

Exploiting Experiential Teaching Practice through the Distance Mode

RACHEL LALITHA EAPEN

Dept of Correspondence Courses, CIEFL, Hyderabad-500 007, India

JULU SEN

Dept of Correspondence Courses, CIEFL, Hyderabad-500007, India

This paper looks at trainee responses to teacher development programmes in laboratory and on-the-field situations, and gives evidence that teachers prefer home try-outs (through the distance mode) to face-to-face laboratory practice teaching sessions. It shows how in fact the distance mode is the most effective medium for professional development, and suggests ways in which a practical teaching course through distance could be developed.

Practice teaching is a crucial component in any teacher training programme. Usually it takes place in a face-to-face situation. Eapen and Sen propose that teachers trained through distance mode could draw from their own experience, and then argue that the practice teaching component itself can be given to them by way of home try outs. We think that this novel suggestion merits the attention of distance educators.

INTRODUCTION

This paper describes a data-based study which examined a face-to-face teaching practice programme given during the 'contact' sessions of a correspondence course in post-graduate teacher training at The Central Institute of English & Foreign Languages (CIEFL) Hyderabad.

The purpose of the study is to gauge base-line data on an existing teacher development module as *part of* a revision programme of all the correspondence materials used for the PGCTE (Postgraduate Certificate in the Teaching of English) programmes by the Department of Correspondence Courses, CIEFL.

The revision programme is to help towards the larger curricular move from teacher training through correspondence to teacher development through the distance mode planned by the Department. The project is being conducted after the existing programme has been in operation since 1972, i.e. for more than 20 years. This study, which examines only the teaching practice is a qualitative analysis of data, for which instruments that have been developed using teaching experience of this Practice Teaching programme, as well as that of the face-to-face practice teaching programmes offered in residential courses at the Institute. Data has been gathered, moreover, in order to develop a full-fledged teacher development module that incorporates recent changes in teacher development studies.

THE BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Teaching practice is being seen today, not just as learning teaching routines, but as means for teacher development, and growth that comes out of a reflection on teaching practices (Wallace, 1992). This means that the teacher is seen to be not just a professional teacher helping learners to achieve goals, but also a professional moving to a new role — that of one who can articulate in theoretical terms his/her own practice. We could say that

this shift in role includes a shift in the function of "teacher as researcher" (first discussed by Stenhouse, 1975) which role involves a participation in "action research" or in

a self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of their own practices, their understanding of these practices, and the situations in which the practices are carried out. (Carr & Kemmis, 1986)

Basically, this sort of professional activism is similar to the "enabling procedures" described by Prabhu (1987), which is what helps teachers to interpret experience, relate perceptions to practical procedures, articulate emerging perceptions and interact productively with other perceptions. Action research, unlike traditional main-stream research, is research that is small-scale in nature and performed by teachers themselves to improve a particular teaching situation, not necessarily generalisable, but with its objectivity emerging from discussions with other teachers. Its priorities are speed of application, acceptability in the school, its practicality and its contribution to change for the teacher and for the school.

This model of teacher development, then, seemed to be most appropriate for us, vis-a-vis practice teaching procedures for PGCTE through the correspondence/distance mode. It was felt to be appropriate because the concept of action research and the metaphor of teacher as researcher necessitated that learning should occur at 'home' in familiar school surroundings which is a natural condition for distance programmes. This fitted in appropriately with our need to: 1) develop a teaching practice course through the distance mode; and 2) build in a relevance for the course — i.e. to confront the accusation that it is Practice Teaching being conducted in laboratory conditions alone, and outside its actual constraints.

This paper describes a preliminary survey made to see how acceptable the concept of action research might be to

our teacher participants, and also to glean whatever we could on the structure and construction of a new practice teaching course through the distance mode, through our questionnaire and discussions. Further, since our teachers are a mix of pre-service and inservice teachers, the possibility of two streams in course construction was also envisaged at the start of the study.

DESCRIPTION OF THE CURRENT PRACTICE TEACHING COMPONENT

The practice Teaching Component of the Methods Course is a Component, that is a practical session in the PGCTE Course which forms the main part of the final contact programmes before the final examination held in June every year for all eligible participants who have completed all the requirements; i.e. for those who have completed 66 or 60 assignments 10, assignments per course, where there are 6 courses to be completed.

