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ABSTRACT

This research evaluates the English Language teacher education programme in two Colleges of Education, institutions that award the National Certificate in Education (NCE) which is the minimum teaching qualification in Nigeria. The research is centred on the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level. It seeks not only to identify the programme objectives but to also examine how the said objectives are interpreted by the lecturers through their classroom practices and the extent to which the objectives reflect the teaching needs of the student teachers in the programme. To understand and explore the topic from diverse perspectives, the case study and naturalistic inquiry are employed as the main research methods in the study. The research participants - five lecturers and six student teachers - are drawn from the two Colleges of Education involved in the study.

Document examination, semi-structured interview and observation are utilised as data collection instruments in the research. An examination of relevant documents not only shows the original intent of the programme but also gives an indication of how the programme is implemented by the regulatory body (National Commission for Colleges of Education) and the management of the institutions. To identify their teaching needs, the student teachers are observed in their respective placement schools and then interviewed. The same process is used for the lecturers to examine their translations of the programme objectives in the classrooms of the two Colleges of Education involved in the study. Thematic analysis is used to analyse the data gathered.

A major finding of this research is the 2-in-1 evaluation model. The model, which has practice as its focus, is proposed for the evaluation of pre-service English Language teacher education programmes in second language contexts. The 2-in-1 evaluation model is an objective based model which also analyses the needs of the programme users simultaneously with the evaluation process. The model obliterates the need for a separate needs analysis as this is done during the evaluation process itself. Practice is used as a lens which allows the model to examine how the different aspects of the programme function. The development of the 2-in-1 evaluation model is based on the methodology and research findings of this study.

A number of themes are generated from the analysed data. These have revealed some equally striking findings which include “institutional autonomy”, discrepancies in the concurrent development of “learner autonomy and teacher autonomy” and “the middleman issue”. The research through its findings, therefore, makes significant contributions to theory, policy and practice.
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CHAPTER ONE- BACKGROUND OF STUDY

1.1. INTRODUCTION - NIGERIA

Nigeria is a Federal Republic in West Africa. It gained independence from Britain on October 1st, 1960 and was declared a Federal Republic in 1963. The country is made up of thirty-six States and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja.

Figure 1.1: Map of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (adapted from World Atlas)
Nigeria is a country rich in ethnic and cultural diversity. There are over four hundred and fifty indigenous languages used and spoken in the country (Ker, 2002:116). In order to foster a sense of unity in the midst of such immense diversity, the English Language was adopted as the nation’s official language after independence in 1960. The language also serves as the medium of instruction from the senior primary (when the students are approximately eight years of age) to the tertiary level of education.

However, of over four hundred and fifty languages used in the country, Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba have been singled out as major languages for consideration as a choice for a national language. This is perhaps because, as described by Ker (2002:117), Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba are regional lingua franca and used by the three major ethnic groups in the country. With the nature of the country’s history, the 1967-1970 civil war, the different regimes, military coups, ethnic clashes, not to mention the very volatile Niger-Delta region, the quest and choice for a national language is seen by many as a very sensitive issue that should not be delved into carelessly (Ker, 2002:116).

1.1.1. Nigeria and the New Millennium Goals

Scholars, activists, politicians, development workers as well as local and international organizations have focused on economic growth and development. September 2000 marked a crucial time in history as leaders from one hundred and eighty-nine countries came together to ratify the Millennium declaration which ultimately resulted in the eight Millennium Development Goals. The United Nations have set a target of 2015 for all nations involved, including
Nigeria, to achieve a majority of these goals. According to Igbuzor (2006:1), the goals, which are aimed primarily at the reduction of poverty and the achievement of at least a basic education for all, include the following:

1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
2. Achieve Universal Basic Education
3. Promote gender equality (in schools)
4. Reduce child mortality
5. Improve maternal health
6. Combat AIDS, malaria and other diseases
7. Ensure environmental sustainability
8. Develop a global partnership for development.

Education has been described as a human right. Goal two, which is directed primarily at education, is thus of great importance to this study. Education is indisputably the key index to any meaningful development in any nation. This is because schooling or education enhances productivity which also brings about empowerment. Such development is aimed at improving the lives of people as it increases their choices, freedom and dignity; hence the call by the United Nations for all people to have at least a basic education.

The wealth or poverty of a nation is determined by the quality of the higher education as those with higher learning capacity and good or laudable skills are likely to have more fulfilled lives than those who are poorly educated (Akpomi, 2009:152). Viewed from this angle, education can therefore be said to be central to the achievement of the millennium goals. With the rapid changes in
globalization, there is an urgent call for change and innovation in the educational systems of most developing countries. Nigeria has thus made a commitment to education in the belief and hope that by overcoming illiteracy and ignorance, there will be an acceleration of the economic growth and development in the nation. To achieve this, Nigeria faces the great challenge of achieving education for all by 2015 (Aloa and Adelabu, 2006:1). This therefore places teachers at the heart of the solution of the nation’s education crises. In Afe’s view (2006:1), teaching and learning depend on teachers because there can be no meaningful socio-economic and political development in any society without them. Ironically, however, scholars within the education sector see the stipulated MDGs as an almost unachievable task in the Nigerian context, especially with the deadline of 2015. The reason for this is attributed to what some have described as the “paltry sum” of 8% allocated to the education sector in the nation’s annual budget (Asomba, 2012:1). This is in contrast to the 25% as recommended by the UN for the promotion of sustainable development and growth in the education sector of a nation.

The “oil boom” era in the 1970s gave rise to the pressing need for higher education (Igbuzor, 2006:5). This inevitably led to the establishment of many tertiary institutions in the country by the Federal Government which in turn resulted in the explosive increase in enrolment of students or candidates into these new tertiary institutions. A lot of money was invested in some major infrastructure.
The decline in the oil market as result of the oil glut in the 1980s brought chaos to the country as most of the money made during the oil boom era had been mismanaged and squandered by the leaders and those in the corridors of power. The delivery of education in Nigeria has suffered seriously from years of neglect. The salaries of teachers were left unpaid; there was degradation of educational structures and facilities and strikes were called in the nation’s tertiary institutions, which consequently led to a sharp decline on the rate of literacy in the country (Igbuzor, 2006:2).

The national literacy rate is said to be at 57%. This undoubtedly shows a major decline when compared to the 71.1% and 64.1% literacy rates in 1991 and 1999 respectively (Igbuzor, 2006:1). The 2005 Nigeria Millennium Development Goals Report (Igbuzor, 2006:2) shows that the literacy level in the country has steadily and gradually deteriorated, especially among the 15-24 years age group. In an almost contrary stance, the Minister for Education in the “Vanguard Newspaper” (Nabugwu, 2013:1) cites an increase in the enrolment of pupils into the nation’s primary schools by 3.7 million from 2010-2012. According to him, the enrolment of students into Junior Secondary School from 2010-2012 has equally increased by 1.1 million. The figures definitely show a major influx in the number of students and pupils going into schools at both the primary and secondary levels of education. However, whether this influx is commensurate with the quality of education given, with regards to the teaching and learning as experienced by the students/pupils, remains to be seen.
Nevertheless, the situation highlights the preparation and selection of teachers as a social concern. There is, therefore, an urgent need for a review and transformation of not just the professional preparation of teachers but their pre-service training programmes in Nigeria as well. As stated by Westbrook et al (2008:1), the present emphasis and interest in the new millennium goals carries major implications for teacher education especially as these goals are directed towards the improvement of educational quality through the transformation and innovation of classroom practices. Thus, the qualities for both pre-service and in-service teacher education have at present become a top priority.

1.2. TEACHER EDUCATION IN NIGERIA -THE ORIGIN

Teacher education refers to teacher preparation. In Nigeria, it is undergone in Colleges of Education and Faculties of Education in Universities that have been specifically created to perform or carry out such functions and activities. Apart from the preparation and training of teacher trainees or student teachers, the Colleges of Education and Universities also perform additional functions of upgrading unqualified and under qualified teachers in the teaching profession (Avoseh, 1992:194). The Colleges of Education were established in order to develop high standard three-year teacher education programmes in middle level colleges. The Teacher Training Colleges, which before now awarded the Grade Two Teacher Certificate (TC II), were abolished in 1998. The National Certificate in Education (NCE), which is awarded by the Colleges of Education, has now been made the minimum teaching qualification in Nigeria, thus replacing the TC II. This has helped to make the process of monitoring the standards of the teaching profession less cumbersome (Avoseh, 1992:198).
Teacher education in Nigeria originated with the coming of the white missionaries during their evangelical mission in the later part of the nineteenth century. It was driven by an urgent need for indigenes that would act as catechists, mass-servers, interpreters and teachers to help the missionaries to teach the people literacy skills so as to enable them (the indigenes) to read the Bible (Omodiagbe, 1992:19). This also paved the way for the use and, inevitably, the rapid spread of the English Language in Nigeria which became a potent tool for communication. The early missionary schools had no formal training for the teachers as those employed were given informal instructions in the homes of the missionaries. As a result, many of the teacher-catechists who took part or wrote examinations under the West Coast Inspectorate were found to be inadequately trained as they lacked the necessary pedagogical skills for the job (Avoseh, 1992:196).

By the end of the nineteenth century, the Methodists, Baptists and Catholic missionaries were taking major steps to pioneer teacher education although this was geared towards furthering their evangelical mission or work in their different regions of missionary operations. Different teacher education programmes sprang up, organised by the different missions. There were no well formulated policies for teacher education and as a result, these pre-service teacher preparation programmes were mostly haphazard since they were based on the respective needs of the missions in charge of them (Avoseh, 1992:196).
1.2.1. Education Reforms and Teacher Education in Nigeria

Most teacher education reforms tend to occur for political rather than educational reasons. This is because, as explained by Ajibola (2008:52), it has become a trend for new governments to abandon policies mid-stream to develop new ones. The Free Education at all levels, Universal Primary Education (UPE) programmes in the past and the present Universal Basic Education Programme, launched by the Federal Government of Nigeria, posed great challenges for teacher education (Olariyan and Obadara, 2008:15). With the past and present policies, the jobs of teachers have become more challenging and cumbersome as they have not only had to inculcate numeracy and literacy skills in their students but have also been faced with the task of laying solid foundations for scientific as well as reflective thinking in their students (Ajibola, 2008:52). The national policy on education aims to make both students and teachers focus more on practical subjects. There is therefore an urgent need for teachers to have sound academic and professional backgrounds.

Given the haphazard structure of many pre-service teacher education programmes which resulted from the lack of well formulated teacher education policies, many teachers in the primary sector received inferior education. An analysis done by Avoseh (1992:198) on the evolution of teacher education in Nigeria revealed that different programmes were developed to meet specific needs. Some were for short-term solutions such as the two year elementary teacher certificate programme and the two-year associateship diploma in education offered at the universities for working teachers. These different
programmes combined with the different admission requirements, led to the
great influx of both qualified and under qualified teachers into the teaching
profession in Nigeria. In order to instil a measure of control and to eliminate any
form of confusion, the NCE was made the minimum teaching qualification by

In Nigeria, the National Teachers' Council (NTC) is saddled with the duty of
accrediting all teaching programmes in order to ensure that the stipulated
minimum standards are not only attained, but maintained and even improved
upon. Although the Universities and Colleges of Education have their respective
co-ordinating bodies – namely the National University Commission (NUC) and
the National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE) - the National
Teachers’ Council serves as a platform of articulation for teacher education
programmes at all levels in Nigeria. With its inauguration in 1989, the National
Commission for Colleges of Education has established the minimum standards
to serve as a bottom line below which no teacher education programme must
sink and above which all teacher education programmes in Colleges of
Education must strive to excel. According to Avoseh (1992:201-202), these
standards ordinarily take into consideration the following:

i) the total credit hours required for graduation

ii) the compulsory courses that must be offered

iii) the ratio of academic to professional courses that must be offered

iv) the qualifications and years of experience of teacher educators who would
teach the student-teachers in these programmes.
The establishment of Colleges of Education was first recommended by the Ashby Commission in 1959 (Ajeyalemi, 2007:1). They were introduced to develop high standard teacher education programmes in middle level colleges. At present, there are about seventy-five Colleges of Education in Nigeria (Isyaku, 2006:4). The Federal Government has given approval to several of these Colleges to develop programmes up to the degree level. With the phasing out of the TC II, and the NCE becoming the minimum teaching qualification, the great majority of graduates from the Colleges of Education, who were originally meant to teach in the secondary schools, now teach in the primary schools.

1.2.2. The Current State of Teacher Education in Nigeria

Education, with special emphasis on higher education, is essential for building a knowledge economy and society in every nation (Saint, Harnett and Strassner, 2003:1). Regrettably, this potential, in higher education systems in developing countries, is often thwarted. The key to modernisation of any society is education and this key, which is the solution of many development problems, is in the hand of the teacher if properly trained (Avoseh, 1992:194). However, very few people seem to realise and acknowledge this fact (Afe, 2006:19).

Teacher education is the bedrock of national development. Inarguably, the health of a nation can be said to be seen in the quality of its teachers. This is because the quality of teachers equally determines the quality of that educational system. However, teacher education in Nigeria is said to be in a lamentably poor state (Igbozor, 2007:6). The cause for this apparently lies in the reality that many education programmes in Africa are not adapted to the needs
and aspirations of the people for whom these programmes have been developed (Ajibola, 2008:56). For teacher quality to rise above the educational system, a strong teacher education programme has to be in place (Afe, 2006:3). This is even more important for third world countries where teachers remain the major managers of knowledge and their roles cannot be efficiently and effectively substituted with machines or computers programmed to teach (Akinwumi, 2008:1) due to lack of technological expertise and very limited financial resources.

Teacher education in Nigeria has been greatly neglected and these years of neglect are beginning to take their toll on the education sector as a whole. Scholars in Education have blamed the government for its inconsistencies in the implementation of formulated policies, many of which have failed due to lack of adequate planning, preparation and provision of the much needed facilities, skilled and well trained personnel that would have ensured the successful implementation of such policies (Afe, 2006:15). As described by Emenajo (1998:6), Nigeria is a nation that has a lot of laudable policies in education but is, however, very low and deficient in the implementation of these policies.

It is an indisputable fact that the 1976 Universal Primary Education and the Free Education at All Levels Policies implemented between 1980-1984 by some State Governments in the country, also led to an explosion in the number of school children enrolled into the schools in Nigeria. Nevertheless, Avoseh (1992:198) points out clearly that the impressive growth in student population in Nigerian schools has not been significantly matched by an appropriate growth in
teacher supply. On average, Obanya (2006:3) places the Teacher–Pupil Ratio (TPR) 1:40 in primary schools. He is, however, quick to caution on the discrepancies that may occur as this figure varies from State to State within the country from as low as 1:19 in Enugu in the eastern part of the country to as high as 1:111 in Yobe State in the northern part of the country.

The Federal Government of Nigeria in a contrary stance, however, has blamed the falling standard of education in the country on the acute shortage and quality of teachers produced by the nation’s tertiary institutions (Afe, 2006:2). The Government accuses the teachers and teacher educators of incompetency in carrying out their duties. This anxiety is echoed by the Kwara State Commissioner who raised alarm over the dismal performance of thousands of teachers (in the State’s primary and secondary schools) in 2008 numeracy and literacy tests meant for pupils in primary four classes. The results of the tests revealed that many of the teachers could not read, let alone use the information from given materials for the preparation of their lesson notes (Inyang, 2008:1).

This act, which was described by the Commissioner as “disgraceful” and “depressing”, led the Commissioner to conclude that the wrong people were in the teaching profession causing and wreaking incalculable damage in the education sector and placing the future of the children in Kwara State in jeopardy. Omole (2008:1) appears to echo the same view as he describes most of the teachers in Nigerian primary and secondary schools as incompetent. Similarly, Ajeyalemi (2008:3), buttressing this point further, states that although having the NCE qualification may certify individuals as teachers, it does not,
however, necessarily make them competent to teach at the intended level of
education. This he says is because of their incompetence in the knowledge of
their subject matter content, teaching and even in their communicative skills.
The need for competent teachers, therefore, cannot be overemphasised
because they determine to a great extent what the next generation will be.

Inyang (2008:2) emphasises that the Kwara State “saga” is a call not just for the
government but to all stakeholders in the Nigerian education sector, to wake up
to the reality of a fallen education system, one that is virtually collapsing and
most of whose products are no longer awarded any serious recognition beyond
the shores of the nation. Nigeria is faced with a crisis in the educational sector
that has arisen due to the incoherent, inconsistent and non-directional
educational policies which have also been poorly implemented. This is in line
with the argument made by Westbrook et al (2008:1) that policy makers and
teacher educators rarely address the suitability and relevance of formulated
policies to the contexts in which teachers work. Therefore, policy makers,
administrators and curriculum planners are not without blame in this matter as
they are said to be largely responsible for pushing forward most of these
policies and have through their very actions hastened the failure and near
collapse of the teaching profession in Nigeria (Inyang, 2008:2).

The inconsistencies and frequent change in and of policies have become very
obvious. According to Ajibola (2008:51), it is gradually becoming a tradition in
Nigeria for different governments to abandon policies in mid-stream. She
stresses that the negative effect of such constant policy somersaults on the
education sector cannot be over emphasised especially as every change in policy seems to occur with a new change in government, which seeks to make its impact felt without a proper consideration of the relevance of such formulated policies to the needs of the people. Based on this, Ajibola (2008:51) thus calls for an urgent assessment and transformation of the different levels of education in the country.

To Inyang (2008:1), the Kwara State “saga” is a pandemic and is a metaphoric representation of the Nigerian educational system as a whole. The ultimate realisation of stipulated educational aims or objectives rests solely with the teachers. This is because it is their ultimate responsibility to translate policies and objectives into action and practice as they teach and interact with their students (Afe, 2006:1). It is disheartening to note therefore, that the teaching profession in Nigeria has become caricatured and ridiculed.

Some scholars and experts in the field have described the teacher education programmes in Nigeria as disjointed and deficient in the production of teachers with the intellectual and professional background needed for their assignment in society (Afe, 2006:15). Blame for this problem has been lodged or placed on teacher educators who Afe (2006) in his inaugural lecture “Reflections of becoming a teacher and the challenges of teacher education”, has referred to as ill prepared. Teacher educators in turn have passed the blame to the government for paying very little attention and for failing to make adequate budget for the training of teachers and for also not putting in place relevant
policies and structures for the retention of good teachers in the teaching profession (Afe, 2006:15).

What teachers do and how they do it go a long way in determining not just the quality of education offered but the quality of teachers produced as well. This may be because, as stated by Afe (2006:19), “the qualities which teachers possess today will inevitably be reflected in the citizens of tomorrow”. As such, it can be said that teachers invariably hold the future of the nation in their hands. In line with this stance, Dike (2002:2) and Akinwumi (2008:1) argue it is of paramount importance that the educators be properly and thoroughly trained and educated so that they too can contribute their quota in the struggle and fight to improve the deteriorating standard of education in Nigeria. This becomes even more important as Obanya in his 2006 article titled “Teaching without Teachers” also shows that Nigerian schools are teaching without teachers at the primary and secondary school levels because of the sharp shortfall in the supply of qualified teachers in schools at both levels of education.

Based on this, Afe (2006:15) argues that teacher education programmes need to be redesigned and directed towards the production of teachers with diversified interests and specialisations, laying emphasis on the creation of new ways of teaching for the new ways of learning. The fact that many teacher educators come into the classroom settings with their own philosophies, strengths and limitations, makes this even more essential (Gorski, 2009:309). The focus on teacher education stems from the firm belief that the child needs certain experiences and competencies to be successful in the society.
Akinwumi (2008:1) describes the primary school level as a foundation level for every child’s education in Nigeria. As such, the incompetence of teachers at this level is of grave concern to many.

According to Ajibola (2008:55), every Nigerian should be able to read and write with understanding and should continue learning by using the written word. Contrary to the objectives of primary education, which lay emphasis on the development and use of effective communicative skills, (Olariyan and Obadara, 2008:10), Ajibola (2008:55) notes that the reverse is the case as in reality there is not only a fall in the reading ability of Nigerians but there is also a big gap between the knowledge taken away from the primary school and that taken to the secondary school. This weak foundation thus affects the performance and competence of students as they proceed from one level of education to another. This point is further buttressed by Dike (2002:2-5) as he observes that of the three levels of education in Nigeria, the primary level is the most troubled. He argues that until the education at this level is improved, the standard of education in the country will continue on a swift downward slide as the tertiary institutions will continue to be populated by students who are not academically and linguistically prepared to face the rigours involved in tertiary education.

From the discussion above, there seems to be ample evidence indicating problems with the Nigerian teacher education system. Although the root of the problem has yet to be clearly identified, it appears that the problem is fast spiralling out of control (Omole, 2008:8). The researcher agrees with Dike (2002) on the need for immediate action so as to save the primary level of
education as the success and progress of the students at this level invariably
determines the success and progress of future students in subsequent levels of
education in the country. As such, the relevance of the primary level in this
research cannot be understated, especially as most of the graduates of the
NCE Programme now teach in primary schools instead of the secondary
schools as originally intended. This research aims to examine the extent to
which the objectives of the NCE programme for English Language teacher
education actually reflect and prepare the student teachers for the challenges
involved in teaching the English Language within the Nigerian context.

1.3. ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING IN NIGERIA – THE CRISES

The English Language in Nigeria has been described by many scholars as a
skill-based subject (Nta, et al, 2008:95) and as such the development of
professional teachers in the subject is needed for the adequate preparation of
students towards competence in the language at all levels of learning in Nigeria.
According to Osagie (2012:1) the results of the West African Council (WAEC)
showed that in 2011 only 31% of the students who took the examinations
passed five subjects, including Mathematics and English Language. Although
the record shows an improvement in the performance of the students from
previous years, it undoubtedly portrays not only the seriousness of the
educational crises but the deplorable and, what Osagie describes as, the
“pitiable state” of the nation’s education.

Ajibade (2005:122) believes that the training system or programmes for all
categories of teachers be reviewed in order to make them more efficient and
effective. As noted by Nta, Egbe and Oden (2008:95), a lot of studies have given undue emphasis to the methods of teaching the English Language without paying equal attention to the expertise and teaching needs of the teacher of the English Language as well as the adequacy of the preparation of the teacher of the English Language in Nigeria. It would appear that more time is devoted to the theoretical aspects of teaching the language than on actually practising the theories learned (Popoola, 2008:77).

Emenajo (1998:7) lends credence to this point as he believes that there is a dearth of trained English Language teachers all through the education system in Nigeria. In his view, the English Language remains the worst taught subject in the school system. This he says is because the practising teachers in English Language are not only poorly motivated but ill trained, overworked, unevenly distributed and above all, abysmally insufficient in number. He argues that many qualified teachers with (what he terms) “paper qualifications” are not able to teach the subject.

Following the same thread of argument with Emenajo (1998), Ajibola (2008:56) states emphatically that there can be no positive impact made in a system of education that lays more emphasis more on “paper certification” and mainly encourages the acquisition of theoretical/subject knowledge (of the course contents of the programme) in which the students or student teachers are just passive recipients of knowledge in the teaching and learning experience. He believes that efforts should also be concentrated on the development of the natural skills of the learner which can only evolve through adequate training and
practice. Nta, Egbe and Oden (2008:98) contend that proper attention should equally be paid to the initial preparation and adequate exposure of English Language teacher trainees to good classroom practices in language teaching. This they believe will help fill the gap.

The need to address professional preparation and development of teachers of the English Language cannot be over emphasised and it should be seen as paramount in effecting the improvement in the quality of student performance in the English Language. The findings from different research conducted by different scholars like Yeh (2008), Kadiri and Onoja (2008) and Ayodele and Akindutire, (2009) have further justified this stance as they have been able to show through their respective studies that there is a definite relationship between quality teacher education and student achievements. Worthy of note also is the partnership between the NTI and the British Council, which through its activities and joint programmes, have demonstrated that the improvement of the teacher’s effectiveness is central to securing improvement in performance in English Language (Nta, Egbe and Oden, 2008:97).

According to Babatunde (2002:130) the English Language is encountered as a second language by many Nigerians through formal classroom settings. Many language scholars have consequently pointed out that the lack of adequate learning facilities is a major disadvantage to this approach. Emphasising this point further, Babatunde also states succinctly that although the importance of the English Language in the Nigerian educational system remains almost unchallenged as it continues to occupy the pride of place, the failure of English
Language teaching in recent years is painfully obvious. Omole (2008:8), observes and states categorically that as the language dwindles and declines so also does the relevance of the teacher of the English Language to the economic development of Nigeria as a nation. Ker (2002:121) apparently toes the same line of argument with Babatunde (2002). In his opinion, the English Language is poorly learnt not because it is a foreign language; it is poorly learnt because it is poorly taught.

As pointed out by Inyang (2008:2), even within Nigeria as a country, many employers of labour still prefer to employ graduates from foreign Universities because of the quality of education. He notes that without a functional education system, the future of Nigeria is indeed a bleak one as it cannot afford a population that is illiterate (and even worse, half-literate) in this scientific and technological age because, as aptly explained by Dike (2002:5), the economic growth of any nation can only be sustained if a good number of the adult working population can read and write well. Competency in the use of the English Language opens up an array of opportunities to individuals within the Nigerian context to improve their financial status and consequently guarantees them growth and a future. The language is essentially regarded as the building blocks on which careers are constructed.

The present state of the education sector has led many Nigerians, linguists and scholars included, to express fears and to envisage that with the current deteriorating standard of the English Language in the country, the majority of the people, not just students and graduates, may have difficulties
communicating intelligibly in the language in the international contexts (Maisamari, 2002:268).

1.3.1. Current Research Focus

Following the thread of the argument above and given the nature of the massive challenge currently encountered by teacher education in Nigeria, this research aims primarily to evaluate the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level in line with the stipulated objectives and policies guiding the implementation and management of the programme in two Colleges of Education within the Nigerian context. The study is in line with the concern raised by Kiely and Rea-Dickens (2005:64) that although most language evaluation research focus on the language, there is, however, a gap in the literature as most of the studies do not take into cognizance the educational policy contexts and management within which such policies are implemented. This research intends to fill this gap as it aims to examine how the objectives and policies under study in the said programme are translated into real practice within the Nigerian context itself.

An English Language teacher education programme in a second language context has been chosen for this research because, as stated by Norris (2009:8), evaluation research, which focus on language teacher education programmes, is limited. Some work, limited in scope, can be found on other language teacher education programmes. However, the same cannot be said for that of the English Language teacher education programme in second language contexts as evaluation research in this area is indeed limited.
Therefore, to bridge the gap between theory and practice identified by Westbrook et al (2008:2), this research aims to study the extent to which the stated objectives of the programme under study reflect the actual teaching needs of student teachers from the Colleges of Education.

The English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level includes both language and literature courses. Given the current challenge faced in the teaching of English Language within the Nigerian context, it is, however, important to state here that it is the language aspect of the programme that is of paramount interest in this research. As has been discussed earlier, in Nigeria the mastery of the English Language invariably determines the performance and the success of students in every other field or area of specialisation.

This research aims to:

1) critically analyse the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme as it pertains to the teaching and learning of the English Language Courses in the programme.

2) identify the teaching needs of the student teachers from the two Colleges of Education under study.

3) examine if and how the stated objectives are interpreted through their realisation by the lecturers in the classes of Colleges of Education.

4) examine if and how the objectives reflect the teaching needs of the student teachers.

Consequently the research questions for the study are as follows:
1. What are the stated objectives of the English Language teachers’ education programme in Nigeria?

2. What are the teaching needs of the student teachers in the two Colleges of Education under study?

3. How are the objectives interpreted and applied in the classes of Colleges of Education in Nigeria?

4. To what extent do the objectives reflect the teaching needs of student teachers in the programme?

1.3.2. Significance of Study

It is envisaged that the findings of this research will lead to the building or development of a theory or model thereby contributing to the development of theoretical knowledge, as well as to practice and policy in language evaluation and language education. Evaluation practice is generally regarded as a context for theory building (Kiely and Rea-Dickens, 2005:16). By giving a detailed description of the procedures involved in undertaking the evaluation of the English Language teacher education programme in the two Colleges of Education involved in the study, the research will contribute to the literature on evaluation of language teacher education which is presently an under-researched area.

The research evaluates an English Language teacher education programme in the Nigerian context using two separate settings – College of Education A and College of Education B (see Section 3.4.5). Although as a case study the research is not able to make general conclusions, nevertheless, through its
findings it is able to draw deep conclusions. As such, the research becomes a guide or springboard for further research in this field by government bodies and other stakeholders in the education industry in Nigeria. This will enhance policy making as well as put in place programmes which will encourage teachers individually to assess the practical impact of their teaching on learners.

The active participation of lecturers and students in the evaluation of the programme in the two Colleges of Education under study not only ensures an implementation of the research findings, it also, more importantly, leads to an understanding of the different programme processes in both Colleges. This will invariably help to create a sense of ownership of the programme, thereby raising the level of commitment and desire of both lecturers and students to see the programme function properly and succeed.

The findings of the research will hopefully act as an “eye-opener” for the government in Nigeria and in particular help it to identify loop-holes within other programmes, placing and developing the needed machineries to match policy with implementation. The study will create the much needed awareness for the development of a system of internal evaluation for educational programmes within the academic community.

The importance of this research as mentioned earlier cannot be overemphasised given the present challenges encountered in the teaching of the English Language. The study can, therefore, be described as a timely one as it aims to tackle the problem from the roots by evaluating an English
Language teacher education programme at the foundation level of teacher education in two different schools. To give an accurate picture of the programme, the study will be carried out by looking at the programme from different perspectives which will involve those of the programme stakeholders. These include the students and lecturers as the primary users of the programme and the policy makers/management of the institution who are regarded in this research as the secondary users of the programme (Robson, 2000:16). This is clearly illustrated in Figure 6.1.
CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. INTRODUCTION

Evaluation research on educational programmes has come a long way over the years. It is a process that involves the collection of information on a programme in order to make relevant judgements and decisions about the programme which ultimately may lead to suggestions for improvement or serve as a basis for the termination of bad programmes (Stufflebeam and Shinkfield, 2007:5). According to Kiely (2009:102), the dimensions of evaluation research presently go a long way to share views on the improvement of teaching in educational programmes. It is a practice driven field which is characterised by constant change and is said to have diversified due to the reflection on experiences by those involved (Goldie, 2006:211). Its focus on practicality brings about the establishment of a quality that serves as a guarantee for respective stakeholders as well as prospective students (Kiely, 2009:103).

There appears to be quite an extensive literature on evaluation research of educational programmes with some of them focusing on language programmes in particular. Inglis et al (1995) in their article titled “Student and Probationary Teachers’ Evaluation of a Concurrent Teacher Education Programme” examine the extent to which students taking the programme relate theory and practice. The findings of the study reveal that the probationary teachers and students are more preoccupied with the task of surviving teaching, adjusting to the school environment and are not too concerned about the theoretical aspects of their training. Llosa and Slayton (2009) in their article “Using Programme Evaluation to Inform and Improve the Education of Young English Language Learners in
US Schools” focus on how programme evaluation can be conducted and the findings communicated in a clear and meaningful manner so as to facilitate the improvement of education for young English Language learners. Norris (2009) in “Understanding and Improving Language Education through Programme Evaluation: Introduction to the Special Issue” examines how language education can be better understood and improved through programme evaluation. He equally stresses the utilisation of evaluation methods to shed light on the outcomes and processes of language programmes.

In spite of the vast amount of research or work already covered in the area of evaluation research, Peacock (2009:259) identifies the field of language teacher education as an area which still requires a lot of evaluative research as it is currently regarded as a major under-researched area. In the view of Freeman and Johnson (1996:397) research in this area is “noticeably missing”. Emphasising this point further, Coskun and Daloglu (2010:24) specifically identified the evaluation of pre-service English Language teacher education programmes as an area still limited in research. Although Ong’ondo and Borg (2011) focus their study on an English Language teacher education programme within Kenya, their work is not evaluative research as it mainly seeks to examine the influence of supervision on the teaching practices of the student teachers in that programme.

Coskun and Daloglu in their 2010 study equally highlight the lack of models specifically designed for the evaluation of pre-service English Language teacher education programmes. This research, which focuses on the evaluation of the
English language teacher education programme at the NCE level in two Nigerian Colleges of Education, aims to fill this gap as it seeks to expand the boundaries of knowledge in this field through the development of a model for the evaluation of the English Language teacher education programme, with particular focus on the second language context.

Norris (2009:8) notes the still insufficient number of published “thorough-going” evaluative studies which focus on specific challenges constantly encountered by language educators across the teaching profession. He attributes this gap in literature to the fact that most reports on evaluative studies are produced for evaluation clients and not for the general academic public. The literature available shows very little description of procedures for the general evaluation of second language teacher education programmes. By undertaking research in the afore-mentioned topic therefore, this study intends to fill the gap as the procedures undertaken and findings of this research will be written clearly in a thesis which in future will be published to serve as reference to other researchers in the field.

Consequently in this Chapter, there is a review of literature relevant to: the concept of programme evaluation and language education, the functions of evaluation in language programmes, evaluation models, evaluation research of language teacher education programmes in different contexts, practical teaching in language teacher education programme and the concept of knowledge and skill in language teacher education programmes.
2.2. THE CONCEPT OF PROGRAMME EVALUATION AND LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Evaluation has been defined in various ways by different scholars. The definitions given are perhaps based on the varied perceptions of the roles played and functions/purposes of evaluation. To Robinson (2003:199), it is the collection, analysis and interpretation of information in order to form value judgements about a specific programme (Robinson, 2003:199). Expatiating further on her definition, Robinson describes it as a value laden exercise directed at the provision of information on various perceptions of the programme’s value, measurement of the extent to which the objectives have been achieved and the provision of the necessary feedback for the overall improvement of the programme. In Stufflebeam’s view (2001:3) it is the assessment of a programme’s merit and worth through a systematic and rigorous process. This definition is taken a step further by Kiely (2009:100) who also sees programme evaluation as a form of enquiry but argues that it does not only give a description of the achievements of a programme; it equally provides reasons for these achievements and proffers suggestions which can be taken as necessary steps to secure more improvements on the programme.

Kiely’s definition of evaluation stands out as it attempts to identify, describe and also give reasons for the said achievements of a programme. It thus focuses on the strength and positive aspects of a programme without necessarily emphasising the weak aspects of the programme which are nevertheless not ignored as he equally proffers or provides suggestions as to how the programme can be further improved. This to a certain extent appears to agree
with the view held or propounded by the proponents of the appreciative inquiry evaluation model (Preskill and Catasambas, 2006:1).

The definitions given appear to emphasise an important element and that is the systematic nature of evaluation programmes. In fact, Salihoglu (2012: 3440) describes it as a prerequisite for any evaluation programme. From the definitions above, evaluation can therefore be said to involve a series of rigorous and systematic activities which not only gives much needed value judgements on educational programmes, but also provides quality information on the various components of the programme and how they function for the achievement of pre-stated or stipulated goals or objectives as well as information on how to improve the programme.

Although evaluation has evolved to the status of an applied science in its own rights and has become an integral part of many educational programmes (Goldie, 2006:211), there is at present a major focus on language programme evaluation which has gained renewed recognition as a result of the increasing demands in language education in response to the persistent challenges encountered by language educators in the teaching field. Language educators are becoming increasingly “tuned in” to the importance and urgent need for the evaluation of programmes not only for improvement, education effectiveness but even for the very survival of the teaching profession (Norris, 2009:7). Nevertheless, despite this renewed recognition, the relationship between evaluation and language education can be described as ambivalent. In other words, it is still regarded by some as a necessary evil. Although evaluations are
essential for the growth and development of educational programmes, many organisations or establishments are not willing to face up to the weakness and faults which may be revealed within such programmes.

Beretta (1992:12), however, attributes this problem to what has been referred to as a general lack of awareness of language educators on the likely contributions of thorough and intentional approaches to the use of evaluation in educational programmes. Although programme evaluation is very often equated with accountability and managerial models of education (Beretta, 1992:19), it is in most cases perceived by teachers as a process that is apart and external to them, an activity which is intrinsically judgemental and value driven and over which they have no control.

Goldie (2006:218) sounds a note of caution as he stresses the need for evaluators to be aware and cautious of the political context in which they carry out their research and of their own values and beliefs. This in Norris view (2009:11) is especially so as most evaluation programmes have come to be wielded as political tools given the fact that the feedback to such activities usually lead to the change or formulation of new policies thereby posing a challenge of political volatility or instability to language programme evaluators.

Many researchers come into the evaluation contexts with and draw on their own values and philosophies which in most cases are based on the literature to which they have been exposed as evaluation is essentially value driven. This, however, is in contrast with the beliefs of the early evaluators who were of the
opinion that evaluation is a value free exercise (Goldie, 2006:210). There is at present an emergence of an evaluation practice that is responsive to the present challenges and demands encountered by practitioners in the field of language education. For example, Cruikshank and Netwell (2003) conducted an evaluative study on meeting the English Language needs of non-English speaking students in a teacher education programme. This can also be related to the outcries and increased concern for the English language demands in teacher education. In Nigeria, for example, although the English Language is described as a skill-based subject (Nta, Egbe and Oden, 2008:95), the teaching of the language in most parts of the country has failed. Salau (2000) evaluates the use of the electronic media in the promotion of a literacy education programme in a northern state in Nigeria. To date, the issue of literacy still poses a very strong challenge in the northern part of Nigeria.

To this end, Moloney (2005:2) argues that teachers should not be isolated as it is not only language experts who need to be trained to deal with learners language needs but all teachers in general. This view is to some extent explored by Gibson (2008:2076) who believes firmly that the roles played by teachers in schools have been deepened and broadened due to the pace of social change which has equally been increased by the expectations of the schools.

Although Peacock (2009:260) argues for a system of regular internal evaluation in teacher-training programmes, he, however, identifies the field of Language teacher education as one that is still under researched. To Barkhuizen and
Borg (2010: 237-238) it is still an area of emergent inquiry. In their view “…it is not characterised by a well-defined research agenda and a programmatic approach to research”. Language teacher education can be said to be a constant negotiation between the actual practices of teachers and current practices and theories evolving in different contexts. In order to create ample “opportunities for shared knowledge development and practical advancement” in the field of Language teacher education, Barkhuizien and Borg (2010:238) thus advocate for more research in the area, across broader geographical backgrounds/contexts. This research caters to this as it is centred on an English language teacher education programme at the minimum level of teaching qualification – NCE - within the Nigerian context.

Interestingly, Tarone and Allwright (2005:6) argue that in planning the language teacher education programmes, the issue of the social context of the school is not taken into consideration. This view is also shared by Moloney (2005:2) who believes that teachers are framed and defined by their work context. The above comments seem to suggest that social context as a factor plays an important role in determining the effectiveness of teaching and learning.

Surprisingly, the argument made by Tarone and Allwright as stated above can be said to be very relevant as findings from many studies on the context under study have shown this to be true. For example, despite the research carried out by scholars and linguists like Odumuh (2002) Oderinde (2005), Omadiagbe (2004) and Ker (2002) in which their respective findings revealed or identified national language policy, curriculum overload, inadequate facilities and lack of
well trained teachers amongst the many factors militating against the teaching of the English Language within the Nigerian context, very little has been done to effectively improve and move language teacher education programmes forward.

With the increased demands for accountability comes an equal increase in opportunities for evaluation which is said to be vital for the development and improvement of language education programmes. As a result, Peacock (2009:261) contends for teacher education programmes to embody a system for internal programme evaluation that include a mechanism for the retrieval and use of feedback in whole programmes. In his view, this becomes a profitable step towards professionalising the field of English language teaching. In addition, Roberts (1998: 235-236) also emphasises the need for language programme evaluations to be carefully planned as they are never neutral and tend to reveal the stresses and competition within an institution.

It thus becomes expedient to make adequate plans and take necessary steps that would help evaluators understand the context of the programme before the commencement of the evaluation exercise (Holden and Zimmerman, 2009:1). With reference to the study at hand, the researcher is a member of staff of one of the Colleges of Education under study and therefore familiar with the context and as such is aware of some of the challenges encountered in the course of conducting the evaluation. In order to collect rich data, the researcher has involved the students and lecturers of the department of English in the two Colleges of Education. There are also interviews for selected student teachers and some language lecturers of the department of English and Literary Studies.
The study involves a series of observations of classes taught by lecturers and student-teachers (on teaching practice) and a critical analysis of relevant documents to the programme. Close attention is also paid to the views of the different programme stakeholders so as to represent their varied value perspective in the evaluation of the programme. This is because of the need for the evaluation to be flexible and responsive (Stufflebeam and Shinkfield, 2007:23).

Over the years language evaluation has evolved and grown from studies centred on teaching methods which were developed based on learning theories, to the management of curriculum, paying special attention to quality assurance and enhancement in educational programmes. This view is further reinforced by Kiely (2009:103) who draws attention to the apparent lack of evaluation research which centres on the actual social worlds of language programmes, the observation of teachers at work as they make education happen on a daily basis and the quality of educational efforts and learning as experienced by the learners. This study, in addition to critically analysing the objectives of the teacher education programme under study, aims to also investigate how these objectives are interpreted and applied as the lecturers teach their students in the classes of Colleges of Education. It also seeks to gather first-hand information on the quality of learning as experienced by the student-teachers who are the learners in this context.

Bartolome (1994:179) strongly insists that it is important to evaluate the language teacher education programme based on the extent to which such
programmes prepare and train the teachers to operate within their own socio-cultural context. Kiely and Rea-Dickens (2005:64) have equally observed that “evaluations often have to be carried out in a manner which looks at the English Language programme but not at the educational policy context… within which it is implemented”. For example, Peacock (2009) in evaluating a foreign language teacher education programme in the Hong Kong context has focused mainly on the programme, not much attention has been given to the issue of policies guiding the implementation of the language and programme within the said context. Igweike (2005) also evaluates the immersion programme for the French language within the Nigerian context. Again there is not much said about the policy guiding the programme and language in the context. This research intends to fill this gap as it aims to evaluate the English Language teacher education programme in two Colleges of Education in Nigeria in line with the stipulated objectives and policies guiding the implementation of the programme within the Nigerian context.

According to Kiely (2009:99), the ultimate aim of any evaluation programme is learning. In order for this to occur and to promote learning at the levels of theory, policy and teaching practice, he thus contends that evaluation programmes be socially-situated cycles of enquiries, dialogue and action. To sustain the development of programme evaluation practice so as to support language education, there must be an increase in public discourse of evaluation through the sharing of meaningful practice and models with other practitioners and researchers in the field. It is envisaged that the findings that will emerge from this study (though centred on the Nigerian context), will lead to the building
of a model or theory as evaluation practice can be regarded as a context for
theory building (Kiely and Rea-Dickens, 2005:16).

By developing a language programme evaluation model, adapted from the
literature reviewed in this study, and outlining the step by step procedure of this
evaluative research, contribution is made to the development of the theoretical
knowledge on practice and policy in language evaluation. The research shows
the manner and extent to which practice is shaped by policy in Language
Teacher Education (LTE).

2.3. FUNCTIONS OF EVALUATION IN LANGUAGE PROGRAMMES

According to Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007:5) evaluation can be referred to
as “society’s most fundamental discipline”. The functions of evaluation in
language programmes vary as they are to a very large extent determined by the
aims, views and beliefs of the evaluator(s). To Goldie (2006:210), the evaluation
process involves decisions on important issues related to evaluation criteria,
performance standards and evaluation weightings. It is virtually impossible for
these not to be affected by the personal views and values of the evaluator(s).
Some evaluation programmes might be aimed at providing information on how
different groups perceive the values of a programme or measuring the extent to
which the objectives of the programme have been achieved and even proffering
suggestions on possible ways for improving aspects of the programme for the
According to Rea-Dickens and Kiely (2005:6) evaluation research can be seen from two angles: it is viewed as a study which performs the function of research which entails expanding the frontiers of knowledge, performing the function of assessing a programme to determine its worth and effectiveness in order to provide information that would facilitate decision making on the programme. It is also regarded as research that focuses on the evaluation process. Evaluation research usually focuses on the study of selected variables that are of interest to the researcher for the development and formulation of theory and policies respectively (Stufflebeam and Shinkfield, 2007:24). The uniqueness of this research can thus be said to be twofold:

1) It seeks to expand the frontiers of theoretical knowledge in the area of policy and evaluation practice and language education by examining not just the language but also paying close attention to the policies which guide the use and implementation of the language within the Nigerian context.

2) It equally seeks to evaluate an English Language teacher education programme at the foundation level of teacher training whose graduates are meant to teach in the Junior Secondary Schools but in reality many eventually teach in the primary schools which coincidentally is also the foundation level for ESL learners in Nigeria.

There is an increased demand for evaluation across the present-day landscape of education (Norris, 2009:12). This is due to the urgent need for accountability in educational programmes and the necessity to demonstrate support for improvement in practice to promote accurate understanding for the need and values of effective language programmes in modern-day society. Despite the
fact that most evaluation programmes are very often used as political tools in many communities and educational settings, they are in fact considered as educational tools which can contribute immensely to the understanding and improvement of educational programmes (Norris, 2009:7). This is because of their unique tendencies to provide strong and significant insights into the nature and structure of programmes. Yang (2009:77) aptly describes evaluation as the heart that not only connects but pumps blood to all other elements of a programme. In other words, for a programme to be “alive” and to achieve its full potential it must have an inbuilt evaluation plan which must be designed and utilised fully.

Evaluations serve internal and external interests as they tend to take on board the interests of primary and secondary stakeholders, informing both formative and summative purposes as well as empowering language teachers and learners in order to make language teaching and learning more effective. Evaluation programmes are used to shed light on the outcomes and processes of a language programme through different perspectives. They provide very useful information for the improvement of language teaching and learning within such programmes and thereby illuminate and ensure the value of language education within the society (Harris, 2009:56).

This evaluation research is formative in nature as it seeks to provide feedback in the form of the evaluation findings which will also be written in the form of a report for the major stakeholders of an on-going NCE programme. This will hopefully lead to the further improvement of the said programme. It aims to
identify and analyse the objectives of the language teacher education programme and also to examine the extent to which the objectives have been achieved. It is hoped that the findings of the research will be utilised properly to assist in the improvement and overall growth or advancement of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level.

Evaluation can be described as an activity that is very integral to the teaching and learning of language. While acknowledging the arguably political nature of evaluation programmes, Harris (2009:55) stresses a crucial need for evaluators to look beyond doing good research and take into serious consideration the different interpretations and uses for evaluation findings which should be communicated in ways to raise public awareness about the complexity of multiple factors affecting and which eventually shape educational effectiveness.

Evaluation programmes do not only raise the awareness of those involved but also tend to focus on the provision of answers to priority questions of a programme. As such, there is the potential for evaluation programmes to transform or change poor educational programmes into highly successful and effective ones. This is because such programmes help to verify or disprove claims as they usually highlight certain elements, characteristics, strengths and weaknesses in a programme that will otherwise have been missed or overlooked. This research examines the English teacher education programme as run or carried out or studied in two different Colleges of Education.
In order to build expertise in the area of language programme evaluation therefore, there is urgent need to encourage the publication of reports on the full process involved in the research (Ellis, 2009:239). Although evaluations which involve teacher education programmes are quite common, and many universities engage in regular evaluations of programmes at the departmental level, most of the evaluation programmes reported on very often are done by external evaluators. Many of such evaluation reports are hardly made public as most stakeholders usually insist that they be kept confidential. The researcher in this case has undertaken this research of her own volition and as such intends to publish the findings of the research to help expand the knowledge in this area.

According to Kiely (2009:99), learning, which is the primary aim of any language evaluation programme, can occur in three different contexts, namely research which involves theory building, policy building and professional practice which involves classroom and curriculum development. This study thus becomes relevant as it aims to create an evaluation model and as such seeks to expand the frontier of knowledge with its contribution to theory and practice. There should be an increase in collaborative activities to allow teachers and other stakeholders to be actively engaged and involved in the monitoring process. This is because, according to Peacock (2009:235), teachers’ feeling of ownership of an evaluation programme increases when they participate in the programme and share in the information gathered. It not only provides new and different perspectives on the phenomena or happenings in the programme, it also creates avenues for teachers to develop their careers as well as providing
them with the much needed inspiration and sense of fulfilment that comes with the achievement of something good.

In summary therefore, the importance of evaluation as discussed above cannot be over emphasised as it continues to perform vital functions which are crucial for the success and growth of any social organisation and programme. It is necessary that a programme’s goals, structure and process be assessed periodically through evaluation to ascertain not only the true state of the programme but to also ensure its constant and advanced improvement (Stufflebeam and Shinkfield, 2007:7).

2.4. EVALUATION MODELS

Evaluation models connote different things to different people. To Galluzzo and Craig (1990:600) evaluation model refer to a philosophical stance towards evaluative practices and techniques of data collection; it is used for the identification of practices. Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007:28) view evaluation model as the theorist’s ideal framework of how an evaluation should be conducted. Evaluation models can thus be defined as a set of steps or procedures (which may also be graphically represented) followed in order to measure or assess the worth of a given programme and to obtain relative data for the subsequent improvement and enhancement of a given programme.

Different models for evaluating language programmes have been developed by scholars and experts in the field of evaluation research. This apparently is due to the fact that different forms of evaluation will serve different purposes.
Evaluation models show the question which a specific form of evaluation desires to answer (Hansen, 2005:448). There are multiple evaluation models, each unique in the manner in which they function. However, for the purpose of this research, a number of evaluation models have been selected and will be reviewed based on their relevance to this evaluation research. The evaluation models selected include the following: the responsive model, objective-based model, illumination model, CIPP model, logic model, evaluation voices and Peacock’s evaluation model.

