



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Denby, Neil

Study of a partnership between a group of initial teacher training students and a group of gifted and talented pupils developing effective ways to teach business and citizenship.

Original Citation

Denby, Neil (2005) Study of a partnership between a group of initial teacher training students and a group of gifted and talented pupils developing effective ways to teach business and citizenship. In: 6th Conference of the international association for citizenship, social and economics education, July 2005, Chicago. (Unpublished)

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/8854/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

Study of a Partnership between a group of Initial Teacher Training students and a group of gifted and talented pupils developing effective ways to teach Business and Citizenship.

Neil Denby,
School of Education and Professional Development;
University of Huddersfield,
Queensgate,
Huddersfield,
HD1 3DH

n.denby@hud.ac.uk

Short version: A partnership reviewed: ITT students & gifted pupils.

Key words:

- Pupil voice
- Gifted and talented
- ITT
- Business
- Citizenship

Abstract

This paper outlines the nature of a partnership between a cohort of University Initial Teacher Training students and a cohort of 'gifted and talented' school pupils. It examines the process of the partnership and subsequent developments. It investigates how the project altered with the input of the participants, in particular the pupils, as evaluations revealed that the priorities of educators were not necessarily the same as those of pupils. Pupil priorities appeared to be just as valid and would possibly lead to better educational outcomes.

The narrative follows through the three years of the project in chronological order, with comments, analysis, discussions and conclusions about each year's project.

The analysis and proposals for further development are grounded in qualitative data from pupils who have seen the full three-year cycle of the study through (these pupils were aged 15 at the time). These comment on what they have both taught and learned and on possible improvements and developments to the programme.

Pupil, student and staff comments are included, along with the researcher's interpretation of how particular participant groups reacted to the conditions that were imposed.

The paper concludes with implications and future research recommendations.

1. Introduction

1.1 Structure

This is a case study of a three year project, part of the UK government's Excellence in Cities (EiC) initiative. In this project, a cohort of secondary school aged children was chosen to work with a cohort of initial teacher training students at a University in the North of England. This paper looks at how each year of the study was planned and delivered, at the evaluations from participants of each year, and at alterations and subsequent improvements that were made. The evaluations were part of annual 'light touch' evaluations used to provide indications of success and possible future directions.

1.2 Organisations

The Research University is a tertiary institution in the North of England which became a University in 1992, although its history stretches back to the early 19th Century. It has over 6,000 full time students, almost 8,000 part time and around 4,000 sandwich students.

It is described on the University website as:

... a dynamic and expanding institution in a thriving West Yorkshire town. It has a friendly reputation, an excellent graduate employment record and high level of student support. Students come from all over the UK and over 60 countries worldwide. (University website accessed June 16, 2005)

The School of Education is one of seven academic schools. It has over 3,000 students including 1,418 post graduate students and 85 research students. Post Graduate Certificate in Education students are on a one or two year course leading to a teaching qualification and qualified teacher status (qts).

The researcher is a Senior Lecturer in Education on Post Graduate courses and Partnership Manager for the University/Schools Partnership.

The school focused on in the study is an 11-16 comprehensive school situated in the North of England. It has been made anonymous throughout the paper by the use of the pseudonym 'Westway School'. It is in a relatively deprived area characterised by a number of indicators of relative poverty and deprivation, (Barnsley, 2005). For example 27% of children in the area are dependent on adults who do not work; 25% of all children live in single parent households; 41% of the population aged 16 – 74 had no qualifications in 2001 whilst attainment at all Key Stages of the English National Curriculum is below the national average. In addition, the 'staying on' rate is low, with 11.3% of all 16 - 19 year olds not in employment, education or training; In its last inspection report, amongst the schools strengths outlined were a very good culture of positive working relationships in a well cared for learning environment, with the majority of pupils with good attitudes to school. However, there were criticisms that pupils' skills in independent learning were underdeveloped. Teaching was at least satisfactory in 91 per cent of lessons; 13 per cent were very good or excellent; and 9 per cent were unsatisfactory, (Ofsted inspection report, 1998).

1.3 Rationale

The school pupil cohort to take part was not identified according to exclusive and narrow definitions. The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) definitions (DfES standards site accessed June 15 2005) limit 'talented' students to just three subjects: Art, Music and PE. Talented students are the top 5-10% of pupils per school as measured by actual or

potential achievement in these areas. Gifted pupils are measured as the top 5-10% of pupils in each measured by actual or potential achievement in the other curriculum subjects. There is no clear definition. As Kendall (2003:2) writes:

Pupils may be included in the gifted and talented cohort for a variety of reasons, including being talented in sport, music or art, not only because of their academic achievement or potential. Schools were not, in general, able to distinguish between pupils identified as 'gifted' and those identified as 'talented'.

The Experiential Learning Initiative was the term given to the cohort who were chosen by the school. This was a deliberate attempt to mask the possible implications of labelling a group 'gifted and talented'. The initiative began in 2002 with a residential outdoor pursuits visit to the Derbyshire countryside.

Gifted and talented cohorts are not 'absolutes'; as they are measured in top percentages, the 'gifted and talented' of one area may not have made the definition in other, higher achieving, areas. Also, once a pupil is in the cohort, it is not necessarily the case that they will remain in the top 5-10%. Pupils develop at different rates and are likely to 'peak' at different times. There is also the possibility that being labelled (or not labelled) as 'gifted and talented' may boost or depress performance. The school in this study is not rare in deciding not to so label pupils in this way.