PRACTICE TEACHING REQUIREMENTS

The Practice Teaching Component carried 25 marks, whilst the written examination carries 50 marks, with 25 marks being assigned to assignments. In other words, Practice Teaching carried 1/4 weight of the entire Methods Course.

For Practice Teaching, participants are required to teach 3 sessions of 30 minutes each. Each session is evaluated and the best of 3 are taken into account for evaluation. The participants work in groups ranging between 10-15 participants per group. They, in turn, teach students who respond to an advertisement sent out by the Institute for a CIEFL Proficiency Course of 20 days' duration. The response in Hyderabad is generally very encouraging, and the majority of students who come (after paying Rs. 10/- for admission), are generally in the age range between 15 and 19. There is a policy for admission to the Proficiency course: bonafide students are given first preference, so that disciplinary problems could be dealt with more easily. This 'policy' however, is generally lowered to include women who have stopped going to school, drop-outs, working students etc. This is necessary because while students are admitted according to needs, admissions are also made in the light of a sudden initial influx of drop-outs that occurs every year. The reasons for this drastic reduction of attendance in the first week itself could be because students realise that participants and not Institute staff are to teach them and that they themselves serve the purpose of 'guinea pigs' and that the Institute staff do not take complete responsibility for the Proficiency Courses. The drop-out rate consequently affects the Practice Teaching classes, so that participants have to struggle to teach a small class of 4-5 sometimes and be evaluated in turn for their teaching. It has also been difficult to ensure a sense of continuity between classes taught by course participants. The Correspondence Courses Department has tried to counter this drop-out by

asking all tutors to take on a one-hour slot before the participants reach the students so that there is guarantee that the students get some teaching, with some semblance of continuity, so that the participants themselves can come in and observe new techniques and required methodology, and get to know tutor expectations. Our experience, however, has been that while initially participants are motivated to come in and to come in and observe tutors' "demonstration classes" — this optional facility is rarely availed of after the initial stages, once work demands take over.

The Practice Teaching sessions can be described as teaching-learning sessions conducted in "laboratory situations". The reasons for this description (the laboratory situation) are the following:

- 1) The Practice Teaching class has very few students — (about 25 maximum and 5-6 minimum number of students). The causes for this has already been discussed. This is an unnatural English teaching situation in India, where classes are on an average 60-120 students in number (if not more).
- 2) The students come to the Institute. There is no interference of class periods, noise from other classes or interference from school authorities. Besides this, every student works with a text — this is not so in "normal" teaching-learning situations where students often don't possess a text-book. In addition to this, all resources like OHP, cassette-recorders, players, teaching materials, teaching aids, cyclostyling, blackboards, roller boards, chalk etc. are in plentiful supply. This is not the case in most teaching-learning situations. In other words, the *constraints* of teaching-learning situations do not operate in Practice Teaching situations. Thus Practice Teaching has often been criticised for its artificiality.
- 3) The participants, furthermore, are not accountable for "portions" that have to be covered for the final examination. All texts and materials used are specially selected for their communicative value, and need not be learnt or engaged with for long or short-term retention in the memory. This is not so in real teaching situations, where public examinations — here memory is the most crucial factor for success — weigh heavily on teaching practice.

The above description of the Practice Teaching course holds good, for both residential and correspondence Practice Teaching courses, and describes the situation of the course since its inception (1958 residence; 1972 correspondence courses). However, the Practice Teaching component can be described as the backbone of the teacher training Diploma courses at CIEFL.

Over the years, some solutions offered to the above criticism have been:

- 1) Peer teaching
- 2) Micro teaching
- 3) Going out to teach in the schools and colleges.
- 4) Block teaching.

While 1) and 2) have been used sporadically in residential courses (where Practice Teaching is carried over a whole semester, and carries the weight of a full course), solution 3) has been tried out once in residential courses and subsequently discarded, because of organisational difficulties. This has not been tried out in the correspondence course programme where the organisational difficulties can only increase, within the three-week contact programme, when Practice Teaching is conducted.

Given such a situation, we felt it was necessary to evaluate the Practice Teaching sessions for correspondence students to document difficulties, opinions and suggestions, actual operational strategies, and experiments. The study also needed to focus on the very important question of reflection on teaching and how this necessary activity could be built into the Practice Teaching component of the Methods course. 44 teachers responded to Questionnaire I, before they began their Practice Teaching programme during the contact session, 46 teachers responded immediately after the P.T. programmes (see Appendix A).

