the notion of language learning as a lifelong pursuit in which different languages may be involved at different times at different levels and for different purposes. So, instead of focusing on starting age, the question rather becomes: “given that languages will be present throughout education, how do we best ensure that conditions for success are fully met?” (Trim, 1999: 676). This approach is evident, for example, in the recent UK ‘Nuffield Languages Inquiry’ which concludes emphatically: “…we must give our children a better start with languages and equip them to go on learning them through life” (Nuffield Languages Inquiry, 2000: 5) and gels, too, with increasing consensus about the effect of age on second language learning. One review characterises the issue cogently as:

In summary, despite the popular perceptions people entertain about the relationship between youth and foreign language learning, the effects of age are difficult to attest and appear to be limited to relatively few aspects of linguistic performance. All things being equal, foreign language learning is most efficient and effective after childhood. Given the diversity of languages around the globe and the pervasiveness of bilingualism and foreign language learning in virtually every nation, it is not surprising to conclude that humans are effective language learners at any age (Scovel, 1999: 284).

This general conclusion tends to support the current practice in New Zealand of not confining IL learning to any critical age period.

---

6 Although some commentators, in light of high drop-out rates at mid- and senior-secondary levels, have cast doubt on the value of the national strategy of encouraging young language learners (Lo Bianco, 2000; Rockwell, 1995: 17).

7 Years 7 and 8 are referred to in Australia as lower secondary school level.
2.2 Rationales for Second Language Learning

Whereas the previous section discussed the age direction in which the expansion of languages education in New Zealand is moving, this section deals with the rationale behind such expansion.

Arguments for second language education can be broadly categorised as either *extrinsic* or *intrinsic*. Examples of the former category would be, say, second language knowledge as a national economic or diplomatic resource in dealings with other countries. The latter category would typically be exemplified by, for example, the general educational or intellectual benefits of the study of ‘symbolics’ (both languages and mathematics would fit this knowledge type) (Phoenix, 1964), involving metalinguistic and cross-cultural awareness as well as cognitive flexibility (Gombert, 1990; Letts, 1999: 211). In this latter respect, Bakhtin’s (1986) concepts of ‘dialogic imaginations’ and ‘boundary activity’ such as cross-cultural encounters have also recently been identified as unique benefits of L2 learning (Kramsch, 1993; Lo Bianco et al., 1999). These terms specifically refer to “the ability to venture into new ways of reading the world, negotiating new discursive and representational spaces and places…. (and) destabilising that powerful cultural normative sense of ‘how things are’” and also “the ‘boundaries’ of individual cultural experience… as the place where the most ‘intense and productive’ life of culture takes place” (Carr, 2002: 9).

Sometimes this general distinction is used to differentiate between ILs (extrinsic justification) and community languages (intrinsic). It has also been fundamental in studies of student motivation for second language learning, with preference being given to the terms ‘instrumental’ (for extrinsic) and ‘integrative’ (for intrinsic), respectively (Holt et al., 2001: 10). In this respect, Australia, for example, during the past 15 years or so and under the impetus of the 1987 *National Policy on Languages*, appears to have experienced something of a polarisation in its broad extrinsic/instrumental rationale for second language learning generally, with European languages progressively being more associated with “linguistic pluralism, multiculturalism and social equity” and Asian languages with “economic and vocational imperatives” (Burns, 2000: 66; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997: 171-9) – checking this with researchers. The major influence on, or symptom of, this trend was undoubtedly the 1994 report entitled *Asian Languages and Australia’s Economic Future*, which was endorsed by the Council of Australian Governments and made the basis for the so-called NALSAS (National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools) strategy whereby funding was made available for the promotion and extension of the study of Asian languages and cultures across the primary and secondary school sectors (Lo Bianco, 2002). An announcement by the Commonwealth Government that all NALSAS funding would cease in 2002, based presumably on certain reservations about the economic significance of the Asian region, created pessimistic shockwaves within the language teaching profession concerning the future fate of languages in general. One commentator has distinguished between a ‘national languages policy’ and the need for a ‘national policy on language study’, whereby the latter could “shift the focus from needing extra money to study languages” to “accepting language study for its worth alone” (Dabelstein, 2002: 7).

In the New Zealand context, the labels ‘socially oriented’ and ‘economically oriented’ have been used for the same sort of general, ‘intrinsic/extrinsic’ distinction (Waite, 1992: 5). The former term is taken as referring to aspects like linguistic/cultural maintenance/identity, human rights such as access to social services and educational goals relating to knowledge,
skills, achievement, lifelong learning and so forth. The latter term involves national goals relating to diplomatic and economic relations with the rest of the world, tourism and individual goals such as access to international labour markets (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997: 180-4).

The strategic plan entitled *Education for the Twenty-first Century* (1994) described second language learning’s benefits under the broad categories (without elaboration) of: intellectual, social, cultural enrichment and economic skills (for international trade and tourism). Likewise, more recently, various curricula for specific languages have enumerated similar, simple lists of benefits, including categories such as: diplomacy, law, education, business and trade, size of economy (e.g. ‘third largest in the world’), science and technology, tourism, culture and cultural exchanges (MOE, 1995; 1998; 2001a; 2001b). At the same time, some of the curricular documents point out that Languages conform to the broad rationale for the whole *New Zealand Curriculum Framework*, namely:

- “to help students to develop and clarify their own values and beliefs”,
- “to respect, and be sensitive to, the rights of people who may hold values and attitudes that differ from their own” (MOE, 1998: 13).

Additionally, specific curricula refer to the need:

- “to provide our young people with opportunities for learning more foreign languages” (MOE, 1995: 5), and
- “to the importance of making languages “more accessible to a larger number of learners and to raise awareness of the importance of the language” (MOE, 1998: 7).

The clearest, most extensive, official rationale statement to date, however, is contained in *Learning Languages. A Guide for New Zealand Schools* (MOE, 2002c). Drawing on both New Zealand and overseas statements and research, it attempts to both list and explain language learning’s key benefits. These are taken to include:

- intellectual challenge
- exploration of different social and cultural environments
- increased understanding of one’s own culture and tolerance for others
- improvement of first language skills
- facilitation of the learning of additional languages
- promotion of intercultural communication
- improvement of student self-esteem
- enhancement of cognitive and social development (including complex problem solving)
- deepening of students’ understanding of human experience
- facilitation of students’ participation in other cultures and societies
- increasing students’ employability (especially in tourism and international business), and
- the general enrichment of New Zealand by enabling it to engage better internationally in commerce, industry and diplomacy (2002c: 8-13).

However, a panoply approach within curriculum statements, rather than a distinguishing between goals as ends or means, runs the risk of being all things to all people, and thereby blurring what is particular and specific about the learning area in question. It also raises, but
evades, the question of whether potential benefits of one kind or another might not be equally or more attainable using other means. And finally, the scope of the benefits claimed represents a disincentive to explore the accuracy of such claims. A good example, in this respect, is the long-term, consistent finding that despite the general educational and social credence given to the importance of languages for international business, organisations in both the public and private domains still tend to neither use effectively nor acknowledge the linguistic skills of the workforce at their disposal (see, e.g. Enderwick & Gray, 1992; Levett & Adams, 1987; Watts & Trlin, 2000).

Awareness of such dangers is evident in an approach which, instead of conceptualising languages study broadly in terms of ‘intrinsic/extrinsic’ or ‘internal/external’ dichotomies, seeks to distinguish between major/minor or prime/incidental learning benefits. One example of this phenomenon is a definition of the aim of LOTE programmes in schools in the Australian State of Victoria:

*The primary aim of all LOTE programs whatever their teaching strategy or student target, is the development of student competence and confidence in the use of the language being taught for communicative purposes. However there are many other potential benefits to be derived from language learning. These include benefits such as broadening cultural horizons, developing intercultural skills and understandings, and raising students’ awareness of the limiting effects of prejudice and stereotyping (Department of Education, Victoria, 1997: 14).*

Another example is the role ascribed to second language teaching in Italian primary and pre-primary schools:

*The basic reasons for official educators promoting L2 learning from a very early age were essentially of a ‘formative’ nature, not of a utilitarian or instrumental motivation: namely, the main concern was with developing the child’s cognitive abilities and cultural understanding. Furthermore, there was an earnest search on the part of educational psychologists, psycholinguists, and language educationalists for the most appropriate methods of L2 teaching for young children. Unanimous agreement pointed to the use of playful procedures capable of involving the child’s total personality, mind and body, according to the principle of ‘total activity’ (Pinto et al., 1996: 27).*

Finally, it is also possible to approach the rationale question from a different direction, namely in a *post hoc* fashion. From specific New Zealand research into student motivation, for example, two studies relating to choice of, or persistence with, Japanese found variously at secondary school level that the main reasons given by students were:

- its usefulness for one’s career, for communicating with Japanese and for travel (Aschoff, 1992), and
- enjoyment, usefulness for communicating with Japanese in the authentic culture and for one’s prospects and/or career (Holt et al., 2001).
In addition a more general study identified the usefulness of Japanese for communicating and for learning about Japanese culture and lifestyle as the chief motivation for learning Japanese (Japan Foundation, 2000).

A further study found that the main factors cited by university students for choosing to study Japanese were:
- global awareness
- understanding the Japanese people, and
- intrinsic interest (Nuibe et al., 1995).

In summary, this section highlights the importance of specifying both clear rationales for IL learning, and realistic achievement objectives.

### 2.3 Depth Versus Breadth

Whereas the previous section indicated good reasons to both differentiate and prioritise the aims of second language learning (which might vary at different age levels) and to take into account learners’ motivations, the following section is concerned with tensions between breadth of provision and depth of learning, particularly at pre-secondary levels.

The essential difference between these two broad approaches is well captured in the French language distinction between sensibilisation (or ‘awareness’) and apprentissage (or ‘language learning proper’) (Giovanazzi, 1992). A clear example of the former approach would be the ubiquitous US FLEX (foreign language exploratory courses) programme – not to be confused with the FLES acronym, mentioned above in Section 2.1. Such exploratory foreign language study is essentially aimed at inculcating in students metalinguistic attributes, such as language and cross-cultural awareness (Kubanek-German, 1996: 5; Pinto et al., 1996: 40-6).

An example of the other approach would be a course firmly focused on language learning, such as the system introduced into Scottish primary schools or the official aim cited from a Victorian Department of Education document (cited above in Section 2.2), both of which accentuate developmentally appropriate, cumulative progress in predefined and carefully monitored second language competencies/attainments of one sort or another (see, e.g. Board of Studies, 2000; Johnstone et al., 1996: 64-6). In some systems – for example, in some US middle schools – it is even possible to encounter both approaches in operation with different classes at the same level (McClendon, 2000).

A primary pattern of language awareness-type course provision in New Zealand and Australia in both the primary and early secondary school sectors, is the so-called ‘taster’ course. This involves either optional or compulsory short courses of a number of second languages which are studied sequentially. Thus a student in, say, Year 7 could be required to study French in Term 1 (c. 12 weeks), Japanese in Term 2, German in Term 3, and Indonesian in Term 4. Or such study could be extended to two terms per language, spread over two years, or restricted to two languages over two years, and so forth.

---

8 With the exception of the State of Victoria where it is “strongly discouraged” (Ministerial Advisory Council on LOTE, 1994: 27).
Apart from such an approach’s implicit or explicit main language learning aim or justification, two advantages that are frequently mentioned include:

a. the opportunity for students to explore preferences and make an informed choice of language studied at secondary school, and
b. the lack of a need for specialist language teaching staff or for an extensive, language-specific resource collection.

The former justification tends to be used for early secondary, the latter for pre-secondary programmes.

On the other hand, critics of the approach frequently point to its inefficiency in terms of specific learning outcomes. The point is made that second language acquisition is a long, cumulative, involved process and needs a considerable, continuous investment in time, both in and out of class, if it is to develop to a level of high proficiency (CCPD & Simpson Norris International, 1999: 139; Holt, 1989). As one American commentator noted tersely but aptly in this regard:

*When students study English for 13 years and still cannot master all the nuances of the language, why do we assume that they can master a foreign language in two years?* (McClelon, 2000: 19).

Another criticism has been that taster courses can trivialise second language study where, due often to a lack of teacher expertise:

- the pace of learning is too slow for significant numbers of students, or
- too much emphasis and time are invested in English-medium cultural activities rather than language learning (as, for example, in the teaching of origami in Japanese courses), or
- instruction is too constrained and repetitive.

Therefore, it is not surprising that students and parents sometimes gain the false impression they have reached significant levels of proficiency or have nothing more to learn. In this respect, one research study in the Australian context noted that parents generally have inflated, unrealistic expectations of the proficiency levels attainable in school programmes (Fraser, 1994), while a further study found that parents tended to view languages study as an enrichment activity rather than a serious commitment (Langdon, 1986).

A further logical problem is, of course, whether taster courses provide enough language learning to actually achieve their professed metalinguistic and cross-cultural aims.

This discussion highlights two important considerations. First, IL learning needs to be sustained for a reasonable period of time if the effects are not to wash out and the challenge and scope of the learning are to be appreciated. Secondly, IL learning from the earliest stage needs to be linked to clear, specific achievement objectives appropriate to the developmental needs of students.
2.4 Support of Teaching

In Section 1.3 above, five major MOE initiatives to support the teaching of ILs in New Zealand have been discussed; the efficacy of the three most recent of these is directly addressed in the discussion of the present study’s empirical findings (see Sections 4 and 5). This section looks broadly at support of teaching for ILE.

Professional support initiatives of the two biggest Australian education systems, Victoria and New South Wales, are of interest for comparative purposes. In both States, initiatives can be broadly divided into three types:

a. teacher training
b. teacher support materials, and
c. the granting of funds for various specific purposes.

Recent examples of support in these areas include, in Victoria firstly:

- 1993 – Retraining Programme offered through tertiary providers of a mixture of some 20 funded, part-time attendance and distance courses in both languages and/or methodology, with teacher release time
- 1994 – LOTE Resource Grants ($500 per language programme) and LOTE Project Grants ($1,000-$10,000 for in-school development activities for curriculum development, including action research, and in-country study tours)
- 1994 – PALS (Primary Access to Languages via Satellite) Project (TV and support materials kit for the teaching of Indonesian, French, German and Italian in Years 3-6 by untrained classroom staff plus organisation of ‘partner’ schools)
- 1994 – Interactive TV Equipment Grant used to fund all government schools for the installation of satellite receiver equipment
- 1994 – LOTE Information Kit (information concerning the establishment and maintenance of LOTE programmes in government primary and secondary schools for school administrators, school councils and teachers)
- 1996 – LOTE Training Programme (an offer through tertiary providers of funded courses to enable teachers to gain basic LOTE teaching qualification of three years of tertiary-level language training plus a methodology course, with teacher release time)
- 2000 – LOTE TSM (Teacher Support Materials) (CD or online* sample units of work/learning sequences plus learning activities and assessment ideas appropriate for particular levels of the revised Curriculum and Standards Framework LOTE. Materials are currently available for French, Indonesian and Chinese; other languages are currently under development) *www.eduweb.vic.gov.au/curriculumatwork
- 2000 – Linking LOTE to the Early Years (a booklet discussing the integration of LOTE with the Early Years Literacy Program plus eight case studies and a PD module)
- 2002 – LOTElinx and Careerslinx Projects (online resource consisting of 21 LOTE-specific websites and two professional association sites containing: information on career opportunities, study options and pathways for language students; methodology and resources for teachers; links to online media, community organisations and tertiary institutions; interactive student pages, email clubs and online quizzes; cultural information; and PD) *www.lotelinx.vic.edu.au, and

- 2002 – Languages Online (CD with curriculum materials for various languages at various levels; refinement of 1994 PALS Project by making the materials more interactive and targeted, self-paced and self-accessed in orientation; under development, with Italian and Indonesian materials produced so far).

In the case of the New South Wales Department of Education and Training, examples of similar provisions include:

- 1994 – ALS (Access to Languages via Satellite) Programme (a complementary project with the Victoria PALS Project, with New South Wales producing and broadcasting the materials for Chinese and Japanese, while having access to the materials broadcast from Victoria, and vice versa). (See evaluation study by Curriculum Directorate, New South Wales Department of School Education, 1995)

- 1995 – SLSOC (Student Language Study in Overseas Countries) (programme to provide students in government central and high schools with the opportunity to undertake 10-15 days of intensive language study overseas, generally at a ‘sister’ school). (See evaluation report via www.curriculumsupport.nsw.edu.au/languages/)

- 1999 – LCI (Languages Continuity Initiative) (funding programme aimed at maximising opportunities for the provision of continuous and sequenced languages learning from Years 5 to 8; funding conditional upon students having a guaranteed pathway for continuous study of a language from primary to secondary school; later provision of CD and printed materials in various languages). (See evaluation study by Chesterton et al., 2002)

- 1999 – Specific Languages (a website – see via website immediately above – for eight languages with diverse information relating to teaching and learning resources, relevant news and events, PD opportunities, discussion forums, links, and so forth)

- 2002 – Languages Online Readers (presents short stories in six languages at different levels with vocabulary lists and associated interactive activities – accessible through aforementioned website), and

- 2002 – LTTI (Language Teacher Training Initiative) (provides funding, in relation to six languages, for time release and tuition costs to support government primary or secondary teachers in undertaking graduate language study).

From the above list of recent teaching support programmes it is evident that more than half of them involve technology, and since 1999, computer technology. The 1994 projects (PALS and ALS) referred to immediately above specifically sought to expand significantly opportunities for ILE, especially in more remote locations, through a team learning and teaching approach. Such an approach recast the role of the primary teacher from 'transmitter
of knowledge’ to facilitator and co-learner who is not the key teacher of the course (which is the role of the TV teacher-presenter) but rather:

... a role model to students in the use of technology for learning, and, more importantly, in motivating the students to succeed, and in monitoring their activity and interaction (Curriculum Directorate, 1995: 36).

An evaluation study of the ALS Programme affirmed generally the value of the distance mode programme, a finding similar to that of Harris (1997) in his evaluation of the New Zealand Interactive Satellite Television Project (see earlier). Also similar to Harris’s evaluation study was the fact that data on student learning outcomes were somewhat vague, with 64 per cent of teachers in the sample stating that “students are learning to use the language taught… to a great or to some extent”, implying that over a third of teachers involved thought that not even ‘some’ learning to use the language had occurred (Curriculum Directorate, 1995: 12).

Recommendations by the evaluators mainly concerned the need for a slower pace, greater interactivity with the TV-teacher and more PD support for classroom facilitators (1995: 5-6), a general finding replicated in similar research in the US (Barker & Garrett, 1987; Oxford & Park-Oh, 1993).

Whilst the production and use of computer-assisted language learning (CALL) software have increased exponentially over the past eight years or so, research into the general efficacy of CALL for ILE has been relatively sparse, apart from evaluation of individual software materials. Particular problems noted in this regard have been:

- the absence of a theoretical framework (Hemard, 1999)
- confusion about the teacher’s role and about the nature of autonomous learning (Blin, 1999; Richmond, 1999)
- concentration on one particular language skill (such as listening) (Tchaicha, 1999), and
- the lack of longitudinal data (Cameron, 1999).

Garrett (1998) has pointed out that there is very little information on what students do with CALL materials and how they affect learning. Egbert and Hanson-Smith (1999: 9) refer to the need to focus on whether the “system of teacher, student and technology is working for learners” rather than concentrating on the general question of the efficacy of technology by comparing CALL and non-CALL environments.

Thus, CALL research to date may be said to lack coherence, which is probably in part due to the fact that second language acquisition (SLA) research, that “rather amorphous field of study with elastic boundaries” (Ellis, 1994: 3), with its numerous theories, models and perspectives, has developed from non-CALL contexts.

In addition to governmental support, within-school support was addressed in a recent New Zealand study, using focus group discussions based on questionnaire findings. It sought to identify critical factors which supported or facilitated the teaching of Japanese in Years 7 and 8 in 72 New Zealand schools (Lilly, 2001). Major factors identified by teachers were:
- Principals’ commitment
- teacher time for upskilling and preparation
- user-friendly resources and equipment
- staff morale or enthusiasm
- positive student attitude, and
- status of the IL programme with colleagues.

These judgements were also generally shared by Principals, with the exception of ‘student attitude’. Principals were also less concerned with teacher ‘enthusiasm’ than with teacher confidence, quality and replaceability/continuity.