2.4.1. Responsive Model

The model was designed by Stake in 1980 (Reeves, 1997:174). It is based on what people do naturally while evaluating things- observation and reaction. The evaluator is expected to be sensitive and alert to respond in the same natural manner that people assimilate and understand information. The model is also referred to as transactional as it responds to the requirements for information by the respective audience or stakeholders of the programme, ensuring that the different value perspectives of the different stakeholders in the programme are reflected and presented in the evaluation report (Payne, 1994:73). It tends to focus more directly on the programme than on the intents of the programme, drawing a constant comparison with that which was originally intended and that which is actually observed in a programme (Worthen, 1990:45). It is an essentially useful model for formative evaluation.
2.4.2. Objective Based Evaluation Model

The model was designed by Tyler in 1949. It is centred on the attainment of the given goals of a specific programme. The quality of the evaluation is determined based on the level of clarity with which the objectives of the programme are given as the programme is only judged successful if the behavioural objectives of the programme are said to be achieved. Standardized or evaluator’s constructed instruments are used to measure students relevant behaviours. The data obtained from the instruments used is used to compare the extent to which performance and objectives will allow modifications so as to rectify problematic areas in the programme under evaluation (Worthen, 1990:44). The model is seen as a logical one which is scientifically acceptable as it involves pre-test and post-test measurements which can be clearly verified.

2.4.3. Illumination Model

The model was developed by Parlett and Hamilton in 1977. It involves an in-depth-investigation of both the programme and its context. It takes into consideration and examines the operation of the programme, influence of different situations in the school, the merits and demerits as perceived by the stakeholders of the programmes, the impact of the programme on the intellectual tasks and academic experience of the students.

2.4.5. CIPP Model

The model was developed by Stufflebeam in 1971. It is described as a four-in-one evaluation model of evaluation which involves context evaluation, input evaluation, process evaluation and product evaluation. These are generally
regarded as separate forms of evaluation although in more comprehensive and complicated programmes they can be used as stages or steps in the evaluation programme. Each component of the CIPP model is discussed below:

Context Evaluation: The context of the programme under evaluation is focused on. A good description and proper examination is given and carried out by the evaluator who also conducts both needs and goals assessments and then attempts to establish if the pre-stated goals or objectives of the programme meet the identified needs. The context evaluation is especially useful when making decisions that have to do with programme planning.

Input Evaluation: This looks at the input and resources to be used in a programme. It also involves a comparison of the programme’s performance with other programmes, the cost benefits and an evaluation of the proposed programme design.

Process Evaluation: The focus is mainly on the implementation of the programme. It also entails a critical monitoring of the programme process. It seeks to identify defects in the procedural design of the programme and its implementation. The Process evaluation helps the evaluator to make decisions that have to do with implementation and formative evaluation.

Product Evaluation: This looks at both the intended and unintended outcomes of the programme. Benefit assessment is carried out to determine the cost effectiveness of the programme as compared to other programmes which are of similar nature and structure. It is useful when making summative evaluation decision about programme.
2.4.6. Logic Model

It refers to a sequence of logical steps which can be graphically represented to illustrate the design and implementation of the programme to be evaluated. Simply put, it can be referred to as the road map of the evaluated programme. It thus serves as a framework of the work of the evaluator. Outcomes are linked with programme activities and the theoretical assumptions or principles of the programme (Kaplan and Garrett, 2005:167). It thus smoothens and aids thinking, planning and communications about the programme’s stated objectives and its actual accomplishments. It illustrates through a systematic means the relationship amongst resources in a programme, planned activities as well as pre-empted changes and results. Its main components include: planned work, resources, activities, intended results, outputs, outcomes and impact.

2.4.7. Evaluation Voices

The model was developed by O’Sullivan and O’Sullivan in 1998. It was adapted from two models, namely Cluster evaluation and Community voices (O’Sullivan and O’Sullivan, 1998:22). It is based on the assumption that programmes which have similar goals are able to strengthen their strategies through cluster networking. It encourages a system of built in evaluation in programmes as it advocates for evaluation expertise to be built and developed from within the programme. Since the staff and other stakeholders are directly involved in carrying out the evaluation, there is likely to be a significant increase in the chances of the findings or report being put to effective use.
2.4.8. Peacock’s Evaluation Model

The model was designed by Peacock in 2009 for the evaluation of Foreign Language Teaching (FLT) training programmes. The model is intended to promote regular internal evaluation in FLT programmes. According to Peacock (2009:262) the design is based on the following procedure:

- Review the literature and produce a set of questions.
- Establish appropriate sources of data in your setting.
- Choose and design data collection methods and instruments.
- Construct an account by relating each interpretation to the others.

Peacock’s model centres on the effective use of a set of fifteen questions developed from the relevant literature. The list of questions is comprehensive and as such, designed to allow for the collection of valuable information from the different stakeholders involved in a programme (Coskun and Daloglu, 2010:28).

Having reviewed relevant literature on evaluation models, it is important to discuss the aspects of some of the models that have been reviewed that may be of relevance and use in this current study. Generally, the type of model used in evaluation research is to a large extent determined by the form and purpose of the study, the object or programme to be evaluated and the problem to be solved (Hansen, 2005:1). This study aims to evaluate an on-going English language teacher education programme situated within the Nigerian context. As such, it becomes necessary to develop an evaluation model that is not only unique and suitable but equally effective for the evaluation of the English Language teacher education programme within the Nigerian context while
paying close attention to not just the language but also to the intricate interplay of factors and related policies which affect the programme, its implementation and ultimately its impact.

The study can be said to be formative in nature as it is primarily concerned with the evaluation of an on-going language teacher education programme with the aim of using the reports and findings generated to identify the strengths and weakness within the programme. It equally aims to determine the programme’s worth and means by which the programme can further be improved for maximal achievements of its stipulated goals. To this end, it becomes expedient that the evaluator be sensitive to the needs of the programme stakeholders taking into consideration their different value perspectives and the context of the programme. This can be done by identifying the needs of the primary users of the programme (as indicated in the CIPP model) who in this case are the student teachers in the programme. These needs, when compared to the identified objectives of the programme, will undoubtedly reveal the extent to which the objectives of the programme are being achieved.

There will be strong focus on the objectives of the programme as it is the focal point of the study and it determines to a great extent the direction of the study. The model designed will involve the use of a series of logical steps or phases which may not necessarily be represented graphically or in a pictorial manner. It is important to look at both the strengths and weaknesses of a programme and to identify and describe why they occur in a given programme in order to ensure
improvement and maximal output and good quality impact for the advancement of a programme.

Given the fact that the Evaluation Voices model draws on a pool of expertise from similar programmes, it encourages that expertise to be drawn from within individual programmes. This no doubt helps stakeholders involved in the evaluation to develop their skills as well as interests in evaluation which ultimately enables them to also carry out their own personal (which may be on a relatively smaller scale) evaluations within their organisation. An aspect of this approach might be considered in order to encourage the stakeholders to be involved in this study, to invest and build a system of internal programme evaluation within the English Language teacher education programme in both Colleges of Education involved in the study. This will not only assist in exploiting the overall success of the programme but will equally help to identify and nip problems that would otherwise have hindered the progress of the programme in the bud.

Like Peacock (2009), a review of relevant literature is undertaken in this study to examine the nature of evaluation research carried out on pre-service English Language teacher education programme within the context under study. This is, however, taken a step further as some studies on the evaluation of other pre-service language teacher education programmes in other contexts are equally reviewed. The primary focus of Peacock’s model is on the effective utilisation of a set of questions developed from the literature reviewed; whereas, in this study, the researcher uses the research questions as her guide. The research
instruments are chosen and designed based on the research questions which equally determine the sources of data for the study (see Section 3.4.6). The choice of research instruments used in the study shows a one sided view of the programme as only the views of the research participants and programme users are reflected. Coskun and Daloglu (2010:39) identify this as a weakness as the view presented is subjective.

In conclusion, it can be said that there is no one acceptable way of evaluating a programme and to enhance improvement and effectiveness of evaluation programmes, an eclectic approach can be used. Consequently, in this evaluation research, a blend of the different approaches discussed above is adopted as no one model of evaluation is necessarily the best or most appropriate (Stufflebeam and Shinkfield, 2007:7).

2.5. EVALUATION OF LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMMES IN DIFFERENT SOCIAL CONTEXTS

Evaluation has emerged as a form of research and enquiry to dialogues within programmes as means for continuous creation and improvement of learning opportunities in language programmes (Kiely, 2009:102). Most language programme evaluation studies carried out in many educational settings are done with different aims which may include confirming or informing second language learning theories, identifying instructional methods which would then be established as a basis for practice in classrooms and even for the development of curriculum materials.
Evaluation of language teacher education programmes is described by Ellis (2009:237) as a relatively neglected field in language teaching research. In fact, as stated by Peacock (2009:279) such kinds of research are indeed “...few and far between”. Nedkova (1998:11) is of the opinion that evaluation programmes have a lot to offer to a variety of audiences especially in the area of teacher education. This may be because of the interests of stakeholders in arguments that validate evidence on issues of the effectiveness of a programme and other classroom practices. To allow for what Patton (2002:247) refers to as investigator’s triangulation (see Sections 3.4.4, 6.2 and 6.4 for details), this section thus focuses on a brief review on the evaluation of language teacher education programmes in four different contexts namely Australia, Hong Kong, Turkey and Nigeria.

2.5.1. Australian Context:

Erben (2004) in his article titled “Teacher Education through Immersion and Immersion Teacher Education: an Australian Case” evaluates the Language and Culture Initial Teacher Education Programme (LACITEP). The study is aimed at finding out the characteristics of the innovative teacher education programme, the effectiveness of the programme and the challenges involved in the implementation of the programme. Of the three research questions of the study, of interest to this research is the second question, which aims to examine the manner, ways and perhaps areas in which the programme can be said to have been effective. The study shows that:
1. many of the students did not initially comprehend the concept of immersion which to most of them probably meant the ability to use the language at a proficient level.

2. the nature and structure of the programme compelled students to be more involved in their studies as it needed a lot of extra effort and work on their part because of the seemingly increased workload.

3. the programme encouraged and guided students to take charge of their own learning by providing good practical hands-on experience through the use of the Saturday Morning Japanese School where they have to take charge of teaching, managerial and administrative duties as a group for a period of ten weeks.

2.5.2. Hong Kong Context:

Peacock (2009) in his article “The Evaluation of Foreign-Language-Teacher Education Programmes” gives a detailed report on a comprehensive evaluation carried out in a pre-service teacher training programme in Hong Kong. The research, which is based on the need for a system of regular internal evaluation in teacher education, is aimed at identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the programme and examining the extent to which the programme meets the needs of its students. The study reveals that:

1. although the programme has a clearly stated philosophy, it is not properly reflected in the contents of the programme.

2. students get good training that makes them capable of using different teaching approaches as demanded or required in varied situations.
3. classroom management, the development and good use of different teaching materials, teaching in the socio-cultural contexts [of the study] are identified as areas which still need some input.

2.5.3. Turkish Context

Salihoglu (2012) evaluates a pre-service English Language teacher education programme within the Turkish context. The study is aimed at the determination of the effective/non-effective components of the programme by exploring the issue from the perspectives of the students and lecturers in the programme.

In conducting the evaluation, Salihoglu (2012:3441) adapts and uses Peacock’s 2009 evaluation model in the development of his data collection tools. A slightly adapted version of Peacock’s questionnaire is administered to the students and lecturers (Salihoglu, 2012:3444). Using the fifteen sets of questions developed by Peacock, he also conducts a semi-structured interview with some of the lecturers in the programme. Adapting Coskun and Daloglu’s (2010) approach, he conducts a focus group discussion with the students to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the programme. The findings from his research reveal that:

1. there is some measure of satisfaction for the programme by students and lecturers.
2. there remains great concern for practice, a strong need for students’ need analysis and the development of students’ proficiency in the English Language.
2.5.4. Nigerian Context

The study carried out by Nta, Egbe and Oden (2008) is based on the appraisal of the curriculum content of the English Language teacher education programme in a Nigerian University. It is aimed at examining the extent to which the curriculum prepares and enables the student (in the programme) through the use of their language skills and knowledge, to meet the curriculum demands of the ESL learners in the nation’s secondary schools. It focuses solely on a critical examination of the portfolio of the English language teacher in Nigeria using the English education programme offered in a University situated in the country. The findings of the study reveal:

1. there is a big gap in the course content which shows a lack in language based courses in the programme curriculum. The number and type of language based courses in the first year are not adequate for the student teachers to build a firm foundation on which to develop expertise and proficiency in their use of the language.

2. some of the courses offered in the second year of study are too broad and pose a problem in teaching with regards to proper in-depth coverage of such courses.

3. there is no provision for courses that deal with language pedagogy in the final year of study.

In another study, still within the Nigerian context, Igweike (2004) engages in the evaluation of a French immersion programme for undergraduate French Language education students in Nigerian Universities. The study has the following as its aims:
1) to measure the extent to which the French Immersion Programme was meeting its stated objectives within the Nigerian context.
2) to identify the flaws in the programme
3) to make recommendations if need be for the improvement of the programme.

In conducting the study, a quasi-experimental pre-test-post-test design is employed. The French Language achievement test, French Language affective trait scale, French culture awareness scale and questionnaires are used as instruments to collect data for the research. A total of three hundred and forty students participated in the study with two hundred and forty of them making up the experiential group in the Nigerian French Language Village in Badagry (Lagos) while the other eighty students make up the control group in Togo. A total of twenty lecturers are equally involved in the study. The findings of the research show the following:

1) Empirically the programme is achieving its goal in Nigeria as some of the objectives are met.

2) At the cognitive level, the experiential group shows a higher degree of performance except in oral skills than the students in the control group. The experiential group’s attitude, motivation and knowledge of the French culture appear considerably higher than those of the students in the control group. However, they show an insignificant gain in the area of interest.

3) With regards to constraints, the findings of the research identified an insufficient number of adequately trained personnel, lack of adequate learning facilities and financial constraints as factors which can seriously hinder the progress of the programme if not urgently attended to.
All five studies illustrated above have made attempts to examine different aspects and issues of language teacher education programmes as related to their respective and unique contexts. The first context is based on the adoption of Japanese as a second language by native speakers of the English Language, through a method of immersion in a language teacher education programme. The current research, however, focuses on the English Language teacher education programme in a context where English has already assumed the status of a second as well as official language. The effectiveness of the programme will be judged against the backdrop of its objectives.

One of the aims of the study in the Hong Kong context is similar to that of this research as it also aims to examine how the programme meets the needs of the students. However, this research examines how the objectives of the programme reflect the teaching needs of student teachers of the programme under study. In other words, it looks at how the programme prepares and trains teachers for the anticipated and likely challenges that will be encountered in their socio-cultural context. This is based on the fact that the design of any language programme is ultimately determined by the language needs/challenges of the context which it serves. There is a major focus on the practical aspect of the programme in this research when compared to that of Peacock’s. Contrary to that of Peacock’s study on the Hong Kong context, the present study involves final year student teachers on their practical teaching exercise. There is also a major difference in the choice and use of research tools in both studies. Whereas Peacock in his work used interviews, questionnaires and essays to gather relevant information, this study is
completely qualitative in nature and utilises observation, interviews and
document analysis. In conducting his interviews with the lecturers in the
programme, Peacock (2009:263) used a set of fifteen questions developed from
his reviewed literature. In this study, questions on the interview schedule are
generated from the research aims and research questions of the study.

In the third context, Salihoglu (2012), by using Peacock’s model, although
slightly adapted, appears to be testing its use within his own context as there is
a constant comparison between his use and that of Peacock’s (Salihoglu,
2012:3444). This current research on the other hand, seeks to develop its own
model (see Section 2.4.8). Salihoglu in his evaluation of the programme
centres great attention on the courses taught and not enough attention is paid
to the practical aspect of the programme. A close examination of the research
tools used in the research reveals that only the primary stakeholders’
perspectives of the programme are presented. In other words, there is more of
the emic perspective and hardly any etic perspective on the programme. This
inevitably gives a one-sided view or perspective of the programme and as such
can be said to be a flaw in the design. Salihoglu (2012:3444) also
acknowledges this flaw by stating "...classroom observations could have been
carried out to see the extent of the match between the students’ perceptions
and their real practices that take place in classrooms." This research, however,
takes into account the practical aspect of the programme by observing lecturers
and student teachers at work in their classes at the Colleges of Education and
placement schools respectively. By using observation, interviews and document
analysis as data collection tools the researcher seeks to present an accurate picture of the programme as seen from both the emic and etic perspectives.

Although the study in the fourth context is Nigerian, it examines an English Language teacher education programme at an entirely different level as it is a degree programme and the graduates teach in secondary schools. Nta, Egbe and Oden (2008) focus their study on just one aspect of the programme: the curriculum content. They also identify the evaluation of a complete English Language teacher education programme - which will involve an examination into the various components and their working process - as an area that is in dire need of further research (Nta, Egbe and Oden, 2008:100). This research evaluates an English teacher education programme at the NCE level based on the objectives and policies guiding the programme. This is done by examining objectives critically in relation to the actual teaching practices that occur in the classes during the programme. It also seeks to determine the extent to which the objectives reflect the actual teaching needs of student teachers of the programme by their classroom and teaching practices in their respective placement schools.

The second study under the Nigerian context examines the effectiveness of a French immersion programme. It determines the effectiveness of the programme based on the achievement of some of the programme's pre-stated goals. It has, however, used the experiential research design which can be said to be invariably different from the designs used in other programmes reviewed in this section, and is no doubt unique to its mode and purpose of study. This
present research, however, is a case study as it is directed at not only assessing the worth of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level in two Colleges of Education but also providing a focused, in-depth description of the achievement of the said programme. Moreover, since the study involves a formative evaluation of an on-going programme with the ultimate aim to improve it, the evaluation research will take the form of a case study which utilises the naturalistic approach rather than that of a comparative experiment (Stufflebeam and Shinkfield, 2007:23).

As noted from above, although the five studies reviewed make reference to the programme philosophies in their respective studies, surprisingly none of these findings have identified any unintended outcomes of these programmes. This is a gap this research intends to fill as it evaluates the English Language teacher education programme in the two Colleges of Education.

In conclusion, having examined the relevant literature, evaluation can thus be described as the main thread or a focal point that holds an entire programme together. The very life and success of programmes depend on it. The reviewed literature revealed that although a considerable amount of research has been done in the area of language evaluation generally, there is still a lot to be said in the area of evaluation of language teacher education with specific reference to the English language teacher education programme. In line with the above therefore, it is of great importance that researchers heed the suggestion proffered by Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007:27) that as evaluators they continuously and relentlessly seek for avenues through which their research
findings might create insights into matters of interest in theory building and policy making.

2.6. PRACTICAL TEACHING AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMMES

Practical teaching or practicum (as it is commonly referred to) is regarded as a crucial part of the training for students in the English Language teacher education programmes. According to Rozelle and Wilson (2012:1196) it is seen as a “beneficial, authentic and practical aspect of the teacher education.” To Ong’ondo and Borg (2011: 511), the practicum is essential in the learning and development of the pedagogical reasoning required by the student teachers to function effectively and efficiently as teachers in their chosen fields. Practical teaching can simply be referred to as the point or phase where theory essentially meets practice in the training of students in English Language teacher education programmes. In other words, the teacher education programmes are designed to allow students during their practical teaching exercise, to put into practice theories and concepts learnt from courses taught. Tuli and File (2009:110) describe the practical teaching exercise as a site where student teachers engage in active practice of pupils in real school contexts during a specific period of time. The practical teaching exercise is seen as an integral component of any teacher education programme as it seeks to provide the student teacher with school-based supervised real teaching experiences, boosting the student teachers’ understanding on the full scope of their roles as teachers (Tuli and File, 2009:107). Gile and Richard (19992:55) further expand on this view as in their opinion challenges faced by the student teachers during
the practical teaching exercise not only provides them with opportunities to engage in reflective activities but to also develop their expertise in the area of practice.

Their definition of the exercise is unique as they emphasize the fact that the student teachers are assigned to specific teachers and class within this given block of time. This is usually the case with most practical teaching exercises. In such cases, teachers invariably become mentors to the student teachers (who have been assigned to their respective classes). This study which evaluates the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level in Nigeria, involves student teachers in the programme as part of the research participants. This will enable the researcher not only to identify the teaching needs of the student teachers but to also explore this mentor-mentee relationship between the student teachers and their class/subject teachers.

2.7. THE CONCEPT OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMMES

According to Harmer (2007:30), it is important and essential for teachers to be knowledgeable in their subjects. This being the case, Eyers (2004:1) explains that the practicum or practical teaching exercise is designed to integrate theoretical knowledge and professional practice. Clift and Brady (2005:331), however, note emphatically that student teachers find it difficult to translate concepts learnt in methods courses into their teaching practice classrooms. To Tuli and File (2009:110), it is necessary for student teachers to build and develop their teaching expertise. To them this involves “...knowing what to teach
and how to teach it and what methods to use with particular topics, particular kinds of students and in particular settings”. In other words, it is one thing to know the subject, and another thing to be able to teach the subject effectively. It thus becomes necessary for the student teachers not just to have good knowledge of their subject but to also have the required skill to pass that knowledge on to the students/pupils that they teach. In effect, this emphasises the need to build not only the content knowledge but the pedagogical content knowledge of students in pre-service language teacher education programmes. In the view of Tuli and File (2009:109), this can be learnt and developed during the practicum as it becomes a frame of reference for student teachers.

The knowledge of how and what to teach does not necessarily come naturally. There are a number of views as to how student teachers learn to perform their teaching tasks. Nettle (1998:193) believes that “teachers teach as they were taught” as many teacher educators would undoubtedly take credits for having some form of positive influence on the teaching practices of some of their student teachers. This may be true as Zanting et al (2001:725) also hold a similar view as they outline the different domains from which information is gathered to build up the knowledge gained by the students during their training in a teacher education programme.

The first domain or source is the training institute, or in this case, College of Education where the students are taught about educational theories and other language courses including methods on how to teach the subject. The second is from the mentors or teachers to whom they are assigned during their practical
teaching exercise. Knowledge through this source is referred to as practical knowledge as it is mostly built on the knowledge acquired through years of experience and teaching practice. The third source is the students themselves, as they also learn from their own experience as learners/students in a classroom. Zanting et al (2001:726) acknowledge the existence of a gap among the three sources/domains of information for the student teachers as they rarely all correspond.

Nevertheless as highlighted by Rozelle and Wilson (2012:1196), student teachers fail to utilise the theories and concepts they have been taught in class. Instead, they tend to rely on the traditional styles of their mentors when they encounter difficulties in the course of practical teaching exercise. Mentors, as used by Rozelle and Wilson (2012), refer to the teachers in the placement schools. Their study shows the involvement of six science teachers in the practical teaching training of student teachers in a Science teacher education programme. The findings reveal that the student teachers, at the end of the one year practicum, became “carbon copies” of the participating science teachers in their teaching practices (Rozelle and Wilson, 2012: 1202).

In contrast, the findings from the research of Ong’ondo and Borg (2011:515-516) show that this mentoring role in the English Language teacher education programme is officially the responsibility of the supervisors in teacher education programmes in the Kenyan University. Interestingly, the findings also reveal an indirect transfer of this responsibility to the teachers (in the placement schools) who, in comparison, spend more time with the student teachers than the
supervisors who only supervise the students four times out of the recommended six stipulated in the programme guidelines. Given that this study, as in the case of Ong’ondo and Borg (2011), involves student teachers on their practical teaching, it will shed light on this mentoring issue, examining how this occurs and exploring possible reasons as to why it happens.

With the role played by the mentors as valuable source of information on varied areas ranging from key skills such as curriculum planning, classroom management and key pedagogic skills, it becomes very necessary for such mentors to be effective teachers and role models. In fact, in the exact words of Yavuz (2011:44), the “mentors need to be subject specialists with successful teaching experience and pedagogical knowledge”. Given that this research examines the teaching needs of the student teachers in the programme under study, it would be interesting to observe and study how the student teachers blend theory and practice together in the classrooms of their placement schools, utilising the knowledge gained from their lecturers, classroom/subject teachers (who in this case act as their mentors) and from their own personal experiences as students.

2.8. AUTONOMY IN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PROGRAMMES

According to Swaine (2012:107) the word autonomy originates from ancient Greek and is interpreted as “giving laws to oneself”. In his view, autonomy has to do with a rational assessment of personal beliefs, aims, attachments, desires and interests. It thus refers to the use of a certain degree of freedom, which with regards to this study can be said to be the degree of freedom in relation to
Jimenez (2009:1) describes autonomy as a much needed aim in education. This suggests the need for educational practices to focus on the use of autonomy in educational programmes. To Lynch (2001, 390-391), autonomy can be practised within and outside institutional boundaries. Nataka (2011:900) sees autonomy as deeply interwoven into what she refers to as the fabric of social and cultural practices. This view apparently tallies with that of Lynch (2001) as it invariably implies that autonomous practices, especially within the educational setting, are subject to change as they tend to vary from one social/cultural context to another. Given that this research evaluates the same English Language teacher education programme in two Colleges of Education located in different settings, it will be interesting to see how their respective autonomous practices affect the running of the programme and the effect this has on the programme design.

The literature is teeming with articles on autonomy in language education programmes (see Swaine, 2012; Adamson and Sert, 2012; Nakata, 2011; Jimenez, 2009 and Little, 2004). There is, however, particular interest devoted to the concept of teacher autonomy and learner autonomy in language education. In fact Nataka (2011:900) refers to teacher autonomy and learner autonomy as the buzzwords in language education programmes. This view is shared by Smith (2003:3) who also believes that learner autonomy and teacher autonomy have gained prominence in second language education discourse. Learner autonomy and teacher autonomy are generally regarded as two concepts that are inter-related (see Jimenez, 2009:1 and Adamson and Sert, 2012:24). In other words they more or less feed off each other, and the
promotion of one inadvertently leads to the development and promotion of the other (Smith, 2001:43-44). Little (2004:2) aptly describes them as mirror images of each other.

As stated by Smith (2003:5), teacher autonomy can be viewed from three different dimensions which include the ability to self-direct teaching, freedom from control and the ability to self-direct teacher-learning. Adamson and Sert (2012:24) also hold the same view as they believe that with teacher autonomy teachers are required to be self-directed and reflective in their practice. From the definition given above, it is clear to see that autonomous teachers work using their own initiative. Al-Mansoori (2008:36-37) takes this a step further as he describes the autonomous teacher as one who is not only reflective and self-directed, but also collaborative both in and outside the work environment. It will be interesting to see what the research findings unfold in this aspect and if the lecturers in the programme under study are reflective, self-directed and collaborative in their teaching practices in Colleges of Education.

According to Little (2004:1) it is necessary for teachers to exploit their professional skills autonomously especially in the area of pedagogical actions in order to create and maintain a learning community. This is because teacher autonomy and learner autonomy are seen as competence and reflect the knowledge and ability of both the teachers and learners respectively (Jimenez, 2009:3). Adamson and Sert (2012:23) acknowledge the crucial part played by teachers in the development of learner autonomy; however, they also point out the need for teachers to be autonomous in both their teaching and learning.
This point is further reiterated by Jimenez (2009:4) as he emphasises the need for teachers to be engaged in a journey of self-discovery as it is necessary for them to also learn how to learn autonomously in order to be able to promote it amongst their students. It will be interesting to see how this plays out in the classroom practices of both the lecturers and student teachers in both Colleges of Education involved in the study.

This research is first an evaluation research which is focused on an English Language teacher education programme in a second language context. As such it contributes to the literature on the evaluation of language teacher education programme. The literature reviewed has examined not only topics or issues related to evaluation in language programmes, but it has equally examined literature related to practice in Language teacher education (LTE).
CHAPTER THREE- METHODOLOGY

3.1. INTRODUCTION

With the ever growing challenge of the constant failure of students in English Language in Nigeria (Ezekoli, 2002:374, Nta, et al, 2008:97 and Osagie, 2012:1), the researcher has chosen a topic which is vital for the improvement and enhancement of the teaching and learning of the English Language in particular and for the improvement of education in general within the Nigerian context. As such, the choice of this research topic can be said to be in line with the belief upheld by Holliday (2002:30) that the need to write research papers indirectly compels researchers to view critically the realities and occurrences around them.

The present study is an evaluation research project on the English Language teacher education programme in two Colleges of Education in Nigeria. In Holliday’s view (2002:28), the choice of a research topic may be related to previous interests or concerns. It may also grow from the lives and professional experience of those in the academic field. The researcher is a member of one of the Colleges of Education under investigation and as such, the study is of intrinsic interest to the researcher.

The research fosters an understanding of the Nigerian education context as it focuses on the study of human activities which relate to the actual teaching and learning experiences of teacher educators and their students in the real world. It should be noted here that although both English Language and Literature courses are taught in this programme, for the purpose of this research, the
focus is on the language component of the programme as this is the area which
is of primary concern and interest to the researcher. This interest has grown out
of a genuine and ever increasing concern over the falling standard of the
English Language and the persistent failure of students in the subject within the
Nigerian context as discussed earlier in Chapter One of this thesis.

As stated by Bennett (2003:11), evaluations are very often carried out with
major attention centred on specific aspects of the programme. The focus of this
research is on the objectives of the English Language teacher education
programme at the NCE level. As already stated in Chapter One, the research
has the following as its aims:

1) to critically analyse the objectives of the English Language teacher education
programme as it pertains to the teaching and learning of the English Language
Courses in the programme.

2) to identify the teaching needs of the student teachers from the two Colleges
of Education under study.

3) to examine if and how the stated objectives are interpreted through their
realisation by the lecturers in the classes of Colleges of Education.

4) to examine if and how the objectives reflect the teaching needs of the student
teachers.

This study is focused on the evaluation of the English Language teacher
education programme at the NCE level in two Colleges of Education in Nigeria.
Using the case study approach, it seeks to find answers to the research
questions by drawing on evidence that can be found only within the context of
the study (Gillham, 2000:1). To this end therefore, the study is based on the following research questions:

1. What are the stated objectives of the English Language teachers’ education programme in Nigeria?
2. What are the teaching needs of the student teachers in the two Colleges of Education under study?
3. How are the objectives interpreted and applied in the classes of Colleges of Education in Nigeria?
4. To what extent do the objectives reflect the teaching needs of student teachers in the programme?

The discussion in this chapter will be centred on evaluation research and evaluation studies, the research paradigm, project research design, research participants, research instruments, pilot study, data collection and the method of analysis.

3.2. EVALUATION RESEARCH, RESEARCH AND EVALUATION STUDIES

Evaluation research differs from other forms of research in its aims and objectives. Its primary preoccupation is not only to add or increase the boundaries of knowledge by developing new or building on existing theories in the field; it also actively seeks to bring about change by providing relevant information for the implementation, operation and general effectiveness of programmes (Clarke and Dawson, 1999:35). It is, however, the emphasis on theory that makes it different from ordinary evaluation studies as well as other evaluation activities such as inspection and systematic monitoring (Clarke and Dawson, 1999:31). In the words of Patton (1990:11), evaluation research is
geared towards action. This, as stated by Shadish et al (1991:34), can be attributed to the fact that it equally seeks to examine if and how existing or available knowledge is effectively utilised to both inform and guide practical action.

Evaluation research is described by Norris (1990:99) as the application of research methods to evaluation which is also seen as an extension of research. Rossi and Freeman (1993:15) stretch this even further as they believe that evaluation research goes beyond the application of research methods. To them, it is equally a political and managerial activity. It therefore becomes expedient that evaluators be conscious of both the social and political contexts in which evaluations occur. However, given the highly volatile nature of the issue of language choice and the raging debates as to who should be held accountable for the deteriorating standard of English Language in Nigeria, it is necessary to state here that the major preoccupation of this research is not to apportion blame or to take sides but to identify possible steps, through the research findings, to resolve the on-going crisis of the English Language in Nigeria. Consequently, this study, which is an evaluation research project, is aimed at not only improving the teaching and learning of the English language within the Nigerian context but it is also aimed at promoting learning as it relates to theory, policy and teaching practice in international contexts/other educational systems.

3.3. RESEARCH PARADIGM

All research has a paradigm, otherwise known as the philosophical framework which determines its methodologies and invariably the methods and research
instruments. In Bell’s view (2005:102), the name may not be important but the framework which determines the research process is. According to Clarke and Dawson (1999:37), this is because the framework serves as a guide to the process of inquiry. For this research, the interpretivist/naturalistic paradigm is used as the philosophical framework. To aptly illustrate the importance of philosophical frameworks as a guide in evaluation research, Shadish et al (1991:34) compare it to military strategies and tactics while the methods or approach chosen to military weapons and logistics.

The epistemological stance of this research is based on interpretivism as it describes and interprets the events and activities in the social organisation - which in this case is the NCE Programme in two Colleges of Education - as they occur naturally (Nazari, 2002:83). The use of the interpretivist approach in this study lays emphasis on human volition, which is aimed at exploring the meanings that motivate actions of individuals (Della Porta and Keatings, 2007:23). By utilising certain research tools, therefore, the researcher not only gives her own interpretations of events and activities in the programme, but is also able to relate those of the primary users and other stakeholders of the programme as well.

According to Della Porta and Keatings (2007:29), the interpretivist choice of topics for research is more often than not based on an inherent interest in a case and for the information that can be gathered about a social complex system. The researcher, as a member of one of the Colleges under investigation, has views/opinions about the NCE programme for the English
Language teachers. However, the adoption of the interpretivist stance to a great extent actively limits interference or intervention by the researcher in the natural research setting. By using the naturalistic/interpretivist approach in this study, there is a conscious decision to think naturalistically. The utilisation of the non-participant observation as one of the research tools in the study allows for events/activities in the programme to be seen as they occur and unfold naturally - with the researcher actively engaged in making sense/meanings from what is observed - in the classes of Colleges of Education and classes taught by the student teachers observed in primary schools. The use of interviews and the examination of relevant documents provide valuable insight into the programme. The research tools engaged in the course of the study thus give an emic view of the phenomenon under study.

This approach is in line with the view held by Lincoln and Guba (1985:88) that with the use of the interpretivist/naturalistic approach, separating the inquired from the inquirer is impossible as data gathered in the course of the study is generated mostly during interaction between the inquirer and the inquired. It is believed that investigating the social world of any phenomenon requires the researcher getting involved or close to the subject of research to gather relevant or significant data (Clarke and Dawson, 1999:40). As stated by Stake (1995:46), “humans generally are curious and researchers have a special compulsion to inquire”. The naturalistic paradigm enables the researcher to explore how individuals make sense of their social world.
The naturalistic paradigm is suitable for this research as one of its standpoints is that a social programme can be fully understood only in its natural setting. This study is concerned with the evaluation of the English Language teacher education programme in two Colleges of Education in the Niger-Delta region of Nigeria. It examines the implementation of the said programme within the Nigerian context in line with the stipulated objectives and policies. The Colleges of Education involved in the study can also be referred to as social organisations since the programme under study involves people who naturally, as social beings, seek interaction and socialisation with other humans and consequently have individual and unique personal experiences, each with their own interpretation.

Worthy of note here is the emphasis on the relativist ontology through the use of the naturalistic paradigm which believes in the existence of multiple realities and equally emphasises subjectivity. As such, with this approach, reality is not seen as a single entity which can be objectively measured but on the contrary, it advocates that true understanding of a concept or an issue is achieved only through the multiple interpretations given by those involved (Della Porta and Keating, 2007:23-24). This research aims to examine the different individual and unique interpretations of the objectives of the NCE programme as given by respective lecturers and student-teachers (in the Department of English in both Colleges of Education) through their classroom practices.
3.4. PROJECT RESEARCH DESIGN

Research design is described by Yin (2009:26) as a logical pattern which serves as a guide, a road map for the entire research process; from the formulation of research questions to the analysis and interpretation of the research findings. The choice for an appropriate research design for this study has been determined and influenced greatly by a number of factors which include the purpose and nature of the research, as well as the type of data to be collected. Discussion in this section will be done under the following headings: qualitative research design, case study approach, naturalistic inquiry, triangulation, data collection process and method of analysis.

3.4.1. Qualitative Research Design

The qualitative research design is used for this research as it is specifically suited for questions which explore the complexities of human behaviour (Darlington and Scott, 2002:3). Far from being a monolithic entity, the design utilises a multitude of qualitative approaches which include ethnography, field research, naturalistic inquiry, case study and connoisseurship (Aksamit, Hall and Ryan, 1990:215). By incorporating two of the approaches (the naturalistic inquiry and the case study), in its research design, this study seeks to identify and understand how the programme’s objectives are portrayed and realised through the teaching/classroom practices of the different lecturers involved in the study. It seeks to examine, from the perspective of the student teachers, the extent to which their teaching needs are reflected in the programme’s stated objectives.
Given the nature of the research questions for this present study, the use of the quantitative approach would be inappropriate as justice may not be done to the topic. This is because, as clearly stated by Yin (2009:11), how and why questions are explanatory in nature and are better explored and answered using the qualitative approach. To give a detailed and vivid description of the research, it becomes important and indeed necessary for the researcher be “on ground” to record events as they unfold and occur naturally in the research setting (Schofield, 1990:209). The use of the qualitative approach in this research, therefore, situates the researcher in the world of the research as the design uses interpretive as well as material practices to make the world or context under study visible (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003:4).

On the other hand, the use of quantitative/experimental approaches would most likely indicate only the extent to which the programme’s objectives are realised and may not necessarily describe how and why the lecturers in the programme under study interpret the objectives in the way that they do (Pawson and Tilley, 1994:292). According to Stake (1995:43), the qualitative approach stands out as it emphasises the holistic treatment of the phenomenon. It also helps to maintain the meaningful characteristics of the phenomenon under study (Yin, 2009:4). The use of this approach in the current study allows for inquiry into specific issues, paying close attention to even very minute details. By giving a thick description of this research, the reader enters into the research setting, going through the same experiences as the researcher through what Stake (1995:42) refers to as experiential learning.
The qualitative approach is used here to make known the uniqueness and complexity of the phenomenon under study (Stake, 1995:63). Every language context has its own unique qualities that make it different from others. With over four hundred and fifty languages spoken in Nigeria and the English Language chosen as the medium of instruction, coupled with the high rate and persistent failure of students in the subject (a situation which has apparently defied almost all solutions), the Nigerian linguistic situation as discussed earlier in Chapter One can be said to be both unique and indeed complex.

Using the qualitative approach, the research examines the NCE Programme for English Language teacher education in two Colleges of Education. Since schools are regarded as social organisations, the study naturally involves people and as such, some lecturers and student teachers in the Department of English (in both Colleges of Education) as well as primary school pupils (in schools where the student teachers did their teaching practice) were involved in the study.

Bell (2005:10) believes that all organisations have both common and unique features as well as interactive processes which researchers aim to identify in order to study the effect on the functioning patterns of organisations. Data for this research was gathered not just by interacting with the research participants, but also by closely observing their varied behaviour patterns in different situations in school, interpreting what they said or did as well as endeavouring to understand the motives behind their actions, utterances and beliefs. By doing this, the research seeks “answers to questions that are centred on how social
experience is created and given meaning” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003:13). The current study is based on certain formulated research questions that will be answered from the evidence drawn from the actual Nigerian College of Education contexts under study through the use of multiple data collection instruments or techniques.

3.4.2. Naturalistic Inquiry

The naturalistic inquiry, along with the case study, has been chosen and employed as the research method for this study. As stated by Aksamit, Hall and Ryan (1990:215) naturalistic inquiry has distinguished itself from other qualitative approaches through quality criteria that require a lot of rigour in its application or utilisation in evaluation research. The use of the approach in this study opened up avenues for the discovery of new ideas and trends in the programme under study.

According to Della Porta and Keating (2007:34) the meanings attributed to a given situation may vary based on the angle from which it is viewed. In order to give the researcher a deeper and clearer understanding of the NCE Programme under study, both the *emic* and *etic* perspectives have, thus, been taken into consideration in the development of the research tools and the collection of data itself. Freeman (1998:70) believes that the *etic* perspective gives information on what outsiders see while the *emic* perspective gives information on what insiders know. With regards to this research therefore, the *emic* perspective is provided by the lecturers and students (who can be referred to here as the primary users of the programme). The *etic* perspective is provided by the
researcher (who although a member of one of the Colleges of Education under investigation, has been away from the setting for about five years and as such can be said to see the events within the programme with a “fresh eye”). With this form of inquiry, events in the study were allowed to occur naturally, while the evaluator made attempts to learn and understand by exploring the different perceptions and interpretations given by research participants in relation to their social experiences.

To understand the experiences of the programme users, the researcher had to experience the programme first-hand in the context in which it functions. The researcher spent twelve weeks in the field gathering relevant data. Since there were two main Colleges involved in the study, situated in different cities, time was allocated in such a way that the researcher not only spent time in the classrooms with students as they were taught but also interacted with both students and lecturers after classes.

The researcher accompanied some lecturers on their teaching practice supervision trips to get a first-hand experience of what really happens during such supervision. This provided a valuable insight into the reaction and performance of student-teachers under pressure. Spending time with the student-teachers (involved in the study) in their respective primary schools (of teaching practice) provided an opportunity to observe and explore the impact of the regular teachers on the classroom practices of the student-teachers.
This study is aimed at examining in detail what the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme mean to different lecturers and how this is translated through their interactions with students and their actions in the classrooms as they teach. It also involves examining, through the personal perceptions and experiences of the student teachers, the extent to which the programme’s objectives meet their (the student teachers’) teaching needs. This requires the researcher to experience the teaching-learning experience directly in the classes of the lecturers in the Colleges of Education and the student teachers in the primary schools respectively. The use of the naturalistic inquiry thus made it mandatory for the researcher to be in the research context, be actively engaged, interacting and sharing in the experiences of the research participants, developing a sense of closeness through empathy and confidentiality within the close physical proximity during the period of study (Patton, 2002:48).

3.4.3. Case Study Approach

The case study approach is a unique and special approach which because of its flexible nature (Mills, Durepos and Wiebe, 2010:99) can be used for both qualitative and quantitative research depending on the type of data required by the researcher. The fact that the study is an evaluation research focusing on the evaluation of the NCE Programme for English Language teacher education in only two Colleges of Education makes the use of the approach even more appealing and appropriate. As earlier stated the study is a qualitative one and as such limits to a great extent the form or amount of control on the research setting and participants by the researcher.
The reason for this is not far-fetched as most evaluation research is centred on specific or particular contexts and as argued by Yin (2009:19), the case study has carved a niche for itself in evaluation research as it is said to occupy a very distinctive position within the said field of evaluation. The approach is therefore employed here to facilitate the study of research participants in their own natural settings and through observation and other techniques involved in the study. Information gathered is interpreted to enhance an understanding of and present a holistic picture of the situation or phenomenon under investigation (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003:5). The approach reflects the point argued by Mills, Durepos and Wiebe, (2010:486) that it is only when there is a complete or detailed account that human meaning can be completely understood.

Given the purpose of this research, it can be said that the case study approach is well suited for the study as the approach is effectively used to enhance an understanding of the multiple structure-segments in a programme or organisation (Mills, Durepos and Wiebe, 2010:76). This study is not only aimed at critically analysing the objectives of the programme under study, but it equally explores the interpretations given by the lecturers and how this affects the realisation of the objectives through their individual classroom practices. It also aims to identify the teaching needs of the student teachers and how they are reflected in the objectives of the NCE Programme within the Nigerian context.

Promoting an understanding of the Nigerian education context, this research focuses on the study of human activities which relates to the actual teaching and learning experiences of teacher educators and their students in the real
world. To Della Porta and Keatings (2008:227), the case study approach is apt at exploring subjects or phenomena about which very little is known. It is equally used to modify or refine existing knowledge. This is because case studies depict the experiences of specific situations so as to capture the very essence of reality in the research as it involves examining the case in its own context (Robson, 2002:178).

According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007:253), case studies create opportunities for in-depth studies of small parts of a problem or topic. Although the focus of this research is on the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level, which arguably can be said to be a small part of the programme, the research is not necessarily concerned with measuring the success of the programme based on the achievement of these objectives *per se*. Rather, it seeks to explore the different interpretations these objectives have for different lecturers in the programme and the impact this has on their classroom practices. It also examines the objectives *vis-a-vis* the teaching needs of the student-teachers which are influenced to a large extent by the present-day challenges encountered in the teaching of English Language in Nigeria.

The researcher is aware that some researchers are less positive about a case study approach in qualitative research design (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003:439) even though it is a “distinctive form of empirical inquiry” (Yin, 2007:1). Some suggest that researchers use the approach when they have an intrinsic interest in a topic (Stake (1995:xi)) but with little interest in its contribution to science.
The current study is one in which the researcher has an intrinsic interest as it concerns the teaching and learning of the English Language by teacher educators and student teachers in the Nigerian context. The study also provides an insight into the complex linguistic issues within the Nigerian context and the means or methods devised by student teachers and their lecturers to cope with the challenges of teaching the English Language within the Nigerian context.

From the study, an evaluation model, which can be used for the evaluation of language teacher education programmes in similar contexts, is developed and takes into cognizance the needs of the student teachers, the impact of the interpretation of the programme’s objectives on lecturers’ classroom practices as well as the impact of stated policies on the implementation of the programme under investigation. The case study can thus be said to be a very popular approach which has made and continues to make significant contribution to knowledge in psychology, sociology, political sciences, anthropology, education and even to the medical field (Yin, 2009:4). As summarily stated by Della Porta and Keatings (2008:223), much of the knowledge acquired and still being acquired in the political and social world is gained from case studies.

By using the approach, an in-depth and overall holistic picture of the NCE Programme under investigation is given as data for the study is gathered as events/activities occur naturally in the classrooms of the Colleges of Education and the primary schools. With the research instruments employed in the study, the insiders’ perspectives as well as that of the “outsider” are accounted for, thereby providing a comprehensive account and producing a complete picture.
of the actual programme. The researcher also acquires a major understanding as well as skill which otherwise may not have been possible with other methodologies (Mills, Durepos and Wieber, 2010:76).

The current research is hinged on interpretivism and it utilises naturalistic inquiry and the case study approach. The major criticisms for the approach have been in relation to discussions on the theoretical frameworks and the inability to relate or generalise its findings to other settings. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2003:439), “in intrinsic case studies, researchers do not avoid generalisations, they cannot.” Contrary to the stance held by Denzin and Lincoln (2003), however, this research, which holds intrinsic interest for the researcher, can be generalised in a number of ways.

To begin with, because of the number of research participants and the fact that the research is a case study utilising two Colleges of Education as the research setting, the research aims at analytical and not statistical generalisations (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007:253). As argued by Yin (2009:14), the case study, like experimental studies, can be generalised to theoretical prepositions thus leading to analytical generalisation.

Generalisations will be made from the research findings through the research process and an evaluation model which evolves from the literature reviewed, the researcher’s own epistemology and knowledge of the research context. This is apparently in line with the view held by Mayring (2007:4) that the procedures leading to the research findings can be generalised. Generalisation
is also made through a rigorous review of related literature of similar studies already done in this area of investigation, paying particular attention to the methods and findings of such research (Yin, 2009:3) as can be seen in Section 2.5 of this thesis.

By using the naturalistic approach in this work, a thick and vivid description is given of events and activities as they happen naturally in the research setting enabling readers to go through the same experiences as those of the researcher, leading them to make their own in-the-head-generalisation or naturalistic generalisation (Stake and Trumbull, 1982:3).

It can be argued that the case study represents only a limited population within a given research setting because of the sample size or number of research participants. The majority and minority language issue with regards to the choice of national language have also been taken into consideration in the selection of the Colleges of Education for this research. The Colleges chosen are strategically located, with one in the minority language spoken area and the other situated in an area where a dialect of one of the major languages is spoken. In doing this, the researcher aims to understand the peculiarity of the case under study (Stake, 1995:8).

For a case study to be a valid form of educational research, Bassey (1999:12-13) argues that the research has to be conducted systematically and critically, be aimed at improving education, be relatable and should expand the frontiers of knowledge. In line with these outlined conditions, the researcher has created
and utilised a research design which can be said to be both systematic and critical to enhance the collection of data that allows for the programme under study to be viewed from different perspective in order to get a complete and accurate interpretation of events and occurrences in the programme. The frontiers of knowledge are also expanded with the development of an evaluation model which can be used for the evaluation of similar language programmes in other contexts.

In-spite of the fact that the use of case study as an approach in the qualitative research design is heavily criticised for its subjective nature, the researcher, however, agrees with Denzin and Lincoln (2003:192) that entering the subjective consciousness to appreciate the intent of research participants is an important way or step to understanding human behaviour in qualitative research. The research design used for this work is such that allows for all voices involved in the research to be heard. Despite the fact that the researcher is the sole collector of data as well as apparent interpreter of it, the research does not portray only the perspective of the researcher. By using observations and interviews simultaneously, the researcher not only questions information gained from documents examined, but also clarifies areas of confusion on things seen and is able to get an idea of the thoughts (which in this case can be said to be the sub-consciousness) of research participants to understand their views. Although the research process is well documented, giving a thick description of it provides a vicarious experience; and readers ultimately are able to give their own interpretations and consequently make or arrive at their own generalisations as well.
The issue of bias and subjectiveness should not be seen as solely associated with the case study method as all researchers come into the research setting with their own values and beliefs irrespective of their chosen methods of research (Bennett, 2003:13). Nevertheless, to tackle issues which may arise as a result of such selective or personal bias and theoretical pre-disposition (Patton, 2002:51), certain measures (which are discussed under the heading “Triangulation” in the next section of this chapter) have been taken into consideration in planning this research design and during the research process as a whole.