In addition to questionnaires used for participants, a small study was conducted (Geetha Durairajan and Lalitha Eapen) (Appendix B) on tutor responses to Practice Teaching, and their opinions and suggestions towards the improvement of Practice Teaching were recorded. Like the participant questionnaire(s) all these responses are being used to develop the instruments themselves.

As an added instrument to develop the hypothesis of reflection, both the Methods and PLT (the Methods course for Diploma students) assignments have been more oriented to the reflection of teaching (Appendix C) in order to contribute to the practice of actual teaching, and to the application of new knowledge to the practice of teaching. There is a questionnaire (Qn.I) also which follows this up.

DISCUSSION

In direct contrast to the Residential group, which averages about 40 participants per year, the correspondence group averages to about 160-170 participants who take the exams per year. Since the correspondence course group is the largest group of teachers being trained at the CIEFL, their responses would be the best barometer of the Practice Teaching course that is the backbone of the teacher training programme at the Institute. Of the 150-160 participants who complete the PGCTE programme through correspondence, 95% of them are inservice trainees, leaving about 5% who are usually employed elsewhere — for convenience they could be described as pre-service trainees. In the residential courses on the other hand, more than 60% if not more, of the class are pre-service trainees — which means that Practice Teaching (Teacher Training in this context) is qualitatively very different from what happens through correspondence. Teachers in correspondence, moreover, have teaching

experiences that range from below 2 years to 11 years and above. Most, moreover, teach at the secondary and + 2 and tertiary stages. There are very few primary teachers or postgraduate teachers.

PLUS POINTS OF PRACTICE TEACHING

In their responses to the questionnaire most teachers see the good points of Practice Teaching. Among some of the strengths of Practice Teaching listed by them are the following:

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) P.T. updates knowledge theory of LL | i) understand PLT principles of language Teaching better awareness of how languages are learnt |
| | ii) Exposure to new materials, techniques |
| b) P.T. promotes practice | i) in time management |
| | ii) classroom management team coordination |
| | iii) planning of classes |
| | iv) teaching skills of language (techniques) |
| | v) making decisions |
| c) P.T. improves the skills of observation, analysis and reflection of others, peers, self analysis. (see strengths and weaknesses of own teaching, see hidden talents, self correction) | |
| d) P.T. changes attitudes, i.e. it creates confidence and experience for freshers, and helps them to understand principles of interaction and participation. | |

FACTORS NEEDING CHANGE IN THE P.T. PROGRAMME

The “good” points of Practice Teaching, were, however, offset by the Programme which it was felt merited change:

- 1) It was generally felt that the programme was not “cost-effective” in terms of actual learning. It was described as time consuming, (3 classes for 25 marks!) and as getting into the way of preparation for the final examination (which followed immediately after Practice Teaching). In fact, it was even felt that what dominated was the fact that Practice Teaching was a course requirement and therefore to be evaluated.
- 2) The general feeling was that Practice Teaching was artificial, lacking spontaneity. It was also seen as a “hiatus between teaching theory and actual classroom situations”.

- 3) Practice Teaching, it was felt, promoted tension, and fatigue. If this is so, Practice Teaching could have a high "affective filter" (Krashen, 1985) that could stand in the way of actual learning.
- 4) It was felt that Practice Teaching was perceived differently by old and new teachers. While younger teachers want more of practice Teaching, older teachers want less of it and prefer to reflect on their teaching in their own environments.
- 5) Language learning could not really happen in Practice Teaching, where the priority was on each teacher teaching a pre-planned unit for 30 minutes (i.e. 3 teachers teach one after another for 30 minutes each). In this connection, it has been suggested by one Residential participant that the term "proficiency" course in English should be changed to "Remedial" course in English.
- 6) Teachers have to, it was felt, perceive their own teaching experience as developmental, and on-the-spot decision-making. Their "fears" of Practice Teaching show that they still see practice teaching as a judgement on the person, that there is a right and wrong way of doing things in the classroom etc. The feeling that lesson plans are a waste of time, for instance, reflects the fact, that even after completion of training, it is not seen that plans are to be treated as guidelines and not blueprints.

