

# **NQT Quality Improvement Study for the Training and Development Agency for Schools**

**Centre for Education and Inclusion Research, the Centre for Research and Evaluation and the Division of Education and Humanities at Sheffield Hallam University**

**Report on Part 1: 'Environment map'**

**April 2008**

## **Authors**

**Sue Drew, Jo Gledhill, Peggy Haughton, Alison Hramiak, Jason Leman, Colin McCaig, Alan Potts, Anna Stevens**

## **Advisers**

**Mike Coldwell, Mike Holland, Terry Hudson, Tricia Young**

## Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Executive summary	4
1 Introduction	9
2 Review of the existing literature on NQTs	9
2.1 Aims	9
2.2 Overview	10
2.2.1 Introduction	10
2.2.2 Global perspective	11
2.2.3 The extent of the problem	11
2.2.4 Policy reactions to the problem	11
2.2.5 Across the country	11
2.3 Reasons for choosing teaching and teacher training	12
2.3.1 Introduction	12
2.3.2 Initial teacher training	12
2.3.3 Employment based ITT routes	13
2.3.4 Not taking up teaching post-training	13
2.3.5 Mature entry to teaching	13
2.4 Induction	14
2.4.1 Accessing Induction	14
2.4.2 Induction Standards	14
2.5 Retention and ongoing professional development	15
2.5.1 Introduction	15
2.5.2 Intention	15
2.5.3 Ongoing professional development	16
2.5.4 Leavers	16
2.5.5 Budgetary constraints	17
2.5.6 Status of teachers	17
2.5.7 Schools in difficult circumstances	18
2.6 Themes	18
2.7 Questions for the remainder of this study	18
3 Methodology and methods	19
3.2 Methods	19
3.2.1 Pre-Pilot methods	19
3.2.2 Pre-Pilot results	20
3.2.3 Pilot methods	22
3.2.4 Pilot findings	22
3.2.5 Conclusions from pre-pilot and pilot	22
4 Methods for Part 1 main survey	22
4.1 Timescale	22
4.2 Sampling	23
4.3 Data analysis	24
5 Findings	24
5.1 Response rates and conventions used	24
5.2 ITT routes into the profession	28
5.2.1 Routes taken by NQTs	28
5.2.2 NQTs history immediately prior to taking up current NQT post	31
5.2.3 Routes preferred by SLT respondents	32
5.3 NQT preparedness for role and their qualities	35
5.4 The recruitment of NQTs	47
5.4.1 Recruitment: overview	47
5.4.2 Recruitment by key stages or by subject specialism	50
5.4.3 Recruitment methods	56

5.4.4 NQTs views on what is important to them in applying for jobs	60
5.4.5 Quality of applications	66
5.5 Retention of NQTs	70
5.5.1 Overview	70
5.5.2 Reasons for NQTs leaving and their destinations	73
5.6 Induction	76
6 Environment map	81
6.1 NQTs routes into their profession	81
6.2 The quality of NQTs	82
6.3 Recruitment of NQTs	83
6.4 Retention of NQTs	85
6.4 Induction of NQTs	86
7 Discussion of the survey findings	87
7.1 Introduction	87
7.2 The quality of NQTs (including issues relating to routes)	87
7.2.1 Points from the literature review	87
7.2.2 Discussion of Part 1 survey findings	87
7.3 The recruitment of NQTs	88
7.3.1 Points from the literature review	88
7.3.2 Discussion of Part 1 survey findings	89
7.4 The retention of NQTs	90
7.4.1 Points from the literature review	90
7.4.2 Discussion of Part 1 survey findings	90
7.5 The induction of NQTs	90
7.5.1 Points from the literature review	90
7.6 Implications for Part 2 of the study	91
8 Conclusions	92
Bibliography	93
Appendices	97
Appendix 1. Tables	97
Appendix 2. SLT questionnaire & NQT questionnaire	115

## Executive summary

This is the report on Part 1 of a three year study commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) that aims to explore whether School Leadership Teams (SLTs) can recruit and retain enough quality Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs). Part 1 (undertaken December 2007 - April 2008) aimed to provide an initial 'environment map' of NQT recruitment and retention.

Part 1 began with a literature review on NQT recruitment and retention. Emergent themes were: recruitment to Initial Teacher Training (ITT) programmes; the adequacy of ITT preparation; ensuring that NQTs progress to and remain in teaching; the support NQTs receive during induction; reasons for leaving the profession; ensuring that the retention of teachers is quality retention; attracting those who have left teaching to return to the profession. The following emerging key points from this review are of particular relevance to Part 1.

- The quality of NQTs.  
NQTs have issues in dealing with parents and handling difficult classroom behaviour. There are variable views on the quality of NQTs who come through employment based routes. In one study most NQTs had worked in supply after ITT, seen as positive for schools and NQTs. Subject knowledge may be a weakness in NQTs.
- The recruitment of NQTs  
There are regional variations; in some areas NQTs find it difficult to find jobs and in others there is a growing demand for teachers. Geographical location of posts is important for NQTs. The number of posts advertised on temporary contracts is increasing, as a result of budgetary constraints, with secondary NQTs more likely to secure an initial permanent post than primary. Disadvantaged schools are more likely to have difficulties in recruiting NQTs.
- The retention of NQTs  
There is a problem in retaining teachers that affects secondary schools more than primary schools. More advantaged schools have better retention of teachers. Teachers may not leave the profession permanently but may move in and out of teaching. Common reasons for leaving the profession are workload and pupil discipline, with financial issues (salary, housing costs etc) more problematic in London than other areas. More teachers are leaving because they are on short term contracts.
- The induction of NQTs  
There may be a relationship between induction experiences and intention to stay in teaching. One study found that 88% of NQTs had a formal induction programme but there are concerns about the quality of induction. NQTs may be afraid to speak negatively about their induction, especially if on temporary contracts. NQTs would welcome more support in addition to their induction.

Research for Part 1 began with a pre-pilot. Interviews were held with SLT members in 10 schools to help clarify questions to include in a survey and the survey methods, and to inform Part 2 of the study in relation to how to encourage participant involvement. Emerging issues to be explored included the quality of NQT job applications, their skills, experience and commitment, the need for training and support in the induction year to encourage retention, and poor retention being related to workload, understanding of the job and difficulties in dealing with parents. Advice offered about survey methods led to the survey being conducted both on paper and online. Advice offered about incentives for participants led to prize draws for equipment for SLTs for survey completion and for i-pods for NQTs, payment to case study schools to cover staff time to participate in interviews, a voucher for staff rooms for schools engaging in telephone interviews, plus certificates to indicate participation.

The paper survey was sent to 4,098 carefully sampled schools (the number of independent schools was limited to 9%) and the team estimated this might lead to 1,000 responses. In the event it was difficult to obtain responses. Several follow-up requests and telephone chasing led to responses from SLTs in 706 schools. 113 schools gave reasons for non completion, of which the main one was 'no time'. The data were analysed by the following main variables: the NQT's route into the NQT job; type of school (primary/secondary); independent/non independent; deprivation (using free school meal eligibility as an indicator); ethnicity (using % of white children); geographical location (the 9 English regions compressed into 4: North, South, Midlands and London).

Key findings are as follows (the number of respondents from independent schools was small and information about them need to be treated with caution).

The full time PGCE is the most common source of NQT applicants, although the undergraduate teaching course is more common in primary schools. The proportions from employment-based routes are similar in primary and secondary schools. Part time PGCEs and supply work are the least common routes. There are some differences in routes taken for schools in deprived areas and regionally. Most NQTs were on ITT programmes immediately before taking up their current posts.

The full time PCGE is the route most preferred by SLT respondents overall, although in primary schools they prefer the undergraduate teaching course. The employment-based route is preferred over the part time PGCE. The route that most deters SLT respondents is supply. There are no differences in preferences for schools in deprived areas and few regionally. Independent schools have more NQTs from the full time PGCE and are stronger in their preference for that route.

Written comments by SLT members give reasons for their preferences. These relate to their familiarity with the routes, the length of the training period, the specialism or breadth of teaching subjects, impressions of differing levels of commitment from those on different routes, differing foci on education theory/pedagogy/child development and relevance of experience during ITT to the school context

Ratings by SLT respondents of NQTs' qualities were mainly 'adequate' or above, ('adequate' being at the neutral point in the rating scale). Aspects related to teaching were most highly rated, with the exception of 'pupil assessment/assessment for learning'. The lowest rated aspects related to dealing with parents or non-teaching colleagues and to administrative work. Mid-rated aspects included 'contribution to the whole school' and 'stamina/resilience'. NQTs self ratings follow a similar pattern, but NQTs rate themselves more highly for all items than do SLT respondents. There are few differences between primary and secondary schools. SLT respondents in independent schools rate NQTs more highly than do those in non-independent schools. There seem to be differences in ratings of NQTs in relation to the degree of deprivation in the school and the ethnicity of school pupils, in both cases this affects the band where school populations are most mixed. Most SLT respondents think the quality of NQTs has stayed the same or improved over the last 5 years (since September 2002). There are some differences between types of school and regionally (SLT respondents from the North are less positive, whilst those in London are more positive).

Written comments by SLT members suggest that standards of NQTs vary but that they are happy with their own NQTs. Concerns included: NQTs driven by standards and the National Curriculum and lacking in creativity and flexibility; NQTs seeing teaching more as a job and less as a profession; the level of support needed for NQTs; classroom and behaviour management; dealing with others in the school environment; NQTs'

unawareness of current policies or strategies; some problems with subject knowledge in shortage subjects.

In primary schools, most recruitment of NQTs in the last five years has been for Key Stage 2, closely followed by Key Stage 1, with less recruitment for Foundation. Most SLT respondents had little or no difficulty in recruiting. Pressure to recruit on a temporary basis has an effect, especially in primary schools.

In secondary schools, common subjects where posts are filled by NQTs are art and design, design and technology, English, history, ICT, maths, PE and general science. The subjects most likely to be filled by somebody not trained in the subject specialism are physics, citizenship, chemistry, PSHE and Religious Education. SLTs rated physics as the most difficult subject for recruiting NQTs, followed by chemistry. Other difficult subjects are maths, ICT, design and technology and general science. The least difficult subjects are art and design, citizenship, geography, history and PE.

Written comments by SLT respondents indicated issues impacting on the recruitment of NQTs: the timing of the recruitment process; the volume of applicants; relationships with ITT providers; the nature of the school; geographical location; the unhelpfulness of references from ITT providers; the helpfulness of local authority 'pools'. The length of time taken to fill posts seems not to be an issue, even for shortage subjects.

NQT respondents rate geographical location as the most important factor when applying for posts. The reputation of the school, impression gained of it and opportunities for promotion are the next most important issues. Least important are factors such as deprivation and ethnicity followed by league tables and exam results. The pattern is similar for the factors affecting whether or not NQTs accept job offers, but here all factors are seen as more important than in applying for jobs apart from geographical location, which is identically important.

SLT respondents most commonly advertise for posts appropriate for NQTs in local authority web sites or bulletins, followed by the TES and local press. Primary and secondary schools have different practices in placing advertisements, as do independent schools and non-independent schools and there are regional differences. The proportions of NQTs using each source differed from the proportions of SLTs advertising in them.

The least important aspect of the selection process for NQTs in attracting them to posts is where the vacancy is advertised. The most important aspects are meeting colleagues, a tour of the school, information provided with the job offer and the interview.

NQTs' written comments about what helps the recruitment and selection process for them refer to information provided, the use of online processes, local authority 'pools' and contact with people in the schools. NQTs have little experience in job applications and are unsure what to look for. Selection processes need to be well organised. Waiting on-site for the decision is unpopular, as is being pressurised for a response. Concerns include the number of applicants, advantages gained by applicants known to the school, schools preferring those trained locally, the lack of experience of NQTs, age and shortages of vacancies.

Most NQT respondents had applied for fewer than 10 jobs and had 1-2 interviews. The estimates from SLT respondents of numbers applying for posts, although higher, is generally supportive of this. There are differences at secondary level between subjects, with some attracting more applications than others.

SLT respondents are generally satisfied with NQT candidates over the last 5 years and most think the quality of candidates has stayed the same or improved. Written comments by SLT respondents suggest that ITT is appropriate for the majority rather than for schools with particular needs. Ratings of satisfaction with NQT candidates is similar in the most and least deprived schools, however, SLTs in schools with a more equal mix of ethnicities were more satisfied with candidates than those in less mixed schools and their satisfaction had most increased. SLT respondents in London are generally more satisfied than in the other three regions.

SLT ratings of aspects related to NQTs' written applications and interviews suggest that NQTs are least effective in addressing the requirements of the job specification, using their experience and showing individuality. Written comments by SLT respondents about written applications referred to poor use of language and style, lack of individuality and lack of targeting the job. ITT support for making applications seems unhelpful, with NQTs coached to provide similar information. Issues at interview include: nervousness; inability to expand on answers or give examples; inappropriate appearance; use of 'teen speak/Americanisms'. Popular selection processes include giving a model lesson, being observed during placement, interview with a pupil council/panel, presentation to panel and presentation of a portfolio.

SLT responses indicate the retention of NQTs is not problematic and NQT responses indicate that most intend to stay in teaching. Secondary school SLT respondents see retention as more problematic than those in primary schools, those in independent schools see it as less problematic than those in the non-independent sector, schools in the North are the least likely to perceive problems and those in London the most likely to do so. However, this is all in the context of the majority not perceiving a problem. NQTs are least likely to leave in the NQT year and most likely to do so after two years.

SLT respondents' written comments on what encourages the retention of NQTs referred to the provision of support in school, NQTs having realistic expectations and the school selecting the right candidate. Influential aspects of the school environment are seen as being those that motivate all staff, not only NQTs, including making reasonable demands on NQTs, good team working, being valued, leadership, a no-blame culture, a disciplined environment, high expectations of pupils and permanent contracts. SLTs consider that if NQTs remain for the first two years they are likely to stay in teaching. Administrative work is seen as stressful and as discouraging retention.

The main reasons why SLT respondents consider that NQTs leave are promotion, end of contract, pupil behaviour, mismatch between skills and the demands of the job and heavy workload. Leaving because of temporary contracts is more common in the North and for promotion in the Midlands and London. Most NQTs who had left since 2002 had gone into other teaching jobs. NQT respondents indicated that where they consider leaving the profession it is mostly because of temporary contracts, heavy workloads and pupil behaviour.

Almost all SLT respondents have a standard induction process in their schools for NQTs, and there are very few differences between schools or regions. Some elements of induction seem standard for all schools, for example 10% release from timetables and having an induction tutor. NQT responses reflect those of SLT members, although far fewer NQTs think they have a written individual programme than SLT respondents indicate.

SLT responses indicate that practices in supporting NQTs are a little more variable, but the pattern of provision is similar in primary and secondary schools. NQTs most commonly spend 2-3 hours a week on induction activities, with those in primary schools

spending more time than those in secondary schools and those in independent schools spending less than in non-independent schools. NQT responses suggest they consider that they spend less time on induction than SLTs think they do.

Written comments by SLT respondents indicate what they see as important in induction: regular reviews and meetings; good communications; shadowing managers; effective use of non-contact time; networking with other NQTs; opportunities for further training and CPD; opportunities for progression within the school and for taking responsibility.

Written comments by NQT respondents indicate that induction is very important in helping them decide whether to stay in the school. NQTs were more critical of induction and the support between schools is seen as variable. Practices seen as helpful by NQT respondents include: good information; support from colleagues; a written record of the process and a written programme. Training needs include: behaviour management; ICT software; managing workloads; planning and assessment; observing others teach and visiting other schools; access to training courses. Financial considerations were not mentioned by the majority. NQT respondents would welcome support from ITT providers that carries into the NQT year, including opportunities to network with other NQTs. Schools are more important than local authorities and experiences of support at local authority level are variable, but some local authority provision was praised. There are concerns about fair assessment of NQTs in school and local authorities might monitor standards.

The discussion of the findings raises a number of issues. In some cases the findings support the issues and points raised in the literature review but not in other cases and this provides areas for further exploration in Part 2 of the study. The following includes key points for further exploration in Part 2 of the study:

- preferences by SLT members for routes into NQT posts, the reasons for those preferences (e.g. familiarity with them) and the implications of this for stakeholders (e.g. supply work not always being seen as beneficial; the part time PGCE route seems not to be highly regarded but may provide a possible route for those with financial or domestic commitments).
- the findings indicate aspects where NQTs seem least prepared and those where they are seen as 'adequate'. ITT seems most effective at helping trainees develop teaching skills and least so at helping them develop skills needed for other aspects of the work. Indications are that NQTs may be least well prepared for situations where they may need to cope with differentiation. Written comments by SLT members suggest quality aspects that the questionnaire did not specify and these need to be explored in Part 2.
- there seem to be no great differences regionally in recruitment issues yet other studies suggest there are, and this needs further exploration.
- generally responses to many aspects of the survey were positive and Part 2 must explore whether this is representative of all schools and if not why not.
- the findings identify anomalies that need to be addressed in Part 2 of the study: different information about the volume of applications; differences in satisfaction ratings by SLTs and indications from the literature; differences between written comments and ratings.
- there are apparent differences in perceptions of NQTs between independent and non-independent schools.
- the findings suggest that retention is not a great problem yet the literature indicates that it is.
- formal induction programmes seem to be standard. However, there are indications that the quality of induction is more variable. Provision in schools, by local authorities and by ITT providers might all be explored with examples of good practice identified.



# 1 Introduction and aims of the study

The Training and Development Agency for Schools' (TDA's) Corporate Plan 2007-10 (TDA 2007) includes as a key strategic aim the development of an effective school workforce by promoting teaching as an attractive career and assuring the quality of initial teacher training.

Sheffield Hallam University has been commissioned by the TDA to explore whether school leadership teams (SLTs) are able to recruit and retain enough quality Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs). An NQT is a teacher in their induction year following the completion of their initial teacher training (ITT). The study will run for three years and aims to identify:-

- the factors that impact on recruitment and retention of NQTs;
- SLTs needs in relation to high quality NQTs;
- how far NQTs meet these needs; their preparation for their role; their integration into schools and performance over time; how these are affected by the ITT route taken;
- how schools measure the performance and progress of NQTs.

The study is in two parts. Part 1 will provide an initial 'environment map' of NQT recruitment and highlight any problem areas. Part 2 will track attitudes of SLTs to NQT recruitment, retention and performance via case studies, telephone interviews and surveys over a three year period. This report focuses on Part 1 of this study, the research for which was conducted between December 2007 and April 2008. Part 1 is seen as providing a basis for the team's subsequent research. Its findings will provide a starting point for the study as a whole and an evaluation of its methods will contribute to the iterative development of the team's research methods.

Part 1 of this study, in order to create an 'environment map', aims to identify:-

- how effective recruitment processes are at attracting NQTs and SLTs perceptions of this;
- NQT retention rates;
- factors that impact on recruitment and retention.

Work to develop an 'environment map' has consisted of a number of elements including a literature review, pre-pilot interviews with schools to identify issues to explore and appropriate ways of collecting data, pilot surveys and finally quantitative on-line and paper based surveys to over 4,000 schools for SLTs and NQTs to complete.

## 2 Review of the existing literature on NQTs

### 2.1. Aims

The literature review was conducted between November 2007 and February 2008. Given the nature of the study and the timescale for the review, a comprehensive systematic consideration of all issues relating to newly qualified teachers (NQTs) was not possible, so the research team concentrated on the core issues of recruitment and retention. The review aimed to consider:

- problem areas with relation to NQT recruitment and retention for further exploration;
- the effectiveness of NQT recruitment;
- the effectiveness of NQT retention;
- the impact of internal and external factors on the recruitment and retention of NQTs.

Key policy documents were identified and databases searched for items relating to the issues in question. The review covered a range of types of publication: books, chapters, journal articles, research reports, statistical data, conference papers and press articles. It aimed to garner a general and broad understanding of issues pertinent to NQT recruitment and retention and identify the existing supporting evidence.

The literature search began with visits to the websites of some of the main organisations relevant to NQT issues: the TDA; the British Educational Communications and Technology Agency (BECTA); Teachernet; the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF). These provided links to key publications and research studies about NQTs. Other online searches included the sites of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the Times Educational Supplement (TES), *Education-line*, and Google Scholar. Additionally two educational databases, ERIC (Educational Resources Information Centre) and BIDS (Bath Information and Data Services), were consulted.

Items identified were accepted or rejected for further analysis on the basis of pertinence to the literature review aims. This process involved checking titles and abstracts for keywords and phrases, date of publication and relevance in relation to location (the study is concerned with England). The items to be reviewed were distributed between members of the research team. Each item reviewed was recorded systematically, all documentation was stored on a drive shared between members of the research team and regularly updated and PDFs of relevant articles could also be stored and accessed by any team member. The annotated bibliographies were analysed to provide the following summary.

## **2.2. Overview**

### **2.2.1 Introduction**

A key source of teacher recruitment statistics is Education Data Surveys. This has historical data on teacher recruitment dating back to the 1980's and is regularly cited in press and governmental publications. One finding from the literature review was that there is very little systematic or comprehensive understanding of the broad picture. Many studies about NQT recruitment and retention are qualitative, encompassing small and specific groups of NQTs or teachers and particular situations and localities: for example, secondary modern language NQTs who studied for a PGCE at the University of Nottingham within a five year period (Smethem, 2007). A major, recent quantitative report is of research conducted by Hobson et al (2007) at the Universities of Nottingham and Leeds, on behalf of the DCSF and TDA, entitled *Newly Qualified Teachers' Experiences of their First Year of Teaching*.

There was a general consensus that there is a serious teacher recruitment and retention problem in England (and Wales). Publications suggest that:

- too few graduates are entering or staying in teaching;
- this is a problem affecting secondary more than primary schools;
- the problem is affecting certain subject areas more than others (although all have a problem to some degree);
- it is exacerbated by the anticipated retirement of a large proportion of current teachers in the next 15-20 years;
- the pattern is subject to regional variation in intensity and focus.

### **2.2.2 Global perspective**

Although this study is concerned with England, it is worth noting that the problem is more widespread. Darling-Hammond (1999) states that in the US at least 30% of teachers are leaving the career within 5 years of entering (cited in Smethem, 2007), whilst Parkinson

(2005) gives this figure as leaving within 2 years. The Organisation for Economic Co-operative Development (OECD) *Teachers Matter* review outlines key concerns across 25 counties in relation to teacher recruitment and retention, which include:

- the attractiveness of a teaching career, particularly for high-demand subject areas, in the face of the undervaluing of teaching as a profession and relatively declining salaries;
- developing the knowledge and skills of teachers to meet schools needs;
- the inequitable distribution of teachers amongst schools, with schools in disadvantaged areas particularly struggling to recruit, select and employ teachers;
- teachers leaving the profession as a result of stress, high workloads, poor working environments and lack of reward or recognition (OECD, 2005).

These are similar issues to those faced by schools in England. All countries facing such problems are attempting to tackle them at national level, using a variety of approaches, such as:

- placing an emphasis on quality of teachers rather than quantity;
- tailoring teacher profiles to development, performance and school needs;
- viewing teacher development as a continuum;
- increasing flexibility in teacher training;
- allowing schools more responsibility for teacher personnel management (OECD, 2005).

### **2.2.3 The extent of the problem**

Wilson's (2005) study of post-16 recruitment and retention of teachers in Further Education (FE) showed that recruitment remains a problem in FE, most prominently in core subject areas (English, maths and science). However, the majority of FE teachers responding had over 10 years experience in the sector and expressed high levels of satisfaction, with only one quarter feeling undervalued (Wilson, 2005). This implies that retention issues in FE are less problematic than in schools, where the evidence suggests that there have been difficulties in providing properly qualified teachers since the early 1990s (Barmby, 2006).

### **2.2.4 Policy reactions to the problem**

Birks (2000) outlines some of the multitude of moves taken to tackle the problems of NQT recruitment and retention, in particular the emergence of a range of new routes into teaching (School Centred Initial Teacher Training, SCITTs; Graduate Teacher routes; Registered Teacher routes) and other initiatives such as governmental support for key workers in purchasing housing and having Local Authority Recruitment Strategy Managers. One initiative to encourage high level graduates to move into teaching is the Fast Track scheme, offering rapid movement up the career ladder, which Tranter (2003) critiques as less sensitive than talent spotting schemes used in the private sector. A study by the University of York suggests that the most effective way of recruiting and retaining teachers may be through offering an enjoyable, intellectually rewarding job, with manageable stress levels, a pleasant environment and congenial and creative colleagues (Birks, 2000). This may be more persuasive for undecided graduates than offers of high earnings, fast tracks to management and a constantly changing environment.

### **2.2.5 Across the country**

Milne's (2007) article in the TES (17.8.07) used data from Educational Data Surveys to outline key differences in patterns relating to the secondary teacher workforce and recruitment across the country. Despite severe shortages of teachers in some subjects (physics, chemistry and mathematics) and growing demand for teachers in certain parts of the country (particularly the East and South East), this is not the case everywhere. In the North and South West of England NQTs struggle to obtain posts and teachers with secure

ones are unlikely to risk changing jobs. Milne claims that whilst the number of training places available is based on projections of the number of teachers needed in the future, courses are frequently funded in Northern universities, in areas where there may not be teaching jobs available and a government spokesperson had suggested that NQTs will need to relocate to find jobs. Hobson et al (2007) found that 34% of those NQTs who struggled to find posts stated that this was because there were no posts in their desired locations, although the study does not state which regions this affected.

Johnson's (2003) report looks at issues in London. He asserts that issues there are no different from those faced in other parts of the country, but rather that it is the extent of the problem in London that is different. He describes the 'Capital Teacher' brand: a proposal for actions to specifically attract NQTs and mid-career teachers to work in London schools.

## **2.3 Reasons for choosing teaching and teacher training**

### **2.3.1 Introduction**

Barmby's study (2006) looks at why people enter a teaching career, beginning with three reasons offered by Kyriacou and Coulthard in 2000:

- for altruistic reasons, a desire to help children and society and perform a socially worthwhile job;
- for intrinsic reasons, such as the activity of teaching children, the ability to use their subject knowledge or expertise;
- for extrinsic reasons, including aspects of the job unrelated to the actual work, such as the holidays, pay levels or status (Kyriacou and Coulthard, cited in Barmby, 2006).

Studies in this area tend to identify intrinsic and altruistic reasons as the most common ones for choosing a teaching career (Barmby, 2006). Barmby's survey (2006) reinforces this finding, with child-orientated, intrinsic and altruistic reasons being most commonly given: the majority of respondents stated that they had 'always had it (teaching) in mind'. This article also explores literature that considers why people had not chosen teaching as a career, including salary, workload, the status of teaching, stress, bureaucracy, school funding and management and pupil behaviour. Those surveyed who had gone into teaching gave reasons that might have led them to decide not to do so, as pupil behaviour, workload and financial reasons (cost of the training and salary) (Barmby, 2006).

### **2.3.2 Initial teacher training**

Noyes (2004) suggests that PGCE programmes may not fully equip teachers for their experiences in the classroom. This study indicates that the courses are too short to instil in NQTs the benefits and importance of self-awareness and self-direction as tools for changing their own behaviour.

Parkinson's study of induction also raises concerns about gaps in initial teacher training (ITT) provision, specifically in Secondary PGCE training. Some of the areas where NQTs have difficulties when entering the school environment are dealing with parents and handling difficult behaviour, which Parkinson (2005) suggests could be addressed more thoroughly in PGCE training. This study also identifies a view from NQTs that they would appreciate greater support after completing their PGCE, in addition to their induction. Of those surveyed, 72% of NQTs felt they would like to keep in touch with the HEI where they completed their PGCE, 53% felt it would help them to be in touch with a local HEI and many felt that opportunities to talk to other NQTs and discuss issues would be useful (Parkinson, 2005).

### **2.3.3 Employment-based ITT routes**

Price and Willett's paper (2006) looks at some of the changes in ITT over recent years. This includes an increasing trend for primary trainees to undertake a PGCE course rather than a more traditional BA or BEd teaching degree, and a dramatic increase in the number of training options based entirely in schools with little or no HEI input. They also discuss the increased importance of schools within the ITT process, now seen less as 'teaching practice' and more as a part of the mentoring and support of trainees. Whilst this places greater pressure on schools, it is also frequently seen as improving standards within the school: NQTs bring new momentum and ideas and encourage reflexive practice in the staff supporting them (Price and Willett, 2006).

Griffiths (2007) looks at experiences from the Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP), an employment-based route into teaching. This, set up as a workplace training model in the south of England, was anticipated to appeal to rural schools that would not ordinarily be able to accept trainee teachers because of the distance to universities. Previous experience in schools (as classroom assistants or voluntary helpers, for example) was seen as beneficial to trainees, helping them to cope with the transition to teaching (Griffiths, 2007): however, this also meant in some instances that schools had unrealistic expectations of their abilities. Schools involved in GTP schemes were generally perceived as very supportive of their trainees, professionally and personally (Griffiths, 2007).

Brookes' study (2005) also looks at the GTP, upon which he says opinion is divided. He cites findings indicating that, whilst meeting the minimum criteria, many trainees are failing to meet the higher standards that they are capable of reaching, as a result of inadequacies in the training. However, other evaluations of this programme have praised the opportunities offered to those who would not enter teaching through more traditional routes (Brookes, 2005). The study included a small survey of GTP mentors alongside interviews, which highlighted some uncertainties in the requirements, standards and expected training of GTP trainees. He concludes that whilst there are concerns for standards, this type of training will inevitably become more common in time.

### **2.3.4 Not taking up teaching post-training**

One recruitment issue is qualified teachers (those who have completed a teaching qualification but not yet undertaken their NQT year) not taking up teaching posts. Bird's study (2002) suggests that the reasons given for not moving into a teaching career are significantly different from reasons given by those teachers who leave teaching without experience of working in schools. Many NQTs felt unsuited to teaching, experienced unsuccessful applications and had concerns around behaviour management.

There is some concern in the literature about NQTs being unable to secure suitable work (e.g. Milne, 2007). However, a recent study for the TDA found that 87% of those contacted post-ITT had successfully found posts (permanent or fixed-term) and 7% were working as supply teachers, meaning that only 6% had been unable to secure a teaching post (Hobson et al 2007).

### **2.3.5 Mature entry to teaching**

Priyadharshini and Robinson-Pant's study (2003) looks at career changers to teaching, in a study for the TDA. This small, qualitative study picked out 6 'identities' for career changers:

- parents
- successful careerists
- freelancers
- late starters

- serial careerists
- young career changers.

The study looked at pulls and pushes into teaching. Teaching was seen to offer a sociable environment, a 'moral' unselfish career, an opportunity to make a difference to society, financial security and long term employment in a chosen location. Priyadharshini & Robinson-Pant felt that mature entrants were realistic about the demands of the career, but many experienced frustrations working with children who were not interested or at low educational levels. The move to teaching as a career was attributed to changed perspectives on life and themselves: changed ideals, life experience and increased confidence with maturity. 'Irritants' were identified as factors that may potentially lead to future retention problems; these included shortfalls in training provision, high stress levels, low pay and problems with school culture (Priyadharshini & Robinson-Pant, 2003).