An interesting difference between teacher and Principal responses concerned possible means of achieving solutions for, or facilitating, the factors. Thus, whereas teachers envisaged Principals being proactive in enthusing School Boards, staff and the community about IL programmes, Principals mainly thought that a policy document outlining the value of IL study would best express ‘Principals’ commitment’. With regard to other factors too, Principals tended to make suggestions that involved documentation, and copying of existing resources or cross-class use of teaching expertise. Teachers, on the other hand, tended to suggest more practical ‘hands-on’ measures, such as opportunities for language acquisition studies, whole- and individual-staff development, additional resources, integrating IL with the school strategic plan, making funds available, and recognising staff input or effort.

Certainly the general ‘support/commitment’ factor appears from other research, too, to be integral to successful IL programmes at both primary and secondary levels. Key aspects identified by researchers from a variety of contexts include:

- support from Principals and other key executive staff (Education Department of Western Australia, 1998)
- involvement with, and by, community organisations (Acquafredda, 1993; Clyne, 1997; Clyne et al., 1995), and
- whole-school recognition of the languages programme and parental demand (Barratt-Pugh & Rohl, 2001).

Chesterton et al. (2002) developed this general dimension further in relation to significant factors involved in promoting continuity in language study across school sectors. Referring to it globally as ‘program embedment’, they defined it specifically in terms of:

- executive support and involvement
- inclusion of IL in the school’s management plan
- community support
- integration of IL with other curriculum areas
- normal reporting of student achievement
- staff participation in training/development, and
- high status of the languages programme within the school community.

Other studies have also emphasised the importance of in-service language teacher education (Djite’, 1994; Reston & McClendon, 2000: 24), and of adequate resourcing, including:
a. materials (Miller, 1996)
b. funding (Nugent, 2000: 34)
c. appropriate class sizes and classroom environment (Lorenz & Rice, 2000: 68; Nugent, 2000: 36), and
d. provision of adequate teaching or classroom time, of the order of 2.5 hours per week (Clyne et al., 1995; Curtain & Dahlberg, 2000).

In summary, earlier initiatives in Australia emphasised the use of generalist teachers and distance learning technology to deliver IL teaching. This parallels current teaching support strategies in New Zealand. Increasingly, however, this ongoing approach has been over-taken by two main additional support strategies: provisions for teacher IL training; and computer-assisted learning materials. With regard to the latter, these materials have sought to exemplify specific language curriculum objectives for teacher use, and a wealth of self-access materials for student use.

Despite the recent proliferation of IL learning software, there is a need for research into the relative learning effectiveness of different packages. Recent New Zealand research has strongly emphasised the importance of leadership in schools that advocates for IL learning and teaching (Lilly, 2001). As noted earlier, this has been replicated in Australian studies.

2.5 Continuity

The issue of continuity of second language learning across the interface between the primary and secondary school levels is clearly important since L2 learning to any advanced degree of proficiency is a long, cumulative process and to interrupt it or fail to build on prior learning is wasteful of valuable economic resources. Nevertheless, it has been a longstanding and vexed issue in most countries pursuing the pre-secondary expansion of language learning. In New Zealand, for example, the project evaluation report entitled Starting Younger identified ‘articulation’ between sectors as a key issue and its complexity involved: difficulties and rewards of inter-sector co-operation, the different school types involved in the Year 7-10 sector generally, lack of coherence and planning with regard to both curriculum and organisation, choice of language(s) taught, provision for additional second language study, resources and the development and sustaining of advanced classes (Peddie et al., 1999: 9).

In the US, the issue of ‘articulation and sequencing’ has also been frequently identified as problematical. As one commentator noted succinctly:

All too often, students who begin a foreign language in elementary or middle school have to interrupt it. Study may resume in high school, where they usually start at the beginning level again. After the usual one or two years of foreign language in high school they are frequently assigned to first-year foreign language classes at colleges and universities.

Unfortunately, many school districts do not have an articulated sequence of language instruction that takes learners from the beginning stages in elementary, middle, or Junior-high to more accomplished levels in high school. Even most colleges and universities express entrance or graduation requirements in classroom seat time (e.g. two years) rather than in measurable knowledge or competencies. Lack of common goals and expected outcomes results in a tremendous waste of educational resources.
does not really matter when students start foreign language study, but they must have lengthy, well-articulated sequences of instruction available to them once they start. (Schulz, 1999: 33).

Such concern has led numerous States to develop various continuity models, strategies and procedures, such as The Collaborative Articulation and Assessment Project in Ohio, the Partnership Across Languages Project in Arizona, and Minnesota’s Articulation and Assessment Project. These approaches tend to indicate that continuity in the study of IL is facilitated by targeting resourcing and facilitating communication and problem identification and problem solving at the local level.

In Europe, too, Dutch education authorities, for example, following the introduction of English as an obligatory subject to primary schools in 1986, instigated two major empirical investigations into continuity between 1990 and 1993 (Edelenbos, 1993; Inspectorate of Education, 1991). The former study concluded that the problem was largely one of subject matter associated with three main factors:

a. courses in use in primary schools were not compatible with those used in secondary schools
b. secondary teachers failed to gather information about or test new students’ prior knowledge or skills, and
c. the primary school curricula and students’ attainments exhibited great variability.

The latter study described the problem in terms of secondary teachers’ general failure to take account of primary students’ prior knowledge and the absence of accurate descriptions of national core objectives for English at the primary level (Edelenbos & Johnstone, 1996: 53f).

A recent evaluation study of the Australian Languages Continuity Initiative (referred to in Section 2.4) (Chesterton et al., 2002), focused specifically on involved staff’s perceptions of the effectiveness and impact of the initiative. A sample of Principals (n = 125), school executive staff (n = 85) and language teachers (n = 103) was asked to list the key points impinging on any plans they may have had for implementing ‘languages pathways’ between school sectors. The six key pathway aspects thus identified are shown below in Table 2.1.
Table 2.1  
**Key Continuity Issues in ALC Responses (% Responses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Management Team</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-operation, communication, support between schools</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on course scope, sequence, pedagogy, student achievement levels</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of teaching</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-school support and commitment</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of staff and language</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate, continuous funding and resources</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Chesterton et al. (2002: 28).

With regard to the ultimate desired outcome of such a strategy, the study was not able to gauge accurately the effect of the initiative on student participation in languages learning in Years 9 and 10. Nevertheless, there was a general impression of increasing participation at the Australian primary-secondary interface, namely Years 6-7 (Chesterton et al., 2002: 31). Final recommendations were generally positive in that continuation of the initiative on a longer basis was supported – although the perceptions cited in Table 2.1 were scarcely unanimous. Four other suggestions worthy of note were:

a. the need for significant staff development for primary teachers in both competency in the second language and language teaching methodology  
b. distribution of ‘best practice’ examples and case studies  
c. production and distribution of curriculum resource materials, and  
d. the reporting of second language achievement in primary school students’ reports (Chesterton et al., 2002: 55f).

Factors that have been thought to be critical elsewhere by researchers interested in the issue of continuity/articulation include:

- the need to offer the ‘same’ languages in linked primary and secondary schools (Reddan, 1998; Reston & McClendon, 2000)  
- the need for an initial, clear definition of the rationale, purpose and outcomes of a languages programme through a sequence of levels (Education Department of Western Australia, 1998). For example, some parents view languages as an enrichment activity rather than a serious commitment, while others harbour unrealistic expectations about attainable proficiency levels (cf. Fraser, 1994 and Langdon, 1986)  
- the need for regular evaluation and monitoring of language programmes (Djite, 1994)  
- concentration on one language in the primary school (Gibbons, 1994)  
- the need for teachers to be able to deal with multilevel learning and mixed-ability groups in a single class (Clyne et al., 1992: 70f; Fernandez et al., 1993: 29), and
the significant effects that students’ language learning experiences in the primary school have on their decisions to continue second language learning in the secondary school (Education Department of Western Australia, 1998: 158).

2.6 Quality of Delivery

2.6.1 Teacher Knowledge

Effective teachers know the subject matter that they teach (Gibbs, 2003). These teachers hold sufficient and relevant subject matter knowledge or content knowledge and this informs their teaching. Similarly, effective teachers know how to teach this content or subject knowledge. That is, they demonstrate that they have appropriate pedagogical content knowledge or teaching knowledge to create learning opportunities for students to grasp subject matter knowledge or content knowledge.

The American National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1994) is clear about its position in relation to such knowledge. In the five core propositions underpinning its teaching standards, the second proposition is that ‘Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students’ (p. 6). Furthermore, the Board claims that:

*Teachers have a rich understanding of the subject (subjects) they teach and appreciate how knowledge in their subject is created, organised, linked to other disciplines, and applied to real world settings. While faithfully representing the collective wisdom of our culture and upholding the value of disciplinary knowledge, they also develop the critical and analytical capacities of their students. Accomplished teachers command specialised knowledge of how to convey and reveal subject matter to students. They are aware of the preconception and background knowledge that students typically bring to each subject and strategies and instructional materials that can be of assistance. They understand where difficulties are likely to arise and modify their practice accordingly. Their instructional repertoire allows them to create multiple paths to the subjects they teach, and they are adept at teaching students to pose and solve their own problems (p. 6).*

Various models of teacher knowledge have been proposed in the literature. Elbaz (1983) identified five categories of teacher knowledge within her construct of ‘practical knowledge’. These categories include:

a. knowledge of self
b. knowledge of the milieu of teaching
c. knowledge of subject matter
d. knowledge of curriculum development, and
e. knowledge of instruction.

Leinhardt and Smith (1985) suggest that teacher knowledge comprises subject knowledge and knowledge about lesson structure. Shulman and colleagues (Shulman, 1986, 1987; Wilson, Shulman, & Richert, 1987) identify seven categories of teacher knowledge, namely knowledge of pedagogy, curriculum, learners and learning, contexts of schooling, educational philosophies, goals and objectives and, importantly, content knowledge.
It is obvious that teachers of ILs need subject content knowledge. Grossman et al. (1989), for example, point out that:

*Teachers*’ subject matter knowledge has assumed for too long the character of the Wizard of Oz. Alternatively, celebrated as all powerful or exposed as mere humbug, subject matter has provoked more controversy than study...
The preliminary results of the growing body of research exploring the relationship between pedagogy and subject matter knowledge indicate that there are several dimensions of subject matter knowledge that are particularly important to the task of teaching. As teacher educators we must consider how best to introduce this knowledge into programmes of teacher education (pp. 23-24).

The argument that teachers cannot retrieve subject matter knowledge as and when required is clearly true on one level – quite simply, you cannot know all that needs to be known. What is clear is that as teachers teach, their content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge are developed by their practice (McNamara, 1991). However, teachers’ conceptual understanding influences student learning. Furthermore, Grossman et al. (1989) report that lack of subject matter knowledge can lead to such strategies as teachers avoiding teaching material they do not know well, heavy reliance on the textbook, and the use of direct styles of instruction. Ball (1990), for instance, found that teachers whose conceptual understanding of mathematics was deficient were often rule-bound in their teaching, going little beyond the procedural knowledge required to solve problems.

Reliance on the textbook can cause problems in itself because the teacher may not be able to detect factual and conceptual inaccuracy, and needs to rely upon the authority of the textbook author. This textbook author may also present subject matter knowledge premised upon inappropriate syntactical knowledge. For example, a textbook on history may present historical knowledge as essentially unchallenged facts. The syntactical knowledge portrayed in this case is one of history as fact-learning. On the other hand, a textbook that uses documentary evidence as the basis of inquiry into the past is based on syntactic knowledge that emphasises interpretation. Similar analogies might be proposed for language learning and language teaching.

In summary, generic pedagogical knowledge will inevitably assist teachers to teach subjects where perhaps their content knowledge is not so strong. However, generic pedagogical knowledge is insufficient on its own because of the unique nature of subjects. Hence, teachers also require pedagogical content knowledge relating to specific curricula. Furthermore, because of the close relationship between pedagogical content knowledge and subject matter knowledge it is also argued that all teachers, regardless of the grade level they teach, require a certain level of conceptual, procedural and structural subject matter knowledge.

### 2.6.2 Teacher Beliefs, Attributions and Effectiveness

Rose and Medway’s (1981) causal chain for conceptualising teacher effectiveness proposes that teachers’ beliefs influence teaching behaviour, which in turn helps explain students’ behaviour and performance. Ashton (1985) makes the observation that:

...until [the emergence of] teacher efficacy research, the search for teacher attitudes and beliefs related to teaching effectiveness had been relatively unproductive (p. 142).
According to social learning theory (Bandura, 1977, 1982, 1986, 1989), how teachers behave can often be better predicted by beliefs about their own capabilities – that is, self-efficacy – than by what they are actually capable of accomplishing. These beliefs help determine what teachers do with the knowledge and skills they have (Pajores & Miller, 1984). Thus, what teachers of ILE believe about their own capability to make a difference will influence how they come to use the knowledge and skills at their disposal.

Teacher self-efficacy has been defined as ‘the extent to which teachers believe they can affect school learning’ (Dembo & Gibson, 1985: 173). Teacher self-efficacy, then, relates to the self-belief that a teacher can willingly exercise control over their events and circumstances (including their own thinking, actions, emotions, and physiological arousal) in order to make a difference in student learning. In this sense, self-efficacy plays a central role in motivation. Teachers will be motivated to act when their beliefs of self-efficacy are not exceeded by their perceptions of the difficulty of the task. Thus, the self-beliefs of teachers of ILE about the difficulty of teaching ILs, and their self-belief in their capability of overcoming that difficulty, are significant in determining their likely effectiveness.

What is also important is that highly self-efficacious teachers are likely to exert more effort and to persist longer when confronting difficulties than are their low-self-efficacious colleagues (Brown & Inoyne, 1978; Schunk, 1981). Further, high self-efficacious teachers are more likely to demonstrate innovativeness by taking risks with new ideas (Berman et al. 1977; Wax & Dutton, 1991) and by demonstrating a willingness to implement new teaching approaches (Stein & Wang, 1988). Thus, it follows that if teachers of ILE have high self-efficacy, they are likely to demonstrate more persistence and resilience even when the odds are stacked against them, and are more likely to be innovative by taking risks with new ideas in the curriculum and different teaching approaches.

In explaining students’ successes or failures, research traditionally suggests that teachers tend to attribute low achievement to characteristics of the children such as patterns of low effort, low motivation and poor work habits (Cooper & Burger, 1980; Cooper & Good, 1983; Tollefson, Melvin & Thippavajjala, 1990). Hall et al. (1992), however, found that high-self-efficacy teachers emphasised the role of the teacher and the programme in explaining students’ successes, and de-emphasised home influences. Thus, the evaluation of ILE resources and support needs to be cognisant of the attributions made by the teacher and the school towards failure and success of students. High-self-efficacy teachers, who are likely to be more effective teachers, are likely to attribute student success to student, programme and instruction factors rather than to home circumstances. Further, they are likely to be in schools that generally demonstrate similar attributions.

Motivated students, and students of ability, impact on teachers’ self-efficacy. Teachers who are successful in helping low-ability students to learn, for example, demonstrate a combination of high self-efficacy and high but realistic expectations for children’s achievement (Good & Brophy, 1987). And when teachers perceive themselves and their students as capable, they are likely to encourage parents’ involvement in children’s learning (Hoover-Dempsey, Bassler & Brissie, 1987). Thus, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the delivery of ILE ideally needs to consider the impact of parent and community involvement, which in turn relates to teachers’ beliefs about their own capability, and that of their students.
The nature of students’ ability to learn and motivation towards learning ILs will influence teachers’ sense of capability to make a difference in their learning. For example, classes that involve students who have elected to study ILs may vary in terms of overall motivation and student self-efficacy compared with classes which are conscripted. Similarly, class size may also be a variable that influences perceptions of effectiveness. Guskey (1987), for example, talks of the impact of scope of influence wherein teachers’ self-efficacy varies according to whether they are working with individuals, small groups or classes. Thus, the evaluation of the effectiveness of ILE needs to account for the group size variable, and the nature of grouping (such as elective versus conscripted).

Virtually all of the relevant research consulted identified teaching or the teacher as the key variable in the quality of delivery of pre-secondary second language education. A general review of foreign language education in the US, for example, defined high-quality instruction as essentially a teacher function of providing “comprehensible input and opportunities for interaction” (Schulz, 1999: 32) which, in turn, is dependent on four things:

- “teachers must be highly fluent in the language and be able to use it confidently and with reasonable accuracy to fulfil everyday communicative needs”
- “teachers must motivate learners to use their language skills and to slowly hone them to a high level of accuracy”
- “small classes” (which are “more supportive of communicative learning than large ones”)
- “continuing... professional development”, which is “particularly crucial for elementary teachers, most of whom have no special training or certification to teach languages at that level” (Schulz, 1999: 32f).

2.6.3 Teacher second language proficiency

Teacher proficiency is also identified as an important ‘condition’ in a review of international literature on fundamental principles of second language learning (Oxford, 1997). Another review of second language teaching in primary schools in five European countries described “the proficiency of teachers in the foreign language” as “a crucial factor” in effective teaching along with organisation of the curriculum, grouping procedures, classroom management and adequate time for learning (Edelenbos & Johnstone, 1996: 80).

Research emanating from Australia has perhaps been the most adamant on the importance of the classroom teacher’s dual abilities in language knowledge/skills and in the management of actual learning. Thus, an investigation into ways of improving proficiency in Asian languages at the higher levels concluded that “the teacher is... a critical factor influencing potential for proficiency” (CCPD, 1999: 140). Teacher skill was also identified as critical in relation to the success of bilingual programmes in Western Australia (Barratt-Pugh & Rohl, 2001). Further, in a study of factors influencing the uptake of four different languages in both primary and secondary schools it was noted that: “the case studies included highlight the critical nature of teacher persona in program success and sustainability” (Education Department of Western Australia, 1998: 160). Another study of effective language teacher characteristics identified “language fluency” and “speaking competency to model content” as essential (Naserdeen, 2001: 22). Likewise, Clyne et al., in a study of language teaching in primary schools, observed succinctly that: “one variable dominates all others in mediating the success of the program. That is, the teacher” (1995: 178).
One researcher has sought to specify how and why teacher second language proficiency is vital via the concept of ‘engaged time’, defined as “time when learners are actively exposed to the target language and engaged in activities based on its use”, so that:

> Success in language teaching largely depends on the teacher’s ability to maximise the amount of ‘engaged time’... Engaged time assumes that teachers and learners are using the target language purposefully and meaningfully and therefore requires proficient teachers who see this use as appropriate (Crawford, 2002: 14).

Whilst supportive of the seminal significance of teacher second language proficiency, Crawford, along with other researchers, has also been critical of the use of itinerant language teaching specialists (who might service, for example, a cluster of primary schools) on pragmatic grounds. Reasons cited for the strategy not working include:

- stress caused between both colleague teachers at the host school and students and the ‘visiting’ teacher due to a lack of a sense of belonging
- the consequent tendency for interactions to be relatively superficial
- the inevitable perception of the language programme as an unnecessary, unintegrated ‘extra’ and a subsequent loss of intensification of classes (Crawford, 2002: 12; Miller, 1996), and
- teacher ‘burn-out’ from “working against the odds to establish a convincing LOTE culture in multiple sites” (Carr, 2002: 8).

The notion, too, that CALL or ‘telematics’ generally can make up for or replace teacher second language proficiency has also been widely criticised. Whilst acknowledging the vast potential of technology in its various media for enhancing second language teaching and learning, it has been pointed out that it cannot compensate for a proficient teacher: “technology is a resource or a tool; it is not a language teaching process or method and will not replace the human element in language teaching” (NBEET, 1996: 37; see too Barty, 1999-2000; Garrett, 1991; McCarthy, 1995).

Indirectly, too, the use of funding for a previously mentioned ‘languages continuity initiative’ of the New South Wales Department of Education and Training in 1999 underlines, at the ‘coal-face’, so to speak, the high value placed on the teacher proficiency variable. Although no particular mode of delivery of the various language programmes was specified or required, it was found that “the bulk of this funding has been used, especially in primary schools, to employ specialist language teachers on a casual basis” (Chesterton, 2002: 31). The next most frequent use of funding by far was for “class teachers, with appropriate content and language experiences” (Chesterton, 2002: 25).

This section highlights the importance of teachers’ beliefs and attributions that they apply to explain success and failure in IL learning. The variable of teacher – especially their beliefs and attributions – is instrumental in explaining how proficient teachers will be in teaching ILs. For this reason, the success of IL programmes depends on teacher education provisions that enhance not just the knowledge of IL, but also teachers’ beliefs in their proficiency.

