CHAPTER THREE

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

3.1 Introduction

The following chapter will discuss matters pertaining to the design of the study. In consideration of the literature review the researcher has embarked on the present design as it is deemed the most suitable given the number of respondents and the classroom environment. The design has also taken into consideration the demands of answering the research questions. Specifically the research design is based on both prescriptive (Dunkin and Biddle, 1974) and descriptive (Cazden, 1986) classroom research.

3.2 The Subjects

The subjects of this study were two groups of ESL primary school teachers. One group consisted of eight teacher trainees who were attending a three-year TESL pre-service course for primary school teachers at Maktab Perguruan Kota Bahru, Kelantan at the time of the study. The second group consisted of eight in-service
teachers who were teaching in eight primary schools in and around Kota Bharu, Kelantan. In order to maintain uniformity in the samples, each sample of teachers consisted of two males and six females. It must be borne in mind that the first group consisted of teacher trainees who had no teaching experience, while the second group consisted of teachers who had a minimum of 5 years of teaching experience. As such, the researcher will be referring to the former as ‘teacher trainees’ and to the latter as ‘in-service teachers’.

The table below shows the sample composition of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>TESL Trainees</th>
<th>In-Service Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine whether there are any differences in both the quantity and quality of instructional language used by teacher trainees as compared to that used by in-service teachers. This is to ascertain whether experience affects the types of instructional language used and the number of errors made among language teachers.
3.4 Recording of Data.

In order to achieve this purpose, the researcher audio-taped the sixteen subjects of this study while they were involved in classroom teaching. The eight subjects who were teacher trainees were undergoing their final teaching practice session in Semester 6 – the last semester in their three year course of teacher training. The other eight in-service teachers were teachers who were teaching in eight neighbouring schools in and around Kota Bharu, Kelantan. The researcher was present at each audio-taping session to carry out the recording. It was important for the researcher to be present to ensure that a standard procedure was adhered to in the gathering of data.

Before each audio-taping session began, a small wireless microphone was attached to the subject concerned in order to obtain a clear recording of teacher language. The researcher taped a total of sixteen lessons in sixteen cassette tapes over a period of one month. All the sixteen tapes were utilized for the purpose of this study.

3.5 Instrument and procedure

Each respondent involved in the study was taped for a 30 minute lesson. Each of these recorded lessons was then transcribed. Preparing the data for analysis required transcription of the audiotapes. The transcribed audiotapes present an
account of the meta language used (Silverman, 2000). That is, through the
collection adopted, the transcription produces the character of the speech or
activity relevant to the study i.e. discourse categories and grammatical accuracy.
This understanding of the status of the transcript is in keeping with the
assumption that there may exist other interpretations of the lessons besides those
analysed in this research. In terms of data analysis the transcript is a
representation of the structures of classroom talk. Furthermore, its
representational nature is determined through the choice of transcription
convention, format of the transcript, and the level of detail. These choices have
implications for analytic interpretation (Bucholtz, 2000,) and the status of
reliability of the study. The classroom instructional language in the lesson was
analyzed according to discourse categories and grammatical accuracy.

To carry out the tabulation more effectively, the researcher has come up
with a particular form to facilitate the analysis of all the instructional language
used in one lesson.
INSTRUCTIONAL LANGUAGE ANALYSIS SHEET

ID: 
GROUP: 
SEX: 

KEY:  
A. To direct learning  
B. To encourage/praise pupils  
C. To indicate disapproval/misbehaviour  
D. To ask questions  
E. To rephrase and respond to questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Instructions/Utterances</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL UTTERANCES

This is actually an Instructional Language Analysis Sheet. All the utterances of instructional language used by the teacher in a 30 minute lesson were written down in the analysis sheet. Then the utterances were classified into one of the five categories of instructional language namely:

A  To direct learning  
B  To encourage / praise pupils  
C  To indicate disapproval / misbehaviour  
D  To ask questions  
E  To rephrase and respond to questions
After classification, the number of utterances in each category were added to determine the total number of utterances in that category. Then, the total number of utterances of the five categories were added to obtain the grand total of all the utterances.

Five discourse categories of instructional language have been identified in the English language syllabus for TESL trainees, KP(BPG)/9577/119, June 1993, and these have been used for the analysis of data in this study.

Examples of the five discourse categories are as follows:

1. To direct learning

   Teacher: Turn to page...
   Teacher: Read the passage silently.

2. To encourage/praise pupils

   Teacher: Well done.
   Teacher: Try again.

3. To indicate disapproval/misbehaviour

   Teacher: Stop Talking.
   Teacher: Stand Up.
(iii) To ask questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Can you hear me?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>How are you today?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) To rephrase and respond to questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Sorry, I don’t hear you.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assess grammatical accuracy, a tally sheet will be used to keep the frequency counts of all the utterances of instructional language which have grammatical errors in them.
### ERROR TALLY SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. L. CATEGORY</th>
<th>TESL TRAINEES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>IN-SERVICE TEACHERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. To direct learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. To encourage/praise pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. To indicate disapproval/misbehaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. To ask questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. To rephrase and respond to questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is actually an Error Tally Sheet. First of all, the researcher referred to the Instructional Language Analysis Sheet where all the utterances from a 30 minute lesson are listed down. The utterances were then studied very carefully. Every utterance with a grammatical error was picked out and indicated in the Error Tally Sheet according to the five categories of instructional language. At the end of the task all the entries were added to get the total. This procedure would be explained in detail in Chapter 4.
3.6 Analysis of Data

Frequency counts and percentages were used to summarize and analyze the data. The analysis of the data collected in the study can be divided into two sections as given below:

a) Total and Mean number of utterances according to different discourse categories of instructional language.

b) Total and Mean number of utterances with errors according to different discourse categories of instructional language.

3.7 Tabulation

After the analysis of the data, the researcher tabulated the data in absolute figures and mean, in order to find answers to the four research questions mentioned in Chapter One, namely:

Research Q1 : Is there a difference in the overall number of utterances between TESL teacher trainees and in-service teachers in the use of instructional language?

Research Q2 : Is there a difference in the mean number of utterances between TESL teacher trainees and in-service teachers in each of the following categories of instructional language: to direct learning,
to encourage/praise pupils, to indicate disapproval/misbehaviour, to ask questions and to rephrase and respond to questions?

Research Q3 : Is there a difference in the overall number of utterances with errors between TESL trainees and in-service teachers?

Research Q4 : Is there a difference in the mean number of utterances with errors between TESL trainees and in-service teachers in each of the following categories of instructional language: to direct learning, to encourage/praise pupils, to indicate disapproval/misbehaviour, to ask questions and to rephrase and respond to questions?

3.8 In-Service and Pre-Service Teachers: Cross Comparisons

The tables used in Chapter 4 will present data pertaining to instructional language used by both teacher trainees and in-service teachers. In this way, the researcher will be able to compare and contrast the patterns of utilization of instructional language of teacher trainees with those of the in-service teachers.

Another advantage of presenting the data in this way is that the researcher can perceive the patterns of language used by individual subjects in each of the two groups. It may then be possible to ascertain whether all the teachers in a particular
group reveal similar patterns of language use, or whether there are any exceptions to the rule.

In Chapter Four, the researcher has examined the analysis of the transcriptions using the five categories of instructional language identified according to the English language syllabus for TESL trainees, KP(BPG)/9577/119, June 1993, in order to find answers to the four research questions mentioned earlier. Eventually these answers may reveal differences in the types of instructional language used and the utterances with errors in the instructional language used in the classrooms.