Bird (2003) promotes mature entrants to teaching (and qualified teachers who have left the profession) as a potential solution to the enduring problem of mathematics teaching shortages, but goes on to say that mature trainees are more likely to experience difficulties in finding a post. One reason may be that they are less able to be flexible about the type of post they are seeking, particularly in relation to geographical location. The study highlighted that mature trainees are likely to apply for posts at a later stage for a variety of personal reasons, leaving fewer opportunities. Mature entrants are also seen as more expensive for an employer as they may have previous experience entitling them to a higher salary (Bird, 2002).

## **2.4. Induction**

### **2.4.1 Accessing induction**

The ability to access posts offering induction can be problematic for NQTs: 94% of Open University respondents to Bird's survey (2003) had worked initially in a supply post after their training. This study identified supply as a method used by schools to identify suitable individuals and NQTs to identify a suitable post. With the then DfEE guidance preventing more than four terms of supply teaching without induction, this may contribute to some degree of wastage (Bird, 2002).

Hobson et al (2007) found that 88% of NQTs in a teaching post had access to a formal induction programme and almost all of these (99%) were monitored by an induction tutor/mentor. This study found that accessing induction whilst working as a supply teacher can be a major problem for NQTs.

Smethem and Adey (2005) carried out a comparison of pre- and post-compulsory induction experiences of NQTs using a small qualitative study, which identified some key differences between those that had and had not received induction. They found that prior to formal induction, NQTs experienced 'culture shock' on beginning teaching, where they felt they had to be seen to be coping and received little feedback or praise and had heavy workloads. Induction was seen as supporting NQTs to develop more positive relationships with other school staff and offering opportunities for reflection and feedback, despite NQTs still experiencing a heavy workload (Smethem & Adey, 2005). In later research Smethem identifies a clear relationship between the early induction experiences of NQTs and their intentions to remain in teaching (Smethem, 2007).

### **2.4.2 Induction standards**

Many of the studies on NQT recruitment show concerns around the induction process. Carrington et al's (2001) study for the TDA of ethnic minority teachers, found that many expressed dissatisfaction with their induction. Heilbronn et al (2002) found that the quality

of induction is inconsistent even within a school and induction tutors do not always have sufficient experience for the role. Castagnoli and Cook (2004) state that induction programmes and professional development opportunities are two of the main factors for NQTs in choosing schools. Barrington (2000) raises questions about the familiarity of NQTs and induction tutors with the expected NQT standards and about the appropriateness of assessment structures. Jackson (2007) also highlights problems: NQTs feel that they are not valued or listened to and many are afraid to speak up about the way they are treated because of their position within school, particularly if employed on a temporary contract.

Lewis, Mackay & Varley (2000) found that standards of induction were variable for primary NQTs. Their small scale study, involving surveys and interviews, raised questions about target setting, monitoring of standards, the extent to which NQTs actually had reduced teaching time and CPD provided. They found that provision was as mixed as that found by HMI in a study carried out 10 years previously (cited HMI, 1993, *The New Teacher in School*).

Bubb (2006) also gives examples of poor practice in NQT induction, which includes insufficient reduction in timetable, lack of training, lack of consultation with NQTs about targets and standards, no support, and bullying of NQTs by the senior management team.

Parkinson (2005) identifies subject knowledge as a weakness for many secondary NQTs, which should be addressed through their induction. However, where the induction tutor comes from a different subject specialism this does not occur. This study also suggests that NQT mentors may lack knowledge of teacher development strategies such as reflexive practice, so that not only are they unable to support NQTs with this, but it may inadvertently lead to NQTs stagnating or adversely affect their progress (Parkinson, 2005).

Hobson et al's (2007) study of NQTs found that 84% of those who had accessed induction had been recommended to pass and 13% had not yet been informed, with only 3% being aware that they were not being recommended to pass (mostly because they had not been in post long enough).

## **2.5 Retention and ongoing professional development**

### **2.5.1 Introduction**

Whilst there are overlapping features, retention issues are separate from those relating to recruitment. There are two primary perspectives from which this has been examined in the literature: the factors that have impacted on teachers to make them leave (or wish to leave) teaching (retention as a problem); the ways in which government/local authorities/schools have tried to improve retention rates (the solution to the problem of retention). Sammons et al (2007) suggest there are two aspects relating to the issue of retention: physical continuation in the role, the way that retention is predominantly defined; and maintenance of motivation and commitment to the role, i.e. the retention of quality, a much more complex issue to both quantify and investigate.

This study found that more advantaged schools experienced better retention in relation to both of these definitions and retention was also better in primary than secondary.

### **2.5.2 Intention**

Smethem's article looking at retention and intention raises the concern that the conceptions of career and career longevity amongst teachers in their first two years of service are significantly at odds with those of previous generations of teachers (Johnson

2004, cited in Smethem, 2007). Smethem proposes 3 models of teacher in relation to intention:

- the career teacher, committed to a long-term career in teaching with ambition for promotion;
- the portfolio teacher, who sees teaching as a temporary career choice and envisages leaving teaching in the future;
- the classroom teacher, committed to classroom teaching as a long-term career and not actively seeking promotion (Smethem, 2007:470).

Hobson et al (2007) finds that those who report themselves as enjoying working as teachers during their induction year are likely to also report positive relationships with colleagues, pupils, non-teaching staff, parents and the head-teacher and are likely to intend to stay in teaching for at least four years.

### **2.5.3 Ongoing professional development**

Day et al (2006) argue that teacher effectiveness increases with time, is related to experience rather than age or responsibilities and is supported by a strong teacher identity, continuing professional development (CPD) and positive colleague and peer relationships.

Hodkinson (2006) examines the CEDP (Career Entry Development Profile), used in the NQT induction year as a starting point for CPD. Respondents to the survey on CEDP suggest that this may not provide a positive grounding for future professional development because needs are not met in the first instance: only 5% had their early CPD needs met and 40% had none addressed at all. Nevertheless, the study found that 94% of NQTs were happy with the quality of the in-service training they received in their NQT year (Hodkinson, 2006). Hobson et al (2007) also consider the CEPD and its role as a bridge between the NQT year and future professional development. Around half of respondents to their survey felt that CEPD had helped them to identify strengths and weaknesses and that it was a useful link between ITT and Induction, although between a quarter and a third did not share this view.

Sammons et al's study (2007) identifies the need for more targeted CPD provision in schools to reflect the needs of teachers at various career stages, and the need for provision that reflects teachers' commitment, resilience and health needs. This was found to support pupil learning and achievement and represents what Sammons et al describe as quality retention.

Bubb and Earley (2006) describe the reasons that prevent teachers, particularly those early in their careers, from undertaking CPD as 'educational vandalism', which is insidious and far-reaching. This, in their view, has various causes: policy changes to remove ring fencing for CPD budgets, poor leadership and management of CPD in schools and teachers themselves, who do not take their personal responsibility for development seriously (Bubb & Earley, 2006). They recommend increased investment, increased emphasis on the CPD coordinator role and viewing the schools as a learning environment for adults as well as children (Bubb & Earley, 2006).

### **2.5.4 Leavers**

The issue of retention is clouded because there are two main ways in which the profession fails to retain teachers. Some research looks into why teachers are lost from the state sector to the private sector (Green et al, 2008). Other research suggests that part of the retention problem can be attributed to teachers moving in and out of teaching temporarily rather than leaving the profession for good (Bird, 2003). An example of this would be Dadley and Edwards (2007) finding that 'leavers' from religious education (RE) teaching are more frequently women who are leaving to start a family.



The EASC study of teacher recruitment and retention used data from exit surveys in West Sussex to explore teachers leaving after 4 or 5 years in the profession and found that this did not relate to pay levels, despite the cost of housing being a key reason for migration from the area (EASC, 2004).

Dadley and Edwards (2007) study of RE teachers examined the most frequently given reasons for leaving the profession: behaviour, lack of support from senior managers, devaluing of the subject, working with non-subject specialists leading to added pressures and workload (heightened for non-curriculum subjects because of lack of available resources for staff). Although this study looks specifically RE, these findings may be relevant to other subjects.

Barmby (2006) found the most common reasons for considering leaving teaching to be workload and pupil discipline. Support with housing, help with childcare and salary were significantly more problematic for those in London than those in the rest of the country.

Smithers and Robinson (2004) identified that leavers are more likely to be younger or older (i.e. nearing retirement) than from a mid-age range, more likely to be women (this may relate to Bird's, 2003, finding that leavers often move in and out of teaching, and Dadley & Edwards, 2007, finding that this is often related to starting a family), and is more frequent in schools in London, the East and the South East (areas identified by Milne, 2007, as those with the greatest need for teachers) (Smithers & Robinson, 2004).

### **2.5.5 Budgetary constraints**

Budgetary concerns run through the issues of recruitment and retention. Castagnoli and Cook (2004) highlight head-teachers' need for money to make changes to attract the right people to their schools. Heilbronn et al's (2002) study found that the number of NQTs employed on temporary contracts is increasing. The LSE's research recorded a net flow of 1,400 experienced teachers from the state to the (better resourced) private sector in 2006 (Green et al, 2008). This may be more a result of the increasing demand for private education in Britain, as differences in pay and satisfaction between the private and state sectors is less significant than is generally believed (LSE, 2007).

Budgetary constraints often mean that schools are unable to offer permanent contracts, and instead use fixed-term contracts. This tends to affect NQTs disproportionately (Williams 1997; cited in Bird, 2002). Smithers and Robinson (2004) found that an increasing number of teachers is leaving the profession due to non-renewal of fixed term contracts. Hobson et al (2007) found that secondary school NQTs were more likely to initially secure a permanent post than primary (76% compared to 58%); primary teachers were much more likely to have had difficulty securing a post (32% compared to 12%). Hobson et al's (2007) study further found that 24% of those intending to secure a post at a different school at the end of their NQT year were doing so because their present contract was ending, and the majority of those not intending to teach in the coming year had been unable to find a teaching post (24%).

OECD identifies that starting salaries for teachers in England have risen much faster than mid-career and top-of-the-scale salaries (OEC, 2007).

### **2.5.6 Status of teachers**

The status of teachers may have some relevance to retention problems. Devaluing of the subject was seen as relating to retention in Dadley and Edwards' (2007) study of RE teachers; devaluation by the school sometimes led to a reduction in budget and also devaluation by colleagues, pupils and parents. Hargreaves et al's study (2007) found that

the perception of teachers' status was similar to that of social workers in the eyes of schools' staff and the public. They noted variations in the perception of status between better and poorer performing schools and between some more marginalised groups of teachers (such as BME teachers or those with SEN responsibility). Their study of media coverage perceived a positive and sympathetic representation of teachers generally (Hargreaves et al, 2007).

### **2.5.7 Schools in difficult circumstances**

Smithers and Robinson (2004) found a move away from schools in more challenging circumstances but this appeared to be turnover (staff moving to other schools) rather than wastage (staff leaving the profession). The continuation stage of this project identified feeling valued and supported as a strong factor in retaining staff (Smithers & Robinson, 2005).

The OECD 2007 edition of *Education at a Glance* identifies that disadvantaged schools, particularly in poorer neighbourhoods or with large proportions of students speaking other languages, are likely to have most trouble attracting teachers and are consequently more likely to employ those with least experience (OECD, 2007). This conflicts with Hobson et al's (2007) finding that 35% of NQTs surveyed stated that their school was high in the league tables, although 18% felt their school was in challenging circumstances.

Noyes (2004) found that teachers were likely to gravitate towards the types of schools they themselves had attended, particularly in relation to socio-economic status, which raises questions about who will teach mathematics in the schools that are unable to produce maths teachers and about the roots of this trend. In relation to the University of Nottingham trainees who were the subject of the study, 40% of PGCE trainees found jobs with the schools that they attended for their main placement, a position selected for them by PGCE tutors. This leads Noyes to question whether lecturers hold responsibility for the reinforcement of this socio-economic cycle. Although Hobson et al (2007) do not address the socio-economic status of schools, they also found that 32% of NQTs obtain posts in schools in which they have undertaken placements during training.

## **2.6 Themes**

From the literature on NQT recruitment and retention several themes emerge. These themes may represent key points along the route from considering a teaching career to becoming an established and successful teacher and may represent those points that need to be addressed in considering solutions to the problems of recruitment and retention of high quality NQTs. They are:

- recruitment to teacher training courses (including attracting the right people and being clear who those people are);
- adequacy of preparation provided by ITT, both for the classroom and for wider school roles such as dealing with parents;
- ensuring that, once qualified, NQTs progress to teaching posts and are able to remain in these posts;
- the support NQTs receive during induction and in addition to the induction process;
- the reasons that teachers leave the profession;
- ensuring that retention of teachers is quality retention; that they continue to undertake CPD and to feel engaged with the job;
- attracting those who have left teaching to return to the profession.

## **2.7 Questions for the remainder of this study**

The following questions might be considered in the three years of this study.

- Do present policies result in attracting the most appropriate people to ITT?

- Are teachers from BA/BEd courses better prepared for classroom management than those who engage in shorter training (e.g. PGCE)?
- Does ITT fail to cover any areas of skills or expertise that NQTs need?
- What do schools expect of NQTs? Do these expectations vary according to the type of ITT (e.g. differences between university-based and workplace training)?
- Are sufficient teaching posts available for ITT graduates in all areas of the country and in all subject areas?
- Are mature entrants to teaching a more 'expensive option' for SLTs?
- Are NQTs familiar with expected NQT standards?
- Are induction tutors familiar with NQT standards?
- Are assessment structures for NQTs appropriate? Are these adhered to?
- Accountability: who is responsible for ensuring NQT entitlements are met?
- Is there sufficient resourcing by Local Authorities of NQT induction?
- Are SLTs committed to appropriate CPD for NQTs?

## **3 Methodology and methods for Part 1 of the study**

### **3.1 Methodology**

For the study as a whole, the methodology is both qualitative and quantitative, with each approach used to inform and guide the other on an iterative basis, to help in refining the research instruments and in collecting data. Part 1 of the study, the 'environment map', began with a small scale qualitative pre-pilot in which SLT members were interviewed to identify issues to explore via a survey, to identify the most appropriate way of conducting the survey to be sent out in January 2008 and also, in preparation for the rest of the three year study, to identify appropriate incentives for schools to participate in all aspects of the study.

This section begins by describing the pre-pilot and subsequent pilot of draft research instruments and also gives the findings of the pre-pilot and pilot, since these impacted on the methods used for the survey that formed the main research method. The pilot of the questionnaires aimed to obtain feedback on format and content prior to the main survey.

### **3.2 Methods**

#### **3.2.1 Pre-Pilot methods**

In December 2007 a pre-pilot interview schedule was developed for interviews with individuals responsible for the recruitment and retention of NQTs in 10 schools. Throughout December 2007 a total of 11 pre-pilot interviews were conducted in these schools, face-to-face or by telephone. Of the 10 schools involved, 4 were secondary and 7 primary. The majority of the schools were from Sheffield Hallam University's catchment area and included urban and rural schools, however, the sample also included schools from other areas/cities including London, York and Manchester. The main areas explored in the pre-pilot interviews were:-

- what questions should be asked in the questionnaires in relation to recruitment and retention issues;
- the most suitable format for the questionnaires i.e. online, paper-based;
- the most effective way of maximising response rates i.e. incentives;
- the most appropriate way of encouraging schools to participate in the 3 year longitudinal project as well as the 'environment mapping' survey.

The findings from the pre-pilot interviews informed the development of the questionnaires to be piloted, including questions to be explored about the recruitment and retention of NQTs, questionnaire format and incentives for schools to participate in the study as a whole.

### **3.2.2 Pre-Pilot results**

Of the 11 interviews conducted in 10 schools, most were with Head-teachers (6). The remaining interviews were with Deputy Heads (3) and other staff responsible for NQTs (2). All those interviewed, apart from 2, were responsible for the recruitment of NQTs; the 2 not responsible for recruitment were either involved in the recruitment process or had responsibility for NQTs once recruited.

#### **Recruitment**

Pre-pilot interviewees were asked about the recruitment of NQTs, in particular about recruiting high quality NQTs. A wide range of issues were mentioned by primary and secondary schools, with little variation between them.

One of the most common problems experienced when recruiting NQTs is the quality of NQT applications. For example, one primary head-teacher commented that 'the standard of applications was disappointing because they lack flair' and a secondary head-teacher felt that 'the school had lots of applications for posts, but sometimes standard of applicants are not satisfactory'. In one primary and one secondary school, lack of suitable references was an issue. For example, the majority of applicants' references come from college tutors, and some head-teachers thought they did not know the student well enough and that references from the applicants' placement school would be more reliable.

Other issues related to the recruitment of NQTs are skills, experience and commitment. For example, one concern is that NQT applicants have limited experience in a variety of different teaching environments.

'I look for students who have had three effective teaching practices, who have done lots of whole-class teaching. The problem with many applicants is that they have not had enough time doing full-time teaching' (primary head-teacher)

A deputy head (secondary) saw the main concerns in recruiting NQTs as being that NQTs need excellent subject knowledge and a commitment to develop their own practice. One primary head-teacher looked for 'personality, commitment to the children, understanding of children's needs, curricular knowledge, team working skills and professional commitment'.

#### **Retention**

The pre-pilot interviews also considered the retention of NQTs. Respondents from primary and secondary schools felt that many NQTs leave after their first year because of lack of training and support.

'We do not have any problems retaining NQTs in this school. I think that it is because we make it challenging for them in a positive way, and we also allow them time for training and visits to other schools.' (primary head-teacher)

'Training has an impact on the retention of teachers. Schools have increasing responsibility in the process of teacher training, and have little knowledge of how to train teachers and in many cases little understanding of the skills that they use in a classroom and how to develop these.' (secondary head-teacher)

Some interviewees in primary and secondary schools felt that NQTs leave because the job is not what they expect and the workload is more than anticipated.

'Workload is the main issue for the retention of NQTs. Some come in and have barely survived the course never mind the teaching. Once they have started the role they often come in and leave to try something else. I think this is partly the course they undertook and the person as an individual not making the right decision.' (primary head-teacher)

Most primary school respondents felt that staff development meetings and continuing professional development (CPD) were crucial in retaining high quality NQTs. These issues were not raised in any of the pre-pilot secondary schools.

Other issues raised related to retaining high quality NQTs were their lack of experience with parents and lack of classroom management. For example, one primary head-teacher felt that 'sometimes trainee teachers have no experience of dealing with parents whilst on their placements and once they start as an NQT in a school they can't deal with the parents'. Another primary school respondent felt that 'overall when NQTs leave it's because of the school and lack of understanding of the job and how they fit into it. Also, some NQTs are unsure about how to manage parents and in some instances NQTs are over confident'.

### **Survey Format & Encouraging Response**

The pre-pilot interviewees were asked about a survey format, ways of maximising response for the initial survey and the 3 year longitudinal study and about possible incentives to increase participation.

There was a mixed response about an appropriate way to distribute the survey i.e. paper-based via mail, online or both. The most favoured method was to have both an online and paper-based survey, giving respondents the option to use either. It became apparent that some schools may not have online access whilst others use the internet frequently. For example, one primary school respondent felt that a paper-based survey was much more appropriate for their school whereas in a large secondary school online was preferred. Only one pre-pilot school felt that a survey was a bad idea, whichever method was used.

The pre-pilot interviews also explored the best way to encourage cooperation from SLTs in the 4,000 survey schools. Responses included:

- a letter asking for cooperation prior to the survey going out;
- appealing to individuals' professionalism;
- emphasise how the project will benefit the school;
- distribute the letter and survey at less busy times;
- incentives;
- endorsement from school bodies.

Most pre-pilot school respondents thought the best way to maximise response rates and increase participation is to offer incentives to schools, these included:

- certificate/plaque for taking part;
- training;
- school equipment;
- online tutorials;
- gift vouchers
- gift for the staffroom;
- cash;
- prize draws.

Respondents considered that the aspects that would encourage schools to participate in the 3 year longitudinal study were similar to the above, with the main ones being cash to release staff and recognition. The majority of pre-pilot schools agreed to pilot the questionnaire and half agreed to be a case study school.

### **3.2.3 Pilot methods**

Two draft questionnaires were developed, one for SLT members and one for NQTs, both of which took into account the findings of the pre-pilot interviews. In January 2008 the draft questionnaires were sent to all 10 schools involved in the pre-pilot interviews. The majority received an online version of the SLT questionnaire via email and 2 were sent hard copy versions. In addition, the schools were also asked to give questionnaires to any NQTs or early career teachers in their school, either hard copy or online. SLTs and NQTs were asked to complete the questionnaires and give feedback on style, ease of completion, content and format, to inform the development of the final questionnaires to be sent out in early February. In total 7 SLT and 7 NQT questionnaires were returned.

### **3.2.4 Pilot findings**

The pilot indicated that the initial questionnaire for SLTs was fairly time consuming to fill in and took longer than the 20 minutes estimated. It was decided to reduce the questionnaire in length, reduce the number of open questions and re-order some questions, for example, the number of questions about vacancies was reduced. The original section on vacancies contained subject specific questions for primary schools, however primary school respondents indicated that NQTs are not generally recruited on this basis but on the basis of the key stage they are trained to teach or other generic skills. The original section on retention asked for specific numbers of NQTs in the school who had left the profession and for what reasons. Respondents found such specific information difficult to provide, so the question was adapted to ask for proportions instead of numbers.

Respondents to the NQT questionnaire reported that it was fairly straightforward to complete and did not take too much time. The analysis of the responses revealed no problematic questions. This questionnaire was adapted in line with the changes to the SLT questionnaire, to allow for comparisons at the analysis stage.

### **3.2.5 Conclusions from the pre-pilot and pilot**

The pre-pilot interviews, pilot questionnaire and the literature review proved very useful in clarifying the survey methods for the 'environment map', in identifying issues relating to the recruitment and retention of NQTs and items to be included in the final questionnaires. In the original tender document it was proposed that the survey be online. However, as a result of the pre-pilot interviews it was decided to also use paper-based questionnaires. The pre-pilot gave an insight into what would be attractive incentives to schools to increase response rates and encourage further participation. Consideration was given to all the incentives suggested and the most appropriate in terms of time, money and feasibility were vouchers, cash and prize draws.

## **4 Methods for the Part 1 main survey**

### **4.1 Timescale**

The timescale was as follows:

- initial letter with publicity leaflet sent 7th Jan
- postal survey sent 7th Feb
- hard copy reminder 27th Feb
- 1st email reminder 3rd March
- 2nd email reminder 7th March

- 3rd email reminder 10th March (from TDA)
- telephone chasing 14th March
- survey closed 27th March.

## 4.2 Sampling

The aim was to survey 4,000 schools in order to achieve a response rate of 1,000. The sampling technique originally proposed was to take 30 of England's Local Authorities and survey all schools within them, providing a representative cross section of schools across the country. This was based upon an 'average' (mean) number of schools per Local Authority area.

It was decided that the sample would need to proportionately represent rural and urban areas and each of the nine English regions. A list of all 354 Local Authorities was prepared and broken down by the nine regions and by low, medium or high population density (using 2002 national statistics data<sup>1</sup>). In the table below N is the number of Local Authorities within each region and the proportions within each population density are given. The total number of Local Authorities sampled initially was 30.

**Table 1 Number of local authorities and related population densities by region**  
(N = number of local authorities)

		High	Medium	Low
		%	%	%
<b>East</b>	N = 48	22.9	39.6	37.5
<b>East Midlands</b>	N = 40	20.0	37.5	42.5
<b>London</b>	N = 33	100.0		
<b>North East</b>	N = 23	26.1	47.8	26.1
<b>North West</b>	N = 43	37.2	44.2	18.6
<b>South East</b>	N = 67	31.3	44.8	23.9
<b>South West</b>	N = 45	20.0	11.1	68.9
<b>West Midlands</b>	N = 34	32.4	29.4	38.2
<b>Yorkshire &amp; the Humber</b>	N = 21	14.3	42.9	42.9

Note: High = 1301+; medium = 261-1300; Low = 0-260.

To produce the sample of Local Authorities, all 354 were listed alphabetically by region and assigned a number from 1 to 354. An online random number generator<sup>2</sup> was used to select a sample of 30 Local Authorities, with any above the target number for each criteria (i.e. region and population density) discarded. A list of schools within these 30 Authorities was created using data from various sources, including the DfES, Edubase and Ofsted, however this list did not provide the 4,000 schools needed for the sample: many low population density areas have small numbers of schools and a small number of high population density areas tend to skew the figures. A further 28 Local Authorities were therefore added to the sample. In total the number of schools sampled was 4,098. Each school in the sample is identified by its URN (Unique Reference Number), a national identifier that allows the sample to be matched with other datasets (for example, to use data held on free school meal entitlements). An additional 7 Local Authorities were later added to the sample, as a number of schools were discarded as ineligible for the criteria of the study (targeting inappropriate age ranges, etc). This brought the final number of Local Authorities sampled to 65.

<sup>1</sup> ONS (2002) National Statistics Data <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/> last accessed 27th April 2008.

<sup>2</sup> Research Randomizer (2008) <http://www.randomizer.org/form.htm> last accessed 27th April 2008.

### **Sampling for telephone follow up**

The mail-out and the postal and email reminders did not provide the hoped for response rate and it was decided to follow up some non-respondents from secondary schools by telephone to enquire why they had not completed the questionnaire and to encourage them to do so. This required a representative sample of the existing sample of schools. Firstly all the secondary schools were identified and allocated consecutive numbers. A random number generator was used to select 230 and those already responding to the survey were eliminated, leaving 182 secondary schools, verified as being statistically representative of the original sample, all of which were telephoned. Reasons for not responding were recorded.

## **4.3 Data Analysis**

The paper questionnaires were electronically scanned and the resulting data were combined with those from online responses. Each dataset was cleaned using a standard procedure, namely checks to ensure that any routing instructions had been followed, range checks on all appropriate variables and logic checks to highlight obvious inconsistencies in the data. In addition 10% of the questionnaires received a complete quality check. The datasets were then analysed using SPSS version 12.

Each questionnaire contained several open-ended questions. The responses were transcribed and manually coded. Frequencies of the coded comments were produced.

## **5 Findings**

### **5.1 Response Rates and conventions used.**

#### **SLT Responses**

Questionnaires were sent to a sample of 4,098 schools. Overall 538 paper copies and 168 online responses were received, giving a total of 706 questionnaires for analysis. A number of schools (113) gave reasons for not participating in the survey such as "no NQTs" or "no time". Including these as 'non applicable' gives a response rate of 18%.

Data from the DCSF database were used to identify school type in the sample despatched; respondents were also asked for the school type on the questionnaire and the resulting data were used for the analysis. Schools are divided in this findings section into primary and secondary. In a small number of cases (20) schools include both primary and secondary. These schools were excluded from the primary and secondary breakdowns but included in all other breakdowns.

In all tables n= the number of respondents to a question. Where there are differences in totals between tables this is because differing numbers responded to questions. To reduce effort needed by respondents, actual numbers, for example of NQTs recruited, were not sought but rather bands were used against which respondents could provide an estimate. This means that the findings are indicative.



**Table 2 School type in the sample (according to DCSF definitions)**

	<b>Total n</b>	<b>%</b>
Primary	2865	69.9
Secondary	566	13.8
Academy	7	0.2
Grammar School	20	0.5
Independent School	361	8.8
Modern School	17	0.4
Technical School	1	0.0
Special Schools	232	5.7
Undefined	29	0.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>4098</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 3 SLT responses by school type**

	<b>Total n</b>	<b>%</b>
Primary	495	70.1
Secondary	191	27.1
Both	20	2.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 4 SLT responses by independent/non-independent schools**

	<b>Total n</b>	<b>%</b>
Non-independent	669	94.8
Independent	34	4.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>703</b>	<b>99.6</b>

The sample restricted the proportion of independent schools surveyed to 9% of the total (i.e. 361 schools) and 34 responded. Although the number of independent school respondents is small, data about them are included as they do suggest differences with the non-independent sector.

**Table 5 SLT responses by region**

	<b>Total n</b>	<b>%</b>
unknown*	1	0.1
East	80	11.3
East Midlands	61	8.6
London	89	12.6
North East	19	2.7
North West	98	13.9
South East	76	10.8
South West	77	10.9
West Midlands	70	9.9
Yorkshire & Humber	135	19.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>100</b>

\* Respondent removed ID

Geographical location was also used as a variable. As indicated in 4.2 above, samples of schools were approached in all 9 regions in England. However, using all 9 regions in the analysis of data proved unhelpful because of the numbers responding in each region and the difficulty of seeing patterns with the numbers of categories in tables. The 9 regions

were therefore reduced to 4. Table 6 below indicates how the regions were combined and the responses in each of the combined regions. The total in Table 6 (705) is less than in Table 5 above as 1 SLT respondent did not provide geographical location.

**Table 6 Regions grouped and SLT responses within them**

	<b>Total n</b>	<b>%</b>
North (NE, NW ,Y&H)	252	35.7
Midlands (EM, WM, E)	211	29.9
South (SE,SW)	153	21.7
London	89	12.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>705</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Data were used from the DCSF database that gives % of pupils eligible for free school meals, as an indicator of deprivation. This was divided into quartiles for the analysis with the percentage ranges shown in Table 7. Please note that data were unavailable for 63 schools. Respondents were asked to give the postcode for their school and this was linked to information to produce an indicator of deprivation. The analysis of data produced similar results for the free school meals and for the deprivation variable and it was decided to use the free school meals variable only.

**Table 7 SLT responses by free school meals in the school**

	<b>Total n</b>	<b>%</b>
0-4.5% (Least deprived)	162	25.2
4.6-9.7% (Lower middle)	161	25.0
9.8-21.4% (Upper middle)	160	24.9
21.5+% (Most deprived)	160	24.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>643</b>	<b>100</b>

In the SLT questionnaire, respondents were asked to give data on % of pupils in their school by ethnic groups. In order to produce a simple indicator to use as a variable in identifying any differences resulting from the ethnicity of school pupils, responses were grouped according to % of white pupils and split in to four groups (Table 8). Where these data were missing, data from the DCSF national database were used. Initially, responses were divided into quartiles according to the ethnicity of pupils in the responding schools but this provided bands that obscured ethnicity (one band was 0 – 75% white).

**Table 8 SLT responses by school ethnicity**

<b>Proportion of white pupils</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>%</b>
0-24%	58	8.4
25-49%	32	4.6
50-74%	86	12.4
75-100%	518	74.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>694</b>	<b>100</b>

### **NQT responses**

In total 272 NQT responses were received: 180 paper and 92 electronic. School data were merged from the SLT dataset into the NQT dataset in order to analyse the NQT data by school demographics.