---

9 Telematics is referred to as the use of modern technologies to communicate information, or educate, across distances (Cunningham, 1992: 10).
2.7 Summary

- The MOE’s concentration on Years 7 and 8 in expanding access to ILE would seem to represent a reasonable compromise in relation to international research findings on optimal starting ages.

- Given the plethora of possible uses and benefits of IL learning, it would seem advisable, particularly with initial ILE programmes, to stress as ILE’s prime aim the acquisition of everyday interactional skills appropriate to the learner’s age and interests. This inevitably represents the fundamental platform on which all later, further development is based. It also enables programmes to be defined in comparable, verifiable, relevant, achievable, task-based terms and satisfies the prime motives of IL learners themselves, identified in three separate New Zealand studies (e.g. Ashoff, 1992; Holt et al., 2001; Japan Foundation, 2000), namely: using the target language authentically and communicatively.

- Given, too, that no school could possibly offer all the languages its students might like to study and that the school community can influence schools’ language offerings, which IL(s) is taught or learned would seem to be less significant than provision for the experience of second language learning generally. The numerous disadvantages that have been associated with the ‘taster’ approach, together with the prolonged, cumulative nature of acquiring proficiency in IL, suggest that the promotion of continuity of the study of one or even two languages together is the more sensible approach to programme organisation and one more likely to both raise the status of ILE with colleagues competing for time and resources and promote continuity arrangements across sectors.

- Some education systems accentuate the provision of additional materials, particularly and increasingly multimedia materials, as a major support strategy for ILE. International and local research suggests the equal or greater importance of factors such as teacher time for upskilling and preparation, including language learning studies, and the commitment of the Principal to the IL programme.

- Relevant research has consistently stressed between-schools communication and cooperation as the main factors in promoting continuity of ILE. This finding underlines disturbingly the cultural gulf dividing the two main sectors of compulsory school education and suggests that a major facilitation strategy of some kind is needed to overcome such barriers between colleagues who are engaged in essentially the same enterprise. It also points to a confusion of aims and objectives in ILE at the pre-secondary level in particular and suggests the need for more standardisation of programmes and learning outcomes accountability.

- Programme delivery quality is generally viewed as mainly attributable to one key factor: teacher proficiency in both the IL and in IL teaching methodology, including the use of technology to enhance classroom teacher instruction, but not replace it. The factor of the teacher is also closely related to important organisational aspects, such as:
  - appropriate expectations for student achievement
  - effective and motivating programming of the IL curriculum, and
  - appropriate allocations of time, space and resources for ILE within the school organisation as a whole.
3 METHODOLOGY

The present project aims to evaluate the effectiveness and utility of the MOE’s resources and support for ILE in Years 7 and 8. The effectiveness and utility of such resources and support are assumed to enhance teacher effectiveness in the teaching of ILE. In turn, students are expected to make more effective gains in learning ILs. An assumption of the researchers, then, was that the resources and support are not context-independent, nor are they person-independent. Thus, in evaluating the effectiveness and utility of resources and support for ILE, there are at least three critical influences to consider – namely, the teacher, the student and the school. In the present study, the focus was fundamentally on RLAs, teachers of ILs, and Principals of schools offering ILE. The view of the student was therefore omitted and ought, the researchers believe, to be the subject of further research (see recommendations).

3.1 Focus of Research

As indicated earlier in this report, the MOE funds resources and provides support to schools delivering ILE for Year 7 and Year 8 students. This resourcing and support includes:

- **Regional Language Advisers to support teachers of ILs**

- **The ILS materials for teachers of ILs, including**
  - Hai  An Introduction to Japanese
  - Si  An Introduction to Spanish
  - Oui  An Introduction to French
  - Ja  An Introduction to German

- **The SLLPP (Years 7-10), which assists schools with some of the set-up and/or resourcing costs of programmes that provide students with opportunities to learn other languages.**

This present project assesses how these resources and support are meeting the needs of students and IL teachers, and how they might be further strengthened in the future. Therefore the research objectives are:

- identify effective delivery characteristics of ILE from national and international literature

- analyse the effectiveness of MOE resources and support targeted to ILE in respect of:
  - meeting the learning needs of students and in particular the development of communication and information skills, social and co-operative skills, self-management skills, and work and study skills
  - supporting teachers to deliver high-quality ILE programmes
  - supporting diversity of provision, and
  - supporting school and cluster planning, management and evaluation of their programmes.
3.2 Participants

The following were invited to participate in the study:

- Regional Language Advisers
- Principals of schools (Year 7 and Year 8) participating in ILE, and
- teachers of schools (Year 7 and Year 8) participating in ILE

It is noted that the sample of participating Principals and teachers was inevitably both self-selecting and subject to a primary selection criterion, namely that participants have some involvement in teaching or the offering of ILE. Thus, participants could not be considered a random sample but rather one that was self-selected after the imposition of a selection constraint. It is important to note this, as it both focuses the responses and narrows the views to those who by their participation in offering ILE have some form of commitment or otherwise to ILE.

3.3 Background Material

The research team reviewed relevant international and national evaluations and research relating to the teaching, learning and delivery of ILE, policy documents, and milestone reports on ILE in New Zealand. In addition, one of the researchers gathered international comparative data through interviews in New South Wales and Victoria, Australia, about similar experiences in the teaching and learning of ILs.

3.4 Clarification of ILE Project with MOE

The two researchers met with MOE officials in June, 2002. The primary objectives of the meeting were to gain clarification on the purposes of the research, and to gather initial background documentation from the MOE. This was subsequently followed up with a further meeting in December when the preliminary findings were discussed in some detail, and further clarification sought.

3.5 Focus Interviews with Regional Language Advisers

The first step in data collection concerned separate interviews, lasting between 90 and 120 minutes, with each of the four RLAs in either Christchurch, Wellington, Auckland or Hamilton. Each interview was audiotaped with the consent of the participant, and subsequently transcribed. Each transcription text was emailed to the respective interviewee who was given the opportunity to clarify, modify or retract any parts of the text which were thought to be unclear or, in retrospect, inaccurate or misleading. To ensure a relatively identical framework without unduly restricting freedom of expression, the researchers used for each interview a single set of ‘starter questions’ focused on the following areas: the role of RLAs; the ILS resource; the SLLPP; quality of delivery; continuity; and general recommendations (see Appendix 4). Before the interviews, participants were:

- advised by the MOE of the purposes of the research (see Appendix 1), and
- advised by the researchers of the purpose of the research, and the general focus of questions, and the kind of data that would be informative to bring to the interview.
Specifically, participants were invited to think about:

- the effectiveness of the ILE programmes in their region
- strengths and weaknesses of the ILE programmes, materials and resources
- experiences, characteristics and needs of ILE teachers
- experiences, characteristics and needs of participating schools
- any data on involvement with ILE teachers, schools, etc, perhaps indicating who initiated contacts (school, teacher, RLA), which teachers and schools were involved, and in what ways (seminars, PD, individual support, etc), and
- any recommendations for increasing the effectiveness of ILE programmes in Years 7 and 8.

### 3.6 Questionnaires

Two similar questionnaires were developed to survey teachers of Years 7 and/or 8 IL classes and Principals of schools teaching an IL(s) at Years 7 and/or 8:

- **Questionnaire for Principals**: The first questionnaire was for Principals of schools which provided ILE for Year 7 and/or Year 8 students (see Appendix 2), and
- **Questionnaire for Teachers**: The second questionnaire was for teachers in schools which provided ILE for Year 7 and/or Year 8 students (see Appendix 3).

Item generation was informed by the demands of the information required. First, items were developed that probed school and participant information. This included gathering such information as participation (and attrition) in ILE, and range of languages delivered. Secondly, an examination of the literature revealed some strong predictors of teaching effectiveness and factors that contributed to effective learning generally and specifically to IL learning. Items were developed which captured a range of dimensions, such as those relating to learning, teaching, student achievement and student enjoyment. These included: the relative comparative status perceptions of ILs relative to each other and to other curricula; the self-efficacy and collective school efficacy of teachers; and Principals’ and IL teachers’ attributions for success and failure in students. Thirdly, specific items were generated which probed the use of, utility and effectiveness of the MOE’s ILS teaching resources, other resources and the RLAs. Fourthly, items were developed which probed current and recommended PD activities and their perceived effectiveness. Finally, items were developed which considered future directions and recommendations for consideration.

In designing each item in the questionnaires, attention was given to the specific factors being examined. These were annotated for the purposes of validity before the questionnaire was administered, and provided a reference to the subsequent analyses of data on each item and item clusters. All items were subjected to peer review and critique for their veracity and clarity. Equivocal items were eliminated, and a pilot form of each questionnaire carried out with volunteer teachers. Further refinement of these items followed this examination.

### 3.7 Selection of Schools

Schools identified by the MOE as delivering ILE to Year 7 and/or Year 8 students were invited to participate. A list of 280 schools throughout New Zealand was assembled from
information provided by RLAs concerning schools in their respective areas teaching or having recently taught an IL(s), although not necessarily at the Year 7/8 level. Some 198 schools were identified as teaching an IL at Year 7 or 8 and both the Principal and IL teacher(s) at each school were canvassed for a response to the relevant questionnaire. Responses were received from 200 teachers at 82 separate schools and from 80 Principals, representing school response rates of 41.4 and 47.6 per cent respectively. For logistical reasons, to do with end-of-year organisational pressures, no follow-up was attempted. A letter of invitation, consent to participate form, information sheet and questionnaire were mailed to all schools. Responses were returned to the researchers by means of pre-paid envelopes.

3.8 Analysis of Data

The data generated from the interviews and questionnaires produced both qualitative and quantitative information. These data were subjected to the usual validation procedures to ensure veracity. The results from the analysis are presented in Section 4 (interview and supportive information from RLAs) and Section 5 (survey data from teachers of IL in Years 7 and/or 8, and Principals from schools delivering ILE in Years 7 and/or 8.
4 RESULTS: Regional Language Advisers’ Appraisals of ILE

To begin with, separate interviews, lasting on average 100 minutes, were held with each of the four RLAs in their respective locations and in the following order: Christchurch, Wellington, Auckland and Hamilton. At each interview an audiotape recording of the discussion was made, with the consent of the interviewee, and later transcribed. At a later date each transcription text was emailed to the respective interviewee who was given the opportunity to clarify, modify or retract any parts of the text which were thought to be unclear or, in retrospect, inaccurate or misleading. To ensure a relatively identical framework without unduly restricting freedom of expression, the researchers used for each interview a single set of ‘starter questions’ focused on the following areas: the role of RLAs; the ILS resource; the SLLPPI; quality of delivery; continuity; and general recommendations. Each is discussed, in turn, below and direct, unattributed quotations are printed in italics.

4.1 The Role of the RLA

All four RLAs considered that their role was both an important and a successful factor in ILE, especially in relation to three things at the Years 7/8 level: the motivating of IL teachers; the introduction of IL programmes into new schools; and the enabling of more and more students to learn an IL.

They defined their basic role-set as consisting of five functions:

a. information provider (for general queries, funding, resources and contacts with useful agencies)
b. PD trainer (organiser/deliverer of relevant seminars or workshops for IL teachers)
c. mentor (adviser for teachers’ personal PD paths, for Principals and teachers in the facilitation of new IL programmes)
d. problem-solver (for specific problems that may arise in the setting up or running of IL programmes), and
e. relationship-builder (with schools and their personnel generally; and between schools, especially in relation to clustering and primary-secondary school continuity cooperation).

In relation to this role-set, all four RLAs referred to certain aspects of what might be called ‘role-stress’. These included:

- scope of responsibility (the size of territory and number of schools for which the RLA was responsible):
  I feel incredibly stretched.
  I have 180 plus schools to look after that I know are running a language programme.

In this regard, the researchers noted that despite the availability of computer resources RLAs generally communicated some difficulty in identifying easily all relevant schools in their respective areas

---

10 This invitation was not, however, subsequently acted on by any of the four RLAs.
role conflict (between the roles of evaluator and facilitator):
The Ministry of Education should split the roles of monitoring funding and supporting funded schools.

This reflects some ambiguity in the role of the RLA because the function of monitoring funding is not formally part of their job description according to the MOE

role diffuseness:
Specific suggestions made by RLAs revealed certain perceived weaknesses in effectiveness, probably reflecting general role-diffuseness:

(There needs to be) more hands-on mentoring in the classroom.
(We) need to get more involved with Principals and politically to get international languages on the table for discussion generally.
(As well as inputs) we now need to look at student outcomes... a huge range, and

lack of co-ordination between regions:
There needs to be some sort of central umbrella to pull us together.

4.2 The ILS Resource

All RLAs viewed the four ILS resource packages as very successful in achieving three things:

a. motivating both teachers and students to learn languages
b. providing an impetus for many schools to offer a language(s) programme for the first time, and
c. providing a further impetus for schools already offering a language to expand their range of language offerings. As one RLA noted:
   It is what gets languages started in schools... they have such a low status in New Zealand.

RLAs also generally found the following characteristics of the ILS resource particularly praiseworthy:

‘user-friendliness’:
Teachers do not need methodology training.
(It has) audiotape backup... teachers can play in their car.
(It’s) just such an amazing time-saver... lots of activities... freedom to choose... worksheets with answers.
It’s a joy to work with... it’s well put together.
It’s possible to do it from scratch... with enough enthusiasm and motivation.
Even experienced language teachers... (and) high schools use it

popularity with students:
Students like it... it’s modern... has people their own age in videos.
Kids love it... language is the high point of the week (it gives them) a fresh start, and

integration with PD activities:
The professional development programme that goes with it (is a) good complement.
PD that goes with it (is) good too...extraordinarily positive feedback.
In this respect, however, it was important for one RLA to draw the distinction between teachers who know something about the language (they teach) and teachers using ILS to learn with the kids. The positive features noted above were thought not to be applicable to the latter group if the aim of the programme is based on language learning outcomes. Further comments by the RLA indicated that this opinion was based on frequent observations of poorly taught lessons, often reinforced by poorly understood PD sessions, and programmes that proceeded at a painfully slow pace:

I’ve been in the classroom and I’ve seen this wonderfully positive teacher who is loving what she is doing and the kids are learning incorrect Japanese, appalling pronunciation and they are still at the level of Ohayo gozaimasu and konnichi wa after about 21 lessons…it would have been better if the teacher hadn’t been to an in-service course and gotten ideas…had put the video on, put the audio tape on, handed out the pieces of paper and shut-up herself completely.

In other words, the concern behind such somewhat exasperated remarks is dysfunctional teaching. In the RLA’s own words again:

Bad teaching can turn off kids to languages for life [and] kids can learn languages faster than that.

Other reservations about the application of the ILS resource, shared generally by RLAs, concerned:

- **need to update material:**
  The need to update the two ‘first-phase’ courses, Japanese and Spanish, produced in 1998, to bring them up to the standard of the two most recently developed courses (French and German in 2000)

- **limitations of taster courses:**
  The tendency to concentrate in schools on ‘taster’ courses (concentrating on the first 10 units), rather than persist with the one language to any depth:

  For all sorts of logistical reasons it is much easier... timetable, size, expertise it’s far easier for the teacher to begin a new language...than to battle with multi-level teaching of a composite Year 7 and 8 class.

  ... tendency to start language for one term.
  Teachers are more or less staying at the beginning level... after a couple of initial years they no longer attend PD meetings or seminars... and [therefore are] keeping the kids at their level.

  Very few schools have a substantial programme in a single language

- **limited teaching and learning time:**
  Time devoted to languages tends to be minimal (often only 40 minutes per week in total), and
• general low regard of Year 7 and 8 ILE by secondary teachers:
Specialist language teachers in secondary schools tend to hold a low opinion of the implementation of the courses in Years 7 and 8 (which is a hindrance to attempts at continuity/articulation between the primary and secondary sectors):

There is a history of secondary teachers being quite negative about Years 7 and 8 programmes... (seen) as just vocabulary learning... hand-holding all the way through.

4.3 The SLLPP

RLAs generally helped with information and queries concerning funding applications from schools. One RLA also held seminars on how to apply and was happy to assist with the actual preparation of proposals with the aim of raising the proportion of funded schools in the region. The general system of funding was also thought to have a positive effect on the likely success of IL programmes since it required planning for sustainability and emphasised the embedded component of PD for teachers.

Although there was some reference to some Principals seeking funding ‘for funding’s sake’ or for public relations reasons to do with competition between local schools, generally funding was viewed as a genuinely enabling factor for curriculum diversification. It tended to be used for equipment, resources and, less frequently, for administrative support.

4.4 Quality of Delivery

Delivery aspects of IL programmes discussed included: their elective status; their possible competitiveness with te reo Māori; teacher competency; and the concept of ‘teacher as learner/facilitator’.

Some RLAs referred to the non-compulsory status of ILs within the key curriculum learning area of ‘Language and Languages’ as problematical in that a subject’s optional or elective status implies the negative message that the subject is basically unimportant. It was acknowledged that, apart from – what might be termed – this general ‘atmospheric factor’, the organisation of instruction did vary across schools teaching ILs in Years 7 and 8. Some made IL learning compulsory with fixed timetable slots, enabling the whole school to study an IL at the same times. Others, at the other extreme, treated IL classes as elective options and slotted them in with a weekly, miscellaneous ‘free activities period’. However, it was generally felt that the tendency was to make IL learning compulsory, with the Principals’ empathy with and involvement in the programme generally being the key factors in such a decision.

RLAs generally shared the opinion that IL classes were not perceived in schools to be in competition with the teaching of te reo Māori, but rather were seen as enhancing them through underlining the importance and normality of second language learning in general. Some RLAs reported that teachers frequently suggested that te reo Māori should be taught similarly to ILS, through the provision of an ILS-type resource. One teacher was reported, in this regard, as saying: Why is it OK to teach Spanish this way but not Māori? Reservations about this analogy were expressed by two of the RLAs themselves in terms of such differences as: te reo Māori is an official language with numerous students and parents having various competence in speaking and, hence, would need to be taught by proficient speakers of the language; the
language’s intimate role in the preservation and conduct of tikanga Māori; and te reo Māori’s link with notions of identity and ‘ownership’.

A split in RLA opinion has already been mentioned in relation to one RLA’s drawing of the distinction between teachers who are reasonably proficient in the IL they teach and those who are learning it collaboratively with the students (see Section 4.2), with the latter generally being responsible for meagre learning outcomes, too slow a learning pace, the teaching of errors in the IL and the dissuading of students from further language learning. The same RLA further related this point indirectly to the non-compulsory status of ILs within the New Zealand Curriculum Framework:

> If languages are as important as every other curriculum area, then why aren’t they taught by somebody who knows the subject?

Another RLA, however, represented the opposite viewpoint and stressed:

> The classroom teacher has a lot of skills which a so-called specialist doesn’t... everything else is there for them.

“Everything else” was used to refer to RLA support and PD. When pressed, however, the same RLA conceded:

> (Collaborative learning was) far from (being) perhaps pedagogically normal... The bottom line is subject content knowledge... they’ve got provided ‘how to deliver’ (i.e. methodology courses)... Not many came to my four (PD) sessions... some think they know it all after two.

A further RLA was optimistic about teachers’ pursuit of further IL studies, mainly through PD funding, in the form of attendance at local evening or university classes or through distance learning options, such as the Correspondence School or some universities. Across the four regions, however, such additional PD activities were probably untypical and restricted more to teachers in urban localities.

Concerns expressed by individual RLAs included:

- the fact that some teachers were counter-productively more or less forced to take on an IL class against their will
- the need for access to initial or ongoing studies in second language teaching methodology
- the lack of IL and methodology courses in pre-service teacher education, particularly for students with prior learning of relevant ILs, and
- the social inequity reflected in the fact that not only did private schools seem to offer more opportunities for IL learning, they employed ‘expert teachers’ to teach ILs.

### 4.5 Continuity

All four RLAs did not view continuity in IL study across the primary-secondary divide as successful, despite some notable exceptions in a particular cluster or school. Half of them clearly ascribed this lack of success to a lack of receptivity in relevant secondary school teachers: (It’s) very hard to move secondary teachers. One RLA diagnosed the basic problem as a threefold communication barrier: lack of information flow; an arrogant attitude on the
part of specialist teachers; and a lack of “understanding of priorities”. This last point was also thought to be an important source of miscommunication by another RLA. Together, they stressed the different emphases of the primary and secondary programmes. The former were characterised as unoriented towards firm curricular requirements, focused on orality and building confidence rather than on literacy skills, tolerant towards playing with the language and having fun, the latter as having a full-on academic language…curriculum delivery mentality. One RLA, however, was dubious about such criticisms of secondary IL teachers, putting them down to the myth (that) the primary teacher teaches kids and the secondary teacher teaches a subject.