3.4.4. Triangulation

Triangulation is defined by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007:141) as the utilisation of two or more methods of data collection in order to study specific aspects of human behaviour. Patton (2002:247) classifies triangulation into four types. These include:

i) data triangulation

ii) investigator triangulation

iii) theory triangulation

iv) methodological triangulation

To ensure that any form of bias is reduced to the minimum in this research, methodological triangulation was used. This is in accordance with the point argued by Bennett (2003:3) that the use of a multi-method approach increases the effectiveness of an evaluation study or research. According to Patton (2002:247), methodological triangulation is of two types; namely triangulation across methods and triangulation within methods. With regards to triangulation
across methods, it can be argued that the present study involves a two-in-one approach as it is actually a case study in which the naturalistic inquiry method is employed. Within the method triangulation is achieved through the researcher’s choice of research tools/ instruments which not only provide the required data to answer the research questions of the study but also complement one another.

Data triangulation is achieved in this research as data was collected from different sources including documents and the research participants (Nazari, 2002:82). Classes taught by lecturers and student teachers (respectively) were observed at different times. The use of data triangulation helped to boost the researcher’s confidence in the data collected and also increased the validity of the research which has been systematically carried out (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007:141).

Investigator triangulation is equally achieved as research done by other investigators in related areas to the current research were reviewed, and the assertions and findings made in this study compared to theirs (Nazari, 2002:82). The use of multiple perspectives to interpret data collected also shows theory triangulation. This process is essential not only for the clarification of meaning but also for the verification of repeatability of the interpretation of the study (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003:443).

3.4.5. Research Participants

It has been argued by scholars that the quality of any research is not only determined by the utilisation of the correct methodology and research
instruments but also in its selection of research participants (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2007:100). This particular research as a case study is more concerned with particularisation than with generalisations (Stake, 1995:8), the researcher aims to understand the programme under investigation. As earlier stated, however, this is not to say that there will not be any generalisations. Such generalisations include analytical generalisation and what has been referred to as petite (Stake, 1995:7) and naturalistic generalisations (Stake and Trumbull cited in Stake, 1982:3) which grow out of refined assertions throughout the process of the research, maximising the readers’ opportunities to learn through reflection.

Two Colleges of Education situated in the Niger-Delta region of Nigeria were chosen as the setting for this research. As simply put by Patton (2002:244), there are no hard or fast rules about sample size in qualitative research. Again, it simply depends on the purpose of the study, that is, what the researcher seeks to know, identifying what will be useful and what will be credible. As qualitative inquiry is more concerned with depth than breadth, and its utilisation in this research is geared primarily towards understanding the phenomenon or programme under study, it can be argued that less is more.

Besides taking into consideration the language of the locality, accessibility played a major role in the selection and choice of the Colleges of Education to be involved in the study. In Stake’s opinion (2000:446), very little is learnt from cases that are less hospitable and accessible. Accessibility, as it concerns this work, can be viewed from two angles, namely, proximity and hospitality. The
issue of proximity is a crucial one as the two Colleges of Education involved in the study had to be within reasonable distance to allow the researcher to commute and shuttle between both with reasonable level of convenience. The researcher also had a contact in College of Education A thus enabling her to gain a relatively easy access. Hospitability can be said to be the main deciding factor for the other College of Education B. As the researcher is a member of staff, the Head of Department was indeed very helpful as he regarded the research as one which is intended for the good of the department in particular and the College of Education in general. Lecturers and students were therefore encouraged by him to participate in the research.

Bennett (2003:8-9) argues for users of a programme to be involved in a study. This, she says, is because such users usually desire to know how a programme functions and to also compare the effectiveness of said programmes to those operating in other locations. Denzin (1989:11) contends that in conducting evaluation, special attention should be paid to the views of those who are encountering the problem under investigation. In line with the above argument put forward by Denzin (1989) and Bennett (2003) therefore, for this study two Colleges of Education, running the same NCE Programme, were used. From the data collected from both Colleges of Education, a comparison on the operation of the English Language teacher education programme in the Colleges of Education is done. Research participants drawn from both Colleges of Education are referred to here as the primary users of the programme and technically can thus be seen as those experiencing the problem (which for the sake of this research, is referred to as the programme) under investigation.
As a qualitative case study, a small number of research participants and only two main Colleges of Education have been involved in the study. To enable the researcher understand the peculiarity of the case under study a total of five lecturers from both Colleges of Education, all teaching language courses, participated in the research. In order to gather relevant data to answer Research Questions 2 and 4 respectively, six final year student teachers, three from each of the Colleges, were involved in the study. This is because the twelve weeks teaching practice course, EDU 344, is done only once in the three-year NCE programme in the first semester of the third year. It is important to state here that the research participants were duly informed as to the nature and purpose of the research and, as adults, gave informed verbal consent to participate in the research. The case study is more concerned with depth than breadth. In other words, it is more concerned with getting as much rich, in-depth detail as possible about one case in order to understand it, than in sampling numerous cases, which may not provide as much in-depth information, to promote an understanding of why and how a case is the way it is. As a result, the research may not be able to make general conclusions but it is, however, able to draw deep conclusions based on its findings which would serve as a basis as well as a springboard for further research (see Section 1.3.2).

3.4.6. Research Instruments

Every research method has research instruments that best complement its utilisation as well as its application, which as discussed earlier in previous sections of this Chapter, are greatly influenced by the researcher’s epistemological and ontological stance. In the opinion of Della Porta and
Keating (2007:25), research methodologies and research methods (which more often than not, equally determine the research tools or instruments) are seen to be intricately linked and rooted in specific epistemology and ontology.

This research is rooted in interpretivism. The case study approach and naturalistic inquiry were utilised as the main research method in the study. The research has also adopted the relativist ontology so as to use multiple perceptions for the interpretation of data. Clarke and Dawson (1999:67) rightly state that the researcher’s quest for an appropriate research method is propelled solely by the need to gather the right data that would answer formulated research questions correctly. Given that the research design for this study is qualitative, the choice of methods and research instruments were influenced by the type of data to be collected which in turn were determined by the very nature of the research questions.

The research tools have been chosen and designed taking into consideration not only the type of data needed but the likely sources of data that would answer the research questions formulated for the study. According to Bennett (2003:68), a major aspect to consider when constructing research questions is to link specific research goals which in turn should be linked to research tools aimed at possible sources of data that will provide answers to the research questions. The research questions were drawn and formulated from the aims of the research. Based on the type of information required, the research tools were matched to each question as follows (please see page 1 of this Chapter for an outline of the research questions):
Research Question 1: Document analysis
Research Question 2: Observation and interview
Research Question 3: Observation and interview
Research Question 4: Document analysis, interview and observation

By using contrastive tools, the researcher was able to gather relevant information on different aspects of the programme. The use of contrastive tools as suggested by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007:141), increased the validity of the research. In doing this, the researcher took into consideration the strengths and weaknesses of each tool and chose a set of research instruments that complement one another in the data collection process so as to build and present a complete and accurate picture of the context and programme under investigation (Patton, 2002:60). The chosen data collection tools for the study include document analysis, interviews and observation.

3.4.6.1. Document analysis

Document is defined by Bell (2005:125) as any form of impression made or created on a physical object by an individual. Documents comprise of written and non-written materials. These include photographs, films, videos, slides, minutes of meetings, school records and reports, as well as other forms of written correspondence.

It can be argued that both the primary and secondary sources of documentary evidence have been examined in this study to collect the required data on the objectives of the programme. According to Clarke and Dawson (1999:83-84),
the primary source is used to describe documents prepared by persons who are directly involved in the phenomenon under study and thus have had a personal or direct experience. The secondary source of documentary evidence, on the other hand, consists of documents prepared or compiled by individuals with no direct or first-hand experience. Such documents include the actual objectives and philosophy of the programme, language policies, policies on teacher education, NCCE (National Commission for Colleges of Education) guidelines for the programme, copies of moderators’ reports on examination results and accreditation report forms. As alternative records to what has not and (perhaps) cannot be observed by the researcher directly (Stake, 1995:68), documents are not only interesting and important for what they contain but also for what they omit (May, 1993:138).

Documentary evidence helped to provide the researcher with the much needed insight into the programme’s origin, management, delivery and development (Clarke and Dawson, 1999:88). In utilising this research tool, the researcher kept an open mind so as to identify unexpected clues as they cropped up, which in turn led to unexpected findings of interest in the research (Stake, 1995:68) which have equally helped to shape the research process. The aim here was to provide the much needed answers to Research Questions 1 and 4. Diaries and research logs kept by the student teachers and researcher respectively were examined. This not only allowed the researcher to keep track of the direction and level of the research but also provided an insight into the interpretations of the day-to-day experiences of the student teachers as they carried out their
work in their respective English Language classrooms (Bell, 2005:173). This contributed useful data for answers to Research Questions 2 and 4.

Relevant documents for this research were obtained from both national and local levels (Bell, 2005:125). Documents on teacher education, language policies, accreditation report form and programme guidelines from NCCE can be classed as documents from the national level since they were issued from the national level. Documents from the local level can be said to include documents such as the journals (kept by the student teachers), the moderators’ report, the Students’ hand book (which contained details of courses taught in the programme and their units), the course allocations and the timetable schedule.

3.4.6.2. Interviews

The interview, which is regarded as the most common method of collecting data for qualitative research, was used in this study to allow for an in depth exploration of the research topic through the use of semi-structured questions (King, 2004:11). Since utterances of research participants are generally regarded as a rich source of qualitative data (Patton, 2002:21), the interview was used in this study to provide an emic perspective of the programme under investigation. It captured the experiences and helped the researcher to understand the perspectives of the interviewees involved in the study. It is in fact described by Stake (1995:64) as “the main road to multiple realities”. The interview was thus chosen as a suitable data collection instrument for this research as one of the aims of this study is to explore the different ways of
interpreting the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level through the classroom practices of some of the language lecturers in the programme. Since the technique is one with which most interviewees are familiar because of its popularity (King, 2004:12), it was used in this research to complement and validate the data collected through observation and document examination.

Patton (2002: 28) describes interview and observation as “mutually reinforcing qualitative techniques.” Observations generally tend to reveal physical experiences of individuals; they do not, however, provide explanations as to why and what these experiences mean to those involved (Darlington and Scott, 2002:75). Although the researcher had an interview schedule (see Appendix A), the interviews conducted with the lecturers and student teachers respectively were semi-structured. This allowed the researcher to probe and explore the responses given by the interviewees while endeavouring to see and understand why and how they hold their respective views (King, 2004:11).

The lecturers and student teachers whose classes were observed were also interviewed as a follow-up to the observations. In choosing the type of interviews employed in this research, the nature of the research questions and the data required for their answers were taken into consideration (Mills, Durepos and Wieber, 2010:496.) In-depth, one-to-one, semi-structured and informal-conversational interviews were used to obtain information from lecturers and student teachers involved in the study as research participants.
According to Gillham, (2000:63) the informal-conversational interview tends to give great insight into the topic of research as most individuals are likely to let down their guard. Their responses usually become more revealing when they are engaged in natural conversations and are not being formally interviewed. Sitting amongst students in the College of Education and primary school classrooms proved to be a very valuable technique. It allowed the students to let their guards down as they began to regard the researcher as one of them. The researcher was thus able to engage in discussions with students before and after lessons, asking questions about their experiences and their thoughts/opinions on class activities.

Information gleaned from such conversations helped to clarify the researcher's views on certain issues which also helped shape the focus of the research. It helped the researcher to refine the interview questions for both lecturers and student teachers. For the formal interview, the researcher used a schedule. This enabled the researcher to have a sense of direction in the course of the interview so as to achieve the required goals for the research. The use of the interview schedule does not, however, mean that all questions asked at the interview were prepared in advance. The reason for this as stated by Mills, Durepos and Wieber (2010:496), is that as interviews progress, questions evolve.

3.4.6.3. Observations
As mentioned earlier, observation and interviews are seen as simultaneous activities and are used in the same (simultaneous) manner in this evaluation
research. Although the interview has the potential to produce very rich and important data, it actually only provides or reflects the interviewee's perception and side of the story. It must be noted that this perception may not necessarily be the case or even the true picture of things (Bell, 2005:185). The observation technique is, therefore, used in this study to create opportunities for the researcher to verify statements/comments made by interviewees as well as offer a view of the programme under study from a different perspective other than those of the research participants.

An overt, participant-as-observer approach was adopted in carrying out this research. Aside from the ethical issues involved, the use of the covert approach had very strong possibilities that could have brought the study to an abrupt end if eventually unearthed. With the overt, participant-as-observer approach however, the researcher had access to direct observation of activities in the field and to the research participants who were engaged in casual discussions which took the form of informal or conversational interviews (Clarke and Dawson, 1999:82). The approach thus proved to be a very valuable tool because, as stated by Patton (2002:286), “everything that goes on in or around a programme is data”.

Observation was used for the collection of data that reflect or provide evidence of the lecturers’ individual interpretation and translation of the programme’s objectives. This was seen from their classroom practices as classes were taught. The technique enabled the researcher to collect “live data” and to see first-hand what happened in real situations, not relying only on second hand
information (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007:396). It also served as a basis for the researcher to compare theory and (said) practice to actual reality. A total of thirty-three classes were observed; eighteen of them were taught by student teachers and fifteen by lecturers.

It should be stated also that some problems were encountered in getting lecturers involved in the study. The researcher originally intended to involve six lecturers in the study, three from each of the Colleges of Education. During the data collection exercise, however, one of the lecturers in College of Education A opted out of the research as she was very uncomfortable and reluctant for her classes to be observed. This did not pose an immediate problem as the researcher was able to get another lecturer to take her place in the study. In College of Education B, instead of the intended three lecturers, only two lecturers agreed to participate in the research. Although this was unplanned for, it did not have a negative impact on the research especially as the naturalistic approach was being used. The action instead opened an opportunity or an avenue for the researcher to seek answers as to why lecturers were hesitant to have their classes observed by outsiders and if this had anything to do with their teaching practice.

Although the researcher had ample opportunities to observe classes without prior disclosure of her identity and purpose of research, these options were not taken because of ethical reasons coupled with the fact that the use of covert observation in this case could have jeopardised the entire research. Some lecturers were sceptical and apprehensive of what the findings would be used
for and who it would be sent to. The researcher had to reassure those involved of confidentiality and assured them that information given would be used strictly and solely for the purpose of the research.

It is necessary to state here that although the lecturers were aware of who the researcher was and the purpose of her research, not all the students were aware of who she was and why she was there. With the exception of one lecturer in College of Education B, no prior introduction of the researcher was made in the classrooms by the other lecturers to the students in their respective taught classes. Most of the students, thus, assumed the researcher was a Year I (level one) student in the Year I lectures, and a Carry-over (repeat) student in the higher level classes (namely Year II and Year III). Although unintentional, this, however, worked to the advantage of the researcher as it allowed her to gather relevant data without necessarily intruding excessively on the natural dynamics of the class. Thus, any evidence of the Hawthorne effect can be said to have been reduced to the very minimum as most of the classes taught by the lecturers and the student teachers were observed at least thrice (Nazari, 2002:82). The data collected through observation were also triangulated with those gathered from other sources using the other research tools – semi-structured interview and document examination. It is important to state here that no ethical rules were broken or breeched as the focus of the researcher was not on the entire class (students) but on the lecturers who were participants in the research.
To avoid that power relationship between the researcher and the student teachers, the researcher initially avoided introducing herself as a lecturer (as one of the Colleges involved was one in which she taught) but instead simply introduced herself as a research student. She was thus able to gain a measure of acceptance as well as trust from the students. Even when a complete disclosure of her identity was eventually given, the research process was not affected in any way as a rapport had already been built between the researcher and the student teachers.

Observations were followed by one on one semi-structured interviews with individual lecturers and student teachers to discuss issues of interest which arose based on the observations made. A total of five lecturers were involved in the study. Observations were used to provide evidence aimed at providing answers to Research Question 2. To identify the teaching needs of the student teachers, a total of six student teachers were observed and interviewed on a one-to-one basis. This not only enabled the researcher to identify actual teaching needs of the students but to also identify the needs alongside with the programmes’ objectives to examine the extent to which the objectives reflect the actual language and teaching needs of the students of the NCE Programme. It also allowed for a critical examination of the achievement of the objectives of the programme and equally provided answers to Research Question 3.

3.4.7. Ethical Issues

Prior to the data collection process, letters requesting permission for access were sent by the researcher to the two Colleges of Education involved in the
study and to the respective placement schools to which the student teachers (involved in the study) were assigned (please see Appendix F). The researcher equally obtained the relevant Letters of Authorisation granting her access to the respective institutions in question. According to Mills, Durepos and Wiebe (2010:101), it is expedient to protect the anonymity of research participants in a case study. In line with this view and for ethical reasons, the Colleges involved in the study will be referred to as College of Education A and College of Education B respectively. The Letters of Authorisation obtained from both Colleges as well as those from the placement schools will not be included in the thesis for the reasons as stated above.

3.4.8. Qualitative Analysis

According to Flick (2004: 193), analysis, interpretation and presentation are central activities for any qualitative researcher. A unique characteristic of qualitative research is in its diversity as it allows for a range of methods or approaches to be used in the research design itself. However, as with any qualitative approach chosen or utilised, the strength lies in its explanatory as well as exploratory powers (Attride-Stirling, 2001:403). As such, documentation of the entire research process from the design to the data collection/fieldwork to the analysis and interpretation is seen as a principal technique in qualitative research which enhances its quality, making it transparent, systematic and rigorous (Flick, 2004:187). Nevertheless, as noted by Attridge-Stirling (2001:386), of all the phases of the research process mentioned above, it is the analytical stage that is the most neglected in qualitative research as most researchers tend to omit the “how question” in their write-up or reports. Although the growth
and development of ground-breaking qualitative research is commendable, Attride-Stirling (2001:385) argues that this growth has not been commensurate with the development of analytical tools [and approaches] for qualitative research. The reason for this is attributed to gross under-reporting of analytical techniques by researchers. The researcher has clearly taken this point into consideration and has therefore outlined and explained the different steps taken in analysing the data gathered in this research (see Section 3.4.7.2).

Analysis can be seen as an activity that occurs throughout the research process in qualitative research. It is not a straight forward process and does not follow a linear pattern but is iterative (Dornyei, 2007:243). In fact, as aptly described by Richards (2003:268-269), the relationship between data and analysis is an intimate and complex one. Analytical approaches in qualitative research vary as the term connotes different things or meanings to different researchers. Qualitative analysis can be imaginative, artful, and flexible; however, whichever approach is used, it is important to ensure that it is scholarly, systematic and intellectually rigorous following certain principled analytical sequences that still allow the researcher room to be creative in the interpretation of results (Richards, 2003:269, Dornyei, 2007: 242). Although the analysis of data is based on the thematic approach, the researcher has adapted some aspects of the approach in accordance with her mode of analysis. This is elaborated on in the “Analytical Process” under Section 3.4.7.2.
3.4.8.1. Thematic analysis

Thematic analysis is used as the analytical method in this study. Braun and Clarke (2006:78) argue that thematic analysis is not just a tool for qualitative analysis as stated by Boyatzis (1998:iv) or a process as stated by Ryan and Bernard (2000:780) but “a method in its own right”. It is described as a method that identifies, analyses and reports patterns within data (Braun and Clarke, 2006:79). Despite being widely used, it is said to be a scarcely acknowledged analytical method in qualitative research (Braun and Clarke, 2006:77). This according to Boyatzis (1998: vii) is because not much is written on how to use thematic analysis. This is taken care of in this research as a step-by-step description of the analytical process is given (see Section 3.4.7.2). This will enable readers to evaluate the process and the results and findings of the study (Flick, 2004:187).

There are qualitative analytical methods which seek patterns within data, like grounded theory, interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA), content analysis and narrative analysis but they are bound or linked to specific theories. Thematic analysis, on the other hand, is different from these in that it is theoretically flexible and as such can be used in most studies regardless of the epistemological stance of the researcher. Boyatzis (1998: vii) rightly describes it as a translator that speaks the language of both qualitative and quantitative analysis. This theoretically flexible nature of thematic analysis will enable the researcher to communicate and disseminate the results and findings of this study to a wider audience even with varied epistemological background or stance.
Thematic analysis allows the researcher to work with large amounts of data from multiple sources, summarising main concepts and allowing for comparison across data sets (Braun and Clarke, 2006:97). This makes it even more appealing as well as appropriate as this study employed three main research tools (interviews, observations and document examination) for the collection of data from different sources for different purposes and at different times (refer to Section 3.4.6 for details). Using thematic analysis, the themes across the data sets from the two Colleges of Education involved in the study were summarised, highlighting their main features and allowing for a comparison of themes which according to Bohm (2004:270) is an important intellectual activity in the analytical process.

3.4.8.2. Analytical process

As stated above, interview, observation and document analysis were used as data collection tools in this research. The documents were analysed first before the interview and observation data to enable the researcher to identify the said objectives as this was central to the study (see Section 4.1). Classes were observed to see first-hand how these objectives were integrated within the classroom practices of lecturers in the Department of English, and to examine the extent to which the afore-mentioned objectives reflect the teaching needs of the student teachers.

A total of five lecturers and six student teachers were observed and then interviewed (see Sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.5). This allowed the researcher to get
the interviewees’ views on issues arising from their observed classes. The
interviews and audio recordings of the observations were transcribed by the
researcher, beginning with those of the lecturers, and then followed by those of
the student teachers. Each transcript was read through immediately after its
transcription to check for accuracy while listening to the audio recordings from
the interviews and observation. To check for discrepancies and to fill in likely
gaps that may have occurred during the observation, the transcript for the
audio-observation notes was compared to the handwritten field notes.

The analysis was done manually. This process not only enabled the researcher
to be immersed in the data, but also to familiarise herself with it (Riessman,
1993:58). The transcripts of lecturers from one College of Education were first
analysed before going on to those from the second College. The same process
was applied to the transcripts for the student teachers. This was to help the
researcher work systematically and to gain insights into the data, identifying
possible similarities and differences in themes that emerged from the data
collected from both Colleges.

Each transcript was read through with the researcher writing comments or
impressions on the transcripts as they came to mind. Apart from reading
through to check for accuracy during the transcription stage, there was no other
pre- reading before the analysis of each transcript. This was to enable the
researcher to study the transcript with a “fresh-eye” and to identify points, ideas
and themes embedded in the transcripts. In contrast to the suggested
procedures given by Boyatzis (1998:45), there were also no pre-established
codes or codebook used in the analysis. Although the questions on the interview schedule (see Appendix A) were formulated based on the research questions for the study, the researcher did not read through the transcripts with the research questions in mind, but with an open mind, commenting on the transcript as she read and as such was not driven by a theoretical interest in the research topic (Braun and Clarke, 2006: 83). The observation schedule (see Appendix B), however, enabled the researcher to stay focused on the key aspects of the study. The inductive analysis, which is essentially data driven, was used in analysing the interview and observation transcripts.

The comments written on the transcripts were collated and put into related groups or categories and given initial headings. These headings served as working titles and were later refined to reflect the central message or point in each category. These were highlighted with coloured pens. Each transcript was analysed using this process to get an initial draft of themes which were then merged and refined to produce a summarised version of the themes made of major themes and other sub-themes. As in the individual transcript, collective summaries of all the themes that emerged from the lecturers’ interviews and observations were produced, first according to the respective Colleges of Education, then a general summary of both Colleges which clearly showed similarities as well as differences in themes. These were highlighted with coloured pens. The same process was applied in carrying out the analysis on the interview and observation transcripts of the student teachers. The approach used by the researcher can best be described as an inward-outward approach,
working from an inner circle outward. The themes identified can thus be said to be closely linked to the data (Patton, 1990:390).

3.4.9. Pilot Study
The researcher carried out a pilot study within the Nigerian context to test the research instruments. At the end of the pilot and as a result of the findings, it became necessary to modify some aspects of the research aims. Changes were also made to the research tools and choice of research participants. The changes that resulted from the pilot are noted below.

Objectives of the programme
It was noted that both English Language and Literature courses are taught in this programme. However, for the purpose of this research, attention is focused on the language aspect of the programme as this is the area which is of primary concern and interest to the researcher. Changes were equally made to the research participants section. Consequently, the first and third research aims have been amended to read:

1) Critically analyse the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme as it pertains to the teaching and learning of the English Language Courses in the programme.

2) Identify if and how these objectives reflect the teaching needs of the student teachers from the two Colleges of Education under study.

The third research aim was amended and split in two to accommodate a fourth aim and now reads as:
3) To identify the teaching needs of the student teachers from the two Colleges of Education under study.

4) To examine if and how the objectives reflect the teaching needs of the student teachers.

The aims were later reshuffled and arranged in a logical/sequential format (see Section 3.1).

**Research Participants**

As a result of the findings from the pilot study, the researcher involved the final year students of the programme in the study instead of the new graduate teachers of the programme as initially planned as they (the student teachers) were scheduled to be on their practical teaching during the data collection period.

**Research Tool**

The focus group interview which was originally intended for use as one of the research instruments for the study was replaced with the semi-structured interview. This is because the teachers involved in the pilot study found it easier and more convenient to talk when they were interviewed on a one–to-one basis than in a group. The interview schedule was also slightly modified.

This Chapter has dealt extensively with a number of issues relevant to this research. These have in their own way shaped and have had an impact on the chosen research design of this work. It has examined the nature of the research, rational for the chosen methods, research instruments, philosophical
stance of the researcher as well as theories adopted in conducting the research.
CHAPTER FOUR – ANALYSIS OF COLLEGE DATA

4.1. INTRODUCTION

As discussed in the previous Chapter, the current research study centres on the evaluation of the English Language teacher education programme in two Colleges of Education within the Nigerian context. It aims to:

1) critically analyse the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme as it pertains to the teaching and learning of the English Language courses in the programme.
2) identify the teaching needs of the student-teachers from the two Colleges of Education under study.
3) examine if and how the stated objectives are interpreted through their realisation in the classes of Colleges of Education by the lecturers.
4) examine if and how the objectives reflect the teaching needs of the student teachers.

This research study, which is essentially qualitative, utilises the naturalistic inquiry and case study as its main research methods (see Sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 respectively for details). To gather data relevant to the research, document analysis, interviews and observations were employed as the main research instruments. The research participants involved in the study are drawn from two Colleges of Education, both situated in the Niger Delta region in Nigeria. In total, five lecturers and six student teachers participated in the research (see Section 3.4.5).
In this chapter, the discussion will be centred on the analysis of College documents, lecturers’ interviews and observation data from both Colleges of Education. For the purpose of clarification and to enable the researcher adopt a systematic approach to the analytical task, the data gathered from the Colleges of Education is referred to in this thesis as college data. Data collected from the student teachers in their respective placement schools is referred to as school data and will be dealt with in Chapter Five.

As stated in Chapter Three, the philosophical framework is based on the interpretivist paradigm. The use of the naturalistic inquiry requires thick vivid description in the analysis of data to allow the readers to go through the same experience as the researcher. Stake (1995:42) refers to this as experiential learning, which enables the readers to draw their own conclusions. To achieve this, summarised versions of the findings are shown on different tables, followed by an in-depth descriptive and critical analysis of the findings as shown on the tables.

### 4.2. ANALYSIS OF COLLEGE DOCUMENTS

In conducting this analysis, documents containing information relevant to the research questions were examined. These documents include: NCCE (2009) *Minimum Standards for Nigeria Certificate in Education*, NCCE (2010) *Curriculum Implementation Framework for NCE Programmes*, timetable schedules and accreditation forms. Below is a table summarising the information gathered from the documents examined.
4.2.1. NCCE/College Documents

The National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE) is the national regulatory body responsible for the uniform co-ordination of programmes in all Colleges of Education in Nigeria. It carries out quality checks by accrediting programmes every five years to ensure that the programmes run in respective Colleges of Education are up to and preferably, above the required minimum NCCE standards. It is equally in charge of the formulation of policies with regards to the development and improvement of NCE-run programmes. As mentioned above, the NCCE documents examined for this research include *Minimum Standards for Nigeria Certificate in Education* (2009) and *NCCE Curriculum Implementation Framework for NCE Programmes* (2010). Information gathered from both documents will be discussed using the following headings: programme objectives, courses and outlines, teaching methods and quality control measures.

4.2.1.1. Programme objectives

A major concern of this work is to critically analyse the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme in the two Colleges of Education. As
both Colleges of Education involved in the study are under the same regulatory body, they thus share the same programme objectives. As shown in the NCCE Minimum Standards (2009:17), the programme has five main objectives. These are listed below:

- Help the students to develop the four language skills – listening, speaking, reading and writing
- Help students become confident and competent in the use of spoken and written English
- Enable students to develop interests and acquire critical skills to appreciate literary works.
- Equip successful students to teach English effectively at the Primary and Secondary School levels.
- Prepare students for further studies in the subject.

As shown above, objective 3, which focuses on the literary aspect of the programme is not relevant to this study, as the primary focus of this research is on the language component of the programme (please see Section 1.3.1 for details). Objectives 1, 2 and 3 are discussed alongside with the findings from the interviews and observations of both lecturers and student teachers. To examine objective 4, student teachers on practical teaching exercises are involved in the study. This allows the researcher to get their own perspectives on the programme and to also identify their teaching needs as they engage in a hands-on experience of teaching. On objective 5, there is not much to show that the students are encouraged to engage in further studies in the subject at the degree level. The degree programmes run in both Colleges of Education provide an avenue for the students who graduate from the NCE programme to gain admission easily into such programmes. However, the degree programme comes with its own repercussion as the findings from the interview data clearly show that it runs at the detriment of the NCE programme as observed in the two Colleges of Education (see Section 4.3.2.2 for details).
4.2.1.2. Courses and outlines

The NCCE Minimum Standards (2009: 20-27) provides a comprehensive list of the language-based courses and the outlines for the English Language teacher education programme. It should be noted here that the courses discussed in this section do not reflect all the courses done in the programme (see Section 4.2.1.1). The list shows a total of sixteen language-based courses spread over a period of a three year NCE programme. With the exception of the Teaching Practice Course, which is six units, all other courses are two units each with three courses classed as electives, namely Practical Listening Skills (ENG 111), Speech Work (ENG 121) and Varieties of English (ENG 223). This is not to say that they are optional, they are in fact compulsory. However, unlike the other core courses in the programme, the elective courses do not pose a problem to the students as they can still graduate even if they fail them. The table below shows a summary of the courses done. These have been grouped into five categories and arranged accordingly in first and second semesters. In a normal academic year, the first semester begins from mid-October to the end of April, while the second semester begins from mid-May to mid-August.
Table 4.2: Summary of Language-based Courses (Single Major)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar/Others</th>
<th>ENG 114- Basic Grammar (Core)</th>
<th>ENG 211- The Structure of English (Core)</th>
<th>ENG 212 – Applied English Linguistics I (Core)</th>
<th>ENG 223- Varieties of English (Elective)</th>
<th>ENG 313 Applied English Linguistics II (Core)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>ENG 112 – Introduction to Phonetics and Phonology (Core)</td>
<td>ENG 121 – Speech Work (Elective)</td>
<td>ENG 214 – Phonetics and Phonology (Core)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>ENG 111 – Practical Listening Skills (Elective)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>ENG 122 – Reading Comprehension (Core)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>ENG 222 – Composition I (Core)</td>
<td>ENG 315 – Composition II (Core)</td>
<td>ENG 324 – Summary Writing Skills (Core)</td>
<td>ENG 329 – Long Essay (Core)</td>
<td>EDU 323 – Research Project (Core)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>ENG 123 – English Language Methods (Core)</td>
<td>ENG 213 – English Language Methods (Core)</td>
<td>EDU 344 – Teaching Practice (Core)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown on the table, some of the courses are foundational and are designed to build the students’ use of English with regards to the correct use of grammar and sentence construction. The courses also draw the awareness of the students to salient issues in language teaching within the Nigerian context. For example the course outline on Applied Linguistics II not only examines language, its characteristics and other related issues, but it also draws the students’ attention to the raging debates on the National Language Question, the use of Pidgin English and the Nigerian English.

Although the first objective of the programme states that it seeks to develop the four language skills of the students, the courses taught through the three levels of the programme seem to indicate otherwise. From the table above it is clear that with the exception of writing and speaking, very little attention is paid to listening and reading as throughout the three year programme, only one course each – ENG 111 and ENG 122 respectively- is taught to promote both skills. Technically, it can be argued that the reading is taken care of by the literary component of the programme; nevertheless, it is important for reading to be taught properly as a skill. ENG 111, even as the only listening course done in the Single Major programme, is classed as an elective. The question thus arises as to the level of seriousness with which the course is undertaken and the aim behind teaching it in the first place.

Information on the table shows that great attention is paid to the development of the writing skills of the students. Nevertheless, there is a loop-hole as a closer examination of the table reveals that there are no writing courses in the first
year (Year I) to build the students skill in this area before their progress to the second year (Year II) of the programme. The table also shows two main method courses designed to prepare students for the teaching practice exercise, which incidentally is a six unit credit course. The course outlines for both courses, ENG 123 and ENG 213, appear detailed. It, however, remains to be seen how the lecturers use this to prepare the students effectively for teaching practice exercise. Students during the teaching practice are sent to different primary and secondary schools to practise and are assessed on their performance over a period of twelve weeks. The Research Project – EDU 323 - is compulsory for all students in the final year of NCE programme. It is the final year dissertation and students can choose topics from their area of study or from education in general.

4.2.1.3. Teaching methods

One of the objectives of this research is to examine the classroom practices of lecturers in relation to the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme. In line with this, data gathered from the Curriculum Implementation Framework for NCE Programmes (2010) gives detailed guidelines on the expected classroom practices of lecturers in the programme. This NCCE document (2010:7) shows a shift from the previous teacher centred approach aimed at the promotion of “rote learning and the mastery of content to constructivist methods that help learners to construct their knowledge using activity-based learner centred approach.” It shows a shift from the previous focus of mastery of curriculum content to actual practice and reflection of knowledge and skills gained by the student in the programme (NCCE, 2010:5).
As indicated in the document, lecturers are expected to organise comprehensive learning programmes that will ensure effective learning on the part of the students and not just a plan to cover the course contents in the programme. In order to develop appropriate teaching skills the document emphasises the need for the creation of ample opportunities for students in the programme to practise teaching. In other words, learning opportunities, reflecting knowledge and skills, as well as attitude need to be created by the lecturers.

As noted in the above discussion, the intent of the NCCE as reflected in the “Curriculum Implementation Framework for NCE Programmes” is laudable. However, whether and how these guidelines are followed and implemented by the lecturers through their teaching /classroom practices is of major interest to this work and will be discussed further in Sections 4.3.2.2, 4.3.2.3 and 4.4.2.2 respectively.

**4.2.1.4. Quality control measures**

The NCCE is responsible for the quality of all educational programmes in Colleges of Education in Nigeria. To ensure that quality is maintained, the NCCE engages in the accreditation of programmes. This is usually done once in five years. A comprehensive list of what is expected during such accreditation exercises can be found in Appendix “C”. Usually it is the practice of Colleges of Education to engage in a mock accreditation exercise in preparation for the main one organized and carried out by the NCCE. A close scrutiny of one of such mock accreditation forms showing the areas to be evaluated, with regards
to the English Language teacher education programme in College of Education B for example, shows, surprisingly, that attention is not focused on the classroom practices of the lecturers or even on the learning experiences of the students in the programme. This suggests an obvious lack of a regular and effective internal evaluation system in the programme.

4.2.1.5. Scheduled lecture times

As already mentioned in Section 4.2.1.2 above, the language based courses are two credit units each. In both Colleges of Education, the allocated teaching time as reflected in the timetable for the courses is one hour a week respectively. However, in the case of College of Education B, lecturers fixed one hour extra to teach their respective courses (see Section 4.3.2.2). Given the comprehensive nature of the programme as shown in the course outlines examined, there is need to question the quality of teaching given in comparison to the allocated teaching time for each language course on the programme. This is even more disturbing as the timeframe for each semester, as previously stated in Section 4.2.1.2, shows that the first semester is about twenty-four weeks and the second semester is only twelve weeks.

An examination of the relevant documents has revealed gaps in the programme objectives and approach adopted to achieve the stipulated objectives of the programme. Although the NCCE attempts to accredit the programme, such evaluation cannot be termed as regular as it is carried out once in every five years, making its usefulness and effectiveness questionable with regards to the current programme under study.
4.3. ANALYSIS OF LECTURERS’ INTERVIEW DATA

In order to adopt a systematic approach to the discussion on the analysis of data for this research, the research questions have been taken into consideration. The discussion in this section is focused on the analysis of the semi-structured interviews for the lecturers. Questions are directed towards gathering information on their background, the programme, interpretation of programme objectives through classroom practices, performance of student teachers during teaching practice supervision and questions related to particular observed practices of lecturers (please see Appendix “A” for the complete Interview Schedule).

As stated above, the analysis of the lecturers’ interviews begins with an analysis of data gathered on the lecturers’ academic background; years of teaching experience, courses taught as well as years spent teaching in the Department of English in their respective Colleges of Education. This information is shown in the following table.
Table 4. 3: Lecturers’ Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Lecturer 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 2 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 3 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 4 (College B)</th>
<th>Lecturer 5 (College B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>MA (English)</td>
<td>PhD (English)</td>
<td>MA (Linguistics) BA (English)</td>
<td>MA (English) BA in English</td>
<td>PhD (Literature in English) BA (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching English Language</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching English Language at the College of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses taught and their codes</td>
<td>ENG 114 - Basic Grammar</td>
<td>ENG 214 - Phonetics and Phonology</td>
<td>ENG 313 - Applied English Linguistics II</td>
<td>ENG 211 - Structure of English</td>
<td>ENG 112 - Introduction to Phonetics and Phonology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 211 - Structure of English</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 112 - Introduction to Phonetics and Phonology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1. Background Information

As shown in the table above, the courses taught by the lecturers are predominantly language based and cover grammar, phonology and linguistics. It is necessary to state here that the list of courses shown on the chart above is by no means a reflection of all the courses included in the programme. The chart only contains a list of the language courses taught for that semester by the lecturers participating in the research (see Appendix G for a schedule of the first semester language-based courses). A comprehensive list of all the language courses is discussed in the document analysis section of this work.

4.3.2 Findings from Lecturers’ Interviews

The findings from the Lecturers’ interviews are grouped under four major headings with other sub-headings under them. These major headings include: lecturers’ views/perceptions of the programme, implementation issues, programme objectives and views on teaching practice supervision. To facilitate the analytical process, the following tables are used to show summarised versions of the findings. These are then closely followed by a descriptive and critical analysis of the information in the tables.
Table 4.4: Lecturers’ Views/Perceptions of the Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Lecturer 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 2 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 3 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 4 (College B)</th>
<th>Lecturer 5 (College B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme design</strong></td>
<td>- designed by NCCE&lt;br&gt;- well-structured in terms of course content by NCCE</td>
<td>- comprehensive&lt;br&gt;- well designed&lt;br&gt;- design and implementation seen as separate entities&lt;br&gt;- comprehensive</td>
<td>- programme becoming worse</td>
<td>- well structured&lt;br&gt;- tougher than other programmes in the College</td>
<td>- well designed by NCCE&lt;br&gt;- no deficiencies&lt;br&gt;- balanced programme&lt;br&gt;- adequate preparation of students for University programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for the current state of the programme</strong></td>
<td>- course outlines are provided for lecturers to prepare teaching materials&lt;br&gt;- provision of the language laboratory makes teaching task easier&lt;br&gt;- presence of a monitoring team</td>
<td>- conflict between NCCE requirements and actual implementation of the guidelines</td>
<td>- intentionally admitting academically weak students&lt;br&gt;- negative orientation from previous level&lt;br&gt;- presence of the degree and part-time degree programme on campus</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality control measures</strong></td>
<td>Monitoring committee&lt;br&gt;- monitoring committee&lt;br&gt;- internal and external moderation&lt;br&gt;- independent teaching practice</td>
<td>- monitoring committee&lt;br&gt;- moderation of scripts</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2.1. Lecturers’ views/perceptions of the programme

The sub-themes generated from the data under this heading are: programme design, reasons for the current state of the programme and quality control measures.

Programme design

On the issue of programme design, four out of the five lecturers interviewed agree that the NCE English Language teacher education programme is well designed. According to Lecturer 1 “…it’s well designed in reference to course content.” Lecturer 2 believes

…it can meet the immediate needs of the secondary school or primary school teachers that we are preparing. But it is the implementation that is the problem.

Lecturer 2 sees programme design and implementation as two separate entities. Lecturer 3, however, argues that although lecturers in the programme are doing their best, the programme is becoming worse and is faced with a number of challenges including the current standard of education. She says

…the standard of education has really gone down, it’s telling on us. So we are doing our best in conditions that are not the best really.

Lecturer 3 explains that the majority of the students entering the programme to study “are not usually the best.” As a result of this, many of such students “fail out.” From her point of view, therefore, lecturers are compelled to work with students who are more or less perceived as failures.

Lecturers 4 and 5 from College of Education B believe the programme is well designed, well structured. According to Lecturer 4, compared to other programmes, the English Language teacher education programme is viewed by
students as a difficult one. In his view, lecturers are guided by a degree of objectivity. He states:

*But I must say that the students have a feeling that students of other departments, I mean departments other than English, find things...somehow easier from their own lecturers.*

Lecturer 5 from College of Education B believes that there are no deficiencies in the programme as it is well structured. He states that since the College operates the English Single major component as designed by the NCCE, there is a good balance as the “...single major component weighs equally [the] English and Literature [courses].” To him, the strength of the programme lies in its adequate preparation of students for further studies in the subject at the University level. In fact he describes the programme as follows:

*...it adequately prepares the students for the Pre University Programme... I mean for the University Programme, for those of them who will go to the University, and then for the middle level Language Education Programme in the... in the J.SS.3 in the Secondary level. So the programme is strong, it’s quite fine.*

**Reasons for the current state of the programme**

With regards to the reasons for the current state of the programme as given on their perception of the programme design itself, the lecturers have different views. Lecturer 1 regards the provision of course outlines and language laboratories as a strong point for the programme as he believes that they make both the preparation of teaching materials and the task of teaching easier for the lecturers. This is in stark contrast to the view portrayed by Lecturer 2 as discussed in Section 4.3.2.2. According to Lecturer 1, the presence of a monitoring team also makes it mandatory for lecturers to be present in their
respective classes at lecture times. The statement below shows the reliance of Lecturer 1 on the pre-prepared materials:

...when you start teaching, it becomes easy because you are armed with what has been prepared in the outline for you because that’s what I use. With the aid of the instruments that are set up in the language lab, it really helps to boost your teaching. It helps make the teaching exercise to be very exciting. That’s a strong point. Then two, there are monitoring committee that have been set up in every department, they go round to make sure that ... we are really doing the job.

To Lecturer 2, although the programme is well designed, it is plagued by numerous problems in its implementation. This can be attributed to the obvious discrepancies between the NCCE requirements and actual implementation of the guidelines in the NCE programme. She states “... because of inadequate funding, our facilities are not adequate.”

Lecturer 3 is of the opinion that the programme is becoming worse. This she attributes to the poor quality of students admitted into the programme, negative orientation of students to English Language as a subject from their previous level of education and the presence of other degree programmes in the College of Education. In her words:

Some of them [the students] even think that English is so easy, if you can’t fit into some other course you can just land in English because everybody speaks English and they come here and they are not prepared.

Lecturer 4 is of the opinion that the programme is well structured but more difficult than other NCE programmes. This he attributes to the level of objectivity amongst lecturers in the department and to the fact that students in the department are made to work hard to earn their grades. According to him:
... whatever scores they have, it is simply what they have scored. I’m trying to say that students from other departments may score higher marks, higher marks that sometimes they may not merit, but that is not the case in English Language department.

From the perspective of Lecturer 4, the standards in the Department of English are high and students are made to work hard. This again appears to be at variance with the view of Lecturer 3 discussed above which suggests a lowering of standards as majority of students admitted into the programme are performing below the required academic standards. Complicating the issue even further is the point made by Lecturer 2 that students entering the programme are required by the NCCE to have a minimum of “five credits for all NCE entry requirement, with English and Maths compulsory.”

According to Lecturer 5 the programme covers courses in the following areas: Language Methodology, Phonology and Grammar and as such cannot be said to be deficient.

**Quality control measures**

According to the lecturers in College of Education A, the programme has certain measures in place for quality control which include the use of a monitoring committee and the use of moderators for the moderation of marked scripts. Lecturers 1, 2 and 3 acknowledge the existence of the monitoring committee. However, its role is restricted to only ensuring that lecturers are in class as scheduled on the timetable. According to Lecturer 1:

...they [the monitoring committee] really do not... check the course content and... what each lecturer teaches to confirm whether it’s in line or not. What they do is just to make sure that there’s a lecturer in class performing his duty at the appointed time.
Lecturer 2 seems to agree with Lecturer 1 on this point as she too states “...every person has some kind of autonomy over ... his lecture method, over the classroom.”

Although Lecturer 2 confirms the existence of the monitoring committee in the School of Languages in College of Education A, she equally acknowledges a lack of an internal monitoring system which focuses on the teaching practices of lecturers and other aspects of the programme. When asked if the programme has an internal monitoring system, she responds “...no, no, nothing like that. We don’t have anything like that.”

Her comments here seem to indicate that the College of Education does not have a system designed to monitor and ensure that the practices utilised by the lecturers in the classrooms of Colleges of Education are geared towards the promotion and achievement of the programme’s objectives. This point is further buttressed by Lecturer 2 as she describes the teaching practices of some of the lecturers in the Department of English. She states: “...some of our lecturers go to class to read from text books, I’m sorry to say.” The last part of that comment clearly shows her dissatisfaction and disapproval of such practice.

To ensure a measure of uniformity in scores awarded to the students, marked scripts, in all the courses taught at the different levels, are moderated. According to Lecturers 2 and 3 the scripts for Year II and III students are moderated externally by selected Lecturers in the subject from other Colleges of
Education, while those of Year I students are moderated internally. Lecturer 2 says

...our Year I students’ scripts are moderated internally; that is the lecturers within the department would swap ... scripts and moderate. But from Year II and Year III, they are sent out for external moderators.

Lecturer 3, in her response, lends credence to this as she also states:

...then we have a system where we ...assess one another’s work. Then we also use external assessors. Part two and part three courses are given to external assessors.

With the use of the internal and external moderators, it would appear that the proof of a lecturer’s effectiveness in teaching is judged by the overall performance of the students in the examination and not necessarily on the lecturer’s teaching practices in class. This is portrayed in the remarks of Lecturer 3 which states:

We call on the course lecturer, why do you have such a high level of failures for instance. Why is it some people have A+, majority are just failing?

There is, therefore, no system in place that periodically checks the performance/ classroom practices of the lecturers.

As seen from the discussion above, the first major theme, “Lecturers’ Views/Perception of the Programme” centred on the design of the programme, reasons for the programme’s current state and measures for quality control as part of the programme itself. The afore-mentioned aspects, therefore, form the sub-themes generated from the first main theme of the Lecturers’ interview findings.
### Table 4.5: Implementation Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Lecturer 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 2 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 3 (College A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCCE policies versus actual practice</strong></td>
<td>- class size</td>
<td>- inadequate funding</td>
<td>- unconducive learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effect on Lecturer's practice</strong></td>
<td>- inadequate feedback to students</td>
<td>- dissatisfied with the programme</td>
<td>- quality of learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Quality of students**             | - mixed learning abilities  
- not all students have a solid academic foundation                                                                                                                                                           | - non-credible results  
- poor academic foundation  
- few good students                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | - not the best calibre of students  
- basic level of knowledge of the subject  
- bottom of the barrel                                                                                                                                                     |
| **Effect on lecturer's practice**  | - relates with students to identify problems  
- correcting errors                                                                                                                                                                                                 | - seeks to improve students' foundational knowledge                                                                                                                                                                      | - works with students already perceived as failures  
- despair                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
4.3.2.2. Implementation issues

As stated earlier, all the lecturers involved in the study from both Colleges of Education, with the exception of Lecturer 3 in College A, agree that the English Language teacher education programme is well structured and well balanced. Lecturers 2 and 3, however, note emphatically that the programme is plagued with a number of implementation problems. These are discussed below under two broad groups namely: NCCE policy versus actual practice and quality of students.

NCCE policies versus actual practice

There seems to be some disparity in the implementation of some aspects of the NCCE stipulated policies in the English Language teacher education programmes in Colleges of Education. Funding appears to play a pivotal role in the implementation/ non-implementation of the NCCE stipulated guidelines for the programme. In order to generate funds, there has been a “population explosion” of students into the programme.

As Lecturer 2 explains “…[NCCE] states that there should be a ratio of 1-30 students, when I have 1-120.” This, she says, is contrary to the guidelines of the NCCE for the programme as it also stretches the facilities provided beyond limits. This is portrayed in the use of the language laboratory of which she says “…because of inadequate funding again, one lab is being shared by seven departments” in the School of Languages. According to Lecturer 2 “…the laboratory… takes only forty students. I have a hundred plus… we find it difficult to find time that is convenient for them to be at the lab.” She goes on to state
that she ends up in most cases not taking the students to the language laboratory because of their number and the inability to find or fix a time that is convenient for each student and their departmental groups. This again is likely to have an impact on the overall learning experience of the students as even the very limited resources provided are not put to adequate use.

Lecturer 3 however, blames the “squeeze in space” (that is insufficient classrooms for lectures) on the presence of the various on-going off-campus degree programmes organised by the College of Education on behalf of some Nigerian Universities due to the need for internally generated revenue.

Lecturers 2 and 3 have equally identified the contact hours for teaching as another area that shows discrepancy in NCCE policies and actual practice. They argue that the contact teaching time given by the school in their respective courses is insufficient and not in line with the recommendations of the NCCE. As Lecturer 2 explains it “...NCCE designed the course I’m teaching now to be a two-credit unit course, but I’m given just one hour.” Lecturer 3, although in agreement with Lecturer 2 on the contact hours not being in line with NCCE stipulated guidelines, she again, blames the problem on the “squeeze in space.” She explains:

Many of these courses we teach here we are supposed to have two contact hours a week, but because of the squeeze in space, we are able to have it only once...