1.4 Aims

The overall aim of the project was to develop ways to deliver elements of Business Education, Economics, Enterprise and Citizenship in innovative ways using the skills and ideas of students and pupils. The group met three times a year over the three year period and developed and recorded a number of activities and lesson ideas. From the

observations and conclusions the aim was to develop a model that could be utilised to good effect by other institutions.

There were three main aims from the point of view of the Research University.

- To raise awareness and interest in pupils regarding the content of Business Education so that many would consider a possible career in business.
- To investigate how Citizenship teaching could be integrated into Business Education based on the high proportion of Business and Economics related content in the Citizenship National Curriculum.
- To enhance the Initial Teacher Training (ITT) course by allowing students a first introduction to pupils and an opportunity to work with them outside the confines of a school placement. In addition, it would help ITT students to reach certain of the Standards for Qualified Teacher Status (See Appendix 1).

The overall aims of the Experiential Learning Initiative may be summarised as developing confident ambitious pupils with high expectations, good qualifications and the ability to succeed in their chosen careers.

2.0 Literature Review

The review of literature is in the areas of interest most apposite to the study. These are Excellence in Cities (EiC) (see 2.1) and its gifted and talented strand (see 2.2), listening to the pupils' voice (see 2.3) and the use of these approaches in securing whole school improvement and effectiveness (see 2.4).

2.1. Excellence in Cities (EiC)

This is a targeted programme of support for schools in deprived areas of the country, aimed at improving urban secondary education in such areas. EiC provides resources to schools in the form of funds and training. It also proposes a set of strategies that are focused on better teaching to lead to improved learning, behaviour and attendance, and to develop leadership skills and potential. Joyce et al (1997:15) conclude that different experiences help pupils to develop:

Increasing the range of learning experiences provided in our schools increases the likelihood of more students becoming more adept learners.

The Excellence in Cities programme was launched in 1999, originally covering 25 LEAs. Partnerships are now running in 57 local authorities. According to the DfES Standards Unit (*accessed June 5 2005*):

Excellence in Cities...offers a real chance to transform urban secondary education in these areas where standards have been too low for too long. Results show that it is already beginning to pay off.

One thread of EiC support is the ‘gifted and talented’ strand which is described by the DfES Standards Unit as ensuring that

...schools introduce teaching and learning programmes and complementary out of school hours study support programmes for their most able 5-10% of pupils.

Welding (1998) suggests the generic characteristics of gifted students; in general they have a ‘thirst for knowledge’, high powers of reasoning and the ability to understand abstract and/or difficult concepts quickly. They can also express themselves lucidly and show analytical and independent thinking.

Not all are in agreement that EiC is an unqualified success. Professor Trevor Kerry, writing in *The Source Public Management Journal* (Kerry 2003) is of the opinion that EiC was:

...a flawed concept from the off. Not because excellence is a bad thing, but because excellence ought to be universal.

The initiative was designed to improve attendance, reduce disaffection, raise standards and provide a vehicle for the 'gifted and talented' to reach their potential. According to Kerry:

Doubt has been cast on the overall effect of throwing large sums of money at each of these areas, as the ends do not appear to justify the means - in other words, the initiative didn't work, or at least did not work well.

Chevalier et al (2005), however, are of the opinion that the school a pupil attends does matter and that the allocation of resources to schools can have potentially important effects on pupil attainment.

2.3 Listening to the Pupils Voice

One theme that emerged strongly in the course of the study was the benefit of 'listening to the pupils voice' as advocated by a number of commentators (Convery 1992; Cooper and McIntyre, 1996; Dadds, 1998; Ruddock and Flutter, 2000).

The project began as a participation project, within a framework laid down by practitioners and, to an extent, government policy. By listening to pupil feedback it became much more of a collaborative study and, as a result, probably more successful.

Cooper and McIntyre (1996:89) in particular comment on the importance of

...the extent to which teachers are willing to share with pupils control over lesson content and learning objectives.

One effect of this collaborative approach was an increase in the esteem of pupils. For example, one participant commented that, in a recent Careers lesson on CVs, he had added to his that he was:

Pupil K: Helping the University to carry out some research into teaching.

This accords with the comment from Ruddock and Flutter (2001:2) that pupils

...need to be sure that teachers are really interested in what they have to say [and] that their views will be given careful consideration...

and from Day (1992:88) that one role of teachers is as

...models of lifelong learning for their students

Ruddock et al (2000:1) opines that educators can learn from pupils:

From their observations about what helps them to learn, what switches them off and what kind of support and recognition they value.

MacGilchrist et al (2005:65) believes that pupils have much to teach us:

Particularly, we learn how articulate and in touch even the youngest pupils can be when they are given time to talk about their learning and their experience of it at school.

One caveat worth noting is that it may be the action of listening that is most important. In some cases, a temporary ‘Hawthorne effect’ (cited in Koontz and Weihrich 1988) is in operation. It may be the mere fact of gaining attention that increases motivation (Flecknoe, 2000) and participation.

2.4 School Improvement and School Effectiveness

These have been a goal of government for over 20 years. In 1984 the Hargreaves Report ‘Improving Secondary Schools’ (Hargreaves 1984) showed that schools were a major factor in increasing pupil attainment. This was one of the foundations on which the National Curriculum (Education Reform Act 1988) was built. A culture of targets and target-setting emerged.