Another view expressed was that such discrepancies between sectors reflected the ‘ad hoc’, ‘stop gap’ nature of language learning in New Zealand, based in turn on the lack of a national policy. Expectations were unclear about whether the Level 1 and 2 achievement objectives in the various IL curricula applied in Years 7 and 8 courses: Children are still starting Level 1 at Year 9.

4.6 General Recommendations

RLAs were unanimous in suggesting the need to update urgently the ILS materials for Spanish and Japanese and to increase the number of RLAs. A majority also stressed the need to organise opportunities for pre-service teacher education. Such teacher education, it was thought, should include both IL proficiency and teaching methodology and be available to student teachers with prior learning experience of the IL, or in-country experience with some conversational fluency.

Practicable suggestions made by individual RLAs included:

- confine taster courses in ILs to the pre-secondary level
- provide special funding for release time for key lead teachers in each area and for cluster leaders
- provide distance or flexi- learning course(s) in language teaching methodology
- provide PD opportunities for RLAs
- make second language learning compulsory in Years 9 and 10
- create a pool of itinerant specialist language teachers to replace classroom IL teachers who do not possess basic IL proficiency, and
- establish scholarships for full-time release for a semester or a year to attend an intensive IL course at a tertiary institution for teachers whose commitment to IL teaching has been shown through their delivering an ILS programme, their attending PD courses and their completion of an elementary IL course in their own time.

4.7 Summary

- RLAs all believed they had been successful in their roles in significantly increasing the number of schools and students involved in ILE and in motivating IL teachers.
- RLAs all viewed the ILS resource as very successful in getting IL programmes started in new schools, in expanding IL offerings in schools already teaching an IL, and in motivating both teachers and students. They did not view it as creating undue competition
with te reo Māori offerings and thought its main advantages were its ‘user-friendliness’, its popularity with students and its easy integration with PD activities.

- All RLAs believed the SLLPP was very effective in contributing to the sustainability of IL programmes and in enhancing PD. Funds from the Pool were thought to be used predominantly for the acquisition of equipment and resources and, to a markedly lesser extent, administrative support.

- RLAs defined their basic role as consisting of five functions:
  1. providing relevant information
  2. training/organising for PD
  3. mentoring teachers and Principals new to ILE
  4. solving problems as they arose, and
  5. building relationships in the form of mutually supportive clusters of IL schools and between secondary schools and their feeder schools, in the interests of continuity.

- All were critical of the following aspects of ILE:
  - the strong tendency in schools towards ‘taster’ courses
  - an associated lack of adequate weekly class time for ILE
  - the great degree of variability in the organisation of ILE across schools
  - unclear expectations concerning achievement objectives
  - a general failure of secondary schools to try to understand both the organisation and ethos of ILE in pre-secondary classes
  - the associated poor efforts to promote continuity across school sectors, and
  - the social inequity involved in private schools’ generally superior ILE offerings and staffing.

One RLA was particularly concerned at the general lack of basic teacher IL proficiency and thought this would “turn off” students to ILE and waste valuable learning time. Other RLAs acknowledged the general anomaly of poor teacher subject knowledge compared with other curriculum areas, but were less concerned about its possible deleterious effects.

- Suggestions made by RLAs for improving their services included:
  - reduce the area and number of schools per RLA
  - increase classroom-based mentoring
  - liaise more with Principals
  - pay more attention to student learning outcomes
  - use different personnel for monitoring funding and for supporting funded schools (but as was noted earlier, RLAs are not formally responsible for monitoring funding)
  - update the Spanish and Japanese ILS courses
  - introduce optional IL and IL method courses for primary student teachers with relevant prior learning experience, and
  - create incentives for IL teachers to develop their IL competencies.
5 RESULTS: Teachers’ and Principals’ Appraisals of ILE

Two similar questionnaires were developed to survey teachers of Years 7 and/or 8 IL classes and Principals of schools teaching an IL(s) at Years 7 and/or 8 concerning the following broad aspects: the extent of the individual’s and the school’s involvement in ILE; their perceptions of students’ engagement with ILE and the efficacy of general resources, including the ILS, RLAs and PD; rationales and directions for ILE; and recommendations for improving ILE.

A list of 280 schools throughout New Zealand was assembled from information provided by RLAs concerning schools in their respective areas teaching or having recently taught an IL(s), although not necessarily at the Year 7/8 level. Some 198 schools were identified as teaching an IL at Year 7 or 8 and both the Principal and IL teacher(s) at each school were canvassed for a response to the relevant questionnaire. Responses were received from 200 teachers at 82 separate schools and from 80 Principals, representing response rates of 41.4 and 47.6 per cent respectively. For logistical reasons, to do with end-of-year organisational pressures, no follow-up was attempted. Nevertheless, it is contended that the magnitude of the response rates provides a sound basis for accepting the data collected as reliable.

To clarify a rather complex set of results, data are presented below under the following headings:

- general profile of the sample
- school management of the IL curriculum
- school appraisals of:
  - ILE
  - ILS, and
  - RLAs
- rationale for ILE, and
- recommendations for enhancing ILE.

5.1 General Profile of the Sample

The three sub-samples were located in five school types, as shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Total Sample by School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Teachers (%) n = 200</th>
<th>Principals (%) n = 80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (Yr 1-8)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (Yr 7-13)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response (nr)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Copies are attached in Appendices 2 and 3.
From this it is evident that most responding teachers and Principals are located in both intermediate and primary schools, with the majority of teachers coming from the former and the majority of Principals from the latter school type.

Another clear preponderance concerns school environment. Geographically, most teachers’ schools (76.5%) and IL Principals’ schools (70%) are located in urban areas. Socio-economically, participating schools tend to be high in the mid-decile range, with average decile rankings (and standard deviations (SD)) for teachers’ schools (of 6.72, SD = 2.88), and for IL Principals’ schools (of 6.7, SD = 2.81)\(^\text{12}\).

Both teacher-schools and the schools of IL Principals taught on average 2.6 different ILs. The most frequently taught language was reported to be French (161 teachers and 56 schools), followed by Japanese (146 and 47), Spanish (138 and 44), and German (128 and 40).

The sub-sample of actual IL teachers comprised mainly classroom teachers (104, 52%); the next most frequent teacher roles were Deputy Principal (27, 13.5%), curriculum leader (26, 13%) and head of department (16, 8%). Nine (just under 5%) of the IL teachers were Principals. Some 78 (39%) of teachers were responsible for leading ILE in their schools. Of these, however, few (15, 10%) received release time to help them with that function. More specifically, eight of them received three hours’ release time per week and seven received in excess of three hours.

### 5.2 School Management of the IL Curriculum

#### 5.2.1 The Teaching of ILs

The general teaching experience of the IL teachers is summarised in Table 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Years</th>
<th>No. of Years Since Beginning Teaching</th>
<th>Total Cumulative Teaching Years</th>
<th>Total Years Teaching an IL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this table it is striking that whereas some 52 per cent of the sub-sample of teachers have 15 or more years of general teaching experience, more than three quarters (77.5%) of the same teachers have taught an IL(s) for fewer than five years. In fact, when one examines the data more closely it is found that more than half (53%) of the sub-sample have been teaching an IL for fewer than two years. This pattern is clearer from a breakdown of the length of time teachers have taught individual languages, as shown below in Table 5.3.

---

\(^{12}\) A social class association was noted, too, in a New Zealand study of Japanese at Year 10 (see Holt et al., 2001: 43f).
Across all four languages it is evident that, with the exception of Japanese, four out of five teachers have less than three years’ experience in teaching the IL. In the case of Japanese, two-thirds have less than three years’ experience. More strikingly, nearly half of all teachers of all languages, except German, have less than one year’s experience. With German, the figure is around a third.

Thus, from both Tables 5.2 and 5.3 it seems that although we are dealing with quite an experienced cohort of teachers, with more than half of them having accumulated 15 or more years’ experience as teachers generally, the depth of experience in specific IL teaching is quite shallow, with around two-thirds of IL-teaching staff having less than two years’ experience in delivering the subject (with the exception of Japanese where the figure is three years).

In this respect it is of interest to examine how staff were assigned to teach an IL(s). Data from the survey showed that the majority of teachers (60.5%) chose voluntarily, while just over a third (36.5%) were required to do so – of these nearly all accepted the task willingly, with only two indicating that they did so against their will.

The general pattern of the organisation of IL teaching is evident from data collected from teachers about the sole or main IL class they currently teach (see Table 5.4).

Table 5.4  
Profile of IL Class Organisation (n = 200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Taught</th>
<th>Main or Sole Language Taught</th>
<th>No. Lessons [L] per Week</th>
<th>No. Mins. [M] per Lesson</th>
<th>No. Weeks [W] per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nr</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nr = nil response
This information indicates that around half of the teachers teach both Years 7 and 8, and that:

- there is a significant preponderance of French taught (see, too, Table 5.3)
- nearly half of classes schedule only one lesson per week
- around 15 per cent of classes have more than two lessons per week
- the majority of lessons last longer than 40 minutes
- around 40 per cent of lessons last less than 40 minutes, and
- around 50 per cent of classes run for up to 20 weeks a year, and around 50 per cent run for between 21 and 40 weeks a year.

In short, the data suggest quite significant variability in the basic organisation of the IL curriculum at Years 7 and 8. The more numerous French classes are probably a reflection of teachers’ prior learning experiences and the preponderance of French in secondary school IL offerings until the second half of the 1990s (see, e.g. Holt et al., 2001: 6).

Data generally reflect a balance of gender in IL classes, which range in size up to 70 students, with the average number of girls and boys per class showing as 14.44 (SD = 7.17) and 14.15 (SD = 6.61) respectively.

Around 30 per cent of all IL teachers taught two different languages and a further 20 per cent taught more than two languages, although nearly half of all classes consisted of only one lesson per week.

Teachers were asked to rate their competency in the IL(s) they taught on a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from ‘not at all competent’ (1) to ‘highly competent’ (5). Results are shown in Table 5.5 (n = >200 because some teachers teach more than one IL).

Table 5.5  
Teacher Ratings of Own IL Competency (n = 247)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Level</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Not at all competent</td>
<td>8 14.0</td>
<td>7 15.2</td>
<td>9 15.5</td>
<td>5 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Not competent</td>
<td>15 26.3</td>
<td>11 23.9</td>
<td>20 34.5</td>
<td>20 23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Unsure</td>
<td>11 19.3</td>
<td>6 13.0</td>
<td>14 24.1</td>
<td>30 34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Competent</td>
<td>20 35.1</td>
<td>13 28.3</td>
<td>10 17.2</td>
<td>22 25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Highly competent</td>
<td>3 5.3</td>
<td>9 19.6</td>
<td>5 8.6</td>
<td>9 10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>57 2.91</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>46 3.13</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>58 2.69</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>86 3.12</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From these data it appears that exactly half of Japanese teachers rate themselves as not competent as speakers of the language (by summing percentages for levels 1 and 2), followed by Spanish (40%), French (29%) and German (29%). Conversely, Japanese teachers are the least confident about their competency (with levels 4 and 5 = 25.8%) and teachers of German the most confident (47.9%), followed by Spanish (40.4%) and French (36.1%). Nevertheless, the difference between means (see Table 5.5) of the four IL groups proved to be statistically non-significant when compared using one-way analysis of variance (df = 3, $F = 1.835$, $p = .141$), so that it seems warranted to assume that the perceptions of competence by teachers of IL are not language-specific but general.

This assessment is supported, too, by data collected concerning teachers’ prior learning experiences of both the IL and IL teaching methodology. Nearly a third of all teachers had had no prior IL-learning experience (31.5%); 30.5 per cent had had some in-country experience (although it is far from clear whether any significant language learning would accrue from the experience); 14.5 per cent had some IL knowledge through their family background but only 19 per cent had studied the IL formally – 11.5 per cent in secondary school to some extent, 5 per cent at a tertiary educational level and 2.5 per cent through a continuing education course of some kind. The majority of teachers (69.5%) had taken part in short courses or seminars on IL teaching but the majority of these by far had been of 10 hours or less in duration (51%); 18.5 per cent had completed some formal studies in the area (with 16 per cent achieving a complete qualification – for example, a specialist Graduate Diploma or the method component of a Diploma in Education); and 6 per cent had had no contact of any sort with method training.

Finally, information was sought on how much time teachers devoted, on average, to preparation for IL classes. Results are shown below in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6  
*Teacher Preparation Time per IL Class in Minutes (n = 192)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Lesson Preparation</th>
<th>Own IL Preparation</th>
<th>Resource Preparation</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>∑ Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>37.79</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>28.11</td>
<td>29.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>30.14</td>
<td>22.90</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>27.53</td>
<td>25.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>23.14</td>
<td>24.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td>24.16</td>
<td>17.69</td>
<td>20.39</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the values of means in the table indicate a conscientious attitude to preparation, standard deviations indicate an extreme variability. For instance, in the first box of Table 5.6 the average Spanish teacher spends somewhere between 1 and 73 minutes preparing a Spanish lesson. In a sense then, SD values in the table reveal a total lack of consistent practice in lesson preparation across all languages.

5.2.2 School IL Procedures

The process of establishing ILs in Years 7 and 8 in sample schools was investigated via reference to who initiated the idea, who was consulted, and what the main motives were.
Both the teacher and IL Principal groups identified almost an identical order of relative frequency for ‘initiator’ of the IL programme(s): Principal (teacher 33%; IL Principal 47.5%), teachers (16.5%; 13.8%), senior executive staff (10.5%; 12.5%), parents and community (10%; 11.3%), the MOE’s IL funding initiative (7%; 3.8%) and Board of Trustees (4.5%; 5%). Notably absent in both groups’ responses was any mention of students, and the insignificance of local secondary school contacts (accounting for 2 per cent and 1.3 per cent of teacher and Principal data respectively).

Information about the extent of consultations that were part of the initiation process was sought, too, in the form of a Likert-type scale from 1 (‘not at all’) to 5 (‘extensive’). Results again were quite similar for both teacher and Principal groups, as shown in Table 5.7.

Table 5.7  Teacher (n = 153) and IL Principal (n = 77) Estimates of Degree of Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Consulted</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.71 (1.04)</td>
<td>4.32 (.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/community</td>
<td>3.01 (1.13)</td>
<td>3.48 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>2.91 (1.18)</td>
<td>2.39 (1.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teachers</td>
<td>3.39 (1.21)</td>
<td>3.58 (1.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3.04 (1.27)</td>
<td>3.42 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from a clear teacher and Principal difference of opinion concerning the degree to which teachers had been consulted, most values hover in the ‘unsure’ category, with it also being agreed that ‘very little’ consultation occurred with the MOE. The groups’ estimates of the single most important reason both for establishing an IL programme and for selecting the specific IL(s) taught were also sought. Table 5.8 details results.

Table 5.8  Teachers’ and Principals’ Estimates of IL Importance (n1 = 144; n2 = 73)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Teachers Starting ILE Programme</th>
<th>Teachers Selecting IL(s)</th>
<th>Principals Starting ILE Programme</th>
<th>Principals Selecting IL(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General educational value</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural competency</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/community demand</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity concerns</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of skilled teachers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quite uniform pattern of response in the above table indicates that around half of both groups view the general idea of ILE in terms of its broad, educational benefits. Likewise, approximately one-quarter of both teachers and Principals believed that intercultural sensitivity was ILE’s next most important benefit. About one in seven of each group considered ILE important in order to provide students with a learning experience that they

---

13 Responses total more than 100 per cent where participants listed more than one main reason.
would soon encounter in secondary school. In other words, neither group thought that more practical considerations relating, for example, to parent or community demand, teacher availability or career relevance were very significant. In selecting which IL(s) to teach, however, the opposite was true. In this instance, the practical concern for the availability of competent teachers was uppermost with half of both groups, followed to a much weaker extent by career relevance and the problem of continuity for Principals, and, for teachers, by continuity and career concerns.

Teachers and Principals were next asked whether they collaborate in the teaching of ILE with the local community and with other schools. Such collaborations were acknowledged by a minority of both groups. Teachers (33.5%) and Principals (40.8%) stated that community collaboration occurred, and collaboration with other schools (teachers, 48.2%; Principals, 40%). Both groups saw community contact mainly in terms of events, such as guest speakers, cultural days or excursions. They varied with reference to the second main type of contact in that teachers mentioned parents in passive terms of ‘interviews, meetings, surveys’, while Principals referred, more actively, to parents’ support. In this general respect, Boards of Trustees did not seem to have any relevance at all for either group. Cross-school Cupertino in ILE was defined, in order of frequency of response, in terms of the maintenance of clusters, PD activities, and secondary school contacts.

In further exploring the issue of continuity with Principals, it was found that 56.6 per cent had no knowledge of whether IL students at their schools continued with its study in Year 9 at secondary school. Around 12 per cent of the remainder of Principals thought that 90-100 per cent did continue and around 8 per cent estimated the proportion continuing to be 50-59 per cent. The remaining 23 per cent were fairly evenly spread from <10 per cent to 89 per cent.

When asked about specific school procedures to facilitate continuity, 58.5 per cent of teachers (n = 183) believed their school did so via two main methods: the cultivation of cross-school contacts (46.3%); and the development of a ‘smart transition form’ (12%) (i.e. a report or assessment form containing information for the secondary language department about what Year 7/8 students have successfully learned in a specific IL programme). Some 23.9 per cent also mentioned that continuity was facilitated by the presence of the secondary school on the same site as the Year 7 and 8 operation. Around 35 per cent of all Principals cited ‘liaison with secondary schools’ as the main way in which continuity was fostered, followed by general ‘encouragement to continue’ as part of the Year 7/8 ethos (26.3%).

Principals were further pressed, in additional questions, to specify how continuity in ILE was facilitated by their associated Year 9 schools. Apart from 8.8 per cent mentioning the fact that the two schools were located on the same site, the main reasons given were school and teacher contacts across sectors (21.3%), and the actual offering of the IL in Year 9 (10%). However, 57.5 per cent of Principals were not able to specify any factors at all. They were asked further whether they could suggest any other ways in which continuity might be promoted, apart from the aspects mentioned previously. Only 33.8 per cent responded, the main suggestions being ‘communication/joint planning’ between sectors (18.8%) and the reporting of Year 7/8 achievement to the secondary school (6.3%).

Information about the actual organisation of IL classes was also sought. The degree to which ILE was compulsory or optional across the sample’s teachers’ and Principals’ schools, together with the number of ILs able to be studied, are shown below in Table 5.9.
Table 5.9  
*Pattern of Offerings in ILE in Sample Schools*

| Year/Course Type          | Teachers | | | Principals | | |
|---------------------------|----------|-----|-----|-------------|-----|
|                           | n   | %  | N  | n   | %  | N  |
| Year 7 compulsory         | 144 | 81.8 | 176 | 66 | 88.0 | 75 |
| Year 7 elective           | 32  | 18.2 | 9  | 12.0 | 75 |
| Year 7 can study >1 IL    | 41  | 97.6 | 42 |     |     |     |
| Year 8 compulsory         | 155 | 81.6 | 190 | 67 | 85.9 | 78 |
| Year 8 elective           | 35  | 18.4 | 11 | 14.1 | 78 |
| Year 8 can study >1 IL    | 46  | 97.9 | 47 |     |     |     |
| Can study 1 IL across Years 7 & 8 | 120 | 98.4 | 122 |     |     |     |

Table 5.9 reveals a clear preference for compulsoriness but also a certain vagueness in that there seems to be relatively little awareness of whether two or more languages can be studied in any year. Twelve teachers noted that three or more languages could be studied at their school(s) and 12 stated that a different language each year was optional.

Finally, both groups were asked whether and what variations had needed to be made to the school curriculum to accommodate ILE. Teachers (50%) and Principals (60%) referred to the need to reduce the amount of time for other curriculum subjects. All other adjustments, in both groups’ responses, accounted for ≤5 per cent and included reducing the length of lunch-time, extending the school day, incorporating IL into English or club/hobbies time and establishing ‘focus weeks’ when extra time could be devoted to ILs.