As explained by Lecturers 2 and 3 above, a two-credit unit course ideally should be taught two hours a week, but instead the reverse is the case, as most of the courses, irrespective of the course units, are taught for only one hour a week.
Inevitably these issues, inadequate funding and allocated teaching hours, and their resultant problems, have had adverse effects on the lecturers which in turn appears to have influenced the manner in which their respective teaching tasks are performed. Lecturer 1 describes the huge class size as “bogus and threatening”. His following statement describes accurately the effect this has on his teaching practice as he explains:

*When one wants to turn up to give the students activities, because of the number, the marking of such things, both the exercises you put into the teaching, one is scared. You have to think twice before you do such things and you cannot be regular in such activities.*

The above statement shows he is handicapped by the “bogus” class size which prevents him from giving not only regular practice exercises/activities but also regular feedback to the students on their performance in the course as he teaches. The present class size prevents him from teaching and adopting methods that he would have preferred to use. This is likely to have an effect on the overall learning experience of the students in the programme.

Lecturer 2 expresses her dissatisfaction with the implementation of the programme as she states “....the... zeal also is not there because of the poor conditions ...in the environment...” Elaborating further on the problem of lack of facilities, she describes the difficulties encountered in teaching a large class without a public address system and the effect this has on the students as well as her own teaching practices. She remarks:

*...it’s not very encouraging to teach a class of over hundred without a loud speaker [microphone] ... you find the class is noisy and you just find yourself discouraged... it kills your zeal.*
The above statement clearly portrays her dissatisfaction at not being provided with the necessary tools/equipment that will enable her to perform and enhance her teaching effectively.

Lecturers 2 and 3 believe that the attempts by the College to cut corners by reducing the actual number of contact hours for teaching in the NCE programme and running the other degree programmes on campus stretches the already very limited resources (provided for the NCE programmes). More importantly, they point out the severe consequences this action has on the quality of learning of students in the English Language teacher education programme. Lecturer 3 points out that the reduction of course hours on the timetable to one hour a week instead of the recommended two hours a week “...tells on the teaching of the subject. We don’t have the time we ought to spend with them.” Lecturer 2, in her explanation, captures the very essence of the matter by clearly stating:

*I find myself scratching on the surface of the topic and I don’t have the time for the in-depth treatment of each topic as I would have loved to or else I’ll end up not covering the syllabus.*

In other words, to enable lecturers to appear to complete the required syllabus or course outlines for their respective courses even in the most basic way, courses are taught using what can be referred to as a superficial approach. A thorough, in-depth teaching of the different topics in essence is actually not done. Lecturer 2 mentions her strategies aimed at helping students cover the scheduled course outline. These strategies include using handouts, making students work in groups, giving in class and out of class work, creating avenues
for students to engage in independent study such that “... *what should be part of the in-depth teaching in class is given as assignment.*”

This, however, increases her workload as she has to intensify her efforts to ensure that students cover all the required topics in the course; she also has to ensure that both the in-class and out-of-class work are marked for over one hundred students before the next class. Lecturer 2 in the following statement gives an apt description of her class activities:

.... [I give] both class assignment and take away assignment because I want to be sure of what they do in class. I give them group work within the class, I give them... out of the group work, I give them like a week later, after I’ve marked them and given them feedback, I now make it an individual class test to see how much they have learnt within the group, that is, if they have learnt at all.

As noted above, she laments her inability to use the language laboratory for controlled practice exercise with the students. She admits to not using the language laboratory as she says “... *most of the time I end up not taking them to the lab.*” This is in contradiction to the response given by Lecturer 1 who states that using the language laboratory makes his teaching more effective and much easier (see Section 4.3.2.1).

Nevertheless, to ensure that the students get the controlled practice, Lecturer 2 has to devise her own methods. She explains:

...what I do ... is... give them an assignment to get pre-recorded speech or to record a programme on BBC or Voice of America or our National Television Authority (NTA) programme, any of the news programme, to record and ... try to ...repeat it in class.

However, like Lecturer 1, Lecturer 2 equally laments the inability to give immediate feedback on such occasions. As she puts it “...*opportunity of*
feedback is very limited ... I mean it's not always possible.” Nevertheless, to ensure that as much as it is possible, her allocated class hours are efficiently and effectively utilised, Lecturer 2 devised a method of preparing handouts ahead of the class for her students. The reason for her action is explained as follows:

The time is limited as it is, so spending so much time writing such things on the board will further eat into your teaching time. So it’s an attempt to reduce the time I spend writing on the board that makes me to prepare these materials and send them out.

From the data, it appears that as a result of the existence of the other degree programmes in the College premises, it is not just the physical facilities that are being stretched thinly but even the lecturers as well. This is because the lecturers in the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE Level constitute the bulk of the workforce for teaching at the degree level. In fact, as Lecturer 1 describes it, lecturers are “overcrowded with work.” In his view this results in the lecturers being “fagged out” [very tired]. This he says “…does not really help the teaching activity much.” This can be interpreted to mean that lecturers are deterred by such drawbacks and as such are not able to apply themselves effectively to their given roles/ tasks.

This point is further expatiated on by Lecturer 2 who explains that as a result of the monetary gains in teaching the degree programmes, most of the lecturers prefer to focus their attention and efforts there to the detriment of the students in the NCE programme. According to her “…they are not teaching well. Some of them don’t go to classes; some of them don’t spend enough time and effort on the students at the NCE level.” All these invariably affect the quality of learning
experienced by the students in the English Language teacher education programme in the College of Education.

**Quality of students**

The quality of students is described by Lecturer 3 as a “challenge” in the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level. There has been a great influx of students into Colleges of Education. In addition to the need to generate funds, another reason for this can be attributed to the competition posed by the on-campus degree programmes in the Colleges of Education. Lecturer 3 in her interview explains that many students who come into the College of Education and are academically sound prefer to enrol in the on-campus degree programmes than in the NCE programmes. It can be deduced from her response that it is the students who are unable to gain admission into the degree programmes that later settle for the NCE programme. In her response she states “...we do not have the best calibre of students.”

It can be said that there appears to be a huge fight between the NCE programme and the on-going degree programmes on campus, for students. The fact that the entry requirement for both programmes (that is the on-campus degree programmes and the NCE programme) is the same further intensifies the situation. According to Lecturer 2, in order to make the NCE programme at par with the on-campus degree programmes, the NCCE raised the entry requirement for students from four credits to five credits in subjects including Mathematics and English. As such, the few students who can be described as being academically “sound” are being lured into the full-time and part-time
degree programmes organised on campus. This thus leaves the NCE programme to settle for the less than credible students, most of whom, according to Lecturer 3, are not even able to fill out forms when presented with them.

As a result of this on-going tussle for students between the NCE programmes and on-campus degree programmes, it appears from the findings that the NCE programme has thrown its doors wide open for the admission of students without thorough scrutiny of and focus on the academic abilities of the students. This thus brings the quality of the students admitted into the English Language teacher education programme into question. According to Lecturer 1, the level of the students actually comes across in their response during lectures. In his view, students in the programme are of mixed learning abilities since “...they do not have the same solid foundation.” As such, Lecturer 1 believes that

... in every ... good number of students you teach, usually you have slow learners, you have those who are ...who learn fast and there are those average students too.

To Lecturer 1 therefore, the quality of students in the programme is normal and is as expected in any institution of learning.

In contrast to this stance however, Lecturers 2 and 3 argue that the level of quality of students in the programme is low as the majority of the students come into the programme with results that are not credible. This, they say, is portrayed in the academic performance of such students in the programme. According to Lecturer 2, although some of the students come into the
programme with distinctions and credits in Senior Secondary Certificate Examination (SSCE) results, she notes emphatically that “...their performance does [do] not match these results.” As described by Lecturer 3:

...there are some scripts, exam scripts you open and you don’t know the language in which it was written. Some of them can be that bad. They can score zero in an exam.

In her view, such students are beyond help as “…they can’t spell anything.” Lecturers 2 and 3 believe that the problem is rooted in the poor academic foundation of the students as many of them come into the programme without the basic knowledge of the English Language [as demonstrated in the results obtained from the Senior Secondary School Certificate Examinations (SSCE) / General Certificate in Education (GCE) which they ought to have having been admitted into the programme with credits in at least five subjects, including Mathematics and English. In spite of this pre-requisite for the admission of students into the programme, Lecturer 2, commenting on the performance of students in her class, still states “…these students are too insecure to begin to learn now because they don’t have the basics.”

Although Lecturer 4 believes that the programme is well designed and the students are made to work hard, he also seems to agree with the views of Lecturers 2 and 3 that not all the students admitted into the programme are at the required academic level. He blames the problem on the inadequate preparation of students from their previous levels of education. In his view:

...a student on teaching practice who is not able to spell correctly or write correctly ...what I feel is the major cause of such a thing is that, the person, before getting to that particular level, such a student did not have a good foundation even from the primary school level.
Nevertheless, in discussing the quality of the students, Lecturers 2 and 3 agree with Lecturer 1 that there are equally good students, although few, in the English Language teacher education programme. Lecturer 3 explains in her interview that compared to the other students in the programme, “...the good ones, who really should be in this place, are qualified to be in this place, are in minority. They are usually like ... at most 10%.”

The data from the Lecturers’ interview reveals that the quality of students in the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level appears to have a significant impact on the teaching practices of the lecturers. In the case of Lecturer 1, who believes that the students are of mixed learning abilities, he learns from the challenges posed by the learning problems of the students. He explains “…if there are challenges, I keep learning…. because when you...as you relate to students, teaching them, you know where they are having problems.”

In contrast to the views held by Lecturer 1, Lecturer 2 argues that from one level to another in the programme, there is a constant struggle to improve students’ expected level of knowledge. She explains “I teach for example, the second level, that is Part Two of NCE. But you find that they have even gained very little in Year One.” In her view this not only further increases her work load but she also finds it very frustrating.

Lecturer 3 on her own part explains that she stays motivated by focusing her attention on the good students. When asked what happens to the weak
students who are unable to write in English, she responds “...they fail. You have to take your solace in the good ones because if you concentrate on the bad ones you’ll be so discouraged.” She is further asked about measures taken at the departmental level to tackle the problem. In her response she indicates that all other lecturers in the department encounter the same problem and as such even though there is not much pooling of ideas to resolve the problem, lecturers do their best at an “individual level” seeking ways to combat or go around the problem. As for Lecturer 3, she says “... [it] pushes me to...to...would I say put more effort into teaching to see if at least the good ones can have something better.”

What is surprising and essentially note-worthy is the fact that some of the lecturers in the programme seem to accept academically weak students as their “lot” in the NCE programme; as though they belonged there, while the good ones should be at the Universities. The academically “sound” students are regarded as the unfortunate students who are not able to gain admissions into University programmes of their choice and have had to settle for less by taking courses /programmes offered in the Colleges of Education. As Lecturer 2 succinctly puts it:

You know once in a while we have good students who should actually have gone to university but maybe for the politics, they were disadvantaged by JAMB [Joint Admission Matriculation Board], or they could not afford to pay through the university so they prefer to come to NCE and you find that the standard is exceptional.

Unlike Lecturers 2 and 3, Lecturer 4, however, from his stand point, calls into question the quality of students admitted into the programme as he categorically
remarks that "...ideally, such a person [academically weak student] ought not to get to the level he is, the level of being an undergraduate in the College [of Education].” Consequently, he appeals for teachers of the English Language at the primary school level to ensure that they do a thorough job in teaching pupils at that level. He equally argues for a more robust mode of assessment to be used by the Colleges of Education to test prospective students prior to their admission into the English Language teacher education programme.

As illustrated in the preceding discussion, there are a number of issues arising as a result of the lack of proper implementation of NCCE stipulated policies, and other government polices related to tertiary educational establishments in the country. The discussion on the theme of “Implementation Issues” has thus shone light on a range of issues/ problems resulting from the manner in which the NCE programme itself is organised with particular reference to the English Language teacher education programme at this level of study.
Table 4.6: Programme Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Lecturer 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 2 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 3 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 4 (College B)</th>
<th>Lecturer 5 (College B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended objectives</td>
<td>- equipping students with knowledge to teach English Language</td>
<td>- to produce teachers to teach English effectively</td>
<td>- training teachers to be role models in the use of the English Language</td>
<td>- primary and secondary objectives</td>
<td>-to prepare students for university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to produce teacher who will serve as models to their students</td>
<td>- to produce teacher who will pass on the competence in English to their students</td>
<td>- to churn out manpower for the primary and secondary school levels</td>
<td>- to produce suitable teachers for primary and junior secondary schools</td>
<td>- to prepare teachers for primary and J.S levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to produce teachers who will pass on the competence in English to their students</td>
<td></td>
<td>- produce teachers to teach English</td>
<td>- produce teachers to teach English</td>
<td>- to produce medium level work force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- serve as models</td>
<td>- serve as models</td>
<td>- equip students with needed skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- produce staff to work in other establishments</td>
<td>- produce staff to work in other establishments</td>
<td>- promote international intelligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- promote international intelligibility</td>
<td>- promote international intelligibility</td>
<td>- equipping students with required skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- equipping students with required skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended programme outcomes</td>
<td>- promoting literacy programme</td>
<td>- improve students’ performance academically in other subjects</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>intermediate staff</td>
<td>- producing administrative workforce for governmental and non-governmental organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- positive change in the attitude of students to academic work after TP exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of programme objectives</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>- programme objectives met partially</td>
<td>- goal of producing good teachers in the subject is elusive</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression of objectives</td>
<td>- assessment: in-class and take-home assignments examinations</td>
<td>- group work</td>
<td>- class discussions</td>
<td>- does model pronunciation of sounds</td>
<td>- matches teaching practice with course objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- constant and regular feedback on work done by the students</td>
<td>- question and answer sessions</td>
<td>- on-the-spot correction</td>
<td>- focuses first on theory for basic knowledge of the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- recycles questions</td>
<td>- assignment</td>
<td>- makes students put into practice what they have learnt</td>
<td>- uses the language laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-teaches the basics</td>
<td>- getting students to engage in small scale research</td>
<td>- uses the language laboratory</td>
<td>- uses pre-recorded materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- uses authentic materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2.3. Programme objectives

One of the major concerns in this study is to identify and critically analyse the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level in two Colleges of Education. Thus, attention in this section will now be directed at the third major theme, “Programme Objectives”, which is generated from the data gathered from the lecturers’ interview. As in the previous themes discussed, a number of sub-themes have also been generated from the third major theme. These sub-themes are as follows: intended objectives, unintended programme outcomes, achievement of programme objectives and expression of objectives.

**Intended objectives**

During the interviews, the lecturers were asked to explain the aims of the English Language teacher education programme in Colleges of Education. It is interesting to note that although all the lecturers agree on one major point, which is that the programme is geared towards the preparation of teachers for the effective teaching of the subject in both the primary and secondary school levels, their individual response to the question is otherwise varied on certain aspects. This in essence gives clues or indications to the different interpretations of the programme’s objectives as perceived by the lecturers. In other words, it shows the objectives of the programme from the point of view of the lecturers.

To Lecturer 1 the programme aims to:

… *prepare students equipped with knowledge so that they can impart knowledge to the young ones who are just coming* … who
are in school now. “The aim is to... teach the.... you know, the students who are - we call them student teachers- teach them so that they can do same to the junior ones.

The aim, as given by Lecturer 1, is based on only theoretical knowledge, which focuses on just competence without much attention to the other required skills which will portray the students’ performance as well.

Lecturer 2 on the other hand, believes the programme is aimed at producing teachers who are not only “…able to teach English effectively” but also “…competent in the language so that they can pass on this competence to the students.” To Lecturer 2 therefore, it is one thing to know the language/ subject, and another thing to be able to teach or transfer that knowledge on to the students. Thus it can be said that her perspective of the aim of the programme takes into consideration the issue of competence as well as the ability of the student teachers to teach English as a subject.

Like Lecturers 1 and 2, Lecturer 3 also believes that the programme is primarily aimed at the production of teachers as she states “…[we’re] teaching them to become teachers, we’re preparing them to become teachers.” In addition, she explains that students in the programme are being trained to be role models. This seems generic as there is no specification of actually what the student teachers are supposed to be models of. She, however, also adds a twist to her definition of the programme’s aims as she states that the major objective of the programme is “…to churn out manpower for secondary school.” This statement suggests a form of mass production of teachers, and raises speculation as to whether this is in any way linked to the issue of population explosion of students.
discussed in Section 4.3.2.2. Her statement indicates that there has been a shift in the focus of the programme from quality to quantity.

To Lecturers 4 and 5, the programme has both primary and secondary objectives. While the primary aim is centred on the production of suitably qualified teachers in English Language for the primary and junior secondary school levels, the programme also aims to produce what Lecturer 5 refers to as “medium level of manpower” for other establishments in the society. In other words, the programme is not only preoccupied with the task of only producing suitably qualified teachers to teach the English Language effectively, but it is equally concerned with the production of people who would be able to work in other positions as well, some of which are listed below by Lecturer 4:

...apart from teachers, they can also produce... staff that can work as intermediate staff, not exactly very senior staff, intermediate staff in establishments, sometimes they can work in banks. They can also work in administrative departments of tertiary institutions as executive officers.

In addition to the points mentioned by the other lecturers, Lecturers 4 and 5 state clearly that the programme is aimed at the promotion of international intelligibility. The programme thus focuses on not just the teaching aspect but also on the development of the language skills of the students. From the comments on international intelligibility, it can be interpreted that the English Language teacher education programme in College of Education takes into consideration the fact that the English Language as a second language within the Nigerian context, is likely to be influenced by the students’ first language or by the language of the immediate community. Thus Lecturer 5 rightly states:

*Because these persons are people who are from backgrounds where they have been influenced by the Mother Tongue, the*
need to be able to study English will resurface as Second Language users.

As such, the programme emphasizes the development of the students’ language/communicative skills to the level where their use of the English Language can be clearly understood even at an international level. Hence Lecturer 4 states “...our students should be able to pronounce English words in a way that their pronunciation will not impede international intelligibility.” Therefore, of the four language skills, there is a major emphasis on the spoken aspect of the English Language. Lecturers in the programme appear to be preoccupied with the concept of Received Pronunciation (RP). The comment given above by Lecturer 4 attests to this. This view is further supported by the remarks made by Lecturer 5 as he says “pronunciation in English affects communication... they [students] should be able to equip themselves with the “RP” standard.”

An equally surprising issue arising from the data is that, with the exception of Lecturers 4 and 5, all the other lecturers participating in the study, who incidentally are from College of Education A, seem unaware of the other intended objectives of the programme. Most of them, from their responses given, view the programme’s intended objective as one that centres mainly, if not only, on the teaching of English Language as a subject. Whereas, on the contrary, documents examined show that this is not just one of, but also the fourth objective of the English Language teacher education programme in Colleges of Education. When asked if there are any other objectives of the programme besides the one related to the effective teaching of the subject, the respective responses of Lecturers 1 and 3 are as follows:
1) ... it might not just be one, certainly it cannot just be one goal but at least that’s the one I can say now.

2) I don’t know if we have separate aims.

Although Lecturer 2 agrees that there are other objectives, she however goes on (without mentioning any other intended objective of the programme) to discuss the effect of English Language on the academic performance of the students taught by the student teachers/graduates of the programme. This point is discussed even further under the next sub-theme, unintended outcomes. Lecturers 4 and 5 mention the promotion of international intelligibility and equipping students with RP thus making specific reference to the development and promotion of speaking skills as one of the objectives of the programme. They also explain that the programme is aimed at equipping students with the needed/required skills. This can be inferred to mean the language and communicative skills as they (Lecturers 4 and 5) had both previously also mentioned the preparation of teachers as part of the programme’s objectives.

Some of the lecturers seem unaware of the specific objectives of the English Language teacher education programme and are unable to draw or make a distinction between the general objectives of the main NCE programme as given by the NCCE, and that of the English Language teacher education programme (under the NCE programme) in particular. In fact, the comments made above by Lecturer 3, “I don’t know if we have separate aims” and the one below clearly shows her own inability to make that distinction: “You know we operate under this NCCE and it’s a big umbrella. So whatever we do, we take it from the NCCE.”
Given the individual responses from the lecturers therefore, there is need to ponder and question if the awareness/ lack of awareness of the knowledge of the other objectives of the programme has influenced in any way the reflection of the objectives in the classroom teaching practices of the lecturers involved in the study.

**Unintended programme outcomes**

In addition to the identified intended objectives of the programme, the findings from the lecturers’ interviews have also revealed some other aims of the programme which have been classed here as the unintended outcomes of the programme. According to Lecturer 1, the programme aims to promote literacy in the society. In his words:

*It helps in the literacy programme of the nation… They are trying to make sure that as many people, if not everybody, is literate. So we are having them around us, teaching them, that clearly makes them to… we are trying to curb the problem of illiteracy in the society.*

This again makes one question if this is related to the issue of population explosion discussed earlier in this chapter, as the Colleges of Education throw their gates open to both academically qualified and unqualified students.

Lecturer 1 also points out a measure of positive change in the attitude of the final year students to academic work on their return to school after their teaching practice exercise. This is shown in his comment:

*Those who you particularly notice before maybe in a class, who use to not be very attentive, this time around they do it with all level of seriousness.*
This change is in addition to getting “…the necessary teaching experience” which originally is one of the stated objectives of the English Language teacher education programmes in Colleges of Education.

Another unintended outcome of the programme identified is that it is aimed at improving the academic performance of students in other subjects, not just in English courses alone. This is aptly explained by Lecturer 2 as she states:

We... we... our aim is to produce teachers that will be able to teach English effectively because we realise that English affects all subjects. The teaching of English affects all subjects.

In other words, to improve the competence and performance levels of students in their individual academic pursuits, their level of English has to be improved by teachers who are equally competent in the use of the English Language “…because the quality of teachers, determines the quality of students.”. As explained by Lecturer 2 “…until they get a good grasp of English they will not be able to cope with the other subjects. It becomes a barrier; their lack of understanding becomes a barrier.” This is even more important as the students in the NCE programme are required to study combined major (which entails the study of two major courses). In the case of the students in the English Language teacher education programme, the combination may be as described by Lecturer 2, “English-Social Studies, English-CRS [Christian Religious Studies] etc.”

Although Lecturers 4 and 5 have classed the production of intermediate staff/medium level work force as part of the secondary objectives of the programme, this is not stated in the policy document for the English Language teacher
education programme. This therefore can be classed as an unintended outcome of the programme under study. The statement made by Lecturer 4 portrays this point clearly:

Then when they also work as executive officers in administrative departments of higher institutions or ministries, these skills too, help them because apart from teaching, we also teach them you know... how to write different forms of business letters...

Achievement of programme objectives

Lecturer 2 is of the opinion that the objectives of the programme have not been completely achieved. This, she argues, is a result of the implementation problems (see Section 4.3.2.2). In her view, the objectives of the programme have only been partially achieved. She states “...it is not possible to say that the aims are being met. As long as there’s a problem of inadequate funding, there’s no way we can say that the aims are being fully met.”

Lecturer 3 is of the same view as Lecturer 2 as she also argues that the achievement of the programme’s objectives can only be discussed in terms of the degree of such achievement. She believes that the College of Education is still striving towards the achievement of the programmes’ given aims. She states:

And I’ll say yes we’re still chasing the aim and objectives. With what we have we are achieving our aims up to some good degree. If we had better...better things better... you know facilities, better atmosphere, more funding we would do yet better.

There is, however, some form of contradiction here with regards to her views on the achievement of the programme’s objectives, as she equally describes the
goal of producing teachers effective in the teaching of the English Language as elusive: “... that thing is eluding us. Some of those bad ones are now teachers themselves and you can’t give what you don’t have.” Given the two statements above, it can be argued that her true perception of the achievement of the objectives of programme is in doubt. Her responses are two-sided and she seems to have adopted what can be referred to here as the “safe-middle” stance.

From the responses of Lecturers 2 and 3 given above, it can be seen that funding and available resources/facilities not only affect the teaching practices of the lecturers in the programme (see Section 4.3.2.2); it is also apparently having an adverse effect even on the achievement of the set objectives of the programme itself.

**Expression of objectives**

A major focus of this research is to identify the different ways in which lecturers, through their teaching practice, reflect and promote the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme in College of Education classrooms. As stated by Lecturer 2, lecturers have autonomy over their respective teaching practices. As such, it is expected that each lecturer will interpret and express the objectives in their own unique way.

For Lecturer 1, this is done through assessment. According to him this can be in-class or take home assignment or through progressive tests and examination. As he explains “...from the mastery of what students have written
you can tell whether the students have been following up...” Although this practice targets the writing skills of the students, it however seems based more on the theoretical aspect and actually does relate to his interpretation of the programme objectives as given above. It does not encourage the students to actively practise by using what has been taught. In essence there is not much emphasis on performance. It can be said that there is no actual promotion of the objectives, rather the focus is on the achievement of the objectives shown through the results of the students from given assessments. The following statement given by Lecturer 1 clearly buttresses this point: “By the time you combine all these various assessment method, you’ll be able to know whether the students...the objectives are met or not.”

Lecturer 2 on the other hand, states that she employs a variety of strategies to promote and express the objectives of the programme in the course of her teaching. One of such strategies involves updating students’ knowledge by re-teaching basic things in the course which they ought to, at their level of study, already have knowledge of. This she says is because “... they didn’t gain much” from their previous level of study. This is clearly reflected in her next statement: “I had to go over some of the things they should have learnt in Year One even in this Year Two class.”

Apart from re-teaching the basics, she also engages students giving them both in-class and take-away tasks to work in different groups. Although this is aimed at making/ encouraging students to interact while they work as a team and to generally improve the “learning process”, Lecturer 2, however, identifies a major
flaw in this approach as she states “...because these students are basically insecure and are not very good, you find that when you give a group assignment, only one person will do it, the others will just append their names...”

In other words, not all the students are actively engaged in the group tasks.

Although like Lecturer 1, she also uses assessment by giving individual tests to the students, she, however, varies hers by using questions already given in the group tasks and after giving each group their feedback. As she puts it “I keep recycling old questions.” She explains that this enables her to monitor how much each student has gained from the group task given to them. In a way this approach can be said to provide students with different/ several opportunities to improve on their current level/ performance.

In spite of the frustration of not being able to use the language laboratory for her course, Lecturer 2 devised another means to help her students to improve their speaking. By improvising she has not only been able to help her students practise their listening and speaking skills actively but has equally exposed them to the use of authentic materials. Although she admits that it is “difficult to improvise” she however,

... give[s] them an assignment to get pre-recorded speech or to record a programme on BBC or Voice of America or our National Television Authority (NTA) programme, any of the news programme, to record and... try to... repeat it in class.

For Lecturer 3, when asked how she goes about achieving the aims in her course, she remarks “It’s by teaching, using methods.” These methods are mentioned in her following statement: “We engage them in discussions during
the class, give them assignment, something to go home and research about. 

We give them test…”

As stated above, Lecturer 3 apparently creates opportunities for the students to practise their speaking skills by participating in class discussions. The assignments also provide avenues for the students to practise and improve not just their study skills but their writing skills as well as they engage in small scale research. An example of such research is illustrated in the assignment given to the Year III students to identify and discuss features in their respective first languages that are transferred into their use of the English Language.

Lecturer 4 has his own approach and has adopted his own strategies to both express and promote the objectives of the programme. According to Lecturer 4, students are encouraged to “… put the things that I teach them into practice. I make sure they practise them…” The statement appears to suggest opportunities created for practice through everyday use of what is taught. This also shows that Lecturer 4 is not essentially preoccupied with just the theoretical aspect of the course, that is the acquisition of theoretical knowledge alone, but he is also concerned with the students’ ability to use the English Language competently. His use of on-the-spot correction as indicated in the following statement also attests to this view:

And when they discuss with me, if any student should make... a mistake, if any student should make a sentence that have [has] an element of syntactic aberration or semantic aberration I quickly... correct the student by telling the student the right thing to make it.
In addition to making students put into practice what is taught, students also have what he refers to as “practical classes” where they make use of the equipment in the language laboratory. Lecturer 4 also uses himself as a model, attempting to pronounce words correctly so as to set a good example for the students to copy in order to develop and improve their speaking skills. He states “I pronounce very well, I use that standard pronunciation.” He thus leads by example.

Lecturer 5 in his adopted approach matches his course objectives with his classroom teaching practices. In other words, he allows the aims of the course he is teaching to dictate what he does in class. This is illustrated in his statement below:

...the objectives of the...the...Phonetics and Phonology course is to equip the students with the skill to be able to communicate effectively in English and make themselves understandable to other users of English outside Nigeria. That is what the Phonetics and Phonology course is intended to do. So to be able to do that, because we know that our students are students from you know the Nigerian background where mother tongue has been preferred in their speech, we teach them the theory work

Like Lecturer 4, Lecturer 5 also believes in developing the practical skills of the students by encouraging them to use the language laboratory. However, unlike Lecturer 4 as shown in the statement above, he focuses first on theory. This he says is to provide students with the much needed basic knowledge. Again, contrary to the approach used by Lecturer 2 where students are directed to authentic materials, in the case of Lecturer 5, students are presented with pre-recorded materials. Lecturer 5 explains:

So they now go to the laboratory and then listen to the models and then they try to talk back. So in this kind of practice session,
they try to improve their speech work in English. And the students too are encouraged to have their own cassettes so that they can record some of these things and play on their own so they can be able to see how they improve.

From the discussion on the theme on “Programme objectives”, it can be said that although most of the lecturers involved in the study are able to identify the major objectives for their respective taught courses, the same cannot be said for the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level. As such, not many of the lecturers actually take into account how to integrate these objectives with their teaching practices. The focus seems to be on the achievement of given objectives. In contrast, however, not much attention is paid to the teaching practices that bring about the achievement of these stated objectives. Although the lecturers all agree that the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level is aimed at the production of effective and competent teachers of English Language, there is not much in their teaching practice to promote the fourth objective, which is centred on equipping students in the programme to teach the English Language effectively at the primary and junior secondary levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Lecturer 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 2 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 3 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 4 (College B)</th>
<th>Lecturer 5 (College B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement schools</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- some schools were below standards</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- no seats in classroom - dilapidated buildings</td>
<td>- class was too large for student-teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of supervision</td>
<td>- supervises only students from the department of English - immediate correction of errors - set criteria for assessment of TP students - lack of uniformity</td>
<td>- supervises only students from the department of English - immediate correction of errors - set criteria for assessment of TP students - lack of uniformity</td>
<td>- supervised students from other departments - not an ideal approach - uses a score card</td>
<td>- supervised students from other departments and only one student from the department of English - focused more on students’ use of English - score card</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-teachers’ performance</td>
<td>- problems in articulation - not following written lesson plan/note - using previously taught topics</td>
<td>- students’ performance rated at 30% - students are not learning from the exercise - language issues - problems with mastery of topics</td>
<td>- some students were good - some had competence issues</td>
<td>- good performance for some - spelling issues - confidence issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling emerging problems</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- intensifies efforts - no pooling of resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2.4. Views on teaching practice supervision

Another major aim of this research is to examine the extent to which the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme in Colleges of Education reflect the teaching needs of the student teachers in the said programme (see Section 4.1). Consequently, attempts have been made by the researcher to explore the issue from the perspective of their lecturers especially as they participated in the Teaching Practice Supervision exercise which involved the student teachers who are equally participants in this research study. The theme, “Views on teaching practice supervision”, was thus generated from the Lecturers’ interview data. Other sub-themes generated from this main theme include: placement schools, mode of supervision, student teachers’ performance and tackling emerging problems.

Placement schools

Lecturers 2 and 4 express their displeasure over the conditions of some of the placement schools to which some of the student teachers are sent for their teaching practice exercise. As noted by Lecturer 2, some of the students “…taught in schools that should not be schools.” She goes on to describe the conditions in the classes of one of such schools:

There were two levels in the same classroom, J.S 1 and...J.S 2 and there’s only one teacher, when this one is teaching... the two of them will teach at the same time.

On the same issue, Lecturer 4, describing one of the schools, states:

…I discovered that the physical environment was not... good for learning. Such environment was not conducive, like the classroom some of them were dirty, some of them were dilapidated and... no good chair, no good classroom.
This unconducive teaching and learning environment invariably affects the performance and, without doubt, the evaluation of the student teachers. As Lecturer 2 rightly states, this is because “...you are expected to score that student.”

Lecturer 5 on the other hand, complains about the number of students in the classrooms of some of the placement schools. Describing the teaching experience of one the student teachers he supervised he states: “I noticed that the students... the class was large. She [the student teacher] had nearly eighty students in the class. It wasn’t easy for the student [teacher] to control the class.” This statement can be said to cast doubts on the level of preparation of the student teachers and their ability to teach large classes. This becomes even more crucial as majority of the classes, in government owned public schools, are large.

It is important to question the methods and the involvement of the Colleges of Education in the selection of placement schools for their students. It can be argued that the idea behind the teaching practice is to expose the student teachers to good practices, to improve them and definitely not to negate or undo the knowledge and experience already acquired during their classroom training. Student teachers should thus be able to practise in schools which serve as models, and allow them to teach the subject competently and effectively, creating as well as making use of facilities and resources at their disposal.
**Mode of supervision**

Although all the lecturers participating in the study admit to having and using a set criteria, which Lecturers 4 and 5 have referred to as a score card, for the assessment of teaching practice students, the mode of supervision in both Colleges of Education, to a very large extent, differs. In College of Education A, lecturers supervise only students from their own departments, in College of Education B it is randomly done as lecturers supervise students from other departments including those from their own departments. According to Lecturer 2 this is because every subject area/course has its own format for teaching the methodology of its subject/course and as such lecturers in their respective fields of studies from relevant departments are regarded as those with the needed expertise to supervise the students in their own departments. This is clearly shown in the comment made by Lecturer 2:

*Each subject has its own methodology that we teach within the department. We teach English methodology, SOS teach SOS methodology and they teach methodology in Education. That is why each of those areas will need to... supervise the students.*

Although Lecturer 5 acknowledges that students are supposed to be supervised twice in line with the NCCE stipulated regulations, he agrees that this is not always the case in College of Education B. He explains:

*But you see, it could happen that sometimes, you know...we...the teaching practice committee of the school or of the College may not be empowered, financially empowered to be able to organise the two trips; otherwise that is the ideal thing as stipulated by the NCCE.*

From his statement it can thus be deduced that there are occasions when students on teaching practice exercise are supervised only once unlike College of Education A where they are supervised thrice.
According to Lecturer 2, the allocation of students to supervisors in the Department of English is done by the Head of Department who shares the number of students on the teaching practice exercise, amongst the lecturers in the department. In the case of College of Education B, however, this is different as is reflected in the comments of Lecturers 4 and 5 respectively:

1) *I supervised... it’s a mixture. It is not that once you are a lecturer in English you must supervise only English Language students.*

2) *...the way the students are being organised here, one does not just see from English. You go there and you see students from Social Studies, students in Agric Science and so on. I saw only one student in English.*

In other words, while lecturers in College of Education A supervise only students from their departments, their counterparts in College of Education B supervise students across all other departments including those from their own departments. From the comment made by Lecturer 5, it can be said that the allocation of students to supervisors is not based on their course of study, but on their placement schools. Lecturer 5 attempting to shed further light on how the students are scored and graded, states:

*The reason is that when you supervise a candidate once, then you now point out the observations for the candidate. Then another person comes to supervise the same candidate, not you again, for objectivity.... The grading that you give, you see, that is why I said objectivity now comes in; the grading that you give is now averaged with the grade of the other person and then the grade of the supervising principal of the school... before you now have the overall score of the candidate.*

Again, unlike College of Education A where the three main courses of the students are taken into consideration (that is the two combined courses and the education course), and the lecturers from these departments are actively involved in assessing and grading the students from their departments, the case
is essentially different in College of Education B. So, although a third supervision is not done, there is, however, a third grade or score given by the head or “supervising principal” of the placement schools to which students have been assigned.

Giving his views on how he supervises students outside his area of expertise, Lecturer 4 explains that he relies very much on his knowledge of most of the subjects taught at his primary level of education. This view is accurately illustrated in his comment as he talks about one of the students he supervised “... the lesson I supervised was on... social studies, the elementary part of it which we also studied when we were in lower levels.

Lecturer 5 explains that he tends to focus on the language and generally uses the template for assessment provided as a score card by the College of Education for the supervision of teaching practice students. Below is an apt description of his identified areas of focus for assessment:

I look at the materials, I look at the lesson plan, lesson note. I look at lesson presentation. We have a score card, so we score based on that. Because I’m a teacher of English I also have to be very, very keen at listening to the students’ expression.

To Lecturer 4, this is not an ideal situation. He believes that “supervisors should be restricted to their area” [of specialisation]. He explains his view on the situation and also pinpoints some of the pit-falls of the situation in relation to the students in the English Language teacher education programme:

What should have been ideal is that someone ... a lecturer in English is supposed to supervise a student in English [department] ...Somebody to supervise should be somebody who knows the subject very well and who can detect fault and I
believe that a lecturer who is not a lecturer in English may not be able to detect some faults about the language from somebody he’s supervising if he goes to supervise somebody that is an English student.

According to him, this is to the detriment of the students in particular and the society in general.

Lecturer 5 raises an interesting point as he argues that it is unfair for student teachers to be made to teach subjects outside of their respective course of study as it denies the student teacher the opportunity to be able to exhibit what he has learnt. His argument raises the question as to the justification of the assessment and grading of such student teachers by lecturers who are from a different field and as such who are also evidently lacking in the expertise required for such supervision.

Given the scenario discussed above, it will not be out of place to query whether the students in the English Language teacher education programme are actually being equipped to teach the English Language effectively and competently in the primary and junior secondary school levels as intended in the fourth objective of the programme.

**Student teachers’ performance**

To identify gaps in the training and other likely areas that posed problems to the student teachers in the programme, lecturers are encouraged to give their feedback and verdict on their (student teachers’) performance during the teaching practice exercise. As pointed out by Lecturer 1 it is not only “...the course content or the topic rather, the presentation of the topic” as well as
comportment that are scored or evaluated. As stated by Lecturer 1, student teachers who did their placement in private schools performed well as “…they are properly monitored such that they put in their best.” Nevertheless, he identifies the following as areas where some of the students he supervised had problems: articulation, use of lesson notes and lesson plans and teaching previously taught topics.

According to Lecturer 1, some of the students supervised are not articulate and had problems expressing themselves. This may be as a result of their confidence level or even their level of English. It should be noted here that one of the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level is for students to be able to communicate confidently using both their writing and speaking skills (see Section 4.2). Lecturer 1 equally notes the inability of some of the students to follow their lesson plan/notes and their desire and attempts to teach already taught topics during supervision to increase their chances for a good performance. However, as will be noted from the comments of Lecturer 2, this usually backfires and hinders the performance of such students during supervision. This act, again, may be due to their inability to teach a new topic using the English Language in a confident manner.

For Lecturer 2, the situation appears dire as she rates the exercise based on the performance of the students as being only “…thirty percent success.” She is of the opinion that the teaching practice exercise is not achieving the initial purpose for which it was designed. This is aptly expressed in her statement: “…you just wonder do they gain from this teaching practice and to a large
extent, I don’t think they do.” She blames this practice on the autonomous practice of the lecturers in the department as she states “…then some of our colleagues don’t go there to actually supervise them well. So when we are all not doing the same thing, it creates a problem.”

Her response seems to suggest that although each lecturer is presented with set criteria provided by the College of Education (see Appendix D) for assessing the student teachers during teaching practice supervision, there is still a lack of uniformity as to how the actual exercise or activity is carried out. She describes the situation as follows, pointing out the effect this has on the mind-set of the student teachers:

No supervisor wants to sit for forty minutes; they say “just hurry up, hurry up, I have other places to go.” So like I said, that can be traced back to us not the students. So the students have already got this idea that when the supervisor comes they don’t need to spend forty minutes, just rush over whatever it is so that he scores you and he or she goes away.

Contrary to the views held by Lecturer 1 on the students’ performance in Private schools, Lecturer 2 elaborates on a very serious concern raised by some placement schools with regards to the quality and competence level of some of the student teachers in English Language as a subject. She explains this as follows:

The schools themselves are not willing to use them properly. They say the quality of our students is not... high enough so they don’t want them passing misinformation.

She apparently believes that there is actual cause for concern as she equally mentions observing some students teachers during the teaching practice supervision “…giving wrong information to the students and doing so
confidently.” This more or less puts the credibility of the students and graduates of the programme into question and again queries whether the programme is actually doing enough to adequately prepare the students in the programme for the tasks ahead of them.

Like Lecturer 2, Lecturer 3 also gives a rating of student teachers performance during the teaching practice exercise. In her view “Some of them are good but ... about half of them are bad and out of the half let’s say about 20% of them are simply embarrassing.” According to Lecturer 3, there are student teachers who have competence problems as many of them do not have a good grasp or mastery of the topic they taught. Like Lecturer 2, she equally witnessed situations where student teachers passed wrong information to the pupils being taught.

As in the case of Lecturer 3, Lecturer 4 acknowledges that there are student teachers whose performance can be classed as being very good. He also points out the good contributions in the creation of teaching materials made by student teachers in some of the placement schools he visited. According to him...

...they made efforts and made available certain instructional materials, instructional materials that were not even in the class, they were not used when the form teacher, the actual class teacher, was teaching those students.

These obviously are things that have been taught in Methodology Courses in the College of Education. It thus shows the student teachers putting into practical use some of the knowledge gained from their time in the College of Education classroom. This is illustrated in his next comment “…I discovered that some of them wrote very wonderful lesson note.”
Having pointed out the positive aspects of the performance of the student teachers, Lecturer 4 also mentions a few negatives. In his interview he notes that some of the student teachers supervised have issues in the areas of spelling and confidence. He explains that many of the student teachers had difficulty spelling “common words” and “… they lacked the confidence to address a group.” This is in line with the point made by Lecturer 1 when he states that some of the student teachers have problems with “articulation.” This, as stated earlier, may be rooted in the development of their speaking skill and their ability to use the English Language competently and confidently. It is important to state here that because the Method Courses (see Table 4.2) are done in the second semester, the level of preparation of the students in such courses for the teaching practice exercise, which takes place in the first semester, could not be verified first-hand by the researcher.

Lecturer 5 on the other hand, supervised only one student teacher from the Department of English. He describes her performance as good and her expression / use of the English Language as flawless. His satisfaction at her performance is expressed in the following statement: “The student taught well, taught well. I'm quite happy with what she did.”

**Tackling emerging problems**

Having identified some of the areas where student teachers encounter problems, some of the lecturers go on to discuss some of the measures they adopt in order to tackle such problems encountered by the student teachers during the teaching practice exercise. According to Lecturer 1 he uses the set
criteria for the assessment of student teachers. He states “…this even informs my correction of the students…”

Lecturer 2 adopts an on-the-spot correction approach to avoid students being taught the incorrect thing. Her approach is clearly explained below:

I had to keep interrupting and you know inviting the student [teacher] for a quiet chat because I feel that if I should leave the errors to go unchecked, the students will be at a disadvantage. You see, I can’t sit by and watch you call a noun a verb or a verb a noun and I will quickly ask you to change what you have just said.

For Lecturer 3, although she also adopts the on-the-spot correction approach for fear of the negative impact such incorrect information may have on the students/pupils being taught, she also tries to enlist the assistance of the class teachers/Head of Department of placement schools to which the student teachers have been assigned. In one of the cases described, the Head of Department of English in one of the placement schools was unable to effect the necessary correction as she too was unaware whether “every day” can be used as an adjective or not.

Expressing her dissatisfaction over the performance of some of the student teachers, Lecturer 3 states “I feel bad, I feel very bad.” She goes on to explain that although she discusses the issue with the Head of Department of English at the College of Education A, not much can be done as he too is “…passing through the same thing, having the same experience.” In other words, there is no pooling of resources or efforts to resolve the problem and lecturers are left on their own to develop their own strategies to tackle the problem if they so
desired. For Lecturer 3, she states that it makes her “…put more effort into teaching to see if at least the good ones can have something better.”

The responses given by most of the lecturers clearly show their awareness of some of the problems experienced by the student teachers. However, it is interesting to also note that not much, again, from the responses give an indication of how and indeed if these problems are addressed or even taken into consideration in the planning and developing of their teaching practices as lecturers in the English Language teacher education programme.

As seen from the discussion on the Lecturers Interviews, the data gathered has revealed some very interesting themes which in different ways have influenced the teaching/classroom practices of the lecturers involved in the study. Below is a table showing a summary of the major themes and their respective sub-themes as generated from the interview data of the lecturers from both Colleges of Education.
### Table 4.8: Summary of Themes from Lecturers’ Interview Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer’s perception of the programme</th>
<th>Programme design</th>
<th>Reasons for current state of the programme</th>
<th>Quality control</th>
<th>---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation issues</td>
<td>NCCE policies versus actual practice</td>
<td>Effect on lecturer’s practice</td>
<td>Quality of students</td>
<td>Effect on lecturer’s practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme objectives</td>
<td>Intended objectives</td>
<td>Unintended consequences</td>
<td>Achievement of programme objectives</td>
<td>Expression of objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views on teaching practice supervision</td>
<td>Placement schools</td>
<td>Mode of supervision</td>
<td>Student teachers’ performance</td>
<td>Tackling emerging problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. ANALYSIS OF LECTURERS’ OBSERVATION DATA

As mentioned earlier in Chapter Three (Section 3.4.6), observation is one of the research tools for this study which enabled the researcher study and witness first-hand how the translation and promotion of the programme’s objectives occur through the individual teaching practices of the lecturers involved in the study. Audio-recordings were made during the observation of classes. These recordings (referred to here as the audio notes) along with the handwritten field notes have been transcribed and analysed. By transcribing the audio notes, the researcher thus has access to direct quotes of statements as used by the lecturers in the course of their teaching. This helps to make even more vivid the activities described in the observation notes. For the purpose of clarification in the discussion of the findings, extracts from the audio notes are highlighted in italics, while those from the handwritten field notes are in bold. The use of the overt participant-as-observer approach (see Section 3.4.6.3 for details) enables the researcher to see first-hand the actual teaching/learning activities as experienced by the students in the classrooms of both Colleges of Education used for the study. In all, the researcher observed twelve classes taught by lecturers who agreed to participate in the research.

4.4.1. Description of Classes

With the exception of the respective locations of the two Colleges of Education, the setting of each class observed is almost the same. The classes can be described as large classes with a minimum of eighty students although most of the classes observed had significantly larger numbers. Classes are arranged in a position that allows all the students to sit facing the chalk board. The lecturers
thus have to stand in front of the class with their backs to the chalk board to address the students. With the exception of the class used by Lecturer 2, which is a lecture auditorium, all other classes have dual exits, one at the front of the class and the other at the back. They also have several windows on both sides of the class that allow for cross ventilation of air. Although the classes are equipped with fans, none of them functioned. Most of the louvre blades on the windows in the classes used for observation in College of Education A are broken.

4.4.2. Findings from Lecturers’ Observation Data

The data gathered from the observation of the classes taught by the five lecturers revealed two major themes (used here as working-titles), namely the use of course materials and classroom strategies. As with that of the lecturers’ interview data, a table showing a summary of the main themes and their sub-themes is used; this is then followed by an in-depth descriptive analysis of the information on each of the tables.
Table 4.9: Use of course materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Lecturer 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 2 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 3 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 4 (College B)</th>
<th>Lecturer 5 (College B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course outline</td>
<td>- introducing the course</td>
<td></td>
<td>- guide map</td>
<td>- what to expect and what is expected - norm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- easing the teaching task - building students’ competence level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text books</td>
<td>- reliance on text book - target practice - boosting students’ understanding of topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- study material - integration with teaching practice - creating a better understanding of topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture notes</td>
<td>- note-taking - extracts from materials - note-taking</td>
<td></td>
<td>- mode of teaching - study material - cultivating note-taking habit - study material - note-taking and copying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handouts</td>
<td></td>
<td>- study material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassettes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- material for practice - assessment - material for practice - assessment - material for practice - assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2.1. Use of course materials

This is one of the main themes that emerged from the Lecturers’ observation data. The lecturers had course materials which they used in different ways. These materials include the following: course outline, text books, lecture notes and handouts.

Course outline

Lecturer 1 uses the course outlines as designed by the NCCE to introduce his courses (English Grammar and the Structure of English) to his Year 1 and 2 students respectively during the first class with them. He begins both lectures by first giving the students an outline of the different topics to be treated in the course. The reason for this is explained to the students in one of the classes as follows: “So you may not necessarily wait until you come to the class before preparing for the lecture. It will even help you if you go through them.” For Lecturer 1 therefore, the course outline is used as a tool directed at making students to study ahead of the class. In other words, the provision of the course outline to the students apparently does not only create an awareness of what to expect in the course, it is equally aimed at developing and improving their study skills and boosting their level of competence in the course. In a way, it can be argued that this would have, to a certain extent, made the task of teaching easier for the lecturer as students would have come to the class prepared to a certain level, having read the topic to be taught beforehand. This agrees with his statement during the interview that the use of the course outline (which is prepared by the NCCE) made his teaching task easier (see Section 4.3.2.1).
As with Lecturer 1, Lecturer 4 in College of Education B also uses the course outline to introduce his courses to his students. Lecturer 4 sees the process as “conventional”. In other words, to him it is just a norm, a pattern, a procedure which he usually follows. However, like Lecturer 1, he also uses it as a means to let students know what to expect in the course and what is equally expected of them in the course. During his first class of ENG 211 “Structure of English” with the Year 2 students, before giving the course outline to the students, Lecturer 4 states:

... this is the first lecture. I will quickly tell you what it entails, what every aspect entails. So that... by the next lecture you’ll start taking them one after the other and we’ll be looking at them in microscopic details. For now I want you to have an idea of what this course is all about.