ORGANISATION OF PRACTICE TEACHING

Participants were critical about the organisation of Practice Teaching. Many favoured 2 instead of 3 sessions. The other proposals were:

- i) to have a first compulsory round that is a trial, and then to have a second round for a selected few, with the third round as optional. Some of the more experienced (with 16 years and above teaching experience) wanted only one session of teaching for evaluation.
- ii) Another criticism was that 30 minutes duration was too short, and therefore it should be extended to 40 minutes. Others wanted more demonstration classes and a longer contact programme. One person suggested Practice Teaching after the exam (free from tension); and that students (guinea-pigs) also should assess the teachers.
- iii) There was an opinion expressed that only ELT experts should monitor/tutor the classes — which brings up the question — who is a "tutor" in "practice teaching"?

The difficulties and undoubtedly negative points associated with Practice Teaching are administrative, academic and learning-oriented in nature. There is no doubt, that Practice Teaching as currently practised is an artificial, time-consuming, anxiety producing activity, a requirement rather than a learning tool. Its elaborate machinery brings about fatigue in learners, teachers and tutors alike.

FINDING SOLUTIONS TO COURSE CONSTRUCTION OF PRACTICE TEACHING

In order to counteract the lack of learning evidenced in the structural organisation of Practice Teaching, we posited reflection through *home try-outs* plus self-evaluation as a useful alternative for our inservice teachers getting trained through correspondence. Reflecting on teaching, observation of peers and self, analysing plans and implementation of plans, could only be conducive, we felt, for teacher growth and development. We hypothesised the home-try-out construct, therefore, in a second questionnaire, (Appendix A Questionnaire 2) which asked for a critical evaluation of teaching after a home-try-out, in order to gauge: 1) the effectiveness of home-try-outs as a tool in teacher development and 2) participant reactions to home-try-outs. The responses we got were interesting and very encouraging for teacher training through the distance mode:

- 1) While it was felt that Practice Teaching was artificial, it was also felt that Practice Teaching was more learner centred, more innovative (in techniques and materials and facilities) more planned (with close tutor supervision) and more effective in promoting new ideas, interaction among learners and information. There was feedback from tutors, more guided self-analysis, etc. Home try-outs on the other hand, were preferred by 23 teachers while 18 preferred Practice Teaching. They were preferred by so many for the following reasons:
- 2) It was felt that home-try-outs taking place on familiar ground in that the students, the environment, and large classes were more familiar to teachers. This meant *less tension* in teaching, more try-out of practical and useful techniques under relaxed conditions, more exercising of on-the spot decision-making, ("it helps me to develop my teaching skills and evaluate myself") more chance of learner autonomy ("we have to cope with our problems"), and coping with constraints, the application of theory to practice done more intimately; and finally the belief that the objectives of Practice Teaching is *for* informed home-try-outs, thus contributing to the validity of the course. It was felt that the situation of the home try-out was radically different from that of Practice Teaching.

It is clear then, in the descriptions given, that there are advantages to both Practice Teaching and the home-try-out. But by and large, what the home-try-out seems to have, which is lacking in Practice Teaching, is absence of artificiality plus *the presence* of all constraints in an actual teaching situation. This, together with the familiarity that participants have with their students and environment and the real-time management strategies available for use, suggests that the Home-Try-Out is a very *practical* and *relevant* strategy for developing the teacher's perceptions on teaching. In the face of the support given to the home

try-out idea, we have therefore devised several tasks for teacher development to be tried as assignments. This is only the first step in the development of teaching materials for a full-fledged practice teaching course that will be developed in the department by 1995. We hope that we will get more responses from students after the assignments have been tried out. We will, thus, get a better understanding of the process to operate to attain the objective of developing reflection on teaching. To sum up, the ideas we have been able to consolidate are the following:

- a) keeping a diary/journal
- b) using peer observation during small tasks, e.g.
 - i) using authentic materials
 - ii) sub skills of reading
 - iii) developing interaction in the class room
 - iv) encouraging learner participation
 - v) adapting materials
 - vi) using TV/Media to develop demonstration classes.
- 3) As a further step after reflection on teaching and Practice Teaching, it is envisaged that the teacher should be encouraged to do some "action-research", on the belief that the "teacher-as-researcher" makes for a "better teacher".
- 4) While reflection always existed as a natural learning activity, a systematic, informed attempt, would only answer the question on why something should happen.
- 5) There is a need for specific differences for preservice and inservice teacher training courses with special

provision made for teachers working through the distance mode.

- 6) Teachers should see the value of the distance mode in developing autonomy and independence in learners. To what extent can their own learning experience be transferred to the classroom could perhaps be considered at the last stage of development before evaluation of Practice Teaching classes.