School effectiveness is generally seen as a quantitative measure – linked to the relevant targets (Coleman and Lumby 1999) whilst school improvement is qualitative – linked to ‘insights rather than statistical analysis’ (Bell 1999) and related more to ‘processes’ than

to quantifiable ‘outcomes’ (Coleman and Lumby 1999). However, distinctions between the two have merged (MacGilchrist et al 2005:33):

By the end of the 20th century the academic performance of students had become a key success criterion for an improving school, thus illustrating how school effectiveness and school improvement research had all but merged.

Aspects of urban whole school improvement are discussed by Barber (1994), Hargreaves (1995) and Stoll and Fink (1996). Barber reviews which targets are most frequently cited by schools and how schools measure these achievements. Both Hargreaves and Stoll and Fink categorize particular school types; Stoll and Fink suggest ways for each to improve. Louis et al (1995) place particular emphasis on improvement in urban schools. Additional commentators include Hopkins (2001) and Professor Ralph Tabberer, who argues that for school improvement to be viable and valid it must be closely aligned to the needs and culture of the school. (Tabberer 1996). Case studies of previous partnership initiatives between schools and HE institutions (Arnold, 1995), can provide a short overview which will give a context to this evaluation. Emmerson et al (2005) provide an overview of how education policies may best be evaluated and provides examples which may be related to both EiC and the School Improvement movement.

Pupil input is also recognized as being important for school improvement. Nieto (1994:396) investigated the importance of listening to pupils when considering changes in policy, concluding that:

One way to begin the process of changing school policies is to listen to students’ view about them.

Sammons (1995:475) points to increases in overall pupil achievement from listening to their opinions:

Schools which respect pupils' accounts and experiences of teaching, learning and schooling, and which then respond by adapting policies and practices, are likely to find enhanced pupils performance.

Gray et al (1999) agree that schools which combine paying heed to pupils views with any of the suggested approaches to school improvement will achieve a more speedy improvement whilst Hannam (1998:3) goes as far as to say that

The views of pupils/students represent the single most neglected source of potential data for school improvement

3.0 Methodology

Case Study

A Case Study approach has been used as the methodology. A Case Study is defined by Yin (2003) as an approach that allows the researcher to view the actions and outcomes from a number of different perspectives. In this research it is based on the collection and presentation of detailed information regarding a cohort of pupils and their interaction with several variables. This is thus a 'multiple' case study design which uses a collective approach (Stake, 1995). In this case the perspectives are those of the two institutions involved, and of the various participants.

The institutions are viewed in terms of initial planning and target setting and the formative and summative evaluations of the study to see if targets were achieved. The participants include the school students (pupils)[see1.3.1]; the cohort of University students, and the staff at each institution. The study is thus presented from a number of perspectives rather than a single viewpoint and no viewpoint is seen as 'elite'. Indeed, the pupil voice is as strong as any of the other participants. A Case Study approach ensures that the report listens to the voices of all the participants, rather than that of an 'elite'

reporting from a 'knowledge position'. (Feagin, Orum and Sjoberg, 1991). The report is essentially iterative in nature (Gabel, 1995; Poell et al, 2001) – a narrative that observes what happened and how the project therefore developed.

Both qualitative and quantitative methodology is used, to enable triangulation (Seale 2000; Denzin 2004). The observations are interpreted by the researcher (Merriam 1988) and used to form conclusions with the intention of developing a model for this type of project that can be successfully applied to other institutions. Yin (1994) suggested that there are at least four applications for the case study methodology. This Case Study considers the results of an intervention by school pupils into a University course and of that course into the life of the pupils. The methodology follows the 'four stage' recommendations of Yin (1994).

3.2 Ethical considerations

Mertens (1998) avers that ethical issues should always be integral to research. The three main ethical principles are explained in Bassey (1999). To accord with the first principle, respect for democracy, the researcher listened to the views of all groups of participants in the study and gave them equal weight. Other groups, such as colleagues at each institution and parents of pupils, were also kept informed. Cullingford and Morrison (1999:256) explain that:

Parents are not only seen as 'primary educators' but necessarily 'involved' and engaged. ...the school cannot work in isolation

All participants were given the opportunity to decline to take part in the study. In regard to the second principle, respect for truth, the researcher tape-recorded the semi-structured interviews, with the clear permission of interviewees.

These recordings were then transcribed verbatim and carefully checked. With regard to the third principle, respect for persons, all participants and the institutions involved have been rendered anonymous whilst wherever possible (such as with the completion of questionnaires or the transcribed tape recordings) respondents identities have been protected. Research has taken place with the blessing of the Headteacher at the School and of senior staff at the University.

It was also essential that, with regard to the third principle, particular care was taken as many of the participants are children. The ethical challenges (and solutions) faced by Thomas and O’Kane (1998) were used to inform the research.

3.3 Research design

The Case Study design was based on observation, reportage and the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data through a variety of instruments. (See 3.1).