Again, this can be said to be directed at improving the competence level of the students in the subject/ course.

The course outline also serves as a guide map for the lecturers as they make constant reference to it and it enables them to know where they are and the grounds/ topics yet to be covered with regards to teaching their respective courses. This is demonstrated by Lecturer 1 during his ENG 114 class as he states “…look in the course outline, you have preposition and what?” For Lecturer 3, however, the course outline appears to play a dual role: as a guide map and a means of monitoring and ensuring that the students follow the lessons being taught. This is illustrated respectively in the following extract taken from both the handwritten field notes and audio observation notes:

In ENG 112, after the collection of assignments from the students, Lecturer 3 proceeded to begin the new lesson by asking “...so we stopped at... where did we
stop last week? Where did we stop? I know where we stopped; I just want to be sure that you are learning."

Text books

The lecturers recommend textbooks for the students in their respective courses; some of the lecturers, however, use books that are personally written by them to teach their courses. Students are thus compelled to buy such books. Lecturer 1 in his Year 2 class appears reliant on the text book as he makes constant reference to it as he taught the students. He is able to integrate the text book recommended with his lesson/teaching practice through the manner in which he used it. This is shown in the following statement made by the lecturer to the students taken from the audio observation notes and an extract from the handwritten field notes respectively:

Let me... page 58, segmentation of words. I’ve classed most of them, so you are going to be very much involved, you’ll do some analysis, you’ll do some work while we are on, and we’ll compile them because as we go along... Then turn to the next page, here you’ll find the morphological analysis of certain words.

Lecturer informs students that exercises would be done from the course text; there would be frequent use of the text and such exercises would be used to make up the score for the CA [Continuous Assessment] as they will be compiled.

The students during his second observation follow the lecturer’s teaching page-by-page from the text book; such that students who did not have the text book were at a disadvantage as some of them apparently had difficulties following/understanding what was being taught.

Lecturer 1 through his actions as described above, not only makes the course book or text book relevant to the course but also uses it as a means to provide
students with as much target practice as possible by providing them with written exercises to work on and relating same to their Continuous Assessment (CA). The text book is also used to help the students prepare ahead of the class as they are encouraged by the lecturer to study topics before they (such topics) are taught in class. This is reflected in his statements to the Year 2 and Year 1 students respectively:

*If you had gone through your text as I told you before, you would have understood that ... these things can be single.*  
**Year 2 students**

*You see it? Please get your materials. I don’t know why you people are delaying. Get your own, so that you people can read up these things.* **Year 1 students**

The teaching practice of Lecturer 1 with regards to his use of the text book as described above can again be said to be geared towards improving the competence of his students in the courses taught by him.

Like Lecturer 1, Lecturers 4 and 5 also have text books which they brought with them to their different classes. However, unlike Lecturer 1, Lecturer 4 uses his just as a study material and does not actively use the material in class, although he does encourage his students to buy the text book. Lecturer 4 more or less links the success in his courses to having the required text books and other course materials (cassette). Stressing on this issue, Lecturer 4, as shown in the following statement, makes it almost mandatory for students to have these materials:

*If somebody has attended lectures all the time and he has obtained other materials there will be some marks for that. But if somebody does not come to class and does not even have the study materials, if such a person fails I will be happy. Are you following? There will be no*
consideration. But we may consider somebody who comes always, who has got all the books and other materials but maybe needs a little mark to pass, we may try to consider such a person.

Lecturer 5 on the other hand, actively uses his course book (which was written by him) in class with the students. As seen in the case of Lecturer 1, he integrates it with his lesson making it relevant as he gives both assignment and class exercises, aimed at providing practice, to the students from the text book. This is aptly illustrated in the following statements showing the lecturer’s use of the text book as he attempts to integrate it with his lesson in his ENG 112 class as discussed above:

1) Take a copy of your book take that page, the front page, here. Are you seeing the diagram? It’s a diagram of your speech organ. It’s a diagram of your what? ...let us now label that diagram with our own organs

2) I will close this class by giving you an assignment. You are going home now, to draw a diagram of the speech organ. So draw this diagram [referring to the diagram on the back cover of the text book], those of you who don’t have the book, I’ll go and get the book for you. So draw it on a full scarp size sheet. Make it big and then we will label in the class.

As shown above, his activities can also be said to be driven towards helping the students to identify and commit to memory the topic taught, thus helping to equally improve their competence in the course.

It is note-worthy to mention here that during the observation of their first classes in their respective courses, both Lecturers 4 and 5 make attempts with the students to fix extra classes in their different courses. This is even more striking as the initial timetable, as in the case of College of Education A, has the courses appearing for only one hour a week. Below are extracts from the
The class started at 10:25am. The lecturer tried to fix an extra class for students on the time-table. Students however said that the time suggested was not convenient. Both the lecturer and the students decided to wait until they had a fuller class to do this change on the timetable so as to ensure that it is convenient for all the students concerned. Lecturer 4

First of all I want you to see [look at] your timetable so that we can agree on our times of meeting. You have one hour Tuesday 9-10. Then, we are going to make another provision so that we can have another lecture. I'm suggesting that we have another lecture at 11 on Thursday because 11 o'clock is free. Lecturer 5

It is interesting to observe that despite what is shown on the timetable, Lecturers 4 and 5 in their respective courses negotiated individually with their students for an extra hour in each of their taught courses. This is clearly at variance with what obtains in College of Education A as previously discussed under the “Implementation Issues” (see Section 4.3.2.2), as one of the concerns raised by both Lecturers 2 and 3 from College of Education A, is that of insufficient teaching time.

**Lecture notes**

While some of the lecturers actively give notes to the students to copy during their lectures, others expect and make the students take notes. With Lecturer 1 the latter is the case as he expects his students to take notes as he teaches and makes illustrations with sentences which he writes on the chalkboard. Although Lecturer 2 expects her students to take notes during her class, she also dictates short excerpts from passages for practice exercises targeted at
improving the students’ auditory perception of specific English speech sounds.

Below is her statement explaining her aims for the action above:

...you need to hear sound and transcribe correctly. Because this is what it’s all about. So here you’ll need to listen. I’m going to be giving you dictation. I’m going to dictate some things. I’ll ask you to listen to what I say. And I’ll ask you to write down what you’ve heard.

The case of Lecturer 4, however, is slightly different. Although he writes the course outline on the chalkboard for his students to copy, he nevertheless not only expects but actually insists that his students cultivate the habit of note-taking during lectures. This is portrayed clearly in a conversation that ensued between him and a student in his first ENG 211 class:

Lecturer: Write Affixation, affixation.... you’re not writing (talking to a student). From day one we’ll just be shouting...
Student: I didn’t...
Lecturer: You didn’t what? Stand up. What’s your problem? Why are you not writing?
Student: I’m just coming...
Lecturer: From where? From travel [a journey]? You went for a [the] weekend?
Student: I just resumed.
Lecturer: And so that is why you’ll sit in class without writing? I don’t want to see something like that next time.

From the above conversation, it can be said that the actions of Lecturer 4 are geared towards not just ensuring students’ active participation during lessons, but also aimed perhaps at boosting students understanding and competence in the topics taught. This is because such measures meant students invariably have materials in the form of their handwritten notes taken in class to study after lectures. Apart from improving their note-taking skills, this is likely to also have a significant impact on their language skills, most especially their listening, reading and writing skills. This is important as one of the aims of the programme
under study is centred on the confident and competent use of the language skills by the students in the programme.

Lecturers 3 and 5 use a combination of the two techniques. They dictate notes for the students to copy and at other times merely explain the concepts being taught and like Lecturer 1, write examples on the chalk board to give illustrations which most of the students copy into their notebooks in class. Both lecturers give notes on specific aspect of the topics that they want students to concentrate on. While Lecturer 3 begins her lesson by giving notes to the students to copy, Lecturer 5 on the other hand, explains the concepts first before giving students notes on specific areas. Below is an excerpt from the handwritten field notes in ENG 112 taught by Lecturer 3 during her first class observation:

Lecturer gave notes as a way of teaching and gave explanations in-between. Students copied notes as dictated by the lecturer and were able to keep up with the pace.

Interpreting the above extract, Lecturer 3 can be said to be reliant on her lecture notes. During the ENG 313 class with the Year 3 students, the class is turned into a discussion class on the assignment given in her previous class as she is not able to bring her lecture notes for that particular class. Below is a conversation between Lecturer 3 and one of her students showing a part of this discussion:

Student: From what I understand from the question, I gave an example with Nna odiqua risky. Then it means, my brother it is risky. So that nna odiqua, it’s being transferred into English.

Lecturer: So in English you say my brother. Eh..he that is it now; that’s a very good one. It doesn’t mean that if you are English, English you now start talking, you say your
brother, he’s not your brother, ok? The nna, is he your brother? The English man doesn’t recognise anything brother apart from the person that came from the same womb with you.

As noted during the observations, Lecturer 3 uses a different mode of teaching (that is giving notes as a mode of teaching and providing explanations in-between) with the Year 1 students. It is possible to assume that this differentiation in the mode of approaching the teaching tasks has some form of relevance to the levels of the students taught and perhaps in the case of the Year 1 students, their “newness” in the programme. However, the use of the lecture notes seems beneficial not only to the lecturers but to the students themselves as it provides them with what can be described as a ready-made reading material and thus allows for equal access aimed at improving their competence in topics taught in the respective courses.

**Handouts**

In addition to her lecture notes, and unlike the other lecturers, Lecturer 2 uses handouts, which also serve as work sheets, in the course of her lectures. These handouts are distributed in class according to the number of groups. A copy of the prepared handouts is given to each group and students are required to work on assigned tasks /exercises as outlined in the hand-outs in their allocated groups. This is in line with what she said in her interview that the handouts are used as a tool for the effective management of her teaching time (see Section 4.3.2.2. for details).

Apart from acting as study material, these handouts become tools by which the Lecturer creates avenues for students to have adequate practice in language
items/topics taught (see Appendix E for a copy of one of the hand-outs). Lecturer 2 through the use of the handouts creates an avenue not only for the students to practise their speaking skills but also to improve their problem-solving skills while working as a group. This is because, in order to engage in and successfully complete given tasks, the students have to make effective use of their language skills. An interesting observation made while watching students work in their respective groups on given tasks is that although the tasks prompted the students to interact amongst themselves, this interaction did not necessarily result in their use of the English Language as many of the students observed used the Pidgin English to engage in their group discussions and tasks. An example of this is described during the observation of the class from the handwritten field note:

Students clustered in groups to do the tasks they were given as it had to be submitted to the lecturer before she left the class at the end of the lecture. Discussion in many of the groups was in Pidgin English.

Cassettes

In addition to using the Oxford Dictionary to teach his Phonetics and Phonology course to the Year 2 students, Lecturer 4 also uses a cassette in which he had pre-recorded (with his voice) the “correct” pronunciations of the English vowels and consonant sounds and words containing these sounds for the students to listen to and practise in their own time. The cassette thus forms a part of the study materials for the students in the course. Students are required to get a copy of the cassette.
The observation data shows that the use of cassettes for recordings is not restricted to only the lecturer, as students are informed that cassettes would also form part of the materials for assessment in the course. Below is an extract from the audio field notes clearly illustrating this:

*I will give you some words to pronounce and your voice will be recorded. You’ll also buy empty cassettes. Your voice will be recorded and I’ll listen to them and score you, external examiner will also listen to them and score you.*

As seen from above, the use of the cassette recordings by Lecturer 4 appears similar to that described by Lecturer 2 as part of her devised strategy (see Section 4.3.2.2). Both Lecturers 2 and 4 have used this technique to provide and allow students to engage in the much-needed controlled practice. The cassettes, as part of materials for assessment, also to a large extent show evidence of the students’ levels of competence as well as performance in the course. The use of cassettes, whether as part of the study materials or material for assessment, shows a strong emphasis on the Received Pronunciation (RP) of English words. This emphasis can thus be said to be directed solely at the improvement of the spoken English of the students, an aspect which Lecturer 4 refers to sadly as being neglected. This practice is note-worthy as one of the major aims of the programme under study is to promote the competent and confident use of the English Language by its students and (one might add) graduates.

The preceding discussion on the theme, “Use of Course Materials” has provided an insight on a range of materials used by the lecturers in the programme to teach their respective course. The discussion in this section, to a certain level
has also made clear how lecturers, in their own unique way, make use of their chosen course materials to teach their classes in the Colleges of Education. As noted in the discussion, the course materials and the methods employed in their use are crucial because of the likely impact on the development of the language skills and the level of competence of students in the programme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Lecturer 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 2 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 3 (College A)</th>
<th>Lecturer 4 (College B)</th>
<th>Lecturer 5 (College B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice work</td>
<td>- written class exercises</td>
<td>- written class exercises</td>
<td>- written class exercises</td>
<td>- drills</td>
<td>- oral drills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- theoretical and practical knowledge</td>
<td>- oral drills</td>
<td>- oral drills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- monitoring students’ progress</td>
<td>- assignments</td>
<td>- assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building students’</td>
<td>- supplementary lecturers</td>
<td>- groups</td>
<td>- instant correction of mistakes/ errors</td>
<td>- instant correction of mistakes/ errors</td>
<td>- spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mastery</td>
<td>- guest lecturers</td>
<td>- feedback</td>
<td>- class debates</td>
<td>- spelling words</td>
<td>- demonstrations and pictorial illustration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2.2. Classroom strategies

One important aspect of this research is its focus on the teaching practices of lecturers in the College of Education classrooms in relation to the promotion of the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme (see Section 4.1). In this section, the researcher aims to centre the discussion on such practices, examining and exploring how lecturers reflect and promote the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level. The theme “Classroom strategies” is generated from the lecturers’ observation data and will be discussed under these two headings: practice work and building students’ mastery in the subject.

**Practice work**

The use of practice work can be described as one that is common amongst lecturers participating in the study. The data gathered from the observation of the lecturers in the classrooms of the two Colleges of Education reveal that the students are engaged in different forms of practice work aimed at reinforcing learning of topics taught in class. This practice work can be classed into three different groups, namely in-class-writing exercises, oral drills and take-home assignments. It is important to explain here that the term in-class-writing exercise as used in this thesis does not necessarily refer only to the writing of essays, but to any task given by the lecturers to reinforce learning and which involves the very act of writing in class during a given lesson.

Most of the lecturers give their students in-class practice exercises that involved writing, not only as a follow-up on the topics taught but also as a means to
demonstrate evidence of their level of understanding the lesson/topic taught. Lecturer 1 in teaching both the Year 1 and Year 2 students, uses practice exercise not only to engage the students in active class participation. Exercises are written on the chalkboard, and students, together as a class with the lecturer, work out the answers to given questions. The following excerpt shows this pattern as noted in the handwritten field notes on the first observation Basic Grammar class for the Year 1 students taught by Lecturer 1:

Lecturer writes out a sentence on the chalkboard:
This is my great friend from the city

With the class, the lecturer identifies the parts of speech in the sentence. The lecturer endeavours to tell the students with this illustration what is expected of them in the course, that is, what they are expected to do or learn in the course.

As shown above, Lecturer 1 through this exercise tries to build the competence of the students as he emphasises that it is not enough to know the definition of terms taught, but equally important to be able to identify the items in context and to use them accordingly. In other words emphasis is placed not just on theoretical knowledge but on the practical aspect as well. The following excerpt taken from the audio and handwritten field notes clearly highlights his main aims/ purpose of using the in-class writing exercises:

All we are doing now is just general discussions on each of these parts of speech... And we are going to record this short class exercise; it will not be recorded as your CA but I want to see how well you have done. I'm giving you an insight into... so that writing the main exam will not be a problem for you. Year 1

Lecturer informed students that they could be asked to do a morphological analysis of underlined words in a given a passage during the exams. Year 2
The remark made by Lecturer 1 above, shows that in-class-writing exercises play multiple roles in his class. In addition to being used to promote theoretical as well as practical knowledge in topics taught, it serves as a means to monitor students’ progress. In-class-writing exercises are used to practise examination format questions to allow the students to become accustomed to the format and possibly enhance/improve not only their competence in the Course but also their performance during examinations.

It is also noted that as in the case of Lecturer 1, Lecturer 2 also uses these practice exercises as means for preparing students for their performance in the examinations. The practice work activities are thus designed with a purpose of improving students’ competence as well as performance in the course of study.

This view is shown in the handwritten field note extract below:

She [Lecturer 2] also gave notice of the oral test and exam, informing students that by doing these activities they were equally being prepared for their exams and tests in the course.

Whereas Lecturer 2 gives such exercises to her students to work on in groups, like Lecturer 1, Lecturer 3, in her own style, encourages her students to work on in-class writing exercises on their own, individually. This is shown in a comment made by Lecturer 3 during one of her classes:

Some people are looking at people’s work to copy from... Why do you have to ask him? Do your work. Ask your lips, ask your mouth, don’t ask anybody. It’s too simple for you to start asking... If I catch you not writing, you’ll be out of this class in one second.

As seen from the last statement she makes it mandatory for the students to do given in-class-writing exercises. Her reason for this, as stated in the audio field
notes, is that it is important for the students to “learn and master” in order to teach the “next generation” effectively.

It is apparent that the use of in-class-writing exercises by Lecturer 3 is not only geared at promoting the language skills of the students but actually boosting their competence level in the course to enable them teach English confidently in the primary and secondary schools. This view is clearly reflected in a statement she made to her Year 1 students during her “Introduction to Phonetics and Phonology” class while encouraging them to do an in-class-writing exercise to practice the identifications of sounds using given criteria: “You need to do this so that when you go into primary schools, you won’t be scared.”

It is, however, interesting to note the manner in which the feedback on the in-class-writing exercises is given. As already mentioned, in the case of Lecturer 1 exercises are done on the chalkboard and the lecturer together with his students in the class work on the exercises to reach the correct answers. At other times, exercises are given to students to do individually. The lecturer in such instances does a “random marking” of students’ work as shown in the case of his Year 2 students described below:

Lecturer goes round the class marking the work of students’ who were able to finish quickly. Students appeared eager and called on him to mark their finished work. There was a lot of laughter and chatter between the lecturer and the students as he moved around the class. He marked the work of just two people on each row – random selection. Students compared their marked work.

As shown from above, this method of random marking surprisingly makes the students eager to do the tasks given on time as they wanted their notebooks to
be marked by the lecturer. Although this method of random marking can be said to be controversial as it clearly lends credence to the concern raised in Section 4.3.2.3 with regards to the issue of inadequate feedback for students. Nevertheless, it can be argued that the approach as used by Lecturer 1 provides him with a sample with which he gets a general overview of the level of competence and performance of students in his course. Instead of discouraging the students, the approach seems to generate an atmosphere of eager participation of the students in the lesson.

With Lecturer 2, the in-class-writing exercises are collected from the groups by the Lecturer, marked and returned with the feedback to the students the following week during her class with the students. Lecturer 3 on the other hand, does not collect the in-class-writing exercises for marking; in fact they are not marked. She, however, like Lecturer 1, works with her students to write the correct answers on the chalkboard. This can be said to be aimed at developing the students’ ability to self-correct.

Most of the lecturers engage their students in oral drills as a form of practice. For Lecturers 2 and 3 poetry rhymes are used for these oral drills. The students are made to recite the rhymes repeatedly, with their attention drawn to the pronunciation of specific sounds in certain words. Lecturer 2 for example, used the “Humpty Dumpty” rhyme to teach stressed syllables, and the tongue twister “Peter Pecker” to teach the “er” sound in English (see handout in Appendix E for details). Lecturer 3 used the “Little Bird” rhyme to teach the “ir” sound in
English. This is illustrated in the excerpt from the handwritten field note on the
Year 1 class taught by Lecturer 3:

...the lecturer taught the vowel number 11 with the children’s rhyme “Little Bird”. Students recited the rhyme and laughed as lecturer drew their attention to the pronunciation of the word “bird”, which many of them pronounced as bed, bud, bored. She drew students’ attention to the word first, focusing on the “ir” that is the vowel number 11 in the word.

Lecturers 4 and 5 use the oral drills to help students practise the correct / Received Pronunciation (RP) of words in English, to make distinctions between sounds and to identify possible errors in pronunciation of English words resulting from interference of the first language. This is because as stated by Lecturer 4 in the audio field notes “...many of the pronunciation we use in the Nigerian society are radically different from what is correct.”

The approach adopted by most of the lecturers to help students achieve that level of international intelligibility in the pronunciation of English words, by using and portraying themselves as correct models to be copied by the students, is laudable, but at the same time, this approach is not devoid of its own failings since the lecturers are non-native speakers of the English Language. As second language users of the English Language, the lecturers are bound to make mistakes as well as errors which they may not even be aware of in their use of the English Language.

Lecturers 2, 3 and 5 give assignments to their students. This is used as a tool aimed at reinforcing the learning of topics taught in class. Assignments thus provide another avenue not only for students to practise topics taught in class,
but also a means for lecturers to cover lost grounds and work ahead of the class to cover more topics ahead of scheduled time, which, as already discussed in the findings from the lecturers’ interview data, may not even be adequate to cover or teach all the topics as stated in the course outlines for the semester (see Section 4.3.2.2). As shown below, Lecturer 5 uses the assignments to prepare students ahead for a new topic in his next class:

*I will close this class by giving you an assignment. You are going home now, to draw a diagram of the speech organ. Yes. Draw this diagram, exactly as it is there, make it beautiful, don’t label. When you come to class in the next lesson, we will label that diagram in the class. But draw a diagram and make sure that it is easy for you to draw so when we meet in class we will label that diagram after discussing Speech Mechanism.*

As in the case of most of the practice exercises discussed, feedback given to the students is limited. Of all the lecturers who give assignments to the students in the observed classes, only Lecturer 2 returns marked assignments with written feedback to the students.

Although Lecturer 3 gives and collects assignments from her students, these are never returned to them. There is no evidence to show that these assignments are actually marked and if indeed any kind of feedback is given to the students on the assignments submitted. This seems to confirm the comment made by Lecturer 2 during her interview where she voiced her concerns over the handling of students’ assignments by lecturers in the English Language teacher education programme. She states “...*some of my colleagues will give assignments and they don’t send the scripts back, no feedback.*"
The quality of the learning experience as portrayed in the discussion above is likely to have a major impact on the performance and competence of the students in the courses taught in the programme as students are provided with little, and in most cases (as seen from the actions of Lecturer 3 above), no feedback at all. The students thus have nothing to learn from or to work with to improve on their current level. This is because, as succinctly stated by Lecturer 2 in her interview, as a result of the lack of feedback, the students “don’t know how they fare” and thus assume that they are doing well in such assignments or even tests.

**Building students’ mastery**

One of the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme is aimed at the production of effective teachers in the subject at both the primary and secondary levels of education. As such it becomes important for students to have the required knowledge to enable them teach the English Language effectively as a subject in the primary and secondary schools and be able to also demonstrate evidence of this knowledge. In other words, effective teaching of the English Language as a subject involves performance, but more essentially, competence in the subject. To help build students’ mastery in the subject for effective teaching, the lecturers employ a range of strategies.

In one of the Year 1 classes observed, Lecturer 1 organises what he refers to as a “supplementary lecture” to which he invites a speaker (referred to here as a guest lecturer) to give a lecture on the topic “Adequate use of English”. The guest lecturer is apparently regarded as an expert in his chosen field of
language practice as he is introduced to the students by Lecturer 1 as an SSCE (Senior School Certificate Examination) examiner. Given his position as one who marks English Language (subject) papers at the national examinations (SSCE), he is able to draw the students’ attention to some of the common errors made in the use of the English Language, especially in the spoken form of the language and as used within the Nigerian context. This is illustrated in the following excerpt from the hand written field notes:

The students listened with rapt attention - but without writing - to the guest lecturer as he listed and gave examples of some of the common errors made side-by-side the correct forms/ interpretations of such statements e.g
My sister has delivered - My sister has given birth
Tap flowing - Water flows
To escort your friend (after a visit) - To accompany your friend

Although many of the errors made the students laugh, it is clear that the guest lecturer has made an impact with his lecture as students, at the end of the lecture, not only rushed to buy his book (which dealt in detail with the topic) but were also observed in the following class using the correct form of some of the errors pointed out by the guest lecturer. By organising this supplementary lecture and using a different speaker other than himself, Lecturer 1 more or less shocks the students into that awareness of the importance of being able to distinguish between the accepted form (which very often, as seen from the examples above, is wrong) and the correct usage of the English Language as teachers to-be in the subject. When asked during the interview why he had invited the guest lecturer to give a talk on that particular topic he says it is not only to reinforce what has being taught but to also correct the wrong
grammatical expressions used by the Year 1 students newly entering the programme. His explanation is as follows:

*I think it’s meant to correct them. I usually introduce him to my classes especially the year one students to help brush up some of the bad... habits, grammatical habits they have...brought along with them from the secondary school. Yes, so that’s the essence.*

The exercise seems focused on building students competence in the subject as well as equipping them with the skill, as noted above, to teach the subject effectively. The exercise, as used by Lecturer 1, can be said to be directed at the improvement of the students’ use of the English Language in both their speaking and writing to the level where they are able to use the language without fear of being misunderstood.

Lecturer 2 divides her large class of one hundred and twenty students into manageable groups of ten members each. This enables her to work more effectively with the students. By dividing the students into these groups she is able to tackle a number of issues, the chief of them all being insufficient time. By making the students work in groups in and out of class, Lecturer 2 is able to cover more topics than she would have been able to because of the limited time allocated for teaching the course. As already discussed above, class work and assignments are given to the students to work on in their respective groups. The lecturer also moves from group to group asking questions based on tasks or exercises given. This method makes the students focused and attentive in class, as they know that anyone in their group could be called to provide the required answers to questions asked. They are thus compelled to participate in the tasks given.
Depending on the nature of the task given, the assignments are usually submitted to the lecturer or presented before the other students in the following week’s class. Students are thus kept engaged and the lost hours as a result of the inadequate time issue, made up for with the time spent on researching and working on the assignments given. In addition to sharpening the research skills of the students, their knowledge or competence are also developed as they have to engage in in-depth study/research of topics that they have been given in order to submit written work to the lecturer or to present their work to the other members of the class. The problem of lack of in-depth teaching of topics, as well as covering the syllabus within the given time for the semester (see Section 4.3.2.3), seem to be well taken care of by this group strategy employed by Lecturer 2. Students feel compelled to engage in given tasks as they are aware that such tasks or assignments would be requested for by the lecturer in her next class or used as part of an on-going in-class exercise. Below is an excerpt from the handwritten field notes showing this:

Lecturer went round the class, sharing hand-outs for the take home group assignments. One group of students also appeared to be working on the group take-home assignment in class.

By using the group strategy in her class, which has about one hundred and twenty students, Lecturer 2 has demonstrated to the students how to manage large language classes, which the students are likely to encounter when they begin their teaching practice and as such it can be argued that she has to a certain level prepared them to be effective in teaching English Language within the Nigerian context.
The provision of feedback to the students ensures that the tasks or assignments are not left undone as the students know that the marks awarded to each task, after it is marked, forms a part of their CA (Continuous Assessment). Although Lecturer 2 expresses her dissatisfaction at not being able to give prompt feedback because of limited time (as discussed in Section 4.3.2.3), she, however, tries to provide the students with regular feedback. The preceding statement is taken from the audio field notes on the observation of her Year II class:

*I want to return the marked scripts for the last assignment. Let me just er... make one or two observations. Even the groups that I’ve just marked now, I noticed that... some of you used the American sound.*

Her comment “*I mark every week*” given during the interview appears to confirm her provision and use of feedback as a means to help students improve on their current level. She, however, also shows her frustration as she states most of the students do not utilise the feedback she gives to them and “*they end up making the same mistakes again*”.

Lecturers 3 and 4 appear to have adopted the same approach to the correction of mistakes and errors. Mistakes once spotted or identified are corrected immediately. The following excerpt from the handwritten field notes on her Year 1 class observation gives a good example of this situation:

*Going through students work as they submitted and identifying mistakes, lecturer immediately draws the students’ attention to the mistakes, handing the work back to them to do the correct thing.*

Again in her class with the Year 3 students, a student makes a mistake in tense, using the present tense of the word “*give*” in a sentence instead of the past
tense “gave” as required in the sentence. As in the case described above, the mistake is identified immediately and the student is able to self-correct as the lecturer presented her with both options stating “You give or you gave?”

It can be argued that the approach enables students to distinguish between wrong and correct forms of words, structures or speech sounds and as such they are able to use them following corrections given. This, as already mentioned in the case of Lecturer 1, improves their use of the English Language as it reduces the amount of mistakes made and as such builds the competence of students in the English Language.

Lecturer 5 uses pictorial illustrations and demonstrations to help make his teaching of topics real as well as memorable for his students. The following excerpt from the audio field notes gives a good description of his use of demonstrations during his lessons:

*Put your finger into your mouth, into your mouth. Right at the upper part of your mouth, the roof, after your teeth, you touch something else. What do you touch? Your gum. You call it gum, we call it teeth ridge. Teeth ridge. The sound produced at the teeth ridge is called alveolar sound. Then, now put your hand again, put your hand again after the roof of your mouth. Don’t forget it’s your mouth and it’s your finger at the end of the day. After the roof of your mouth, run your finger, you will meet a surface that is rough at the back, immediately after the teeth ridge. Not so? Is your own not rough?*

Using this approach he makes the students use themselves as their own models for learning the speech organs. Although it is not a very comfortable sight to watch, it appears effective as the students are not likely to forget the experience for some time. In a way, it can also be said that he is also teaching
them how to teach the speech organs and as such contributing to building their teaching skills in the subject. In his words from the interview, the approach is practical and makes the lecture “more down to earth and understandable.”

The preceding discussion in this section has certainly illuminated a range of interesting issues. It has examined the lecturers’ choice of course materials and how the course materials are used in the classes taught by the lecturers. There has also been a detailed discussion on the different classrooms strategies used by the lecturers to promote the objectives of the programme. In all, it is fair to say that the lecturers have not actually made a conscious effort to promote the objectives of the programme, because as stated in Section 4.3.2.3., many of them are unaware of what the programme’s main objectives are. Their focus, rather, is on achieving the primary objectives or aims of their respective taught courses. However, as seen from the observation data analysed, some of the lecturers have, through their use of their chosen course materials and unique classroom strategies, been able to work with their students towards the achievement of some of the stated objectives of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level. Below is a table showing a summary of the themes from the observation data:
Table 4.11: Summary of Themes from Lecturers’ Observation Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Course Materials</th>
<th>Course outlines</th>
<th>Textbooks</th>
<th>Lecture notes</th>
<th>Handouts</th>
<th>Cassettes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Strategies</td>
<td>Practice work</td>
<td>Building students’ mastery in the subject</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this Chapter there has been a direct focus on the data gathered from the two Colleges of Education involved in the study. This includes not only data gathered from the documents examined, but there has also been a detailed, in-depth discussion on the analysis of data from both the interviews and observations of lecturers in the programme. Whether at the organisational level of the two Colleges of Education, or in the individual teaching practices of the lecturers in the programme, autonomy seems to be a central theme running through the findings gathered from the data collected from the Colleges of Education. This would be elaborated on further in the Discussion Chapter of this thesis.
CHAPTER FIVE – ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL DATA

5.1. INTRODUCTION

In Chapter Four an in-depth analysis of the data collected from the two Colleges of Education was carried out. In this Chapter, Analysis of School Data, attention will be centred on analysing the data gathered from the student teachers in their respective placement schools. The primary aim here is not only to identify the teaching needs of the student teachers but to also examine the extent to which the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level reflect the teaching needs of the student teachers (see Section 4.1). As in the case of the College data, analysis of the School data begins with the summarised version of the findings on different tables. This is followed by an in-depth descriptive and critical analysis of the findings as illustrated on the respective tables. The discussion in this Chapter will be based on the following headings: document analysis, analysis of student teachers’ interviews and analysis of student teachers’ observation data.

5.2. DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

A total of six student teachers, who are also final year students in the programme, participated in the research. Each student teacher is asked to write a reflective journal on their experience in the Teaching Practice exercise. The journals and copies of their lesson notes are analysed to identify possible gaps in their training. Findings from the data gathered from the documents will be discussed alongside those from the interviews as they both represent data which reflect the views of the participants on the phenomenon under study.
Below is a table showing the documents examined and a summary of the information gathered from them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Reaction to practical teaching</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Self-assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson notes</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Subject mastery</td>
<td>Language use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of the journal provides the student teachers with an opportunity to engage in self-assessment and as such, present an overall picture of the practical teaching as experienced by them. The lesson notes and journals afford the student teachers the opportunity to use their writing skills which invariably portray their level of competence in the use of the English Language. The themes generated from the documents examined will be discussed alongside those of the interview as they both represent the perspectives of the student teachers on the phenomenon under study. Extracts from the student teachers’ journals are highlighted in bold, while those from the interviews are in italics.

### 5.3. ANALYSIS OF STUDENT TEACHERS’ INTERVIEWS

The semi-structured interview format is used. The interview questions for the student teachers are directed towards gathering information on their background and their experience during the teaching practice exercise (please see Appendix A for the complete Interview Schedule). The interview questions are designed to provide answers to Research Questions 2 and 4 (see Section
4.1) of this study. As earlier stated, the student teachers are all final year students in the programme. Of the six student teachers who participated in the study, four are from the Department of English/SOS (Social Studies), one is from the Department of English/ Theatre Arts and the other is from the Department of English/ Igbo. As shown on the table below, Student-teachers 1, 3 and 5 are from College of Education A, while Student-teacher 2, 4 and 6 are from College of Education B. The following table gives a summary of the background information of the student teachers who participated in the study.

Table 5.2: Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Student-teacher 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 2 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 3 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 4 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 5 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 6 (College B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course of study</td>
<td>English/ SOS</td>
<td>English/ Igbo</td>
<td>English/ SOS</td>
<td>English/ SOS</td>
<td>English/ Theatre Arts</td>
<td>English/ SOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class taught</td>
<td>Primary 3</td>
<td>Primary 4</td>
<td>Primary 1</td>
<td>Primary 5</td>
<td>Primary 2</td>
<td>Primary 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.1. Findings from Student Teachers' Interviews

In this section the discussion will focus on the themes and sub-themes generated from the interview data of the student teachers. These themes include the following: teaching practice placement, theory versus practice and areas of difficulties. As in the previous chapter, these themes and their respective sub-themes will be summarised in tables which will then be followed by an in-depth analytical discussion on each of the themes as illustrated in their
respective tables. To avoid repetitions, the findings from the journals and lesson notes will be discussed alongside the interview findings.
Table 5.3: Teaching Practice Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Student-teacher 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 2 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 3 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 4 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 5 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 6 (College B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial reaction</strong></td>
<td>- fear</td>
<td>- fear</td>
<td>- expectations</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>- preliminary preparations: background check</td>
<td>- confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- relief</td>
<td></td>
<td>- confident and competent</td>
<td></td>
<td>- reasons for choice of school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- reservations/ fear</td>
<td></td>
<td>- reservations/ fear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for feelings/ actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- no prior teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>- shy</td>
<td></td>
<td>- preliminary preparations: background check</td>
<td>- confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- shy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- reasons for choice of school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- reservations/ fear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- good in the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tackling the problem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- viewed TP exercise as a challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- advice and encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- update knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External influence</strong></td>
<td>- class teacher’s influence</td>
<td>- watch and learn</td>
<td>- watch and learn</td>
<td></td>
<td>- class teacher’s influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- observation of lessons</td>
<td>- positive influence</td>
<td>- format or pattern to follow</td>
<td></td>
<td>- class teacher as know-it-all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- monitoring</td>
<td>- monitoring and feedback</td>
<td>- adviser</td>
<td></td>
<td>- teaching methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- feedback from other class teachers</td>
<td>- adapting class</td>
<td>- good books of the class teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>- monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- given format/method</td>
<td>teacher’s teaching methods</td>
<td>- class teacher’s views</td>
<td></td>
<td>- utilising feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td>- feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>- supervisor from different department</td>
<td>- preparation</td>
<td>- learnt from mistakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- satisfied with performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 10-15 minutes for supervision</td>
<td>- self evaluation</td>
<td>- given good feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- effect</td>
<td></td>
<td>- mixed feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- self evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>- extra workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.1.1. Teaching practice placement

This is one of the major themes generated from the student teachers’ interview data. In order to identify the teaching needs of the student teachers (see Section 4.1 for Research Aims) it is necessary to involve the final year students who are on their practical teaching exercise. The teaching practice exercise usually takes place in the first semester and it spans over a period of three months/twelve weeks. The theme “Teaching Practice Placement” will be discussed under the following headings: initial reaction, tackling the problem, external influence and supervision.

**Initial reaction**

Fear appears to be a strong emotion with which some of the student teachers battle in the course of their practical teaching exercise. Describing her emotions during her allocation to her placement school, Student-teacher 1 states “...I was very, very scared.” Student Teacher 2 also states “...I had fear.” When asked to give reasons for such emotion they both blame it on their personalities and their inability to speak in public before people. The interview data reveal that the fear is not just limited to speaking in public or their shy nature but there is also fear of what and how to teach. The following comment paints an apt picture of the inner turmoil experienced by Student-teacher 1:

*Inside my mind, I know that I will teach but when I was watching my [class] teacher teaching, I’m asking myself how am I going to do it. How am I going to stand in front of people and talk?...I was scared because I don’t know exactly what I will teach.*

This anxiety, as seen from the statement, apparently also stems from the awareness that as student teachers, their performance in and out of the
classroom is being monitored, observed and judged by the other permanent teachers in the placement schools. This is clearly expressed in the comment made by Student-teacher 2 in her journal “I had big fear in me on how to stand in front of children [pupils] and their teachers to teach...” This fear can thus be said to be borne out of a sense of insecurity, being out of their comfort zone and a strong sense of uncertainty in their ability to engage effectively in actual teaching exercise with their pupils. This clearly is the case as Student-teacher 1 mentions her relief as the class teacher informed her that she would not be teaching but observing her (the subject/class teacher) teach. This can be described as an orientation phase organised by the permanent teachers in the placement schools which is intended to show the student teachers the “ropes” in the teaching exercise. Student-teacher 2 is reluctant to teach, and like Student Teacher 1, is relieved when she is asked to observe her class teacher.

The fears of Student-teacher 1 can also be attributed to the uncertainty in her abilities to use the English Language on a competent level. In fact her statement during the interview clearly portrays this:

... the greatest fear I had is that at times when you are speaking English, you cannot be able to know if you are getting it or if you are getting the correct thing, or the correct tenses there, that is the area of my fear... I find it difficult, a bit difficult to teach because in English there are many grammatical words in English Language which you supposed to use and which you supposed not to use...

This she explains is because the English Language is not her language and she has no prior experience of teaching the English Language as a subject. Therefore she learns not only how to teach the subject, but the subject itself as she teaches her pupils. Nevertheless, she is aware of the area where she is
weak and still harbours the fear of making mistakes and errors in her use of the English Language.

Student-teacher 5 explains that she is not afraid of talking before people, a trait which perhaps can be attributed to the nature of her course of study (see Table 5.2) and also to the fact that as stated in her journal entry she has had previous teaching experience. She however has strong reservations about the placement school to which she is allocated because of the high level of academic performance of the pupils in the school. Her fear is that this could be an embarrassment for her if she makes mistakes in class in the course of teaching the pupils. In her words:

*the pupils there they are very insulting [rude] and so on; also they are good in talking English. ...if you make any mistake the students will just be laughing at you*.

It can be argued that this statement, in a way, reflects the level of preparation of the student teachers for the practical teaching exercise. An extract from the journal of Student-teacher 1 clearly portrays this as she summarises her experience on the first day of teaching in the primary 3 class to which she was assigned:

*My first day was characterized with fear of inexperience, missing words, confusion and fear in the face of the pupils and class teachers watching me.*

As seen from the discussion above, it will, therefore, not be out of place to question the approach, manner or extent to which the student teachers have been prepared to engage in the actual teaching of English Language as a subject.
Although Student-teacher 5 eventually decides to take up the challenge of teaching in that particular school, the reason is based on her own self-improvement as she regards it as an opportunity to improve on her current level of English. She explains “...they [the pupils] will still build up my vocabulary, build up the way we [I] speak, because of them you’ll be afraid of speaking jargons.” While Student-teachers 1 and 2 are inhibited with fear as result of the choice of placement school, Student-teacher 5 actually has an incentive for her choice and this clearly is not only to improve her teaching skills but to also boost her level of competence in the English Language especially in the area of vocabulary development in her speaking skill.

With Student-teachers 3 and 6, their initial reaction is one of confidence as they are competent in the subject. With Student-teacher 3, although she classes her use of the English Language as good, her expectations on the Teaching Practice exercise are more or less shattered as she had envisaged that the task would be an easy one especially as she is given a very junior class, Primary 1 to teach. She remarks “it has not been easy” as she still struggled to find ways to help the pupils show an understanding of topics taught in class. She thus describes the experience as stressful.

This again brings the discussion to the “how question” which is one with which the student teachers struggle in the practical teaching exercise. This is of grave concern as one of the objectives of the programme is to produce competent and effective teachers to teach the English Language in both the primary and secondary levels of education.
Tackling the problem

For Student-teacher 1, combating the fear she experiences is done in two ways: updating her knowledge and using feedback received from the other permanent teachers who observed her classes. She explains it as thus:

...When they corrected me, I adjust some certain things including that grammatical error. As a process, when I teach up to two or three times I pick, which help me in some areas in teaching English. What I did is that after they corrected me, I went home I picked some text books which we used in our departmental courses. I used it, I searched the content, I find the grammatical words how to use it, then from there I pick up [improve]....

Whether the problems (of grammatical errors) are dealt with effectively remains to be seen because, as shown in the statement above, there are clearly still errors which are definitely cause for grave concern, given that the student teacher in question is in the final year of her training as an English Language teacher in the College of Education.

With Student-teacher 2 the approach adopted to combat her fears is slightly different. Although like Student-teacher 1 she gets advice and encouragement from the other class teachers who are permanent, (as described in her journal entry) she deals with her fear by viewing the practical teaching exercise as a challenge which must be done and as such, braces up to it. This is clearly confirmed in her statement during the interview as she states “...as I was going on, I start enjoying it because I’m not the type that used to talk in public. I’m a shy person but now I learnt a lot.” The statement shows she has evolved from that initial state of fear which was obviously caused by her “shy” nature to one who is confident in her speaking. This view is expressed in her journal entry:
Having been corrected, I continued in the correct way and the aunty [the subject/class teacher] came to me and congratulated me for doing the teaching well, so the aunty stopped following me to the class.

Student-teacher 2 from the statements above can be said to have metamorphosed through the process from a shy being into a teacher of the English Language appearing confident as well as competent in her use of the English Language. As such, she can be described here as having gained a measure of independence, and the confidence of the afore mentioned subject teacher. This is a crucial point to note as it is directly linked to the aims of the programme, which refer to the confident use of the English Language by its students and their ability to teach the subject effectively as well as competently.

**External influence**

As illustrated in the discussion below, the data show that the student teachers have had a significant amount of input from people other than their teacher educators in the Colleges of Education. These contributors (and their contributions) have been referred to here as the external influence. Data from the interviews and journals reveal that the class/subject teachers in the different placement schools play an extensive role in developing and moulding the teaching practice/ methods adopted by the student teachers to engage in their given teaching tasks. It is important to state here that some of these class teachers are perhaps trained to teach other subjects and as such may not necessarily have the required expertise to teach English Language as a subject.
According to Student-teachers 1, 2 and 3, they are made to observe the subject/class teachers at work (teaching) before being allowed to teach their respective assigned classes. This period of observation varied from a few days to a week depending on the teacher and the class involved. With Student-teacher 1 it is one week, Student-teacher 2 observes the subject teacher for four days, while Student-teacher 3 does her own observation for two days. The observation period can be seen as a form of orientation for the student teachers coming into the school to teach and it appears to have been made compulsory. 

In fact Student-teacher 3 puts it succinctly in her journal entry:

*I was not allowed to commence teaching rather I was asked to watch my subject teacher teach my subject (English Language)*

Although all three student teachers mentioned above are happy to watch their subject/class teachers teach as instructed by the school, their reasons are different. For Student-teachers 1 and 2, it is because of their fear to actually stand before the pupils and teach. This seems to be a reflection of how they view themselves, as trainees in the system who are not yet ready or sufficiently equipped to engage in the task of teaching English as a subject. This view is amplified in the comment made by Student-teacher 1 during her interview when she described herself as “...*a novice, because I cannot say that er...I am perfect in the area of teaching because I don’t know exactly what to do...*” The comment from Student-teacher 2, “...*to learn from them how to teach*” also buttresses the above point.
Student-teacher 3 on the other hand, feels “capable of teaching the pupils”. She, however, wants to observe the subject teacher in order to see how it (the teaching task) is done. She explains it as follows in her interview: “So that [those] two days I was not allowed to teach, I even preferred it, because I want to get used to how she’s taking them [the pupils] the subject.” This seems to suggest that she is not just observing to see how it is done, but equally aiming to get accustomed to the method used by the subject teacher.

The student teachers are more or less conditioned to use the methods prescribed and demonstrated by the subject/class teachers. From the data, it can be interpreted that the student teachers are not encouraged to showcase or display the knowledge and skills gained in the course of their training in the College of Education classrooms. It can be argued that it may have been more appropriate at the initial stage to allow the student teachers to first teach in order to show their own methods and skills, and the lapses if any, corrected. Given that the student teachers are still in training, this may have provided the class/subject teachers with an opportunity to learn something new, thus making learning a two-way street between the class/subject teachers and the student teachers.

The whole process used by the subject/class teachers is directed towards what can be referred to as a “re-schooling” of the student teachers. It implies that the student teachers in the theoretical aspect of their training in the classrooms of Colleges of Education have not been taught methodologies that are relevant or current. It also implies that the lecturers in the programme are either out-of
touch or out dated in the approaches to which they have, as practitioners, exposed the student teachers to. This, thus, raises the question of how current and effective the methods used by the class/subject teachers really are. As such, there is great cause for alarm as there is a tendency and danger for the good and current/relevant to be overtaken by the bad and perhaps, the out-dated, in the approach and knowledge of English Language teaching.

As seen in the discussion above, most of the student teachers are placed under observation, and monitored to ensure that they follow or adhere to given procedures in teaching English Language as a subject (especially as demonstrated during the orientation week). In her interview Student-teacher 1 gives a short description of the first class she taught and the reaction of the class/subject teacher:

*The first topic I taught them [the pupils] was “Asking Questions about the Past.” I dropped my lesson note; I’m [was] teaching them off-head [off the top of my head], so when I was explain to them what asking question about the past is all about, at that process, they [the teachers] said I made a mistake. So after my teaching, the class teacher called me and said this is how to go about it.*

Her errors are pointed out and as she notes in her journal she “adjusted quickly” by implementing the corrections as given.

Student-teacher 2 in her journal entry also paints a very catching picture of the monitoring as done by the subject/class teacher:

*...the aunty [subject teacher] that was taking the course, who promised to guide me, called me and pointed out my errors to me and corrected me. Having bein [been] corrected, I continued in my corrected way and the aunty came to me and congratulated me for*
doing the teaching well, so the aunty stopped following me to class.

This suggests that the actual monitoring activities are not just concerned with identifying students’ errors but actually the monitoring activities also entail placing the student teachers under close observations for a given period to ensure that methods shown (during the orientation week) are being correctly utilised. This is illustrated in the following comment from Student-teacher 2 during the interview:

*S sometimes I forget to revise the previous lesson, the Aunty [subject/class teacher] will remind me. Maybe sometimes after teaching, they will call me say you didn’t explain very well in this area, that I should go back and explain well for them [the pupils] to understand it...*

Student-teacher 3 in her interview also explains her own encounter in class with the subject teacher as she is interrupted in the course of teaching the pupils for not using the observed methods as shown in her first week of resumption at the placement school and corrected accordingly:

*So the day I was to teach, my Aunty saw me, she said “...no, no, let me tell you the way you will do it. That is if you want to introduce a topic, you have to bring before them some questions that will remind them of the previous knowledge they have so that they can easily understand the topic you are trying to introduce.” So when I came I was not using that method...*

Describing her emotions in relation to the incident mentioned above, Student teacher 3 states in her journal entry that she feels embarrassed and ashamed especially as the subject/class teacher described her efforts for that day as having done (accomplished) nothing in the course of teaching the pupils in the lesson in question.
It appears from the on-going discussion that the student teachers are regarded as trainees without the adequate knowledge, competence and skills required for teaching English Language as a subject. This seems to confirm the comment made by Lecturer 2 in her interview when she talked about the reluctance of some schools to use student teachers from the Colleges of Education during their practical teaching exercise (see Section 4.3.2.4). Student teachers appear not have been encouraged to develop their creative and imaginative abilities and to work exercising their own initiatives. Being monitored by the subject/class teachers ensures that they do not deviate from the methods that they have observed as this perhaps would have been seen as an aberration of the norm. The following statement given by Student-teacher 4 during her interview confirms this view “...when I looked at the lesson note for the permanent teacher it was different from what we were taught in school.” Expressing her confusion in the system, Student-teacher 4 states as follows in her interview and journal:

It was so because whenever I go to somebody the person will give a different thing to do, different from the one we were taught in school; and when I go the next person, the person will say it’s wrong and that I had to start again.

At submission the teacher in charge made lots of corrections that I had to rewrite everything. I wrote all over again. Even up till now, I still don’t know if my lesson note or plan is correct.

