



UNIVERSITÄT
KOBLENZ · LANDAU

Preparing teacher students for linguistic and cultural diversity

Prof. Dr. Astrid Rank
rank@uni-landau.de



18th European Conference on Reading
Jönköping 2013



Content

1. Background
2. Research Questions
3. Research Design
4. Research Methods
5. The Types
6. Intervention
7. Results
8. Discussion



1. Multicultural and multilingual pupils in German primary schools

- 2010: 29 % of all families in Germany with children under age have an immigrant background (Destatis 2012)
- In Germany a third of the children between 5 and 10 years come from immigrant families (1 143 000 children), most of them German citizens without own migration experience (888 000 children) (Destatis o.J.)



1. Do teacher students have the competencies to deal with cultural heterogeneity and multilingualism?

Research by Hallitzky und Schließleder (2008), Karakaşoğlu-Aydın (2000) , Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse (2006) , Braud (2007), Bender-Szymanski (2008) , Straub (2007)

All in all one can say that development of competencies is possible but very inconsistent, because of the often unsystematical organisation of teacher training in this field.



2. Research Questions

- Which pedagogical competencies in managing linguistic and cultural diversity do primary school teacher students bring with them?
- Can empirically grounded types be observed ?
- Do the competencies change by working with the children and attending the seminar?

3. Research Design

	Teacher Students		Pupils	
Pre-test (September/ October 2010)	Students of the situated seminar (n = 20) Experimental Group EG	Students of the non situated seminar (n=33) Control Group CG	24 children with migrant background (Training Group)	20 pupils with migrant background, without training (Control Group)
	Questionnaire about knowledge and application Interviews about beliefs		Test of phonological awareness	
Intervention phase (October 2010 - February 2011)	EG: Situated seminar, the students work once a week with children	CG: Seminar with the same content but without working with children	Once a week training through teacher students	No training (Control group)
Post-test (February 2011)	Questionnaire about knowledge and application Interviews about beliefs		Reading and writing test	
Follow up (July 2011)	Questionnaire about knowledge and application Interviews about beliefs		Reading and writing test 6	

3. Research Design

	Teacher Students		Pupils	
Pre-test (September/ October 2010)	Students of the situated seminar (n = 20) Experimental Group EG	Students of the non situated seminar (n=33) Control Group CG	24 Children with migrant background (Training Group)	20 Pupils with migrant background, without training (Control Group)
	Questionnaire about knowledge and application Interviews about beliefs		Test of phonological awareness	
Intervention phase (October 2010 - February 2011)	EG: Situated seminar, the students work once a week with children	CG: Seminar with the same content but without working with children	Once a week training through teacher students	No training (Control group)
Post-test (February 2011)	Questionnaire about knowledge and application Interviews about beliefs		Reading and writing test	
Follow up (July 2011)	Questionnaire about knowledge and application Interviews about beliefs		Reading and writing test	

4. Research Methods

Item Example: Written text of a Turkish pupil: This child is in Germany only since a few weeks and already started school in Turkey.

Mark the correct statements with a cross:

In this text interference mistakes of the Turkish can be found.

MZP	n	Anzahl Items	MW	SD	Cronbachs Alpha
1	48	7	0,45	0,12	0,462
2	28	7	0,58	0,13	0,284
3	30	7	0,59	0,08	0,061

Knowledge test:

Bad statistical values for reliability, but it is possible to calculate the means for the increase of knowledge



4. Research Methods: Half standardised interviews

- Guided interviews on 3 measuring points with 8 students
- Analysis (Schmidt 2010):
 - Finding categories in the material
 - Coding the material
 - Discussing and describing the categories, developing a coding manual
 - Average 17.2 codings per interview
 - Intercoder reliability for two interviews; 80 % and 84 %



4. Empirically grounded construction of types (Kelle & Kluge 2010)

- Development of relevant analyzing dimensions, grouping the cases and analysis of empirical regularities
- Analysis of meaningful relationships
- **Contrasting dimensions: pre-knowledge, beliefs, motivation and pre-experience**
- Search for "contradicting" and "deviating" cases, reduction of the attribute space to types
- Two types and two intermediate (IM) types