**Table 9 NQT responses by school type**

	Total n	%
Primary	162	62.3
Secondary	98	37.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 10 NQT responses by independent/non-independent schools**

	Total n	%
Non-independent	249	92.9
Independent	19	7.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 11 NQT responses by region**

	Total n	%
North	79	29.5
Midlands	80	29.9
South	67	25.0
London	42	15.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 12 NQT responses by free school meals in the school**

	Total n	%
Least deprived	55	22.9
Lower middle	52	21.7
Upper middle	65	27.1
Most deprived	68.0	28.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>240.0</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 13 NQT responses by school ethnicity**

	Total n	%
0-24	23	9.0
25-49	16	6.3
50-74	39	15.3
75-100	177	69.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>100</b>

The route taken by NQTs into the profession was also a key variable. The categories used were:

- full time PGCE i.e. a one year full time course taken by graduates (who already have a degree in a subject specialism), including teaching practices, with Qualified Teacher Status (QTS)
- part time PGCE i.e. similar to the full time PGCE but usually taken over a 2 year period
- undergraduate teaching course i.e. these courses include both subject specialisms, educational issues and teaching practices, with QTS
- employment-based routes i.e. Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP), Registered Teacher Programme (RTP) and Overseas Teacher Trained Programme (OTTP)
- supply work i.e. temporary work as a teacher obtained via an agency to provide cover for teachers in school (e.g. necessitated by illness or by cover for CPD type activities). Supply work is most likely to be undertaken by NQTs after their ITT whilst they are seeking more permanent posts.

Within the following sections, information is provided on those variables that indicate differences. Where there are no or few differences between categories detailed information is not given.

**Table 14 NQT responses by route into becoming an NQT**

	Total n	%
Full time PGCE	156	57.4
Part time PGCE	13	4.8
Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc	59	21.7
Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP	34	12.5
Other	10	3.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>100.0</b>

## 5.2 ITT routes into the profession

### 5.2.1 Routes taken by NQTs.

SLT responses indicate that the full time PGCE is the most common source of NQT applicants for posts in schools overall (Table 15).

**Table 15 Routes taken by NQT applicants for vacancies: SLT member responses**

	Full time PGCE	Part time PGCE	Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc	Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP	Supply work
	%	%	%	%	%
All	7.0	0.9	2.4	3.5	0.6
Most	42.7	1.8	18.9	4.3	1.7
Some	43.2	22.7	53.4	36.4	23.8
A few	5.1	23.3	15.7	33.8	34.5
None	2.0	51.4	9.6	22.1	39.5
<b>Total n</b>	<b>653</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>362</b>

Table 16 (this re-presents data in Table 14 above that reported on response rates) suggests that the sample of NQTs responding to the survey, although much smaller than the sample of SLT members responding, mirrors SLT perceptions about routes into NQT jobs. The highest proportion of NQTs surveyed was from full time PGCEs, followed by undergraduate teaching courses, then by employment-based routes, then part time PGCEs and finally by supply work.

**Table 16 Routes taken by NQTs: NQT responses**

Full time PGCE %	Part time PGCE %	Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc %	Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP %	Supply work %	Total n
57.4	4.8	21.7	12.5	3.7	<b>272</b>

SLT responses indicate clear differences between secondary and primary schools, with Table 17 indicating that, as might be expected, the undergraduate teaching course is a much more common route for NQTs applying to primary schools than to secondary schools. Overall, the part time PGCE seems to be the least likely route for NQT applicants, Table 16 indicating that it is more common for NQTs applying to primary schools than for those applying to secondary schools. The differences between primary and secondary seem smaller for the employment-based routes, with both types of school replying mainly

that some applicants are from those routes. However, a much larger proportion of primary than secondary schools have never had NQT applicants from employment-based routes. Whilst applicants from supply work are, along with those from part time PGCEs, least common overall, they seem more common in primary than secondary schools.

Although the number of respondents from independent schools is small and caution should be exercised in placing too much credence on this information, Table 18 suggests that there is a greater focus in independent schools on full time PGCEs.

**Table 17 Routes taken by NQT applicants for vacancies by type of school: SLT member responses**

	Full time PGCE		Part time PGCE		Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc		Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP		Supply work	
	Pri %	Sec %	Pri %	Sec %	Pri %	Sec %	Pri %	Sec %	Pri %	Sec %
All	5.8	8.6	1.3	0.0	3.1	0.0	3.4	1.9	0.4	0.0
Most	31.3	71.4	2.6	0.0	24.0	1.9	3.4	5.8	2.4	0.0
Some	53.8	18.9	28.3	9.3	59.4	30.5	31.9	44.9	26.8	15.0
A few	6.9	0.5	18.7	35.1	9.9	37.1	30.2	41.7	32.1	41.1
None	2.2	0.5	49.1	55.7	3.6	30.5	31.2	5.8	38.2	43.9
<b>Total n</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>107</b>

**Table 18 Routes taken by NQT applicants for vacancies, by independent and non-independent schools: SLT responses**

		All/Most	Some/A few	None	Total
		%	%	%	n
Non-independent	Full time PGCE	49.0	49.1	1.9	<b>621</b>
	Part time PGCE	2.8	45.4	51.7	<b>317</b>
	Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc	21.4	68.7	9.9	<b>476</b>
	Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP	7.5	70.1	22.4	<b>438</b>
	Supply work	2.3	58.9	38.8	<b>348</b>
Independent	Full time PGCE	66.7	30.0	3.3	<b>30</b>
	Part time PGCE	0.0	57.1	42.9	<b>14</b>
	Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc	15.0	80.0	5.0	<b>20</b>
	Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP	9.1	72.7	18.2	<b>22</b>
	Supply work	0.0	38.5	61.5	<b>13</b>

In Table 19 although the differences are not great, there are indications that schools in the most deprived areas have fewer NQTs from full time PGCEs, more who have taken undergraduate teaching courses, more from employment-based routes and more who have done supply work (and in 5.2.3 below there are indications those having done supply work may not be well regarded by SLTs, so that this may be an indicator of difficulty in recruitment). As Table 20 indicates, care must be exercised in looking at patterns by school ethnicity as the number of responses from schools in any category other than over 75% white are small. However, there seems to be a greater proportion of NQTs in the 'most/all' category in schools with the smallest % of white pupils from full time PGCEs and undergraduate teaching courses, a greater proportion from employment-based routes in schools with 25 – 49% white pupils and a greater proportion of those who have done supply work in schools with the smallest % of white pupils.

**Table 19 Routes taken by NQT applicants for vacancies, by eligibility for free school meals: SLT responses**

	Pupils eligible for free schools meals				
		Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived
		%	%	%	%
Full time PGCE	All/Most	39.5	53.0	53.6	48.4
	Some/A few	59.2	44.3	43.0	51.6
	None	1.4	2.7	3.3	0.0
Part time PGCE	All/Most	1.7	1.2	3.4	4.1
	Some/A few	40.0	44.0	52.8	41.9
	None	58.3	54.8	43.8	54.1
Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc	All/Most	19.4	20.0	21.4	24.1
	Some/A few	75.9	66.7	67.0	65.5
	None	4.6	13.3	11.6	10.3
Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP	All/Most	7.9	6.4	9.1	6.7
	Some/A few	75.2	70.9	66.4	69.2
	None	16.8	22.7	24.5	24.0
Supply work	All/Most	2.7	4.4	2.1	0.0
	Some/A few	71.6	58.9	54.3	53.8
	None	25.7	36.7	43.6	46.3

**Table 20 Routes taken by NQT applicants for vacancies, by ethnicity of school: SLT responses**

	White pupils	Some/A			Total n
	%	All/Most %	few %	None %	
Full time PGCE	0-24	60.7	39.3	0.0	56
	25-49	44.8	55.2	0.0	29
	50-74	45.0	51.3	3.8	80
	75-100	49.7	48.2	2.1	477
Part time PGCE	0-24	4.2	37.5	58.3	24
	25-49	0.0	46.2	53.8	13
	50-74	0.0	53.8	46.2	39
	75-100	3.2	45.4	51.4	249
Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc	0-24	32.3	61.3	6.5	31
	25-49	8.3	75.0	16.7	24
	50-74	20.0	70.8	9.2	65
	75-100	21.7	68.6	9.8	369
Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP	0-24	7.7	76.9	15.4	39
	25-49	18.2	72.7	9.1	22
	50-74	4.9	78.7	16.4	61
	75-100	7.8	67.7	24.6	334
Supply work	0-24	3.3	73.3	23.3	30
	25-49	6.3	50.0	43.8	16
	50-74	2.4	50.0	47.6	42
	75-100	1.9	58.0	40.1	269

Table 21 suggests some regional differences in the routes taken by NQTs into the teaching profession and this may relate to the ITT providers in those regions. The full time

PGCE route seems to be less common in the Midlands, as does the part time PGCE (also less common in London) and does supply work. There are higher rates of 'none' for the employment-based routes in the South and North than in the other two regions.

**Table 21 Routes taken by NQT applicants for vacancies, by region: SLT responses**

		Region			
		North	Midlands	South	London
Full time PGCE	All/Most	52.7	40.3	56.0	52.4
	Some/A few	46.8	55.0	42.6	46.4
	None	0.4	4.7	1.4	1.2
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>84</b>
Part time PGCE	All/Most	4.1	1.1	4.0	0.0
	Some/A few	56.1	31.1	48.0	44.2
	None	39.8	67.8	48.0	55.8
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>43</b>
Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc	All/Most	24.6	22.1	18.9	12.7
	Some/A few	68.3	68.3	67.9	76.2
	None	7.1	9.7	13.2	11.1
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>63</b>
Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP	All/Most	4.3	11.2	7.8	6.7
	Some/A few	70.3	70.8	66.0	75.0
	None	25.4	18.0	26.2	18.3
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>60</b>
Supply work	All/Most	0.8	3.9	1.1	4.2
	Some/A few	68.8	41.2	62.1	60.4
	None	30.4	54.9	36.8	35.4
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>48</b>

### 5.2.2 NQTs' history immediately prior to taking their current NQT post

For 91.5% of NQT respondents, their current post is their first teaching job after completing ITT (Table 22). This differs to some extent according to the ITT route taken (Table 23), with the greatest proportion for whom it is the first post coming from employment based routes (note that SLT written comments suggest that often those taking employment based routes remain in the school where they trained) and the greatest proportion for whom it is not the first post being from part time PGCEs.

**Table 22 NQTs for whom this is the first teaching post after completing ITT: NQT responses**

	First teaching post after ITT	
	Total n	%
Yes	247	91.5
No	23	8.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 23 NQTs for whom their current post is the first teaching post after completing ITT, by route taken: NQT responses**

	FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp based
	%	%	%	%
Yes	93.5	69.2	93.1	97.1
No	6.5	30.8	6.9	2.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>34</b>

For the 23 NQTs who had previous teaching jobs, most jobs had been temporary (Table 24) and only 4 (Table 25) had been for over a year. The main reason for leaving (Table 26) was the end of a contract.

**Table 24 Permanent/temporary nature of NQTs' previous teaching jobs: NQT responses**

	Total n	%
Temporary	15	65.2
Permanent	8	34.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 25 Length of stay by NQTs in previous teaching jobs; NQT responses**

	Total n	%
Less than 1 month	1	4.3
1 month	1	4.3
2-6 months	10	43.5
7-12 months	7	30.4
over 12 months	4	17.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 26 Reasons why NQTs left previous teaching jobs: NQT responses**

	No %	Yes %	Total n
End of contract	52.2	47.8	23
For promotion	91.3	8.7	23
Change of subject or specialism	100.0	0.0	23
Heavy workload	95.7	4.3	23
Type of class taught	95.7	4.3	23
Mismatch between skills and demands of the job	95.7	4.3	23
Issues to do with pupil behaviour	95.7	4.3	23
Other	60.9	39.1	23

### 5.2.3 Routes preferred by SLT respondents

Table 27 indicates that the full time PGCE is, overall, the route most preferred by SLT members, followed by the undergraduate teaching course. The preferences of primary and secondary SLT members reflect the pattern for the NQT applicants by route, in other words secondary schools prefer the full time PGCE route and primary the undergraduate teaching course. The column in Table 28 indicating proportions who would be deterred by an NQT applicant having taken a certain route adds an emphasis to the preferences. For both primary and secondary schools, the employment-based route is preferred over the part time PGCE and the proportions indicating preference for it are higher than those who actually take NQTs from this route. The highest proportions of respondents who are deterred by a route is where NQTs have done supply work before applying for posts with



them. On the face of it this seems surprising since this will have provided work experience, but it may suggest to SLT members questions about their quality if they have been unable to obtain NQT posts.

Although the number of respondents from independent schools was small and caution must be exercised in interpreting the findings, the data suggest that SLT members in independent schools are even stronger in their preferences for PGCEs (full time and part time) than for undergraduate teaching courses and that they are less likely to prefer employment-based routes and those who have done supply work than non-independent schools.

**Table 27 NQT applications, routes preferred by SLT members: SLT responses**

	Full time PGCE	Part time PGCE	Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc	Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP	Supply work
	%	%	%	%	%
Strongly preferred	24.2	2.4	27.9	13.3	1.8
Preferred	44.9	14.5	32.1	29.6	9.6
No preference	29.3	72.6	36.8	47.2	66.8
Deterred	1.5	9.0	2.7	6.9	16.6
Strongly deterred	0.2	1.4	0.5	3.0	5.3
<b>Total n</b>	<b>608</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>397</b>

**Table 28 NQT applicants' routes preferred by SLT members, by type of school: SLT responses**

	Full time PGCE		Part time PGCE		Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc		Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP		Supply work	
	Pri %	Sec %	Pri %	Sec %	Pri %	Sec %	Pri %	Sec %	Pri %	Sec %
Strongly preferred	17.9	37.6	2.4	2.4	34.6	6.3	11.8	16.7	2.2	0.0
Preferred	47.3	42.5	16.1	12.2	35.8	23.4	23.2	43.2	11.5	6.0
No preference	32.4	19.9	68.5	79.7	28.9	60.2	52.6	35.2	66.3	66.7
Deterred	2.2	0.0	11.2	4.9	0.5	8.6	8.7	3.1	15.2	20.5
Strongly deterred	0.2	0.0	1.7	0.8	0.2	1.6	3.7	1.9	4.8	6.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>419</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>117</b>

**Table 29 NQT applications, routes preferred by SLT members, by independent and non-independent schools: SLT responses**

		Strongly preferred/ preferred	No preference	Strongly deterred/ deterred	Total
		%	%	%	n
Non-independent	Full time PGCE	68.7	29.6	1.7	<b>621</b>
	Part time PGCE	16.6	72.4	11.1	<b>317</b>
	Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc	61.5	35.8	2.8	<b>476</b>
	Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP	43.9	46.2	10	<b>438</b>
	Supply work	11.9	66.4	21.7	<b>348</b>
Independent	Full time PGCE	83.3	16.7	0	<b>30</b>
	Part time PGCE	26.3	73.7	0	<b>14</b>
	Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc	34.8	52.2	13	<b>20</b>
	Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP	28.6	61.9	9.5	<b>22</b>
	Supply work	0	68.8	31.3	<b>13</b>

Table 1 in Appendix 1 indicates that there are no great differences in the preferences of SLT members for the different routes into the profession between schools in relation to indications of deprivation, although Table 29 above indicates that schools do receive different proportions of applicants from the different routes according to this variable. Table 2 in Appendix 1 indicates that there are few differences between the four regions of England, although SLT respondents in London had stronger preferences for all the categories than the other three regions, with the exception of 'supply work' where they were more likely to be deterred than were respondents in the other regions.

#### **Comments by SLT members: preferences for NQT routes**

The questionnaire included a comments box asking SLTs for reasons for their preferences for the routes NQT applicants have taken. The comments indicated a clear preference for full-time PGCE and undergraduate teaching course routes, as these were seen as 'proper qualifications' and SLT members were familiar with them, contributing to their greater confidence in them. The balance of theory and practice provided by institution-based training was seen as positive. Respondents emphasise the need for this balance and for NQTs to have had a range of practical experiences in different settings.

Many respondents have no preference for the route taken but are more influenced by the individual NQT and their skills/experience/potential: some feel that much further development is needed by NQTs, once in post, regardless of route ('there is still much to be learned once teaching begins'). The quality of the NQT's existing experience (particularly that gained from placement) is important, as is the NQT matching the school ethos and needs and fitting in well with the team. Schools with specialist requirements feel that no route fully meets their needs (e.g. SEN, high BME populations, etc).

Some respondents prefer NQT applicants who have had teaching placements in their school: schools that work closely with training providers tend to prefer NQTs from them and some providers are seen as providing better quality training.

Some concerns were expressed about the quality of overseas trained teachers and their commitment to the job in the long term.

Comments on particular routes are as follows.

### ***Full time PGCE***

Comments indicate why this seems preferred as a route, particularly by secondary schools. SLT respondents seem knowledgeable about PGCE courses and are confident that they work to QTS standards. Some feel the intensity of the PGCE year is good preparation for the NQT year. Some consider that PGCE routes lead to NQTs being better qualified in their subject specialism, in which they already hold a degree, and that their knowledge here is more up-to-date, particularly important in secondary schools. There is a feeling that PGCE candidates are more mature in outlook and more ready for the workplace, and some assume that they will bring industry and life skills that younger people cannot.

More critical comments include that the course too short and that one year is insufficient time to learn teaching skills. Some consider that NQTs are able to deliver lessons but lack understanding of pedagogy and child development. There is also a view that those from a PGCE route may be less committed to teaching, having opted for it after a first degree. It is possible that such comments come from primary SLT members.

### ***Part-time PGCE***

This route was not really commented on by many respondents, but there were indications of a suspicion that NQTs from this route are not fully committed to teaching.

### ***Undergraduate teaching course***

Many respondents refer to BEd courses rather than to the BA/BSc (the BEd is more common but BA courses are very similar); again SLT respondents are knowledgeable about such courses and confident that they operate to QTS standards. This route is seen as providing more in-depth study of education/ current theory/pedagogy/child development/current practices, all seen as highly important. The courses provide more time to develop skills of self-reflection and encourage adaptability in order to support learning. More time is spent in school/on placement. There is a view that choosing a 3/4 year degree indicates greater commitment to teaching than does the PGCE, which might have been chosen as an 'afterthought'. Primary education needs to cover a broad range of subject areas in addition to all other aspects of the teaching job (planning, differentiation, behaviour management, etc), so that some feel that more than one year training is essential.

### ***GTP/RTP***

Those preferring this option generally like to train teachers in-house rather than take on those trained elsewhere, suggesting that NQTs from these routes may have been trained within the same school and many comments imply this: classroom experience is gained 'on the job'; experience is specific to the specific school environment and NQTs are better prepared for the demands of day-to-day teaching. NQTs without prior experience in schools were perceived as potentially weak.

Many NQTs from this route have past experience as teaching assistants, seen as positive (indicating commitment to the job/school, experience in school). However, some see the 'leap' from classroom assistant to teacher as too great.

However, this route is also seen to result in NQTs lacking breadth of experience of different schools through placements and as variable in the quality of the training provided ('only as good as the teacher they trained with'). Where schools are involved in GTP they can be 'confident of quality', but this is an expensive option for a school because of the input required to provide the training.

### Supply

Where there were positive comments, they suggested that the NQTs appointed had previously been on supply in the school, for example SLT members had been able to see them teach, knew them and they had a chance to prove themselves. Some consider that having experience in many schools helps one's development as a teacher.

However, some feel that those going into supply are not of the same quality as those who initially get full time contracts and there is a suggestion that those who come from supply work may be less committed and may struggle to take on the level of commitment needed in a full time position (see the negative ratings in Table 27 above).

### 5.3 NQT preparedness for role and their qualities

SLT members rated most highly NQTs' commitment to children and least highly their ability to deal with parents. Table 30 suggests that, with the exception of pupil assessment/ assessment for learning SLT members see NQTs as better prepared for directly working with children than for other contributions to the school, for example working with non teaching colleagues or parents or doing administrative work. For all items in Table 30 most responses fall in the adequate and above categories, however.

**Table 30 Evaluation by SLT members of the quality of NQTs: SLT responses**

	Very good	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very poor	Total	Mean *
	%	%	%	%	%	n	
Commitment to children	36.0	54.7	9.1	0.3	0.0	<b>673</b>	<b>1.7</b>
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	20.3	64.0	15.1	0.6	0.0	<b>681</b>	<b>2.0</b>
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	16.2	63.6	19.3	0.9	0.0	<b>678</b>	<b>2.0</b>
Lesson planning	20.5	53.8	24.4	1.3	0.0	<b>679</b>	<b>2.1</b>
Awareness of what the job entails	16.0	60.4	20.7	2.8	0.1	<b>676</b>	<b>2.1</b>
Ability to deal with children	16.0	57.5	25.0	1.6	0.0	<b>677</b>	<b>2.1</b>
Subject/specialism knowledge	16.8	54.4	26.4	2.1	0.3	<b>678</b>	<b>2.1</b>
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	13.3	59.0	26.5	1.2	0.0	<b>675</b>	<b>2.2</b>
Contribution to the whole school	14.5	54.4	28.0	3.1	0.0	<b>678</b>	<b>2.2</b>
Stamina/resilience	10.5	52.4	32.4	4.4	0.3	<b>678</b>	<b>2.3</b>
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	12.7	44.6	35.5	7.2	0.0	<b>679</b>	<b>2.4</b>
Awareness of future professional standards for teachers	8.0	48.5	38.3	5.2	0.0	<b>678</b>	<b>2.4</b>
Commitment to parents	6.3	46.8	43.0	3.8	0.2	<b>665</b>	<b>2.4</b>
Administrative work	5.4	45.8	43.4	5.3	0.2	<b>666</b>	<b>2.5</b>
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	6.4	41.6	42.2	9.5	0.4	<b>676</b>	<b>2.6</b>
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	7.1	36.9	45.7	10.0	0.3	<b>661</b>	<b>2.6</b>
Ability to deal with parents	3.5	33.8	54.2	8.3	0.1	<b>677</b>	<b>2.7</b>

**\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response**

Table 31 indicates NQTs' ratings of their own abilities, against the same aspects used in the SLT survey. Although, as Table 31 indicates, NQTs generally rate themselves more

highly than SLT respondents rate them, there is broad agreement between SLT and NQT respondents about the aspects for which NQTs are well prepared and those for which they are less well prepared. As with the SLT respondents, NQT respondents rate their abilities to deal with children more highly than they rate their abilities to deal with other aspects of the teaching role, such as administrative work and dealing with parents.

**Table 31 NQTs' evaluation of their own qualities: NQT responses**

	Very good	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	Mean*	Total n
Commitment to children	52.1	39.3	8.6	0.0	0.0	1.6	267
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	53.6	35.6	9.7	1.1	0.0	1.6	267
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	50.4	40.7	8.6	0.4	0.0	1.6	268
Lesson planning	47.8	39.6	10.8	1.5	0.4	1.7	268
Awareness of what the job entails	42.2	43.3	12.2	2.2	0.0	1.7	270
Ability to deal with children	38.9	46.7	12.6	1.9	0.0	1.8	270
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	39.0	43.9	13.4	3.7	0.0	1.8	269
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	34.0	42.9	20.9	1.5	0.7	1.9	268
Subject/specialism knowledge	34.4	43.1	18.3	2.7	1.5	1.9	262
Contribution to the whole school	25.3	49.8	22.7	1.9	0.4	2.0	269
Awareness of future professional development needs	26.9	45.9	23.1	3.7	0.4	2.0	268
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	25.6	47.8	21.5	4.4	0.7	2.1	270
Stamina/resilience	29.6	37.8	26.6	6.0	0.0	2.1	267
Administrative work	18.4	41.6	30.7	8.6	0.7	2.3	267
Commitment to parents	14.6	42.7	31.8	9.4	1.5	2.4	267
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	17.2	35.2	32.6	13.1	1.9	2.5	267
Ability to deal with parents	11.9	37.8	35.6	12.6	2.2	2.6	270

**\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response**

Table 32 considers quality against the routes from which all or most candidates come. SLT respondents rate NQTs from employment-based routes most highly for most of the aspects, indeed the only aspect for which they do not receive ratings higher than or equal to the other two main routes is 'team working skills with teaching colleagues' (rated most highly for full time PGCE). There seems a discrepancy here with SLT preferences for routes (the full time PGCE is preferred overall, see Table 27 above) There is considerable agreement between the ratings of SLT and NQT respondents. NQT respondents from employment-based routes also rate themselves more highly than the other routes for many aspects (Table 33), with higher or equal ratings for all apart from 'team working skills with teaching colleagues' (this time rated most highly for undergraduate teaching courses), 'subject specialist knowledge' (rated most highly for full time PGCEs, but note that SLT respondents rated full time PGCE and employment-based routes equally here), 'lesson planning' (full time PGCE best here), 'awareness of future professional development needs' (undergraduate courses best here), and 'pupil assessment/assessment for learning' (undergraduate courses best here).

**Table 32 Quality of NQT applicants by the routes from which ALL/MOST applicants come: SLT responses**

	<b>FT PGCE</b>	<b>UG Teaching</b>	<b>Emp- based</b>	<b>FT PGCE</b>	<b>UG Teaching</b>	<b>Emp- based</b>
	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>
Awareness of what the job entails	2.1	2.3	1.8	316	103	32
Ability to deal with children	2.1	2.1	2.0	317	103	32
Commitment to children	1.7	1.7	1.6	315	103	32
Ability to deal with parents	2.7	2.8	2.5	318	103	32
Commitment to parents	2.4	2.4	2.3	312	102	31
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.9	2.1	2.0	318	103	32
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.4	2.4	2.4	316	103	32
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.6	2.5	2.5	307	99	32
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.0	2.3	2.0	315	103	32
Contribution to the whole school	2.2	2.2	2.1	315	103	32
Stamina/resilience	2.3	2.4	2.2	316	102	32
Lesson planning	2.0	2.1	1.9	317	102	32
Administrative work	2.5	2.6	2.4	312	99	32
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	2.1	2.2	2.0	314	103	32
Awareness of future professional standards for teachers	2.4	2.5	2.2	317	103	31
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	2.0	2.2	2.0	316	103	31
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.5	2.7	2.3	315	103	32

***\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response***

**Table 33 NQTs' evaluation of their own qualities by route taken: NQT responses**

	FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp- based	FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp- based
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Awareness of what the job entails	1.8	2.3	1.6	1.5	156	13	59	32
Ability to deal with children	1.8	2.3	1.6	1.6	156	13	59	32
Commitment to children	1.6	1.9	1.4	1.4	156	12	59	31
Ability to deal with parents	2.7	2.5	2.5	1.9	156	13	59	32
Commitment to parents	2.6	2.2	2.3	1.9	153	13	59	32
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.9	2.3	1.6	1.7	156	13	59	32
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.2	2.4	1.8	1.8	156	13	59	32
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.6	2.8	2.2	2.2	154	13	59	32
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.0	2.5	1.5	2.5	151	10	59	32
Contribution to the whole school	2.1	2.3	1.9	1.6	156	12	59	32
Stamina/resilience	2.0	2.8	2.2	1.9	155	13	59	32
Lesson planning	1.7	2.1	1.5	1.8	155	13	59	32
Administrative work	2.4	2.8	2.2	2.2	155	13	59	32
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	1.6	2.2	1.4	1.4	154	13	59	32
Awareness of future professional development needs	2.1	2.6	1.8	2.0	155	13	59	32
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	1.6	1.8	1.5	1.5	155	13	59	32
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.0	2.5	1.7	2.0	155	13	59	32

**\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response**

Although the differences between types of school are not great, Table 34 indicates that apart from being able to work with support staff and non-school colleagues, where NQTs in primary schools are rated more highly, ratings by SLT respondents for the two types of school are either the same or NQTs in secondary schools are rated more highly (e.g. for subject specialist knowledge, contribution to the whole schools, stamina/resilience, lesson planning).

As already indicated, there were few respondents from independent schools, however Table 36 shows that the SLT respondents from independent schools rated the quality of NQTs more highly than did respondents from non-independent schools against every item but one ('commitment to children'), where it was rated equally. Table 37 indicates considerable agreement by NQT respondents with the SLT ratings, but just as with the breakdowns by route, NQTs' views varied more than did those of SLT. NQTs in independent schools rated themselves more highly (or equally) than did those in the non-independent sector against all items apart from 'commitment to parents' and 'stamina/resilience'. This may imply that the environment in non-independent schools is more demanding and that there may be differences in the requirements of working with parents.

**Table 34 Evaluation of the quality of NQTs by SLT members, by type of school: SLT responses**

	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
Awareness of what the job entails	2.2	2.0	471	189
Ability to deal with children	2.1	2.2	471	189
Commitment to children	1.8	1.7	472	184
Ability to deal with parents	2.7	2.7	471	189
Commitment to parents	2.5	2.4	464	184
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	2.0	1.9	475	189
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.3	2.5	474	188
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.6	2.7	463	182
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.3	1.8	473	188
Contribution to the whole school	2.2	2.1	474	187
Stamina/resilience	2.4	2.2	473	189
Lesson planning	2.1	1.9	473	189
Administrative work	2.5	2.4	461	188
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	2.2	2.1	471	187
Awareness of future professional standards for teachers	2.4	2.4	474	187
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	2.1	2.0	474	188
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.6	2.4	471	188

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 35 NQTs' evaluation of their own qualities by route taken: NQT responses**

	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
	Mean*	Mean*	Total N	Total N
Awareness of what the job entails	1.8	1.7	161	97
Ability to deal with children	1.8	1.8	161	97
Commitment to children	1.5	1.6	161	94
Ability to deal with parents	2.6	2.5	161	97
Commitment to parents	2.4	2.3	159	96
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.9	1.8	161	96
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.0	2.2	161	97
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.5	2.5	159	96
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.0	1.8	153	97
Contribution to the whole school	2.1	1.9	160	97
Stamina/resilience	2.1	2.1	160	95
Lesson planning	1.7	1.6	161	95
Administrative work	2.3	2.3	160	95
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	1.6	1.6	160	95
Awareness of future professional development needs	2.1	2.0	161	95
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	1.7	1.5	161	95
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.0	1.8	161	95

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*



**Table 36 Evaluation of the quality of NQTs by SLT members, by independent and non-independent schools: SLT responses**

	Non-Ind	Ind	Non-Ind	Ind
	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n
Awareness of what the job entails	2.1	1.8	641	32
Ability to deal with children	2.1	1.8	641	33
Commitment to children	1.7	1.7	637	33
Ability to deal with parents	2.7	2.4	641	33
Commitment to parents	2.5	2.2	630	33
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	2.0	1.7	645	33
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.4	1.9	643	33
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.6	2.1	627	31
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.2	1.7	642	33
Contribution to the whole school	2.2	1.8	643	32
Stamina/resilience	2.3	2.3	643	32
Lesson planning	2.1	1.8	643	33
Administrative work	2.5	2.2	630	33
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	2.2	2.0	639	33
Awareness of future professional standards for teachers	2.4	2.1	642	33
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	2.1	1.8	643	32
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.6	2.2	640	33

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 37 NQTs' evaluation of their own qualities, by independent and non-independent schools: NQT responses**

	Non-independent		Independent	
	Mean*	Total n	Mean*	Total n
Awareness of what the job entails	1.8	247	1.6	19
Ability to deal with children	1.8	247	1.5	19
Commitment to children	1.6	244	1.4	19
Ability to deal with parents	2.6	247	2.3	19
Commitment to parents	2.4	244	2.5	19
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.8	246	1.6	19
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.1	247	1.9	19
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.5	245	2.4	18
Subject/specialism knowledge	1.9	239	1.9	19
Contribution to the whole school	2.0	246	1.9	19
Stamina/resilience	2.1	244	2.2	19
Lesson planning	1.7	245	1.5	19
Administrative work	2.3	244	2.3	19
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	1.6	244	1.4	19
Awareness of future professional development needs	2.1	245	2.0	19
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	1.6	245	1.4	19
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	1.9	245	1.7	19

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

In Appendix 1 Table 3 indicates no great differences in SLT respondents' ratings of the quality of NQTs against the indicator ('free school meals') of deprivation for the school. However, Table 38 below, indicates that NQTs who work in schools that are in the upper middle quartile for deprivation rate themselves differently from those in the other bands. Schools in the upper middle quartile may have the most equal mix of children from deprived and less deprived homes. They rate themselves more lowly (or in some cases equally) on all aspects and do not rate themselves more highly for any aspects. Table 39 shows a few small differences in relation to the ethnicity of the school population, particularly for schools falling into the band of 25-49% white pupils and it might be hypothesised that this relates to those schools having a more equal mix of ethnicities than the do the other schools: the items for which quality is judged to be lower by SLT respondents all relate to relationships with adults, 'commitment to parents', 'ability to deal with parents' and 'team working skills with non school colleagues'; the items where they are rated more highly are 'awareness of what the job entails', 'awareness of future professional standards'. This pattern is even more pronounced for NQT respondents' own scores (Table 38). NQTs working in the 25-49% white pupils band rate themselves lower (sometimes equal) against all items apart from 'team working with teaching colleagues', 'stamina/resilience' and 'lesson planning'. Table 4 in Appendix 1 indicates no great differences between the four geographical regions in the ratings of NQT qualities.