Questionnaires may be considered to give basically (but not exclusively) quantitative data, interviews to give basically (but not exclusively) qualitative. There are important considerations to take into account before an instrument is used. First, validity: essentially this is the extent to which your data means what you think it does; and the extent to which it measures reality. Does the data collection instrument ask the correct questions in the correct form (face validity) and are the concepts used and referred to in the instrument clear and well explained (content validity)? Second: transferability; can the results of the study be transferred to a different situation and still remain valid. Goetz and LeCompte (1984) refer to this as ‘comparability’:

... the degree to which components of a study – including the units of analysis, concepts generated, population characteristics and settings – are sufficiently well described and defined that other researchers can use the results of the study as a basis for comparison

There are further question marks over the transferability of the results. To be able to effectively transfer results readers need as much detail as possible about the original research including the reasons for the choice of methodology, the size and composition of a sample, the nature and intention of interview questions, and so forth. Qualitative research usually provides the best opportunities for transferability but only if it contains in-depth detail. For example, an ethnographic 'thick description' would be more likely to be transferable, (Hammersley, 1990)

The Case Study methodology used, and the 'rolling cohort' (see 3.4) in terms of both student and pupil groups, means that transferability is not really an issue. Each set of groups will reveal its own problems. For example, in Year 3, a number of factors worked to improve the relationship both within groups and between groups of pupils and students. (See 5.3).

The research approach adopted is an ethnographic and interpretative one. The questions in the interview schedule were designed to lead to explanations, rather than bare facts. The researcher did not want preconceptions of answers, but to allow respondents to speak freely. The interview schedule was thus designed to 'open up' further avenues for the qualitative part of the research. In the interpretative paradigm of ethnographic (Atkinson, (1990); van Maanen (1995); Atkinson and Hammersley (1998); Brewer, (2000)) tradition, the qualitative analysis is designed to develop as the data - in this case, opinion, reflections and experience - is collected. Interviewees were therefore encouraged to give

as detailed and as open an account as possible. (The interview schedule and questionnaire may be found at Appendix 2.)

3.4 Sample

Each subject teacher was asked to nominate those pupils across the Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 age ranges, whom they thought had shown promise in a particular area sufficient to place them in the top 5-10% in that subject. Part of the reasoning behind this (which requires further research) was the belief that mixed age (vertical) groups would function better as older pupils assisted the younger ones in their development and that if each had a different talent, then this would provide a range of compatible skills. Forty-five pupils were chosen and divided into six mixed age groups.

The pupil cohort is a 'rolling cohort' of pupils aged from 12 -15 i.e. years 8, 9 and 10 of Key Stage 4. Year 11 was thought unsuitable due to the pressure of public examinations; Year 7 was thought unsuitable due to the pupils having only just entered the school.

3.5 Conduct of the Research

The research has taken place over three years. In each year, three meetings between the School and the University took place; two on the University campus and one at the school. This balance was chosen for two reasons: firstly, the University boasts much better information technology equipment; secondly, it was seen as an opportunity to give pupils a 'taste' of University life so that they would be more likely, in the future, to wish to go there. The pupils carried out planned projects, with University students as mentors. Preliminary contact was made via email between the two groups. This provided an initial

bridge and allowed groups to plan before the visit. Pupils were encouraged to work on their own volition until the next meeting.

Year 1

This involved planning a business project over three meetings. By the end of the first day of Year 1, each group had planned a project.

At the second meeting each of the six groups made a presentation of their ideas to an audience of over 100. The afternoon was given over to University student presentations on aspects of business education.

The third meeting included the presentation of Certificates of Achievement to pupils in the form of booklets where both cohorts could record evaluations. The day's task was to describe, consider and evaluate the e-mentoring project.

Year 2

Each day of the second year was to be 'host' to a separate project, that did not require ongoing communication. Although one of the initial thrusts had been the e-mentoring idea, it was decided not to make this central to the success of the project, but to allow such communication to take place as each group felt necessary. Two of the projects were business orientated, whilst the third was a Citizenship orientated session led by a British born Sikh.

Year 3

The activities in the third year were more interactive – a business enterprise day, a day preparing lesson ideas using information technology and the construction of a magazine of resources to help beginning teachers of Business and Citizenship.

4.0 Analysis

4.1 Year 1

Groups were encouraged to go down particular routes, which teachers had decided were appropriate. A memorandum from the school's headteacher, for example, suggested a desired path (See Appendix 3). Pupils were also provided with an outline business plan prepared by the coordinator of the gifted and talented group. This did not serve to develop pupils' abilities to develop leadership skills (Joyce: 1997) nor build on their ability to show analytical and independent thinking. (Welding 1998) (See 2.1)

Problems were occasioned by the communication model used. The distance mentoring model was that the students would contact Westway pupils by email for initial planning purposes; after the first meeting, this email contact would continue so that pupils could draw on the experience and help of their student mentors at any time. Unfortunately, there were drawbacks in terms of both technology and usage. At the school end, the technology was not always available, (Chevalier et al 2005). In terms of usage, students had other priorities such as teaching placements and tended to not be instrumental in initiating conversations or to answer queries with any alacrity, (Ruddock and Flutter, 2001). (See 2.3). The model also erroneously assumed that pupils would know what questions to ask and what sort of help they needed.

There were issues with the management of expectations. Groups had expected to realize ideas, not just plan them.

*Pupil A: The project we decided on was to investigate the feasibility of developing a common room for pupils. The decision was made through an initial discussion between pupils and University students after the suggestion was made **by our teachers**. (My emphasis.) On reflection the group felt that it was a good choice because the school is considering the idea Although it was felt that the project would be ambitious and a big challenge, the group believe that they are equipped for such a challenge.*

Pupil D: I expected that each group may be actually allowed to see their final idea in full working format, this I believed would keep the students motivated to progress through the venture.