	Type 1: Clichee-ridden, anxious student (n=4)	Type 2: Intercultural experienced, reflecting student (n=2)	IM type A: Not reflecting, naive optimistical student (n=1)	IM type B: Theoretician, high knowledge, no experience (n=1)
Pre-knowledge	Little	Average to high	Little	Very high
Pre-experience	Little	Many, own ones and with children, reflect the experiences	Many, are reviewed very stereotypically	None
Beliefs about cultural heterogeneity	Problem orientated, stereotypes	Almost no stereotypes, view “normality”	Very stereotypical point of view	No stereotypes
Beliefs about linguistical heterogeneity	Awaits communication problems with children and parents	Multilingualism as a chance, problem-solving aptitude	Problem orientated, but also positive	Positive, but see problems
Motivation to work in heterogeneous, culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms	Fear and defence	Challenge for the own competencies	Challenge	Fear, because of the poor preparation, but also optimistical view

	Type 1: Clichee-ridden, anxious student (n=4)	Type 2: Intercultural experienced, reflecting student(n=2)	IM type A: Not reflecting, naive optimistical student (n=1)	IM type B: Theoretician, high knowledge, no experience (n=1)
Pre-knowledge	Little	Average to high	Little	Very high
Pre-experience	Little	Many, own ones and with children, reflect the experiences	Many, are reviewed very stereotypically	None
Beliefs about cultural heterogeneity	Problem orientated, stereotypes	Almost no stereotypes, view “normality”	Very stereotypical point of view	No stereotypes
Beliefs about linguistical heterogeneity	Awaits communication problems with children and parents	Multilingualism as a chance, problem-solving aptitude	Problem orientated, but also positive	Positive, but see problems
Motivation to work in heterogeneous, culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms	Fear and defence	Challenge for the own competencies	Challenge	Fear, because of the poor preparation, but also optimistical view



5. Pre- Experience

- Little experience, has hardly ever been abroad, doesn't reflect these experiences
- Holiday impressions: different cultures are part of the picturesque holiday flair ("restaurants where there do not sit all the tourists, but which are still a bit smaller and more Italian" JO19RA, MZP1, 50)
Distinguish between "real" immigrants (language problems) and fully integrated ("One can actually almost not talk about a migration background" AN17NE, MZP1, 36 - 42)



5. Beliefs about cultural and linguistic heterogeneity

- Heterogeneity is an exception – unreflected clichés and stereotypes
- "But there are certain types, I would say, from parents who simply don't want to bend to the culture, and live their lives the way they want, no matter what school is for the children or for society" (JO19RA, MZP1, 83)
- "If there are so many children who come together from so many different cultures, the cultures, um yes, just do not harmonize" (HE13RA, MZP1, 36)
- "The children are, um, so proud when sometimes they can tell us something in their own language or a song is sung or something" HE13RA, MZP1, 412) - Spot-allowing foreign cultures in an otherwise mono-cultural education
- "That they don't understand when I tell them to do this or that. And that then I stand virtually all alone to help those children, because the parents most likely can not." (AN17NE, MZP1, 62)

	Type 1: Clichee-ridden, anxious student (n=4)	Type 2: Intercultural experienced, reflecting student (n=2)	IM type A: Not reflecting, naive optimistical student (n=1)	IM type B: Theoretician, high knowledge, no experience (n=1)
Pre-knowledge	Little	Average to high	Little	Very high
Pre-experience	Little	Many, own ones and with children, reflect the experiences	Many, are reviewed very stereotypically	None
Beliefs about cultural heterogeneity	Problem orientated, stereotypes	Almost no stereotypes, view “normality”	Very stereotypical point of view	No stereotypes
Beliefs about linguistical heterogeneity	Awaits communication problems with children and parents	Multilingualism as a chance, problem-solving aptitude	Problem orientated, but also positive	Positive, but see problems
Motivation to work in heterogeneous, culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms	Fear and defence	Challenge for the own competencies	Challenge	Fear, because of the poor preparation, but also optimistical view



5. Pre-Experience

- Previous experience with linguistic and cultural diversity
- Have been abroad, have experienced strangeness firsthand and based on these previous experiences also reflect the linguistic and cultural diversity of their future pupils.
- BE28IA says of her year abroad in Norway:
"But, um, I could just easily imagine what it's like to have to write exams and actually only know the everyday language. Because you learn it, yes, when talking to people. And at school something else is required." (BE28IA, MZP1, 14)
- Positive approach to people with a migration background, contacts, give courses etc.