The reason for this may not be far-fetched. The preceding discussion not only shows the insecurity as experienced by the student teachers in their own abilities but also suggests that the subject/class teachers assumed a “know-it-all” figure before the student teachers. This is because corrections (note, not
suggestions) made by the subject/class teachers are to be accepted as final and implemented by the student teachers accordingly. The situation as expressed in the comments above, points to a stark contrast between what is taught in the College of Education classrooms and the actual teaching practices in the English Language classrooms of most of the placement schools to which the student teachers have been assigned. This variance, as already highlighted, suggests that either the lecturers in the English Language teacher education programme, operating in both Colleges of Education, are either out-of-touch with current and relevant practices or their good work/taught practices are being sabotaged by the actions of the subject/class teachers in the placement schools.

Findings from the data also suggest that some of the student teachers are not very comfortable with some of the corrections given. As such, they can be said to be dissatisfied with the approach adopted by the subject/class teachers towards them; however, they feel compelled to use the corrections and adopt the approach given to them so as to remain in the good books of the subject/class teachers. This is reflected in the following excerpt from the journal of Student-teacher 3:

The period she corrected me, although I took it, I had the impression that human beings are different and possess different characters and may not have the same teaching procedures [styles]. They may be aimed at the same goal but different approach to teaching. When I started teaching, I was able to convey the message to the pupils using my own method which seemed easy for me...
As seen above, Student-teacher 3 clearly feels displeased at being interrupted in the middle of teaching her Primary 1 pupils by the subject/class teacher who condemns her approach used in teaching the topic and gives her corrections as she (subject/class teacher) thought right. Although the student teacher is apparently not happy with the corrections as she feels she was achieving her lesson objectives with the approach she was using, she has to teach using the corrections given by the subject/class teacher.

The subject/class teachers play multiple roles. Aside from acting as mentors and taking the student teachers under their wings as mentees, they act as advisers, encouraging the student teachers through the exercise as the need arose. As explained by Student-teachers 2 and 4, the encouragement from their respective class teachers gives great boost to their confidence levels and helps them to overcome that initial fear of speaking in public which Student-teacher 4 in her journal described as “stage fright”. The subject/class teachers are seen as dependable/reliable sources that the student teachers can consult when they feel stuck or encounter difficulties on how to go about teaching a specific topic or to gather information on the topic itself. This is reflected in a statement by Student-teacher 5 during the interview “...I go to my Aunty, but not always, if I don’t know it, she’ll put me through.” The view of the subject/class teachers as pillars of knowledge to be consulted is also apparently shared by Student-teacher 6 in his interview as he discusses his initial difficulties in preparing for his first lesson:

I have not taught before so how do I do that? So I now confront [met with] the... one of the English mistress [teacher], she now asked me... she now gave some bearings [ideas] that I should go, look at the way I will do it...
As in the case of Student-teachers 1, 2 and 3, Student-teachers 5 and 6 are also monitored and given feedback which they are expected to put into practice. They also have to submit their lesson notes to the Head of Department in their placement schools, who then makes the relevant corrections before allowing them to teach the pupils in class with the marked lesson notes.

Given the delicate and vital role played by the subject/class teachers in the training of the student teachers in the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level, it becomes necessary to question the level of competence and indeed expertise of the subject/class teachers in their role as mentors to the student teachers. This becomes even more important as one of the aims of the programme under study is to produce effective and competent teachers to teach the English Language as a subject in both the primary and secondary levels of education.

Interestingly, the findings from the interviews also reveal that apart from the subject/class teacher, members of family also acted as another source of influence on the teaching practice of the student teachers. Discussing how she got ideas for teaching her listening comprehension lesson, Student-teacher 4 states “…I got it from my younger brother…he’s in another school, I asked him how his teacher usually teach it and he told me so I now used it in teaching. Explaining how she got the ideas on the use of the Clue chart in her composition lesson with her Primary 5 pupils during her first supervision, she states:

My head, I had it in me, I just told my mum in the house that I never knew the instructional material to use but I had
the idea. So she was the one that just said “...if that's the case why don't you just buy a cardboard and do it”. So that’s how I did it. Two of us kind of added...added the ideas to paper.

Her use of the strategies mentioned above will be discussed in further in Section 5.4.2.2.

**Supervision**

The practical teaching or teaching practice (as it is called in Nigeria), is a six credit units course and it is regarded as core course which all final year students in the NCE programme, regardless of their departments or course of study, must engage in and pass. A comment from the journal of Student-teacher 2 as she prepares for the first supervision emphasises the crucial nature of the teaching practice course:

> Fear came upon me because I know what it means, if they supervise you and you fall [fail], you will have it [as a] carry-over [course] and it is three months for the teaching practice...

In other words, failure in the course means the student teachers concerned will not be able to graduate from the programme and would also have to wait for another academic year before repeating the teaching practice exercise. Supervisors are sent by the two Colleges of Education to different placement schools to supervise (assess) their student teachers as they teach the pupils in the classrooms of their respective placement schools. The data gathered show that most of the student teachers who participated in this research have positive feedback from their supervisors as in most cases both the strengths and weaknesses in their performance are pointed out to them. Student-teacher 2
commenting on the feedback she received during her first and second supervision states:

*The supervisor said that I did well, that I was ok. You know in that my last [the first] supervision, I didn’t talk loud. They [the supervisors] complained about my voice, so this one [the second supervision], I now increased it.*

As seen from the comments above, the supervisors do not only commend her, they also show her areas which need improvement. The supervision exercise on its own has been a learning experience for her as she uses the corrections given during the first supervision to improve on her performance in the second supervision.

Although Student-teachers 4 and 5 are happy about the feedback they got on their first supervision, they are however not thrilled by their performance or the comments they are given during the second supervision. This they say is because they were not adequately prepared for the supervision as they were not expecting the supervisors that day and thus had not prepared or developed a teaching aid to help make the lesson easier for the pupils to understand. Student-teacher 4 explains the situation as follows:

*...I wasn’t expecting the supervisors. I wasn’t ready for the supervision so my lesson note also was not in good shape. It was kind of scattered and the lesson notes that were ok, there were no instructional materials for them while the ones that were not really sound, I had instructional materials for them. I needed a good lesson note and also instructional material, that’s why it wasn’t ok.*

The above statement from her interview raises questions and grave concern as to the level and quality of monitoring given to the student teachers by the subject/class teachers in the placement schools. The monitoring does not
appear to have been thorough especially as seen in the case of Student-teacher 4, who has topics in the lesson note that are not well developed/written. The lesson note (which was described as scattered) is apparently, from her description above, in a disorganised state. This no doubt affected her performance as well as ability to teach the topics competently.

Student-teacher 4 also notes that the lecturer who supervised her is from a different department from hers in College of Education. This confirms the point made by Lecturer 4 during his interview when he states that lecturers in College of Education B are allocated to supervise student teachers irrespective of their course of study (see Section 4.3.2.4). According to Student-teacher 4, the supervisor only spent fifteen minutes in her class for a lesson that should have lasted for forty minutes. Again, this lends credence to the issues raised by Lecturer 2 in relation to lecturers not all doing the same thing and the likely effect this may have on the performance and teaching practices of the student teachers (see Section 4.3.2.4).

Student-teacher 5 also has similar issues as she too does not have any instructional materials for the topic she is meant to teach on the day the supervisors came. However, as shown in her comment below, her concerns apparently went beyond that:

\[I \text{ was not prepared at all. When they now came I was confused, I said what will I teach? And what even made things so hard for me is that they said you will teach the topic you had that day... Even when I was teaching I was still unstable, even when the lecturer came in to supervise, I was unstable [not composed] because I was not prepared.}\]
Although Student-teachers 4 and 5 are able to do their own self-evaluation on their performances during the second supervision, their comments indicate that the student teachers only engage in model practices when they perceive that they are being observed, and at other times, they allow the practice to slip. This almost suggests a complete defeat of the entire aim of the practical teaching exercise. In essence, the teaching practice exercise is directed towards exposing as well as encouraging the student teachers to engage in and maintain model teaching practices. Hopefully, such practices would have had a positive influence on the student teachers’ teaching practice, enabling them to teach English Language effectively and competently.

Student-teacher 6, like Student teacher 2, has positive feedback and apparently learns from the mistakes made in the first supervision and used them to improve the second supervision. He, however, makes some comments in his interview which reflected his mixed feelings on the issue of the departments of lecturers assigned for supervision. His comments show that he prefers supervisors outside his field of study as they are not too familiar with his subject and consequently pose a sense of security for him. In his second supervision, although he is not supervised by a lecturer from his department, he is not too happy as his second supervisor is from the Department of French and as such has a good grasp or knowledge of the English Language. Expressing his concern he states “...She’s in Language, the former Dean of Language [from the Department of French]; that’s why I was confused...when it comes to this she will be very strict...”
The comment by Student-teacher 6 implies that the fact that the supervisor is in a related field of study scares him as he feels a lot of pressure resulting from the need to impress. This is in direct contrast to the point raised on the level of competence and expertise that supervisors from a completely different field of practice bring to the supervision exercise of the student teachers of the English Language teacher education programme. The data gathered show that this fear affected the performance of Student teacher 6 negatively. Commenting on the corrections/observations made by the supervisor, he states:

…she comment[ed] on the initial thing I made use of that I was introducing my previous lesson, we revised it since it’s an old topic, she said in that place instead of me using understood, “…now I know that you people have understood the lesson…”, I went to use understand. I used my present tense in my past tense. It’s supposed to be understood, that’s where she corrected me. And what she complained again was I don’t have erm... instructional material.

As shown from the preceding discussion, the theme “Teaching Practice Placement” has illuminated a number of interesting issues which in their own way affect the teaching practices of the student teachers. As such, it is relevant to the study as it aims to identify the gap and relevance in the training of the student teachers in relation to the actual practice that they encounter in the practical teaching exercise itself.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Student-teacher 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 2 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 3 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 4 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 5 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 6 (College B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student teachers’ view on</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training</td>
<td>- equipped</td>
<td>- adequate training</td>
<td>- equipped</td>
<td>- inadequate training</td>
<td>- training is adequate</td>
<td>- theoretically adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- problem in</td>
<td>- theoretical</td>
<td>- dissatisfied with training</td>
<td>- theoretical, abstract</td>
<td>- inadequately prepared</td>
<td>- incompetent and confidence levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>application of knowledge</td>
<td>- no micro teaching</td>
<td>- attention not focused on</td>
<td>- attention not focused on</td>
<td>- prior teaching experience</td>
<td>- lapses are from students</td>
<td>- relied on the class teacher for direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teaching topics</td>
<td>teaching topics to the</td>
<td>teaching topics to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>different levels</td>
<td>different levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach to task</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- opting to teach</td>
<td>- reluctant to teach</td>
<td>- devised own teaching</td>
<td>- stepped out of comfort zone</td>
<td>- self evaluation</td>
<td>- competence and confidence levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when ready</td>
<td>- adapted teaching methods</td>
<td>- adapted class teacher’s</td>
<td>techniques</td>
<td>- unable to apply theoretical</td>
<td>- questioned her techniques</td>
<td>- relied on the class teacher for direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- background reading/</td>
<td>teaching methods</td>
<td>needed more flexibility</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>- making lessons simpler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preparation for lessons</td>
<td>- use of level-related</td>
<td>- compelled to use</td>
<td>-(compelled to use the class</td>
<td>- cross checked lessons with class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vocabulary</td>
<td>class teacher’s methods</td>
<td>teacher’s lesson note format</td>
<td>teacher - relied on own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- concerned by pupils’ reaction</td>
<td>- learnt from mistakes</td>
<td>teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to her teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits of the exercise</strong></td>
<td>- increased subject mastery</td>
<td>- able to speak in public</td>
<td>- still has a lot to learn</td>
<td>- gained confidence</td>
<td>- able to devise and adapt</td>
<td>- teach with confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- devised own teaching</td>
<td>- confidence boost</td>
<td>- clear sense of</td>
<td>- more creative and adventurous</td>
<td>own teaching methods</td>
<td>- boost in competence level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>methods</td>
<td>- exercise was stressful</td>
<td>direction (career choice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- become more creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- boost in confidence level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.1.2. Theory versus practice

Given the number of units (which is six) allotted to the Teaching Practice course, it can be referred to as the nucleus of the programme. It serves as the make or break point where it is assumed that as students of the English Language teacher education programme, the student teachers are afforded the opportunity to put into practice what they have been taught in class. This theme, “Theory versus Practice” thus explores this angle using the following sub-themes as generated from the interview data: student teachers’ views on training, approach to task and benefits of the exercise.

**Student teachers’ views on training**

The student teachers with the exception of Student teacher 4 agree that their training in the classrooms of Colleges of Education, although theoretical, have been adequate. As Student-teacher 1 puts it

> It equipped me so much because without knowing what is English and without knowing what... as I mentioned grammatical words ...without the lecturer taught [teaching] it to me, I cannot able to teach and I cannot able to know how to use it.

Highlighting the theoretical nature of their classroom learning experience but equally apparently emphasising the fact that they have been given the relevant tools with which to work, Student-teacher 2 states (referring to the classroom experience) “…that one is theory, while this one is practical, to practice what we’ve been taught.” Student-teacher 5 has the same view as she commends the training they have been given by remarking “…there’s nothing like lapses because they taught us very well.”
For Student-teacher 4, however, it is this theoretical point that clearly emphasises or marks out the abstract nature of the English Language teacher education programme in the classrooms of Colleges of Education. In her interview, she explains it as follows:

*It was like we were just taught on the theoretical aspect on the whole thing. So when we got to the class, the practical aspect of it was so abstract, it was kind of different from the theory we were taught in class.*

Identifying what she regards as one of the major flaws/lapses in their classroom training, Student-teacher 4 points out categorically “…we were not taught how to teach topics.” Student-teachers 3 and 6 share the same view. Elaborating further on the issue, Student-teacher 6 gives a brief description of their training, noting areas that are supposed to have prepared them for the teaching practice experience generally. He, however, pinpoints the absence of the one aspect that he feels is crucial for that preparation in the course of their classroom training. He explains:

…*what we were given there is just a guideline as in teaching generally, not specifically on the subject. I’m saying that they taught us generally on how teaching is, how we should manage the classes, how we should get prepared, dress and other things, not really how we should, I mean English per se should be taught, the techniques and all that…*

This thus suggests an absence or what can be referred to as a “hands-on” learning experience for the students in the programme. One consistent theme that runs through the journals written by the student teachers on their experience is that of struggling on how to identify the approach/method of teaching that best suits a topic. They had problems not only in the identification of the appropriate pedagogy but also encountered problems related to
pedagogy content knowledge. For example, Student-teacher 4 describing some of the difficulties she encounters states in her journal:

**There were some difficult topics which I just couldn’t explain to the pupils’ understanding mostly because of their [the topics] abstract nature**

As explained by Student -teacher 3 in her journal, this may be because:

**These topics cannot be taught in the same way. Some may sound more interesting than others. The most important thing to note is the method used in approaching these topics.**

From the above discussion it is clear that most of the student teachers feel that the training placed them at a disadvantage. In fact the following comment from Student-teacher 5, on a “Descriptive Essay” lesson for her Primary 2 class, to some extent, sums up the story and clearly illustrates the confusion and problem this issue posed for her:

*Imagine Primary 2, giving them that kind of topic. How would you feel? How would you explain it to their understanding? That's why I said it's difficult.*

This statement in a way contradicts her views on the issue of lapses in the programme (see page 227). In her interview, she admits to having problems on how to teach a specific topic on the day of her second supervision. Below is her statement showing how the issue was resolved:

...*how do I go about this topic? So I now went to meet my department English teacher in the classroom, she was able to give me some clues that I should call pupils out, I should ask them to give me... make a sentence and through their sentences I was able to go through the topic.*

The College documents examined reveal that the students in the programme are taught English and Literature Methodology courses. These courses are core
courses and as such meant to be taken seriously. It is assumed that in such courses students are exposed to different teaching methods and are equally given the opportunity to practise in class on peers through microteaching as stated in the course outlines. However, as the findings from the data have revealed, this is not the case, since the students after supposedly going through those courses still have trouble knowing how to teach specific topics, with most of the student teachers lamenting over their lack of prior teaching experience. Ideally, such prior teaching experience should have been gained during the microteaching in the English Methods course.

Although the student teachers admit that they have participated in a microteaching exercise with the course lecturer assessing them, they however state that the exercise was done in groups. When asked about the number of people in such groups, Student teacher 2 replies “...sometimes ten, maybe twelve people.” Explaining how the process worked, Student teacher 2 states:

   In the group you’ll bring your own suggestion, this person will bring his own. At the end of the whole thing, one person will come and teach.

It may be safe to assume that the adoption of the group microteaching approach is as a result of lack of time as suggested by Student-teachers 2 and 3 respectively in their interviews, or perhaps as a result of the problem caused by the population issue and huge class size (already discussed in Chapter Four of this thesis). On the role played by other members of the group while one person teaches, Student-teacher 2 said “...they watched.” Student-teacher 4 apparently confirms this statement as she states simply and clearly “...we didn’t even do anything during the microteaching.”
In other words not all the students are given the opportunity to teach and acquire the much-needed practice/experience in a course that should ideally prepare them for the task of teaching during the practical teaching exercise. For most of the student teachers therefore, the first real experience of teaching they have is during the practical teaching exercise. This, to some extent, explains or at least sheds light on the dependence of most of the student teachers on their respective subject/class teachers for guidance and support. This essentially raises questions as to how equipped and prepared student teachers actually are before embarking on the Teaching Practice exercise which is equally a core and crucial course in the programme.

**Approach to task**

As seen from the interview data (and the student teachers’ journals), the student teachers approach their teaching tasks in different ways. With Student-teacher 1, for example, she opts to teach only when she feels she is ready. Although initially terrified at the prospect of teaching, the period of observation helps her. She explains it as follows:

*Then I was watching my Aunty [class teacher/subject teacher] teaching, her teaching was very interesting, I enjoyed it, so...in fact I am the one that told her that “Aunty since I have been watching you since one week, upper week I will like to teach so that I will know how teaching is. As God so have it, the Aunty accepted.*

Her comments above seem to indicate a change in her perception and attitude towards the entire exercise as she appears to have gained courage and confidence from observing the class/subject teacher teach the pupils. This perhaps helps to demystify the teaching exercise making it look much easier
and less complicated than the student teacher had anticipated. As explained by Student-teacher 1, the class/subject teacher does not categorically ask or compel her to use a specific method to the pupils; she claims “…It’s what I developed inside me, with the help of the one I’m getting from the school. No, nobody tell me any method I will use, it’s the one I developed inside me.” She however goes on to state aspects of the class/subject teacher’s teaching method that she adapted:

I take [took] from her own how she demonstrates, how she compose[s] herself in the area of teaching, the way she is organising her class, how she teach, how she writes something like the subject on the board, eh he... I copied some of them, how she taught…I copied some of her own, then I add my own.

As shown above, the statement itself contradicts her previous statement as it clearly shows the sources from where she gains the knowledge and actively learns to teach. It is also possible to deduce from the previous comment that the student teacher may not be fully aware of the class/subject teacher’s influence on her teaching practices. It is equally interesting to note from the above comment that Student-teacher 1 thought it necessary not only to focus on the class/subject teacher’s teaching style but also on her classroom managerial skill which incidentally is also an important skill needed for an effective teacher.

Student-teacher 1 uses her mistakes as a learning curve, she uses the corrections she is given by the class/subject teacher and other teachers as a spring board to help her to improve. This can be attributed to the fact that such corrections make her engage in background reading to further prepare for her lessons. She explains this as follows:
What I did is that after they corrected me, I went home I picked some text books which we used in our departmental courses. I used it, I searched the content, I find [found] the grammatical words how to use It [them], then from there I pick up [improved].

Student-teacher 2 initially shows great reluctance to teach. She states “I don’t want to first of all go and teach”. She eventually comes to view the exercise as a challenge. However, fascinating points to note are the reasons for her reluctance which show that aside from her issue of “shyness” (as she refers to it), she also said she wants to learn how to teach. This view is also reflected in her journal where she writes “…the aunty called me and pointed out my errors to me and corrected me. Having been [been] corrected I continued in the correct way…” This suggests that she does not exactly adapt the teaching style or methods of the class/subject teacher but uses the methods as prescribed by the class/subject teacher.

This also appears true even in the case of Student-teacher 6 as he too explains in his interview that although he came into the practical teaching exercise with high levels of confidence and competence, he relies heavily on the directions / advice given to him by the class/subject teacher. This may be attributed to daunting nature of the practical teaching exercise as perceived by the student teacher.

According to Student-teacher 2, she is instructed by her class/subject teacher to use level-related vocabulary when teaching the pupils. She explains the situation as follows:
sometimes after teaching, they will call me say you didn’t explain very well in this area, that I should go back and explain well for them to understand it, that I will use erm... small, small... let me say small “English”. I will not use the word that is difficult for them.

This leads to her becoming conscious of her use of language when teaching and as she states summarising the main points in the lesson using “…the language you know that they would understand”.

Student-teacher 3 devises her own teaching techniques, although as discussed earlier, she feels compelled to use the class/subject teacher’s methods in order to be in her good books and to avoid confrontations.

Like Student-teacher 3, Student-teacher 4 feels inhibited from applying theoretical knowledge gained during their training in the College of Education classrooms. However, unlike Student teacher 3, her reasons for such inhibitions are not essentially centred or caused by the subject/class teacher. In her interview she explains:

The truth is what we learnt in school is actually applicable in class. If we are able to use it to teach, it’s ok; but most times most of us teaching-practice students we don’t really... we don’t really put into practice what we are taught in school because sometimes we forget, we forget to use them, at other times we just feel that that method will not be good enough to teach the pupils.

In other words from her point of view, the reason for student teachers failing to apply theoretical knowledge gained in the classroom can be said to be related to confidence in their ability to use what they have been taught. An example of this is given in the lesson note format problem as written in her journal:
I had to make do with the little knowledge I had about it from school. At submission, the teacher in charge made lots of corrections that I had to rewrite everything.

The issue is even further compounded as she notes in her interview:

...whenever I go to somebody the person will give a different thing to do, different from the one we were taught in school; and when I go the next person, the person will say it's wrong and that I had to start again.

This suggests that the lesson note format changed with each student teacher she approached as they too apparently have different subject/class teachers. This again seems to emphasise the lack of confidence and ability to use the theoretical knowledge already gained in the classrooms of Colleges of Education. As the practical teaching exercise continued, however, she becomes innovative, creative and adventurous in her approach adopted in teaching the pupils. Describing how she taught a listening comprehension lesson she explains “...I read out a passage to the pupils, so I asked them to listen. I read it a second time to them, and then I asked them questions which they answered in their notes”. Asked how she got the idea on the method used as she said she was not taught how to teach listening at the College of Education, she replies “...I got it from my younger brother. He’s in another school, I asked him how his teacher usually teach[es] it and he told me so I now used it in teaching. When asked about the reaction of her subject/class teacher, she states “…she didn’t say anything. I didn’t ask her about how to go about it.”

It is important to note here the growth development of Student-teacher 4 as she gradually steps into that phase of independent practice or what the researcher would like to tag as the “budding of the butterfly”.

Student-teacher 5 on the other hand engages in self-evaluation as she constantly questions her techniques seeking to improve her teaching methods. The following statement from her interview gives an indication of the frustration felt by Student-teacher 5 as a result of her perceived inadequacies to effectively teach the pupils during the first few weeks of the practical teaching exercise:

> when I give them homework, or gave them class work to do, some will come without doing anything, some will even copy the question back to me. I'll be angry; I'll say why, why is all these things? Does it mean I'm not trying my best? Does it mean I'm not teaching? ...I decided to work on myself.

She thus cross-checks lessons prepared with the subject/class teacher, seeking ways to make the lesson simpler and easier for the pupils to understand. The findings from the interview also show a reliance of Student-teacher 5 on previous learning experience. The following statement illustrates this:

> I introduced another topic which is "Guided Composition", I found it easy to explain it. Then I now flashed back to what they taught us about composition in school, so I now decided to explain it...

To teach the pupils, it is likely that in the Guided Composition class she used the knowledge gained as well as the method adopted by her lecturer at the College of Education. This view is made even more pronounced or resonant by her following statement:

> The repetition will let the thing stick in them... to me it is because if you ask me to repeat something, often and often, next time, two days’ time you come to me, I'll be able to do it.

As seen from the above statement, Student-teacher 5 does not only seek to apply theoretical knowledge gained but seeks to also use her own learning
experience to shape her teaching practice as reflected in her use of the repetition technique.

Student-teacher 6 shows a strong reliance on the textbooks and the scheme of work. This is shown in his statement below as he explains why he did not particularly find it difficult to prepare his lessons:

_Not really because I have the guide, which is the module. The module will give you the topic, objectives to be achieved at the end, content and everything you need to prepare the lesson so you achieve your goal at the end. I think that one was a guideline to me and sometimes I go to my Aunty, but not always, if I don’t know it, she’ll put me through._

From the above statement, it can be interpreted that Student-teacher 6 with respect to his approach to teaching in the class, relies more on the information he gathered from the module guide and related text books as well as advice and inputs from his subject/class teacher. Reference or reliance to his theoretical knowledge, to an extent, can be said to be limited.

**Benefits of the exercise**

Many of the student teachers apparently find the practical teaching exercise beneficial to their training as teachers of English Language. Two common points that constantly echo across statements made by the student teachers in the course of their interviews are that the practical teaching exercise helped improve their competence and confidence levels in teaching the English Language as a subject.
Commenting on how she has benefited from the practical teaching exercise, Student-teacher 1 states that she has enjoyed the experience as the exercise has provided her with the much needed hands-on teaching experience which allows her not only to improve her teaching skill but most essentially her competence in the use of the English Language. To her, the teaching practice exercise provides a forum for her to learn and improve on areas where she perceived she had problems in: “... grammatical words [tenses]; secondly using of capital [upper case] letters and small [lower case] letters”.

For Student-teacher 2, the case is similar as she too acknowledges a boost in her confidence levels and her ability to now speak even in public forums without being shy. This as previously mentioned was a major reason for her initial reluctance to teach at the beginning of the teaching practice exercise. She explains that as a result of participating in the teaching practice exercise “...you learn how to teach and er... correct my mistakes and now I can now stand boldly and teach. I can stand in public and speak”.

Student-teacher 3 describes her teaching practice experience as wonderful; she however believes that she still has a lot to learn. Although like Student-teacher 1, she agrees that the exercise affords her the opportunity of, again, having that hands-on practice, she has not found it “easy”. She explains:

as a result of the lack of prior teaching experience there were things that I don’t know of because when I came, I thought the knowledge I have and the method I thought I will use for them is not really... erm... though it didn’t go well the way I planned it.
It is therefore not surprising that she states that in order “...to improve I want to get more knowledge of it...” What is however shocking is her following statement “... though I’m not praying that I’ll be a teacher in future...” The statement shows that there are students in the programme who are not really interested in becoming teachers. This confirms the comment made by Lecturer 3 in her interview that those who should not be in the programme were being admitted into the programme to study a course aimed at making them teachers of the English Language. With Student-teacher 3, however, it can be said that the whole exercise has been an eye-opener, giving her a clear sense of direction in her choice of career.

Student-teacher 4 describes her teaching practice experience as an “interesting” one and has built and made her more confident. As she explains:

I can now stand before pupils and talk, not just pupils, even my mates, now I can face them. Before I came here, I never thought I’ll be able to do it but from the daily experience I’ve been able to.

This new found confidence perhaps helps her to step out of her comfort zone, becoming more creative and imaginative in her choice and use of teaching methods as well as instructional materials.

In the case of Student-teacher 5, the teaching practice exercise has made her to pay attention to areas in her teaching that she otherwise would not have been concerned about. Her initial hurdle in teaching the pupils makes her reflect and adapt a teaching technique which she feels allows her to engage the pupils in her lessons. With Student-teacher 6, his mastery in the subject has improved
tremendously as he seeks constantly to update his knowledge. He explains: “I started going through some of my text books and I kept reading (studying) to know more”.

Contrary to the view held by Lecturer 2 (see Section 4.3.2.4), the teaching practice exercise apparently does have a number of benefits as outlined in the preceding discussion. The theme, “Theory versus Practice” in this Section, seeks to bring home the topic/study, making it real as it examines the ability of the student teacher to blend theory and practice together during the teaching practice exercise. It sheds light on the student teachers’ perception of their training programme, making known some of the apparent weaknesses in the programme based on their own experiences. The discussion of this theme more or less lays bare their own methods, showing how they as student teachers engage in the seemingly daunting teaching task.
Table 5.5: Areas of Difficulties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Student-teacher 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 2 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 3 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 4 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 5 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 6 (College B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>- no prior teaching experience</td>
<td>- level-appropriate vocabulary</td>
<td>- no prior teaching experience</td>
<td>- identifying suitable teaching methods</td>
<td>- making pupils understand the lesson</td>
<td>- varying teaching methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- no prior teaching experience</td>
<td>- issues with mode of class monitoring and supervision by class teacher</td>
<td>- format for writing lesson notes</td>
<td>- opposition from class teacher</td>
<td>- using teaching aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- difficulties explaining ideas/concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td>- tackling pupils’ language problems</td>
<td>- apportioning time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- developing instructional materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>- linguistic background</td>
<td>- teaching senior classes</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>- not feeling competent</td>
<td>- errors corrected by pupils</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- aware of her inadequacies</td>
<td>- increased workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- feels embarrassed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- fear of mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- use of College text books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>- class control</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>- engaging pupils</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>- engaging the pupils</td>
<td>- classroom control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.1.3. Areas of difficulties

The current study aims to identify the needs of the student teachers in the English Language teacher education programme in two Colleges of Education. This theme, “Areas of Difficulties”, illuminates this aspect of the study as it examines areas perceived to be difficult and problems encountered by the student teachers as they engaged in their teaching duties in their respective placement schools. The discussion on this major theme will be done under the following sub-headings: teaching methods, competence and classroom management.

Teaching methods

The student teachers’ interview findings reveal that the majority of the student teachers involved in the study see this as a major problem during their teaching practice exercise. Teaching method problems as identified from the findings ranged from lack of prior teaching experience, knowing which method to use in a class to explain certain topics/concepts to pupils, to the choice and use of relevant instructional materials.

One major issue raised by the student teachers is that of the lack of prior teaching experience. As shown from the interview data, most of Student teachers complain that although they have the theoretical knowledge of what the task of teaching entails, the majority of them lacked the practical hands-on experience. Student-teacher 1 for example states “I have been hearing about teaching but I don’t have any experience of it”. This statement seems to suggest that she has never taught before. Student-teachers 2 and 3 said that although
as part of their training in the College of Education classrooms they participated in the microteaching exercise, these were done in large groups of 10-12 people. According to Student-teacher 2 “…only one person taught…” Student-teacher 4 explains the situation as follows:

We formed a group and we chose a group leader so it was our group leader that really performed the task so...we didn’t even do anything during the micro-teaching.

In other words, the micro teaching did not essentially provide the majority of the student teachers with the teaching experience, as may have been intended, prior to the commencement of the teaching practice exercise.

Another area of difficulty identified by the student teachers is that of choosing and using an appropriate teaching method relevant to the topic. For Student-teacher 4 this is a particularly difficult issue. Her dilemma and frustrations are clearly portrayed in the following statement:

For example, when I was to teach “Direct and Indirect Speech” I never really knew how I was going to teach, teach it to the understanding of the pupils because it’s very difficult. The rules guiding it, they are not rigid, they are not solid, at one point they are applicable, and at another you don’t use them so...

A major concern for Student-teacher 4 is that of time management. Apportioning and managing her time effectively, in her view, affected her performance during her second supervision as she is not able to cover relevant aspects of the topic and spent too much time in trying to introduce the topic to the pupils. In the following comment she explains why the time problem occurs:

English Language is not like some other subjects where you can just teach, summarise and go out. You have to evaluate, you have to give them class work which they
have to do in the class and submit within the forty minutes given to us and it's not always enough.

Student-teacher 5, afraid the poor performance of her pupils would be reflected in her teaching practice performance report, struggles to find an appropriate teaching style to suit the level of pupils in her class (see Section 5.3.1.2).

Student-teacher 6, like Student-teacher 4, finds it difficult to explain and make seemingly difficult or complex topics simple for the pupils to understand. He explains this in his following statement:

... what I really mean by the topic is difficult is that the people you are giving that topic to, they are too tender.

Student-teacher 2 has similar problem, although in her case she has to consciously learn to use level-related vocabulary when teaching her pupils to enhance their understanding of lessons taught.

The case of Student-teacher 3 is strikingly different as she does not essentially struggle with knowing which method to use. Her issue is more of being allowed, being given the flexibility to use the methods she feels appropriate for teaching her lessons without the interference of the subject/class teacher as she finds it distracting (see Section 5.3.1.1.).

**Competence**

The findings from the student teachers’ interview show competence in the English Language as another area of difficulty for the student teachers. The lack of confidence expressed by Student-teachers 1 and 5 in their teaching of the English Language (as discussed in Section 5.3.1.2), portrays their level of
competence in the language. This thus calls into question the level of preparation/training of the student teachers in the classes of Colleges of Education. Student-teacher 1 attributes her problem to her linguistic background. It is interesting to note that she is aware of her inadequacies in the subject and has taken some steps towards improving them (see Section 5.3.1.2). Whether the steps taken are adequate or even effective enough to address the problem remains to be seen.

With Student-teacher 5 that initial fear of not being competent plays a significant role in her choice of placement school (see Section 5.3.1.1). She feels embarrassed at having her errors made known to her by her pupils. This emotion is made clear in her following statement:

…one thing I understand in my pupils that I’ve taught, if I make any mistake on the board, they’ll pick it [point it out]. I’ll just quickly correct it, look at what they are saying and correct it immediately. It makes me feel bad; you know I’m teaching them.

Explaining how she takes care of the competence problem, Student-teacher 5 states “…I started going through some of my text books”. She also sought advice from fellow student teachers.

Competence in the subject is crucial especially as one of the major objectives of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level is to produce teachers who are effective and competent in the teaching of the English Language. However, the discussion so far shows a strong sense of insecurity portrayed by the student teachers with regards to their level of competence in the English Language. This suggests a problem as it is a direct
pointer to an area where the programme appears to be failing. Reasons for this would be elaborated on further in the Discussion Chapter.

**Classroom management**

Student-teachers 1 and 6 find it difficult to control their classes, to keep them quiet in order to make the environment conducive for learning. According to Student-teacher 1 “...classroom management, controlling children is not easy.”

Student-teachers 3 and 5 also state that they find it difficult to engage their pupils in their lessons for the duration of the class. Student-teacher 3 describes it as a challenge and explains the situation as follows:

*I think one of the challenges is er.. the one I got from the pupils, sometimes as you are teaching them some persons will not give you attention. Sometimes you’ll be distracted as you are teaching. You will have to go to that pupil and say “... keep calm, sit up, listen to me”*

As shown in her statement, it is possible to deduce that this not only affects effective learning for the pupils, it also poses as a distraction which invariably affects the teaching process. The issue of the classroom management can be said to be related to that of the teaching methods already discussed above. Interestingly, a close scrutiny of the course outlines of two of the method courses, ENG 123 and ENG 213 (see Table 4.2), reveals a lack of focus in classroom management in both courses. This, thus, pinpoints an area that requires serious attention. It highlights the need for the student teachers to be taught and made aware of the different methods/activities available to them to enable them make their classes interactive enough to hold the attention span of their pupils.
The discussion of the findings of the student teachers’ interviews has revealed a range of issues which require attention, while enabling the researcher and readers to view the programme under study, and the teaching practice exercise in particular, from the perspective of the student teachers. Below is a table showing a summary of the themes:

Table 5.6: Summary of Themes from Student Teachers’ Interview Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Practice Placement</th>
<th>Initial reaction</th>
<th>Reasons for feelings/actions</th>
<th>Tackling the problem</th>
<th>External influence</th>
<th>Supervise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory versus Practice</td>
<td>Student teachers’ views on training</td>
<td>Approach to task</td>
<td>Benefits of the exercise</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Difficulties</td>
<td>Teaching methods</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>classroom management</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4. ANALYSIS OF STUDENT TEACHERS’ OBSERVATION DATA

As already mentioned in Section 5.3.1.3, the analysis of the student teachers’ interview data provides a measure of understanding of the phenomenon under study from the perspective of the student teachers. However, to create an accurate and balanced view/picture, observation was also used as a research tool (see Section 3.4.2). This thus ensures that both the emic and etic perspectives are portrayed. As in the case of the lecturers’ observation data (see Section 4.4) audio recordings and handwritten field notes were taken during the observation of classes taught. The audio recordings are transcribed and with the handwritten field notes analysed and used to examine themes as
generated from the data gathered. A total of eighteen classes taught by the student teachers were observed.

5.4.1. Class Description

Each classroom has about forty pupils. The seats, which are wooden with attached desks, are arranged in three columns. The class has only one door and it is situated at the front of the class. The chalkboard is also at the front of the class. Pupils sat three to a seat, facing the chalkboard. The classroom is well ventilated with two double wooden windows on opposite sides of the main walls of the classroom. A teacher’s desk is placed at one end of the chalkboard, opposite the main entrance of the classroom.

5.4.2. Findings from Student Teachers’ Observation Data

A major emphasis of this study is to identify the teaching needs of the student teachers and to relate them to the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level. Consequently, the discussion of the findings from the observation data from the student teachers will be done using the following as its main themes: language needs, teaching skills and class teachers’ influence. As in Section 4.4, the excerpts from the handwritten field notes are highlighted in bold, while those from the audio notes are in italics.
Table 5.7: Language Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Student-teacher 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 2 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 3 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 4 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 5 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 6 (College B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>- tense/verb use</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>- use of past tense</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- inaccurate</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sentence constructions</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling/vocabulary</td>
<td>- use of difficult words</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>- incorrect spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- mode of correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue interference</td>
<td>- inability to distinguish</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between “gr” and “gl” sounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.2.1. Language needs

The findings from the observation data reveal that some of the student teachers observed have language problems. These problems have been classed as language needs and will be discussed under the following sub-themes: grammar, spelling and mother tongue interference.

Grammar

Student-teacher 1 in her interview has already identified grammar as an area in which she has difficulties (please see Section 5.3.1.1). The data from the observation confirm this as it highlights problems in her use of tense/verbs and also note sentences that are grammatically incorrect as a result of incorrect sentence formation/construction. The following is an extract from a Composition titled “myself” which was written on the chalkboard by the student teacher for the pupils to copy during one of her classes:

I need financial help to back up my education because I is the future of tommorrow.

It is disturbing to note that although the composition is prepared beforehand, and read in class by the student teacher and later by a pupil, the error in the last part of the sentence of the composition goes undetected by the student teacher. This suggests that the student teacher does not know the correct usage of the verb “is” or she is unaware that the sentence is grammatically incorrect. The following statements, taken from the audio notes in two different lessons taught by her, confirm the view above. They equally indicate a problem in her sentence constructions:

All these is the name of what... animal. All these is a name of what?
Mary has gone to school. Mary has do what?

Evidence of grammatical errors can also be seen in statements from her interview and journal entries (please see Section 5.3.1.2).

Student-teacher 5 also has problems in her use of tense as well as sentence structure. An example of this is shown in the following extract from the audio field notes: “Did you understand what is irregular verbs now?” The problem is also reflected in some of the comments made during her interview and in her journal. Examples of this are shown below:

...my Aunty [class teacher] always told me that “...not that you don’t know what you are doing but you are faster, as a teacher you have to be calm, take your word gradually ... your tone, people will not understand you because in the process of teaching you speak faster as if... you have stammer... you are stammering, the way you’ll be speaking fast is like you’re stammering...” (Interview)

What really make me happy was that it is my subject area. ...And when they [the pupils] submit I look at the homework and I found out that they understand it... (Journal)

Spelling/vocabulary

Student-teacher 1 has spelling problems. As indicated in the extract above, “tommorrow” is spelt wrongly. Her mistake and grammatical error are spotted and corrected by a subject/class teacher and a pupil after the composition was read by her and pupils in the class. Below are their respective comments from the audio field notes:

Aunty...you made a mistake in tommorrow. Pupil
Aunty, Aunty, what you wrote is wrong. I am the future of tomorrow, not I is. Class teacher
She also has problems in her use of correct punctuations. For example, the title of the composition “myself” as shown above is written using the lowercase “m”. Writing about the lesson in her reflective journal, she acknowledges her weakness in her use of correct punctuation. As stated in her journal “no one is above mistakes”. It is important to emphasise that there is great difference between making genuine mistakes and not knowing how to use or do something which in her case relates to her inability to use the punctuations correctly as a teacher of the English Language. This is because with mistakes an individual is able to make the necessary corrections without being told how to do such corrections.

Student-teachers 2 and 6 have problems in their use of vocabulary. With Student-teacher 2, however, it is related to her use of complex or difficult words in the explanation of concepts or topics as she teaches. An example of this is seen in the Primary 4 class as she teaches a lesson on “Adverbs ending in ly”. Student-teacher 2 defines adverbs as “… words that modify verbs”. However, confusion ensues when the pupils are given sentences and are unable to identify the adverbs in the sentences. One of the examples given is “Birds fly high”. The following extract from the handwritten field notes shows interaction that ensued between the researcher and the pupils in the class in an attempt to find out why they are unable to do the exercises on “Adverbs” given by the student teacher:

I asked a pupil for the meaning of the word modify and she described it as a word that makes the sentence correct. She couldn’t answer the first question so I had to rephrase it to: “What does the teacher mean/ what do you understand by an adverb modifies a verb?” Another pupil was asked the same question as the
first. Again, the pupil could not explain the meaning of modify, she said she did not know what the word modify meant.

This draws attention to the need for Student-teacher 2 to use level-related vocabulary (see Section 5.3.1.2) when explaining topics to the pupils to enable them to understand what is taught so as to make the teaching/learning process effective.

Student-teacher 6, on the other hand, has problems related to spellings. This is evident in the spelling of the words tour which he spelt as “ture”, and feather which he spells as “fether” as he teaches a lesson on the “oor” and “er” sounds to his Primary 4 pupils. Unlike Student-teacher 2 whose attention is drawn to the issue by the subject/class teachers, Student-teacher 6 is made aware of his mistakes by a pupil who asks for the meaning of the word in the presence of his supervisor from the College of Education. Although he explains the meaning of the word, he does not make any corrections on the spelling of the word written on the chalkboard until the supervisor spells the word for him. This certainly indicates a weakness in the area of the correct spelling of words.

**Mother tongue interference**

The findings suggest that the mother tongue has an effect on the student teacher’s use of the English Language. Showing her apparent frustration at the pupils’ inability to distinguish between “grass” and “glass” in a “Consonant Clusters” lesson, Student-teacher 1 during one of her lessons brings the objects in question into class – a glass cup and a blade of grass. The extract from the audio notes shows the explanation given to the pupils by Student-teacher 1:
One is glass [pronounced grass] and grass. The two of them is sounding the same thing but different meaning”. Another one is blade [pronounced bred] bread and blade [bred], they are sounding the same thing but different meaning.

To Student-teacher 1 therefore, bread and blade, grass and glass, respectively, are perceived as homonyms. The /l/ sound is perceived and pronounced as /r/ sound in her mother tongue. It is this feature that has been transferred into her use of the English Language which, as seen from the discussion above, appears to hinder the pupils’ comprehension of the lesson on “Consonant Clusters”. It is important to draw attention to the fact that she perceives the sounds as the same and teaches the same to the pupils. It is alarming to note that the wrong information is being passed on to the pupils; it is however more shocking to note her inability to distinguish between the /l/ and /r/ sounds.

The discussion in this Section has examined the language needs of the student teacher. Given that one of the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme in the Colleges of Education emphasises the competent use of the English Language by its graduates, it becomes necessary that the language needs of the student teachers be taken into consideration in the planning and execution of the programme. This becomes paramount as the use of language by the student teachers invariably becomes a reflection of their level of competence in the English Language.
**Table 5.8: Teaching Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Student-teacher 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 2 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 3 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 4 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 5 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 6 (College B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of topic</td>
<td>- awareness</td>
<td>- competent</td>
<td>- competent</td>
<td>- good language</td>
<td>- knowledge of topic</td>
<td>- correct examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- level of preparation</td>
<td>- good command of language</td>
<td>- sounding board</td>
<td>- competent</td>
<td>- incorrect examples</td>
<td>- demonstration of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- incorrect examples</td>
<td>- used correct examples</td>
<td>- advised peers</td>
<td>- teaching tips</td>
<td>- wrong information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods/learning</td>
<td>- repetition</td>
<td>- involving pupils</td>
<td>- repetition</td>
<td>- innovative</td>
<td>- repetition</td>
<td>- question/answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td>- rote learning</td>
<td>- teacher centred</td>
<td>- question/answer</td>
<td>- clue chart</td>
<td>- rote learning</td>
<td>- teacher centred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- instructional materials</td>
<td>- dull</td>
<td></td>
<td>- variety in teaching and</td>
<td>- consonant chart</td>
<td>- monotonous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>learning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class management</td>
<td>- noisy</td>
<td>- exercising control</td>
<td>- noisy</td>
<td>- class teachers</td>
<td>- exercising control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- class teachers</td>
<td>- measures</td>
<td>- class teachers</td>
<td>- involving pupils</td>
<td>- measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- restless pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td>- undermining the authority</td>
<td>- undermining the authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- control measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>of the student teacher</td>
<td>of the student teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5.4.2.2. Teaching skills

A major concern of this research is to critically analyse the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme in the College of Education. As one of the objectives of the programme under study is to produce competent and effective teachers of the English Language, this theme explores how the student teachers, with their theoretical knowledge from their College of Education classrooms, teach English Language as a subject. The theme will thus be discussed using the following sub-themes: mastery of topic, methods/learning activities and classroom management.

**Mastery of topic**

The English Language teacher education programme aims for the students in the programme to be competent in their use of the English Language. This thus makes it necessary for the students to have a good command of the English Language. Although Student-teacher 1 gradually gains confidence in her ability to teach the English Language (see Section 5.3.1.2.) issues arising from her “Consonant Cluster” lesson calls into question her level of competence in the English Language. As already stressed, the inability to pronounce a given sound is one issue. However, being unable to distinguish between the sounds and passing on the same wrong information as a teacher to the pupils, is an entirely different issue. In fact, it gives cause for alarm. It clearly shows her knowledge in the topic. Another example is shown in her definition and example of the abstract noun as shown below in the audio field notes:

*What is abstract noun? This type of a noun can either see it or you touch it. Something like... everybody look at Peter. Abstract noun you see it or you touch it.*
Although it is easy to immediately assume that she made a mistake in the definition given, however, the example used is a clear indication of her level of knowledge in the topic.

Student-teacher 5 has similar problems as Student teacher 1. During her lesson on “Irregular Plurals” she is apparently unaware of her constant use of the term “Irregular” Verb instead of “Irregular Plural”. However, as shown below from the audio field notes, although the definition of “Irregular Plural” as given by her is questionable, she initially begins the lesson by giving the correct examples:

Student teacher: *I said irregular plurals are words that you can change but they represent the same word. The word you are going to change will mean the same word with the other word that is singular. Do you get it? Like you say foot now, feet; woman, women.*

As the lesson progressed, however, her level of knowledge of the topic becomes apparent as she obviously became confused not just with the topic but also gives the wrong examples to the pupils as she tries to further explain the topic. The extract below clearly illustrates this point and shows interaction between Student-teacher 5 and her pupils during the lesson:

**Student teacher:** Irregular plurals are words that can change, like b-o-o-k to b-o-o-k-s. One is single, but when you add “s” it becomes more than one. Are you getting it now? ... It’s a word that can change but the word remains the same, it means the same thing. Boot or boots, it’s still giving you the same meaning, the meaning did not change. Did you get me? So what is irregular verb now?

**Pupils:** An irregular verb are words that change

**Student teacher:** But remain the same in meaning. Say it again.

**Pupils:** Irregular verbs are words that can change but remain the same.
**Student teacher:** Florence, what’s irregular verb... plural I mean?

As seen from the above extract, the examples given are wrong and are not examples of irregular plurals in English.

In spite of the fact that they have to devise their own means/strategies to help their pupils understand their lessons, Student-teachers 2, 3, 4 and 6 demonstrate a mastery of topics taught. For example Student-teacher 2 in her “Adverb” lesson is able to define the term correctly and gives correct examples.

Student-teachers 3, 4 and 6 are also competent in their use of English and able to teach the subject effectively. Interestingly, however, as seen from the observation data, Student-teacher 3 is consulted for advice by her fellow student teachers who have problems in preparing their lessons. One of such incidents is recorded in the handwritten field notes as indicated below:

**Student-teacher 3 had just finished teaching when Student-teacher 5 walked into her class and asked for help with the topic “Collective Nouns”. A discussion ensued between them, in which Student teacher 3 made a few suggestions on likely examples to be used and referred Student teacher 5 to a text book for more examples.**

From the extract above, it can be argued that Student-teacher 3 amongst her peers was regarded as competent in the English Language. Mastery of the topic/subject, therefore, is crucial and necessary if the student teachers are to be regarded as competent teachers of the English Language. As such, the lack of competence as demonstrated by Student-teachers 1 and 5 can be said to be a confirmation of the statement made by Lecturer 2 that she supervised student
teachers who confidently passed wrong information on to their pupils (see Section 4.3.2.4). This suggests that the incident was not an isolated case, but one that apparently occurs among student teachers who lack the required mastery to teach English Language as a subject.