The pupils' voice came through clearly in criticizing Year 1 in terms of both expectations and communications. There appeared to be very set ideas about projects to which they objected. As 'gifted and talented' independent learners, (Kendall 2003), this is not surprising.

Students also voiced criticisms:

Student A: Westway teachers were unable to let there be a free flow of ideas.

Student B: Halfway through the day we had lots of exciting ideas; teachers came and changed agenda which demotivated our group.

It became apparent that staff had decided on a limited number of possibilities and were not willing to allow students and pupils free reign with ideas. Thus, teacher intervention was seen as a demotivating factor. There was, according to Student F:

Too much influence from teachers.

Staff recognized that help was needed with both communication and organization – that staff expectations of pupil abilities and motivation were too high:

The main difficulty was poor communication. [Management of the project] was very light hands organization by teachers, and some of the groups found it difficult to agree a time to meet (very little school time had been allocated) and there were some technical problems in trying to email. Also at the time,

very few of our students had any experience of business studies. (Staff Coordinator's Report 2003)

4.2 Year 2

Evaluations and comments were discussed by pupils and staff and changes were made.

Whilst there would be time and opportunity for pupils to contact student mentors before the first visit, it was decided that such contact should not be necessary between the three days but that each should be 'self-contained', (Ruddock et al 2001).

Other benefits to pupils were being identified. In the words of the member of staff who coordinated the project from the school side:

None of the projects were ever realized but a lot was achieved in terms of building confidence and encouraging people to work in teams. (Report to Parents, internal to Westway School, 2003)

Pupils lacked knowledge and understanding of business topics, ideas and concepts. The student mentors made the mistake of assuming high levels of knowledge and understanding, (Kendall 2003). Their own understanding of the qualities of a 'gifted and talented' group particularly exacerbated this. (See 1.3) One student commented

Student D: Nobody from either party within the mentor group knew what was expected. Contact for an awareness of abilities was needed.

The second year was more successful in meeting the aim of actually achieving an outcome on each day. Pupils did not feel that they had been in some way 'cheated' (as they certainly did with the business plan ideas that were not allowed to be brought to fruition.) Activities on the two business focused days were better managed than in Year 1 but insufficiently ambitious to stretch pupils. As one commented

Pupil F: It doesn't take much to put a powerpoint together, it just like takes one person to do it and put it together; all the rest of you can do is watch.

One comment on Year 1 was reversed:

Pupil G: The first project that we did, we didn't really have a lot of input. We had to do all the work but someone else had planned it. Problems this year include the speed of what we've done. This year there has been too much planning and not enough doing.

There are problems with group work and computers. Often only one of a group can actually input material and the opinions and efforts of other members can become secondary. Mixed reactions were evidenced:

Pupil K: The one we did on fair-trade was most useful because I'm doing business studies this year and that helped.

Pupil L: Fairtrade one at the school was definitely least useful where we were on computers all the time. I like them to be more hands-on.

.

4.3 Year 3

Students, staff and pupils discussed the evaluations and comments in detail. The reaction was to try to find an alternative that would be exciting and innovative, that would involve the pupils in equal measure to the students, that would have a realizable (and fairly instant) outcome and that would integrate elements of business education and citizenship.

(See 1.4)

Pupil B: I can do the sort of stuff we've been doing, but would like something more fun. Working on computers isn't always fun, but teachers seem to think it is.

They also preferred a definite outcome:

Pupil E: It would be good to take something away from here, something that we've done. Can't we do that?

Pupils also expressed a desire for an element of competition or recognition, (Ruddock and Flutter, 2001).

Comments from staff, students and, most emphatically, pupils, show that the third pattern of operation has been the most successful. In particular, the enterprise day seemed to have something for everyone, so that groups could plan, make, make financial estimates, use market knowledge, act and present.

Pupil O: The one where we had to make and sell one of them objects. We worked as a team well and probably achieved most that day. It was the most fun one.

Pupil N: There was more teamwork involved and exchange of ideas. We had a lot of fun but still learned a lot.

The production of the ‘magazine’ also seemed to be a motivating factor. University technology allowed all the pages to be displayed and the best inputs in terms of both content and design to be rewarded, (Chevalier et al, 2005). Pupil M commented:

Ours was the best – we put a lot of work into it – but I think theirs was a better design. We can’t all win.

Also, the problems with communication seemed to diminish. This could have been due to better preparation of both cohorts, or merely the effect of email technology becoming more commonplace. According to Pupil C:

We got to know the students better this year, and they’ve had more to do with us than other years. There was better contact, they seemed more interested. Email has worked well. We can talk to them more as a friend.

The pupils’ voice comes through strongly here in terms of the help that older pupils could offer due to experience:

Pupil H: I think they’re more prone to listen to me because I’ve been doing this longer than them.

Whilst another averred that:

Pupil I: Now we’re the oldest ones here, we can take the lead. But we know how the younger ones feel because we were there.

5.0 Conclusions

The overall aim of the project was to develop ways to deliver elements of Business Education in innovative ways using the skills and ideas of students and pupils. (See 1.4) The first aim, to raise awareness and interest in pupils regarding the content of Business Education has proved successful as Westway School now has a thriving and successful Business Education Department. Due to their involvement with the project, many of the pupils opted for Business Studies as a subject. This meant that a number of the early problems of understanding were reduced in subsequent years. Those who had been in the cohort for more than a year also felt that they now, thanks to the activities, had a good working knowledge of business.