Evaluation pattern for correspondence course Practice Teaching.

- 1) Summative evaluation and formative evaluation to be separated — i.e. tutors to go to student support centres for organising evaluation of home try-outs in familiar school situations, while contact programmes should give final assessments.
- 2) In contact programmes, only two classes to be assessed, and take the best of the two for evaluation.
- 3) Lesson plans, observation, and self-evaluation to be counted as part of assessment.
- 4) Some feedback *not* to be evaluated (rough work?), but explanatory feedback to be given.
- 5) Value of home try-outs to be increased, so that the value ratio (of home try-out to contact programme laboratory situations) is at a ratio 60:40.

It is conceivable that the above course description could have been developed without data. But it came out of a research, and a qualitative needs analysis ensures that resistances and needs are being taken care of. This adds to the relevance and usefulness of a course.

NOTES

¹The Other courses include:

Methods of Teaching English
 Materials for Teaching English
 Introduction to Linguistics
 Modern Grammar and Usage
 Phonetics and Spoken English
 Interpretation of Literature and advanced Rhetoric

REFERENCES

- Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. (1986) *Becoming Critical: Education, Knowledge and Action Research*. Geelong, Deakin University Press, Australia.
- Krashen, S.D. (1985) *The Input Hypothesis: issues and implications*, Longman, London.
- Prabhu, N.S. (1987) *Second Language Pedagogy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975) *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*, Heinemann, London.
- Wallace, M.J. (1992) *Training Foreign Language Teachers — A reflective approach*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Questionnaire-1 (Optional)

To be filled in before coming to the Contact Programme in June 1992.

1. Name
2. Roll No.
3. Contact Centre
4. No. of years of Teaching Experience
5. Level of Teaching :
 - a) Plus Two
 - b) Secondary
 - c) Undergraduate
 - d) Post-graduate
6. Whether previously trained in ELT
 - a) Yes
 - b) No

This questionnaire should be filled in by you, immediately before and after the teaching of a class. It is important that you observe every step of this exercise carefully.

1. The Lesson Plan — Fill in before teaching.
 - a) Objectives
 - b) What the student should do
 - c) What the teacher should do
2. Reflection on teaching — Fill in after teaching.
 - a)
 - i) Were your objectives appropriate?
 - ii) Was the classroom activity suitable for the objectives?
 - iii) Would you change your objectives?
 - iv) Would you change your lesson plan?
 - b) Changes made in your plan
Where did you make changes in your plan?
 - i) What students did.
 - ii) Give reasons — Why did this happen?
 - iii) What the teacher did.
 - iv) Give reasons — Why did this happen?
3.
 - i) Were you happy with everything that happened in class? Yes/No
 - ii) If No, What made you unhappy? State the problems.
 - iii) Choose a major problem out of these. Name it.
 - iv) How did you handle it?
 - v) Why did you handle it the way you did?
 - vi) Would you handle it the same way again? Yes/No
 - vii) If No, Why not?
 - viii) If no, what else/more could you have done, if you were given a second chance?
 - ix) Has the incident change your mind about the general view of how to go about the practice of teaching? (e.g. you may have decided in general to be more strict, to use group work less, to ask more questions etc.)
3.
 - i) Comment on the activity of reflecting on your teaching. Did it help you? Yes/No
 - ii) If Yes — how did it help you? (You can tick off more than one answer here)
 - a) It helped me to understand the principles of teaching better
 - b) It helped me to be a better teacher
 - c) It helped me to understand my students better
 - d) any other

Appendix A

Questionnaire-2 (Practice Teaching-PT)

Name :
Roll No. :
Centre :
Years of teaching experience :
Level of Teaching :
Whether previously trained or not in ELT :

Answer the following questions:

1. What are the strengths of the Practice Teaching Course?
2. What are its weaknesses?
3. How could this programme be changed/organised according to you?
4. Did you try out a class as suggested by us (Practice Teaching Encl.II. Appendix-C)?
5. If yes,
Did you find any difference between teaching at home, in real class and teaching here?
6. Which class appeals to you more? Would you prefer more PT classes or more of the home try-out, on your own?
7. Why? Give your reasons.