**Methods/learning activities**

The programme objectives emphasise the training of teachers who are not only competent in their use of the English Language but who are also competent and effective in teaching English Language as a subject. As seen here, being competent in the use of the English Language is entirely different from being effective in the teaching of English Language as a subject. The teaching of the subject involves the use of different methods and other learning activities. A common approach used by most of the student teachers is repetition. Findings from the observation data show that Student-teacher 1, 3 and 5 use this approach in a manner aimed at reinforcing learning. Pupils are made to repeat definitions of concepts/ topics taught. The extracts below show the use of repetition in classes taught by Student-teachers 1 and 5 respectively:

**Teacher writes the topic on the chalkboard and asked pupils to define the word noun. One pupil volunteered and the whole class was asked to repeat the given definition three times. She then focused on different rows to get them to recite the definition.**

**Student teacher:** Irregular ver...plural... say it  
**Pupils:** Irregular plural...  
**Student teacher:** ...are words...  
**Pupils:** ... are words...  
**Student teacher:** ...that can change...  
**Pupils:** ... that can change...  
**Student teacher:** ... but remain the same...  
**Pupils:** ...but remain the same...  
**Student teacher:** ... in meaning.
Pupils: ... in meaning.
Student teacher: Say it.
Pupils: Irregular plurals are words that can change but remain the same in meaning.

It can thus be argued that to the student teachers, repetition demonstrates the understanding/ non-understanding of the topic taught. This appears to be in line with the view expressed by Student-teacher 5 in Section 5.3.1.2. Repetition as used above can also be said to promote rote learning, in which the pupils master the definitions without an actual understanding of what they have committed to memory.

As illustrated below, Student-teacher 3 on the other hand uses repetition as an “attention grabber” to help the pupils focus on the topic.

Student teacher: Today our topic is Singular and Plural.
Everybody say Singular and Plural.
Pupils: Singular and Plural.
Student teacher: Singular and Plural
Pupils: Singular and Plural

Many of the student teachers adopt the teacher centred approach to their teaching. The student teachers become disseminators of knowledge. Although pupils are involved in the teaching/learning process, their roles appear limited to answering questions. This very often has the effect of making the class/ lesson border on the edge of boring. This is portrayed in the following extract from the handwritten field notes on the Comprehension lesson taught by Student-teacher 2 to her Primary 4 pupils:

Teacher read the comprehension passage. She asked pupils about their different religions and asked for those who were not Christians to raise their hands. A few students laughed. She then asked them to answer the questions from the reading passage as given in the
text book. Students were not asked to read the passage aloud. She read and explained the questions to pupils who appeared to be having difficulty with the questions asked in the passage.

As already noted above, a pre-reading task is not done; it is therefore not surprising to notice (as revealed by the data) pupils experiencing difficulties answering the questions from the passage read.

There are, however, instances where pupils are asked by teachers to demonstrate to help explain concepts taught to other pupils in the class. For example Student-teacher 6, in the absence of the required teaching aid during his first supervision, follows the advice of the first Supervisor and used pupils in his class as part of his teaching aid. Below is a short description from the handwritten field notes of how he involves his pupils while teaching a lesson on “Forms of Adjectives”:

The student-teacher wrote the following on the chalkboard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Comparative</th>
<th>Superlative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tall</td>
<td>Taller</td>
<td>Tallest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He called out three students to demonstrate by arranging them according to their heights. He then asked the class to identify the tallest amongst them. Using the same format, he made an illustration with the adjective “beautiful”. He also used the pupils’ school bags to illustrate the word near.

His approach can be said to be innovative as he uses what is available to him to enhance the learning of his pupils. Nevertheless, it became monotonous as he adopts the same strategy in almost all his lessons. This perhaps explains the
objection of the second Supervisor who queried him for not having the appropriate instructional materials for his lesson (please see 5.3.1.2).

As illustrated below from the handwritten field notes, Student-teacher 4 also adopts an innovative approach in introducing her lesson on “Old and New Ways of Communication”:

The student teacher asked a pupil to whisper something into the ear of another pupil next to him. That pupil then whispered the same message to the one next to him and the process continued until it got to the last person on the fifth row. Pupils appeared to enjoy this. The last pupil stood up and said the information given to her “Promise said “let’s talk.” Whereas, the actual words of Promise were “I ate bread.” The message by the time it got to the last person on the chain had been distorted and changed completely.

She explains to the pupils that the exercise is directed at helping them understand the nature of communication and in her words “communication involves passing/sending message from one person to another”.

The use of the clue chart in a composition lesson “Talking about Myself” by Student-teacher 4 is quite unique when compared to the methods used by the other student teachers. This is further explained in the handwritten field notes below:

She called a pupil and asked him to mention five things about himself. The pupil mentioned his name, age, where he comes from and what he does. The student-teacher placed what she referred to as a Clue chart on the chalkboard. Together with the pupils, the student-teacher built an essay on the chalkboard using the illustrations from the chart and examples given by the pupils in the class. She asked pupils for
information and used their responses to build and develop the essay...

As seen above, the approach adopted by Student-teacher 4 affords her pupils the opportunity of using the clues as guidelines to construct the essay together with the teacher. This shows a major difference when compared to the approach used by Student-teacher 1 in her composition lesson “Myself”. In the case of Student-teacher 1, the essay is copied from her lesson note onto the chalkboard and read to the pupils. With Student-teacher 4, pupils are given clues with which to build the essay on the chalkboard with the student teacher acting as a guide. Instead of being passive recipients of knowledge, the pupils become actively engaged in the process of gaining that knowledge. By using different approaches in the lessons illustrated above, Student-teacher 4 has created a variety in the teaching and learning process.

**Classroom management**

This theme is important because for teaching and learning to be effective, it has to be done in a conducive environment. Student-teachers 1, 3 and 4 experienced some difficulties in this area. During her second observation, Student-teacher 1 finds it difficult to engage pupils in her lesson as the class is extremely rowdy. The handwritten field notes below give an apt description of what occurred:

> Pupils were distracted, some copying notes, while others chatted. The student teacher visibly struggled to control the class. The noise from the permanent teachers chatting at the front of the class almost overshadowed the voice of the student teacher.
As noted above, and from most of the cases observed, the class/subject teachers appear to contribute to the chaos in some of the classrooms, thereby making the teaching task more difficult for the student teachers and learning almost impossible for the pupils involved. This is particularly true in the case of Student-teacher 4 when the permanent teachers practically undermined her authority as a teacher during an on-going lesson. The situation is clearly illustrated in the handwritten field notes below:

Again, the student teacher appeared to struggle with class management issues as the class was quite noisy at certain periods during the lesson. The permanent teachers did not help matters as they were shouting messages to each other over the heads of the pupils during the lessons and also talking and sending pupils on errands out of class during lesson.

In order to bring some measure of control to the situation during her lesson, Student-teacher 1 as indicated in the audio field notes, resorts to using the following tactics:

**Student teacher:** No noise, no noise. Hands on your lips everybody. Put your hands on your lips. Leave whatever you are doing. I said leave whatever you are doing, put your hand on your lips.

Student-teacher 3 asks pupils to keep all books in their bags and to fold their arms across their chest. This is to ensure that they give their full attention to what she is teaching. Student-teacher 4 on the other hand repeatedly asks her pupils to be quiet. Student-teachers 1 and 3 use measures that more or less make the pupils dormant as they are not allowed to write, but compelled to sit still as they listened to the teacher as she talked.
Given the level of the classes, the fact that children usually have a short attention span, coupled with the permanent teachers discussing in the middle of lessons being taught, it is not surprising that the pupils soon become distracted “...and engaged in some chatting of their own”. Although the bulk of the blame for the noisemaking (as shown in the field notes above) can be placed on the subject/class teachers, it is also inarguably a reflection of the inadequate and perhaps ineffective teaching/learning activities used by the student teachers in their respective practices.

The discussion in this section has so far examined the student teachers’ mastery in English Language as a subject and the activities used by the student teachers to impart learning. It has also, interestingly, raised questions as to how the student teachers can tackle classroom management problems in order to maximise the teaching/learning experiences of their pupils in English Language classrooms.
Table 5.9: Class Teacher’s Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Student-teacher 1 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 2 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 3 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 4 (College B)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 5 (College A)</th>
<th>Student-teacher 6 (College B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseer/mentor</td>
<td>- monitoring - feedback - use of pidgin/indigenous language - subject teacher</td>
<td>- monitoring - different field</td>
<td>- monitoring - subject teacher</td>
<td>- monitoring - subject teacher - teaching practices</td>
<td>- monitoring - lesson note errors - different field</td>
<td>- cross-checked work - different field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.2.3. Class teachers’ influence

During the teaching practice exercise, student teachers are assigned to the class teachers in their respective classes. As identified in the findings of the observation data, not all the teachers involved are trained as to be teachers of the English Language. This theme thus examines the role played by the subject/class teachers in the practical training of the student teachers. This will be discussed under the following heading: overseer/mentor.

**Overseer/mentor**

The class teachers played distinctive roles in the teaching practice exercise. The teachers in many cases acted as overseers, monitoring the activities and teaching practices of the student teachers assigned to them. As seen in the case of Student-teacher 1, she has more than one class teacher in her class and although this has some obvious drawbacks (see Section 5.4.2.2), she is monitored and given feedback. This is illustrated below from the audio field notes where a teacher draws her attention on how to teach the parts of speech:

**Class teacher:** *Aunty, English Aunty, how many types of nouns do you write... do you have? You have to write it first, before you begin to say one two, three, hmm...? Aunty first of all write types of nouns before you put whatever you want to put on the board.*

The data provides ample evidence of where and how Student-teacher 1 in particular is monitored and given feedback (see Section 5.3.1.2). What is in question, however, is the quality of the said monitoring. Despite the group of teachers present in her classroom, Student-teacher 1 still gives the wrong definition of the abstract noun to the pupils as she teaches a lesson on “Parts of
A group of four class teachers seated around a desk were marking test scripts. They chatted in pidgin for over ten minutes as the lesson was going on. A lot of the mistakes made by the student teacher as she taught the lesson went unnoticed during this period as no attention was being paid to her. Class teachers were engrossed in a discussion while the student teacher passed on wrong information to the pupils in their presence.

The incident described above undoubtedly calls into question not just the issue of mentoring but that of quality mentoring. This is because as mentors the class teachers are not only expected to have the required expertise to teach the subject, but they are also supposed to stand as role models for the student teachers to emulate and to demonstrate good teaching practices. The qualities exhibited in the incident above cannot in any way be said to be good enough for the student teachers to emulate.

For Student-teachers 2, 3 and 4, although their class teachers are present in their respective classrooms as they teach the pupils, the observation findings reveal that they are not given any feedback by the class teachers. This perhaps can be attributed to the fact that the student teachers are already halfway through the teaching practice exercise and are perhaps seen as having learnt the “ropes”. However, as noted in the classroom of Student-teacher 4, the behaviour of some of the permanent teachers during her lesson (see Section 5.4.2.2) cannot in any way be termed as appropriate teaching practice for student teachers to emulate.
Student-teacher 5 is monitored; the class teacher is present when she teaches the lesson on “Irregular Plural” (see Section 5.4.2.2). As noted in the handwritten field notes, it is only after fifteen minutes into the lesson that her attention is drawn by the class teacher to some of her mistakes. This again raises questions as to the inspection/marking of her lesson note by the class teacher before the commencement of the lessons for that week. She is apparently not given enough feedback as most of the mistakes and errors go unchecked and some, even undetected. The following handwritten field notes showing her use of a supposed consonant chart in a “Verbal Reasoning” lesson, further reiterates the point discussed above:

The student teacher hung a chart on the chalk board with the following written on the chart:

B C D F G H J K L M N P Q R ST V W X Y Z

Pupils were then informed that these were consonant sounds and asked to read them aloud. Pupils read what was written on the chart as letters of the alphabets.

The illustration above is a reflection of her competence in the subject. It is apparent that she does not understand the topic and has also demonstrated a lack of knowledge as to how sounds in the English Language are taught. Consequently in the follow-up exercises given to the pupils they seek to identify the consonants in the words not by their sounds, but by the presence of the letters. The following extracts from the handwritten field notes further explains this:

The student teacher wrote the following words on the chalkboard, giving an example with the first two:

But = 2  Very = 3  Car =  Calf =  Dam =

She then asked the pupils to come out and underline the consonants in each word and write the total number beside the word.
As seen from the Consonant chart above, the consonant “C” does not exist in the English Language, but rather it is the letter of the alphabet “C” that is represented by the consonants /k/ and /s/. Her analysis of the word “very” is wrong as it does not have a consonant at the end of the word and the letter of the alphabet “Y” as used in that word produces a vowel sound- the short “e” sound.

In her interview when asked about the reaction/comments of the subject/class teacher on the approach she used to teach the topic, Student-teacher 5 states:

She said nothing. And they did not correct me, if really I’m not correct, they would have. My English teacher do come after me and check. Since she did not correct me...

With Student-teacher 6, although he is monitored and his work cross-checked by the class teacher, he still experiences difficulties in developing and designing instructional materials for his lessons (see Sections 5.3.1.2 and 5.4.2.2).

The discussion above indicates that the monitoring done by some of the permanent teachers is not thorough and again raises questions as to the quality of feedback given to the student teachers. It equally leads to questions about their competence in English Language as a subject and their knowledge of the current trends in teaching methods of the subject. This again draws attention to the nature of support provided by the class teachers to help the student teachers develop correct and current teaching practices. Below is a summary of the themes from the student teachers’ observation data:
Table 5 10: Summary of Themes from Student Teachers' Observation Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Needs</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Spelling/vocabulary</th>
<th>Mother tongue interference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching skills</td>
<td>Mastery of topic</td>
<td>Methods/learning activities</td>
<td>Classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Teachers’ Influence</td>
<td>Overseer/mentor</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this Chapter, attention has been centred on the analysis of the School data. The School data consist of data gathered from the student teachers in their respective placement schools. The focus has been on identifying the teaching needs of the student teachers. The discussion has highlighted weaknesses/loopholes in the training of the student teachers and gaps resulting from issues related to the mentoring of the student teachers by the subject/class teachers who can be said to have become the middlemen in the training of the student teachers in the English Language teacher education programme in both Colleges of Education. These issues will be elaborated on in the Discussion Chapter.
CHAPTER SIX – DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

6.1. INTRODUCTION

The research evaluates an English Language teacher education programme in two Colleges of Education within the Nigerian context. Chapter One of this research gives an introduction to teacher education in Nigeria as well as the rational for this research. Chapter Two shows a review of literature related to the evaluation of language programmes, evaluation models and issues related to practical teaching in language teacher education programmes. Chapter Three examines the research methodology with attention directed at the research design and research process. Chapters Four and Five are centred on the analysis and interpretation of data which is purely qualitative in nature, and the findings generated from the data gathered from the two Colleges of Education and the student teachers in their respective placement schools.

In this chapter, Discussion and Conclusion, attention will be directed at answering the research questions for this study. The main findings of the research will be highlighted and discussed in line with the reviewed literature. This will be followed by a discussion on the limitations of the current research. Recommendations will also be made in the light of the findings of the research.

6.2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND FINDINGS

The research, which is centred on evaluating an English Language teacher education programme in Nigeria, aims to:

- critically analyse the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme as it pertains to the teaching and learning of the English Language Courses in the programme.
• identify teaching needs of the student teachers from the two Colleges of Education under study.
• examine if and how the stated objectives are interpreted through their realisation in the classes of Colleges of Education by the lecturers.

• examine if and how the objectives reflect the teaching needs of the student teachers.

Consequently, the research questions generated from these aims are:

1. What are the stated objectives of the English Language teachers’ education programme in Nigeria?

2. What are the teaching needs of the student teachers in the two Colleges of Education under study?

3. How are the objectives interpreted and applied in the classes of the two Colleges of Education?

4. To what extent do the objectives reflect the teaching needs of student teachers in the programme?

An examination of the research aims and questions above shows that the answers required to the stipulated research questions go beyond mere yes/no and agree/disagree questions. In fact Yin (2009:11) describes them as explanatory questions. Answers to such questions are best provided by an effective exploration of the phenomenon through the use of a qualitative research design. This section will focus on answering the research questions based on the findings generated from the research. These will be examined alongside the aims of the research and the literature reviewed.
6.2.1. Research Question 1

What are the objectives of the programme?

The objectives of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level are as follows:

- Help the students to develop the four language skills – listening, speaking, reading and writing
- Help students become confident and competent in the use of spoken and written English
- Enable students to develop interests and acquire critical skills to appreciate literary works.
- Equip successful students to teach English effectively at the Primary and Secondary School levels.
- Prepare students for further studies in the subject.

Although the research evaluates the English Language teacher education programme in two different Colleges of Education, the objectives of the programme in both Colleges of Education are essentially the same. This is because NCE programmes in all Colleges of Education are co-ordinated by a national body, the National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE).

This research seeks to evaluate the programme based on the objectives. This is in line with the view held by Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007:24) on the focus of evaluation research on selected variables of interest to the researcher for the formulation and contribution to theory and policies (see Section 2.3). The primary focus of this evaluation research is on the objectives of the programme; however, it does not necessarily seek to establish if these objectives are achieved per se or seek to base the success of the programme on the achievement of the stipulated objectives. Rather, the attention is on critically analysing the objectives, their translation into practice by the lecturers in the programme and examining the extent to which the teaching needs of the
student teachers are considered in the formulation and even the implementation of the stated programme objectives. It seeks to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the programme based on the findings of the above. In line with this therefore, it is important to reiterate that this research is essentially concerned with the language component of the programme. This being the case, the third objective as stated above, which is focused on the literary component of the programme, is not relevant to this research. As such, the literary courses and classes have not been examined nor observed in this research.

The objectives for the programme as seen above are laudable; however, the findings of the research reveal a mismatch between policy and practice in that there are discrepancies in the approach adopted by the Colleges of Education to achieve the stated objectives (see Section 4.3.2.2.). This is similar to Peacock’s 2009 findings on the Hong Kong context (see Section 2.5.2) which show that although the philosophy of the programme is well stated, it is not mirrored in the content of the programme he investigated. In this present study for example, although the first objective of the programme emphasises the development of the four language skills – speaking, listening, reading and writing - very little attention is given to the development of listening and reading as only one course each is devoted to the development of these two skills in the duration of an entire three year programme (see Section 4.2.1.1). Another instance is that of objective five. Besides the presence of the on-campus degree programmes, which the findings from the interview show run at the detriment of
the NCE programmes, there is nothing in the research findings to suggest the promotion of the fifth objective of the programme (see Section 4.3.2.2).

Interestingly, the findings also reveal that in addition to the intended objectives stated above, the programme also has a number of unintended outcomes (see Section 4.3.2.3) which are listed below as follows:

- Promoting literacy programmes
- Improving students’ attitude towards academic work through the teaching practice exercise
- Improving students’ performance academically in other subjects
- Producing intermediate personnel for the administrative sector

There is an increase in the number of people coming into the programme in search of educational qualifications. It can be argued that the first unintended outcome of the programme as seen above is directed towards the promotion of the new Millennium Development Goals (Igbuzor, 2006:1). The admission of great numbers of students indirectly aids the promotion of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) to which Nigeria as a nation is committed (see Section 1.1.1). This is because it creates various opportunities for a good number of people who are literate and in search of educational qualifications to improve their standard of living. Such qualifications invariably improve their chances of getting good jobs. In addition, the overpopulated programme also provides en mass training for the teachers needed for the promotion of literacy at the elementary level of education in the country.
This confirms the view held by Westbrook et al (2008:1) on the implications of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) on teacher education programmes. Albeit in the case of this English Language teacher education programme under study, it can be said to have a negative impact as, contrary to the view of Westbrook et al, it does not necessarily improve the quality education received. As seen from the findings, this increase has led to the programme being over populated and has caused the already very limited facilities provided for the programme stretched far beyond limits. Thus the quality of education as experienced by the students in the English Language teacher education programme in the two Colleges of Education can be described as patchy and not entirely satisfactory (see Section 4.3.2.2).

A second unintended outcome of the programme is also revealed in the findings which is an improvement of students’ attitude towards academic work through the teaching practice exercise. The findings show that the student teachers, having experienced the reverse role of students to teachers during the teaching practice exercise, understand what should be appropriate and acceptable behaviour in the classroom. This undoubtedly stems from the problems experienced with classroom management during the teaching practice exercise (see Section 5.3.1.3). The research findings equally show that the student teachers study their College course materials to help them teach their lessons effectively during the teaching practice exercise. In fact, Student-teacher 6 clearly states during his interview “I started going through some of my text books and I kept reading (studying) to know more”. It can be said that the experience gained through the teaching practice exercise cultivated a renewed
interest in their course of study, causing a change in their attitudes towards their work in the College of Education classrooms (see Section 4.3.2.3). This change is also noted by Lecturer 1 as he states “Those who you particularly notice before maybe in a class, who use to not be very attentive, this time around they do it with all level of seriousness.”

This also accounts for the third unintended outcome which aims to improve the students’ performance in other subjects. With the production of competent and effective teachers in English Language, the educational state of the country is equally improved. This is because teachers from the English Language teacher education programme aim to pass on the same competence to their pupils/students. This is aimed at enabling them to improve not only in English as a subject but in all other subjects as well given that the English Language is the medium of instruction.

The fourth unintended outcome of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level is to produce junior/intermediate personnel for administrative duties in both governmental and non-governmental establishments in the country. As in the previous paragraph, this again is linked to the proficient/competent use of the English Language by graduates of the programme. This gives a clear indication as to why Nta et al (2008:95) refer to the English Language as a skill-based subject. Nta et al (2008) in their study evaluated an English Language teacher education programme in a Nigerian University paying specific attention to the curriculum of the programme (see Section 2.5.4). In this study, however, the focus is on the objectives of the
English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level in two Colleges of Education. Although this study, like that of Nta et al (2008), examines the curriculum of the programme, it however focuses on only the language component of the curriculum and examines this alongside the implementation of the programme. Nta et al (2008) utilised only document examination as their main research tool in their own study (see Section 2.5.4). In contrast to this, the researcher in this study has used a number of tools to triangulate data collected (see Section 3.4.4) and has through the tools used also been able to examine not only the implementation of the programme, but also observe and relate the teaching practices and the teaching needs of the lecturers and the student teachers respectively to the stipulated objectives of the programme.

6.2.2. Research Question 2
What are the teaching needs of the student teachers in the two Colleges of Education involved in the study?
As seen from the findings in Section, 5.4.2 the teaching needs of the student teachers are of two categories, namely language level needs and teaching skills. In Section 5.3.1.3 these areas are also identified by the student teachers as areas in which they experienced great difficulties. Under the language needs, findings from the research show that the student teachers have problems with grammar, spelling, level-related vocabulary as well as mother tongue interference. The mother tongue interference, as shown in Section 5.4.2.1, refers to a transfer of features in the mother tongue into the second language which in this case is the English Language.
The teaching-skills needs show problems in the mastery of English Language as a subject, teaching methods and classroom management. The discussion on the teaching needs of the student teachers as reflected in Sections 5.3.1.3 and 5.4.2.1 clearly identifies competence in the English Language as a major problem/need of the student teachers. The findings show the inability of some of the student teachers to use the English Language accurately and confidently. This shows some similarity to the findings of Salihoglu (2012:3444) as he also identifies proficiency in the students’ use of English as a problem in dire need of attention in the Turkish context (see Section 2.5.3). The research findings in this study equally highlight a more disturbing problem which is the student teachers’ lack of the required competence in the English Language to teach the subject even at the very elementary level of the primary school. In other words, it invariably shows a lack of the very basic knowledge in the subject by the majority of the student teachers. This is clearly contrary to the point made by Harmer (2007:30) that teachers, as an absolute necessity, be knowledgeable in their subjects in order to be able to teach the subjects competently and effectively. This therefore inhibits the promotion as well as the achievement of the second and fourth intended objectives of the English Language teacher education programme in both Colleges of Education.

According to Eyers (2004:1) the practical teaching period is supposed to be one where student teachers match theoretical knowledge and professional practice. In this study, however, problems are also identified in the student teachers’ choice and use of teaching methods (see Section 5.4.2.2) and even in the development and use of appropriate, creative and innovative teaching
materials. This shows their level of preparedness and gives an indication of the theoretical knowledge gained from the Colleges of Education for the teaching practice exercise. Most of the methods and strategies used to teach the pupils are such that promote repetition and rote learning.

Interestingly, one of the student teachers based her teaching method on her own learning experience at the College of Education. This confirms the point raised by Zanting et al (2001:726) that student teachers learn to teach from their own classroom experience (see Section 2.7). The methods used by majority of the student teachers as seen in Section 5.4.2.2, cannot be said to promote understanding of the topics on the part of the pupils, as the pupils merely commit such topics taught to memory without necessarily having a good understanding of them. Their methods are centred on encouraging rote learning. Although Ongondo and Borg (2011:511) believe that the practicum is one that essentially promotes the learning and development of the student teachers’ pedagogical reasoning, findings in this research show a stifling of growth in this specific area in the teaching practice experience of the student teachers (see Section 5.3.1.2).

Tuli and File (2009:110) equally argue for student teachers to be allowed to develop their teaching expertise. Contrary to their view however, the findings of this research, as seen in Sections 5.3.1.2 and 5.4.2.2, tell a different story as student teachers’ practices are greatly influenced by the teaching practices of their subject/class teachers. To a great extent it can be argued that the student teachers have been prevented from developing their own expertise in
classroom practices and management. The findings as illustrated under the sub-theme “Approach to Task” in Section 5.3.1.2 show that student teachers, very often, are compelled to use methods as directed by the subject/class teachers whether or not such methods are appropriate for the primary/young learners.

There are also issues related to classroom management. The student teachers do not show a lot of creativity and innovation in their design and use of learning activities to engage their pupils actively in their lessons. The disruption in most of the lessons is caused by activities of some of the subject/class teachers as the findings show student teachers struggling to manage classes that at some points become very rowdy. The findings show the student teachers apparent lack of skills and knowledge in adequate classroom control and use of lively, innovative and engaging learning activities to hold/capture the attention span of pupils for the duration of a 30-40 minutes lesson. This to some extent is in contrast to Peacock’s (2009) findings in his evaluation of an English Language teacher education programme within the Hong Kong Context as discussed in Section 2.5.2. Peacock (2009:273) highlights classroom managerial issues as problems also encountered by the students in the programme; however, the findings of his research show that the students are well trained in the programme and as such are able to use any approach as demanded in any situation. The same, regrettably, cannot be said for this present programme under study.
Findings in this research show that the student teachers find it difficult to rise to challenges when encountered (see Section 5.3.1.1). This accounts for their reliance/dependence on the subject/class teachers in their respective placement schools; thus, confirming the view of Rozelle and Wilson (2012:1196) but raises serious doubts as to the adequacy and effectiveness of the training of the student teachers in the Colleges of Education. As stated by Gipe and Richard (1992:55) challenges during field experience/practical teaching exercise can provide student teachers with opportunities for reflective thinking and in a way serve as basis for the development of their expertise in the area of practice. This, thus, makes the failure/reluctance of the student teachers to rise to challenges a cause for concern.

6.2.3. Research Question 3
How are the objectives interpreted and applied in the classes of the two Colleges of Education?

A third aim of this study is to examine how lecturers in the programme interpret and translate the objectives of the programme through their teaching practices. This is clearly different from the aims of Peacock (2009), Coskun and Dalogu (2010) and Salihoglu (2012) who conducted their evaluation research in foreign language contexts. This study examines ways in which the lecturers promote the objectives of the programme through their classroom/teaching practices in two Colleges of Education in a second language context.

From the findings, it is clear that lecturers are aware of the objectives/aims of their respective taught courses. However, in spite of this, there is a shocking
lack of awareness of the complete list of the English Language teacher education programme goals/objectives on the part of most of the lecturers in the programme. This aberrantly suggests a form of custom and practice in the system. This finding is both interesting and unique as it shows a complete contrast to that found in the work of Coskun and Daloglu (2010) and Salihoglu (2012) where lecturers show good knowledge of the programmes’ philosophies and goals.

The focus of the lecturers in the current programme under study, as illustrated in Section 4.3.2.3, is on Objective 3 which is directed towards the production of effective and competent teachers in English Language. This is seen in the responses given by Lecturers 1, 2 and 3 when asked about the objectives of the programme (see Section 4.3.2.3). Lecturers 1 and 3 show their lack of awareness of other intended objectives of the programme in their respective responses below:

Lecturer 1:  *Er... it might not just be one, certainly it cannot just be one goal but at least that's the one I can say now.*

Lecturer 3:  *I don't know if we have separate aims.*

Without the required knowledge of all the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme (as demonstrated in the discussion in Section 4.3.2.3), it becomes difficult, if not almost impossible, to practise and promote the stated objectives. Other than aiming to achieve the aims of teaching specific courses in their respective allocated courses, the objectives of the programme are apparently not taken into consideration in the planning and execution of the teaching and learning activities in the classrooms of the two Colleges of
Education. An evaluation of the programme has identified a weakness which equally affects the process of the programme. This confirms the view expressed by Norris (2009:8) on the use of evaluation methods to shed light on the outcomes and processes of an educational programme in order to improve it.

The NCCE *Curriculum Implementation Framework for NCE Programmes* (2010:7) clearly makes a case for a pedagogical shift in the approach adopted by lecturers from that of simple teaching/lecturing to what it describes as a “comprehensive learning programme”. Kiely and Rea-Dickens (2005:64) argue that evaluation programmes focus primarily on the language programmes without taking into consideration the policies and implementations of such policies guiding the programme within the contexts of study. An examination of the current teaching practices of the lecturers in the programme alongside the *NCCE Curriculum Implementation Framework* is a clear demonstration of action on the concern raised.

With the exception of one particular lecturer, not much change is noted in the teaching practices of the other lecturers. The framework clearly emphasises the use of specific teaching methods aimed at engaging the students (see Section 4.2.1.3). Lecturer 2, however, notes in her interview that some lecturers still sometimes read directly from text books throughout a one hour lecture. This is contrary to the requirements in the curriculum framework as stated by the NCCE. Although the curriculum framework allows for the use of text books, it does not limit/restrict learning activities to only this avenue (see Section 4.2.1.3). Instead it deemphasises the focus on mastery of content and
advocates for a demonstration of knowledge gained through skills and change in attitude.

The findings show the use of theoretical practices, that is, written class exercises, assignments, and even oral drills, but the use of practical hands-on experience for the students is sadly lacking in most of the classes observed (see Section 4.3.2.3). This creates a vivid contrast to the findings of Erben (2004) on the Australian context which show a more practical hands-on experience with the students taking charge of their learning in the Saturday Morning School (see Section 2.5.1).

The *NCCE Curriculum Implementation Framework* (2010) stresses the need for lecturers to design and teach their classes without adopting a rushed-approach aimed merely at the completion of given course outlines. Unfortunately, this seems to be the case as the course outlines not only serve as guides (see Section 4.4.2.1) but have apparently metamorphosed into ready-made lecture materials for some of the lecturers. Not much attention is devoted to being innovative and creative in the planning and development of lectures/lessons for the students. The timing also contributes to the problem as lecturers have insufficient time allocated for the teaching of their respective courses (see Section 4.3.2.2). The findings show that this has an adverse effect on the programme. In fact as pointed out by Lecturer 2 in Section 4.3.2.2, she merely scratches the surface of topics as she struggles to cover the course outline so as not to place the students at a disadvantage. In spite of the use of the rushed-
approach adopted by most of the lecturers, they are still not able to cover the course outlines for their courses.

Most of the teaching practices of the lecturers observed in the College of Education classrooms are geared towards building the theoretical mastery of the students in the subject. Lecturer 3 in the following statement gives a clear picture of what some of the activities in her class entail:

*We engage them in discussions during the class, give them assignment, something to go home and research about. We give them test...*

The over population of the programme has equally led to the admission of students who from their performance in class show that they are not competent enough to be in the English Language teacher education programme thus making the already difficult task of the lecturers even more complex as the teaching and learning experience in the classroom of the two Colleges of Education is brought into question. Lecturer 1 as seen in Section 4.3.2.2 raises an interesting issue with regards to the effect of class size on his teaching practices. He draws attention to the inhibition experienced, his inability to use certain learning activities and provide adequate feedback to his students. Thus, in this respect, Maloney’s view (2005:2) that lecturers are framed and defined by their context can be said to be true and relevant (see Section 2.2).

Lecturer 5, discussing his own teaching practices, explains that in order to build students’ content knowledge in his course, he focuses first on the theoretical aspect before taking the students to the language laboratory to use pre-recorded materials for speech practice. The teaching practices of most of the
lecturers as examined in line with the view portrayed by Kiely and Rea-Dickens (2005:64) in Section 1.3.1 is clearly at variance with what is stated and required in the NCCE Curriculum Implementation Framework. In other words, the findings reveal that the teaching practices of the lecturers are influenced not only by the implementation policies but also by constraints in the contexts of the given programme (see Sections 4.3.2.2 and 4.3.2.3).

6.2.4. Research Question 4

To what extent do the objectives of the programme reflect the teaching needs of the student teachers in the programme?

Interest in this evaluation research was originally generated as a result of the concern for the poor performance of students in the English Language (see Section 3.1). This is in agreement with Goldie’s view (2006:211) as he describes evaluation as a practice driven field that is highly diversified as a result of the reflections of those engaged in it. In this research, an examination of the teaching needs of the student teachers in relation to the objectives of the programme reveals the level of competence and quality of preparation of the students to work and function as teachers of the English Language in the Nigerian context. This is in line with the point made by Bartolome (1994:179) as he stresses the need for programmes to be evaluated based on the training and preparation of teachers to work in the same socio-cultural context (see Section 2.2).

In Section 4.3.2.1, the English Language teacher education programme in the two Colleges of Education is described by some of the lecturers in the
programme as well designed, well-structured and comprehensive. Relating this
to the objectives of the programme, it can be said that the programme’s
objectives have taken into cognizance the following points:

- the need for the development of the four language
  skills of the students in the programme
- the ability of the students to use the English
  Language confidently
- the ability to teach the English Language at a
  competent and confident level
- the need to develop an interest in further/higher
  studies in the same field/course

In relation to the programme’s stipulated objectives, the findings of this research
show that the student teachers have certain teaching needs – language needs
and teaching skills (see Section 6.2.2). Consequently, in this section the
discussion is centred on the objectives of the programme and an examination of
the measures used/ put in place by the two Colleges of Education to address
these needs.

As noted in Section 4.3.2.1, the programme is plagued with a number of
implementation issues which have obvious impact on the teaching practices of
some of the lecturers in the programme as it affects the promotion/non-
promotion of the objectives of the programme (see Section 6.2.3). This equally
has implications as to how the identified teaching needs of the student teachers
are addressed.

In order to identify the teaching needs of the students, student teachers on their
teaching practice exercise are involved in the study. As shown in the discussion
in Section 2.5, the approach adopted here is different from that used by Peacock (2009), Coskun and Daloglu (2010) and Salihoglu (2012). Although their respective studies involve students of the programmes under study, the students are not on a practical teaching exercise (see Sections 2.5.2, 2.5.3 and 3.4.5). The approach can be said to be similar to that used by Erben (2004) in the evaluation of a foreign language teacher education programme in the Australian context. As shown in his study, the students are made to engage in a ten week practical exercise, teaching and managing the Saturday Morning School (see Section 2.5.1).

The researcher in this study utilises three main research tools designed for the study (see Section 3.4.6) and is also able to identify the teaching needs of the student teachers without engaging separately in a needs analysis as indicated in the use of the CIPP Model designed by Stufflebeam in 1971 (see Section 2.4.5). In addition to seeking the views of the student teachers on the subject of their teaching needs through in-depth, one-to-one semi-structured interviews, the researcher equally observes student teachers at work to identify the teaching needs first hand. This allows her to compare said practice to actual practice (Section 3.4.6.3). The identification of the needs of the students in Salihoglu’s study (2012) for example is not based on his own first hand observation but only on the information he is given by the students in the programme (see Section 2.5.3).

On the teaching needs of the student teachers, the findings show that the lecturers in the programme are aware of the needs of the student teachers, with
particular reference given to their language needs and the low competence in
the subject/course of some of the students in the programme. This is reflected
in the comments of Lecturers 2, 3, and 4 as they complain about the poor
quality of students coming into the programme (see Section 4.3.2.2). The
findings show that these teaching needs become even more glaring during the
teaching practice exercise. For example Lecturer 2 complains of the refusal of
some placement schools to use the student teachers because of the poor
competence in their use of English and their inability to teach the subject. She
also comments on witnessing student teachers passing wrong/incorrect
information to their pupils while teaching (see Section 4.3.2.4). Lecturer 3
equally describes the performance of some of the student teachers she
supervised during the teaching practice exercise, as “downright embarrassing”
(see Section 4.3.2.4).

The findings clearly show weakness in the subject knowledge and pedagogical
content knowledge as utilised and portrayed in the classroom practices of some
of the student teachers. It is, however, interesting to note here that in spite of
the knowledge of the obvious needs of the student teachers, very little is done
at the Departmental level within the School of Languages to address the issue.
This again points to the autonomous nature (see Section 4.3.2.4) of the
programme as run in both Colleges of Education involved in the study as
lecturers are left to their own devices and practices (see comments from
Lecturer 3 in the same section). An obvious example is seen in the findings
which show that the lack of prior teaching experience (Section 5.3.1.1) affects
the performance of the student teachers during the teaching practice and their perception by the subject/class teachers in their respective placement schools.

Even with the knowledge from their supervisory field experience with the student teachers, lecturers still lump students into large groups of ten – twelve people for micro-teaching exercise where only one person is assigned to teach while the others watch. This deprives the student teachers of the much-needed teaching experience before the teaching practice exercise. This is contrary to the requirements of the NCCE (2010) *Curriculum Implementation Framework for NCE Programmes* as it states clearly that all students are to do microteaching sessions and those who fail the microteaching should not participate in the teaching practice exercise. This shows the recognition of the importance and the need for prior teaching experience as a preparation phase for the main teaching task with which student teachers are encountered during the teaching practice exercise (Tuli and File, 2009:107).

In the case of College of Education B in particular, it cannot be said that the lecturers in the programme are completely in touch with the practices or teaching needs of their student teachers as they do not always supervise them (see Section 4.3.2.4). The findings show that in both Colleges of Education there is a lack of an essential feedback loop where observed practices and problems/teaching needs are addressed and can be used as a learning point to improve the teaching practices of lecturers in order to help improve the performance of other students/student teachers in the programme.
Contrary to the stated goals of the programme, the findings show that the confidence of some of the student teachers is inhibited by their level of competence in the English Language. This is expressed in their speaking and writing skills. Failure to build students’ mastery in the subject stems from a number of reasons which include insufficient teaching time as well as over stretched and non-use of facilities as a result of the large population of students in the programme (see Section 4.3.2.2). The insufficient teaching time results in the lack of thorough teaching of topics by lecturers.

The impact of the lecturers’ teaching practices on the teaching practices of the student teachers is also evident in their adoption of some of their teaching styles. For example, in teaching English sounds, some of the student teachers use the self-model approach adopted by some of the lecturers (see Sections 4.3.2.3 and 5.4.2.2). This is in agreement with Nettle (1998:193) who states that teachers teach as they have been taught. Although as seen in the case of Student-teachers 1 and 5, this self-model approach has strong disadvantages as pupils can be taught wrong pronunciations without the use of correct or even authentic materials and the teachers are unaware of their own linguistic inadequacies. This again reiterates the need for the student teachers not only to have the knowledge of how to teach English as a subject but to also be aware of different materials that can be used when teaching different topics under English Language as a subject.

As illustrated in the preceding discussion, the objectives of the programme are clearly stated, the problem, however, lies in the measures put in place for the
promotion/ non-promotion of the programme objectives. The study also shows that although lecturers are aware of the objectives of their individual taught courses, they however fall short when it comes to the programme objectives as their focus is only on the production of teachers in the subject. The study has also identified the need for an internal evaluation system in the programme. In fact, Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007:7) rightly point out the importance of periodically evaluating the goals, structure, as well as process, of an educational programme in order to ensure its constant and advance improvement. In this case, the feedback from the student teachers’ assessment during their teaching practice exercise can also be used to improve and fine-tune the teaching practices of the lecturers in the programme (Kiely, 2009:102).

In addition, this ensures the active involvement of the lecturers in the evaluation of their students during the teaching practice exercise. It equally creates opportunities for the lecturers to also indirectly evaluate their own teaching practices in relation to the performance of the student teachers during the teaching practice exercise. It provides them with a sense of ownership of the programme (Peacock, 2009:235) and removes the fear that comes with feeling threatened or “witch-hunted” in the workplace.

6.3. EMERGING FINDINGS

Having answered the research questions based on the findings of the research and relevant literature in Section 6.2, this section turns its attention to the unique findings of this research as well as its contribution to theory and practice. This study provides learning within all three domains. Using the programme
objectives as the nucleus for the research, it evaluates an English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level by examining the teaching practices of lecturers and the teaching needs of the student teachers in the programme. The research also proposes an evaluation model for second language context based on the literature reviewed and the research process utilised in the study. Consequently in this section the discussion will be on the following emerging findings of the research: autonomy, the middleman issue and the development of an evaluation model. According to Kiely (2009:99), learning is the main aim of any evaluation research and this can be done in any three levels including theory building, policy building and professional practice. This study, as illustrated in the following discussion, provides learning on all three domains identified above.

6.3.1. Autonomy

As already mentioned, the NCCE is the national body responsible for designing and ensuring the uniformity and quality of programmes in all Colleges of Education in Nigeria. However, in the case of the English Language teacher education programme under study, the research findings show that each College of Education exercises a measure of autonomy in the running and implementation of the programme. Although the NCCE has well established policies which are meant to act as guides for the implementation of the programme in respective Colleges of Education and the programme is accredited by the NCCE every five years, the findings of this research show some discrepancies between the NCCE requirements and actual on-ground practice (please see Section 4.3.2.2).
From the discussions on the findings in the Analysis Chapters (Chapters Four and Five), it is clear that autonomy plays a major role in the programme under study. The findings indicate that autonomy does not affect the design of the programme, as it is the same in all Colleges of Education within the country. Autonomous practices, however, become visible in the implementation of the programme itself in the two Colleges of Education. This is in line with the view of Lynch (2001:390-391), on the practice of autonomy within institutional boundaries.

Autonomy is reflected in the teaching practices of the lecturers and even down to the student teachers’ choice of placement school for the teaching practice exercise. There are also elements of autonomy noticed in the practices of the subject/class teachers in the placement schools. An example of this is clearly illustrated in the case of Student-teacher 4 and her experience with the lesson note problem explained in Section 5.3.1.3.

Autonomy is also seen in the implementation of the programme at the managerial level of both Colleges of Education. This is reflected in the allocation of teaching time for the different courses, availability of lecture/classrooms, mode of teaching practice supervision, class size and even the use/ non-use of supposed learning facilities. The findings show significant differences in the implementation of the programme in the two Colleges of Education. For example, in College of Education A, two unit courses are taught for only one hour every week and lecturers are unable to fix extra classes because of the problem resulting from the “squeeze in space” mentioned by Lecturer 3 in
Section 4.3.2.2. Whereas, in College of Education B, although allocated time for each of these courses is one hour a week and is reflected in the official departmental timetable, lecturers in the programme are encouraged and allowed to fix extra class (one hour) every week. So instead of one hour as it obtains in College of Education A, two unit courses are taught for two hours every week in College of Education B. In the area of supervision during teaching practice exercise, College of Education A only allows lecturers to supervise student teachers from their own departments. In College of Education B, the situation is different from that of College of Education A, but similar to that described in the Kenyan context by Ong’ondo and Borg (2011:515) as lecturers are allocated to supervise student teachers irrespective of the students’ departmental background or programme of study. These differences show a lack of uniformity in the running of the same programme in two different Colleges of Education. Although the differences may be regarded as minor, they have profound consequences on the promotion and achievement of the objectives of the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level. This is illustrated in the discussion in Sections 4.3.2.4 and 6.2.2.

The lecturers also exercise autonomy over their teaching practices. There are no measures in place to check or guide the practices of lecturers in the classrooms of the Colleges of Education. Even the accreditation forms (see Appendix C), which show the requirements for the preparation for accreditation exercise, do not give this area much attention. In fact as indicated from the findings in the research, lecturers view any attention to their teaching practice with high levels of suspicion (see Section 3.4.6.3) and in some cases, with
some measure of hostility. Seen in this light, Smith’s reference (2003:3) to
teacher autonomy as freedom from control can be said to be relevant in this
instance. Hence, despite the lecturers’ awareness of the needs of the student
teachers (see Section 6.2.4), there is no pooling of resources or ideas, peer
teaching or even peer assessment to improve the teaching practices of the
lecturers in aid of the development of the student teachers in the field.
Consequently the description of teacher autonomy, given by Al-Mansoori,
(2008:36-37), as one that seeks to improve learner autonomy through the use
of self-directed and reflective and collaborative practices, cannot be said to be
applicable here.

Surprisingly, in contrast to the autonomy exercised by the lecturers in the
classes of Colleges of Education, findings show that the practice of learners’
autonomy is notably missing. This shows a contradiction to the view expressed
by Jimenez (2009:1) that learner autonomy and teacher autonomy are
interrelated, which seems to suggest a concurrent development of both. Even in
the placement schools, the practices of the student teachers are curbed. They
are not given complete control of their lessons as they are made to observe and
adopt teaching methods prescribed by the subject/class teachers in their
respective placement schools.

Findings show that the student teachers are given control over their choice of
placement schools for the practical teaching exercise. This in itself cannot be
termed as bad as it shows the student teachers becoming actively engaged in
their training process. However, there is an obvious absence of a system to
monitor and guide student teachers to ensure that the right choices are made. They are left to their own devices and very often choose and practise in schools which can be described as sub-standard (see Section 4.3.2.4).

The teaching practice exercise is an essential part of the training of the student teachers; as such it should not be handled in such a trivial manner. The aim of the exercise is to expose the student teachers to valuable hands-on teaching experience as well as to improve their competence in the English Language. It provides them with a good opportunity to practise. This being the case, it is also very much about learning and as such student teachers should be directed to model schools where they can get the best experience as beginners to aid them in the development of their own unique teaching practices as seen in Erben (2006) where students managed a model Saturday School. To this end, the English Language teacher education programme thus exhibits a strong weakness in its lack of control over this area.

As illustrated in the findings, institutional autonomy as it relates to the English Language teacher education programme is crucial and has far-reaching effects on the implementation and perception of the programme itself. This makes it an area that deserves further and thorough academic scrutiny. In the same vein, the implications of the lack of the concurrent development of learners' autonomy, with an already existing practice of teacher autonomy, is certainly one in need of further exploration.
6.3.2. The Middleman Issue

Although the English Language teacher education programme is referred to as well designed and comprehensive (see Section 4.3.2.1), the findings from the research, identify what the researcher refers to as the “weakest link” in the programme design. The findings reveal a void, a disconnection of some sort, in the training of the student teachers in the programme in the two Colleges of Education. This vacuum is caused by the limited control exercised by the Colleges of Education over the training of the student teachers in their respective placement schools. The void is equally acknowledged in the findings of Ong’ondo and Borg (2011) in their study aimed at examining the influence of supervision on the teaching practices of student teachers in an English Language teacher education programme within the Kenyan context.

This void is particularly noticed in the apparent lack of awareness and interest by the Colleges of Education in the students’ choice of placement schools for the teaching practice exercise. This is evident in the comments made by Lecturers 2 and 4 respectively (see Section 4.3.2.4). They point out that the physical environment of some of the placements schools made the schools/classrooms unconducive for teaching and learning. This, in its own way, equally affects the performance of some of the student teachers during the supervision exercises because as explained by Lecturer 2 “...you are expected to score that student.” Describing a classroom in one of such schools, Lecturer 2 states as follows:

*There were two levels in the same classroom, J.S 1 and er...J.S 2 and there’s only one teacher, when this one is teaching... the two of them will teach at the same time.*
In itself, the control given to the student teachers to choose their placement schools cannot be condemned as already explained in Section 6.3.1. Rather, it is the absence of explicit guidelines to aid the student teachers in making informed choices that is called into question here. There is a huge gap between what is expected and what actually happens in the classrooms of the Colleges of Education and the classrooms of the placement schools. The fact that some of the student teachers were teaching in schools, which according to Lecturer 2, “...should not be schools”, raises questions as to the very essence of the teaching practice exercise.

The findings also reveal that the training of the student teachers, during the teaching practice exercise, is unofficially and indirectly handed over by the Colleges of Education to the class/subject teachers in the placement schools. There is no formal co-ordination between the institutions and the placement schools (Ong’ondo and Borg, 2011:516). No formal training or guidelines are given to the class/subject teachers to aid them in working with and training the student teachers placed under their supervision.

More surprising and note-worthy, however, is the lecturers’ awareness and reaction to some of the teaching needs of the student teachers in the English Language teacher education programme. As illustrated in the discussion in Section 4.3.2.4, the lecturers in both Colleges of Education are aware of some of the problems experienced by the student teachers during the teaching practice exercise. For example, Lecturers 1 and 4 comment on the lack of confidence expressed in the speaking of some of the student teachers. Lecturer
2 also talks about the reluctance of some of the placement schools to use the student teachers in their classrooms because of their low level of competence/subject knowledge. As seen in the discussion in Sections 5.3.1.1. and 5.3.1.2, the problem is further amplified by the student teachers who also express their fears on their level of preparation for the exercise. For example, Student-teacher 2 states “I had big fear in me on how to stand in front of children [pupils] and their teachers to teach...” Student-teacher 4 states “...we were not taught how to teach topics.” The reason for this perhaps can be attributed to her following comment “...we didn’t even do anything during the microteaching.”

It is shocking to note that in spite of the lecturers’ awareness of some of these teaching needs very little is done by the lecturers in the programme to address the concerns identified during their supervision exercise. Students are still placed in groups of ten to twelve to do the microteaching. As such, most of them still do not get the much required teaching experience before going for the teaching practice exercise. This, in itself, as stated in Section 6.2.4, is against the NCCE requirements.

