

Written evidence

Members of the Oracy APPG will consider written, verbal and audio-visual evidence and oversee oral evidence sessions. All evidence will inform the final report.

The extended deadline for submitting written evidence is 20th September 2019. We would appreciate if the submissions would follow the following guidelines:

- Be in a Word format
- No longer than 3000 words
- State clearly who the submission is from, and whether it is sent in a personal capacity or on behalf of an organisation
- Begin with a short summary in bullet point form
- Have numbered paragraphs
- Where appropriate, provide references

Please write your evidence below and email the completed form via email to inquiry@oracyappg.org.uk with the subject line of 'Oracy APPG inquiry'

Dr Jan Hardman

Full name:

University of York

School or Organisation:

Associate Professor in Language Education

Role:

Written evidence:

1. Submission

The submission is from Dr Jan Hardman, sent on behalf of the University of York.

The submission is based on a study funded by the UK's Education Endowment Foundation entitled 'Classroom talk, social disadvantage and educational attainment: raising standards, closing the gap' (2015-2017). It was a collaboration between the University of York and the Cambridge Primary Review Trust. The project team consisted of Professor Robin

Alexander, Professor Frank Hardman, Dr Jan Hardman, Dr Taha Rajab, Mark Longmore and David Reedy.

2. Highlights

- We evaluated the implementation of a 20-week dialogic teaching intervention and its impact on pedagogical practices and student learning in 78 primary schools serving socio-economically deprived areas in the cities of Birmingham, Bradford and Leeds.
- Year 5 students (i.e. 9- and 10-year-olds) in the intervention schools made on average two additional months' progress in English and science, and one additional month's progress in mathematics, compared to students in control schools. Students eligible for free school meals made two additional months' progress in English, science and mathematics compared to free school meals children in control schools.
- Teachers receiving the intervention made significantly greater use of dialogue and discussion.
- Student contributions following the intervention were more extended and expansive in content and reasoning.
- Stimulated critical reflection using video played an important role in the process of pedagogical change.

3. The study

The study set out to evaluate the effectiveness of a school-based professional development intervention designed to change teachers' pedagogical practices to improve the quality of whole-class talk, thereby producing higher learning outcomes.

It was found by the independent impact evaluation that following the 20-week dialogic teaching programme that students were on average two months ahead of their control peers in English, mathematics and science (Jay, et al., 2017).

The process evaluation also showed positive results in the intervention schools in terms of improved pedagogical practices and quality of classroom talk. The process evaluation findings showed teachers in the intervention schools made significantly greater use of open questions, thus achieving a better balance of closed and open questions, and that they used a wider repertoire of follow-up talk moves to promote extended student contributions than those found in the control schools. Such contributions involved the students in sharing, explaining, arguing and justifying their thinking and building on the ideas of other students. In contrast, teachers in the control schools largely operated within a recitation script made up of closed questions, brief student answers and low-level evaluation as to the appropriateness of the answer. When extended student contributions did occur in the control schools, they were often, limited to explanations/analysis and they tended to lack evidence. Overall, the whole-class teacher-student interaction identified in the intervention schools showed a high degree of reciprocity leading to higher levels of student engagement and learning outcomes compared to the control schools (Alexander et al., 2017; Hardman, 2019).

The study also shows that schools need to be central to the professional development process by providing teachers on-going training to support improvements in pedagogical practices. This was a viewpoint largely supported by headteachers, teachers and mentors in the intervention school interviews. Observation/ feedback routines structured explicitly as part of whole-school professional development have been found to be particularly effective in enabling teachers to work on implementing pedagogical changes to improve student learning outcomes. Feedback loops using video footage, as in the current study, have also been found to be a powerful tool for teacher professional development. According to the interviews, this element of school-based professional development was found to be most useful by the intervention teachers and mentors in changing their pedagogical practices and

provided them with opportunities for monitoring and self-evaluation of their talk practices (Alexander et al., 2017; Hardman, 2019).

The limitation of running a 20-week programme as revealed in the interviews with teachers, mentors and headteachers for implementing and embedding a dialogic pedagogy also points to the need for teachers to be given sustained periods of time to try out new approaches and to reflect and receive feedback on their efforts. Such findings suggest that teacher professional development needs to be sustained over time, focused on teaching subject content and embedded in the classroom.

4. Conclusion

Overall, the impact and process evaluations of the study revealed that in addition to significant gains in student learning attainment there were changes in pedagogical practices and higher levels of student participation in the classroom talk in the intervention schools following the dialogic pedagogy training. Teachers, mentors and headteachers were also very positive about the professional development programme in terms of it improving student participation, engagement and learning. The findings also point to the fact that the repertoire of student talk is central to the learning process and that it is the teacher who enables such talk to occur.

5. References

External impact evaluation report

Jay, T., Willis, B., Thomas, P., Taylor, R., Moore, N., Burnett, C., Merchant, G., & Stevens, (2017). *Dialogic Teaching: Evaluation Report and Executive Summary*. London, UK: Education Endowment Foundation.

<https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/our-work/projects/dialogic-teaching/>.

Internal process evaluation report

Alexander, R., Hardman, F., & Hardman, J. with Rajab, T., & Longmore, M. (2017). *Changing Talk, Changing Thinking: Interim Report from the In-House Evaluation of the CPRT/UoY Dialogic Teaching Project*. York, UK: University of York.

<https://www.york.ac.uk/education/research/social-disadvantage-and-educational-attainment>

Article

Hardman, J. (2019). Developing and supporting implementation of a dialogic pedagogy in primary schools in England. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol 86,

1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102908>