Appendix B

Questionnaire for PT Tutors

1. Name:
2. No. of years as a PT Tutor
CC Residential
3. No. of years of teaching experience:
a) School (8-10) b) College (+2) c) Degree (+3)
(d) Postgraduate e) Teacher Training
4. Area of specialization at M.Phil./Ph.D. level :
a) Literature
b) Language Teaching
c) Linguistics
5. Do you think that PT is a useful/necessary activity?
Yes No
6. If Yes, which of the following do you think are applicable as reasons. (Tick off as many as you think are appropriate).
a) a new awareness of LT for in-service teachers;
b) making theory practical,
c) orientation for new teachers (pre-service);
d) any other (please specify).
7. Do you think PT is more useful for
i) in-service teachers
ii) pre-service candidates
iii) both types
8. List under each of these categories given below, reasons, which according to you, make PT suitable/ useful for :
Pre-service candidates Inservice teachers Both types
9. In your entire experience as a PT tutor, what were some of the general reactions of students to PT. Tick all appropriate responses. Please go by general reactions of students who fall into each category and not by stray responses.
a) provides a perception of what language is, in terms of language use and language learning.
CC Residence
b) relevant for actualizing the principles of language teaching.
c) helps one to understand how skills can be developed in the language classroom.
d) extends one's knowledge of the range of techniques that would be used in a classroom.
e) a useful laboratory situation for trying out new ideas.
- f) a laboratory situation to arrive at/visualize teaching/learning programmes.
CC
Residence
g) an immediate/direct transfer of suggested ideas/ techniques into the real time classroom.
h) an absolutely artificial laboratory situation, with no scope for real-life classroom implementation.
i) totally irrelevant to a real-time teaching situation.
10. Structure of PT. Do you feel that the structure of PT needs to be changed? Yes No
If Yes, in what way?
11. The students of PT feel that there need be only 2 instead of 3 cycles of PT. What is your reaction to this. State it in a line or two.
12. Go back to question No.5 regarding usefulness of PT. If you have said 'No' to it, please give your reasons.
13. Are you aware of PT having been tried out in any other way (taking our participants to colleges/schools to teach, to avoid artificiality).
Yes No
If yes, how successful was it? Please give your reasons.
14. Did you have any trouble in suggesting/providing materials for PT ?
CC Residence
Yes No Yes No
15. Would you prefer to use a proficiency course designed by CIEFL ?
CC Residence
Yes No Yes No
If yes, (CC/Residence) please give your reasons.
16. What are the differences, if any, as you perceive between PT for in-service teachers and pre-service potential teachers.
17. Are you happy with the evaluation pattern used in PT ? Yes No
18. If No, what are you unhappy about ?
19. What solutions then can you offer ?
20. The evaluation of PT does not cater to ensuring a uniform parity of evaluation across groups/tutors/ centres. Do you think this problem can be solved?
Yes No
If Yes, what ways would you suggest ?
If No, why do you feel so ?

Appendix C

Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages Hyderabad-500007

Department of Correspondence Courses Assignment No. 5
(based on Lessons 8, 9 and 10)

Methods/PGCTE/1992-93

Answer Q. 1 or 2.

1

i) This assignment asks you to examine your teaching **plans** for 1 class, over **one week** — that is, perhaps for 3 classes. Examine and describe these classes under the following heads:

a) What are you going to teach (reading, writing, speaking, listening, lessons, a poem, a prose lesson, grammar items, and other) ?

b) Why have you chosen to teach this (or these) item(s)? Are the students weak at this? Is it in the syllabus? Did someone ask you to do this?

Do you feel the students enjoy this ? That is it a useful activity?

(c) What activity do you plan to give the class? e.g. silent reading/loud reading/writing/analysis of paragraphs/role play/discussion/practice writing/transcription/performing a task/dictation/a combination of these/any other. (600 words)

ii) Now critically evaluate your classes against the light of teaching plans, under the following heads:

a) Was the item chosen for teaching useful? Did you continue with the activity or make changes in methodology/activity etc.? What changes did you make?

b) Why did you make changes? Give your reasons (even reasons which might not seem too academic like 'I felt tired' or 'The class was bored' etc. should be included)

c) What is the basic difference between your plan and the implementation of your plan or your actual teaching? What did you do in your teaching, that you would not repeat? (600 words)

OR

2

a) What are some of the considerations in decision-making for language teaching at the level of:

1. Language policy making

2. The teacher's classroom planning? (600 words)

b) Look at the following teaching situations and say whether they are instances of:

a. initial teaching

b. consolidation

c. 'plateau' teaching

d. Remediation, or

e. Enrichment

Give reasons for your answer. (100 words each)