5. Beliefs about cultural and linguistic heterogeneity

- Little stereotypes, heterogeneity is normal, classes are a mirror of society
- The crucial difference to the other types is:
- They feel responsible
- They don't see the problems with the children, but in their own teacher competence.

"So, in the children themselves, in dealing with the children I would not see a problem. My problem would be whether I find out in each child, what it can and what it can't not and what is now the next step to take. So, this fundamental problem of proper diagnosis and then also take steps to promote it. "(RA25NA, MZP1, 51, 52)

	Type 1: Clichee-ridden, anxious student (n=4)	Type 2: Intercultural experienced, reflecting student(n=2)	IM type A: Not reflecting, naive optimistical student (n=1)	IM type B: Theoretician, high knowledge, no experience (n=1)
Pre-knowledge	Little	Average to high	Little	Very high
Pre-experience	Little	Many, own ones and with children, reflect the experiences	Many, are reviewed very stereotypically	None
Beliefs about cultural heterogeneity	Problem orientated, stereotypes	Almost no stereotypes, view “normality”	Very stereotypical point of view	No stereotypes
Beliefs about linguistical heterogeneity	Awaits communication problems with children and parents	Multilingualism as a chance, problem-solving aptitude	Problem orientated, but also positive	Positive, but see problems
Motivation to work in heterogeneous, culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms	Fear and defence	Challenge for the own competencies	Challenge	Fear, because of the poor preparation, but also optimistical view

	Type 1: Clichee-ridden, anxious student (n=4)	Type 2: Intercultural experienced, reflecting student(n=2)	IM type A: Not reflecting, naive optimistical student (n=1)	IM type B: Theoretician, high knowledge, no experience (n=1)
Pre-knowledge	Little	Average to high	Little	Very high
Pre-experience	Little	Many, own ones and with children, reflect the experiences	Many, are reviewed very stereotypically	None
Beliefs about cultural heterogeneity	Problem orientated, stereotypes	Almost no stereotypes, view “normality”	Very stereotypical point of view	No stereotypes
Beliefs about linguistically heterogeneity	Awaits communication problems with children and parents	Multilingualism as a chance, problem-solving aptitude	Problem orientated, but also positive	Positive, but see problems
Motivation to work in heterogeneous, culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms	Fear and defence	Challenge for the own competencies	Challenge	Fear, because of the poor preparation, but also optimistical view



6. Intervention

- Experimental group: University seminar, every student works with a child every week/ input in the seminar sessions
- Control group: Only input



6. Types in the seminars

	MA26TE	BE19BE	RA25NA	BE28IA	JO19RA	AN17NE	HE13RA	WO02R A
EG	Type 1	IM type B	Type 2	Type 2				
CG					Type 1	Type 1	Type 1	IM type A

No randomization! Different types choose different seminars!
Type 2 and IM type B want to gain experience.



6. Types in the seminars

	MA26TE	BE19BE	RA25NA	BE28IA	JO19RA	AN17NE	HE13RA	WO02RA
EG	Type 1	IM type B	Type 2	Type 2				
CG					Type 1	Type 1	Type 1	IM type A

Big change in the situated seminar for this student – changes from type 1 to type 2! No stereotypes any more, working with the child was very positive, intercultural point of view could be gained.



7. Effects of the intervention

- The CG could also reduce stereotypes and gain knowledge
- But the biggest and most enduring changes were in the situated seminar



7. The intermediate types show:

- Neither knowledge alone (IM type B) nor experience alone (IM type A) are sufficient: Both has to be gained!
- This means for pre-service teacher training: Work with cases and situations, but also good instruction – situated learning!



8. Discussion

Thank you!
Are there any questions?

rank@uni-landau.de