**Table 38 NQTs' evaluation of their own qualities, by eligibility for free school meals: NQT responses**

	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Awareness of what the job entails	1.6	1.9	1.7	1.6	67	65	52	54
Ability to deal with children	1.8	2	1.7	1.7	67	65	52	54
Commitment to children	1.5	1.8	1.5	1.5	66	65	51	53
Ability to deal with parents	2.4	2.8	2.6	2.4	67	65	52	54
Commitment to parents	2.2	2.6	2.5	2.3	67	64	52	54
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	66	65	52	54
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2	2	2.2	2.1	67	65	52	54
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.4	66	64	52	54
Subject/specialism knowledge	1.8	2.1	1.9	1.8	64	64	52	52
Contribution to the whole school	2	2.1	2	2	67	64	52	54
Stamina/resilience	2	2.4	1.9	2.1	66	64	51	54
Lesson planning	1.6	1.9	1.5	1.6	66	65	51	54
Administrative work	2.3	2.5	2.1	2.3	66	64	51	54
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	1.5	1.8	1.4	1.5	66	65	51	54
Awareness of future professional development needs	1.9	2.2	2	2	66	65	51	54
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.5	66	65	51	54
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	1.9	2.1	1.9	1.8	66	65	51	54

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 39 Evaluation by SLT members of the quality of NQTs, by school ethnicity:  
SLT responses**

<b>% of white pupils</b>	<b>0-24%</b>	<b>25-49%</b>	<b>50-74%</b>	<b>75-100%</b>	<b>0-24%</b>	<b>25-49%</b>	<b>50-74%</b>	<b>75-100%</b>
	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>
Awareness of what the job entails	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.1	57	32	80	497
Ability to deal with children	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.1	57	31	80	498
Commitment to children	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.7	57	31	81	493
Ability to deal with parents	2.7	3.0	2.6	2.7	57	31	81	497
Commitment to parents	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.4	55	31	79	489
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	57	32	82	499
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.6	2.6	2.3	2.4	57	32	81	498
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.6	55	32	82	481
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.1	56	32	82	497
Contribution to the whole school	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.2	56	32	83	497
Stamina/resilience	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	57	32	81	497
Lesson planning	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.1	56	32	82	498
Administrative work	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.5	56	30	80	489
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.1	57	32	81	494
Awareness of future professional standards for teachers	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.4	57	31	82	497
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.0	57	32	82	496
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.5	57	31	81	496
Other (please specify)	2.0	2.3	2.9	2.8	1	3	10	29

***\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response***

**Table 40 NQTs' evaluation of their own qualities by school ethnicity: NQT responses**

<b>% of white pupils</b>	<b>0-24%</b>	<b>25-49%</b>	<b>50-74%</b>	<b>75-100%</b>	<b>0-24%</b>	<b>25-49%</b>	<b>50-74%</b>	<b>75-100%</b>
	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>
Awareness of what the job entails	1.6	1.9	1.7	1.8	23	16	38	176
Ability to deal with children	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.8	23	16	38	176
Commitment to children	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.6	22	16	38	174
Ability to deal with parents	2.5	2.9	2.5	2.5	23	16	38	176
Commitment to parents	2.2	2.8	2.2	2.4	23	16	37	174
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.9	22	16	38	176
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.1	23	16	38	176
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.5	22	16	38	174
Subject/specialism knowledge	1.8	1.8	2.0	2.0	21	16	36	172
Contribution to the whole school	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.1	23	16	37	176
Stamina/resilience	2.0	1.9	2.1	2.1	22	16	38	174
Lesson planning	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.7	22	16	38	175
Administrative work	2.1	2.4	2.2	2.4	22	16	38	174
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6	22	16	38	174
Awareness of future professional development needs	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.1	22	16	38	175
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.6	22	16	38	175
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	1.9	1.9	1.8	2.0	22	16	38	175
Other	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.5	1	2	2	2

**\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response**

Table 41 indicates that, overall, most SLT respondents consider that the quality of NQTs has either stayed the same or improved over the last 5 years (i.e. since September 2002). Table 42 suggests that SLT respondents consider that NQTs from employment-based routes have most improved over that period, Table 43 that SLT members in primary schools are less positive than those in secondary schools and Table 44 that SLT respondents in independent schools are more positive about improvements in the quality of NQTs (although the number of SLT respondents in independent schools is small and again there are more NQTs from the full time PGCE route in independent schools).

**Table 41 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years (since September 2002): SLT responses**

Increased	Slightly increased	Stayed the same	Slightly decreased	Decreased	Total
%	%	%	%	%	n
15.7	35.7	35.6	11.3	1.7	655

**Table 42 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years, by the routes NQT applicants come from: SLT responses\***

	FT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp-Based
	All/Most	All/Most	All/Most
	%	%	%
Increased	17.0	15.2	19.4
Slightly increased	36.3	36.4	38.7
Stayed the same	34.1	34.3	29.0
Slightly decreased	10.9	12.1	9.7
Decreased	1.6	2.0	3.2
<b>Total n</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>31</b>

\*Figures calculated from those who said all or most come from the above routes only. Part-time PGCE and supply work not included as fewer than 10 respondents for all or most.

**Table 43 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years (since September 2002), by type of school: SLT responses**

	Primary	Secondary
	%	%
Increased	15.5	16.2
Slightly increased	33.5	41.1
Stayed the same	37.4	30.8
Slightly decreased	12.0	9.7
Decreased	1.5	2.2
<b>Total n</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>185</b>

**Table 44 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years (since September 2002), by independent and non-independent schools: SLT responses**

	Non-independent	Independent
	%	%
Increased	15.9	13.3
Slightly increased	35.6	36.7
Stayed the same	34.8	50.0
Slightly decreased	11.9	0.0
Decreased	1.8	0.0
<b>Total n</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>30</b>

SLT respondents in the most deprived schools are more likely to consider that the quality of NQTs over the last 5 years has decreased (Table 45). Table 46 indicates that more SLT respondents in the schools with the highest proportions of children from ethnic minorities consider that quality has decreased (it may be that there are overlaps between schools where there are indications of high deprivation and where there are high proportions of children from ethnic minorities). However, SLT respondents from schools

that may have more equal mixes of white and non white pupils are least likely to consider that the quality of NQTs has decreased.

**Table 45 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years (since September 2002), by indicators of deprivation: SLT responses**

	Pupils eligible for free schools meals			
	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived
Increased	19.9	16.7	16.4	11.3
Slightly increased	30.1	41.3	36.8	33.8
Stayed the same	32.9	32.0	32.9	41.7
Slightly decreased	14.4	10.0	11.2	11.9
Decreased	2.7	0.0	2.6	1.3
<b>Total n</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>152</b>

**Table 46 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years (since September 2002), by school ethnicity: SLT responses**

% of white pupils	0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
	%	%	%	%
Increased	17.9	18.8	13.9	16.0
Slightly increased	30.4	34.4	38.0	35.7
Stayed the same	33.9	43.8	36.7	34.7
Slightly decreased	14.3	3.1	10.1	12.0
Decreased	3.6	0.0	1.3	1.7
<b>Total n</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>476</b>

There do seem to be regional variations, with SLT respondents in the North most likely to consider that quality of NQTs has decreased and those in London least likely to think so. SLT respondents in London have the most positive views of improvements in the quality of NQTs. However, across all regions the majority of respondents consider that quality has remained the same or improved.

**Table 47 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years (since September 2002), by region: SLT responses**

	North	Midlands	South	London
	%	%	%	%
Increased	17.1	12.4	16.2	18.8
Slightly increased	29.9	43.3	33.1	38.8
Stayed the same	35.9	32.0	39.4	36.5
Slightly decreased	15.4	10.3	9.2	5.9
Decreased	1.7	2.1	2.1	0.0
<b>Total n</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>85</b>

**Comments by SLT members: perceptions of the quality of NQTs**

Most respondents were generally happy with the standard of the NQTs they have recruited, or were happy with some. There was a general feeling that standards are very varied but many respondents seem to consider themselves as fortunate in the NQTs that they have employed.

NQTs generally appear to have improved with regard to record keeping, standards, targets, assessment, etc. Some respondents consider that their lesson planning has improved others that it has declined.

Several negative comments were made about aspects not been included in the items to be rated in the questionnaire. NQTs seem more standards driven, quite rigid with regard to the National Curriculum, and less able to think creatively and to respond to children's needs, indeed creativity was mentioned frequently as lacking in NQTs. NQTs seem inflexible in their approaches and are unable to differentiate in lessons and effectively teach varying abilities (this is reflected in the ratings provided in relation to deprivation and ethnicity). There is less focus on children's enjoyment and wider learning and more on core subjects: literacy and numeracy.

Some SLT respondents have a sense that NQTs are less committed to the profession, seeing teaching less as a vocation, and are less inclined to engage with the broader school community and extra-curricular activities (this is reflected in the ratings provided). However, some see those NQTs that have been successful at interview as motivated, engaged and eager for progression, bringing fresh enthusiasm to the school. Many respondents indicate that the support required and expected by NQTs can be high. Respondents referred to NQTs' inability to deal with others within the school environment, such as the SLT, colleagues (particularly regarding team working), teaching assistants and parents. Managing behaviour and classrooms are issues. Some NQTs are not prepared for the difficulty of the NQT year, in particular for dealing with stress, workload and paperwork.

NQTs may not always be up to date with current school issues: national policies and measures change frequently and there are some concerns that ITT providers do not provide up to date training here. Particular concerns are about lack of awareness of national strategies other than those dealing with school subjects, e.g. extended day, healthy schools. NQTs may lack knowledge in some areas, and there was specific mention of SEN and addressing diversity. There are some problems with subject knowledge, particularly in the shortage areas of maths and science.

A small number of comments suggest a tendency for male NQTs to be regarded as less able than female NQTs.

## **5.4 The recruitment of NQTs**

### **5.4.1 Recruitment: overview**

SLT members were asked to rate three items that the pre-pilot had suggested presented difficulties in recruiting NQTs. The ratings given (see Table 48) indicated that these are less problematic than the pre-pilot had suggested, with less than 8% of respondents indicating that the staff available to engage in recruitment created a problem for them. A greater proportion (13.2%) indicated that pressure to recruit on a temporary basis was problematic. There do, however, seem to be somewhat different problems for primary and secondary schools, since lack of administrative support for the recruitment process seemed to be a greater issue for primary schools (Table 49), as did having to recruit staff on a temporary basis. Written comments offered by SLT respondents are given below the tables and may be more indicative of the issues faced. Further breakdowns by other variables, for example by region, are not provided as no particular difference were noted (for an example see Appendix 1 Table 5 for the information on independent and non-independent schools).

**Table 48 Problems in recruiting NQTs: SLT responses**

	Yes	Total
	%	n
Number of teaching staff able to engage in recruitment process	7.7	666
Administrative support for the recruitment process	6.4	660
Pressure to recruit temporary rather than permanent posts	13.2	659
Other (please specify)	28.0	50

**Table 49 Problems in recruiting NQTs by type of school: SLT responses**

	Yes		Total	
	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec
	%	%	n	n
Number of teaching staff able to engage in recruitment process	7.7	7.2	469	180
Administrative support for the recruitment process	8.0	2.7	462	182
Pressure to recruit temporary rather than permanent posts	15.6	7.7	462	181

**Comments by SLT members: what helps/hinders in recruitment processes in being able to recruit good quality NQTs**

Budgetary constraints may impact on recruitment, particularly in smaller schools. Respondents here referred to an item specified in Tables 48 and 49 above: inability to offer permanent contracts, with temporary and fixed-term posts deterring the best candidates. Other costs that may deter SLTs from recruiting NQTs are related not to the recruitment process but to costs in supporting NQTs once employed: time out of the classroom and time for mentoring. The following further issues, mentioned by SLT respondents, had not been specified in the questionnaire.

Timing of the recruitment process is a major issue. The earlier in the year that schools can advertise posts, the better the field of NQTs, although there is some concern that recruiting too early in the year means that PGCE students have had little teaching practice or experience on their courses, and it can be harder to make judgements about them. If schools are unable to recruit early enough, the field of applicants is much smaller and of less quality. Late spring and summer are the worst times of year to recruit.

Some schools experience problems in NQTs applying for many jobs and accepting but then, later, rejecting posts.

The volume of applicants can be problematic: the cost of producing and sending out application packs (some schools now use online methods); answering queries and guiding candidates around school; the time required for short-listing and time for interviewing. In some schools, supportive governors help with this (although Table 103 suggests that usually governors are not involved in recruitment or induction).

Comments indicated that a school working closely with ITT providers helps in recruiting good quality NQTs. Schools in partnerships with ITT providers receive many applications from NQTs from those providers, and SLT members are able to talk informally to tutors about applicants.

The nature of the school impacts on recruitment. There are challenges for schools with particular needs, such as those in deprived communities or in special measures and schools under threat of closure. The reverse is the case for schools with good local reputations and good results, and where schools are known to be very supportive of staff and to provide CPD. Faith schools can struggle to attract applicants, especially if staff are required to hold a certain faith: even where there is no such requirement faith schools can



be off-putting for candidates. Candidates may be deterred by the lack of opportunities for progression that small schools can offer. Respondents' comments indicate that some independent schools have fewer means of promoting their vacancies (see Table 65 below indicating the proportions of schools advertising via the local authority) and see advertising as expensive. Other concerns from independent schools include that they are unable to offer high salaries and that NQTs may be unaware that they can complete the NQT year in the independent sector (however, the quantitative information provided by SLT respondents from independent schools suggests that they do attract good quality NQTs).

The geographical location of schools can be an issue. Comments indicate that schools in rural areas may have a shortage of candidates, particularly younger NQTs who may not want a rural lifestyle. Schools close to the London boundary receive fewer applicants as they are unable to offer inner and outer-London allowances. Lack of affordable housing is problematic in some areas (the South-East in particular), as is the cost of living. Some respondents feel the general reputation of their area deters NQTs (e.g. new towns).

There can sometimes be problems in recruiting for subject specialisms, with maths, science, modern foreign languages and English mentioned.

Respondents experience problems with the references for NQTs they receive from ITT providers. They feel that these do not give adequate descriptions of individuals, focussing instead on the course programme followed. Such references also frequently take a long time to come through, delaying the process. Some prefer to have references from placement schools and see them as carrying more weight than ITT provider references.

There were many positive comments regarding local 'pool' systems as these ease the process and the burden of recruitment for schools, although these must be well managed and kept up to date. There were positive mentions of pools in Oldham, Richmond, Blackburn, Luton and the Black Country.

### ***Comments by SLT members: on the length of time taken to recruit NQTs to the most difficult to fill posts***

The majority of respondents stated that there were no problems or that this issue was not applicable to them and in general the length of time taken to recruit for 'difficult to fill' posts seems to be the same as for any post. Where there is a problem, schools may use agencies to fill the post on a supply basis and the supply person may be subsequently recruited, they may look outside the specialist subject area or they may contact ITT providers for recommendations and referrals.

### ***Data from the surveys***

Although the written comments above by SLT and NQT respondents suggest there are large numbers of applications, the data from the NQT survey do not support this. The majority of NQT respondents (77.2%) had applied for fewer than 10 jobs (Table 50). Those from employment-based routes applied for even fewer jobs (93.9% applied for less than 10, Table 51) than the overall figures suggest. Those from undergraduate courses have applied for the most jobs, but even there 69% had applied for less than 10.

**Table 50 Numbers of posts applied for by NQTs: NQT responses**

	Less than 10	11-20	21-30	31-40	Over 41	Total
How many posts did you apply for?	77.2	14.1	4.2	1.9	2.7	<b>263</b>

**Table 51 Number of posts applied for by NQTs by route taken: NQT responses**

	FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp based
	%	%	%	%
Less than 10	76.5	76.9	69.0	93.9
11-20	16.3	15.4	13.8	6.1
21-30	3.3	7.7	6.9	0.0
31-40	2.0	0.0	3.4	0.0
Over 41	2.0	0.0	6.9	0.0
<b>Total n</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>33</b>

Table 52 provides more data that suggest that the scale of the recruitment activity for NQTs was relatively modest, with most going to fewer than 5 interviews. In Appendix 1 Table 8 indicates that the pattern for interviews by route is similar to that of applications by route, i.e. those from the employment-based route had fewest interviews before getting a job and those from undergraduate teaching courses the most. Note that the indications are from the written comments that many from the employment-based routes stay in the schools in which they trained. In Appendix 1, Table 9 shows that most NQTs received a job offer from less than 10 applications.

**Table 52 Numbers of interviews to which NQTs were invited and which they attended: NQT responses**

	None	1-2	3-5	6-10	Over 10	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
How many interviews were you invited to?	1.5	58.9	31.7	6.8	1.1	<b>265</b>
How many interviews did you attend?	1.9	70.7	24.1	3.0	0.4	<b>266</b>
How many job offers did you receive?	5.3	92.1	2.6	0.0	0.0	<b>266</b>

#### **5.4.2 Recruitment by key stages or by subject specialism**

##### **Primary Schools**

Table 53 indicates that fewer NQTs had been recruited for the Foundation stage than for Key Stages 1 and 2 since September 2005 (as at Spring 2008). Almost half the NQT respondents (Table 54) had not been trained in any subject specialism and small numbers had been trained in each specialism identified, with literacy having the largest (although small) numbers.

**Table 53 Have you employed NQTs in the following stages since September 2005: SLT responses**

	Yes	Total
	%	n
Foundation stage	47.0	<b>370</b>
Key Stage 1	70.1	<b>394</b>
Key Stage 2	73.9	<b>360</b>

**Table 54 Specialism in which NQT respondents teaching foundation or key stage 1&2 were trained: NQT responses**

	%	Total n
No subject specialism	44.3	66
Art	5.4	8
Geography	6.0	9
History	2.7	4
ICT	3.4	5
Literacy	8.1	12
Music	3.4	5
Numeracy	5.4	8
PE	2.0	3
Science Combined/General Science	3.4	5
Other	16.1	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>149</b>

Table 55 indicates that SLT respondents did not experience many difficulties in recruitment for Foundation or Key Stages 1 and 2 (KS1, KS2), with KS2 presenting the least difficulties.

**Table 55 Difficulties in recruiting NQTS in foundation or key stage 1&2 since September 2005: SLT responses**

	Very difficult		2		3		4		Not difficult		Total n
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%			
Foundation stage	4.2	9.1	13.3	21.2	52.1						<b>165</b>
Key Stage 1	1.1	5.6	13.2	25.2	54.9						<b>266</b>
Key Stage 2	3.5	7.8	12.8	15.5	60.5						<b>258</b>

For Foundation posts, fewer written applications per post were received than for KS1 or KS2 posts (Table 56 below), i.e. there were more %s in the categories indicating lower numbers of applications. There were more applications for KS2, and Table 56 above shows that SLT respondents considered there to be the least difficulties in recruiting for this. Table 57 shows that the most usual number of interviews carried out by schools for a post is 3-5 for Foundation and KS1 and KS2.

**Table 56 Number of written applications for suitable vacancies for NQTS: SLT responses**

	Number of written applications					
	0-5	6-10	11-20	21-50	Over 50	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
Foundation stage	36.8	24.9	15.8	12.6	9.9	<b>253</b>
KS1	23.9	27.3	18.7	18.7	11.3	<b>326</b>
KS2	27.0	20.5	21.1	18.6	12.7	<b>322</b>

**Table 57 Number interviewed for vacancies suitable for NQTS: SLT responses**

	None	1-2	3-5	6+	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
Foundation stage- number interviewed	5.3	25.1	63.0	6.6	<b>243</b>
KS1 - number interviewed	1.9	20.9	68.0	9.2	<b>316</b>
KS2 - number interviewed	1.9	19.3	69.9	8.9	<b>316</b>

## Secondary schools

Table 58 gives an indication of the subjects most likely to be taught by NQTs who were trained in that subject (art and design, design and technology, English, ICT, maths, general science), those where they are likely to be taught by an NQT trained in another subject (citizenship, PSHE) and those where there is a possibility that they might be taught by somebody not trained in the subject (physics, chemistry, biology, RE). Table 59 shows the numbers of NQTs responding by their teaching specialism and the specialism they were trained in. Numbers here in each subject are very small but the table does give a sense of the subjects that might not be taught by those trained in them (note that of the 4 teaching physics, 1 was trained in this subject).

**Table 58 Subjects taught by NQTs in the schools of responding SLTs employing NQTs training in the subject of the post: SLT responses**

Subject	<i>Trained in the subject of the post</i>	
	Yes	Total
	%	n
No subject spec	32.3	31
Art and design	90.4	104
Citizenship	48.8	43
Design and Technology	92.2	102
PSHE	36.4	33
English	97.4	153
Geography	87.6	97
History	87.3	110
ICT	91.6	107
Mathematics	99.3	144
French	96.0	50
German	93.3	15
Spanish	100.0	35
Spanish/French	100.0	19
Music	82.1	78
PE	97.0	133
Religious Education	81.9	83
Science combined/General science	95.5	133
Biology	82.0	61
Chemistry	81.4	59
Physics	75.0	52

**Table 59 Specialism NQT respondents are teaching in secondary schools and those they were trained in: NQT responses**

	<b>Trained in the subject</b>	<b>Teaching the subject</b>
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>
No subject specialism	1	2
Art and design	5	5
Citizenship	1	1.0
Design and technology	7	7
English	15	17
Geography	10	9
History	4	5
ICT	2	2
Mathematics	5	5
Modern foreign language	9	9
Music	2	2
PE	10	10
Religious education	5	4
Science Combined/General Science	10	7
Chemistry	2	1
Biology	2	3
Physics	1	4
Other	13	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>104</b>

Table 60 gives SLT respondents' views of the levels of difficulty in recruiting for the different subject areas in secondary schools. Physics is by far the most difficult subject area, followed by chemistry, ICT and maths. History seems to be the least difficult, followed by art and design.

**Table 60 Level of difficulty in recruiting NQTs, by secondary subject areas: SLT responses**

	<b>Very Difficult</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Not difficult</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>
No subject spec	0.0	0.0	27.3	27.3	45.5	<b>11</b>
Art and design	2.5	7.6	19.0	29.1	41.8	<b>79</b>
Citizenship	4.3	13.0	21.7	21.7	39.1	<b>23</b>
Design and Technology	13.8	20.0	18.8	21.3	26.3	<b>80</b>
PSHE	8.3	16.7	25.0	16.7	33.3	<b>12</b>
English	9.3	17.8	21.7	14.7	36.4	<b>129</b>
Geography	1.3	7.8	22.1	29.9	39.0	<b>77</b>
History	0.0	4.9	16.0	27.2	51.9	<b>81</b>
ICT	30.1	18.1	16.9	18.1	16.9	<b>83</b>
Mathematics	29.5	24.0	20.2	14.7	11.6	<b>129</b>
Music	3.9	9.8	33.3	17.6	35.3	<b>51</b>
PE	0.9	6.6	17.0	26.4	49.1	<b>106</b>
Religious Education	8.5	16.9	25.4	25.4	23.7	<b>59</b>
Science combined/General science	19.3	24.8	20.2	18.3	17.4	<b>109</b>
Biology	12.8	15.4	17.9	30.8	23.1	<b>39</b>
Chemistry	23.8	31.0	11.9	21.4	11.9	<b>42</b>
Physics	45.9	29.7	8.1	13.5	2.7	<b>37</b>
French	7.7	7.7	28.2	35.9	20.5	<b>39</b>
German	15.4	15.4	38.5	15.4	15.4	<b>13</b>
Spanish	9.7	9.7	35.5	19.4	25.8	<b>31</b>
Spanish/French	0.0	17.6	35.3	29.4	17.6	<b>17</b>

SLT responses show that they estimated that they received the fewest applications for physics posts (Table 61). The subjects where there were most likely to be 21-50 applications were geography, history, English and PE. The numbers interviewed are fairly similar for most subjects (Table 62), although for physics fewer tend to be interviewed and this applies also to ICT, and more seem to be interviewed for history and English.

**Table 61 Number of written applications for suitable vacancies for NQTs, by secondary subjects: SLT responses**

	Number of written applications					Total n
	0-5	6-10	11-20	21-50	Over 50	
	%	%	%	%	%	
No subject spec	87.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	16
Art and design	36.4	31.8	23.9	6.8	1.1	88
Citizenship	65.4	26.9	3.8	3.8	0.0	26
Design and Technology	54.7	22.1	20.9	2.3	0.0	86
PSHE	66.7	28.6	4.8	0.0	0.0	21
English	42.8	24.6	23.2	9.4	0.0	138
Geography	41.7	25.0	21.4	10.7	1.2	84
History	38.9	26.7	22.2	10.0	2.2	90
ICT	62.5	26.1	10.2	0.0	1.1	88
Mathematics	61.4	23.5	12.9	2.3	0.0	132
Music	58.7	23.8	15.9	1.6	0.0	63
PE	31.2	33.0	25.7	10.1	0.0	109
Religious Education	60.6	22.7	13.6	3.0	0.0	66
Science combined/General science	54.5	23.6	20.0	1.8	0.0	110
Biology	46.0	26.0	22.0	6.0	0.0	50
Chemistry	53.7	24.1	20.4	1.9	0.0	54
Physics	68.8	22.9	8.3	0.0	0.0	48
French	47.4	42.1	7.9	2.6	0.0	38
German	47.4	36.8	10.5	5.3	0.0	19
Spanish	44.0	40.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	25
Spanish/French	43.8	31.3	18.8	6.3	0.0	16

**Table 62 Number interviewed for vacancies suitable for NQTs, by secondary subjects: SLT responses**

	<b>None</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<b>3-5</b>	<b>6+</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>
No subject spec	26.7	46.7	20.0	6.7	<b>15</b>
Art and design	4.5	31.3	59.7	4.5	<b>67</b>
Citizenship	20.0	45.0	35.0	0.0	<b>20</b>
Design and Technology	4.3	43.5	50.7	1.4	<b>69</b>
PSHE	25.0	40.0	35.0	0.0	<b>20</b>
English	0.8	30.3	59.7	9.2	<b>119</b>
Geography	4.4	29.4	61.8	4.4	<b>68</b>
History	5.3	20.0	72.0	2.7	<b>75</b>
ICT	5.4	43.2	50.0	1.4	<b>74</b>
Mathematics	1.8	41.2	51.8	5.3	<b>114</b>
Music	3.9	45.1	51.0	0.0	<b>51</b>
PE	1.1	16.1	75.3	7.5	<b>93</b>
Religious Education	8.6	39.7	50.0	1.7	<b>58</b>
Science combined/General science	3.2	36.2	57.4	3.2	<b>94</b>
Biology	8.7	30.4	58.7	2.2	<b>46</b>
Chemistry	10.4	37.5	47.9	4.2	<b>48</b>
Physics	19.0	35.7	45.2	0.0	<b>42</b>
French	0.0	45.7	54.3	0.0	<b>35</b>
German	0.0	27.8	72.2	0.0	<b>18</b>
Spanish	0.0	33.3	62.5	4.2	<b>24</b>
Spanish/French	0.0	38.5	61.5	0.0	<b>13</b>

Table 63 also suggests that the volume of applications made is not high no matter what the subject. The numbers of NQT respondents for each subject are quite small, with English (17) and PE (10) having the most. Although the numbers are very small, only those in English, PE and physics were invited to more than 6 interviews. Those in English seemed overall to have been most often invited to interview. In Appendix 1, Table 10 shows the job offers by subject, with most responses for all subjects falling within the 1-2 category. Because of the way the question was worded it is not known how many had 1 job offer and how many had 2.

