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1. Introduction: Teacher Development, Educational Technology and issues of Quality and Scale

- ADEA 2005: report on quality of education in Africa: “Access must be combined with an emphasis on quality”

- World Bank 2011: 2020 Education Strategy: “many children and youth in developing countries leave school without having learned much at all”


- Moon 2014: launch of 2013-14 GMR: a great numbers of poorly or unqualified teachers, teaching ever increasing numbers of students
Common forms of Teacher Development

e.g. context: UP 2012:
* RMSA introduction; NCERT maths & Science exams
* 449 new schools; 402 schools ‘uplifted’; 26,000 teachers to train through INSET
Rigorous Literature Review: Teacher Education in Developing Countries

How can teacher education and guidance materials best support effective pedagogy?

i) teacher **peer support**;

ii) **alignment** of professional development with teachers’ needs... and **follow-up monitoring** of teachers;

iii) **support from head teachers**; and

iv) **alignment with the curriculum and assessment**.

Westbrook et al, 2013
Educational Technology?

• Many studies show that increased access to ICT, of itself, has little or no demonstrable impact on quality of educational practices or outcomes

• IRI, classroom audio or video on teachers mobiles, eReaders for literacy, CAL for remedial maths, project based learning: some examples of impact

• Characterised by: strong curriculum-pedagogic focus, supported by learning materials; robust teacher development & monitoring

2. English in Action: Upscaling a school-based, mobile enhanced, Teacher Development Programme

Conceptual framework

- teachers identity and expertise is developed in context of local practice
- the school is the main setting of professional learning
- cultural artefacts and tools mediate learning
- support mechanisms integrated school-based peer support

Social Practice Theory. See for example: Chaiklin and Lave, 1993; Vygotsky, 1962; Bruner, 1996; Sen, 1999

As scale increases...

- Availability of international or national expert capacity (time), per teacher, substantially decreases

- Centralised delivery becomes increasingly unmanageable (workload, travel time, communications)

- Inputs (number of days for face-to-face support, extent of materials) need to increasingly align with national norms for sustainability
...emphasis on local peer support, with practice expertise via (offline) mobile technology
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3. Research Findings from first large-scale cohort (4,368 teachers) 2012-2013
# Teacher & Student Perceptions

**Focus:**
1. Teachers’ views (on ELT, practice, students and the programme)

**Sample:**
- 269 primary teachers, 123 primary head teachers and 143 secondary teachers.
- 376 primary and 457 secondary students.

**Findings:**
- Teachers report improved competence (96%-99%) and confidence (88-89%) in using English.
- Most teachers (63-66%) strongly agree has impacted teaching practice.
- 89% of all teachers say focus of lessons is now on student communication and interaction.
- Students report regularly speaking in English (79%-80%).

**Issues:**
- Strong residual attachment to traditional practices: e.g. primary students reported enjoying learning grammar rules (95%) and being corrected by the teacher (98%).
- Secondary teachers perceive improvements in own English competence, not evidenced in assessments.
- 2/3 of primary students, but only 1/3 of secondary students, report talking mostly in English.

---

To what extent do teachers show improved classroom practices, particularly in relation to the extent and language of student talk? 

**findings:**
- student talk time increased substantially (to 27% primary; 24% secondary).
- student talk in target language increased substantially (to 91% primary; 87% secondary).
- substantial increases in observations of student talk in pairs or groups (18% primary; 28% secondary).
- teachers talked less (45-48%) but used target language more (76-87%).

**issues**
- Despite increases in pair and group talk, primary student talk was dominated by choral work (46%), and secondary students by individual talk (53%).
- This quantitative study doesn’t shed light on the *quality* of student talk.
- Observations show secondary teachers using spoken English more than primary teachers; student perceptions are the opposite.

**sample:**
401 lesson observations (256 primary, and 145 secondary).

primary (61%) and secondary (21%) female teachers

---


[www.eiabd.com/publications/](http://www.eiabd.com/publications/)
learning outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>focus:</th>
<th>To what extent do the students and teachers show improved EL competences?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sample:</td>
<td>605 teachers (246 primary, 286 secondary; 73 primary heads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>884 students (463 primary; 421 secondary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>findings:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• primary students: improvement over baseline (34% more Grade 1 or above; 20% more Grade 2 or above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• primary girls (74% pass) higher than boys (65% pass).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• secondary students: improvement over baseline (14% more Grade 2 and above, and 11% more Grade 1 and above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>issues</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Primary teachers improved over baseline (7% more Grade 2+; 3% more Grade 3+).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secondary teachers no statistically significant difference to baseline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secondary teachers self-reporting of improvement very similar to primary teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secondary students still improved, but not as much as primary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


www.eiabd.com/publications/
4. Discussion: Quality and Scale - Teacher Development, Educational Technology, Evidence

- how do teachers learn to improve practice?
- challenges of scale?
- role of educational technology, if any, in improving quality?

[Is] …the education research community… [providing] the sort of evidence that policy makers and practitioners want’?

(Moon, 2014. GMR launch, IoE, London)