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ABSTRAK


Berasaskan analisis protokol rakaman pita pelajaran tersebut, didapati bahawa pelatih-pelatih dan guru-guru terlatih telah menguasai pengajaran mereka semasa mengajar. Walau bagaimana pun diperhatikan bahawa guru-guru pelatih jarang bertanya soalan dan banyak bergantung pada satu kategori bahasa guru. Mereka bergantung terutamanya kepada ‘Untuk mengarah pembelajaran’ iaitu sebanyak 62.3% kata-kata. Ini menunjukkan bahawa pengajaran mereka adalah lebih kepada mengarah. Disebaliknya guru-guru terlatih pula lebih menanya soalan dengan menggunakan tiga kategori bahasa guru iaitu ‘Untuk mengarah pembelajaran’ (37.8%), ‘Untuk menanya soalan’ (39%) dan ‘Untuk mengungkapkan semula serta bertindak balas kepada soalan-soalan’ (13.7%). Ini menjadikan pembelajaran mereka lebih interaktif.
Dari segi ketepatan pula, kegunaan bahasa guru oleh guru-guru pelatih adalah tidak memuaskan. Sebahagian besar kata-kata yang digunakan mengandungi kesilapan-kesilapan tatabahasa. Didapati sejumlah 208 kata-kata mempunyai kesilapan dari sebanyak 569 kata-kata yang disebut. Guru-guru terlatih pula hanya membuat 37 kesilapan kata-kata mereka dari sejumlah 690 kata-kata. Dalam erti kata lain, guru-guru pelatih mempunyai peratus kesilapan yang lebih tinggi dalam kata-kata mereka (36.6%) jika dibandingkan dengan guru-guru terlatih (5.4%).
ABSTRACT

This study explores the differences in the quantity and quality of instructional language among TESL teacher trainees and in-service teachers. The trainees were chosen because they were the ones who were involved in the first and second practicum sessions. The in-service teachers came from the primary schools in Kelantan. The data of the study was obtained by taping thirty-minute lessons which were based on prepared lesson plans.

Based on the protocol analysis of the taped lessons, it was found that both the trainees and in-service teachers tended to dominate their lessons while teaching. However it was observed that teacher trainees hardly asked questions and relied heavily on one category of instructional language. They relied mainly on ‘To direct learning’ which record a high percentage of utterances (62.3%) thus making their teaching more directive. On the other hand the in-service teachers made use of more questions, using 3 categories of instructional language namely ‘To direct learning’(37.8%), ‘To ask questions’(39%) and ‘To rephrase and respond to questions’(13.7%) thus making their lessons more interactive.

In terms of accuracy, the use of instructional language by the trainees was not satisfactory. A large proportion of utterances were plagued with grammatical errors. There was a total of 208 utterances out of a possible 569 utterances that had errors in them. In-service teachers made only 37 utterances with errors out of
a total of 690 utterances. In other words, the teacher trainees had a higher percentage of utterances with errors (36.6%) when compared to the in-service teachers (5.4%).
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