Consequently the student teachers go into the teaching practice exercise with gaps in their training and a huge sense of insecurity and self-doubt. They are perceived by the class/subject teachers as ill prepared and lacking in the required knowledge to teach the subject competently. This view is reinforced by Lecturer 2 as she states the concerns expressed by some of the placement schools:
The schools themselves are not willing to use them properly. They say the quality of our students is not high enough so they don't want them passing misinformation.

Consequently, the class/subject teachers assume a “know-it-all stance” and the orientation phase is organised by them to “break in” the student teachers and teach them the “ropes” on how, from their perspective, the English Language as a subject should be taught. (see Section 5.3.1.1). Given their sense of insecurity, most of the student teachers regard the class/subject teachers as lifelines, pillars of support to which they (the student teachers) cling for advice and guidance during the teaching practice exercise. They, thus, seek to learn from the class/subject teachers what they have not learnt in the classrooms of the Colleges of Education.

Although greatly underplayed and in some cases completely unacknowledged (Ong’ondo and Borg, 2011:516), the role of the class/subject teachers have metamorphosed to that of the middleman in the training of the student teachers in the English Language teacher education programme. This is because of the multiple roles which they assume during the teaching practice exercise. These include their roles as mentors, overseers, and their assumption of the “know-it-all” stance as they become a source of reference to be consulted by the student teachers (see Sections 5.3.1.1. and 5.4.2.3). The input of the subject/class teachers as middlemen in the English Language teacher education programme remains largely unrecognised as is reflected in the dissatisfaction of the cooperating teachers in the study conducted by Ong’ondo and Borg (2011) in the Kenyan context.
The role of mentoring is handed over to the class/subject teachers who in most cases as indicated in the findings of this evaluation research, lack the required expertise and are untrained for the crucial task and roles of mentors and overseers (see Sections 5.3.1.1 and 5.4.2.3). As shown in the study conducted by Ong’ondo and Borg (2011), it is the teacher educators who are required to act as mentors to the student teachers, although according to the findings, this is not done to a satisfactory level. Their study shows a contrast to what obtains within the (Nigerian) context under study. In the Nigerian context, the supervisors have no established rapport with the student teachers, their visits are restricted to just two during the entire twelve week teaching practice exercise as opposed to the four done (instead of the recommended six) in the Kenyan context.

Regardless of this, it is important to state here that the class/subject teachers become the middlemen as they step in to fill the gulf created in the training of the student teachers during the practicum. Their role in the training of the student teachers in the English Language teacher education programme can be said to be taken for granted. This is because in spite of the impact/ influence of the class/subject teachers on the teaching practices of the student teachers, not much attention is paid to this unique middleman niche carved out by the class/subject teachers. Findings in this current research show that the student teachers can be influenced by positive or negative teaching practices depending on the experience and qualification of the class/subject teachers to whom the student teachers are attached. This is equally seen in the findings of Rozelle and Wilson (2012:1201) which show the co-operating science teachers
producing “carbon copies” of themselves as their respective student teachers copied/imitated their teaching practices. A major difference as shown in the findings between this current research and that of Rozelle and Wilson (2012), however, is that the co-operating teachers who worked with the student teachers as indicated in their findings are trained and are specialised in their field of science teaching.

The situation as described in the findings of this current evaluation research is different not only in the aspect of the subject concerned, which is the English Language and not Science, but also because the findings in this present study show that some of the student teachers in this evaluation research are assigned to and mentored by class teachers who are not specialists/professionals in the teaching of the English Language. As stated by Yavuz (2011:44) mentors should be specialist in the subject with good teaching experience and equally brilliant pedagogical skills. Regrettably, however, the findings in the context under study show differently (see Sections 4.3.2.4 and 5.4.2.3). This makes the middleman issue a crucial one and the middleman, the weakest link in the chain of the programme design.

6.4. CONTRIBUTION TO THEORY AND PRACTICE

As rightly noted by Coskun and Daloglu (2010:24) the literature on the evaluation of language teacher education programmes is limited in the area of the production of evaluation models specifically designed for pre-service English Language teacher education programmes. Having reviewed the relevant literature, examined other evaluation models and taking into
consideration the researcher’s philosophical stance, context of the research and research methodology (see Sections 2.4, 3.3 and 3.4), an evaluation model is developed based on the findings of this evaluation research. This agrees with the belief of Kiely and Rea-Dickens (2005:16) of evaluation practice as a context for theory building. The research findings thus show the development of a formative evaluation model specifically designed for the evaluation for pre-service English Language teacher education programmes in second language contexts. This is illustrated in the diagram below:

Figure 6.1: 2-in-1 Evaluation Model

The research proposes the 2-in-1 evaluation model for the evaluation of pre-service English Language teacher education programme in second language contexts in particular. The model adopts a two-in-one approach as it not only evaluates the programme, it also takes into cognizance the needs of the
programme users. Using the data collection tools adopted in the evaluation process (see Section 3.4), it obliterates the need to conduct a separate needs analysis - as observed in the use of the CIPP model (Lynch, 1996) - as this occurs simultaneously with the evaluation process itself.

The 2-in-1 evaluation model examines the translation of programme objectives into practice by teacher educators/lecturers and a reflection of the same objectives in the practices of the students in the programme. The model equally focuses on how the regulatory body of the programme and the management of a given institution, through their own practice, implement the programme’s objectives and policies. It also examines the resultant effect/influence this has on the translation of the programme objectives as expressed by the teacher educators/lecturers and reflected by the students in the programme. In doing this, the model takes into consideration the programme policies and its management within the context of study, an area identified by Kiely and Rea-Dickens (2005:64) as one in which research is noticeably missing.

The 2-in-1 evaluation model is an objective based model, with practice as its central focus. The programme objectives are critically analysed in relation to practice. This shows a major difference from the model developed by Peacock (2009). The model involves the major stakeholders in the programme – the primary users (students and lecturers) and the secondary users (regulatory body/ management) of the programme. The model, thus, creates avenues for their voices to be heard (see Figure 6.1). Coskun and Daloglu (2010:39) in their evaluation, describe the evaluation design of Peacock’s model as having a
weakness in that the research tools used reflect only the perspectives of the programme users as there was no observation to match said practices to actual practices. With the emphasis on practice in this model, this weakness is removed.

As stated by Kiely (2009:103) the focus on practicality not only establishes the quality of a programme, but it also serves as a guarantee for the stakeholders as well as prospective students. This is not to say that the curriculum of the programme is left in isolation. The curriculum is developed based on the objectives and the implementation of the curriculum is examined through the translation of the objectives in the classrooms and the actions of the regulatory body and management of the institutions to promote the objectives through the given curriculum.

The involvement of the teacher educators/lecturers in the evaluation model not only encourages them to own and participate in the evaluation programme as recommended by Peacock (2009:235), but the whole evaluation task becomes less cumbersome and easy to manage. It equally helps to sharpen and improve the expertise of the lecturers in evaluation practice (O'Sullivan and O'Sullivan, 1998:22). In this regard, the 2-in-1 evaluation model aids in the promotion of prompt, regular internal evaluation of individual language teacher education programmes (Peacock, 2009:262). This again is contrary to the design of O’Sullivan and O’Sullivan (1998) as their evaluation model emphasises the use of networking from similar programmes for the creation of a pool of expertise.
Given that the central focus of the model is on practice, the evaluation model allows for both purely qualitative and mixed methods to be used for the collection of data in the evaluation process. Unlike other objective based evaluation models, this model does not necessarily seek to establish the success/failure of programmes based on the achievement/ non-achievement of programme objectives. Rather, it creates a lens through which to view and examine how the different processes of the programme function. Building on the belief of Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007:24) that theories are developed based on selected variables that are of interest to the researcher (see Section 2.3), the researcher, as indicated in the above diagram is interested in evaluating the objectives of the programme in relation to actual practice.

In line with the concern raised by Norris (2009:8) on the apparent lack of literature showing “thorough going” evaluative procedures, a brief description of the evaluation procedure used in this research is outlined below:

- Identify the aims for the evaluation
- Formulate questions based on the aims
- Design the research tools using the formulated questions as a strong reference point
- Using practice as a focal point, critically analyse the objectives of the programme, examine the translation of the objectives by the teacher educators/lecturers in the classrooms and examine the reflection of the same objectives in the practices of the students.
- Examine how the programme’s regulatory body/ management of the institution, through their actions, implement the programme and the effect this has on the practices of both the lecturers and students in the programme.
From the outlined procedures above, it is clear that with the use of the 2-in-1 evaluation model there is great focus on the how question, hence the mixed method and pure qualitative approach are recommended as suitable research methods for use with this model. The 2-in-1 evaluation model not only allows for the identification of the needs of the students in the programme, but also for the identified needs to be examined in relation to the level of preparation of the students to function and encounter challenges within their own context (Bartolome, 1994:179).

In addition to its theoretical contribution, the study also makes contribution to policy and practice. As illustrated in Section 6.3.1 one of the emerging findings of the study is autonomy. Although the literature on autonomy is quite vast, there is, however, still a gap in the literature on institutional autonomy in English Language teacher education programmes. As indicated in the findings of this research, it is seen in almost every section of the programme and has a great effect on the programme design and its implementation. Contrary to available literature, the research findings show that although teacher autonomy and learner autonomy are said to be interlinked (Adamson and Sert, 2012:24), the presence of one does not necessarily mean and guarantee the presence of the other.

The research also uncovers an important aspect of the programme design, the middleman as the weakest link in the programme design. The study highlights an important niche carved out by the subject/class teachers for themselves in the programme design, although unacknowledged by the institutions. This is
illustrated in the overlapping role played by the subject/class teachers as middlemen in the programme and their influence on the student teachers (see Section 6.3.2). This unrecognised power in the hands of the middlemen allows them to wield great influence over the student teachers and they are thus able to promote or inhibit the achievement of the programme objectives. As such, they can be said to have the ability to make or break the programme. This is because depending on the kind of influence, whether positive or negative, they are able to help student teachers improve on what they have learnt in the classrooms during their training, match theory to practice or completely undo the supposedly good work already achieved. In spite of the amount of control they exercise over the programme, the findings of the research, however, show that this aspect of the programme is not evaluated during accreditation exercises conducted by the NCCE. The middleman issue is thus one that is crucial to the English Language teacher education programme, but yet it remains one that has not been adequately addressed in the literature.

6.5. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The research, although interesting, had its fair share of challenges. One major problem encountered in the study was getting the lecturers involved in the study. As explained in Section 3.4.6.3, not all the lecturers in the programme were comfortable with having their classes observed. This perhaps had to do with their own sense of vulnerability, fear of having their teaching practices and competence judged and not wanting their weaknesses identified or seen by others. Some of the lecturers viewed the whole exercise with great suspicion.
They regarded it as some form of secret assessment of their practices in the classrooms for the management of the institution.

Not all the lecturers teaching language based courses in both Colleges of Education were involved in the study. The researcher initially intended to involve only six lecturers, three from each College of Education involved in the study. However, as previously discussed in Section 3.4.6.3, only five lecturers teaching language courses eventually participated in the study. There were three lecturers from College of Education A and only two lecturers from College of Education B. The number of lecturers who participated in the research should have been more as this may have provided further insights into the programme under evaluation as their own interpretations of the programme objectives as well as their teaching practices would also have been examined and taken into account in the data provided.

Despite granting the researcher the permission for access (see Appendix F for Permission for Access Letters), the management of both institutions involved in the study still viewed the research with a measure of mistrust. Although the researcher was allowed to observe classes and interview the lecturers, she was not given access to all the relevant documents in the programme. For example, the NCCE Accreditation Reports in both Colleges of Education were withheld. The researcher, in one of the Colleges of Education was, however, given the next best thing, which is a mock accreditation report. She was also given a copy of the accreditation form which allowed her to get an overview of what the accreditation exercise entailed.
In contrast to the number of language based courses on Table 4.2, only five courses as illustrated on Table 4.3 were directly involved in the study with their classes observed as lecturers taught students in the classrooms of both Colleges of Education. These courses namely are as follows:  
ENG 112 – Introduction to Phonetics and Phonology  
ENG 114 - Basic Grammar  
ENG 211 – Structure of English  
ENG 214 - Phonetics and Phonology  
ENG 313 – Applied English Linguistics II  

In other words, as seen from Table 4.2, not all the classes on the language-based courses were observed. This again can be attributed to the reluctance of lecturers to participate in the study and to the fact that some of the language-based courses are essentially second semester courses and as the data collection was done in the first semester, not all the classes could be observed. One of such courses affected is the ENG 123 – English Methods course. Being a second semester course, the class was not observed. The researcher was unable to observe and determine first-hand how the student teachers are taught to teach the English Language as a subject in the primary and secondary schools, and the teaching practices of the lecturers. Consequently, the data collected on this aspect was based only on the information provided from the student teachers’ interviews and the observation of their classes in the primary schools.
Locating student teachers who would be interested in participating in the research was also an issue. This is because they were already in their respective placement schools in different towns. The researcher had to get their contacts from the lecturers in the department and then went round some of the placement schools in search of those who might be interested in taking part in the study.

Being a member of one of the Colleges of Education under study, a huge problem encountered by the researcher was on how to distance herself from the research and not to bring her own judgement into it. It was quite a struggle to remain quiet and not to critique or advise student teachers in areas where they were obviously wrong, especially at the point where some of them gave or taught the wrong information to the pupils.

The main participants in this research have been the lecturers and the student teachers. Nevertheless, the middlemen - the class/subject teachers - could have been involved in the study to give a more balanced view not only on the programme itself but on the performance and needs of the student teachers. The examination of the NCCE and College documents indirectly provide a voice for the regulatory body/management of the institutions as their views are represented in the documents and other records. There is, however, no doubt that their direct involvement in the research would have provided a more detailed and in-depth view of the programme under study.
The research participants included both male and female lecturers and student teachers. This being the case, gender could have been used as one of the research variables. This would have shown a different perspective in relation to the classroom teaching practices of the research participants.

As seen from the preceding discussion, the limitations of the research may have had some form of effect on this evaluation research. An even richer and perhaps more diverse perspective of the programme might have been reflected in the findings of the research. However, as with all research, this creates grounds for recommendations for further research.

6.6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

In-spite of the limitations discussed above, this research has uncovered a number of very interesting findings that would require further studies. In this research, the main English Language programme consists of two major components, the language and literary components. However, being a teacher education programme, students are required to take major courses from both education and the Department of General Studies (GSE). Some of these other components of the English Language teacher education programme in both Colleges of Education have not been examined in this study as the researcher’s interest has been on only the language component of this programme. Further research in this area can be extended to include all four major components.

The gap in language evaluation literature suggests that most evaluation research on language teacher education programmes focus mainly on the
English Language component of the programme (see Peacock, 2009, Coskun and Daloglu, 2010 and Salioglu, 2012). Not much consideration is given to the other components of the programme which make the English Language teacher education programme a complete whole. Research in this area can be used to examine how the different components work and complement each other in the achievement of the programme objectives and the effect this has on the eventual preparation of the students in the programme as teachers of the English Language within a second language context.

The 2-in-1 evaluation model is developed based on the findings and methodology of this evaluation research. Although the model is designed specifically for the evaluation of an English Language teacher education programme within a second language context, this does not necessarily restrict its use to only this context or programme. The model, as seen from the diagram and the description on the procedure in Section 6.4, can be used to evaluate any teacher education programme regardless of its context. Further studies in this area can be done to test the 2-in-1 evaluation model.

The middleman issue is identified in this work as one in which there is still much room for research. It is seen as the weakest link in the programme design. An evaluation research can be done in this area to examine the middleman issue and how it affects/changes the English Language teacher education programme design. This is particularly important as most evaluation programmes on English Language teacher education programmes tend to focus on the immediate programme within the institutional contexts, failing to pay much attention to the
practical placement schools which as seen in the findings of this research form a crucial part of the programme design.

Institutional autonomy and its effect on the teaching practices of lecturers and student teachers in language teacher education programmes in different contexts is also an area worth further scrutiny. One of the findings of this research is the lack of concurrent development and the presence of teacher autonomy with an obvious absence of learner autonomy in the English Language teacher education classroom. This gap, as stated in Section 6.3.1, is yet to be addressed as it evidently shows contradiction to available literature (see Adamson and Sert, 2012; Jimenez, 2009 and Smith, 2003). Research in this area is necessary and can be directed at the exploration of why the situation is as described (see Section 6.3.1).

As discussed in Section 6.5, since the research involved both male and female research participants, further studies can be done by using gender as a variable and re-analysing the data to explore its implications on the teaching practices of the research participants.

As the focus of this evaluation research is an English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level, the research would be incomplete without some recommendation for the NCCE as the regulatory body for all NCE programmes in Nigeria. Therefore, in order to improve the current programme as well as other NCE programmes and in line with the recommendation
discussed above, with particular reference to the concerns raised on the middleman issue and institutional autonomy, the NCCE can:

a) engage in further investigations into the implementation methods/patterns of the different NCE programmes in Colleges of Education so as to explore and identify means of harmonising institutional autonomy for a positive implementation of the NCE programmes geared also towards the achievement of stated programme goals.

b) explore how better collaborative relations can be formed between the Colleges of Education and placement schools. Research can also be carried out on how best to accredit/ assess as well as support such placement schools and their teachers (as subject specialists) in the provision of the required maximum learning and teaching experience for the student teachers during the practical teaching exercise.

6.7. CONCLUSION

This research has focused on the evaluation of an English Language teacher education programme in two Colleges of Education in Nigeria. In carrying out the evaluation, the researcher utilises a qualitative research design, with document analysis, interview and observation as the main research tools. The analysis is done with the utilisation of thematic analysis. A number of themes are identified and used to provide answers to the research questions.

The research through its findings makes contributions to both theory and practice. It proposes the 2-in-1 evaluation model, which is centred on practice, for the evaluation of English Language teacher education programmes. The 2-
in-1 model is an objective based model which also analyses the needs of the programme users simultaneously with the evaluation process by utilising the same research tools. Using practice as a lens, the model examines how the different aspects of the programme function.

The research identifies the middleman as the weakest link in the English Language teacher education programme design. The middleman issue and institutional autonomy are, thus, identified as crucial issues affecting practice in Language teacher education (LTE). The study also makes recommendations for further study to allow for a further exploration of some of the issues unravelled in the findings.
REFERENCES


Afe, J.O (2006) “Reflections on Becoming a Teacher and the Challenges of Teacher Education” Inaugral Lecture Series 64 University of Benin


Zanting, A., Verloop and N. Vermunt, J.D. (2001) “Student Teachers Eliciting Mentors’ Practical Knowledge and Comparing it to their Own Beliefs” Teaching and Teacher Education Vol. 17, pp. 725-740
APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Interview Schedule for Lecturers

General Questions:

1) Please tell me what you think about the NCE Programme as it pertains to the teaching of English.
2) Tell me about the strong and weak points of the programme.
3) Please explain the objectives of the programme.
4) Describe how you integrate these objectives with your teaching practices.
5) Tell me about the courses you teach.
6) Please describe some of the challenges you encounter while teaching the students.
7) Tell me about the TP supervision and the performance of some of the students you supervised.

Interview Schedule for Student Teachers

Tell me about your TP experience

Describe some of the difficulties you have experienced.

Explain how you have coped with some of the difficulties encountered.

Relate your training in College of Education classrooms to what you have actually experienced during this TP exercise.

Tell me about your TP supervision and how you think you performed.
APPENDIX B

Observation Schedule – College of Education

Familiarise myself with the school setting. Move around; interact with some teaching and non-teaching staff as well as a few students.

Observe actual learning experience of students

Identify lecturers’ individual translations and interpretations and promotion of the English Language teacher education programme through their presentation/teaching of their lessons, interaction with students and reaction to students’ responses/reaction.

Observe interaction amongst students during lessons.

Observation Schedule- Primary Schools

Familiarise myself with the school routine. Interact with the School Head and student teachers interested in participating in the study.

Observe the morning assembly to get a “feel” of how they start their day.

Check for the achievement of Programme’s objectives through student teachers’ teaching in class.

Identify current teaching needs of student teachers and lapses in training.
MOCK/INTERNAL ACCREDITATION

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

PROGRAMME: ENGLISH

DATE OF VISIT: 10/11/11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE LEVEL</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Student File. (Yr 1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>Highly Available</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Available</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>List of students (indicating sex)</td>
<td>Highly Available</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Available</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Students Continuous Assessment</td>
<td>Highly Available</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Available</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Marking Scheme</td>
<td>Detailed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not detailed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Past Questions (for 3 Years)</td>
<td>Good quality</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Students Project (Title)</td>
<td>Very Appropriate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>External Moderator. (Provide Curriculum Vitae). Moderator not more than 4 years</td>
<td>Strong Evidence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair Evidence</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little Evidence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Quality of External Assessment</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Academic Staff List (with qualification, Ranks &amp; Years of Teaching Experiences)</td>
<td>Highly qualified</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly qualified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Support/Non-Teaching staff List.</td>
<td>Very Adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Development Scheme for Academic/Non Teaching staff with Dates (i.e. Conferences, workshop, seminar and higher)</td>
<td>Highly adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Laboratories/Resources Centres/Studios/Equipment are available and are adequately equipped. (Provide list of Equipment)</td>
<td>To a large extent To a fair extent To a little extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Laboratories/Resources Centres/Studios/Equipment are optimally utilized.</td>
<td>Well utilized Fairly utilized Not utilized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Safety Equipment (fire extinguisher, sand buckets, first aid Boxes) should be functional</td>
<td>Highly Functional Fairly Functional Not Functional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Copies of the section of your department curriculum from the NCCE minimum standard.</td>
<td>50 copies 30 copies 10 copies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Student's Attendance Register at lectures. (for 3 Years)</td>
<td>Highly Available Available Fairly Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>HOD'S office, is it in conformity with NCCE guideline?</td>
<td>Very Adequate Adequate Fairly Adequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>HOD'S, Possession of minimum of Master's degree and should not be less than a senior Lecturer.</td>
<td>Highly qualified Qualified Fairly qualified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Acculturation/SWISS/Excursion/Field trip/Teaching Practice (Know the duration of T.P &amp; SWISS) (keep records)</td>
<td>Highly available Available Fairly available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Departmental Library. Is it well stocked with relevant and current textbooks, journals and Periodicals?</td>
<td>Highly Adequate Adequate Fairly Adequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Documents/Materials for Quality Control Unit (QCU)</td>
<td>Available Fairly available Not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GENERAL INFORMATION

Name of Institution: 
Programme seeking Accreditation: 
Nature of the Programme (Single or Double Major): 
Dates of Accreditation: From To 

(Asessor's Rating should be backed up with documented pieces of evidences)

### SECTION I: Organization and Management of the Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE LEVELS</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There is a clear statement of the vision and mission which reflects the teacher education goals and objectives.</td>
<td>Very Clear, Clear, Fairly Clear, Not Clear</td>
<td>3, 2, 1, 0</td>
<td>Refer to NPE, MDGs and NPTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The vision and mission are compatible with the national, regional and global expectations</td>
<td>Very Clear, Clear, Fairly Clear, Not Clear</td>
<td>3, 2, 1, 0</td>
<td>Refer to NPE &amp; MDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The institution has a Functional Quality Assurance Unit (QAU).</td>
<td>Functional, Fairly Functional, Not Functional, No evidence</td>
<td>3, 2, 1, 0</td>
<td>Visit the QAU and assess facilities and activities including assessment tools and framework that QAU uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is evidence of prompt implementation of internal quality assurance feedback</td>
<td>Implemented To a large extent, Fairly implemented to a fair extent, Not implemented to a little extent, No evidence</td>
<td>3, 2, 1, 0</td>
<td>Visit the QAU, assess facilities and activities and examine records of implementation of monitoring reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Institution has a clear process for staff recruitment.</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Institution has a clearly defined remuneration, and reward system for both staff and students</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There is evidence of students' active involvement in decision-making process in the institution</td>
<td>Actively involved</td>
<td>Fairly involved</td>
<td>Barely involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Quality of institutional leadership (Academic): Provost: Possession of higher degrees, professional qualifications and registration with a professional body. Must have a cognate experience of 15 years as stipulated in NCCE guideline.</td>
<td>Highly qualified</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>Fairly qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Quality of institutional leadership (Academic): Deputy Provost: Qualifications same as that of the provost. Must also have taught in tertiary institution for not less than 10 years cognate experience</td>
<td>Highly qualified</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>Fairly qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quality of institutional leadership (Academic): Dean: Possession of minimum of Masters' Degree, Professional Qualifications and should not be less than a Principal lecturer</td>
<td>Highly qualified</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>Fairly qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of institutional leadership (Academic): <strong>Head of Department.</strong> Possession of minimum of Masters' Degree, Professional Qualifications and should not be less than a Senior Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examine CVs, credentials and APER records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Registrar.</strong> Possession of minimum of First degree, registration with a professional body and must have at least 10 years cognate experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examine CVs, credentials and APER records for the last three sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bursar.</strong> Possession of at least First Degree, registration with a professional body and must have at least 10 years cognate experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check personal files - examine CVs, credentials and APER records for the last three sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Librarian.</strong> Possession of at least Masters' Degree, professional qualifications and must have at least 10 years cognate experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check personal files - examine CVs, credentials and APER records for the last three sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>There is gender sensitivity in Management membership.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflects NCCE stipulated ratio to a large extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check relevant documents and files (30:70 ratio) for evidence of specific gender concerns for the last three sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>There is gender sensitivity in Academic Staff.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflects NCCE stipulated ratio to a large extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check relevant documents and files (30:70 ratio) for evidence of specific gender concerns for the last three sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>There is gender sensitivity in non-academic Staffing</td>
<td>Reflects NCCE stipulated ratio</td>
<td>Check relevant documents and files (30:70 ratio) for evidence of specific gender concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>There is gender sensitivity in Student population.</td>
<td>Reflects NCCE stipulated ratio</td>
<td>Check relevant documents and files (30:70 ratio) for evidence of easy access of females into science &amp; technology based courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The institution has adequate financial resources to run the programme.</td>
<td>Very adequate (₦1 million and above per student per annum)</td>
<td>Go through relevant financial books and documents and related funding to student population. Ask for institution budget provision for the last three sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate (₦750,000-Less than ₦1 million per student per annum)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly adequate (₦500,000- Less than ₦750,000 per student per annum)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence (Less than ₦500,000 per student per annum)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The fee structure for the programme is stated with least unexpected add-on expenditure to be incurred by the students</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>Check relevant documents and files and interview students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The sources of income for the programme in particular and the institution in general are stated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 21 | To a large extent 3  
To a fair extent 2  
To a little extent 1  
No evidence 0 | check relevant documents and files and interview students and relevant institutional leaders |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The income and expenditure of the institution are subjected to regular internal auditing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 22 | To a large extent 3  
To a fair extent 2  
To a little extent 1  
No evidence 0 | Request for internal auditors' reports for the last three sessions |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The income and expenditure of the institution are subjected to regular external auditing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 23 | To a large extent 3  
To a fair extent 2  
To a little extent 1  
No evidence 0 | Request for external auditors' reports for the last three sessions |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In the management of the programme, including budgeting the institution adopts a participatory approach involving all the staff (e.g. Congregation, Academic Board, etc.).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 24 | Fully involve 2  
Fairly involve 1  
Not involve 0 | Check the Academic Calendar and go through other relevant documents and files. Also interview non-Management Staff |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>There is regular performance appraisal by colleagues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25 | Regular 2  
Fairly Regular 1  
Not Regular 0 | Check relevant documents and files and interview management and non-management staff |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>There is regular performance appraisal by students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 26 | Regular 2  
Fairly Regular 1  
Not Regular 0 | Check relevant documents and files and interview management and non-management staff |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relevant statutes are available</th>
<th></th>
<th>Request for relevant document (Law)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (Law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (Law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The Governing Council is properly constituted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (Law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properly Constituted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (Law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly constituted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (Law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Constituted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (Law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Council Meetings are regularly held</td>
<td></td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (See college law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (See college law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Regular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (See college law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Regular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (See college law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Council Committees are properly constituted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (See college law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properly constituted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (See college law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly constituted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (See college law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not constituted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents (See college law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Academic Board Meetings are Regular</td>
<td></td>
<td>Go through relevant documents / minute of the meeting for the last 3 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents / minute of the meeting for the last 3 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Regular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents / minute of the meeting for the last 3 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Regular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Go through relevant documents / minute of the meeting for the last 3 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Teaching/Non-teaching staff ratio in line with NCCE guideline</td>
<td></td>
<td>See NCCE Ratio for Teaching/Non-Teaching Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally in line with NCCE stipulated ratio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>See NCCE Ratio for Teaching/Non-Teaching Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly in line with NCCE stipulated ratio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>See NCCE Ratio for Teaching/Non-Teaching Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not in line with NCCE stipulated ratio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>See NCCE Ratio for Teaching/Non-Teaching Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The institution has qualified academic staff in terms of Qualifications and staff/students' ratio per programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>Request for staff list &amp; staff files and sample not less than 20% of the files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% possess Master’s Degree and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Request for staff list profiles and staff files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 75% possess Master's Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Request for staff list profiles and staff files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 50% possess Master's Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Request for staff list profiles and staff files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The institution has Quality Academic Staff in terms of Ranks: 25% Principal and chief lecturers 50% Lecturers 1 to Senior Lecturers 25% Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>Request for staff list profiles and staff files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff mix reflected NCCE stipulated guidelines: To a large extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Request for staff list profiles and staff files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Request for staff list profiles and staff files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Request for staff list profiles and staff files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/N</td>
<td>ITEMS</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE LEVELS</td>
<td>SCORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The discipline of staff follows (well-publicized) laid down procedures</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The discipline of students follow (well-publicized) laid-down procedures</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>There is evidence of proper budget preparation for both capital and recurrent expenditure in the institution</td>
<td>Strong Evidence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair Evidence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Evidence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION II: Curriculum Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE LEVELS</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Learning activities are designed to accommodate emergent global issues such as gender sensitivity, social equality, peace and conflict resolution, etc.</td>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Check for innovations in the course offering to reflect the global issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ask for lectures' Notes preparation and sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>The institution has a democratic practice of time allocation through a process of deliberations.</td>
<td>Very Democratic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Refer to Documents of Space and Time-Table Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Democratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Democratic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>The implementation of the NCCE Minimum Standards is in such a way that it has adequate input in terms of theory, practical, field trips and co-curricular activities</td>
<td>Very Adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interview students and lecturers. Check lectures and students' notes, exam question papers, marking scheme and scripts. Samples of students portfolio, answer scripts &amp; marking scheme, reports on field trips and co-curricular activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Adequate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Preparation for practice teaching is provided through various in-house hands-on experiences including micro-teaching.</td>
<td>Very Adequate Provision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate Provision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Adequate Provision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate Provision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>The student work experiences (teaching practice and SIWES) are well organized and supervised as stipulated in NCCE guideline.</td>
<td>Very Adequately organized and supervised</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequately organized and supervised</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly organized and supervised</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequately organized and supervised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Acculturation/Excursion/Educational visit are implemented in line with NCCE guideline.</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>The school-based experiences are comprehensive to include exposure not only to the instructional role of teachers but also their other roles and functions.</td>
<td>Very Comprehensive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Comprehensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Comprehensive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Teachers serve as professional models and mentors for their students</td>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>There are enough copies of NERDC National curriculum on the programme and NCE Minimum Standards in the departments.</td>
<td>30 copies and above available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-29 copies available</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-19 copies available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturers refer to NERDC National Curriculum in their role facilitators of learning and students have access to the document for their actual Teaching Practice experiences and Methods’ class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturers do it and students have access</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturers do not refer to it but students have access</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturers do not refer to it but students have no access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturers do not refer to it and students have no access</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Request for copies from HOD and interview the students. Ask for lecturer Notes on the programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Records kept by teachers show that learning experiences available to trainees are followed by feedback, reflection and follow-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Check Continuous Assessment (C.A) scripts and interview students and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>The institution employs the services of external examiners for Teaching Practice assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appoint one each for all the programmes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appoint one each for a school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appoint one for the colleges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No external assessment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Check records from the TP coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lecturers take students’ attendance at lectures and enforce it strictly before admitting students into examinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly regular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Check lecturers’ attendance register and the HOD records and interview Exams Invigilators for the last three session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>There exist adequate evidence of continuous assessment as a process of evaluating the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Adequate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Check students’ C.A scripts and score sheets from Head of Department (HOD). Also interview students and check the reports in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>The evaluation protocol used by the institution for the programme is comprehensive in its coverage of objectives in terms of the three domains of learning.</td>
<td>Very Comprehensive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Comprehensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Comprehensive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>The examination system provides for adequate redress in case of alleged unfairness and non-transparency</td>
<td>Very Adequate Provision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate Provision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Adequate Provision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate Provision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>There is evidence of quality of examination questions in terms of standard and coverage of content.</td>
<td>Very high quality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High quality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair quality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>There is evidence of fairness and consistency in scoring of students’ scripts.</td>
<td>Very strong evidence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Evidence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair evidence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak evidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>The institution employs Information and Communication Technology (ICT) extensively in developing test item bank</td>
<td>Very extensive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly extensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>The institution employs ICT extensively in display of students’ results at the end of each academic year.</td>
<td>Very extensive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly extensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OAI.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>The institution employs ICT extensively in computation of results.</td>
<td>Very extensive&lt;br&gt;Extensive&lt;br&gt;Fairly extensive&lt;br&gt;Not at all</td>
<td>3&lt;br&gt;2&lt;br&gt;1&lt;br&gt;0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>The institution employs ICT extensively in storage and retrieval of results</td>
<td>Very extensive&lt;br&gt;Extensive&lt;br&gt;Fairly extensive&lt;br&gt;Not at all</td>
<td>3&lt;br&gt;2&lt;br&gt;1&lt;br&gt;0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Teachers provide a variety of learning experiences including individual and collaborative learning experiences</td>
<td>Adequate Provision&lt;br&gt;Adequate Provision&lt;br&gt;Fair Provision&lt;br&gt;No Provision</td>
<td>3&lt;br&gt;2&lt;br&gt;1&lt;br&gt;0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>The institution Lecturers refer to current NCE Minimum Standards and further break them into scheme of work and lesson plan</td>
<td>To a very large extent&lt;br&gt;To a large extent&lt;br&gt;To a fair extent&lt;br&gt;To a little extent</td>
<td>4&lt;br&gt;3&lt;br&gt;2&lt;br&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>The quality of the products of the programme is satisfactory in terms of expectation of the employers</td>
<td>Very satisfactory&lt;br&gt;Satisfactory&lt;br&gt;Fairly Satisfactory&lt;br&gt;Not satisfactory</td>
<td>3&lt;br&gt;2&lt;br&gt;1&lt;br&gt;0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>The institution has comprehensive feedback system in place through which relevant data are collected and collated e.g. through the Alumni Association</td>
<td>Very Comprehensive&lt;br&gt;Comprehensive&lt;br&gt;Fairly Comprehensive&lt;br&gt;Not comprehensive</td>
<td>3&lt;br&gt;2&lt;br&gt;1&lt;br&gt;0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>The institution has an admission policy which is appropriate, clear, inclusive and widely publicized as stipulated in NCCE Minimum Standards</td>
<td>To a very large degree&lt;br&gt;To a large degree&lt;br&gt;To a fair degree&lt;br&gt;To a little degree</td>
<td>4&lt;br&gt;3&lt;br&gt;2&lt;br&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/N</td>
<td>ITEMS</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE LEVELS</td>
<td>SCORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>The institution adheres strictly to the defined admission criteria and admission procedures ensuring a fair and transparent admission process as stipulated in NCCE Minimum Standards.</td>
<td>90% of student sample and above admitted based on the criteria</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>The institution prepares an academic calendar reflecting all the activities of the programme every session on the basis of deliberations</td>
<td>Very regular</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly regular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not regular</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>The activities contained in the academic calendar are for adequately optimizing effective and coordinated use of available resources</td>
<td>Very adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Adequate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION III: Infrastructure and Learning Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE LEVELS</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Laboratories/ Studios/ Resource Centres are available and are adequately equipped as stipulated in NCCE Minimum Standards.</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visit the facilities and compare with the provision of NCE current Minimum Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Laboratories/ Studios/ Resource Rooms/ Workshops are Optimally utilized and in line with carrying capacity.</td>
<td>Well Utilized</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visit the facilities and assess the use and carrying capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Utilized</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Utilized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>The Institution has adequate infrastructure and facilities for social, cultural and leisure activities for the students, such as recreation centre, sporting facilities, etc. and adequately put into use.</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Principal Officers' offices - Provosts, Registrar, Bursar, Librarian and Director of work</td>
<td>Totally in line with NCCE guideline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Dean's Offices</td>
<td>Fairly in line with NCCE guideline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>H O D's Offices</td>
<td>Not in line with NCCE guideline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>The Lecture Rooms</td>
<td>Totally in line with NCCE guideline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>The Lecture Theatres are adequate and well furnished</td>
<td>Well furnished</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visit the relevant facilities to assess adequacy in terms of carrying capacity.
Visit the Offices and compare with NCCE Academic Guideline provisions.
Visit the Offices and compare with the provision in the current NCE Minimum Standards.
Visit the Offices and see current NCE Minimum Standards.
Assess the lecture rooms and relate them to students' population and institutional carrying capacity.
Assess the lecture theatres and relate them to students' population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The institution’s library seating capacity is in line with NCCE guideline</th>
<th>Totally in line with Fairly in line with Not in line with</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Visit the library and relate it to students’ population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>The institution’s library’s furnishing is in line with NCCE guideline</td>
<td>Totally in line with Fairly in line with Not in line with</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visit the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>The library is well stocked with relevant and current textbooks, journals and periodicals in line with NCCE guideline</td>
<td>20 titles per student 10 titles per student 5-9 titles per student 1-4 titles per student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Check the library stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>The institution has in place virtual library for the use of the college</td>
<td>To a large extent To a fair extent To a little extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visit the virtual library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>The implementation of Library Book Development Policy is in line with NCCE guideline</td>
<td>To a large extent Fairly in line with Not in line with</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Check relevant financial records from the bursary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>The institution spends enough percentage of its yearly recurrent expenditure on the library</td>
<td>10% expenditure 5-9% expenditure 2.4% expenditure 0-1% expenditure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Check the financial records of the institution. Interview the librarian and collect photocopy of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>The library provides user services in line with NCCE guideline</td>
<td>10 - 14 services 5-9 services 2-4 services 0-1 services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Check the records and various sections of the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>The sections of the library is in accordance with NCCE guideline</td>
<td>9-12 Sections 5-8 Sections 2-4 Sections 0-1 Sections</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visit the library and inspect the various sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>The library’s bindery section is adequately equipped with binding equipments and consumables</td>
<td>Adequately equipped Fairly equipped Not equipped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Check the bindery section and inspect the binding equipments and consumables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/N</td>
<td>ITEMS</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE LEVELS</td>
<td>SCORES</td>
<td>INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>The institution has the practice of appraising its work through in-house research and innovative practices including Workshops/conferences and seminars</td>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Request for the relevant documents on action research and innovative practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a fair extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To a little extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>The institution has college and school journals published regularly</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Obtain copies of such journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly regular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not regular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>There is evidence of college-community relations</td>
<td>Strong Evidence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Request for evidence (college-community relations committee) and interview lecturers and students, community leaders and organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair Evidence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little Evidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>There is evidence of networking with LEA, SUBEB and MOE</td>
<td>Strong Evidence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Request for documents on evidence of collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair Evidence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little Evidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>There is evidence of a system of External moderation</td>
<td>Strong Evidence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Go through the external examiner’s reports for the past three sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair Evidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak Evidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Quality of external assessment</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Go through the external moderators’ reports for the past three sessions and judge the coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/N</td>
<td>ITEMS</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE LEVELS</td>
<td>SCORES</td>
<td>INDICATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Extent of implementation of external examiners' recommendations and suggestions by the department and Academic Board of the institution in the last three sessions.</td>
<td>Fairly Implemented</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Go through the external examiners' reports and find out from the HOD/staff about the extent of its implementation. Ask for Academic Board meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lowly implemented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Implemented</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>The titles and format of the students' projects are appropriate</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Check the titles and the format of the projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Appropriate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>The conception, methodology and findings of the students' projects are consistent with the results obtained.</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Read through selected students' project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly consistent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not consistent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION V: Student/Staff Support and Progression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE LEVELS</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Orientation given to fresh students about the institution and its programmes.</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Refer to Orientation documents and documentaries and also interview some students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Comprehensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Comprehensive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Adequate access of ICT facilities for staff</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visit the ICT facilities &amp; also interview staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Adequate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Adequate access of ICT facilities for students</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interview students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly Adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>The institution has opportunities for teaching staff development</td>
<td>Adequate opportunities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Check the relevant records &amp; collect list of lecturers that benefited in the last three sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly adequate opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>The institution has opportunities for non-teaching staff development</td>
<td>Adequate opportunities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Request for relevant documents &amp; collect list beneficiaries in the last three sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly adequate opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>There is evidence of students advisory system in the institution</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Request for duty/assignment schedules of lecturers and also interview students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>The institution has a functional Guidance and Counseling (G&amp;C) Unit</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visit the G &amp; C Unit &amp; assess facilities and operations. Check record for evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly functional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not functional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>The institution provides adequate enabling environment for students to form union and associations</td>
<td>Adequate opportunity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Check the provision of the students' book, visit students' Affairs office, interview students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair opportunity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate opportunity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No opportunity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>The institution supports the lecturers with adequate fund to produce hand-outs to students free of charge</td>
<td>Full support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interview the lecturers and the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partially support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SECTION VI: Amenities and Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE LEVELS</th>
<th>SCORES</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>The quality of the road leading to the institution is</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assess the quality in terms of being tarred/untarred, maintained/not maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>There is a good road network in the institution</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Go round the institution also assess the map of the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Adequate safety measures are provided and properly located within the institution (e.g. fire extinguishers, sand buckets, first aid boxes etc.)</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Confirm both availability and functionality of the devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not adequate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>The institution has a functional clinic that is adequate for staff and students population.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visit the Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly functional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not functional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>The institution is well landscaped</td>
<td>Landscaped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inspect the surrounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly landscaped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not landscaped</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>The institution is connected to the National Grid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Examine facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>The institution has adequate back-up facilities for electricity supply</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Examine facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not adequate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>The institution has a functional water supply system</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Examine facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly functional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not functional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>The institution has adequate and well maintained toilet facilities for staff and students.</td>
<td>Well maintained and adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inspect the facilities and interview staff and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly maintained and adequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poorly maintained but adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poorly maintained and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution has well maintained students hostel that are habitable</td>
<td>Well maintained and habitable</td>
<td>Fairly maintained and habitable</td>
<td>Poorly maintained and not habitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>KEY AREAS</th>
<th>MAXIMUM MARKS OBTAINABLE</th>
<th>MARKS OBTAINED</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Organization and Management</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Curriculum Implementation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Infrastructure and Learning Resources</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Research, Development and Extension</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Students/Staff Support and Progression</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Amenities and Environment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a programme to have Full Accreditation, it must score 70% and above in sections I and II, as well as 70% of the additions of sections III-VI.

### ACCREDITATION STATUS

Accreditation Status of a Programme depends on the mark obtained by the programme thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>MARK RANGE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>REMARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>70% and above</td>
<td>Full Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>60 – 69%</td>
<td>Interim Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Below 60%</td>
<td>Denied Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accreditation subject panelists should score the programme as stated and tick only one of the three options above.

### ACCREDITATION TEAM MEMBERS

(Every Accreditation subject panelist must sign this report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Address, GSM no and e-mail</th>
<th>Signatures and Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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APPENDIX D

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

TEACHING PRACTICE ASSESSMENT FORM
NOTES ON THE USE OF THIS FORM

1. This form is aimed at (a) standardizing the supervisor's evaluation of the student teachers' performance.
(b) Provide the College with a profile of a student teacher's academic and professional strength or weakness or both.
2. This form consists of six questions, which require the supervisor to rate on a scale shown on the maximum mark column.
3. Supervisors are expected to comment in the column provided in each question. This will guide or ensure appropriate correction and scoring of the student teachers.
4. The student teacher is expected to have the light-green copy of the complete assessment form. Scores, however, SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED. Scoring or ticking should be done by the supervisor thereafter.

NAME OF STUDENT______________________MAT NO______________________DEPT______________________

TEACHING PRACTICE SCHOOL______________________SUBJECT TAUGHT______________________TOPIC______________________

CLASS______________________DURATION______________________DATE______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MAX MARK</th>
<th>SCORE AWARDED</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Statement of objectives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Content (i) Logicality and Sequence (ii) Adequacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Adequacy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Introduction (Relevance)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Development of lesson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Mastery of subject matter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Use of chalkboard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Time management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Questioning technique</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(g) Effective use of instructional materials: (relevance) (adequacy) (variety)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(h) Class participation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Summary / Conclusion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>CLASS MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Class Control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Class Arrangement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Reaction and Reinforcement of pupils' responses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION SKILLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Clarity of Voice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Appropriate use of language</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Suitability of Assessment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Attainment of stated objectives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>TEACHER'S PERSONALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Neatness / Dressing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Comportment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) TOTAL SCORE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL COMMENT__________________________________________________________

NAME AND SIGNATURE ________________________________DATE______________________

OF SUPERVISOR
APPENDIX E

Eng.214-Class Activity 1a
1) law/raw; /l ɔː/; /lɛ/; /l/ & /r/ contrasted
2) ray/lay; /rei/, /lei/; /r/ & /l/ contrasted
3) river/liver; /rivə/; /livə/; /r/ & /l/ contrasted
4) climb/crime; /klaim/, /kraɪm/; /l/ & /r/ contrasted
5) glass/grass; /glaːs/, /graːs/; /l/ & /r/ contrasted

Eng.214-Class Activity 1b
Write out the words with the same sound in the middle:
1) bear 2) fair 3) foot 4) read 5) where 6) lead

Eng.214-Class Activity 1c
Instruction: Read out this dialogue to distinguish between the sounds.
A: Peter, do you like peas and cheese?
B: No, I prefer beans and meat. What about you, Mary?
C: I like peas and cheese, but I prefer beans and meat.
Eng.214-Class Activity 1d
Instruction: Write out the sounds that occur most frequently in these texts:

I- Father Francis fried five fresh fishes for five Fathers from France.

II- She sells sea shells at the sea shore.
   The shells she sells are sea shells.

III- Peter pipper picked a peck of pickled pepper
   If Peter pipper picked a peck of pickled pepper Where is the peck of pickled pepper Peter pipper picked?
Eng.214-Group Class Activity 3

Instructions:
a) Divide this text into syllables e.g. I met a tra-der who gave me a gra-der.
b) Mark the stressed syllable with a big O and the unstressed syllable with a small o e.g.
   I MET a TRA-der who GAVE me a GRA-der.
c) Write out the words that make minimal pairs e.g. tra-der/gra-der; /treidə/ /greidə/.
d) Write out the contrasting sounds e.g. /t/ & /g/
e) Recite this text with the correct pronunciation and stress.

TEXT 1

HUMPTY DUMPTY SAT ON A WALL
HUMPTY DUMPTY HAD A GREAT FALL
ALL THE KING’S HORSES AND ALL THE KING’S MEN
COULDN’T PUT HUMPTY TOGETHER AGAIN!
### Eng.214-Activity 5(Phonetic Bingo)-Group Homework

**Instruction:** Write the word that contains the sound in the column provided below it. You have been given a clue as to the type of word and an example of each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clue</th>
<th>/æ/</th>
<th>/ei/</th>
<th>/ʃ/</th>
<th>/ə/</th>
<th>/ɔː/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal e.g.</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>snake</td>
<td>shark</td>
<td>cheetah</td>
<td>horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective e.g.</td>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>crazy</td>
<td>shy</td>
<td>sober</td>
<td>awful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Drink e.g.</td>
<td>Sandwich</td>
<td>cake</td>
<td>fish</td>
<td>butter</td>
<td>prawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of the body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Provost,  
College of Education,  

Dear Sir,

PERMISSION FOR ACCESS TO YOUR COLLEGE
I am a PhD student at the University of Sunderland, Sunderland, United Kingdom and I wish to request for permission to include your College in an educational research. My area of research is centred basically on the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level. It is aimed at examining the programme, its policies and objectives and the impact on the teaching practices of student teachers in the programme. The research would require the participation of staff and students of the Department of English as it would involve the observation of classes and interviews. Please find attached copies of my Letters of Identification and Attendance from the University.

Sir, I would be grateful if my request is granted.

Yours faithfully,

Emarievbe Ejovi A.

Enclosures:
The Head..........., 
........................,
....................,
Dear Sir,

PERMISSION FOR ACCESS TO YOUR SCHOOL
I am a PhD student at the University of Sunderland, United Kingdom and I wish to request for permission to include your school in an educational research. My area of research is centred on the English Language teacher education programme at the NCE level. It is aimed at examining the programme, its policies and objectives and the impact on the teaching practices of student teachers of the programme. The research would require the participation of teaching staff, student teachers (teaching English Language) and pupils as it involves the observation of classes and interviews. Please find attached copies of my Letters of Identification and Attendance from the University.

I would be grateful if my request is granted.

Yours faithfully,

Emarievbe Ejovi A.

Enclosures:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/NO.</th>
<th>COURSE CODE</th>
<th>COURSE TITLE</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>LECTURER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PART ONE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Practical/Listening Skills</td>
<td>2E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Intro. To Phonetics and Phonology</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Basic Grammar</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PART TWO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>The Structure of English</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Applied English Linguistics i</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Phonetics and Phonology</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PART THREE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>Applied English Linguistics ii</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>Composition II</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOD: ENGLISH