### 5.3 School Appraisals of ILE Aspects

#### 5.3.1 ILE in General

Teachers and Principals were asked to give an estimate of the relative benefit to students of learning various ILs. Results are shown in Table 5.10.

From the table it is clear that both groups view the learning of te reo Māori as generally more beneficial to students than the learning of a Pasifika language, although a noticeably larger proportion of teachers consider the study of either to be equally beneficial. In comparisons with the other four ILs, however, there is a clear pattern for teachers to again view the study of all five to be equally worthwhile, with an almost equal proportion being equally split between preference for te reo Māori and preference for the other language. Principals, on the other hand, tend to view the learning of te reo Māori as clearly more beneficial than any other language, with an almost equal proportion split between the other two options (‘same’ and preference for the IL).
Table 5.10  Teachers’ and Principals’ Appraisals of the Relative Value of ILs for Students (NB: variations between N and n are explained by extraneous responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Preference</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori &gt; Pasifika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori &gt; French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori &gt; Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori &gt; Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori &gt; German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasifika &gt; French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasifika &gt; Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasifika &gt; Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasifika &gt; German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French &gt; Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French &gt; Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French &gt; German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese &gt; Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese &gt; German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish &gt; German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of both groups perceive the learning of any IL as preferential to the learning of a Pasifika language. At the same time, around a third of teachers view the study of either as equally beneficial while this view is shared by only one in six Principals. Nearly all teachers believe the study of any of the ILs to be equally beneficial; this view is shared to a lesser extent (between 33% and 43%) by Principals. There is also a tendency for Principals, in comparison with teachers, to view Japanese as more beneficial than the other three ILs (33-35% vs 20-22% for teachers). French is viewed by Principals as relatively more preferable than either German or Spanish, a view not shared by teachers in the case of Spanish.

Both groups were next asked to estimate the relative value of learning an IL compared with other key learning areas of the curriculum. Apart from the fact that relatively low response rates (see N figures in Table 5.11) seemed to indicate a certain ambivalence or unsureness, a clear pattern emerged with more than 80 per cent of both groups generally responding for all areas with either ‘yes’ (i.e. students would benefit more from studying the other curriculum area than studying an IL) or ‘same’ (i.e. both are of equal benefit), as shown below in Table 5.11. The only exception to this level was the response rate for Principals in relation to Social Studies at around 72 per cent. This was due to a clearly lower estimation on their part, than that of teachers, of its benefit being equal for students with IL studies. This followed a general trend, however, in that Principals regularly estimated the equality of benefit of ILs as lower (by an average of 10%) than all other curriculum areas when compared with teachers. Thus, the overall valuations placed on other areas of the curriculum, when compared with ILE, indicate, in the case of teachers:

- a clear preference for English and Mathematics but with some acknowledgement of equality of value (at c. 20%)
- a lesser but still salient preference for Science and Health/Physical Education with a stronger equality of value (c. 30%), and
- a less significant preference (<50%) for the areas of Technology, the Arts and Social Studies (with generally similar responses for both categories of ‘more’ and ‘equal’ value).

In the case of Principals, far less value was placed on equality of learning benefits than was the case with teachers, the former group’s valuations ranging from 9.3 to 30.2 per cent (mean = 20.24%, cf 32.2% for teachers). Consequently, Principals’ preferences for all other curriculum areas were correspondingly higher than teachers’ (on average 13%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &gt; French yes same</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &gt; Japanese yes same</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &gt; Spanish yes same</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &gt; German yes same</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies &gt; French yes same</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies &gt; Japanese yes same</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies &gt; Spanish yes same</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies &gt; German yes same</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/PE &gt; French yes same</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/PE &gt; Japanese yes same</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/PE &gt; Spanish yes same</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/PE &gt; German yes same</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology &gt; French yes same</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology &gt; Japanese yes same</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology &gt; Spanish yes same</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology &gt; German yes same</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics &gt; French yes same</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics &gt; Japanese yes same</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics &gt; Spanish yes same</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics &gt; German yes same</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &gt; French yes same</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &gt; Japanese yes same</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &gt; Spanish yes same</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &gt; German yes same</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts &gt; French yes same</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts &gt; Japanese yes same</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts &gt; Spanish yes same</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts &gt; German yes same</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were also asked to describe, using a five-point Likert-type scale, their experience and/or beliefs about a number of aspects of IL teaching, and much higher response rates suggested greater confidence in judgement. First, both groups were asked to estimate how most teachers would describe their school’s teaching of ILE. The clear majority of both groups judged it to be either ‘effective’ or ‘highly effective’, although only around one in six selected the latter (teachers, n = 189, 49.2% and 18.5% and Principals, n = 78, 61.5% and 15.4%). At the same time, however, some 30 per cent of teachers and 20 per cent of Principals indicated that they were ‘unsure’.

Second, both groups were asked to judge how most teachers in their schools generally would describe ILE. A quarter of teachers (25.9%) and Principals (23%) believed staff generally would rate IL teaching as ‘extremely difficult’ or ‘difficult’; 36.5 per cent and 27 per cent, respectively, were ‘unsure’ and 37.5 per cent of teachers and 50 per cent of Principals thought staff would rate it as ‘not difficult’ or ‘not difficult at all’.

Third, teachers only were asked to describe their own ability in ILE. Most (82.9%) confidently asserted they were either ‘capable’ or ‘highly capable’ (n = 193), with the remainder being mainly ‘unsure’. Fourth, and finally, teachers only were asked to provide their best description of their own IL teaching. Most (76%) responded ‘not difficult/not difficult at all’ whilst 18.2 per cent characterised it as ‘difficult/extremely difficult’; 5.7 per cent were unsure.

Next, groups were asked to make a number of judgements about students’ IL learning. First, they were invited to rate how enjoyable they thought ILE was for the students. Most teachers (94.5%) and Principals (98.8%) believed students found ILE ‘enjoyable/highly enjoyable’. Second, they were asked to describe their pupils as IL learners. Most teachers (88%) and Principals (91%) rated them as ‘capable/highly capable’. Teachers were then asked to describe generally their students’ IL achievements. Most (88%) viewed them as ‘achieving/high achieving’ (n = 199), with 8.5 per cent unsure.

Finally, student failure and achievement were explored by first asking both teachers and Principals to estimate how the school would most likely assess the general causes of both; teachers only were then asked to provide their own responses to both scenarios. Results are shown below in Table 5.12.
Table 5.12  Attribution of Causes of Student IL Failure and Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRAIBUTION</th>
<th>TEACHERS If Student Fails</th>
<th>TEACHERS If Student Succeeds</th>
<th>PRINCIPALS If Student Fails</th>
<th>PRINCIPALS If Student Succeeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View-point</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school own</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school own</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school own</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school own</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school own</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school own</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school own</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school own</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 5.12 it is evident that teachers and Principals are in general agreement concerning both the student and the teacher cause variables associated with student failure. Teachers also exhibit the same pattern of attribution in relation to the school and themselves. Both groups agree that failure in students is associated, in order, with student ability and student background. The only mild differences relate to the Principals’ greater emphasis on the variable of student background, their dismissal of student effort as a variable, and a tendency to see the teacher variables contributing more to failure than is the case with teachers’ estimates. On the other hand, in assessing the causes of achievement, Principals attribute more generously to teacher variables than do the teachers themselves (by a factor of almost 20 per cent). If a student fails, Principals attribute this to a variety of factors, being in order of importance poor teaching, student background, student ability, teacher competence, teacher knowledge and teaching resources. Teachers, on the other hand, attribute student success to good teaching, and student failure mainly to student ability (external attribution), followed by poor teaching (internal attribution), lack of student effort (external attribution) and teacher knowledge (internal attribution). A similar pattern is associated with the variable of teaching resources, with Principals slightly more likely than teachers to concede their role in failure but far less positive than teachers in estimating their involvement in achievement. It must be remembered, however, that generally speaking there was a relatively low rate of response with the only variable of any clear strength being that of good and bad teaching.

5.3.2 The ILS Resources

Teachers’ and Principals’ appraisals were sought on the appropriateness of the four IL resource packages developed by the MOE in terms of learning outcomes, teaching ideas/activities and assessment activities. Both groups were impressed by the ILS on all three dimensions with ‘appropriate/extremely appropriate’ responses ranging from 70 to 89 per cent.
(Tn = 197, Pn = 75), with the remainder of responses in the ‘unsure’ category. Teachers were generally more enthusiastic than Principals; their average percentage approval rate across all three properties was 83.3, compared with 75.4 for Principals. In both cases the ‘ideas/activities’ aspect was most strongly, and ‘assessment activities’ the least, supported.

Both groups were asked to assess the ‘effectiveness’ of the ILS resource along a number of dimensions. Results are shown in Table 5.13.

It is clear from Table 5.13 that both groups thoroughly endorse the ILS resource, in both general and specific terms. Generally, teachers are more enthusiastic, averaging an approval rate of 77.4 per cent (for both ‘effective’ categories) across all eight measures, compared with 68.1 per cent for Principals. This is reflected in the higher proportion of ‘unsure’ responses for Principals (ranging from 33% to 43%, compared with 20% to 36% for teachers). Within the eight measures, the first three are distinctly more highly approved of by both groups than the remaining five which relate to more general, across-the-curriculum skills, with self-management skills judged by both groups to be the least affected skills area.
Table 5.13  Percentage Judgements by Teachers and Principals of ILS Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Extremely Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Extremely Ineffective</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tchr Princ</td>
<td>Tchr Princ</td>
<td>Tchr Princ</td>
<td>Tchr Princ</td>
<td>Tchr Princ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general</td>
<td>33.7 30.7</td>
<td>54.1 45.3</td>
<td>11.2 24.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>196 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting students’ learning needs</td>
<td>26.0 22.7</td>
<td>58.7 54.7</td>
<td>14.3 21.3</td>
<td>1.0 1.3</td>
<td>196 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing students’ communication skills</td>
<td>23.6 14.1</td>
<td>64.3 59.4</td>
<td>11.5 25.0</td>
<td>1.3 0.5</td>
<td>182 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing students’ information skills</td>
<td>15.3 10.9</td>
<td>63.4 54.7</td>
<td>19.7 34.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>183 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing students’ social skills</td>
<td>9.4 4.7</td>
<td>64.6 60.9</td>
<td>23.8 32.8</td>
<td>1.7 1.6</td>
<td>181 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing students’ co-operative skills</td>
<td>12.7 6.3</td>
<td>64.6 58.7</td>
<td>21.5 33.3</td>
<td>0.6 1.6</td>
<td>181 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing students’ self-management skills</td>
<td>10.1 3.2</td>
<td>51.1 54.0</td>
<td>36.0 42.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>178 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing students’ work &amp; study skills</td>
<td>11.2 4.8</td>
<td>56.4 59.7</td>
<td>29.1 35.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>179 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Groups were then asked to respond more freely, without criteria supplied, by providing their own formulations of the ILS’s major strengths and weaknesses. Both groups identified as the major strength its ‘user-friendliness’ (specifically for teachers with little IL knowledge or teaching experience), registering 31.3 per cent (teachers) and 42.9 per cent (Principals). Other strengths identified by teachers ranged from 7.6 per cent to 24.3 per cent and included ‘matches students’ development needs’, ‘provides variety of useful activities’, ‘is well organised and sequenced’ and ‘uses multimedia resources too’. Principals’ responses followed the same general pattern, ranging in value from 5.7 per cent to 20 per cent, with a slight variation in the items. Response rates, however, were generally rather weak (n = 144 and 35 respectively), suggesting relative unsureness about the topic area.

Major weaknesses identified by teachers, in descending order (from 23.3% to 6.8%), were ‘need for more resources/activities’, ‘difficulty in cueing CDs/videos’, ‘lack of teacher time’, ‘too much photocopying needed’, ‘multimedia difficult to operate’ and ‘lack of associated PD’. Principals’ view-values ranged from 29.4 per cent (for ‘too few resources/activities’ and ‘lack of PD’) to 17.6 per cent (‘cueing problems’) and 11.8 per cent (‘lack of teacher time’.
and ‘too much emphasis on writing’). Responses for both groups were slightly stronger with regard to ILS strengths but, again, the overall response rate was particularly weak (n = 73 or 36.5 per cent of the total teacher sample and n = 17 or 21.3 per cent of the Principal sample). Participants also did not generally proffer more than one suggestion; total second responses numbered a total of 11 – eight for teachers and three for Principals.

Finally, the two groups were requested to evaluate a set of ILS descriptors, using a Likert-type scale and to evaluate specific ILS and RLA services in relation to three aspects. Additionally, teachers were asked to evaluate some specific ILS resources. Results are reported below in Tables 5.14 and 5.15.

Table 5.14  
**Teacher and Principal Descriptions of ILS Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILS Descriptor</th>
<th>Teacher %</th>
<th>Principal %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readable</td>
<td>0.6 5.0 42.0 52.5 181</td>
<td>18.2 43.9 37.9 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>1.1 6.6 47.5 44.8 181</td>
<td>18.2 45.5 36.4 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>1.1 8.8 42.9 47.3 182</td>
<td>21.2 42.4 36.4 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>0.6 0.6 7.2 42.2 180</td>
<td>1.5 18.5 33.8 46.2 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to use</td>
<td>0.6 1.1 6.6 40.3 181</td>
<td>18.5 38.5 41.5 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to integrate</td>
<td>0.6 2.3 35.0 41.8 177</td>
<td>37.9 36.4 25.8 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy for planning and teaching</td>
<td>0.6 1.1 10.1 44.1 44.1 179</td>
<td>1.5 19.7 42.4 34.8 66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Key: 1 = extremely poor; 2 = poor; 3 = unsure; 4 = good; 5 = excellent.)

Table 5.14 again reveals strong endorsement of the ILS resource, especially by teachers using it (whose ratings generally exceed those of Principals as a group by a margin of some 10 per cent). Both groups clearly believe the resource to be readable, informative, comprehensive, appropriate and easy to use; the quality of being ‘easy to integrate with other curriculum areas’, however, is relatively and uniformly low, with some 62 per cent of each group agreeing.

Table 5.15  
**Teacher and Principal Evaluations of General and Individual Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Personal Use %</th>
<th>Effectiveness %</th>
<th>Relevance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILS</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>high 69.5 med 21.2 low 9.3</td>
<td>high 79.0 med 17.6 low 3.4</td>
<td>high 77.8 med 17.9 low 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILS</td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>high 44.1 med 26.5 low 23.5</td>
<td>high 53.1 med 28.1 low 12.5</td>
<td>high 50.0 med 28.1 low 15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLAs</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>high 43.2 med 34.8 low 22.0</td>
<td>high 79.4 med 13.7 low 6.9</td>
<td>high 81.3 med 12.5 low 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLAs</td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>high 27.3 med 33.3 low 36.4</td>
<td>high 42.9 med 45.7 low 8.6</td>
<td>high 48.5 med 39.4 low 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>high 55.6 med 28.4 low 16.0</td>
<td>high 73.5 med 21.7 low 4.8</td>
<td>high 79.0 med 18.6 low 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>high 26.3 med 41.6 low 32.1</td>
<td>high 45.1 med 41.4 low 13.5</td>
<td>high 48.9 med 42.9 low 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheets</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>high 64.7 med 27.6 low 7.6</td>
<td>high 64.3 med 33.3 low 2.3</td>
<td>high 71.8 med 25.9 low 2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15 indicates that, in terms of personal use, some two-thirds of teachers make ‘high’ personal use of the ILS resource generally and of its worksheets. Less than half state this about RLAs and only a quarter make extensive use of the CD materials incorporated in the ILS. Perhaps understandably, Principals’ responses to the personal use category remain
essentially non-committal. In terms of a high degree of both ‘effectiveness’ and ‘relevance’
teachers as a group clearly endorse the general ILS resource, the RLAs, the videos and the
worksheets (in that order of preference). The CD resource is clearly thought by the majority of
teachers to be moderately relevant and effective. Principals, again, endorse the general
relevance and effectiveness of the ILS and the RLAs but at a significantly lower level of
approval. Comparatively speaking, the generally lower response levels of teachers within the
‘personal use’ category suggest pressures of time rather than a relative lack of interest.

Also noteworthy, in connection with the general responses reported in the two tables
immediately above, was the fact that the invitation for either teachers or Principals to list other
learning resources used (including educational technology) was taken up by only a few
individuals, suggesting possibly:

- pressures of time
- a general lack of resourcefulness, or
- a lack of alternative resources.

5.3.3 Regional Language Advisers (RLAs)

Information about RLAs was sought under three broad headings: schools’ contact with them;
their general effectiveness and usefulness; and schools’ general preferences in the PD area.
Some 20 per cent of both teachers and Principals reported that they had had no contact within
a previous 12-month period with their respective RLAs. Around a quarter of teachers reported
having had contact once in that period, and around a fifth reported having had contact twice or
three times. A sixth had contact more than three times. (Percentage figures, respectively, are:
26.6, 19.1, 18.1, 16; n = 188.) The pattern of response for Principals was similar, with the
exception of the last category, relating to the more than three contacts during the previous 12
months (21.9, 17.8, 13.7 and 27.4; n = 73). This indicates that just over a quarter of Principals
had relatively frequent contact with RLAs.

Most teachers (53.6, n = 153) reported that RLA contact had been initiated by the RLA
themselves (cf 23.8% for Principals; n = 63) and 34 percent of teachers reported that contact
been initiated by themselves (cf 68.3% for Principals). For teachers the only other significant
sources of initiation for RLA contact noted were a local language teachers’ association
meeting (3.9%) and the ‘school’ (4.6%), presumably the Principal or Assistant Principal.
Principals estimated that contact had been due to themselves in 7.9 per cent of cases.

The main type of RLA support provided through such contacts was identified as school PD
support by both teachers (76.4%, n = 161) and Principals (46.7%, n = 60). This included a
variety of possible activities, including in-service courses, workshops on resources and their
use, introductory meetings, group discussions, and so forth. The next most frequent, and only
other significant, support category, for both groups, was individual teacher support (23% and
41.7%, respectively).

Participants were next asked to evaluate the effectiveness of RLAs with regard to 19 different
aspects. Results are shown in Table 5.16. Participants (again representing only around two-
thirds of total group samples) rated the overall effectiveness of RLAs as very effective. Half
of teachers (n = 147) rated them in the highest category of ‘highly effective’, with just over a
third of Principals agreeing (n = 52). This pattern of relative conservatism of judgements on
the part of Principals was evident in their combined category 4 and 5 estimates being
generally lower than those of teachers (average of 66.6 per cent across the other 18 criteria cf 74.4 per cent for teachers). Teachers were most impressed by RLA contact in respect of their language and language teaching competencies, access to further resources and general influence on their actual classroom practice (with all relevant criteria rating >80 per cent). Principals tended to be relatively uniformly supportive across variables, although both groups concurred in assessing their contributions to the development and management aspects of schools and clusters as least effective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language knowledge</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language competence</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teaching knowledge</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in language teaching</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on my teaching</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on my programme</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on school programme</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced my teaching</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided positive feedback</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided insights into learning</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided guidance on teaching</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided guidance on assessment</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided access to further</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist school and cluster planning</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist mangmnt of school/cluster</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist school/cluster ILE</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide school prof development</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of contact</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall effectiveness</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princ</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Key: 1 = highly ineffective; 2 = ineffective; 3 = unsure; 4 = effective; 5 = highly effective.)

Attention was next focused on PD support. Both groups were asked to rate the usefulness of recent PD experiences, of possible future PD activities and to indicate preferences for certain activity types. Results are summarised below in Table 5.17.
Table 5.17  
Teacher and Principal Evaluations of PD Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD Area</th>
<th>Teachers %</th>
<th>Principals %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>highly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of PD undertaken in the past year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLA PD</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-initiated PD</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLA-initiated, school-based PD</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL teacher conference</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal study of IL</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal study of language teaching</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZALT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What future PD topics would increase effectiveness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLA PD</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-initiated PD</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLA-initiated, school-based PD</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL teacher conference</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal study of IL</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal study of language teaching</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General effectiveness of PD topics in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal IL competence</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL teaching method</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of language learning</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your PD preference?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual RLA assistance</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary study course</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based seminars and workshops</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site block course</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site block course</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A striking feature of responses in this table is the relatively low rate; for teachers the average number responding to 20 of the 21 cues (leaving out the aberrant NZALT item totalling 6) is 102.2 (or barely half the sample size) and for Principals’ 15 items the average number is 26.9, or just on a third of the total sample. This level of non-participation would seem to be related to personal judgements of a relative lack of experience and hence judgement in PD matters.