The second aim, to investigate how Citizenship teaching could be integrated into Business Education, did not prove as successful. The Citizenship element of the work tended to take a back seat to the Business elements. These appeared more 'exciting' than the Citizenship aspects (such as Fair Trade, or the experiences of a British born Sikh). Pupil comments indicated that they had a definite preference for a particular sort of learning experience, (MacGilchrist et al, 2005).(See 2.3) and that this was the experiential one characterized by the Business learning.

Whilst the approach of dividing the days up into three separate projects in Year 2 allowed the project to be managed more easily, it actually undermined this aim in that the two elements of Business Education and Citizenship Education were no longer integrated, but were clearly separated

The third aim of enhancing the Initial Teacher Training (ITT) course by allowing students a first introduction to pupils and an opportunity to work with them outside the confines of a school placement, was achieved. Students were happy. It also enabled ITT students to reach certain of the Standards for Qualified Teacher Status particularly Standard 2.4, understanding how pupils' learning can be affected by their physical, intellectual, linguistic, social, cultural and emotional development; Standard 2.6 relating to pupils with Special Educational Needs; Standard 3.1.4 regarding teaching in teams and planning for the deployment of additional adults who support pupils' learning; standard 3.1.5 about learning in out-of-school contexts; Standard 3.2.2 by practising monitoring and assessing pupils as they teach, and giving constructive feedback and Standard 3.2.4 in supporting more able pupils.

Students were able, through the various meetings and the email links, to practice and hone a number of their skills. They were involved, with the pupils, in: large and small group work; planning and making presentations; facilitating discussion; supervising written and oral work and assessing and evaluating the eventual outcomes.

5.4 Areas for Future Investigation

Further research and analysis is necessary before the Research University can claim to have a 'model' that can be successfully transferred to other institutions. The model that has worked best so far has been the third year of the cycle. There are a number of possible reasons for this, including better communication and the greater experience of the pupils involved.

Several other research questions arise. There has been little focus, for example, on the student voice (that of the ITT students). Also, the effect of vertically streamed pupil groups has not been investigated. In addition, the factors which led to the success of the final stage of the study have not been sufficiently isolated. Is this success due to adopting a particular style of learning (Gardner; 1993) or even, perhaps, due to being away from the usual place of instruction?

Other benefits of the study may also be investigated. For one participant, for example, it was a confidence booster.

Pupil A: I was going to drop out after year one, but stayed. I think they have helped my confidence especially in speaking to people and doing presentations.

For others, it has led them to a study of an area that they had not previously considered.

Pupil C: I took business because of these days. I didn't know what it was about and thought it was boring but there's a lot more to it and I'm enjoying it.

Of course, the model finally chosen must meet the most stringent conditions. Not only must it reach the University's and School's aims, but must satisfy that most demanding of audiences, the pupils. Perhaps this last at least was achieved:

Pupil K: This was really fun, I've enjoyed all the days. I think that all of our lessons should be at the University if they are as good as this!

Correspondence: Neil Denby, School of Education and Professional Development;
University of Huddersfield, Queensgate, Huddersfield, UK
n.denby@hud.ac.uk

Bibliography and References.

- Arnold, R. (1995). *The Improvement of Schools through Partnership: School, LEA and University*. Slough: NFER, EMIE.
- Atkinson, P. (1990) *The Ethnographic Imagination*. London: Routledge.
- Atkinson, P. and Hammersley, N. (1998) *Ethnography and Participant Observation* In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (pp. 110-136). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Barber, M. (1994). *Urban Education Initiatives: The National Pattern*. Stafford: University of Keele.
- Barnsley (2005) Local Area Agreement 'One Barnsley' 2005-8; Barnsley Local Education Authority
- Bassey, M (1999) *Case Study Research in Educational Settings* Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Bell J (1999) *Doing Your Research Project. (3rd Edition)*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Brewer, J.D. (2000) *Ethnography*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Charmaz K. (1995) *Grounded Theory* in Smith J.A., Hawe R. and Langenhove L; *Rethinking Methods in Psychology*; London: Sage
- Chevalier A, Dolton P and Levacic R (2005) 'Do Schools matter?' Chapter in Machin and Vignoles (Eds) (2005) *What's the Good of Education? The Economics of Education in the UK*. Princeton University Press
- Coleman and Lumby (1999) The Significance of Site-based Practitioner Research in Educational Management. Chapter in Middlewood, Coleman and Lumby (Eds) (1999) *Practitioner Research in Education, Making a Difference*. London: Sage.
- Convery A (1992) Insight, Direction and Support: a case study of collaborative enquiry in classroom research. In Biott, C and Nios, J (eds) (1992) *Working and Learning together for Change*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Cooper, P and Macintyre, D (1996) The importance of power-sharing in classroom learning. In Hughes, M (ed) *Teaching and Learning in Changing Times*. Oxford. Blackwell
- Cullingford C, Morrison, M (1999) *Relationships Between Parents and Schools: A Case Study*. Educational Review. Vol 51.3; pps 253-257
- Dadds, M (1998) Supporting Practitioner Research : a Challenge; *Educational Action Research*. Vol 6 pps. 39-52
- Day, C (1993) Reflection: a necessary but not sufficient condition for professional development. *British Educational Research Journal* Vol 19 pps. 83-93
- Denzin N, K "The Art of Politics and Interpretation". In SN Hesse-Biber and P Levy (2004) *Approaches to Qualitative Research; A Reader on Theory and Practice*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- DfeS standards site: <http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/sie/eic/EiCOverview>. accessed June 2005.