**Table 63 Numbers of posts applied for by NQTs, by secondary subjects: NQT responses**

Secondary: subject specialism	Number of posts applied for				Total n
	Less than 10	11-20	21-30	31-40	
No subject specialism	1.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	2
Art and design	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	5
Design and technology	6.6	12.5	0.0	0.0	7
English	17.6	12.5	0.0	0.0	17
Geography	8.8	12.5	0.0	0.0	9
History	4.4	12.5	0.0	0.0	5
ICT	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
Mathematics	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	5
Modern foreign language	8.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	8
Music	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
PE	8.8	12.5	100.0	0.0	10
Religious education	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4
Science Combined/General Science	6.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	6
Chemistry	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Biology	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	3
Physics	3.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	4
Other	9.9	25.0	0.0	0.0	11
<b>Total n</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>101</b>

**Table 64 Numbers of interviews invited to, by secondary subject: NQT responses**

Secondary: subject specialism	How many interviews were you invited to?					Total n
	0	1-2	3-5	6-10	Over 10	
No subject specialism	0.0	1.4	4.5	0.0	0.0	2
Art and design	0.0	5.7	4.5	0.0	0.0	5
Design and technology	0.0	7.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	7
English	0.0	14.3	22.7	20.0	50.0	17
Geography	50.0	8.6	4.5	0.0	50.0	9
History	0.0	4.3	9.1	0.0	0.0	5
ICT	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
Mathematics	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	5
Modern foreign language	0.0	10.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	8
Music	0.0	1.4	4.5	0.0	0.0	2
PE	0.0	8.6	4.5	60.0	0.0	10
Religious education	0.0	4.3	4.5	0.0	0.0	4
Science Combined/General Science	0.0	8.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	6
Chemistry	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Biology	0.0	1.4	9.1	0.0	0.0	3
Physics	0.0	1.4	9.1	20.0	0.0	4
Other	50.0	11.4	9.1	0.0	0.0	11
<b>Total n</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>101</b>

### 5.4.3 Recruitment methods

SLT respondents most commonly use local authority web sites and bulletins to advertise posts, followed by the TES and then by the local press. Table 65 indicates that the TES and local authority websites are the sources of advertisements for jobs most used by NQTs. There are, therefore, discrepancies between where advertisements are most



commonly placed and where NQTs most commonly look for them. Table 66 shows the different practices of NQTs from different routes in using sources of advertisements.

**Table 65 How vacancies suitable for NQTs are advertised: SLT responses**

	How often these publications are used					
	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
Local authority web site	66.3	14.5	7.0	3.9	8.3	<b>588</b>
Local authority bulletin	65.4	14.3	10.0	2.7	7.7	<b>601</b>
TES	30.3	16.4	14.4	11.7	27.2	<b>591</b>
Local press	24.3	14.5	28.4	10.4	22.4	<b>567</b>
National web site	14.2	5.5	11.7	14.8	53.8	<b>472</b>
Teaching agencies	2.3	2.5	15.3	18	61.8	<b>471</b>
Education Guardian	0.7	1.3	4.0	14.1	80.0	<b>455</b>

**Table 66 Sources of advertisements for posts used by NQTs**

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
TES	52.9	17.6	16.0	5.3	8.2	<b>244</b>
Local authority website	49.3	19.3	12.1	6.3	13.0	<b>223</b>
Local authority bulletin	28.2	15.4	17.9	9.2	29.2	<b>195</b>
Local press	19.6	17.6	24.5	10.8	27.5	<b>204</b>
National website	18.1	14.4	18.1	12.8	36.7	<b>188</b>
Teaching agencies	4.8	10.8	16.7	14.5	53.2	<b>186</b>
Education Guardian	3.8	6.0	19.1	15.8	55.2	<b>183</b>

**Table 67 Sources of advertisements for posts used by NQTs by route taken: NQT responses**

		FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp based
		%	%	%	%
TES	Always/Often	78.8	41.7	62.0	63.0
	Sometimes/Rarely	15.8	41.7	30.0	18.5
	Never	5.5	16.7	8.0	18.5
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>27</b>
Education Guardian	Always/Often	13.5	12.5	2.6	5.6
	Sometimes/Rarely	41.4	25.0	23.1	22.2
	Never	45.0	62.5	74.4	72.2
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>18</b>
Local press	Always/Often	37.3	40.0	33.3	39.1
	Sometimes/Rarely	37.3	20.0	31.1	47.8
	Never	25.4	40.0	35.6	13.0
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>23</b>
Local authority bulletin	Always/Often	41.4	44.4	27.8	62.2
	Sometimes/Rarely	31.9	22.2	16.7	17.8
	Never	26.7	33.3	55.6	20.0
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>45</b>
Local authority website	Always/Often	75.0	64.0	63.8	85.7
	Sometimes/Rarely	16.7	16.0	22.0	8.2
	Never	8.3	20.0	14.2	6.1
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>49</b>
National website	Always/Often	30.9	25.0	38.1	28.6
	Sometimes/Rarely	31.8	50.0	28.6	28.6
	Never	37.3	25.0	33.3	42.9
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>21</b>
Teaching agencies	Always/Often	14.4	12.5	19.0	11.1
	Sometimes/Rarely	31.5	37.5	35.7	16.7
	Never	54.1	50.0	45.2	72.2
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>18</b>

Table 68 below indicates differences indicated by SLT respondents between primary and secondary schools in their advertising methods, and comments offered in section 5.4.1 above suggest that this might relate to budgetary constraint. Primary schools are much less likely to advertise posts in the national press and are much more likely to use local means of advertising, particularly local authority bulletins or web sites. They are also less likely to use national web sites and this suggests that forces other than budgetary ones are at play here and that primary schools seek local candidates. Table 66 above suggests quite a discrepancy between where advertisements are placed and where NQTs look for them, given that more NQTs from undergraduate courses go into primary schools and they are not heavy users of local authority bulletins or the local press. Table 69 below suggests that advertising practices in independent schools (note the number of independent school respondents is small) do differ, with more use of the TES and Education Guardian.

**Table 68 How vacancies suitable for NQTs are advertised, by type of school: SLT responses**

	Always/Usually %		Sometimes /Rarely %		Never %		Total	
	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec
TES	26.2	89.7	33.3	9.7	40.5	0.5	393	185
Education Guardian	0.9	3.3	16.4	24.0	82.7	72.7	324	121
Local press	40.0	35.4	31.3	55.5	28.7	9.1	390	164
Local authority bulletin	87.8	58.9	6.9	28.5	5.3	12.7	434	158
Local authority web site	89.8	55.8	6.3	24.5	3.9	19.7	431	147
National web site	14.5	34.1	25.2	30.2	60.2	35.7	337	126
Teaching agencies	3.9	7.5	26.4	51.1	69.7	41.4	330	133

**Table 69 How vacancies suitable for NQTs are advertised, by independent and non-independent schools: SLT responses**

		Non-independent	Independent
		%	%
TES	Always/Usually	45.0	82.8
	Sometimes/rarely	26.8	13.8
	Never	28.2	3.4
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>29</b>
Education Guardian	Always/Usually	1.8	5.6
	Sometimes/rarely	17.9	22.2
	Never	80.2	72.2
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>18</b>
Local press	Always/Usually	38.9	34.6
	Sometimes/rarely	38.3	50.0
	Never	22.8	15.4
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>26</b>
Local authority bulletin	Always/Usually	81.7	11.1
	Sometimes/rarely	13.1	0.0
	Never	5.2	88.9
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>18</b>
Local authority web site	Always/Usually	83.1	5.6
	Sometimes/rarely	11.1	5.6
	Never	5.8	88.9
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>18</b>
National web site	Always/Usually	19.3	31.6
	Sometimes/rarely	26.8	21.1
	Never	53.9	47.4
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>19</b>
Teaching agencies	Always/Usually	4.9	5.6
	Sometimes/rarely	33.7	27.8
	Never	61.4	66.7
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>18</b>

Table 70 indicates some regional differences in how vacancies suitable for NQTs are advertised. London schools are the most likely to use the TES and agencies (internal advisers to the project suggest that the survey may not have identified other sources used by London schools). The local press is more used in the North and Midlands, as are local authority bulletins. National web sites are least used in the Midlands.

**Table 70 How vacancies suitable for NQTs are advertised. by region: SLT responses**

		North	Midlands	South	London
		%	%	%	%
TES	Always/Usually	41.6	43.8	49.2	64.0
	Sometimes/Rarely	29.7	28.1	20.3	21.3
	Never	28.7	28.1	30.5	14.7
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>75</b>
Education Guardian	Always/Usually	3.2	1.5	0.9	1.8
	Sometimes/Rarely	16.5	16.7	18.5	25.0
	Never	80.4	81.8	80.6	73.2
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>56</b>
Local press	Always/Usually	43.6	46.9	25.4	27.4
	Sometimes/Rarely	35.3	37.1	48.4	35.5
	Never	21.1	16.0	26.2	37.1
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>62</b>
Local authority bulletin	Always/Usually	86.0	81.9	74.4	63.8
	Sometimes/Rarely	10.0	14.7	10.5	20.3
	Never	4.1	3.4	15.0	15.9
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>69</b>
Local authority web site	Always/Usually	86.1	84.5	80.0	55.9
	Sometimes/Rarely	8.8	9.5	9.6	23.5
	Never	5.1	6.0	10.4	20.6
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>68</b>
National web site	Always/Usually	23.0	12.8	21.5	24.1
	Sometimes/Rarely	26.7	24.8	28.0	27.6
	Never	50.3	62.4	50.5	48.3
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>58</b>
Teaching agencies	Always/Usually	5.0	2.8	1.9	14.8
	Sometimes/Rarely	33.1	28.2	32.7	47.5
	Never	61.9	69.0	65.4	37.7
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>61</b>

#### 5.4.4 NQT views on what is important to them in applying for teaching jobs

Table 71 indicates that the geographical location of teaching vacancies is the most important factor in encouraging them to apply for posts. Reputation of the school, the perception the NQT has of the SLT, the latest Ofsted report and promotion possibilities are next in importance to them. The table suggest that issues related to the characteristics children are much less important to them (for example exam results, ethnicity, and deprivation). As discussed in section 6, NQTs may not wish to appear biased against groups of children.

**Table 71 Factors that attract NQTs to apply for teaching posts and their importance to the NQTs: NQT responses**

<b>Importance for job applications</b>	<b>Very high</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Very low</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Total n</b>
Geographical location	45.7	33.5	14.5	3.3	3	<b>1.8</b>	<b>269</b>
Reputation of school	22.7	42	29.4	5.2	0.7	<b>2.2</b>	<b>269</b>
Your perception of the Headteacher/Senior Leadership Team	21.5	35.9	27.8	10.4	4.4	<b>2.4</b>	<b>270</b>
Latest Ofsted report	8.7	32.1	42.6	12.5	4.2	<b>2.7</b>	<b>265</b>
Potential for promotion	14.6	30.3	34.8	13.1	7.1	<b>2.7</b>	<b>267</b>
School type	11.2	21.9	38.7	13.4	14.9	<b>3</b>	<b>269</b>
Salary offered	8.2	25	39.2	14.2	13.4	<b>3</b>	<b>268</b>
Size of department	3.8	22.3	40.5	20.5	12.9	<b>3.2</b>	<b>264</b>
School exam results	2.2	11.9	41.6	29	15.2	<b>3.4</b>	<b>269</b>
League table position	0.4	9.3	36.6	32.8	20.9	<b>3.6</b>	<b>268</b>
If the school is situated in an area of deprivation	3	7.8	32.8	27.6	28.7	<b>3.7</b>	<b>268</b>
If the school has a highly diverse ethnic mix of pupils	0.7	10.4	30.9	21.9	36.1	<b>3.8</b>	<b>269</b>
If the school has a high number of pupils entitled to free school meals	1.1	3	21.2	25.3	49.4	<b>4.2</b>	<b>269</b>

***\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response***

Although the overall pattern is similar, there are some differences in how the factors are rated by NQTs from different routes (Table 72). Reputation of school is more important to those from a part time PGCE route than other routes and to those from employment-based routes. Potential for promotion and salary are also more important factors to those from employment-based routes. In Appendix 1, Table 13 indicates that there are no great differences in the ratings of factors by NQTs according to the levels of deprivation of the pupils. Although there are small differences by the four geographical regions there does not seem any discernible pattern (Appendix 1, Table 14)

**Table 72 Factors that attract NQTs to apply for teaching posts and their importance to the NQTs by route taken: NQT responses**

	FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp based	FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp based
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Geographical location	1.8	1.5	2.0	1.5	154	13	59	33
Reputation of school	2.1	1.8	2.5	2.3	155	13	59	32
School type	2.9	3.5	3.1	3.1	154	13	59	33
League table position	3.6	3.4	4.0	3.3	154	13	58	33
Your perception of the Headteacher/Senior Leadership Team	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.2	155	13	59	33
School exam results	3.4	3.2	3.8	3.2	154	13	59	33
Size of department	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.1	152	12	58	32
Latest Ofsted report	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.7	151	13	58	33
If the school has a high number of pupils entitled to free school meals	4.1	4.2	4.4	3.8	155	13	59	32
If the school has a highly diverse ethnic mix of pupils	3.7	4.2	3.9	3.7	154	13	59	33
If the school is situated in an area of deprivation	3.6	3.9	4.0	3.5	153	13	59	33
Salary offered	3.0	3.0	3.4	2.6	153	13	59	33
Potential for promotion	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.4	153	13	59	32

NQTs were then asked to rate the items for their importance in accepting job offers. The pattern in Tables 73 and 74 below is similar to that in Tables 71 and 72 above, but apart from geographical location, which has a similar rating, the other items are rated as of more importance in accepting a job offer than in applying for posts. This suggests that NQTs make their decision about geographical location on applying for posts but that they are more likely to keep their options open with regard to the other factors, deferring their decision on them until they receive a job offer.

**Table 73 Factors that are important to NQTs in accepting job offers: NQT responses**

Importance in accepting job offer	Very high	2	3	4	Very low	Mean*	Total n
Geographical location	46.9	34.5	14.0	1.9	2.7	1.8	258
Your perception of the Headteacher/Senior Leadership Team	35.9	38.2	19.3	5.0	1.5	2.0	259
Reputation of school	24.4	42.6	27.9	3.1	1.9	2.2	258
Potential for promotion	16.7	31.5	34.6	10.1	7.0	2.6	257
Latest Ofsted report	9.0	27.5	45.9	11.8	5.9	2.8	255
School type	12.8	25.7	37.7	10.1	13.6	2.9	257
Salary offered	11.6	26.4	38.0	11.2	12.8	2.9	258
Size of department	8.3	26.0	39.0	15.0	11.8	3.0	254
School exam results	3.1	13.2	45.0	22.5	16.3	3.4	258
League table position	1.9	14.7	35.7	26.7	20.9	3.5	258
If the school is situated in an area of deprivation	3.9	10.9	31.9	23.7	29.6	3.6	257
If the school has a highly diverse ethnic mix of pupils	0.8	13.5	29.3	20.5	35.9	3.8	259

**Table 74 Factors that are important to NQTs in accepting job offers by route taken:  
NQT responses**

	FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp based	FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp based
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Geographical location	1.7	1.5	2.1	1.5	150	13	58	30
Reputation of school	2.1	1.7	2.4	2.2	151	13	58	29
School type	2.7	3.5	3.0	3.0	149	13	58	30
League table position	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.2	151	13	57	30
Your perception of the Headteacher/Senior Leadership Team	2.0	1.8	2.1	1.7	152	13	57	30
School exam results	3.2	3.2	3.8	3.1	150	13	58	30
Size of department	2.8	3.4	3.3	2.9	149	12	57	29
Latest Ofsted report	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.8	148	13	57	30
If the school has a high number of pupils entitled to free school meals	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.0	151	12	58	30
If the school has a highly diverse ethnic mix of pupils	3.7	4.0	3.9	3.8	151	13	58	30
If the school is situated in an area of deprivation	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.7	150	13	58	29
Salary offered	2.8	2.8	3.2	2.7	150	13	58	30
Potential for promotion	2.5	2.5	2.9	2.5	149	13	58	30

The first draft of the questionnaire for SLT members included a question about the aspects of the recruitment and selection process used by them. The pilot for the questionnaire indicated that it was too long and this question was removed from the SLT questionnaire, but it was retained in the (shorter) questionnaire for NQTs. NQTs were asked to rate aspects of the recruitment and selection process in relation to their importance in attracting them to apply for and to accept a post. The least important aspect was where the vacancy is advertised. Note that section 5.4.3 and Tables 65 and 66 suggest that NQTs often do not use the sources of advertisements preferred by SLTs and that they therefore may be missing out on vacancies. Table 75 below reinforces the impression that NQT applicants are unaware of the importance of using all sources possible for vacancy information. NQTs rated as most important meeting colleagues, touring the school, information provided with the job offer and the interview. Table 76 suggests, although the differences are not great, that those from part time PGCEs rate the various aspects as being less important than do those from other routes. There seem to be no great differences between the four geographical regions (Appendix 1, Table 15).

**Table 75 The importance of aspects of the recruitment and selection process in attracting NQTs to posts: NQT responses**

Aspects of the recruitment and selection process:	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	Total n	Mean
Meeting colleagues as part of the interview process	36.6	43.8	15.8	2.6	1.1	265	1.9
Tour of the school as part of the interview process	37.7	40.8	17.0	3.4	1.1	265	1.9
Information provided with the job offer	33.7	44.4	19.2	2.3	0.4	261	1.9
The interview	27.8	53.2	16.0	3.0		263	1.9
The written information sent to applicants	24.4	48.5	21.4	5.3	0.4	266	2.1
Teaching exercise as part of the interview process	17.9	39.2	31.6	9.5	1.9	263	2.4
The composition of the interview panel	12.5	45.7	32.8	7.9	1.1	265	2.4
Where the vacancy is advertised	14.3	22.9	39.1	18.0	5.6	266	2.8
If the school has a high number of pupils entitled to free school meals	1.2	4.7	20.5	25.2	48.4	4.2	258

**Table 76 The importance of aspects of the recruitment and selection process in attracting NQTs to posts by route taken: NQT responses**

	FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp based	FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp based
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Where the vacancy is advertised	2.8	3.3	2.8	2.8	153	12	59	33
The written information sent to applicants	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.3	154	12	58	33
The composition of the interview panel	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	153	12	58	33
The interview	1.9	2.1	2.0	2.1	153	12	57	32
Teaching exercise as part of the interview process	2.3	2.5	2.6	2.3	153	12	57	32
Tour of the school as part of the interview process	1.9	1.7	2.0	1.8	154	12	59	32
Meeting colleagues as part of the interview process	1.8	2.0	2.1	1.9	154	12	59	32
Information provided with the job offer	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.8	152	12	57	32

**Comments by NQT respondents: views on what helps or hinders the recruitment and selection processes from the standpoint of an applicant.**

NQTs would like more information to be provided by schools; not all schools send out such information (about the school, the specific post and the selection process at interview, including information about the group for any 'model lesson' required). All information needs to be clear, straightforward and honest. Having good information in advance makes candidates 'feel secure'.

Applying to posts in other areas was seen as difficult because schools seem to prefer those who have trained locally. Some respondents felt that being an NQT was a disadvantage, as they cannot offer experience. Mature NQTs consider that age is a



problem in getting interviews. One respondent mentions friends who never made it into a teaching post because of the shortage of jobs. Another respondent who had wanted a full-time job initially experienced taking a supply post as negative, but it had offered experience in many schools and a permanent contract had resulted from it.

Downloadable application forms are liked by NQTs as they are easily adapted for different applications and online applications give ease of access. Email notification of new vacancies is seen as helpful by some. Some prefer to deal directly with schools than intermediary websites. 'Pools' are popular as a way of applying to many schools at once.

Being able to speak to the head-teacher before interview/application is useful, as is meeting other staff and heads of department at interview. Having a tour of the school, before or linked to the interview is helpful and where schools are not keen to offer tours there is a suspicion that they may be hiding something. A friendly welcome from staff, school receptionist/office manager and head-teacher are important. Opportunities to meet pupils and teach a lesson are also useful for candidates in helping them see if the school is right for them. Some think that having lessons observed in their current (e.g. placement) post, rather than the school applied to, gives a better indication of skill; others think that teaching the children in the school applied for helps in knowing what the school is like. It might be helpful to observe a lesson in the department they would be working in. It helps to have an opportunity to talk to those on placement from ITT programmes and to NQTs at the school. NQTs have little experience of teaching when applying for jobs and this makes it difficult to know what to look for when considering a post in a school.

NQT comments indicated that some liked interview processes that include different activities whilst others did not. Interview tasks must be relevant to the job. The selection process (interview and other activities) needs to be well organised and run to time (time 'hanging around' is not appreciated, unless informal chats with staff can be arranged). Waiting on-site for the decision is unpopular. The time required for selection processes can be problematic during the year (or final year) of the ITT programme. Visiting schools can be time consuming and expensive, if applying to those at a distance.

The number of people applying for the same posts is seen as a problem. NQTs are disheartened by applying to jobs that go to 'inside candidates' or those with experience at the school (through placements, etc) and feel that may be invited to interview to 'make up the numbers'. Having been on placement in a school was seen as an advantage in applying to the posts they advertised.

Fast responses from schools about selection decisions are preferred but pressure from schools to make a quick decision about offered posts is disliked. NQTs are concerned that they might get a poor reputation amongst heads if they refuse job offers (note, here, SLT comments that sometimes candidates accept offers but subsequently renege on this and one wonders if pressure to accept quickly affects this?). Feedback on unsuccessful applications and interviews is valued.

Support from training institutions on applying for jobs (a seminar/tutorial) is seen as useful, although some NQT respondents felt they needed greater support, such as in identifying examples of experience to use or in dealing with interviews and selection processes.

### 5.4.5 Quality of NQT applicants

SLT respondents are generally satisfied with the quality of NQT applicants (Table 77 indicates a total of over 70% who are very satisfied or satisfied). The proportions who think that quality has improved and who think that it has stayed the same are more or less equal, with just over 11% thinking it has worsened slightly or more so (Table 78).

**Table 77 Satisfaction with the choice of NQT candidates over the last 5 years (since September 2002): SLT responses**

Very satisfied	2	3	4	Very dissatisfied	Total
%	%	%	%	%	n
26.0	45.2	23.6	4.0	1.2	<b>670</b>

**Table 78 Changes in satisfaction of NQT candidates over the last 5 years (since September 2002): SLT responses**

Improved	Slightly improved	Stayed the same	Got slightly worse	Got much worse	Total
%	%	%	%	%	n
11.2	31.7	45.9	10.4	0.8	<b>652</b>

Table 79 indicates that the level of satisfaction with the choice of NQT applicants over the last 5 years is similar for both primary and secondary schools, although primary schools tend to be more 'very satisfied'. In relation to changes in satisfaction levels, primary schools are more likely to report that their satisfaction has stayed the same and secondary schools more likely to report an improvement in satisfaction. Tables 6 and 7 in Appendix 1 suggest that, as with other variables above, respondents from independent schools tend to be more positive in their ratings.

**Table 79 Satisfaction with the choice of NQT candidates over the last 5 years (since September 2002) by type of school: SLT responses**

	Primary %	Secondary %
Very satisfied	29.1	17.0
2	41.5	54.8
3	23.8	23.9
4	4.1	3.7
Very dissatisfied	1.5	0.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>188</b>

**Table 80 Changes in satisfaction of NQT candidates over the last 5 years (since September 2002) by type of school: SLT responses**

	Primary %	Secondary %
Improved	12.1	9.7
Slightly improved	27.8	41.6
Stayed the same	48.3	38.4
Got slightly worse	10.6	10.3
Got much worse	1.1	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>185</b>

Tables 81 and 82 indicate that there is similarity between the perceptions of SLT respondents from the least and most deprived schools, and then similarity between the perceptions of the respondents in the middle two categories. This suggests that NQTs are best prepared for schools that do not fall within extremes. Table 83 suggests that schools that have a more equally mixed group of pupils by ethnicity (i.e. 25-49% white) are more satisfied than schools falling in the other bands in this variable. Table 84 indicates that this group is also more likely to have improved satisfaction.

**Table 81 Satisfaction with the choice of NQT candidates over the last 5 years (since September 2002) by indicator of deprivation: SLT responses**

	Pupils eligible for free schools meals			
	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived
	%	%	%	%
Very satisfied	24.8	25.8	26.5	25.7
2	40.9	52.3	45.2	43.4
3	28.2	17.4	23.2	25.7
4	5.4	3.2	3.2	4.6
Very dissatisfied	0.7	1.3	1.9	0.7

**Table 82 Changes in satisfaction of NQT candidates over the last 5 years (since September 2002) by indicator of deprivation: SLT responses**

	Pupils eligible for free schools meals			
	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived
	%	%	%	%
Improved	16.4	11.5	9.2	8.8
Slightly improved	24.7	38.5	33.3	33.1
Stayed the same	45.9	42.6	45.8	42.6
Got slightly worse	12.3	7.4	10.5	14.2
Got much worse	0.7	0.0	1.3	1.4

**Table 83 Satisfaction with the choice of NQT candidates over the last 5 years (since September 2002), by school ethnicity: SLT responses**

% white pupils	0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
	%	%	%	%
Very satisfied	22.8	31.3	26.5	26.1
2	52.6	37.5	49.4	43.8
3	19.3	28.1	18.1	24.9
4	5.3	3.1	3.6	3.9
Very dissatisfied	0.0	0.0	2.4	1.2
<b>Total n</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>486</b>

**Table 84 Changes in satisfaction of NQT candidates over the last 5 years (since September 2002), by school ethnicity: SLT responses**

% white pupils	0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
	%	%	%	%
Improved	18.2	18.8	9.8	10.4
Slightly improved	20.0	34.4	35.4	32.3
Stayed the same	52.7	37.5	45.1	45.2
Got slightly worse	7.3	9.4	9.8	11.3
Got much worse	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.8
<b>Total n</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>471</b>

SLT respondents in London are the most satisfied with the choice of NQT candidates over the last 5 years, with the proportions in each of the other three regions identified being about the same (Table 85). The difference between London and the other regions is smaller in relation to changes in perception about satisfaction over that period. SLT respondents in the North are slightly less positive about changes in their satisfaction with choice of candidates (Table 86).

**Table 85 Satisfaction with the choice of NQT candidates over the last 5 years (since September 2002), by region: SLT responses**

	North	Midlands	South	London
	%	%	%	%
Very satisfied	27.4	22.2	23.6	34.5
2	44.8	46.0	43.8	47.1
3	23.7	24.7	26.4	16.1
4	3.3	5.1	4.9	2.3
Very dissatisfied	0.8	2.0	1.4	0.0
<b>Total n</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>87</b>

**Table 86 Changes in satisfaction of NQT candidates over the last 5 years (since September 2002) by region: SLT responses**

	North	Midlands	South	London
	%	%	%	%
Improved	12.1	10.0	7.7	17.0
Slightly improved	28.4	32.6	34.5	34.1
Stayed the same	45.3	46.3	47.2	44.3
Got slightly worse	13.8	10.0	9.2	4.5
Got much worse	0.4	1.1	1.4	0.0
<b>Total n</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>88</b>

Table 87 indicates that only a small percentage of SLT respondents thought candidates' written applications were poor. However, the written comments (see below) suggest that there may have been some confusion here, with some respondents reporting on the standard of applications in general (this is what was asked for) and others reporting on the standard of those appointed. The written responses suggest a more critical view of applications than Table 87 suggests. This may also relate to how respondents interpreted the term 'adequate'. Table 87 and the comments are, however, generally in line, with both indicating that applicants are least good at addressing the job specification, indicating their individuality and making use of their experience. There seem to be no differences in views from SLT respondents in relation to any other variables e.g. route taken, type of school, schools with differing proportions of ethnicity of pupils, schools in the four geographical regions (see Appendix 1, see Tables 16 - 23). Again, respondents from independent schools were more positive in their perceptions). There were no great differences in the perceptions of SLT respondents from schools in the different categories indicating deprivation. Addressing the job specification, indicating their individuality and making use of their experience are also those areas where applicants perform the least well at interview (Table 88), although the ratings there are higher (presumably as those least able to present those aspects have been 'weeded out' at written application stage).

**Table 87 Quality of written applications made by NQTs: SLT responses**

	Very good	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very poor	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
Use of English	6.9	64.0	27.1	1.6	0.3	<b>667</b>
Presentation (e.g. formatting, handwriting)	9.3	62.8	25.7	2.2	0.0	<b>669</b>
Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	5.9	56.8	31.8	5.4	0.2	<b>666</b>
Individuality	5.7	43.4	40.7	9.2	1.1	<b>654</b>
Makes good use of past/relevant experience	5.4	48.0	42.8	3.8	0.0	<b>661</b>

**Table 88 Quality of performance at interview by NQTs: SLT members' views**

	Very good	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very poor	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
Clarity of speech	8.3	73.5	17.6	0.6	0.0	<b>665</b>
Rapport with panel	5.6	63.7	29.2	1.5	0.0	<b>661</b>
Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	4.6	57.7	35.8	2.0	0.0	<b>657</b>
Individuality	7.6	58.6	32.7	1.1	0.0	<b>654</b>
Makes good use of past/relevant experience	5.4	51.8	39.6	3.1	0.2	<b>651</b>

**Comments by SLT members: NQT's written applications and interview performance.**

Although the above tables do not suggest this, written comments offered by SLT respondents indicated that there are huge variations between candidates, with some written applications and interview performances being at a very high standard and some being very poor. Possible reasons for the difference between the ratings and the written comments were offered: there is a difficulty in providing a rating when there are such variations; many related their ratings to those they had selected, giving a positive slant. Many respondents commented on huge fields of applicants, with over 100 applicants for single posts, making it difficult to differentiate between candidates.

Complaints by SLT respondents about poor quality written applications included: poor spelling, punctuation and grammar; poor writing style (e.g. too informal); incorrect name of school or head-teacher; clearly in a standard format used for multiple applications; no individuality demonstrated; no reference to the person specification/job description and skills required for the post; applicants who do not have the requirements specified.

Advice offered by respondents was that applications should be targeted at the school and job and show an awareness of both. Candidates should look at Ofsted reports/school prospectus/etc, particularly for 'unusual' schools, such as boarding schools, special schools, small schools, religious schools, etc. Many respondents recommend that candidates visit the school before applying, but equally some see this as too demanding on their time. Candidates need to make themselves 'stand out', showing individuality and expressing personal views and opinions. They should use portfolios to show their abilities and should make use of 'outside' experiences.

Responses suggest that the support given by ITT providers is not very helpful for candidates, as schools receive applications that look very similar from NQTs who have studied with the same provider. Candidates seem to be often 'coached' by ITT providers to give the 'right answers' at application and interview stages, and this is unhelpful. ITT providers need to give more/better advice and guidance. Some respondents state that

NQTs nearly always present well in application and at interview, and this might imply good quality support from the local ITT provider.

There were very positive comments from schools recruiting from Local Authorities pre-selected 'pools', which were seen to reduce the bureaucracy of the recruitment process and to weed out weaker applicants at an early stage.

At interview some candidates present themselves badly. Younger candidates, in particular, may struggle with nerves and need to show more confidence, but most SLT respondents seem to be understanding and sympathetic about this. Many interviewees are unable to expand on their answers or to back them up with examples. Some comments were about personal appearance (inappropriate clothing, tattoos, etc). There were also comments about the quality of spoken English ('teen-speak'/Americanisms) and about clarity of speech and expressing ideas.

Popular selection methods used when candidates are called to interview process include: giving a model lesson (popular); being observed in their own school or on a placement; interview with school council/student panel; presentation to panel; reviewing examples of work (e.g. portfolios); a story session with children.

## 5.5 Retention of NQTs

### 5.5.1 Overview

Although the literature review for this study (see section 2 above) suggests that there is a problem with the retention of NQTs, the data from the survey of SLT members indicate that they do not perceive such a problem. Only 1% of SLT respondents thought retention was definitely a problem and only 11.5% saw it as a problem to some extent (Table 89).