Generally speaking, around two-thirds of participating teachers found most PD activities ‘highly’ useful or effective (56-80%). The area of PD with the least appeal to teachers was that of continuing IL education through a tertiary education course of some kind, with more than a third (37.2%, n = 94) viewing it as having ‘little’ usefulness. Principals were less
supportive; for example, all of the six PD activities they had engaged in during the previous 12 months between 44 per cent and 71 per cent judged them to be of ‘little’ usefulness. Paradoxically, however, five of these same areas were nominated by between 55 and 68 per cent of Principals as being ‘highly’ useful areas for future PD activity. Half or more (56-66%) also rated highly the effectiveness of PD topics like IL teaching method and personal IL competence.

5.3.4 Rationale for ILE

Teachers and Principals were also asked to comment, without any category guidance or cues, on the three most important goals for ILE. Results are shown in Table 5.18. Note that the individual responses were clustered in categories.

Table 5.18  Teacher and Principal Appraisals of Three Main Goals of ILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First n = 125</td>
<td>Second n = 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden cultural horizons</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment/fun</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to communicate in L2</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate desire to learn</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand L1 better</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-classifiable/ extraneous responses</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six factors were subsequently identified, namely:

- broaden cultural horizons
- enjoyment/fun
- able to communicate in second language
- generate a desire to learn
- continuity, and
- understand first language better.

Both groups identified the same set of five goals, and in approximately the same order of preference. Nearly half of both groups thought that broadening cultural horizons was the main goal, followed by enjoyment/fun and the ability to communicate in another language. Teachers only thought that the next most important goal was to generate the desire to learn in general. Finally, both Principals and teachers identified in the same order of preference, continuity and the benefit of understanding the mother tongue better as the least important goals.

Teachers alone were also probed without guidance concerning the single most significant outcome of their teaching of ILE. Four items were mentioned with roughly equal frequency: enjoyment of learning (26.2%, n = 149); desire to continue IL learning (25.5%); confidence in
communicating in an L2 (22.1%); and understanding of and respect for another culture (21.5%).

They were further asked to what extent their ILE teaching integrated with other curricula. The most frequent response (43.4%, n = 152) was ‘none/very little’, followed by links made with the Social Studies and Arts areas (32.2%), with English (8.6%) and with Mathematics and Technology (7.2%).

Teachers’ three main assessment strategies were next questioned. Results are shown in Table 5.19. From this it is clear that in assessment terms teachers place greatest emphasis on oracy, although it is not clear to what extent formal tests are involved. The assessment of writing, likewise, may only partly involve tests. Otherwise, the testing ethos is obviously informal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>First n = 135</th>
<th>Second n = 110</th>
<th>Third n = 84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral tests and observation</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written assessments &amp; tests</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer assessment</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class participation</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-classifiable/ extraneous responses</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked whether student performance and achievement in ILE were reported to parents in the same way as other curricula such as Mathematics or Reading, 36.7 per cent (n = 166) of teachers indicated ‘no’ and 7.8 per cent stated that the matter was ‘under consideration’. The largest group (41.6%) replied in the affirmative; they referred to normal reporting methods such as ‘reports, progress cards and homebooks’. Some 11.4 per cent also reported to parents but informally by commenting on attitude, effort and participation rather than grades.

Finally, teachers were asked whether the introduction of ILE in their schools had influenced the teaching of te reo Māori. Some 52 per cent (n = 123) replied in the negative; 11.4 per cent indicated that it was treated and timetabled like ILs; a further 10 per cent believed ILE had heightened an awareness of the importance of te reo Māori; and 9.8 per cent stated that it had had the effect of reducing the amount of te reo Māori taught. Only 5.8 per cent believed it had heightened the need for a te reo Māori language kit similar to the ILS.

5.4 Recommendations for Enhancing ILE

Both teachers and Principals predominantly planned to continue the existing range of ILs taught in their schools in the next two years (teachers = 91.9%, n = 160; Principals = 85.1%, n = 74). Only 1.9 per cent of teachers and 8.1 per cent of Principals planned to expand the range of ILs taught, while 5.6 per cent of teachers and 6.8 per cent of Principals planned to expand
access to the existing range taught. No participants planned to reduce either access to existing ILs taught or the range currently offered and only one teacher indicated the intention to substitute the current IL being taught with another.

Participants were next asked what they considered to be the greatest threats to the continuance of ILE in their respective schools. Teachers emphasised three key factors:

a. the already crowded curriculum (43.5%, n = 147)
b. lack of adequate teachers (25.2%), and
c. funding (13.6%).

Principals also emphasised the same three things but in a different order:

a. funding (33.8%, n = 68)
b. teacher adequacy (32.4%), and
c. the crowded curriculum (25%).

Unprompted suggestions for improving ILE in their schools were responded to by teachers as follows:

- increase in PD (35.9%, n = 128)
- more time allowance (34.4%), and
- more funding (14.4%).

Principals again basically agreed with the same categories, but in a different order, namely funding and PD (each 32.7%, n = 49) and along with more time allowance for teachers the need, too, for specialist teachers (both 12.2%).

With specific respect to funding, it was found that of the 80 Principals responding, 45 had applied previously for funding under the contestable SLLPP and 37 had been successful. The size of grants received varied from $1,400 to $8,400, with the average grant size being $7,800. When queried concerning the use to which such funding had been put, 32 Principals replied indicating that the purchase of resources was the main use (68.8%), followed by ‘clustering’ (15.6%) and PD workshops (12.5%).

Specific recommendations were also sought from both groups concerning improving the roles of RLAs. Teachers suggested, in order of frequency:

a. more visits/contact (33.3%, n = 72)
b. more PD for teachers (29.2%)
c. more curriculum resources (19.4%), and
d. lesson observations (16.7%).

Principals focused on just two measures:

a. more visits/contact with RLAs (47.2%, n = 36), and
b. the training of teachers in language teaching methodology (41.7%).
Finally, recommendations were fielded for improving ILE in New Zealand schools generally. Although response rates were disappointingly low, both teachers and Principals clearly designated ‘more funding’ as the prime solution (teachers = 32.2%, n = 87; Principals = 43.3%, n = 30). Further teacher suggestions, in order of frequency, included:

a. raising the profile of ILE (16.1%)
b. more cluster-based PD (14.9%)
c. providing more time/starting ILE earlier and making it compulsory (both 12.6%)
d. more advisory support (6.9%), and
e. employing specialist teachers (4.6%).

For Principals the remaining order of suggestions was:

a. raise the profile of ILE (20%)
b. using native speaker contacts (13.3%)
c. providing more time for ILE (10%), and
d. more clustering and advisory support (both 6.7%).

5.5 Summary

1. The sample of IL teachers and Principals reported on may be characterised as:

   - located predominantly in intermediate and primary schools in mainly urban and mid-decile areas, and
   - teaching on average 2.6 ILs per school, with a fairly equal spread across schools of the four ILs studied.

   Classroom teachers made up about half of the teacher sample, with the rest exercising additional responsibilities. Around four-fifths of teachers were responsible for leading ILE in their schools, although less than 10 per cent of them received any release time for that role.

   Around half of IL teachers had less than one year’s IL-teaching experience, even though around half had 15 years’ or more general teaching experience.

   Around half of teachers taught two or more ILs and about a third of teachers were required to teach an IL, rather than volunteer.

   From a total of 45 Principals who had applied for funds from the SLLPP, 37 (82%) were successful. The average grant size was $7,800 and this was used mainly for the purchase of resources.

2. The general profile of ILE organisation within schools may be described as follows:

   - around half of classes have only one lesson per week, lasting about 50 minutes
   - the average class size is 28, with equal numbers of boys and girls
   - schools reveal a clear preference for compulsory ILE in both Years 7 and 8
   - timetable provision for ILE was achieved in the majority of schools by reducing the amount of time for other subjects
nearly half of teachers estimated that no integration of ILE with other curricula occurred in their schools
around a third indicated that links were made with Social Studies and the Arts
achievement was mainly assessed by teachers through oral tests and observation, and
less than half reported to parents on IL achievement in the same way as other curricular areas.

3. Salient aspects of teacher IL competency included:

- around half (for Japanese) to a third of teachers rate themselves as not competent in speaking the relevant IL
- about a third of teachers had had no prior IL learning and only one in five had engaged in some formal IL study, at either secondary or tertiary level
- nearly a third had not participated in any type of language teaching method course and the majority of the two-thirds who had done so had participated in courses lasting less than a total of 10 hours
- teachers estimated that, on average, about an hour of preparation was involved in each class they taught, although very wide variability was noted in this regard
- a clear majority of both Principals and teachers judged their schools’ ILE to be ‘effective/highly effective’; a third of teachers and half of Principals rated IL teaching as ‘not difficult’; and over 80 per cent of teachers rated their own IL teaching as ‘capable/highly capable’
- nearly all Principals and teachers believed students found ILE to be ‘enjoyable/highly enjoyable’
- around 90 per cent of Principals and teachers rated their students as ‘capable/highly capable’ and ‘achieving/high achieving’
- Principals were more likely to attribute student failure to poor teaching than to other factors, whereas teachers attributed it mainly to student ability
- Principals, as a group, strongly identified good teaching as the key factor in student success, and this view was also shared by teachers, but to a lesser extent, and
- teachers identified four items equally as important outcomes of ILE teaching: enjoyment; desire to continue; confidence in communicating; and cross-cultural empathy.

4. The impetus for ILE in schools was attributed by both teachers and Principals mainly to Principals, then teachers, then senior executive staff and parents/community. This represents a perception which contrasts sharply with RLAs’ estimates of their own influence. It may well be that the relative influence of the RLA impacted more on the development of ILE rather than in the initiation of ILE within schools. Both groups considered the importance of ILE lay mainly in its broadly educational value and its capacity to sensitise students to cultural differences. This contrasted with views concerning which specific IL should be taught, when more practical considerations were uppermost, such as teacher availability, career relevance and continuity. It also contrasted with both groups’ views on the main goals of ILE. Intercultural empathy was identified as the main goal and ‘fun/enjoyment’ as the next most important, followed by the ability to communicate in the IL. More than half of both groups acknowledged no ILE collaboration occurred with either local schools or the community generally and more than half of
Principals had no knowledge of whether IL students in their schools continued with these studies in Year 9, although nearly two-thirds of teachers believed their schools tried to facilitate continuity. When pressed for hypothetical ways in which continuity could be fostered, the majority of Principals were unwilling/unable to specify any at all.

5. Appraisals of ILE in relation to other curriculum areas revealed that both groups considered Pasifika languages to be of less benefit than either ILs or te reo Māori. Teachers generally viewed the study of either te reo Māori or any IL as equally beneficial. Principals revealed a slight preference for te reo Māori followed by Japanese and French. Principals regarded all other curriculum areas to be more important than ILE while teachers showed only a clear preference for English and Mathematics.

6. Both groups, especially teachers, were strongly supportive of the ILS materials in both general terms and with regard to specific components. Two-thirds of teachers reported making ‘high’ personal use of the resource generally (compared, for example, with less than half of teachers responding in this way to their use of the RLAs’ support services). During the previous year around a quarter of both groups had no contact with RLAs and around a half had had two or more contacts during that period. For the majority of teachers such contact had been RLA-initiated, while the opposite was true of Principals. Both groups described PD as the main type of RLA support received. In this capacity, teachers rated their effectiveness as very high, while Principals were less laudatory. Around two-thirds of teachers found most PD activities in which they participated to be very effective. Principals, on the other hand, were generally much less enthusiastic.

7. The overwhelming majority of both groups planned to continue with current ILE provisions into the future, but not to expand them. Three key factors, in order of importance, identified by teachers as impediments to sustainability were:
   a. the already crowded curriculum (43.5%, n = 147)
   b. lack of adequate teachers (25.2%), and
   c. funding (13.6%).

Principals also emphasised the same three things but in a different order:
   a. funding (33.8%, n = 68)
   b. teacher adequacy (32.4%), and
   c. the crowded curriculum (25%).

8. The questionnaire was relatively taxing. It is not surprising, therefore, that a marked feature of the surveys was the frequently low response rates of both groups to numerous questions. For example, if the 19 tables are examined above, we find considerable fluctuation with nine of the tables (Nos. 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19) revealing an average rate of 65 per cent for teachers and six of the tables (Nos. 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18) averaging 53 per cent for Principals. This, together with a number of self-contradictions, discussed above, possibly suggests a certain confusion about the ILE area generally. In particular, Principals’ scaled responses were generally more noticeably conservative or moderate in their estimates, suggesting also a certain lack of assuredness about many of the judgements made.
6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This section discusses the results reported in the previous two sections in light of the initial research questions and the literature review findings (see Sections 1 and 2). Consequently, the following considers first how the needs of students and teachers are being met by the three services: RLAs, ILS materials and the SLLPP and, second, how these services might be further strengthened in the future. In addition, consideration of these three services will incorporate notions of best practice from relevant research literature and of effective delivery characteristics with regard to four areas: key student general skills’ development; teacher quality support; diversity of provision; and general ILE management.

6.1 RLAs

From data gathered directly through interviews with the four current RLAs it is evident that they all perceive their work to be generally effective in introducing ILE to significant numbers of new schools, in providing new opportunities in ILE for ever-increasing numbers of students and in motivating IL teachers. They believed that they supported teachers effectively, and hence indirectly through them their students, in disseminating important information, in providing them with pertinent, regular PD activities, in mentoring them in the development of their classroom abilities, in building mutual support networks with other schools and in generally being a resource person for problems or queries of any sort.

Data from the survey of teachers and Principals generally supported RLAs’ positive self-evaluation. An average of half of teachers rated them as ‘highly effective’ across 19 different criteria, with the highest ratings (around 70%) relating to their professional expertise (language knowledge, language competence, language teaching knowledge, skill in language teaching). When ratings for ‘effective’ and ‘highly effective’ were combined, teacher appreciation of RLAs’ effectiveness was very marked – approaching, for example, 90 per cent for the four professional criteria mentioned immediately above (see Table 5.16). Teachers also perceived RLAs to be relatively proactive in that more than half reported that RLA contact had been initiated by the RLA themselves. More than three-quarters of teachers reported that the main type of support received from RLAs was PD; the next most significant support factor was individual teacher support. In rating the usefulness of recent PD sessions, future PD needs and teachers’ preferences (Table 5.17) teachers were again highly appreciative of RLAs’ support in this area (with RLAs’ PD rated ‘highly’ by 80 and 74 per cent across the first two categories). When asked for suggestions as to how to improve the roles of RLAs both teachers and Principals suggested basically ‘more of the same’: more RLA visits and more PD, as the two main responses. This is consistent with their evaluation in Table 5.15, of their ‘personal use’ of RLAs, with less than half rating it as ‘high’.

Clearly then both data sets confirm perceptions of high effectiveness of RLAs in supporting teachers and indirectly their students. Other local research literature also attests to their efficacy. An evaluation study of the first phase in the development of advisory services concluded that RLAs ‘added great value’ to the ILS materials by developing cluster systems, enhancing teacher skills and confidence and assisting schools in their planning and organisation for ILE (ACENZ, 2002: 33). Internationally, little material concerning the use of itinerant, specialist, adviser personnel is retrievable, at least in published form, suggesting that systems tend to support ILE more through material resources.
RLAs also made suggestions as to how their roles might be further improved. These included:

- reducing the area and the number of schools covered by each RLA
- providing more individual teacher mentoring
- splitting the roles of monitoring funding and facilitating ILE in funded schools, and
- focusing schools more directly on student learning outcomes.

With specific reference to diversity of provision, it would seem self-evident that RLAs promote diversity, in terms of location and school type (predominantly primary and intermediate) and size, simply through their mobility and availability. Data supplied by schools (see Section 5.2.1) attest also to excellent gender balance in IL classes generally, a persistent problem for many other school systems and levels in ILE (see, e.g. Carr, 2002). Formally, and informally with RLAs themselves, the function of cluster planning and assisting schools with organisational and assessment issues in ILE is viewed as basic to their role. This was acknowledged by some two-thirds of both teachers and Principals in relation to assessment and to a lesser extent by both with regard to assistance with school and cluster planning, school management and evaluation (around 55% on average; see Table 5.16).

6.2 ILS Resource

RLAs were convinced that the four ILS packages were a very effective impetus in getting languages started in schools. They also considered their organisation and quality to be strong motivating factors for both teachers and students. The features that made them particularly appealing, they thought, were their self-contained, easy-to-use organisation of materials (such as video lessons, back-up audiotape and CD practice materials and worksheet activities), their popularity with students because they could identify with characters their own age in video materials, for example, and their practicality for PD purposes.

Teachers surveyed also thoroughly endorsed the ILS materials in terms of their general effectiveness (88%), their readability, informativeness, comprehensiveness, appropriateness, effectiveness, ‘user-friendliness’ for teachers with little IL experience and for planning and teaching (see Tables 5.13 and 5.14). With specific reference to four key, cross-curricular student skills they were also highly enthusiastic about ILS’s effectiveness in developing communication and information skills (84%) and also social and co-operative skills (76%); although they were less certain, though still positive, about self-management (61%) and work and study skills (67%), with around a third reporting they were ‘unsure’. Finally, some two-thirds of teachers indicated that they make ‘high’ personal use of the ILS resource generally and of its worksheets; 56 per cent made high use of the video resources but only a quarter did the same for the CD resource, with a third registering ‘low’ personal usage. The same evaluation pattern was in evidence for the dimensions of ‘relevance’ and ‘effectiveness’.

It has been noted above, in discussions of relevant international literature, that the use of ILS-type, CALL and other distance, self-contained IL materials has been widespread, particularly in providing learning opportunities for students in remote area locations. Evaluations have been generally positive in terms of access but somewhat ambivalent in terms of outcomes. Thus, for example, a study of the New South Wales ALS Project, as well as a number of US studies, were non-committal concerning learning outcomes but very supportive of the
programme in general (see discussion in Section 2.4). This is supported from data supplied by teachers in relation to their preferred assessment strategies; see Table 5.19.

It has also been pointed out that whilst the definite trend, in Australia for example, is for State education departments to develop more interactive CALL materials rather than whole-class, lesson-replacement support materials, there is little hard information on either the optimal integration into overall programmes or the general learning effectiveness of such materials.

Relevant literature (see Section 2.6) does appear adamant, however, about the vital importance of the variable, described in ideal terms by one commentator as: “an empathetic, pedagogically-sound and linguistically-competent teacher in the classroom with the students for an optimal weekly time allocation” (Cunningham, 1992: 10). Teacher IL proficiency was also identified by one RLA as so significant as to neutralise the value of both resources like the ILS and PD provided by RLAs (see Section 5.3.2).

Suggestions by RLAs for further improving the ILS resource included: the need to revise the first two packages (for Japanese and Spanish) to bring them to the level of quality of the latter two (for French and German). Teachers agreed with this and, additionally, mentioned specifics, such as increase the number of resources and activities, and improve the cueing devices on both videos and CDs.

In terms of diversity of provision, the ILS resource clearly facilitates access to ILE across a wider range of school size, type and location. It also enables a certain amount of integration with other curricular areas, particularly Social Studies and the Arts, and, according to teacher estimates, is a valuable source of major generic skills across the whole curriculum.

6.3 Second Language Learning Proposals Pool

The general opinion of RLAs concerning the effectiveness of the funding pool was that it did promote the likely success of IL programmes by requiring schools to plan for sustainability and emphasised PD and that it was generally enabling in diversifying the curriculum through providing equipment and resources mainly, with some administrative support. These effects are borne out by data from the teacher and Principal surveys which indicated that 92 per cent of teachers and 85 per cent of Principals planned to continue offering the current range of ILs taught. More than half of the responding schools were in receipt of Ministry funding. Principals also indicated that, after further resource purchases, cluster development and PD were the next most frequent use of pool funds.

RLAs were aware that some tendency was evident of schools seeking funding for its own sake or for merely competitive reasons relating to neighbouring schools. This is quite possibly a significant effect since Principals tended to think quantitatively by also considering funding to be the greatest single threat to the continuance of ILE in their schools. This is possibly at variance with their teachers. In these respects teachers placed far less emphasis on funding and stressed more qualitative factors relating to the actual classroom (see Section 5.4).