- Emmerson C, McNally S and Meghir C (2005) 'What Can Policy Do?' Chapter in Machin and Vignoles (2005) (Eds) *What's the Good of Education? The Economics of Education in the UK*. Princeton University Press
- Feagin, J., Orum, A., and Sjoberg, G. (Eds.). (1991). *A case for case study*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press
- Flecknoe, M (2000) Can Continuing Professional Development for Teachers be Shown to Raise Pupils Achievement. *Journal of In-Service Education*, Vol. 26 (3) 2000, pp. 437-456
- Gabel D, (1995) "An Introduction to Action Research"; *Presidential address, National Association for Research in Science Teaching*, San Francisco. April 24, 1995.
- Gardner, Howard (1993) *Frames of Mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*, Fontana Press. Cambridge.
- Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago. Aldine.
- Goetz J.P. and LeCompte M.D., (1984) *Ethnology and Qualitative Design in Education Research*. Orlando. Academic Press.
- Gray, J., Hopkins, D., Reynolds, D., Wilcox, B., Farrell, S. & Jesson, D. (1999) *Improving schools: Performance and Potential*, Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Hammersley, M. (1990) *Reading Ethnographic Research*. London. Longman.
- Hannam, A (1998) cited in Ruddock, J and Flutter, J (2000) *Pupil Participation and Pupil Perspective: 'Carving a new order of experience'*. Cambridge Journal of Education. Vol 30 (1)
- Hargreaves A (1984) *Hargreaves Report 'Improving Secondary Schools'* London HMSO
- Hargreaves, D.H. (1995). School Culture, School Effectiveness and School Improvement, in *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 6, 1, pps. 23-46.
- HMSO (1988) *Education Reform Act*. London
- Joyce, B; Calhoun, E and Hopkins, D. (1997) *Models of Learning – Tools for Teaching* Buckingham and Philadelphia. Oxford University Press
- Kendall L, (2003) *Excellence in Cities: The Characteristics of Gifted and Talented Pupils* Excellence in Cities Evaluation Consortium; NFER; London
- Kerry T; (2003) *The Source Public Management Journal*. Stockport
- Koontz, H and Weirich, H (1998) (9th Edition) *Management*. Singapore. McGraw Hill.
- Louis K S, Kruse S D and Associates (1995) *Professionalism and Community: Perspectives on Reforming Urban Schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- MacGilchrist B; Myers K and Reed J (2005) *The Intelligent School (2nd Edition)* London: Sage
- Merriam, S, B (1988) *Case Study Research in Education* San Francisco, Jossey Bass.
- Mertens D M (1998) *Research Methods in Education and Psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Nieto, S (1994) cited in Ruddock, J and Flutter, J (2000) *Pupil Participation and Pupil Perspective: 'Carving a new order of experience'*. Cambridge Journal of Education. Vol 30 (1)

Ofsted inspection report: www.ofsted.gov.uk accessed June 2nd 2005

Poell, R.F van der Krogt F.J and Wildemeersch D.A (2001) Constructing a Research Methodology to develop Models for Work-related Learning: Social Science in Action. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*. Vol. 14. No. 1 pps. 55-70 Taylor Francis

Ruddock, J and Flutter, J (2000) *Pupil Participation and Pupil Perspective: 'Carving a new order of experience'*. Cambridge Journal of Education. Vol 30 (1) pps 75-89

Ruddock, J and Flutter, J (2001) *Consulting Young People in Schools*. ESRC: Homerton College, Cambridge University.

Sammons, P. M (1995). Gender, Ethnic and Socio-Economic Differences in Attainment and Progress: A Longitudinal Analysis of Student Achievement over nine years. *British Educational Research Journal* 21(4): 465 - 485.

Seale C (2000) *The Quality of Qualitative Research, Introducing Qualitative Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Stake, R.E. (1995) *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Stoll L and Fink D (1996) *Changing Our Schools. Linking School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Tabberer, R. (1996). Research and Diversity in School Improvement, *Education Journal*, 2: pps. 33-5.

Thomas, N. and O'Kane, C., (1998), 'The ethics of participatory research with children', *Children and Society*. 12: pps. 336-348

University website: accessed June 2005

van Maanen, J. (Ed) (1995) *Representation in Ethnography*. London. Sage Publishing.

Welding, J. (1998) The Identification of Able Children in a Secondary School: a study of the issues involved and their practical implications. In *Educating Able Children* (Volume 2)

Yin, R.K. (1994) *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Yin, R.K. (2003) *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Appendices.