Table 90, which gives the responses of the NQTs surveyed to the question 'Do you intend to stay in teaching?' supports the perception of the SLTs, with over 90% saying that they intended to do so.

**Table 89 How far retention of NQTs is seen as a problem: SLT responses**

		Total
	%	n
Yes, definitely	1.0	5
Yes, to some extent	11.5	58
No	87.5	443
<b>Total n</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>506</b>
NA		158

**Table 90 NQT respondents' intentions to remain in teaching: NQT responses**

Yes	No	Don't know	Total
%	%	%	n
91.1	0.4	8.5	<b>270</b>

SLT respondents from secondary schools were more likely than those from primary schools to perceive a problem (Table 91). There were also some differences between independent and non-independent schools, with SLT respondents from non-independent schools likely perceive problems than independent schools (Table 92) and there were some regional differences (Table 93), with SLT respondents in the North the least likely to perceive problems and those in London the most likely to do so. There seem to be no

great differences between routes taken and in the ratings of deprivation (see Appendix 1 Tables 28 and 29) or in relation to school ethnicity (see Appendix 1 Table 30).

**Table 91 How far retention of NQTs is seen as a problem, by type of school: SLT responses**

	Primary	Secondary
	%	%
Yes, definitely	0.9	1.2
Yes, to some extent	9.8	15.1
No	89.2	83.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>172</b>

**Table 92 How far retention of NQTs is seen as a problem, by independent and non-independent schools: SLT responses**

	Non-independent	Independent
	%	%
Yes, definitely	1.0	0.0
Yes, to some extent	11.8	4.3
No	87.1	95.7
<b>Total n</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>23</b>

**Table 93 How far retention of NQTs is seen as a problem, by region: SLT responses**

	North	Midlands	South	London
	%	%	%	%
Yes, definitely	1.2	1.3	0.9	0.0
Yes, to some extent	8.8	12.1	11.5	16.2
No	90.0	86.6	87.6	83.8

Where NQTs had left the schools surveyed, SLT responses indicated that they tended not to do so during the NQT year (Table 94) and they seemed most likely to leave 2 years or more after appointment. Table 95 indicates that NQTs in secondary schools are more likely to leave than are those in primary schools. Table 31 in Appendix 1 suggests that the patterns are similar for independent and non independent schools. NQTs may not wish to leave during the NQT year as they need to complete the year to get fully qualified status, and they may not wish to leave in the first year thereafter because of financial incentives. For example, some secondary school teachers who started their PGCE or SCITT programme in maths or science from September 2006 can receive a 'golden hello' payment of £5,000. Teachers in other secondary subjects such as ICT, modern languages and English can receive £2,500. The 'golden hello' payments are made after successful completion of induction year, at the start of second year of teaching.

**Table 94 Retention of NQTs recruited since 2002: SLT responses**

	All	Most	Some	A few	None	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
Are still with you	24.9	49.1	16.6	6.2	3.3	<b>634</b>
Left less than one year after appointment	0.6	1.1	7.2	22.8	68.3	<b>360</b>
Left one year after appointment	1.4	0.6	8.8	45.2	44.1	<b>363</b>
Left two years after appointment	1.1	2.0	16.0	43.8	37.1	<b>356</b>
Left more than two years after appointment	1.9	5.4	26.0	45.0	21.7	<b>369</b>

**Table 95 Retention of NQTs recruited since 2002 by type of school: SLT responses**

	Are still with you		Left less than one year after appointment		Left one year after appointment		Left two years after appointment		Left more than two years after appointment	
	Pri %	Sec %	Pri %	Sec %	Pri %	Sec %	Pri %	Sec %	Pri %	Sec %
All/Most	74.2	72.5	1.9	1.4	3.2	0.0	4.3	1.4	8.1	5.6
Some/A few	21.2	26.9	27.4	34.0	47.5	63.1	43.8	83.4	63.3	82.4
None	4.6	0.5	70.8	64.6	49.3	36.9	51.9	15.2	28.5	12.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>434</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>142</b>

Table 96 indicates that schools in the North are most successful in retaining NQTs. NQTs in London were the least likely to leave during the first year but the most likely to leave after two years. The proportions leaving more than 2 years after appointment are similar across the regions. Table 32 in Appendix 1 suggests that patterns are similar for the least and most deprived schools and similarly for the middle categories in the deprivation variable.

**Table 96 Retention of NQTs recruited since 2002: SLT members views by region**

		North	Midlands	South	London
		%	%	%	%
Are still with you	All/Most	80.2	74.9	64.5	70.9
	Some/A few	18.5	21.5	29.1	26.6
	None	1.4	3.7	6.4	2.5
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>79</b>
Left less than one year after appointment	All/Most	0.8	2.0	1.1	3.7
	Some/A few	29.4	38.4	30.7	14.8
	None	69.7	59.6	68.2	81.5
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>54</b>
Left one year after appointment	All/Most	2.5	2.0	0.0	3.8
	Some/A few	55.0	50.0	60.0	49.1
	None	42.5	48.0	40.0	47.2
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>53</b>
Left two years after appointment	All/Most	1.7	3.1	4.8	3.6
	Some/A few	58.5	59.2	56.0	69.6
	None	39.8	37.8	39.3	26.8
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>56</b>
Left more than two years after appointment	All/Most	7.3	7.7	8.5	5.1
	Some/A few	71.0	68.3	72.0	74.6
	None	21.8	24.0	19.5	20.3
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>59</b>

**Comments by SLT members: what encourages the retention of NQTs?**

Support for NQTs is considered very important by SLT respondents, from a range of sources: colleagues; SLT; mentor. Support for planning is specifically mentioned by a small number of respondents, suggesting that this is an area that NQTs struggle with. The support of the school governors for staff development is mentioned by some. Support in dealing with parents is mentioned by one respondent. The ability of the school to offer classroom support in the form of teaching assistants is important in some schools, as is the financial capacity to achieve this.

Some SLT respondents mention the NQT's expectations upon commencing their post and the importance of having a realistic understanding of the job, so that it is important for the



school to present a realistic picture at interview. One respondent commented that the NQT having teachers in the family helps. The recruitment and selection process must also be effective, ensuring that the right person was recruited in the first place.

Many comments about encouraging retention relate to the school environment, for example reasonable demands being made of the NQT, good team working, encouragement, being valued, good leadership, a good working atmosphere, job satisfaction and opportunities for all. Some respondents commented that these are motivators for all staff, not only for NQTs, and that they are important in the NQT year and beyond. The NQT needs to fit into the school and understand its ethos. A 'no blame' culture is mentioned by some. NQTs need to be treated with respect as part of the school team and seen as professionals, equal with other staff. 'Having a say' is seen as important, so that the NQT is able to contribute to the school. It is important for NQTs to become involved in the school community. A disciplined school environment encourages retention, as does one where there are high expectations of pupils. Pupil behaviour is mentioned as being significant for retention, with well-behaved pupils encouraging retention and NQTs needing effective strategies for behaviour management. Feeling successful in the job is important and difficult school experiences are likely to reduce retention. NQTs also need a good work-life balance.

Respondents commented that NQTs need to plan to stay in teaching for at least the next few years and to be fully committed. One comment was that if NQTs stay for more than two years, they are likely to stay in the longer term, implying that the first two years are the most challenging. This is reinforced by numerous comments referring to 'into second year and beyond...!'

Some SLT respondents mentioned the need for affordable housing within the locality, and there were a few mentions of cash incentives, and having salaries compatible with the cost of living and that are competitive with those offered in industry.

Budgetary concerns were mentioned by some SLT respondents. Comments about having the financial capacity to keep teachers in post beyond their NQT year suggest that the NQTs had been appointed on a temporary basis. Some schools seem unable to offer security in contracts, their budgets dictate that they repeatedly offer short-term contracts, and NQTs leave for more security. Less significant is the ability of schools to pay for progression and responsibilities.

The volume of paperwork and administration is seen as a factor preventing retention, as it adds to the stress of teaching. Comments offered about induction and CPD are given in section 5.6 below.

### **5.5.2 Reasons for NQTs leaving and their destinations**

The reasons offered by SLT respondents for NQT's leaving their posts supports the data in 5.5.1 above about the point at which they tend to leave (i.e. 2 years or more after appointment), since the most common reason is for promotion (Table 93).

Over 90% of NQTs surveyed indicated that they intended to stay in the profession. For those who did not intend to do so (i.e. not just leave their current post but leave the profession), the main reasons for leaving were heavy workload and pupil behaviour.

**Table 97 Main reasons why NQTs leave their posts: SLT responses**

	Yes	Total
	%	n
For promotion	51.0	575
Other (please specify)	33.7	575
End of contract	31.8	575
Mismatch between skills and demands of the job	18.3	575
Heavy workload	13.7	575
Issues to do with pupils behaviour	12.2	575
Type of class taught	6.6	575
Change of subject specialism	4.5	575

**Table 98 Reasons why NQTs consider leaving the profession: NQT responses**

	No	Yes	Total
	%	%	n
End of contract	83.3	16.7	24
For promotion	100.0	0.0	24
Change of subject or specialism	95.8	4.2	24
Heavy workload	37.5	62.5	24
Type of class taught	87.5	12.5	24
Mismatch between skills and demands of the job	87.5	12.5	24
Issues to do with pupil behaviour	79.2	20.8	24

There are differences here between types of school. Table 99 suggests that temporary contracts are more common in primary schools and that NQTs in secondary schools are more likely to leave for promotion. More SLT respondents in secondary schools indicated that a mismatch between the NQT's skills and the job and pupil behaviour were reasons for NQTs leaving.

Although the number of SLT respondents from independent schools is small, Table 100 below suggests some different perceptions there of why NQTs leave from perceptions in non-independent schools. The respondents in independent schools suggest that NQTs are more likely to leave for promotion and less likely to leave because of the end of a contract or because of heavy workload or the type of class taught (although pupil behaviour is similar in both as a reason for NQT's leaving).

**Table 99 Main reasons why NQTs leave their posts by type of school: SLT responses**

	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
	%	%	Total n	Total n
End of contract	36.4	24.0	382	183
For promotion	40.3	72.7	382	183
Change of subject specialism	5.0	3.8	382	183
Heavy workload	14.1	13.7	382	183
Type of class taught	7.6	4.9	382	183
Mismatch between skills and demands of the job	16.5	22.4	382	183
Issues to do with pupils behaviour	8.6	20.2	382	183

**Table 100 Main reasons why NQTs leave their posts, by independent and non-independent schools: SLT responses**

		Yes	Total
		%	n
Non-independent	End of contract	33.0	545
Independent	End of contract	7.1	28
Non-independent	For promotion	50.5	545
Independent	For promotion	60.7	28
Non-independent	Change of subject specialism	4.6	545
Independent	Change of subject specialism	3.6	28
Non-independent	Heavy workload	14.1	545
Independent	Heavy workload	7.1	28
Non-independent	Type of class taught	7.0	545
Independent	Type of class taught	0.0	28
Non-independent	Mismatch between skills and demands of the job	17.6	545
Independent	Mismatch between skills and demands of the job	32.1	28
Non-independent	Issues to do with pupils behaviour	12.3	545
Independent	Issues to do with pupils behaviour	10.7	28

Table 101 indicates that temporary contracts are more common in the North, leaving for promotion is slightly more common in the Midlands and London and a mismatch between NQT skills and the needs of the job is slightly more common in the South and London.

**Table 101 Main reasons why NQTs leave their posts, by region; SLT responses**

		Yes	Total
		%	n
End of contract	North	48.5	198
	Midlands	26.3	167
	South	26.3	133
	London	10.4	77
For promotion	North	49.5	198
	Midlands	56.9	167
	South	45.1	133
	London	51.9	77
Change of subject specialism	North	3.5	198
	Midlands	6.0	167
	South	6.0	133
	London	1.3	77
Heavy workload	North	15.7	198
	Midlands	12.6	167
	South	13.5	133
	London	11.7	77
Type of class taught	North	7.1	198
	Midlands	7.8	167
	South	3.8	133
	London	7.8	77
Mismatch between skills and demands of the job	North	15.2	198
	Midlands	17.4	167
	South	22.6	133
	London	20.8	77
Issues to do with pupils behaviour	North	10.1	198
	Midlands	13.8	167
	South	12.8	133
	London	13.0	77

Overall, SLT respondents considered that most of those who had left had done so to go into other teaching jobs, again belying the literature review that suggests a problem in NQTs leaving the profession (section 2 above). There seems to be very little difference between SLT members in primary and secondary schools in their views on how many NQTs go into other teaching jobs. Fewer secondary school NQTs are seen as leaving for reasons other than to go to another job.

**Table 102 Destinations of NQT's leaving since 2002: SLT responses**

	All	Most	Some	A few	None	Total n
	%	%	%	%	%	
Gone to other teaching jobs	49.0	31.5	5.5	10.9	3.1	<b>457</b>
Gone to jobs in education or working with children other than teaching	2.4	1.8	9.0	24.7	62.0	<b>166</b>
Gone to a job not working with children	3.4	1.1	9.0	34.8	51.7	<b>178</b>
Have left but not gone to another job	3.4	0.6	5.7	36.8	53.4	<b>174</b>
Other (please specify)	9.1	6.1	6.1	60.6	18.2	<b>33</b>

**Table 103 Destinations of NQT's leaving since 2002 by type of school: SLT responses**

	Gone to other teaching jobs		Gone to jobs in education or working with children other than teaching		Gone to a job not working with children		Have left but not gone to another job	
	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
All/Most	77.6	85.2	8.0	0.0	7.7	1.2	7.1	0.0
Some/A few	18.5	13.0	32.2	35.1	28.6	59.5	46.9	37.8
None	3.9	1.8	59.8	64.9	63.7	39.3	45.9	62.2
<b>Total n</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>74</b>

Table 33 in Appendix 1 indicates that there are few differences between the four regions of England specified in relation to destinations of NQTs leaving schools.

## **5.6 Induction**

Almost all SLT respondents indicate that there is a standard induction in their schools for NQTs (Table 104), with small proportions indicating that induction varies according to the number of NQTs in any one year or for all subjects, although more indicate that it varies for some subjects. Table 105 indicates that where practice does differ it is more likely to do so in secondary schools (which focus more on subject specialisms and tend to be larger and therefore with more NQTs in a year). Table 34 in Appendix 1 suggests that independent schools also have standard inductions but that there are more likely to be variations for subject specialisms or where there are a number of NQTs in a year.

**Table 104 Standardisation of induction: SLT responses**

	Yes	Total
	%	n
Standard induction for all NQTs	95.1	691
Induction varies for all subjects	6.5	663
Induction varies for some subjects	14.9	663
Induction varies according to number of NQTs in one year	9.8	662

**Table 105 Standardisation of induction, by school type: SLT responses**

	Primary		Secondary	
	Yes	Total	Yes	Total
	%	n	%	n
Standard induction for all NQTs	95.9	465	94.1	177
Induction varies for all subjects	1.3	6	18.1	34
Induction varies for some subjects	10.0	46	26.1	49
Induction varies according to number of NQTs in one year	8.0	37	15.1	28

It seems from SLT responses that 10% time release from the timetable for NQTs and having an induction tutor are standard (Table 106). Common practices include observing other teachers and going on external courses, having a mentor or coach and an individual written programme. It seems less common for NQTs to visit other schools or to have training in school by external specialists. NQT responses about what they experience are similar to SLT responses (Table 107). The pattern does not seem to differ much between primary and secondary schools (Table 108), although primary NQT's seem much more likely to visit other schools. Table 35 in Appendix 1 suggests that practices are similar between independent and non-independent schools. There were no regional differences.

**Table 106 Induction processes for NQT: SLT responses**

	Always include	Usually include	Sometimes include	Rarely include	Never include	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
10% time release from timetable	98.4	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	<b>687</b>
Induction tutor	94.4	2.1	1.6	0.7	1.2	<b>680</b>
Observing other teachers in your school	86.2	12.0	1.6	0.0	0.1	<b>690</b>
Formal external training courses	81.7	12.5	4.7	0.9	0.3	<b>687</b>
Other mentor/coach	69.3	11.8	10.9	4.2	3.9	<b>645</b>
Written individual programme	65.9	14.0	9.9	6.6	3.7	<b>656</b>
Visits to other schools	44.0	26.9	21.1	7.1	0.9	<b>677</b>
Training in school by external specialists	36.8	21.7	26.0	11.1	4.5	<b>650</b>

**Table 107 Induction processes: NQT responses**

	Yes	Total
	%	n
Induction tutor	93.8	272
10% time release from timetable	93.8	272
Formal training courses	84.2	272
Observing other teachers in your school	82.7	272
Other mentoring/coaching	69.5	272
Training in school by external specialists	51.5	272
Written individual programme	45.6	272
Visits to other schools	37.1	272
Contact with school Governors	19.5	272

**Table 108 Induction processes for NQTs by type of school: SLT responses**

	Always/Usually include		Sometimes /rarely include		Never include		Total n	
	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec
Induction tutor	95.6	98.4	2.7	1.6	1.7	0.0	473	190
Other mentor/coach	76.7	91.4	17.6	8.6	5.6	0.0	443	185
Written individual programme	81.7	74.6	14.8	21.0	3.5	4.4	458	181
Observing other teachers in your school	97.9	98.9	1.9	1.1	0.2	0.0	484	189
Formal external training courses	96.9	86.6	3.1	12.3	0.0	1.1	485	187
Training in school by external specialists	59.1	57.8	36.7	39.0	4.3	3.2	447	187
Visits to other schools	80.9	44.6	18.7	53.8	0.4	1.6	477	184
10% time release from timetable	99.6	100.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	481	189

Practice in supporting NQTs seems a little more variable (Table 109). SLT respondents indicate that virtually all schools have one member of staff overseeing NQT induction. It seems to be unusual for governors to be involved in induction. Again, the pattern of provision seems similar (Table 36 in Appendix 1) in both primary and secondary schools and in independent and non-independent schools (Table 37 in Appendix 1).

**Table 109 Individuals who support induction: SLT responses**

	Always %	Usually %	Sometimes %	Rarely %	Never %	Total n
One member of teaching staff overseeing NQT induction	91.6	7.2	0.7	0.4	0	682
Other teaching staff designated to support NQTs	54.0	22.0	17.8	3.9	2.3	641
Governors involved in induction	6.7	8.0	20.4	36.7	28.2	627
Explicit monitoring of NQT induction	78.3	12.9	4.7	3.3	0.8	660
Explicit evaluation of NQT induction	71.8	16.2	7.4	3.2	1.5	662
Other (please specify)	85.7	9.5	0.0	4.8	0	21

SLT respondents indicate (Table 110) that most commonly NQTs spend 2-3 hours a week on induction (60.2%), with most other NQTs spending 1 hour a week (28%). NQTs in primary schools spend more time on induction than do those in secondary schools (Table 112), according to SLT respondents. Table 113 below suggests that NQTs in independent schools spend less time on induction than do those in non-independent schools (but the number of SLT respondents from independent schools is small)

**Table 110 Average time an NQT spends on induction activities: SLT responses**

	%
1 hour per week	28.0
2-3 hours per week	60.2
4-5 hours per week	9.8
Over 6 hours per week	2.0
<b>Total n</b>	<b>661</b>

**Table 111 Average time NQT spends on induction: NQT responses**

	%
1 hour per week	43.4
2-3 hours per week	50.4
4-5 hours per week	3.5
Over 6 hours per week	2.7
<b>Total n</b>	<b>258</b>

**Table 112 Average time an NQT spends on induction activities, by type of school: SLT responses**

	Primary	Secondary
	%	%
1 hour per week	24.3	38.0
2-3 hours per week	60.6	58.7
4-5 hours per week	13.1	1.1
Over 6 hours per week	1.9	2.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>179</b>

**Table 113 Average time an NQT spends on induction activities, by independent and non-independent schools: SLT responses**

	1 hour per week	2-3 hours per week	4-5 hours per week	Over 6	Total n
	%	%	%	%	
Non-independent	27.4	60.1	10.4	2.1	<b>627</b>
Independent	41.9	58.1	0.0	0.0	<b>31</b>

Tables 38 and 39 in Appendix 1 suggest that there are no great regional differences here.

The amount of time staff spend on NQT induction (Table 114) reflects that spent by NQTs (Table 111), but SLT respondents suggest that more time is spent by supporting staff than by NQTs. Slightly more time seems to be spent by secondary school staff (Table 115). Schools in London (Table 117) seem to spend less time supporting NQTs than those in other regions.

**Table 114 Average time a member/members of staff spend(s) supporting NQTs in their first year: SLT responses**

	%
1 hour per week	29.6
2-3 hours per week	58.0
4-5 hours per week	8.9
Over 6 hours per week	3.6
<b>Total n</b>	<b>676</b>

**Table 115 Average time a member/members of staff spend(s) supporting NQTs in their first year, by type of school: SLT responses**

	Primary	Secondary
1 hour per week	31.5	24.1
2-3 hours per week	55.6	63.6
4-5 hours per week	9.3	8.6
Over 6 hours per week	3.6	3.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>187</b>

**Table 116 Average time a member/members of staff spend(s) supporting NQTs in their first year by independent and non-independent schools: SLT responses**

	1 hour per week	2-3 hours per week	4-5 hours per week	Over 6
	%	%	%	%
Non-independent	29.8	57.3	9.4	3.6
Independent	28.1	68.8	0.0	3.1

**Table 117 Average time a member/members of staff spend(s) supporting NQTs in their first year, by region: SLT responses**

	North	Midlands	South	London
	%	%	%	%
1 hour per week	32.4	25.7	33.3	24.7
2-3 hours per week	53.5	60.9	55.8	67.1
4-5 hours per week	10.0	10.4	7.5	4.7
Over 6 hours per week	4.1	3.0	3.4	3.5

**Comments by SLT members: induction and CPD**

Specific features of the induction programme considered important by SLT respondents are regular reviews and meetings, an open door policy, clear communications and opportunities to shadow managers. Some mention adherence to PPA (Planning, Preparation and Assessment time) rules as important, particularly 10% release time and 10% PPA time. Effective use of the non-contact time is significant. Networking with other NQTs in the area is seen as important to some respondents. Other forms of peer-support are also mentioned, such as buddying with recent NQTs within the school, or peer-coaching schemes.

Opportunities for further training and CPD are frequently mentioned by SLT respondents as important. Also important are opportunities for progression within the school and for NQTs to take on responsibility, seen as investment in the individual by the school. Some respondents comment on the importance of recognising the personal development of the NQT. Some comment on the importance of having a budget that allows them to offer the types of training and support needed by NQTs.

**Comments by NQT respondents: induction**

A good induction programme is very important. Those who mentioned poor experiences in the NQT year were unlikely to stay at the school. NQTs see the level and form of support between schools as very varied. NQT respondents mention: having a pack giving school policies, procedures and practices in the school would be helpful (existing staff sometimes assume knowledge); relationships with and support from SLT/mentor/induction tutor/colleagues is very important; having a dedicated mentor/induction tutor is essential; support from other staff within the school is important. One comment was that a balance between having full information and not being overwhelmed by it is important for the NQT year. A written record of the process is important in assessing development over the year



and some consider that the NQT should have written confirmation of the induction programme, particularly regarding mentor time.

Training needs identified by NQTs for the NQT year include: behaviour management; specific ICT software; support with managing workloads; guidance on planning and assessment; observing others teach and visiting other schools. The option to request free training courses is important and it is important to have access to information about training that is available.

Additional support from ITT providers during the NQT year would be helpful. Opportunities to talk to other NQTs from the same types of school would be appreciated, an example of such provision being in the Richmond area.

Schools are seen as more important in relation to induction than local authorities. Experiences of support at local authority level vary and some are mentioned as particularly good: Blackburn with Darwen and South Gloucestershire. Others are seen as offering very little support for NQTs or little information. Some NQTs have concerns that they may not be fairly assessed in school and suggest that local authorities might monitor standards (as universities monitor standards of school placements).

One NQT mentioned that having studied via the GTP helped during the NQT year and some felt that their PGCE had not given them adequate preparation for everyday school life.

NQTs not starting in September are more likely to encounter problems with the induction process, for example one had experienced problems through not having a class of her/his own, sharing classes, not having a classroom, etc.

Salary is important to some, but was not mentioned by the majority. One stated that salary for NQTs should be higher given the workload (a mature entrant from a previous career), and others commented that the salary is too low. Support with student loans/debt and support for buying homes are also concerns.

## **6 Environment map**

Please note that the number of respondents from independent schools was small and the data from them need to be treated with caution.

### ***6.1 NQTs routes into their NQT posts***

The full time PGCE is the most common source of NQT applicants overall, although the undergraduate teaching course is more common in primary schools. Independent schools have an even greater focus on the full time PGCE. The proportions from employment - based routes are similar in primary and secondary schools. Part time PGCEs and supply work are the least common routes.

Schools in the most deprived areas have fewer NQT applicants from full time PGCEs and more from undergraduate teaching courses, employment-based routes and supply work than do schools in more advantaged areas.

There are some regional differences. The full time PGCE and part time PGCE are less common in the Midlands, as are NQTs from supply work. More SLT respondents in the South and North have had no applicants from employment-based routes.

Most NQTs (over 91%) were on ITT programmes immediately before their current posts. Of the remainder, most had been in temporary teaching jobs.

The full time PGCE is the route most preferred by SLT respondents overall, although in primary schools they prefer the undergraduate teaching course. The employment-based route is preferred over the part time PGCE. The route that most deters SLT respondents is supply. Independent schools are stronger in their preference for full time PGCEs and less likely to prefer employment-based routes and supply work.

There are no differences in patterns of preferences for routes between SLTs from the most deprived and more advantaged schools. There are few regional differences in SLT preferences, although schools in London are more likely to be deterred by supply work.

Written comments by SLT members suggest their preferences relate to: their familiarity with the route; balance of theory/practice in institution-based routes; their experience of trainees on teaching placements in their schools; particular ITT providers.

- Full time PGCEs have an intensity that is a good preparation for the NQT year and NQTs from this route have better subject knowledge and are more mature: the downside is that one year is a short time to develop the skills needed, the NQTs lack knowledge of pedagogy/child development and they may be less committed to teaching (chosen as an 'afterthought').
- There is a suspicion that part time PGCEs produce less committed NQTs.
- Undergraduate teaching programmes are seen as: providing more in-depth study of education/theory/pedagogy/child development, more time to be reflective, more time on placement; their students are seen as having a greater commitment to teaching.
- Comments on employment-based routes suggest that NQTs were trained in the schools they are now working in, their ITT is specific to the school environment and many had been teaching assistants (seen as positive): the downside is lack of breadth of experience in different schools and the expense for the school in providing ITT.
- Where NQTs have previously done supply work in the school and are known this is seen as positive, but those from supply work are also seen as less committed.

## **6.2 The quality of NQTs**

Ratings by SLT respondents of NQTs' qualities were mainly 'adequate' or above, with very few ratings in the 'poor' or 'very poor' categories. Note that 'adequate' is the mid point of a 5 point scale and can therefore be seen as neutral rather than positive.

Aspects related to teaching were most highly rated, with the exception of 'pupil assessment/assessment for learning'. The lower rated aspects were those related to parents or non-teaching colleagues and administrative work. Mid-rated aspects included 'contribution to the whole school' and 'stamina/resilience'. NQTs' self ratings follow a similar pattern ('ability to deal with parents' is the lowest rated item by both SLT and NQT respondents), but NQTs rate themselves more highly for all items than do SLT respondents. They rate themselves much more highly for 'pupil assessment/assessment for learning' than do SLT respondents and there are differences in the ranking of the aspects, for example NQTs' self rating on 'stamina/resilience' is relatively lower than the SLT rating. For all items other than 'commitment to children', 'team working with teaching colleagues' and 'meeting QTS standards' over 20% of SLT respondents used the 'adequate' category, for several items over 30% did so and for working with parents over 50% did so.

There are few differences between types of school, although primary school SLT respondents rate NQTs slightly more highly on dealing with non-teaching colleagues and slightly lower on most other aspects. SLT respondents in independent schools rate NQTs

more highly than do those in non-independent schools. This may mean that independent schools are attracting the best NQTs or it may relate to differing requirements in the environments in which the NQTs operate. There do seem to be differences in ratings of NQTs in relation to the degree of deprivation in the school and the ethnicity of school pupils. For the former (deprivation) the differences appear in the ratings by NQTs but not in SLT ratings, for the latter (ethnicity) the differences appear in the ratings by both NQTs and SLTs. In both cases it is the band that is likely to indicate school populations that are most mixed, that is where there may be more equal number of children from both deprived and less deprived homes and where there may be more equal numbers from different ethnic groupings.

Most SLT respondents think the quality of NQTs has stayed the same or improved over the last 5 years (since September 2002), although those in primary schools are less positive and those in independent schools are more positive overall. More SLT respondents from deprived schools and from those with the highest proportions of children from ethnic minorities think quality has decreased. However, SLT respondents in schools where there is likely to be a more equal mix of ethnicities are least likely to consider that the quality of NQTs has decreased. SLT respondents from the North are less positive, whilst those in London are more positive.

Written comments by SLT members suggest that standards of NQTs vary but respondents are happy with their own NQTs. Concerns included: NQTs seem standards driven and rigid with regard to the National Curriculum and lacking in creativity and flexibility, with less focus on children's enjoyment; NQTs seem less committed to teaching as a profession, see it as a 'job' and are less inclined to engage in extra curricular activities; the support needed for and expected by NQTs is high; classroom and behaviour management are issues; NQTs have difficulty in dealing with others in the school environment; NQTs are ill prepared for the difficulty of the induction year; NQTs are unaware of current policies or strategies; there are some problems with subject knowledge especially in shortage subjects; male NQTs are sometimes seen as less able than female NQTs.

### **6.3 Recruitment of NQTs**

SLT respondents did not consider that the availability of teaching and administrative staff to engage with recruitment impacts to any extent on recruitment. More considered that pressure to recruit on a temporary basis has an effect, especially in primary schools.

In their written comments, SLT respondents indicated aspects that impact on their ability to recruit NQTs: the timing of the recruitment process; the volume of applicants; relationships with ITT providers; the nature of the school (e.g. in deprived areas, small schools, faith schools); geographical location (including costs of housing and living issues in London); the unhelpfulness of references from ITT providers; the helpfulness of drawing on local authority 'pools'. Subject areas with recruitment difficulties include maths, science, modern foreign languages and English. Comments indicate that the length of time taken to fill posts is not an issue, even for shortage subjects. Where posts cannot be filled they use supply teachers, look outside the specialist subject or contact ITT providers for referrals.