International literature suggests that targeted funding in ILE can be very effective. An evaluation of the 1999 New South Wales Languages Continuity Initiative by Chesterton et al. (2002), for example, reported clear gains in articulation practices between primary and secondary schools. Presumably results have been positive with continued funding initiatives,
reported in Section 2.4, to support PD, resourcing, equipment acquisition, curriculum materials, visits abroad, and so forth.

Clearly, again, the SLLPP has promoted diversity by virtue of having facilitated the establishment of IL programmes in numerous locations and school types and sizes which would not otherwise have been encouraged to participate in ILE for their student communities. It has also clearly supported clustering of schools as a local support device for teachers, and supported teachers in improving the quality of ILE through PD. One area needing further investigation, however, is the extent to which the purchase of resources in various forms (from textbooks and cultural materials to equipment) has contributed to the quality of IL programmes. It is noted that one question common on both the teacher and the Principal survey forms which related to identifying and evaluating ‘other resources’, additional to the ILS and RLA PD support, was answered by only a handful of participants.

6.4 Conclusions

1. All three MOE services (RLAs, ILS and SLLPP) have been, and continue to be, very successful in expanding and sustaining pre-secondary ILE nationally, and across a wide variety of school types and locations. They all play an important role in meeting students’ learning needs across a range of key generic skills areas, in supporting teacher quality of delivery, in promoting diversity of provision and in supporting school and cluster planning.

2. The ILS resource kit’s reception by teachers and students is generally marked by enthusiasm and enjoyment. It can be further improved by updating the first two ILs (Spanish and Japanese) to the level of the latest two ILs (French and German), by improving the cueing devices on CD, audio and video media, and by increasing the number and type of pre-designed activities.

3. Principals and especially teachers rate the services of RLAs, especially PD in various forms, as highly effective and appropriate. Areas for possible improvement include: closer role definition, better co-ordination between RLAs, and an increase in their number.

4. Whilst the funding pool has undoubtedly acted as an impetus for the introduction of new and further IL programmes across a variety of schools, it is not clear to what extent funding has contributed to specific learning outcomes and to what extent it is viewed as a status symbol.

5. Principals, in general terms, stood out in the report’s surveys as generally less responsive to questions than teachers and as relatively unsure in their assessments of various aspects of ILE. This suggests that although they may be the key players in decisions to introduce ILE to schools, they may be less than confident about the consequent pedagogical details.

6. Given the general enthusiasm and enjoyment associated with the success of these three support initiatives in expanding significantly ILE in Years 7 and 8, a key question naturally arises in conjunction with their possible strengthening in the future, namely: should the aim of pre-secondary ILE remain largely input focused or ‘experiential’ or should it be more co-ordinated and output focused, aligned more carefully, for example, with the learning specifications for Levels 1 and 2 of the respective IL national curricula?
This is not to suggest, of course, that ‘enjoyment’ and learning outcomes are mutually exclusive.

7. Since, finally, the key means to successful learning is predominantly the teacher, consideration needs to be given to providing additional support to develop further both the teacher’s own IL proficiency and their understanding of IL-appropriate methodologies. Such further two-pronged PD is especially important in light of increasing evidence from the relevant international literature that the basis of second language acquisition, especially in the earlier stages, is authentic communication. This implies that L2 should be the medium of the everyday language classroom more than English is, which in turn implies that communication is best ‘authenticated’ through an instructional approach that is task based, interactive, problem solving and appropriate to the learner’s age and interests.
7 RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This final section makes a number of recommendations concerning topics that could usefully help to inform further or refine ILE policy generally. These are followed by some suggestions for further, related research.

7.1 Recommendations

7.1.1 ILS

1. Review and update the Japanese and Spanish kits.

2. Review the utility and especially ease of use of the ILS CD, audio and video materials. In particular, it is noted that improved cueing procedures would be useful for teachers.

3. Increase the number and range of suggested activities for best practice in each IL. In particular, these should be related to promoting authentic communication in the classroom and to programme achievement objectives in relation to curriculum statements.

4. Increase the number of activities that direct teachers to independent study, to seek further information, and to recreate teaching tasks in innovative ways rather than simply repeating activities in technicistways.

5. Limit the development of further IL programmes, and focus on enhancing the quality of the range presently offered.

7.1.2 RLAs

1. Define RLA role-sets more precisely, preferably through consultation with RLAs, national language advisers, clusters and teachers (both primary and secondary). If, for example, it were agreed that individual ‘hands-on’ mentoring was an important role and/or that greater co-ordination between the MOE, the RLAs themselves and national language advisers and lead teachers was necessary, consideration should be given to increasing the number of RLAs due to the time-consuming nature of such activities.

2. There is a strong suggestion that RLAs become less involved in helping schools with their application for assistance and more involved in assisting teachers. The funding role and its monitoring might better be served by a direct relationship between the school, Principal and the MOE. The MOE in 2003 has established a direct relationship with the schools for the funding pool application process, which gives RLAs more opportunities to focus on quality teaching aspects.

3. Include as an important RLA role strategies to increase teachers’ attention to learning outcomes via the integration of school IL programmes with task-based achievement objectives based on Level 1 and 2 curriculum statements.
4. Increase the attention on meaningful assessment and assessment reporting procedures so that the treatment of ILs moves into the realm of actual curriculum of equal relevance to most others.

7.1.3 SLLPP

1. Prioritise applications which concentrate on Outcome 1: the development and improvement of teacher capability.

2. Investigate how appropriate and successful is the use of additional resources acquired by schools through the funding pool.

7.1.4 Principals

1. Explore ways of both informing Principals about the details of ILE and committing them to its whole-school value, through means such as regional seminars, website updating, and so forth.

2. Investigate, with Principals’ advice, possible ways of normalising ILE in terms of its reporting to parents and secondary schools and its equitable status relating to timetabling, number of classes and total time per week, appointment of lead teachers (with an appropriate time allowance) to take responsibility for the IL programme within the school, space, and resources.

3. Explore with Principals problems and solutions related specifically to ILE staffing, such as timetabling, teacher supply and turnover, recruitment of various possible staff categories, and the advantages and disadvantages of using non-trained native speakers.

7.1.5 Teacher Competency

1. Devise ways and means of including in the pre-service teacher education of primary teachers an optional component to both build on students’ prior IL learning experience and provide basic teacher education in IL-specific teaching methodology.

2. The MOE might consider funding the development of IL materials specifically for teachers to enhance their personal-level knowledge, subject content knowledge and skills.

3. Increase the range of PD avenues currently available to IL teachers, for example through provision of time release for block courses, more ‘LangSem’ type activities at a local level, and study-leave incentives for outstanding practitioners for full-time attendance at local or overseas IL courses.

4. Prioritise specific PD courses on topics such as integrating IL programmes with curriculum-specific Level 1 and 2 learning outcomes, teaching multi-level classes, integrating ILs with other curriculum areas, improving communication with secondary colleagues and developing a reporting procedure to promote cross-sector continuity.

5. Regularise as a systemic norm through appropriate time and/or special responsibility allowance the positions of ‘lead teacher’ (with general responsibility for a school’s IL programme) and ‘cluster leader’ (with responsibility for promoting the continuing
development of ILE in an area through regular PD and other mutual support and consultation).

6. Increase opportunities for people conversant in specific ILs to work alongside IL teachers. It is suggested that this could include, but not be limited to:

- funding non-registered teachers with IL competence to work alongside registered teachers
- providing payments of honoraria for people competent in IL to assist in classrooms, and
- appointing proportional positions for language-competent people (preferably teachers) to work alongside clusters of schools.

7.2 Suggestions for Further Research

1. A study of the learning efficacy of various interactive CALL technologies in comparison with each other and with non-technologised learning contexts.

2. The showcasing of highly effective, innovative IL-teaching techniques, using numerous outstanding practitioners and IL-specific pedagogies, through the production of videos for private or PD-group use.

3. A feasibility study on the redefining of second language learning as a separate, compulsory (for a certain period) Key Learning Area identifying sub-areas: te reo Māori, ILs and ‘community languages and Pasifika languages’14.

4. An investigation of the efficacy of the co-learner/facilitator classroom teacher model of pre-secondary ILE. The aim of such a study would be to probe the extent to which ‘mis-teaching’ occurs or an ethos of false confidence works counter-productively.

5. An exploration study of the effective, best-practice teaching of the ‘culture’ component of ILE (since the area is often criticised for being too shallow and also for abetting the promotion of cultural stereotyping).

6. The production of a promotional video, for both general school and community purposes, to emphasise the value and benefits of second language learning and stressing the difference between goals as means (e.g. the immediate goal of acquiring first basic conversational proficiency, then adding literacy, etc) and goals as ends (using an acquired proficiency for some application or other, such as interpreting/translating or travelling or researching or in a bilingual job, etc).

7. Research specifically to inform about the following, and to make recommendations for future best practice:

- what and how do teachers of ILE actually teach?
- what do students actually learn, and to what standards, from ILE?

---

14 Second language learning was identified as an area of concern through the Ministry of Education’s Curriculum Stocktake process. The Curriculum Stocktake Report is available on http://www.minedu.govt.nz.
- to what extent do students continue with ILs post Year 8?
- what are the actual curriculum impacts resulting from including ILs in the presently over-crowded curriculum?
- what are the specific impacts on te reo Māori that result when ILE is incorporated in Year 7 and 8 curricula?
- how do teachers’ beliefs change with regard to te reo Māori after ILs have been present in the Year 7 and 8 curricula?
- to what extent do the ILS resources promote dependence on prepared resources at the expense of teacher innovativeness?
- given that neophyte teachers predominate in delivering ILE while also dealing with the survival associated with early levels of teacher development, to what extent do neophyte teachers’ versus experienced general teachers’ perceptions of teaching ILs vary?
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Kia ora koutou.

Please find attached a letter which informs you all of an evaluation that is being undertaken by AUT on behalf of the Ministry of the support provided for International languages education for Years 7 & 8. As providers of that support your work will come under scrutiny. Please be assured that the evaluation in no way sets out to measure the performance of any of the people involved. The evaluation has clear goals, and these are explained in the accompanying letter. It is time the Ministry took stock of the materials and support provided in order to gain information about what is effective for student learning so that solid decisions for teacher support can be made for the future. I hope that you will all find the process useful and worthwhile also in the work you are currently engaged in. This process is part of the quality procedures that the Ministry has in place for all of its projects.

Please contact me if you have any queries or concerns.

Gail Spence
Curriculum Facilitator Language & Languages
Curriculum Division
Ministry of Education
Private Bag 1666
Wellington
Ph. 04 463 8027 (direct dial)
Fax: 04 463 8051
Kia ora koutou

Graeme Oldershaw  Executive Director ACENZ
Brian Clark    Project Director ACENZ - until June 30 2002
Catherine Hannagan  Project Director ACENZ - from June 30 2002
Regional Language Advisers Wendy Thomson
Jeanne Gilbert
Noeline Grant
Jo Guthrie

Re: Research Project- International Languages Education at Years 7-8

This letter is to inform you that the Ministry of Education has contracted the Auckland University of Technology (AUT) to carry out an evaluation of Ministry of Education resources and support relating to International Languages Education, and to ask for your willing participation in this important process. The project will be carried out over the next few months, and is retrospective to 1998.

As you are aware, the Ministry funds the following resources and support to schools delivering International Languages Education to year 7 and 8 students:

- Regional Advisers in International Languages Education to support teachers of international languages;
- The International Language Series (ILS) materials for teachers of international languages -
  - Hai: An Introduction to Japanese
  - Si: An Introduction to Spanish
  - Oui: An Introduction to French, and
  - Ja: An Introduction to German;
- The Second Language Learning Proposals Pool years 7 - 10, which assists schools with some of the set-up and/or resourcing costs of programmes that provide students with opportunities to learn other languages.

The Ministry wants to assess how these services are meeting the needs of students and international languages teachers, and how they might be further strengthened in the future. Therefore the research objectives are to:

- Identify effective delivery characteristics of International Languages Education from national and international literature;
- Analyse the effectiveness of Ministry of Education resources and support targeted to International Languages Education in respect of:
  - meeting the learning needs of students and in particular the development of: communication and information skills, social and co-operative skills, self management skills, and work and study skills;
  - supporting teachers to deliver quality International Languages Education programmes;
– supporting diversity of provision; and
– supporting school and cluster planning, management and evaluation of their programmes.

There will be areas of focus for each of the Ministry supported services. For the Regional Advisers in International Languages Education some key questions are:

- How do the regional advisers utilise available resources and support in International Languages Education?
- How do schools make use of these services and are there significant differences in school practice? and
- How do teachers and schools perceive the service delivery of the regional advisers, and are there variations in the ways schools/clusters use these services?

For the International Language Series (ILS), some key questions are:

- What is the uptake of these resources and what other resources are used in conjunction with, or instead of, the ILS resources? and
- What are the perceptions of international languages teachers of these resources?

For the Second Language Learning Proposals Pool years 7-10, the project will look at how schools use this funding to establish effective International Languages Education programmes, particularly for year 7 and 8 students, and how this resource complements other Ministry of Education resources and support.

The research team will review related evaluations, policy documents, milestone reports, and incorporate key national and international academic literature where appropriate. A survey of schools delivering International Languages Education at years 7 and 8 will be carried out as well as interviews with key personnel. The research team from AUT will be in touch shortly to arrange a time to interview each of you. The Ministry asks for your full support in participating in the research process. The research report stands to make a valuable contribution to our knowledge base of how well the support for second language learning in Years 7 and 8 is meeting learner and teacher needs and how we can strengthen our resources and support.

Please contact me should you require any further information.

Yours sincerely

Gail Spence
Curriculum Facilitator
gail.spence@minedu.govt.nz
Appendix 2

international languages education project
evaluation of international languages education in Years 7 and 8

Questionnaire for Principals of schools which provide International Languages Education for Year 7 and/or Year 8 students
The Ministry of Education is seeking an evaluative review of the International Languages Education [ILE] programmes now operating in Years 7 and 8 in New Zealand Schools. This questionnaire invites you to provide information about the International Languages Education programmes which you and your school have been involved in. In particular, we are focusing on

a. The Ministry of Education ILE Series resource materials, including their utility, usage, effectiveness limitations and strengths

b. the professional support provided through site-related professional development programmes, Regional Advisers, and other professional development opportunities, and

c. recommendations for Ministry of Education policy initiatives for future high quality delivery of programmes in IEL.

- The information you provide will be seen only by the research team.
- Individual teachers and schools will be anonymous in the reports which are provided to the Ministry of Education.
- If you wish to be identified to the research team, and to make yourself available for possible follow-up discussion, please let us know.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Principal Researchers

Professor Colin Gibbs
Head of School: Education
Auckland University of Technology

Professor Ron Holt
Head of School: Languages
Auckland University of Technology
1. **school information**

1. What International Languages are taught in your school?
   - [ ] Spanish
   - [ ] Japanese
   - [ ] German
   - [ ] French
   - [ ] Other  

2. My school is
   a. Decile ______
   b. [ ] urban
      [ ] rural
   c. [ ] Intermediate
      [ ] Middle school
      [ ] Full Primary (years 1-8) school
      [ ] District High school (years 7-13)
      [ ] Area school

d. What is the ethnic composition and participation in ILE in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of students in school</th>
<th>Number of students learning…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Have you applied for Ministry of Education ILE funding?  **YES/NO**

f. Is your school funded by the Ministry of Education’s Second Language Learning Contestable Fund for ILE?  **YES/NO**

g. If yes, what grant did you receive, and how has it been used?
   •
   •
   •
   •
   •
3. Who initiated the idea to teach International Languages in your school?
   - parents/community
   - Board of Trustees
   - Principal
   - Senior staff
   - teachers
   - students
   - in response to the funding initiative of the Ministry of Education
   - other ________________

4. When your school considered International Languages Education, to what extent did consultation occur with
   | teachers | not at all | very little | some | extensive |
   | parents/community |                     |             |      |           |
   | Ministry of Education |                  |             |      |           |
   | Language teachers |                     |             |      |           |
   | students |                     |             |      |           |

5. What is the main reason it was decided that International Language Education would be incorporated into the curriculum at your school?

   __________________________________________________________________________________

6. What is the main reason your school selected the specific language(s) that is/are currently taught in your school?

   __________________________________________________________________________________

7. To what extent do students studying ILE at your school continue with ILE when they enter Year 9?
   - unknown
   - less than 10%
   - 10-20%
   - 20-30%
   - 30-40%
   - 40-50%
   - 50-60%
   - 60-70%
   - 70-80%
   - 80-90%
   - 90-100%

8. Suggest ways by which continuity in students’ learning might be facilitated for International Language Education when they enter Year 9 and beyond.
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
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9. When it comes to International Languages Education, what collaboration does your school have with
   a. the community
   b. other schools

10. To fit International Languages Education in your school’s curriculum, what variations did you need to make to the existing curriculum?

11. In your school, International Languages Education is
   ☐ Year 7: compulsory
   ☐ Year 7: elective
   ☐ Year 8: compulsory
   ☐ Year 8: elective
   otherv

12. Year 7 and 8 students would benefit from learning

| Language | More than | Language | | | | | |
|----------|-----------|----------|---|---|---|---|
| Māori    | more than | Pacific  | yes | no | neither | same |
| Māori    | more than | French   |     |   |     |     |
| Māori    | more than | Japanese |     |   |     |     |
| Māori    | more than | Spanish  |     |   |     |     |
| Māori    | more than | German   |     |   |     |     |
| Pacific  | more than | French   |     |   |     |     |
| Pacific  | more than | Japanese |     |   |     |     |
| Pacific  | more than | Spanish  |     |   |     |     |
| Pacific  | more than | German   |     |   |     |     |
| French   | more than | Japanese |     |   |     |     |
| French   | more than | Spanish  |     |   |     |     |
| French   | more than | German   |     |   |     |     |
| Japanese | more than | Spanish  |     |   |     |     |
| Japanese | more than | German   |     |   |     |     |
| Spanish  | more than | German   |     |   |     |     |
13. Year 7 and 8 students would benefit from learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>more than</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>neither</th>
<th>same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and PE</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and PE</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and PE</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and PE</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. school and International Language Education [ILE]

14. When it comes to teaching ILE, my school might be best described as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not capable at all</th>
<th>not capable</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>capable</th>
<th>highly capable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. When it comes to teaching ILE, my school might be best described as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not effective at all</th>
<th>not effective</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>effective</th>
<th>highly effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. Most teachers in my school would describe teaching ILE as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>extremely difficult</th>
<th>difficult</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>not difficult</th>
<th>not difficult at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. students and International Language Education [ILE]

17. How enjoyable is ILE for students in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>not enjoyable</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>enjoyable</th>
<th>highly enjoyable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
18. When it comes to learning ILE, I would describe my students as
not capable at all  not capable  unsure  capable  highly capable

19. When students fail to achieve in ILE, I would most likely explain this as resulting from
- poor teaching
- student background
- teaching resources
- student gender
- teacher competence
- student ability
- teacher effort
- student effort
- lack of teacher knowledge
- other ______________________

20. When students achieve in ILE, I would most likely explain this as resulting from
- poor teaching
- student background
- teaching resources
- student gender
- teacher competence
- student ability
- teacher effort
- student effort
- knowledge of teachers
- other ______________________

21. From my point of view, the three most important goals for students learning an International Language are
most important goal ______________________
second most important goal ______________________
third most important goal ______________________

4. Ministry of Education’s International Language Series (ILS) teaching resources

22. The objectives/learning outcomes of the Ministry of Education’s International Languages Series teaching resources are
completely inappropriate  unsure  appropriate  extremely inappropriate  appropriate

23. The teaching ideas/activities in the Ministry of Education’s International Languages Series teaching resources are
completely inappropriate  unsure  appropriate  extremely inappropriate  appropriate

24. The assessment activities in the Ministry of Education’s International Languages Series teaching resources are
completely inappropriate  unsure  appropriate  extremely inappropriate  appropriate
25. I would say that, overall, the Ministry of Education’s International Languages Series teaching resources are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>extremely ineffective</th>
<th>ineffective</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>effective</th>
<th>extremely effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To what extent are the Ministry of Education’s International Languages Series teaching resources effective in meeting the learning needs of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>extremely ineffective</th>
<th>ineffective</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>effective</th>
<th>extremely effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. To what extent are the Ministry of Education’s International Languages Series teaching resources effective in providing for the development of students’ communication skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>extremely ineffective</th>
<th>ineffective</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>effective</th>
<th>extremely effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>information skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-operative skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-management skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work and study skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. The major weakness of the Ministry of Education’s International Languages Series teaching resources is

........................................................................................................................................................................................................