Appendix 1: Qualifying to Teach Standards

Appendix 2: Interview schedule and questionnaire

Appendix 3: Outline plan

Appendix 1

Selection of Standards for Qualified Teacher Status

- 1.1** They have high expectations of all pupils; respect their social, cultural, linguistic, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and are committed to raising their educational achievement.
- 1.2** They treat pupils consistently, with respect and consideration, and are concerned for their development as learners.
- 1.3** They demonstrate and promote the positive values, attitudes and behaviour that they expect from their pupils.
- 1.5** They can contribute to, and share responsibly in, the corporate life of schools.
- 2.4** They understand how pupils' learning can be affected by their physical, intellectual, linguistic, social, cultural and emotional development.
- 2.5** They know how to use ICT effectively, both to teach their subject and to support their wider professional role.
- 2.6** They understand their responsibilities under the SEN Code of Practice, and know how to seek advice from specialists on less common types of special educational needs.
- 3.1.4** They take part in, and contribute to, teaching teams, as appropriate to the school. Where applicable, they plan for the deployment of additional adults who support pupils' learning.
- 3.1.5** As relevant to the age range they are trained to teach, they are able to plan opportunities for pupils to learn in out-of-school contexts, such as school visits, museums, theatres, field-work and employment-based settings, with the help of other staff where appropriate.
- 3.2.2** They monitor and assess as they teach, giving immediate and constructive feedback to support pupils as they learn. They involve pupils in reflecting on, evaluating and improving their own performance.
- 3.2.4** They identify and support more able pupils, those who are working below age-related expectations, those who are failing to achieve their potential in learning, and those who experience behavioural, emotional and social difficulties. They may have guidance from an experienced teacher where appropriate.
- 3.3.1** They have high expectations of pupils and build successful relationships, centred on teaching and learning. They establish a purposeful learning environment where diversity is valued and where pupils feel secure and confident.

Appendix 2

Interview Schedule.

Let me first introduce the reason for this research. You have now been part of the group that has seen through all three years of the project with the University. We would like to find out what you thought about it so that we can improve on it in the future. With your permission, I am going to tape your answers. Please feel free to withdraw from the interview at any time. The first question I will ask you will be your name, for the tape.

This is just so that I can identify different speakers. You and your comments will always be kept anonymous in any report.

Main question.	Notes and supplementaries.
1. Which of the nine sessions do you best remember?	Why? Maybe its because it was the most recent, or most useful, or most enjoyable. Other reasons for it being memorable (such as ‘the first time I came’) may also be significant to the individual. This is also a way of seeing which session had the most impact (whether positive or not).
2a. Which of the sessions was the most useful?	Better to ask this as two questions with the supplementary of ‘why do you think so’ for each.
2b. Which of the sessions was the least useful?	
3a. Which of the sessions do you think you had the least planning and input into?	This is to find out which they felt ‘imposed’ and which they felt they had more ‘ownership’ of. Were the ‘owned’ or ‘imposed’ ones more effective/memorable? Why?
3b. Which of the sessions do you think you had the most planning and input into?	
4. Would you rather be involved in the planning or told what to do?	Why?
5. The four groups that are involved are the University, the School, our trainees and the pupils.	Can you remember any other groups from outside having a significant impact? Which group makes the most contribution? Other groups that may be mentioned include parents and outside speakers. If groups are named by the respondent, they should be encouraged to expand on their contribution.
6. Problems?	This is intended to be a very open question and to elicit information on all manner of problems. You may need to suggest areas, such as communication, use of technology, relationships within and between groups etc. but should only do so if answers are not forthcoming.
7. How would you see further development?	Open question for improvements to the project from a pupil point of view. Items such as transport and food

	should not be ignored. Impractical suggestions can be 'accepted' in order to move on to practical ideas.
8. What is your opinion of business Studies.	As a subject; as an area of interest/to study? Has the opinion changed since involvement in the project?
9. Opinion of BS Citizenship	As a subject; as an area of interest/to study? Has the opinion changed since involvement in the project?
10. Any other comments, problems, suggestions?	This is a 'catch-all' to make sure there has been nothing missed by the other questions. Don't worry too much if the response is negative.

Questionnaire (Pilot)

1. Name..... (first name only)

2. Age Years..... Months.....

3. In what year did you first participate in the project?

4. Please try to recall briefly the content of each session that you have attended and put a cross for those sessions you did not attend. Please do this on your own.

2003

- 1.....
- 2.....
- 3.....

2004

- 1.....
- 2.....
- 3.....

2005

- 1.....
- 2.....
- 3.....

5. Do you now study Business Studies at GCSE? (please delete) YES/NO

6. If not, do you intend to study Business Studies at GCSE? (please delete) YES/NO

7. Has the project affected your decision at all? (please delete) YES/NO
 8. Please give each session you attended a mark out of 10 for a) interest b) usefulness c) enjoyment

2003

Interest 1 2 3

Usefulness 1 2 3

Enjoyment 1 2 3

2004

Interest 1 2 3

Usefulness 1 2 3

Enjoyment 1 2 3

2005

Interest 1 2 3

Usefulness 1 2 3

Enjoyment 1 2 3

9. How much input do you think you had when **planning** the sessions? Use the scale from 0 – none to 10 – a lot.

2003 1 2 3

2004 1 2 3

2005 1 2 3

10. How highly would you rate your **involvement** in the sessions? Use the scale from 0 – none to 10 – a lot.

2003 1 2 3

2004 1 2 3

2005 1 2 3

11. Please add any other comments or observations.

.....

.....

.....

.....

(Appendix 3) Outline instructions from Headteacher.

Suggested focus for business and enterprise development in school, to be undertaken by the cohort identified through Excellence in Cities.

Each project should include the following elements:

- Strategic planning*
- Timescales and deadlines*
- Perceived outcomes*
- Light touch management including use of ICT*
- “Financial Management”*
- Organisational structure*

Pupil Groups could use one of the following to develop:

- School based study support centre*
- Use of quadrangles*
- A school publication*
- Use of smallholding in school*
- School as a community learning facility*
- Casting project with Westway Foundry*
- School Council*
- Westway High School archive*
- A stationery shop*
- A pupil advice centre*
- Youth facilities in the community*