NQT respondents rate geographical location as the most important factor both when applying for posts and in accepting them. The reputation of the school, impression gained of it and opportunities for promotion are the next most important issues. Least important to NQTs in applying for jobs are factors such as deprivation and ethnicity followed by league tables and exam results. The pattern is similar for the factors in affecting whether or not NQTs accept job offers, but here all factors have higher ratings than they do in relation to

job applications apart from geographical location, which is identical. The implication is that applicants decide on geographical location at the point of application but that other factors become more important once a job has been offered.

In primary schools, most recruitment of NQTs in the last five years has been for Key Stage 2, closely followed by Key Stage 1, with less recruitment for Foundation. Over 70% of SLT respondents had little or no difficulty in recruiting for these three stages.

In secondary schools, subjects where posts are commonly filled by NQTs are art and design, design and technology, English, history, ICT, maths, PE and general science. The subjects most likely to be filled by somebody not trained in the subject specialism are physics, citizenship, chemistry, PSHE and Religious Education. SLTs rated physics as the most difficult subject for recruiting NQTs, followed by chemistry. Other difficult subjects are maths, ICT, design and technology and general science. The least difficult subjects are art and design, citizenship, geography, history and PE.

SLT respondents most commonly use local authority web sites or bulletins, followed by the TES and local press, to place advertisements for posts appropriate for NQTs. The proportions of NQTs using the sources differed from the proportions of SLTs using them, for example about 80% of SLT respondents always or usually use local authority bulletins but about 44% of NQT respondents always or usually do so. Primary and secondary schools have different preferences for placing advertisements, with secondary school SLTs more likely to place them with the national press and national web sites. Independent schools are more likely to use the national and local press than are non-independent schools. There are also regional differences. London schools are most likely to use the TES and agencies, local press and local authority bulletins are more used in the North and Midlands than in other areas and national web sites are less used in the Midlands than in other areas.

NQTs rated aspects of the selection process in their importance in attracting them to posts. Least important for them is where the vacancy is advertised. The most important factors are meeting colleagues, a tour of the school, information provided with the job offer and the interview.

NQTs' written comments about what helps or hinders the recruitment and selection process for them include: they like full, clear, honest information to be provided; online systems are popular; local authority 'pools' are popular; contact with people in the schools is very important (meeting staff, a tour of the school – where not provided this is seen as suspicious, a friendly welcome, meeting pupils and a chance to teach them, talking to those on placement there or to other NQTs). NQTs have little experience in job applications and are unsure what to look for. Selection processes need to be well organised and run on time and waiting on-site for the decision is unpopular, as is being pressured for a response. Concerns include the number of applicants, advantages gained by applicants known to the school, schools preferring those trained locally, the lack of experience of NQTs, age as a problem and shortages of vacancies.

The data indicate that most NQT respondents had applied for fewer than 10 jobs and had 1-2 interviews. The estimates from SLT respondents of numbers applying for posts, although higher, is generally supportive of this. There are differences at secondary level between subjects, with some attracting more applications than others.

SLT respondents are generally satisfied with NQT candidates over the last 5 years and most think that over that period the quality of candidates has stayed the same or improved. Primary school SLT respondents more likely to be 'very satisfied', although secondary schools are more likely to note an improvement in satisfaction. Satisfaction with NQT

candidates is similar (slightly less satisfied) in the most and least deprived schools, suggesting that NQTs may be less well prepared for schools at the extremes here. Written comments by SLT respondents about the quality of NQTs suggest that ITT provide training that is appropriate for the majority, rather than for schools that have particular needs. However, SLT responses suggested that those in schools with a mix of ethnicities were more satisfied with candidates and were also those whose satisfaction had most increased over the previous 5 years. SLT respondents in London are generally more satisfied than in the other three regions.

SLT ratings of aspects related to NQTs' written applications and interviews suggest that NQTs are least effective in addressing the requirements of the job specification, using their experience and showing individuality. However, SLT written comments are much more critical of all aspects than the ratings suggest. Although the question asked for general impressions of all NQT candidates, written comments suggest that some responded for those they had employed and also that there is such variation between candidates that it is difficult to provide overarching ratings.

Written comments by SLT respondents about written applications included: poor spelling, punctuation and grammar; too informal a style; incorrect name of school or head-teacher; lack of individuality; in a standard format and not directed at the post; applicants not having the requirements for the job. Candidates should: target the school and the job; look at key information about the school (e.g. Ofsted reports); express personal views and make themselves stand out. Some advise candidates to visit schools in advance but others see this as too onerous on staff time (see above the NQT comments that lack of tour availability makes them suspicious about a school). ITT support for making applications seems unhelpful, with NQTs coached to provide similar information and answers. Issues at interview include: nervousness (but this is allowed for); inability to expand on answers or give examples; inappropriate dress or appearance; use of 'teen speak/Americanisms'. Popular selection processes include: giving a model lesson; being observed in the placement school; interview with a pupil council/panel; presentation to panel; presentation of a portfolio.

## **6.4 Retention of NQTs**

SLT responses indicate that they do not have a problem with the retention of NQTs (87.5% say not at all, 11.5% to some extent). NQT responses indicate that 91.1% intend to stay in teaching, with 8.5% uncertain.

Secondary school SLT respondents are more likely to consider retention problematic than those in secondary schools, those in independent schools perceive less of a problem than those in the non-independent sector, schools in the North are the least likely to perceive a problem and those in London the most likely to do so, but this is all in the context of the majority not perceiving a problem. Where NQTs do leave, SLT respondents consider that they tend not to do so in the NQT year, are more likely to do so in their second year, and more likely again to do so from two years onwards. There are some differences between the most and least deprived schools but these seem not to follow a discernable pattern. Schools in the North seem to be slightly more successful in retaining NQTs and SLTs in London thought NQTs were more likely to leave after 2 years than those in other regions.

SLT respondents' written comments on what encourages the retention of NQTs referred to the provision of support: from a range of colleagues; from school governors for staff development; for specific development needs; from teaching assistants. The NQT having realistic expectations matters, so schools must present a realistic picture at interview, as does the school selecting the right candidate in the first place. Influential aspects of the school environment are seen as being those that motivate all staff, not only NQTs,

including: making reasonable demands on NQTs; good team working; being valued and treated with respect; good leadership; a no-blame culture; a disciplined environment and one where there are high expectations of pupils; budgets that allow for permanent contracts. SLTs' comments suggest that if NQTs remain for the first two years then they are likely to stay in teaching. Administrative work is seen as stressful and as a factor discouraging retention.

The main reasons SLT respondents offered for NQTs' leaving is promotion, end of contract, pupil behaviour, mismatch between skills and the demands of the job and heavy workload. Promotion was mentioned more often in secondary schools and temporary contracts in primary schools. SLT respondents in independent schools were more likely to offer reasons related to promotion than to temporary contracts, workload or behaviour (this supports an emerging impression that independent schools attract high quality NQTs). Leaving because of temporary contracts is more common in the North and for promotion more so in the Midlands and London. SLT respondents considered that most NQTs who had left since 2002 had done so to go into other teaching jobs. NQT respondents indicated that where they are considering leaving the profession it is mostly because of temporary contracts, heavy workloads and pupil behaviour.

## **6.5 Induction of NQTs**

Almost all SLT respondents indicate that there is a standard induction process in their schools for NQTs, and there are very few differences between schools or regions. The only differences are in how far induction is adapted for subjects or depends on the numbers of NQTs, and even there the differences are small (different practices are more likely in secondary schools). There seem to be some elements of induction that are standard for all schools, for example having 10% release from timetables and having an induction tutor. It is less common for NQTs to visit other schools or to have in-school training from external specialists. Practices are similar between independent and non-independent schools. NQT responses reflect those of SLT members, although far fewer NQTs think they have a written individual programme than SLT respondents indicate.

SLT responses indicate that practices in supporting NQTs are a little more variable, but the pattern of provision is similar in primary and secondary schools. They also indicate that NQTs most commonly spend 2-3 hours a week on induction activities, with those in primary schools spending more time on induction than those in secondary schools and those in independent schools spending less time than those in non-independent schools. SLT responses suggest that more time is spent on induction by supporting staff than by the NQTs. NQT responses differ, in that they indicate that a higher proportion spend 1 hour a week on induction (43.4%) than do SLT responses (29.6%).

Written comments by SLT respondents indicate that they see the following as important in induction: regular reviews and meetings; an open door policy; clear communications; opportunities to shadow managers; effective use of non-contact time; networking with other NQTs, peer support and 'buddying'; opportunities for further training and CPD. Opportunities for progression within the school, for NQTs to take on responsibility and recognising the personal development needs of the NQT are all seen as important. Schools need to have a budget allowing them to offer the training and support needed.

Written comments by NQT respondents indicate that induction is very important, and poor experiences mean that the NQT is unlikely to stay in the school (however, this might be set against the data suggesting that retention is not a big issue). NQT written responses were much more critical than were SLT responses and the level and form of support between schools is seen as very varied. There may be problems in induction for those not

starting in September. The effectiveness of induction also relates to their experiences in their ITT.

Practice seen as helpful by NQT respondents include: having a pack giving school policies, procedures and practices; support from SLT/mentor/induction tutor/colleagues; having a dedicated mentor/induction; a balance between having full information but it not being overwhelming; having a written record of the process and a written programme. Training needs include: behaviour management; ICT software; managing workloads; planning and assessment; observing others teach and visiting other schools; access to training courses and information about them. Financial considerations are important to some, but were not mentioned by the majority.

NQT respondents referred to sources of support. They would welcome support from ITT providers that carries into the NQT year, including opportunities to network with others. Schools are more important to them than local authorities, and experiences of support at local authority level are variable, with some provision praised. There are concerns about their fair assessment in school and local authorities might helpfully monitor standards.

## **7 Discussion of the survey findings**

### **7.1 Introduction**

The Part 1 survey explored four main areas:

- the quality of NQTs
- the recruitment of NQTs
- the retention of NQTs
- the induction of NQTs.

This section discusses the findings of the Part 1 survey in relation to findings from the literature review that are particularly relevant to the survey findings (the literature review considered other aspects that will become more relevant as the study progresses into Part 2). It should be noted that many of the points arising from the literature review derive from small scale studies.

This discussion also considers the implications of the findings from Part 1 for Part 2 of the study.

### **7.2 The quality of NQTs (including issues relating to routes)**

#### **7.2.1 Points from the literature review**

- NQTs have difficulties in dealing with parents and handling difficult behaviour in the classroom.
- There are varying views on the quality of NQTs from employment based routes.
- In one study most NQTs had worked in supply after ITT and this was seen as positive for schools and NQTs.
- One study identified that subject knowledge may be a weakness in NQTs.

#### **7.2.2 Discussion of Part 1 survey findings**

The survey results suggest that ITT routes are differentially preferred by SLT respondents, and there are differences here between primary and secondary schools. The written comments made provided valuable insights into reasons for the preferences that can be explored in Part 2 of the study. The comments suggest that having a range of routes is valuable as each provides different benefits, but they also suggest that SLT members are

influenced by their familiarity with particular routes and there are implications here for how information about routes is disseminated to schools.

Our survey indicates, contrary to suggestions from the literature review, that having done supply work is not seen as very beneficial prior to gaining an NQT post and that indeed it might be a deterrent. Intuitively, careers advisers and others may suggest that supply work might be advantageous in offering useful experience, but this appears not to be the case. The part time PGCE route seems not to be highly regarded, and this may be of concern, since it may provide a route for those with financial or domestic commitments.

The findings support the point emerging from the literature review that ability to deal with parents is seen by SLT respondents and by NQTs as the most difficult aspect for NQTs of those aspects explored. Although behaviour management was not an aspect specified in the survey, ability to deal with children and working with a full class were, and both were rated quite positively. Generally, the highest ratings were for the aspects of the work related to teaching activities. The lowest ratings were for aspects such as team working with non teaching colleagues, dealing with parents and commitment to them, administrative work (and assessment for learning). The suggestion is that ITT is most effective at helping trainees develop teaching skills and least effective at helping them develop the skills needed for other aspects of the work.

There are some indications that NQTs are least well prepared for situations where they may encounter the need to cope with differentiation to a considerable extent. This is suggested by ratings indicating that those in schools with very mixed populations find it more difficult to deal with a number of the aspects specified.

The findings do not indicate (see points from the literature above) that there are concerns about subject knowledge but they do suggest that there are variable views about the employment-based routes and that this may, at least in part, be related to unfamiliarity with them. Generally the quality of NQTs is seen by SLT respondents to have stayed the same or increased, with the indications being that the quality of NQTs is acceptable or better than that. The proportions responding using the 'adequate' category suggests there are a number of aspects of ITT that might be usefully reviewed by the providers.

Written comments by SLT members suggest quality aspects that the questionnaire did not specify, including creativity and flexibility, classroom and behaviour management (although the questionnaire did include dealing with children and working with a whole class, it did not use those terms) and awareness of current educational policies and strategies. These might be further explored in Part 2 of the study. It might also be interesting to explore the reasons why independent schools generally rate NQTs higher than do those in the non-independent sector.

## ***7.3 The recruitment of NQTs***

### **7.3.1 Points from the literature review**

- There are regional variations.
- Geographical location of posts is important to NQTs.
- In some areas NQTs find it difficult to find jobs.
- In some areas there is a growing demand for teachers.
- The number of posts advertised on temporary contracts is increasing, as a result of budgetary constraints.
- Secondary NQTs are more likely to secure an initial permanent post than primary.
- Disadvantaged schools are more likely to have difficulties in recruiting NQTs.



### 7.3.2 Discussion of Part 1 survey findings

The findings support a key point from the literature that the temporary nature of posts is problematic in recruiting NQTs and that this is more of an issue in primary than secondary schools. However, the findings suggest fewer regional variations than does the literature. The number of SLT respondents in the Part 1 survey meant that breakdowns by the 9 English regions might not be very meaningful and the 9 were combined into 4. This may have obscured finer differences between regions. The findings also do not support the contention that recruitment is more difficult in deprived schools. The findings suggest that, although there are issues for some subject specialisms in secondary schools, SLTs generally do not find it difficult to recruit NQTs. Physics is seen by far as the most difficult subject to recruit for. The findings also indicate that SLTs are generally satisfied with candidates.

There are indications of some differences in perception. For example, SLTs' written comments suggest that a school being in a deprived area is off-putting to students whilst NQTs claim that it does not discourage them. This may be a genuine difference in perception, or NQTs may be reluctant to provide ratings that might indicate bias on their part against certain groups of children, and this might be further explored in Part 2 of this study. NQTs seem not to most use the sources of advertisement that are most used by SLTs, and this problem is compounded by their considering that source of advertisement is the least important factor in attracting them to posts. NQTs see tours of schools as important and wonder if schools that do not provide them are hiding something, but some SLTs see tours as just too time consuming. SLTs list a large number of issues they see as impacting on their ability to recruit, yet the most important motivator for NQTs in applying for posts is the geographical location. There seems to be some scope for sharing of perceptions between NQTs and SLTs and for clarifying any misunderstandings.

The findings include information that might be helpful for a range of stakeholders, including SLTs, ITT providers and NQTs, for example the factors of most importance to NQTs in gaining impressions of schools at interview and the factors of most importance to SLTs in judging applicants.

ITT providers might give attention to the support provided to students in job seeking and application skills, particularly to ensure they are using the most appropriate vacancy sources, especially given that different types of school use different sources and that the usage of sources varies between regions. Attention also needs to be given to encouraging the expression of individuality and ensuring that applications are well targeted. Avoiding 'coaching' of students that might lead to standardised approaches is clearly advisable. There are indications that basics related to use of language (written and spoken) need attention. NQTs may also need support in identifying key issues to look out for in schools when deciding whether to apply or to accept posts (as they comment, their lack of experience makes them uncertain of what to look for).

There are anomalies that need to be addressed in Part 2 of the study. Written SLT and NQT comments suggest a high volume of applications, yet the numbers of applications made and interviews attended by NQTs is low, and lower than SLT responses about numbers of applications and interviews. SLT responses here are lower than the written comments suggest and lower than might be assumed. Satisfaction ratings by SLTs are high and are in line with their ratings of the quality of NQTs, yet problems are suggested by the literature and anecdotally. There are a number of possibilities, of which one is that there is general satisfaction amongst SLTs with the quality of NQT candidates. However, Part 2 of the study needs to explore other possibilities, such as how rating categories were interpreted. Differences between written comments and ratings reflects a phenomenon experienced by educators, that individuals (for example students) feel more

comfortable giving negative verbal feedback than they do in providing negative ratings. The findings may relate to the nature of the sample. The team had difficulty in obtaining responses and it may be that those schools with good practice in recruiting and supporting NQTs were those responding.

## **7.4 The retention of NQTs**

### **7.4.1 Points from the literature review**

- There is a problem in retaining teachers and this problem affects secondary schools more than primary schools.
- More advantaged schools have better retention of teachers.
- Leavers may not leave the profession permanently but may move in and out of teaching.
- Reasons for leaving the profession are commonly workload and pupil discipline with financial issues (salary, housing costs etc) more problematic in London than other areas.
- More teachers are leaving because they are on short term contracts.

### **7.4.2 Discussion of the Part 1 survey findings**

The points from the literature review that are supported by the findings are that reasons for NQTs' leaving are short term contracts, workload and pupil discipline, although financial reasons did not emerge in the findings. However, the findings indicate that there is no great problem in retention, although it does support the literature review in that there is even less of a problem in primary than secondary schools. The indications are also that where NQTs do leave, they do so mainly to go to other teaching jobs, i.e. they are not lost to the profession.

Clearly a major question is, if the indications from elsewhere are that there is a problem, why did this survey not pick this up? From the standpoint of NQT responses this might be explained by this being at the initial stages of the study when our sample are in their first year of teaching, and the indications are that NQTs are unlikely to leave until they achieve full QTS. This does not explain, however, the responses of SLTs, who were asked to report on the last 5 years.

Perhaps there is no serious problem in retaining NQTs. Perhaps, and this issue is picked up in the preceding section, this was a self selecting sample of schools that are good at retaining NQTs. The written comments about what encourages retention leans one to consider that this might be a possibility. However, at this stage it is not possible to say and clearly it will be a concern for Part 2 of the study to explore this issue further.

## **7.5 The induction of NQTs**

### **7.5.1 Points from the literature review**

- NQTs would welcome more support in addition to their induction.
- One study found that 88% of NQTs had a formal induction programme.
- One study found a relationship between induction experiences and intentions to stay in teaching.
- There are concerns about the quality of induction.
- NQTs are afraid to speak up about their experiences in the induction year, especially if on a temporary contract.

### **7.5.2 Discussion of the Part 1 survey findings**

The survey found that there is a formal induction programme for an even higher proportion of NQTs than that indicated in the literature review. It also indicated that induction is an important influence on NQTs in deciding whether to stay in teaching, but the survey also found that retention did not seem to be a great problem for the schools surveyed (see 6.4 above).

The survey found few differences in patterns between schools in their having standard induction programmes or in the aspects included in them and the nature of support provided. However, the sort of data collected may not adequately indicate differences in the quality of provision and the written comments by NQTs more helpfully suggest this. These comments, positive or negative, suggest what NQTs think they need in induction and can usefully form the basis for further explorations in the study. There is a sense, from the quantitative data and from the written comments, that SLT members see their induction provision as more positively than do NQTs.

NQT comments suggest that whilst schools are of prime importance in their induction, ITT providers and local authorities might also have important roles in providing or facilitating support.

SLT comments suggest they see the following as important in induction: regular reviews and meetings; open and supportive communications; work shadowing; use of non-contact time; peer support from other NQTs; opportunities for further training and CPD; opportunities for progression and for the assuming of responsibility; budgets that support such activities.

NQT comments suggest the following as important in induction: full but not overwhelming information e.g. about school policies and practices; a dedicated mentor and support from others in the school; written records of the process and a written programme. Training needs include: behaviour management; on ICT software; managing workloads; planning and assessment; observing others teach and visiting other schools; access to training courses and information about them. They also see the monitoring of their assessment during the NQT year as important.

Whilst there are overlaps between the two sets of comments there are differences in focus, with NQT comments reflecting much more specific needs in relation to specific topics and more rigorous monitoring.

### **7.6 Implications for Part 2 of the study**

The discussion of the findings raises a number of issues. In some cases the findings support the issues and points raised in the literature review but not in other cases and this provides areas for further exploration in Part 2 of the study. The following includes key points for further exploration in Part 2 of the study:

- preferences by SLT members for routes into NQT posts, the reasons for those preferences (e.g. familiarity with them) and the implications of this for stakeholders (e.g. supply work not always being seen as beneficial; the part time PGCE route seems not to be highly regarded but may provide a possible route for those with financial or domestic commitments).
- the findings indicate aspects where NQTs seem least prepared and those where they are seen as 'adequate'. ITT seems most effective at helping trainees develop teaching skills and least so at helping them develop skills needed for other aspects of the work. Indications are that NQTs may be least well prepared for situations where they may

- need to cope with differentiation. Written comments by SLT members suggest quality aspects that the questionnaire did not specify and these need to be explored in Part 2.
- there seem to be no great differences regionally in recruitment issues yet other studies suggest there are, and this needs further exploration.
  - generally responses to many aspects of the survey were positive and Part 2 must explore whether this is representative of all schools and if not why not.
  - the findings identify anomalies that need to be addressed in Part 2 of the study: different information about the volume of applications; differences in satisfaction ratings by SLTs and indications from the literature; differences between written comments and ratings.
  - there are apparent differences in perceptions of NQTs between independent and non-independent schools.
  - the findings suggest that retention is not a great problem yet the literature indicates that it is.
  - formal induction programmes seem to be standard. However, there are indications that the quality of induction is more variable. Provision in schools, by local authorities and by ITT providers might all be explored with examples of good practice identified.

## 8 Conclusions

The literature review for Part 1 usefully identified a range of themes and points that informed the survey conducted for Part 1 and will inform Part 2 of the study. Many of the items reviewed were reporting on small scale studies and this current large scale study provides an opportunity to explore their findings. The Part 1 survey in some cases supported findings from the literature and in some cases did not, providing areas to explore in Part 2.

Generally, the findings of the Part 1 survey are more positive than the literature review suggested they might be and this is a key issue for exploration in Part 2. Of particular interest is whether or not the nature of those responding influenced the data: the team had difficulty in obtaining the response rate and the indications from telephone follow-ups are that schools are over burdened and that completion of surveys is relatively low on their agenda. An aspect the team will explore in Part 2 is whether those SLTs responding had a particular interest in the NQT issue and whether their provision is unusually good, or whether the findings are indeed representative of the whole. There are implications here for the methods to be used in Part 2 of the study. A further consideration for Part 2 is that the written comments offered by SLT and NQT respondents did not always reflect the ratings provided. An emerging issue seems to be a difference between perceptions of NQTs in independent and non-independent schools and it may be worth re-considering the inclusion of the former in the sample to explore this further. Part 2 will use a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods and Part 1 provides an invaluable base to consider the relationship between those methods.

The Part 1 survey provides valuable information for a range of stakeholders and the key aspects of this information are given in section 6 above, which summarises the main findings. This information particularly points to differences between the routes taken by NQTs before beginning their NQT year (ITT and supply) and between primary and secondary schools, and it gives indications of differences for schools that have pupil populations suffering from deprivation or that include mixed ethnicities. Differences in perceptions emerge between SLT and NQT respondents. There are also findings suggesting commonalities that will also be of interest to stakeholders, for example the aspects where NQTs are seen as best and least prepared for their roles.

## Bibliography

- Barmby, P. (2006) Improving teacher recruitment and retention: the importance of workload and pupil behaviour. *Educational Research*, 48 (3), pp247-265.
- Barrington, R. (2000) *An investigation into the induction period which considers the perspectives of NQTs and their induction tutors*. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference. Cardiff University: September 7-10.
- Bird, E. (2003) To what extent can diversification of routes to qualified teacher status contribute to the supply of mathematics teachers? In *Shortage of mathematics teachers – what progress?* Proceedings of a National Day Conference, pp. 71–106. Milton Keynes: The Open University.
- Birks, P. (2000) *Improving the Two Rs: LEA Support for Teacher and Headteacher Recruitment and Retention (EMIE Report No.56)*. Slough: NFER, EMIE.
- Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Stoll, L., Thomas, S & Wallace, M (2005) *Creating and sustaining effective professional learning communities*, Nottingham: Department for Education and Skills.
- Brookes, W. (2005) The Graduate Teacher Programme in England: mentor training, quality assurance and the findings of inspection. *Journal of In-service Education*, 31 (1), pp 43-62.
- Bubb, S & Earley, P. (2006) Induction rites and wrongs: the 'educational vandalism' of new teachers' professional development, *Journal of In-service Education*, 32(1), pp5–12.
- Bush, A., Edwards, L., Hopwood Road, F., & Lewis, M. (2005) *Why here? Report of Qualitative Work with Teachers Working in Schools above and below the Floor Targets, Part of the ippr Choice and Equity in Teacher Supply Research Project*, London, Department for Education and Skills.
- Carrington, B., Bonnett, A., Demain, J., Hall, I., Nayak, A., Short, G., Skelton, C., Smith, F. & Tomlin, R. (2001) *Ethnicity and the professional socialisation of teachers*. London: Teacher Training Agency.
- Castagnoli, P. and Cook, N. (2004) *Growing Your Own Leaders: The impact of professional development on school improvement*, Full Practitioner Report, Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.
- Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (2007) *Education at a Glance 2007*. OECD.
- Cunningham, M. & Hargreaves, L. (2007) *Minority ethnic teachers' professional experiences: Evidence from the Teacher Status Project*. RR 853 London: DfES.
- Dadley, E.M. & Edwards, B. (2007) Where have all the flowers gone? An investigation into the retention of religious education teachers, *British Journal of Religious Education*, 29(3), pp249-271.

Day, C., Stobart, G., Sammons, P., Kington, A., Gu, Q., Smees, R., & Mujtaba, T. (2007) *Variations in Teachers' Work, Lives and Their Effects on Pupils: VITAE Report (DfES Research Report 743)*, London, Department for Education and Skills.

Education and the Arts Select Committee (2004) *Teacher Recruitment and Retention Subgroup Report*, <http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/CS/committee/EDA/EDA090604i6a.pdf> last accessed 3rd April 2008.

Education Data Surveys (2007) <http://www.educationdatasurveys.org.uk/?q=node/3> last accessed 4th April 2008.

Green, F., Machin, S., Murphy, R., & Zhu, Y. (2008) *Competition for Private and State School Teachers, The London School of Economics and Political Science, Paper No' CEEDP0094* <http://cee.lse.ac.uk/cee%20dps/ceedp94.pdf> last accessed 15th April 2008.

Griffiths, V. (2007) Experiences of training on an employment-based route into teaching in England', *Journal of In-Service Education*, 33 (1), pp107-123.

Hargreaves, L., Cunningham, M., Hansen, A., McIntyre, D., Oliver, C., & Pell, T. (2007) *The Status of Teachers and the Teaching Profession in England: Views from Inside and Outside the Profession. Final Report of the Teacher Status Project*. DfES Research Report, 831A.

Heilbronn, R., Totterdell, M., Bubb, S., & Jones, C. (2002) *The whole school management of induction: central factors for success*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association. University of Exeter: September 12-14.

Hobson, A.J., Malderez, A., Tracey, L., Homer, M., Mitchell, N., Biddulph, M., Giannakaki, M.S., Rose, A., Pell, R.G., Roper, T., Chambers, G.N., & Tomlinson, P.D. (2007) *Newly Qualified Teachers' experiences of their first year of teaching: Findings from Phase III of the 'Becoming a teacher' project*, London, Department for Education and Skills.

Hodkinson, A. (2006) Career Entry Development Profiles and the statutory induction arrangements in England: a model of effective practice for the professional development of Newly Qualified Teachers?, *Journal of In-Service Education*, 32(3), pp.287-300.

Hustler, D., McNamara, O., Jarvis, J., Londra, M., Campbell, A., & Howson, J. (2003) *Teachers Perceptions of Continuing Professional Development*, DfES Research Brief 429: London, DfES.

Jackson, A. (2007) *The development of questioning as an enrichment to the professionalism of beginning teachers*. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference. Institute of Education: University of London: September 5-8.

Johnson, M (2003) *Schooling in London: An overview*. Institute for Public Policy Research.

Lewis, P., MacKay, S., & Varley, S. (2000) *Monitoring the induction experience of newly qualified teachers*. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference. Cardiff University: September 7-10.

LSE (2007) *New research on independent schools-their effects on teacher supply and the returns to private education*  
[www.lse.ac.uk/collections/pressAndInformationOffice/newsAndEvents/archives/2008/IndependentSchoolsResearch.htm](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/pressAndInformationOffice/newsAndEvents/archives/2008/IndependentSchoolsResearch.htm) last accessed 3rd April 2008.

Milne, J. (2007) *North-south divide in teachers' jobs*. The Times Educational Supplement, August 17th p9.

Moor, H., Halsey, K., Jones, M., Martin, K., Stott, A., Brown, C. & Harland, J. (2005) *Professional Development for Teachers Early in their Careers: an Evaluation of the Early Professional Development Pilot Scheme* (DfES Research Report 613). London: DfES.

Morton, R. (2002) *Hello and Handcuffs: LEA Support for Teacher and Headteacher Recruitment and Retention (EMIE Report No. 67)*. Slough: NFER, EMIE.

Noyes, A., (2004) *Where have all the maths teachers gone? Proceedings of the British Society for Research into the Learning of Mathematics 24 (3)*, pp21-26.

OECD, (2005) *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing and retaining teachers*, Paris, OECD.

Parkinson, J. & Pritchard, J. (2005) *The Induction experiences of newly qualified secondary teachers in England and Wales. Journal of In-service Education*, 31(1), pp 63-81.

Powney, J., Wilson, V., Hall, S., Davidson, J., Kirk, S., Edward, S., Mirza, H.S. (2003), *Teachers' Careers: The Impact of Age, Disability, Ethnicity, Gender and Sexual Orientation*, London, Department for Education and Skills.

Price, A. & Willett, J. (2006) *Primary teachers' perceptions of the impact of initial teacher training upon primary schools. Journal of In-service education*, 32(1), pp33-45.

Priyadharshini, E. & Robinson-Pant, A. (2003) *The attractions of teaching: an investigation into why people change careers to teach, Journal of Education for Teaching*, 29(2), pp.95-112.

Purcell, K., Wilton, N., Davies, R., & Elias, P. (2005) *Education as a graduate career: entry and exit from teaching as a profession*. London: Department for Education and Skills.

Sammons, P., Day, C., Kington, A., Gu, Q., Stobart, G. & Smees, R. (2007) *Exploring variations in teachers' work, lives and their effects on pupils: key findings and implications from a longitudinal mixed-method study, British Educational Research Journal - Special Issue*, 33(5), 681-701.

Smethem, L. & Adey, K. (2005) *Some effects of statutory induction on the professional development of newly qualified teachers: a comparative study of pre- and post-induction experiences. Journal of Education for Teaching*, 31(3), pp187-200.