28. The major strength of the Ministry of Education’s International Languages Series teaching resources is

........................................................................................................................................................................................................

29. I would say that the Ministry of Education’s International Language Series teaching resources are best described as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>extremely poor</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>readability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informativeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehensiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriateness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ease of use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. other support resources

30. List and evaluate other resources (including educational technology, additional texts, etc) you use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List ILE resources you use</th>
<th>personal use</th>
<th>effectiveness</th>
<th>relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE International Language Series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILE Regional Advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. ILE Regional Advisers
   a. how many times has your school used the ILE Advisers in the last 12 months?
      ☐ nil  ☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ > 3

   b. Who initiated the majority of contact between the Regional Advisers and the school?
      ☐ teachers  ☐ Principal  ☐ School  ☐ Adviser  ☐ other ______________

   c. What kind of support was provided?
      ☐ school professional development support  ☐ individual teacher support  ☐ other _____________
d. I would evaluate the effectiveness of the ILE Regional Advisers as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>highly ineffective</th>
<th>ineffective</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>effective</th>
<th>highly effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>knowledge of language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence in language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge of language teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skill in language teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact on my own teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact on my programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact on school programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enhancing my teaching confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing positive feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing insights into learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing guidance on teaching ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing guidance on assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing access to further resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assisting school and cluster planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assisting school and cluster management of ILE programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assisting school and cluster evaluation of ILE programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing school development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. professional development support

32. As Principal, what professional development in International Languages Education have you been involved in the last 12 months
   □ none
   □ school based professional development
   □ attendance at relevant language teaching conference
   □ personal study in language
   □ personal study in language teaching
   □ other ________________________________
33. As Principal, what areas of professional development in International Languages Education have you found useful?
- none
- individual based professional development
- school based professional development
- language learning professional development
- language teaching professional development
- ILE Adviser-lead professional development
- Ministry of Education funded professional development
- other ____________________________

34. What professional development related to International Language Education have your ILE teachers been involved in the last 12 months?
- none
- school based professional development
- attendance at relevant language teaching conference
- personal study in language
- personal study in language teaching
- other ____________________________

35. What professional development has your ILE teachers found useful?
- none
- individual based professional development
- school based professional development
- language learning professional development
- language teaching professional development
- ILE Adviser-lead professional development
- Ministry of Education funded professional development
- other ____________________________

36. What areas of professional development would increase effectiveness?
- individual based professional development
- school based professional development
- language learning professional development
- language teaching professional development
- ILE Adviser-lead professional development
- Ministry of Education funded professional development
- other ____________________________

37. What professional development topics would increase effectiveness?
- topics related to personal language competence
- topics related to teaching of language
- topics related to assessment of language learning
- other topics such as ____________________________
future directions

39. Our school plans in the next two years to
   - continue existing range of International Languages
   - discontinue existing range of International Languages
   - expand the access to the existing International Languages taught
   - reduce the access to the existing International Languages taught
   - expand the range of International Languages taught
   - reduce the range of International Languages taught
   - substitute the International Languages presently being taught

Comment

40. What are the greatest threats to the continuance to International Languages Education in your school?

recommendations

41. How might International Languages Education be improved in your school?
42. How might the services from the Regional Advisers contribute more directly to student effectiveness in ILE learning?

43. What recommendations would you make to improve International Languages Education in schools in New Zealand?
Appendix 3

International languages education project
Evaluation of international languages education in Years 7 and 8

Questionnaire for teachers in schools which provide International Languages Education for Year 7 and/or Year 8 students
The Ministry of Education is seeking an evaluative review of the International Languages Education [ILE] programmes now operating in Years 7 and 8 in New Zealand Schools. This questionnaire invites you to provide information about the International Languages Education programmes which you and your school have been involved in. In particular, we are focusing on

a. the Ministry of Education ILE Series resource materials, including their utility, usage, effectiveness limitations and strengths

b. the professional support provided through site-related professional development programmes, Regional Advisers, and other professional development opportunities, and

c. recommendations for Ministry of Education policy initiatives for future high quality delivery of programmes in IEL.

• The information you provide will be seen only by the research team.

• Individual teachers and schools will be anonymous in the reports which are provided to the Ministry of Education.

• If you wish to be identified to the research team, and to make yourself available for possible follow-up discussion, please let us know.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Principal Researchers

Professor Colin Gibbs
Head of School: Education
Auckland University of Technology

Professor Ron Holt
Head of School: Languages
Auckland University of Technology
1. participant information

1. Presently, I am *(please tick appropriate boxes)*
   - [ ] Principal
   - [ ] Deputy/Assistant/ Associate Principal
   - [ ] Curriculum/Syndicate Leader
   - [ ] Head of Department/Section
   - [ ] Classroom Teacher
   - [ ] Other ______________________

2. Do you have responsibility for leading International Language Education in your School?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

3. If you answered ‘yes’ to question #2, do you have release time?
   - [ ] Yes *(how many hours per week?)*
   - [ ] No

4. a. When did you first begin teaching? _____
   b. Since then, how many years in total have you taught *(sum part-time and full-time teaching time)?* _____
   c. How many years in total have you taught ILE programmes *(sum part-time and full-time teaching time)?* _____
   d. What International Languages have you taught and for how many years?
      - [ ] Spanish _____ years
      - [ ] German _____ years
      - [ ] Japanese _____ years
      - [ ] French _____ years
      - [ ] Other _____ years
   e. How did you come to teach International Languages Education?
      - [ ] personal choice
      - [ ] I applied for a teaching position that included ILE
      - [ ] I was assigned or required to teach ILE
      - [ ] Other (explain) ____________________________
f. For each class of students in International Languages Education you teach:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Year 7 or Year 8</th>
<th>International Language taught eg. German, Japanese, Spanish, French</th>
<th>No. of teaching sessions per week</th>
<th>Length of teaching session (minutes)</th>
<th>No. of weeks of instruction in a year</th>
<th>No. of students in class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. How personally competent are you as a speaker of the International Languages you teach?

**Spanish**

- [ ] not taught
- [ ] not at all competent
- [ ] not competent
- [ ] unsure
- [ ] competent
- [ ] highly competent

**German**

- [ ] not taught
- [ ] not at all competent
- [ ] not competent
- [ ] unsure
- [ ] competent
- [ ] highly competent

**Japanese**

- [ ] not taught
- [ ] not at all competent
- [ ] not competent
- [ ] unsure
- [ ] competent
- [ ] highly competent

**French**

- [ ] not taught
- [ ] not at all competent
- [ ] not competent
- [ ] unsure
- [ ] competent
- [ ] highly competent

**Other language**

- [ ] not taught
- [ ] not at all competent
- [ ] not competent
- [ ] unsure
- [ ] competent
- [ ] highly competent
h. What instruction have you had in learning the international language?
   - [ ] none
   - [ ] already a speaker
   - [ ] in-country experience
   - [ ] personal independent study
   - [ ] studied at High School as a secondary student
   - [ ] attended night courses
   - [ ] university study
   - [ ] other __________________________

5. What instruction have you had in teaching the international language?
   - [ ] none
   - [ ] second language learning teaching qualification __________
   - [ ] short course/seminars (less than 10 hours)
   - [ ] short course/seminars (10 hours or more)
   - [ ] other __________________________

6. For each hour of teaching, on average how much preparation do you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>preparing lesson</th>
<th>understanding content</th>
<th>preparing resources</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>total time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. school information

7. What International Languages are taught in your school?
   - [ ] Spanish
   - [ ] Japanese
   - [ ] German
   - [ ] French
   - [ ] Other ______________

8. My school is
   a. Decile __________
   b. [ ] urban
      [ ] rural
c.  ☐ Intermediate  
☐ Middle school  
☐ Full Primary (years 1-8) school  
☐ District High school (years 7-13)  
☐ Area school

d. What is the ethnic composition and participation in International Languages Education in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of students in school</th>
<th>Number of students learning…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakeha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. What percentage of student drop-out from International Languages Education classes?
   During Year 7: _____%  
   During Year 8: _____%  
   Between Year 7 and Year 8: _____%

f. Is your school funded by the Ministry of Education’s Second Language Learning Contestable Fund for ILE?  
   YES/NO

g. Who initiated the idea to teach International Languages in your school?  
☐ parents/community  
☐ Board of Trustees  
☐ Principal  
☐ Senior staff  
☐ teachers  
☐ students  
☐ in response to the funding initiative of the Ministry of Education  
☐ other ____________________
h. When your schools considered International Languages Education, to what extent did consultation occur with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quartile</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very little</th>
<th>some</th>
<th>extensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents/community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. What is the main reason it was decided that International Languages Education would be incorporated into the curriculum at your school?

________________________________________________________________________

j. What is the main reason your school selected the specific language(s) that is/are currently taught in your school?

________________________________________________________________________

k. Suggest ways by which continuity in students’ learning might be facilitated for International Languages Education when they enter Year 9 and beyond

•
•
•

l. When it comes to International Languages Education, what collaboration do you as a teacher have with?
   a. the community
   b. other schools
m. To fit International Languages Education in your school’s curriculum, what variations were made to the existing curriculum?

n. In your school, International Languages Education is *(tick)*
   - Year 7: compulsory
   - Year 7: elective
   - Year 8: compulsory
   - Year 8: elective
   - other__________________________

o. Can a student study more than one language in your school *(tick)*
   - During Year 7
   - During Year 8
   - Across years 7 and 8
   - comment_______________________________________

p. Year 7 and 8 students would benefit from learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>More than</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>neither</th>
<th>same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
q. Year 7 and 8 students would benefit from learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>More Than</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and PE</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and PE</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and PE</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and PE</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>more than</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. School and International Language Education [ILE]

9. When it comes to teaching ILE, my school might be best described as
   - not capable at all
   - not capable
   - unsure
   - capable
   - highly capable

10. When it comes to teaching ILE, my school might be best described as
    - not effective at all
    - not effective
    - unsure
    - effective
    - highly effective

11. Most teachers in my school would describe teaching ILE as
    - extremely difficult
    - difficult
    - unsure
    - not difficult
    - not difficult at all

12. When it comes to teaching ILE, I would describe myself as
    - not capable at all
    - not capable
    - unsure
    - capable
    - highly capable
13. When it comes to teaching ILE, I would describe myself as
☐ not effective at all ☐ not effective ☐ unsure ☐ effective ☐ highly effective

14. For myself, I would describe teaching ILE as
☐ extremely difficult ☐ difficult ☐ unsure ☐ not difficult ☐ not difficult at all

4. students and International Language Education [ILE]

15. How enjoyable is ILE for your students?
☐ not at all ☐ not enjoyable ☐ unsure ☐ enjoyable ☐ highly enjoyable

16. When it comes to learning ILE, I would describe my students as
☐ not capable at all ☐ not capable ☐ unsure ☐ capable ☐ highly capable

17. When it comes to ILE, I would describe my students as
☐ not achieving ☐ low achieving ☐ unsure ☐ achieving ☐ high achieving
at all

18. When students fail to achieve in ILE, the School would most likely explain this as resulting from
☐ poor teaching ☐ student background
☐ teaching resources ☐ student gender
☐ teacher competence ☐ student ability
☐ teacher effort ☐ student effort
☐ lack of teacher knowledge ☐ other ____________________

19. When students achieve in ILE, the School would most likely explain this as resulting from
☐ poor teaching ☐ student background
☐ teaching resources ☐ student gender
☐ teacher competence ☐ student ability
☐ teacher effort ☐ student effort
☐ lack of teacher knowledge ☐ other ____________________
20. When students fail to achieve in ILE, I would most likely explain this as resulting from
- poor teaching
- teaching resources
- teacher competence
- teacher effort
- lack of teacher knowledge
- student background
- student gender
- student ability
- student effort
- other ________________

21. When students achieve in ILE, I would most likely explain this as resulting from
- poor teaching
- teaching resources
- teacher competence
- teacher effort
- lack of teacher knowledge
- student background
- student gender
- student ability
- student effort
- other ________________

5. Ministry of Education’s International Language Series (ILS) teaching resources

22. The objectives/learning outcomes of the Ministry of Education’s International Language Series teaching resources are
- completely inappropriate
- unsure
- appropriate
- extremely inappropriate
- appropriate

23. The teaching ideas/activities in the Ministry of Education’s International Language Series teaching resources are
- completely inappropriate
- unsure
- appropriate
- extremely inappropriate
- appropriate

24. The assessment activities in the Ministry of Education’s International Language Series teaching resources are
- completely inappropriate
- unsure
- appropriate
- extremely inappropriate
- appropriate

25. I would say that, overall, the Ministry of Education’s International Language Series teaching resources are
- not effective at all
- not effective
- unsure
- effective
- highly effective
To what extent are the Ministry of Education’s International Language Series teaching resources effective in meeting the learning needs of students

☐ not effective at all  ☐ not effective  ☐ unsure  ☐ effective  ☐ highly effective

26. To what extent are the Ministry of Education’s International Language Series teaching resources effective in developing students’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>extremely ineffective</th>
<th>ineffective</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>effective</th>
<th>extremely effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-operative skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-management skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work and study skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. The major weakness of the Ministry of Education’s International Language Series teaching resources is

________________________________________________________________________

28. The major strength of the Ministry of Education’s International Language Series teaching resources is

________________________________________________________________________

29. I would say that the Ministry of Education’s International Language Series teaching resources are best described as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>extremely poor</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>readability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehensiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ease of use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. other support resources

30. List and evaluate other resources (including educational technology, additional texts, etc) you use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List ILE resources you use</th>
<th>personal use</th>
<th>effectiveness</th>
<th>relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Medium Low</td>
<td>High Medium Low</td>
<td>High Medium Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE International Language Series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILE Regional Advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. International Language Education Regional Advisers

   a. how many times has your school used the ILE Advisers in the last 12 months?
   - nil
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - > 3

   b. Who initiated the majority of contact between the Regional Advisers and the school?
   - teachers
   - Principal
   - School
   - Adviser
   - other ___________________________

   c. What kind of support was provided?
   - school professional development support
   - individual teacher support
   - other ___________________________
d. I would evaluate the effectiveness of the ILE Regional Advisers as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>highly ineffective</th>
<th>ineffective</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>effective</th>
<th>highly effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>knowledge of language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence in language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge of language teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skill in language teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact on my own teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact on my programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact on school programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enhancing my teaching confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing positive feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing insights into learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing guidance on teaching ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing guidance on assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing access to further resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assisting school and cluster planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assisting school and cluster management of ILE programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assisting school and cluster evaluation of ILE programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing school development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. professional development support

a. What professional development in International Languages Education have you been involved in the last 12 months
   - [ ] none
   - [ ] school based professional development
   - [ ] attendance at relevant language teaching conference
   - [ ] personal study in language
   - [ ] personal study in language teaching
   - [ ] other ____________________________
b. What areas of professional development in ILE have you found useful?
   - none
   - individual based professional development
   - school based professional development
   - language learning professional development
   - language teaching professional development
   - ILE Adviser-lead professional development
   - Ministry of Education funded professional development
   - other __________________________

32. What areas of professional development would increase effectiveness?
   - none
   - individual based professional development
   - school based professional development
   - language learning professional development
   - language teaching professional development
   - ILE Adviser-lead professional development
   - Ministry of Education funded professional development
   - other __________________________

33. What topics of professional development would increase effectiveness?
   - none
   - topics related to personal language competence
   - topics related to teaching of language
   - topics related to assessment of language learning
   - other topics such as __________________________

34. What is your preference for professional development in International Languages Education
   - no preference
   - individual assistance from experts (such as Regional Advisers)
   - school-based professional development seminars/workshops
   - professional development block courses, on-site
   - professional development block courses, off-site
   - university (or other tertiary) course study
   - other such as __________________________
8. **teaching International Language Education**

35. When teaching international languages, my three main emphases are:

- 
- 
- 

36. From my point of view, the three most important goals for students learning an International Language are

   most important goal _______________________

   second most important goal _______________________

   third most important goal _______________________

37. Briefly describe an example of your best practice in teaching International Language Education

38. Bullet point the key components of a typical lesson you might teach in International Languages

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
-
39. What main assessment events, if any, do you use in assessing International Languages?
   •
   •
   •
   •
   •

40. Is assessment of student performance on International Languages Education reported to parents in the same way as for other curricula (such as reading, mathematics, etc)? Please explain.

future directions

41. Our school plans in the next two years to
   □ continue existing range of International Languages
   □ discontinue existing range of International Languages
   □ expand the access to the existing International Languages taught
   □ reduce the access to the existing International Languages taught
   □ expand the range of International Languages taught
   □ reduce the range of International Languages taught
   □ substitute the International Languages presently being taught

Comment
42. What are the greatest threats to the continuance to International Languages Education in your school?

recommendations

43. How might International Languages Education be improved in your school?

44. How might the services from the Regional Advisers contribute more directly to student effectiveness in International Languages learning?

45. What recommendations would you make to improve International Languages Education in schools in New Zealand?
Starter questions for focus interviews with Regional Language Advisers

Pre-Interview

1. **Contact from Ministry of Education.**
   The Ministry of Education advised the four Regional Advisers of the research and its purposes and encouraged their support and involvement. (See appendix #1 for copy of Ministry of Education correspondence.)

2. **Establishing interviews and initial general focus questions.**
   Once interview times were established, participants were advised of some advance organisers to set the scene for the interview. Participants were invited to think about
   - the effectiveness of the ILE programmes in their region
   - strengths and weaknesses of the ILE programmes, materials, resources
   - experiences, characteristics and needs of ILE teachers
   - experiences, characteristics and needs of participating schools
   - any data on involvement with ILE teachers, schools, etc, perhaps indicating who initiated contacts (school? teacher? adviser?), which teachers and schools were involved, and in what ways (seminars, professional development, individual support, etc)
   - any recommendations for increasing the effectiveness of ILE programmes in Year 7/8.

**Introduction to Interview Session**

The Ministry funds the following resources and support to schools delivering International Languages Education to year 7 and 8 students:
- Regional Advisers in International Languages Education to support teachers of international languages;
- The International Language Series (ILS) materials for teachers of international languages -
  - Hai: An Introduction to Japanese
  - Si: An Introduction to Spanish
  - Oui: An Introduction to French, and
  - Ja: An Introduction to German;
• The Second Language Learning Proposals Pool years 7 - 10, which assists schools with some of the set-up and/or resourcing costs of programmes that provide students with opportunities to learn other languages.

Purpose of the Interview

The Ministry wants to assess how these services are meeting the needs of students and international languages teachers, and how they might be further strengthened in the future. Therefore the research objectives are to:

• Identify effective delivery characteristics of International Languages Education from national and international literature;
• Analyse the effectiveness of Ministry of Education resources and support targeted to International Languages Education in respect of:
  ➢ meeting the learning needs of students and in particular the development of: communication and information skills, social and co-operative skills, self management skills, and work and study skills;
  ➢ supporting teachers to deliver quality International Languages Education programmes;
  ➢ supporting diversity of provision; and
  ➢ supporting school and cluster planning, management/evaluation of programmes.

Key Starter Questions

A. Regional Advisers:

• How do the regional advisers utilise available resources and support in International Languages Education?
• How do schools make use of these services and are there significant differences in school practice?
• How do teachers and schools perceive the service delivery of the regional advisers, and are there variations in the ways schools/clusters use these services?
• What are the current strengths and weaknesses in the delivery of Regional Advisor support?
• What are the perceived strengths and weaknesses of International Languages Education (Years 7 /8)?

B. International Language Series (ILS)

• What is the uptake of these resources and what other resources are used in conjunction with, or instead of, the ILS resources?
• What are the perceptions of international languages teachers of these resources?
• What are the perceived strengths and weaknesses of these materials?
• How might the effectiveness of these materials be enhanced?
• What supplementary materials would be useful for International Languages Education?
C. Second Language Learning Proposals Pool years 7-10

- How do schools use this funding to establish effective International Languages Education programmes, particularly for year 7 and 8 students?

- How does this resource complement other Ministry of Education resources and support?

- Is the funding targeted appropriately?

- How might the funding be better targeted?

D. Recommendations

- How might the teaching of International Languages Education be improved in schools?

- How might the services of the Regional Advisers contribute more directly to student effectiveness in International Language Education?

- What recommendations would you make to improve International Languages Education in schools (Years 7/8) in New Zealand?