Smethem, L. (2007) *Retention and intention in teaching careers: will the new generation stay?. Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 13(5), pp465-480.

Smithers, A. & Robinson, P. (2003) *Factors affecting teachers' decisions to leave the profession*, Nottingham, Department for Education and Skills.

Smithers, A. & Robinson, P. (2004) *Teacher turnover, wastage and destinations*, Nottingham, Department for Education and Skills.

Smithers, A. & Robinson, P. (2005) *Teacher turnover, wastage and movements between schools*, Nottingham, Department for Education and Skills.

Training and Development Agency for Schools (2006). *A political history of the challenges faced by the government in improving teacher training provision in England: 1990 - 2005*. London: TDA.

Totterdell, M., Woodroffe, L., Bubb, S. & Hanrahan, K. (2004) *The impact of NQT induction programmes on the enhancement of teacher expertise, professional development, job satisfaction or retention rates: a systematic review of research on induction*. London: Institute of Education.

Tranter, S. (2003) *Talent Spotting: Recognising and developing leadership potential*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Wilson, P., Hopwood, V., & Antill, M. (2005) *Recruitment and Retention in the Post-16 Learning and Skills Sector*, London, Department for Education and Skills.



## Appendix 1

**Table 1 NQT applications, routes preferred by SLT members; SLT members' views by eligibility for free school meals**

		Pupils eligible for free school meals			
		Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived
		%	%	%	%
Full time PGCE	Strongly preferred/preferred	71.9	66.4	68.5	68.9
	No preference	24.4	33.6	28.7	30.4
	Strongly deterred/deterred	3.7	0.0	2.8	0.7
Part time PGCE	Strongly preferred/preferred	16.7	16.7	14.8	19.4
	No preference	70.2	73.5	75.0	69.9
	Strongly deterred/deterred	13.1	9.8	10.2	10.8
Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc	Strongly preferred/preferred	65.3	57.8	57.4	65.4
	No preference	32.2	39.8	38.8	32.4
	Strongly deterred/deterred	2.5	2.3	3.9	2.2
Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP	Strongly preferred/preferred	43.2	45.5	39.0	47.7
	No preference	44.1	47.9	50.0	42.1
	Strongly deterred/deterred	12.6	6.6	11.0	10.3
Supply work	Strongly preferred/preferred	14.6	6.1	15.0	11.3
	No preference	64.6	69.4	62.6	71.3
	Strongly deterred/deterred	20.7	24.5	22.4	17.5

**Table 2 NQT applications, routes preferred by SLT members by region**

		North	Midlands	South	London
		%	%	%	%
Full time PGCE	Strongly preferred/Preferred	66.4	63.4	73.9	82.3
	No preference	30.8	36.1	25.4	15.2
	Deterred/Strongly deterred	2.8	0.5	0.7	2.5
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>79</b>
Part time PGCE	Strongly preferred/Preferred	17.8	13.5	15.7	25.0
	No preference	70.4	76.2	78.7	59.6
	Deterred/Strongly deterred	11.8	10.3	5.6	15.4
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>52</b>
Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc	Strongly preferred/Preferred	57.7	57.0	64.2	68.2
	No preference	38.3	40.7	33.3	27.3
	Deterred/Strongly deterred	4.0	2.3	2.4	4.5
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>66</b>
Employment based route e.g. GTP, RTP	Strongly preferred/Preferred	39.4	50.6	38.5	40.0
	No preference	50.6	44.5	49.0	41.5
	Deterred/Strongly deterred	10.0	4.9	12.5	18.5
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>65</b>
Supply work	Strongly preferred/Preferred	11.0	6.8	19.8	9.4
	No preference	66.9	72.6	64.2	56.6
	Deterred/Strongly deterred	22.1	20.5	16.0	34.0
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>53</b>

**Table 3 Evaluation by SLT members of the quality of NQTs by eligibility for free school meals**

Pupils eligible for free school meals				
	Least deprived	Lower middle	Upper middle	Most deprived
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*
Awareness of what the job entails	2.1	2.1	2.0	2.2
Ability to deal with children	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.3
Commitment to children	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.8
Ability to deal with parents	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.8
Commitment to parents	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.5
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.9	2.0	1.9	2.1
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.6
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.7
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.3
Contribution to the whole school	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.3
Stamina/resilience	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.3
Lesson planning	2.1	2.1	2.0	2.1
Administrative work	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.3
Awareness of future professional standards for teachers	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.5
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.2
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.6

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 4 Evaluation by SLT members of the quality of NQTs by region**

	Region			
	North	Midlands	South	London
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*
Awareness of what the job entails	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.0
Ability to deal with children	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.1
Commitment to children	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.7
Ability to deal with parents	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
Commitment to parents	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.4
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.9
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.2
Contribution to the whole school	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.3
Stamina/resilience	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.4
Lesson planning	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.0
Administrative work	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.5
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.0
Awareness of future professional standards for teachers	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.3
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.0
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.6

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 5 Problems in recruiting NQTs: SLT members' perceptions by independent and non-independent schools**

		Non-independent	Independent
		%	%
Number of teaching staff able to engage in recruitment process	Yes	7.6	6.7
	No	92.4	93.3
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>633</b>	<b>30</b>
Administrative support for the recruitment process	Yes	6.2	6.7
	No	93.8	93.3
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>627</b>	<b>30</b>
Pressure to recruit temporary rather than permanent posts	Yes	13.2	10.0
	No	86.8	90.0
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>627</b>	<b>30</b>

**Table 6 SLT members' satisfaction with the choice of NQT candidates over the last 5 years (since September 2002) by independent and non-independent schools**

	Non-independent	Independent
	%	%
Very satisfied	25.9	28.1
2	44.8	50.0
3	24.1	15.6
4	3.9	6.3
Very dissatisfied	1.3	0.0

**Table 7 Changes in satisfaction of NQT candidates over the last 5 years (since September 2002) by SLT members by independent and non-independent schools**

	Non-independent	Independent
	%	%
Improved	11.5	6.5
Slightly improved	31.7	32.3
Stayed the same	45.1	61.3
Got slightly worse	11.0	0.0
Got much worse	0.8	0.0

**Table 8 Number of interviews and job offers, by route taken: NQT responses**

		FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp based
		%	%	%	%
How many interviews were you invited to?	0	2.6	0.0	1.7	3.0
	1-2	56.1	69.2	55.9	72.7
	3-5	32.3	30.8	33.9	21.2
	6-10	7.7	0.0	6.8	0.0
	Over 10	1.3	0.0	1.7	3.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>33</b>
How many interviews did you attend?	0	3.2	7.7	1.7	3.0
	1-2	69.0	61.5	69.5	81.8
	3-5	23.9	30.8	25.4	15.2
	6-10	3.9	0.0	1.7	0.0
	Over 10	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>33</b>
How many job offers did you receive?	0	4.5	0.0	8.5	3.0
	1-2	93.6	100.0	88.1	90.9
	3-5	1.9	0.0	3.4	6.1
	6-10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Over 10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>33</b>

**Table 9 Number of posts, interviews and job offer combined: NQT responses**

How many posts did you apply for?	How many interviews were you invited to?	How many interviews did you attend?	How many job offers did you receive?	Total n	Posts applied/ Interviews invited success rate (maximum)	Interviews attended/ Offers success rate (maximum)
Less than 10	1-2	0		<b>1</b>	51-100%	
"	"	1-2	0	<b>2</b>	51-100%	0-50%
"	"	"	1-2	<b>136</b>	51-100%	51-100%
"	3-5	1-2	1-2	<b>21</b>	51-100%	
"	"	3-5	0	<b>2</b>	51-100%	0-50%
"	"	"	1-2	<b>28</b>	51-100%	51-100%
"	"	"	3-5	<b>4</b>	51-100%	51-100%
"	6-10	1-2	1-2	<b>3</b>	51-100%	51-100%
"	"	3-5	1-2	<b>2</b>	51-100%	51-100%
"	"	"	3-5	<b>1</b>	51-100%	51-100%
11-20	0			<b>1</b>	0-50%	
"	1-2	1-2	0	<b>1</b>	0-50%	0-50%
"	"	"	1-2	<b>10</b>	0-50%	51-100%
"	3-5	1-2	1-2	<b>4</b>	0-50%	51-100%
"	"	3-5	0	<b>1</b>	0-50%	0-50%
"	"	"	1-2	<b>11</b>	0-50%	51-100%
"	"	"	3-5	<b>1</b>	0-50%	51-100%
"	6-10	1-2	1-2	<b>2</b>	51-100%	51-100%
"	"	6-10	1-2	<b>4</b>	51-100%	0-50%
"	Over 10	1-2	1-2	<b>1</b>	51-100%	51-100%
"	"	6-10	1-2	<b>1</b>	51-100%	0-50%
21-30	0			<b>1</b>	0-50%	
"	1-2	1-2	0	<b>1</b>	0-50%	0-50%
"	"	"	1-2	<b>3</b>	0-50%	51-100%
"	3-5	3-5	1-2	<b>4</b>	0-50%	51-100%
"	6-10	3-5	1-2	<b>1</b>	0-50%	51-100%
"	"	6-10	0	<b>1</b>	0-50%	0-50%
31-40	3-5	3-5	1-2	<b>5</b>	0-50%	51-100%
Over 41	3-5	3-5	1-2	<b>3</b>	0-50%	51-100%
"	6-10	3-5	3-5	<b>1</b>	0-50%	51-100%
"	"	6-10	0	<b>1</b>	0-50%	0-50%
"	"	"	1-2	<b>1</b>	0-50%	0-50%
"	Over 10	Over 10	1-2	<b>1</b>	0-50%	0-50%

**Table 10 Subject NQTs teach, by subject specialism: NQT responses**

<b>Secondary subject specialism trained in</b>	<b>Secondary subject specialism working in</b>	<b>% within subject</b>	<b>Total n</b>
No subject specialism	No subject specialism	100.0	<b>1</b>
Art and design	Art and design	80.0	<b>4</b>
	Design and technology	20.0	<b>1</b>
Design and technology	Design and technology	71.4	<b>5</b>
	Art and design	14.3	<b>1</b>
	Other	14.3	<b>1</b>
English	English	100.0	<b>15</b>
Geography	Geography	90.0	<b>9</b>
	Other	10.0	<b>1</b>
History	History	100.0	<b>4</b>
ICT	ICT	100.0	<b>2</b>
Mathematics	Mathematics	100.0	<b>5</b>
Modern foreign language	Modern foreign language	100.0	<b>9</b>
Music	Music	100.0	<b>2</b>
PE	PE	100.0	<b>10</b>
Religious education	Religious education	80.0	<b>4</b>
	History	20.0	<b>1</b>
Science Combined/ General Science	Science Combined/ General Science	50.0	<b>5</b>
	Physics	30.0	<b>3</b>
	Biology	20.0	<b>2</b>
Chemistry	Chemistry	50.0	<b>1</b>
	Science Combined/ General Science	50.0	<b>1</b>
Biology	Biology	50.0	<b>1</b>
	Science Combined/ General Science	50.0	<b>1</b>
Physics	Physics	100.0	<b>1</b>
Other	Other	76.9	<b>10</b>
	English	15.4	<b>2</b>
	Design and technology	7.7	<b>1</b>

**Table 11 Numbers of interviews attended by NQTs by Secondary subject specialism**

Secondary: subject specialism	How many interviews did you attend? %				Total n
	0	1-2	3-5	6-10	
No subject specialism	0.0	1.2	7.1	0.0	2
Art and design	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	5
Design and technology	0.0	6.2	14.3	0.0	7
English	0.0	17.3	21.4	0.0	17
Geography	33.3	8.6	0.0	33.3	9
History	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	5
ICT	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	2
Mathematics	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	5
Modern foreign language	0.0	9.9	0.0	0.0	8
Music	0.0	1.2	7.1	0.0	2
PE	0.0	8.6	14.3	33.3	10
Religious education	33.3	2.5	7.1	0.0	4
Science Combined/General Science	0.0	7.4	0.0	0.0	6
Chemistry	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	1
Biology	0.0	1.2	14.3	0.0	3
Physics	0.0	2.5	7.1	33.3	4
Other	33.3	11.1	7.1	0.0	11
<b>Total n</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>101</b>

**Table 12 Numbers of job offers by secondary subject: NQT responses**

Secondary: subject specialism	Job offers received %			Total n
	0	1-2	3-5	
No subject specialism	0.0	2.1	0.0	2
Art and design	0.0	5.3	0.0	5
Design and technology	0.0	7.4	0.0	7
English	0.0	16.8	100.0	17
Geography	40.0	7.4	0.0	9
History	0.0	5.3	0.0	5
ICT	0.0	2.1	0.0	2
Mathematics	20.0	4.2	0.0	5
Modern foreign language	0.0	8.4	0.0	8
Music	0.0	2.1	0.0	2
PE	0.0	10.5	0.0	10
Religious education	20.0	3.2	0.0	4
Science Combined/General Science	0.0	6.3	0.0	6
Chemistry	0.0	1.1	0.0	1
Biology	0.0	3.2	0.0	3
Physics	0.0	4.2	0.0	4
Other	20.0	10.5	0.0	11
<b>Total n</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>101</b>

**Table 13 Factors that attract NQTs to apply for teaching posts and their importance to the NQTs, by indicators of deprivation: NQT responses**

	Pupils eligible for free school meals							
	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Geographical location	1.9	1.9	1.6	1.8	66	65	52	55
Reputation of school	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.0	66	64	52	55
School type	3.0	3.4	2.8	2.7	65	65	52	55
League table position	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.5	65	65	51	55
Your perception of the Headteacher/Senior Leadership Team	2.5	2.5	2.2	2.1	66	65	52	55
School exam results	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.3	66	65	52	54
Size of department	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.0	63	65	51	53
Latest Ofsted report	2.6	2.9	2.6	2.5	65	65	49	55
If the school has a high number of pupils entitled to free school meals	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.1	66	65	52	54
If the school has a highly diverse ethnic mix of pupils	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.8	66	65	52	54
If the school is situated in an area of deprivation	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.7	65	65	52	54
Salary offered	2.9	3.1	2.9	3.1	64	65	52	55
Potential for promotion	2.5	2.8	2.5	2.9	65	65	51	55

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 14 Factors that attract NQTs to apply for teaching posts and their importance to the NQTs, by region: NQT responses**

	Region							
	North	Midlands	South	London	North	Midlands	South	London
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Geographical location	1.7	1.9	2.0	1.8	78	80	67	41
Reputation of school	2.4	2.1	2.2	2.2	78	80	67	40
School type	3.1	3.1	2.7	3.0	77	80	67	41
League table position	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.5	78	80	66	40
Your perception of the Headteacher/Senior Leadership Team	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.4	78	80	67	41
School exam results	3.5	3.2	3.6	3.4	78	80	66	41
Size of department	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.1	74	79	67	40
Latest Ofsted report	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.7	75	80	65	41
If the school has a high number of pupils entitled to free school meals	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.0	78	80	67	40
If the school has a highly diverse ethnic mix of pupils	3.6	3.9	4.0	3.5	78	79	67	41
If the school is situated in an area of deprivation	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.6	78	78	67	41
Salary offered	2.9	3.0	3.2	2.6	77	79	67	41
Potential for promotion	2.9	2.5	3.0	2.2	78	78	66	41

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*



**Table 15 The importance of aspects of the recruitment and selection process in attracting NQTs to posts by region: NQT responses**

	Region							
	North	Midlands	South	London	North	Midlands	South	London
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Where the vacancy is advertised	3.0	2.6	2.8	2.5	77	77	66	42
The written information sent to applicants	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.0	78	77	65	42
The composition of the interview panel	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.2	78	76	65	42
The interview	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.7	77	77	63	42
Teaching exercise as part of the interview process	2.6	2.3	2.3	2.3	77	77	65	41
Tour of the school as part of the interview process	1.9	1.8	2.0	1.8	78	77	65	41
Meeting colleagues as part of the interview process	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.8	78	77	65	41
Information provided with the job offer	2.0	1.8	2.0	1.9	77	76	64	40

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 16 Quality of written applications, by routes from which NQT applicants come: SLT responses**

		FT PGCE		UG Teaching		Emp- based	
		Mean*	Total n	Mean	Total n	Mean*	Total n
All/Most	Use of English	2.2	310	2.3	102	2.2	32
	Presentation (e.g. formatting, handwriting)	2.1	311	2.2	102	2.1	31
	Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.3	308	2.5	101	2.3	30
	Individuality	2.5	308	2.6	99	2.3	30
	Makes good use of past/relevant experience	2.4	305	2.5	101	2.2	30
Some/A few	Use of English	2.3	302	2.3	330	2.3	314
	Presentation (e.g. formatting, handwriting)	2.3	304	2.2	332	2.2	316
	Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.4	304	2.4	332	2.4	314
	Individuality	2.6	294	2.7	325	2.6	305
	Makes good use of past/relevant experience	2.5	302	2.5	329	2.5	311

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 17 Quality of written applications made by NQTs by type of school: SLT members' views**

	Mean*		Total n	Total n
	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec
Use of English	2.2	2.3	180	470
Presentation (e.g. formatting, handwriting)	2.2	2.2	181	471
Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.4	2.3	179	470
Individuality	2.6	2.4	178	459
Makes good use of past/relevant experience	2.5	2.4	178	466

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 18 Quality of written applications made by NQTs: SLT members' views by independent and non-independent schools**

	Non-independent		Independent	
	Mean*	Total n	Mean*	Total n
Use of English	2.3	633	2.1	31
Presentation (e.g. formatting, handwriting)	2.2	635	2.1	31
Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.4	631	2.0	32
Individuality	2.6	619	2.3	32
Makes good use of past/relevant experience	2.5	627	2.1	31

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 19 Quality of written applications made by NQTs: SLT members' views by ethnicity**

% White Pupils	0-24	25-49	50-74	75-100	0-24	25-49	50-74	75-100
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Use of English	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.2	57	32	82	487
Presentation (e.g. formatting, handwriting)	2.2	2.4	2.1	2.2	57	32	81	490
Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.4	56	32	82	485
Individuality	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.6	56	30	79	478
Makes good use of past/relevant experience	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.4	57	32	80	481

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 20 Quality of written applications made by NQTs: SLT members' views by eligibility for free school meals**

Pupils eligible for free school meals				
	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*
Use of English	2.20	2.22	2.34	2.25
Presentation (e.g. formatting, handwriting)	2.22	2.14	2.30	2.20
Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.41	2.26	2.50	2.39
Individuality	2.52	2.51	2.66	2.62
Makes good use of past/relevant experience	2.53	2.37	2.55	2.41

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 21 Quality of written applications made by NQTs, by region: SLT responses**

	Region							
	North	Midlands	South	London	North	Midlands	South	London
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Use of English Presentation (e.g. formatting, handwriting)	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.1	239	196	146	85
Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.2	2.3	2.1	2.2	240	197	146	85
Individuality	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.3	237	197	146	85
Makes good use of past/relevant experience	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.5	233	193	144	83
	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.5	237	193	145	85

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 22 Quality of performance at interview, by routes from which NQT applicants come: SLT responses**

		FT PGCE		UG Teaching		Emp- based	
		Mean*	Total n	Mean*	Total n	Mean*	Total n
All/Most	Clarity of speech	2.1	310	2.2	97	2.1	32
	Rapport with panel	2.3	309	2.3	97	2.1	32
	Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.4	308	2.4	96	2.2	31
	Individuality	2.2	306	2.4	97	2.1	30
Some/A few	Makes good use of past/relevant experience	2.4	305	2.5	97	2.2	30
	Clarity of speech	2.2	301	2.1	335	2.1	313
	Rapport with panel	2.3	298	2.3	333	2.3	311
	Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.4	297	2.4	332	2.4	310

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 23 Quality of performance at interview by NQTs by type of school: SLT members' views**

	Mean*		Total n	
	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec
Clarity of speech	2.1	2.0	469	179
Rapport with panel	2.3	2.3	466	179
Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.4	2.3	463	177
Individuality	2.3	2.2	461	176
Makes good use of past/relevant experience	2.4	2.3	458	176

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 24 Quality of performance at interview by NQTs: SLT members' views by independent and non-independent schools**

	Non-independent		Independent	
	Mean*	Total n	Mean*	Total n
Clarity of speech	2.1	<b>630</b>	1.9	<b>32</b>
Rapport with panel	2.3	<b>627</b>	2.0	<b>31</b>
Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.4	<b>623</b>	2.0	<b>31</b>
Individuality	2.3	<b>619</b>	2.0	<b>32</b>
Makes good use of past/relevant experience	2.4	<b>618</b>	2.1	<b>30</b>

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 25 Quality of performance at interview by NQTs: SLT members' views by eligibility for free school meals**

Pupils eligible for free school meals				
	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*
Clarity of speech	2.14	2.05	2.15	2.12
Rapport with panel	2.34	2.18	2.32	2.28
Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.40	2.26	2.42	2.41
Individuality	2.31	2.23	2.31	2.30
Makes good use of past/relevant experience	2.53	2.33	2.44	2.39

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 26 Quality of performance at interview by NQTs; SLT members' views by region**

	Region							
	North	Midland	South	London	North	Midlands	South	London
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Clarity of speech	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.1	<b>238</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>84</b>
Rapport with panel	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.2	<b>236</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>83</b>
Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.3	<b>235</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>84</b>
Individuality	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.2	<b>234</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>80</b>
Makes good use of past/relevant experience	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	<b>234</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>82</b>

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 27 Quality of performance at interview by NQTs: SLT members' views by ethnicity**

% White Pupils	0-24	25-49	50-74	75-100	0-24	25-49	50-74	75-100
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Clarity of speech	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.1	55	32	80	487
Rapport with panel	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	55	31	80	484
Addresses the requirements of the job/person spec	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.3	55	32	80	480
Individuality	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.3	54	30	79	480
Makes good use of past/relevant experience	2.5	2.6	2.4	2.4	54	31	79	477
Other (please specify)	2.3	2.0	3.7	1.8	3	2	3	20

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 28 NQT intentions of staying in teaching by route taken**

	FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp based
	%	%	%	%
Yes	89.0	92.3	96.6	91.2
No	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Don't know	11.0	7.7	3.4	8.8
<b>Total n</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>34</b>

**Table 29 NQT intentions of staying in teaching by eligibility for free school meals**

	Pupils eligible for free schools meals			
	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived
	%	%	%	%
Yes	93.9	89.2	92.3	90.9
No	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0
Don't know	6.1	9.2	7.7	9.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>55</b>

**Table 30 How far retention of NQTs is seen as a problem by SLT members, by type of school by ethnicity**

% White Pupils	Yes, definitely	Yes, to some extent	No	Total
	%	%	%	n
0-24	2.2	11.1	86.7	45
25-49	0.0	11.1	88.9	27
50-74	1.7	16.9	81.4	59
75-100	0.8	10.9	88.3	366

**Table 31 Retention of NQTs recruited since 2002: SLT members' views by independent and non-independent schools**

		<b>Non-independent</b>	<b>Independent</b>
		<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Are still with you	All/Most	73.8	74.2
	Some/A few	22.7	25.8
	None	3.5	0.0
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>31</b>
Left less than one year after appointment	All/Most	1.8	0.0
	Some/A few	30.0	31.6
	None	68.2	68.4
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>19</b>
Left one year after appointment	All/Most	2.0	0.0
	Some/A few	53.8	55.6
	None	44.2	44.4
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>18</b>
Left two years after appointment	All/Most	3.2	0.0
	Some/A few	59.8	60.0
	None	37.0	40.0
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>15</b>
Left more than two years after appointment	All/Most	7.2	10.0
	Some/A few	70.5	80.0
	None	22.3	10.0
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>20</b>

**Table 32 Retention of NQTs recruited since 2002 by eligibility for free school meals: SLT members' views**

<b>Pupils eligible for free school meals</b>					
		<b>Most deprived</b>	<b>Upper middle</b>	<b>Lower middle</b>	<b>Least deprived</b>
		<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Are still with you	All/Most	69.1	75.7	77.9	73.2
	Some/A few	28.8	20.1	16.8	24.2
	None	2.2	4.2	5.4	2.7
Left less than one year after appointment	All/Most	4.6	0.0	1.2	1.2
	Some/A few	20.7	42.9	29.6	25.3
	None	74.7	57.1	69.1	73.5
Left one year after appointment	All/Most	0.0	2.4	1.3	2.4
	Some/A few	57.1	62.4	52.5	43.5
	None	42.9	35.3	46.3	54.1
Left two years after appointment	All/Most	0.0	4.8	5.0	2.3
	Some/A few	64.3	54.2	57.5	64.8
	None	35.7	41.0	37.5	33.0
Left more than two years after appointment	All/Most	7.5	8.5	6.3	5.7
	Some/A few	63.4	67.1	75.9	77.0
	None	29.0	24.4	17.7	17.2

**Table 33 Destinations of NQTs leaving since 2002 by region: SLT members' views**

		Region			
		North	Midlands	South	London
		%	%	%	%
Gone to other teaching jobs	All/Most	79.6	84.8	74.8	82.9
	Some/A few	19.1	12.9	17.5	15.7
	None	1.3	2.3	7.8	1.4
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>70</b>
Gone to jobs in education or working with children other than teaching	All/Most	7.4	4.8	2.3	0.0
	Some/A few	38.9	38.1	31.8	19.2
	None	53.7	57.1	65.9	80.8
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>26</b>
Gone to a job not working with children	All/Most	3.4	4.8	6.3	3.4
	Some/A few	44.1	45.2	45.8	37.9
	None	52.5	50.0	47.9	58.6
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>29</b>
Have left but not gone to another job	All/Most	3.5	2.5	4.0	7.4
	Some/A few	40.4	50.0	36.0	48.1
	None	56.1	47.5	60.0	44.4
	<b>Total n</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>27</b>

**Table 34 Standardisation of induction: SLT members' views by independent and non-independent schools**

		Yes
		%
Non-independent	Standard induction for all NQTs	95.1
Independent	Standard induction for all NQTs	93.9
Non-independent	Induction varies for all subjects	5.9
Independent	Induction varies for all subjects	18.8
Non-independent	Induction varies for some subjects	14.6
Independent	Induction varies for some subjects	21.9
Non-independent	Induction varies according to number of NQTs in one year	9.6
Independent	Induction varies according to number of NQTs in one year	15.6

**Table 35 Induction processes for NQTs; SLT members' views by independent and non-independent schools**

		Always include	Usually include	Sometimes include	Rarely include	Never
		%	%	%	%	%
Non-independent	Induction tutor	94.1	2.2	1.7	0.8	1.2
	Other mentor/coach	69.2	11.6	10.9	4.4	3.9
	Written individual programme	65.9	14.0	9.8	6.6	3.7
	Observing other teachers in your school	86.0	12.2	1.7	0.0	0.2
	Formal external training courses	81.9	12.3	4.7	0.8	0.3
	Training in school by external specialists	37.2	21.8	27.0	10.2	3.9
	Visits to other schools	43.9	27.0	21.6	6.8	0.6
	10% time release from timetable	98.6	1.1	0.3	0.0	0.0
Independent	Induction tutor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Other mentor/coach	71.4	14.3	10.7	0.0	3.6
	Written individual programme	67.7	12.9	9.7	6.5	3.2
	Observing other teachers in your school	90.6	9.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Formal external training courses	74.2	19.4	3.2	3.2	0.0
	Training in school by external specialists	25.0	21.4	7.1	28.6	17.9
	Visits to other schools	40.0	26.7	13.3	13.3	6.7
	10% time release from timetable	93.8	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0

**Table 36 Individuals who support induction by type of school: SLT members' views**

	Always/Usually		Sometimes/Rarely		Never		Total	
	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec	Pri	Sec
	%	%	%	%	%	%	n	n
One member of teaching staff overseeing NQT induction	98.5	99.5	1.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	<b>477</b>	<b>189</b>
Other teaching staff designated to support NQTs	70.2	88.7	26.6	10.8	3.2	0.5	<b>440</b>	<b>186</b>
Governors involved in induction	15.1	14.2	57.3	57.4	27.5	28.4	<b>436</b>	<b>176</b>
Explicit monitoring of NQT induction	92.2	89.1	6.9	10.9	0.9	0.0	<b>462</b>	<b>183</b>
Explicit evaluation of NQT induction	88.1	87.4	10.2	11.5	1.7	1.1	<b>463</b>	<b>182</b>



**Table 37 Individuals who support induction: SLT members' views by independent and non-independent schools**

		Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
		%	%	%	%	%
Non-independent	One member of teaching staff overseeing NQT induction	91.7	7.1	0.8	0.5	0.0
	Other teaching staff designated to support NQTs	53.8	21.8	18.0	4.1	2.3
	Governors involved in induction	7.0	8.2	21.0	36.8	27.1
	Explicit monitoring of NQT induction	78.6	13.0	4.6	3.2	0.6
	Explicit evaluation of NQT induction	72.3	16.1	7.3	2.7	1.6
Independent	One member of teaching staff overseeing NQT induction	93.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Other teaching staff designated to support NQTs	60.0	23.3	13.3	0.0	3.3
	Governors involved in induction	0.0	4.0	8.0	36.0	52.0
	Explicit monitoring of NQT induction	75.0	7.1	7.1	7.1	3.6
	Explicit evaluation of NQT induction	64.3	10.7	10.7	14.3	0.0

**Table 38 Average time an NQT spends on induction activities; SLT members' views by region**

	North	Midlands	South	London
	%	%	%	%
1 hour per week	29.4	28.9	27.2	23.5
2-3 hours per week	57.1	61.9	62.6	60.5
4-5 hours per week	10.9	8.2	8.8	12.3
Over 6 hours per week	2.5	1.0	1.4	3.7

**Table 39 Average time an NQT spends on induction activities; NQT responses by region**

	North	Midlands	South	London
	%	%	%	%
1 hour per week	50.0	40.3	42.9	34.2
2-3 hours per week	44.7	49.4	55.6	60.5
4-5 hours per week	3.9	5.2	1.6	0.0
Over 6 hours per week	1.3	5.2	0.0	5.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>38</b>

**Table 40 Average time an NQT spends on induction activities; NQT responses by eligibility for free school meals**

	Pupils eligible for free schools meals			
	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived
	%	%	%	%
1 hour per week	35.9	41.7	52.9	42.3
2-3 hours per week	57.8	48.3	37.3	57.7
4-5 hours per week	3.1	5.0	5.9	0.0
Over 6 hours per week	3.1	5.0	3.9	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>52</b>

**Table 41 Average time an NQT spends on induction activities; NQT responses by route taken**

	<b>FT PGCE</b>	<b>PT PGCE</b>	<b>UG Teaching</b>	<b>Emp based</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
1 hour per week	47.0	50.0	35.7	40.6
2-3 hours per week	47.7	50.0	58.9	46.9
4-5 hours per week	3.4	0.0	5.4	3.1
Over 6 hours per week	2.0	0.0	0.0	9.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>32</b>

## Appendix 2