

A Qualitative Observation Study of Primary and
Secondary Lessons Conducted by Teachers
Participating in English in Action

Medium-scale qualitative study 2b Practice
Report 1: Synopsis

RESEARCH REPORT

English in Action (EIA). (2011).

*A Qualitative Observation Study of Primary and Secondary Lessons
Conducted by Teachers Participating in English in Action
(Study 2b Practice), Report 1: Synopsis.*

Dhaka, Bangladesh: EIA.

For more information about English in Action, visit: <http://www.eiabd.com/eia/>

© English in Action, 2011

Published by English in Action (EIA) in Dhaka, Bangladesh

English in Action
House 1, Road 80, Gulshan 2
Dhaka-1212, Bangladesh.
Phone: 88-02 8822234
88-02 8822161
Fax: 88-02 8822663
Email: info@eiabd.com

A Qualitative Observation Study of Primary and Secondary Lessons Conducted by Teachers Participating in English in Action

Executive Summary - 2b Practice

The 2b Practice reports bring together evidence from a qualitative observation study of English language teaching (ELT) aspects in a sample of EIA lessons. The lessons analysed for this study were conducted by teachers who were participating in the pilot phase of the EIA intervention and had undergone English in Action (EIA) training for nine months. The purpose of the observations was to build on the first quantitative observation study of classrooms (Study 2a, see EIA 2011a), which established that a change had occurred in classrooms by showing the extent of the ELT aspects being used. As a qualitative study, the focus of the 2b Practice study was on *how* teachers were implementing approaches they had been learning through the EIA project. Note, the study's sample size means that the findings reported here cannot be taken as representative of all teachers participating in EIA.

Prior to the EIA intervention, most teaching 'did not encourage a communicative approach to learning English' (EIA 2009a, p. 7). Teachers dominated the lessons, doing almost all of the talking. In two-thirds of lessons observed, the majority of language spoken was Bangla, opportunities for students to participate were low, and very few students spoke in English during a lesson. In most classes students were 'not interactive at all' (EIA 2009a, p. 8).

The findings of this study (2b Practice) include evidence of some important changes emerging across a sizeable number of classrooms. The areas in which there has been the greatest degree of change are those where teachers remain very much in control (lesson structure, teacher-led activities and use of EIA materials). Nonetheless, there is evidence of more student-focused activities; some, notably pair and group work, are strongly represented. These relatively 'safe' strategies may be a stepping stone to other communicative practices for many teachers.

The EIA programme appears to be helping some teachers to give the learning of individual students a more prominent place. Instances of monitoring, checking understanding, dealing with errors and feedback all show a concern for student learning which reveals the underlying understanding that effective teaching is not simply a matter of transmitting the right information, but depends on interaction between student and teacher. It will certainly be important to support the development of this aspect of teachers' repertoire as the project develops.

At present, much interaction is at the level of teachers relating to whole classes, or to individuals within the class. However, in several episodes there is a progression to group and pair activities, both of which increase participation and give each student much greater experience of speaking English.

The motivating qualities of EIA resources are increasing participation. Students are listening attentively to spoken audio, and the levels of physical and vocal participation show that songs and rhymes are a popular feature. Teachers are using the resources in ways that promote meaningful use of language by providing both context and ways into interactive activities. Songs are one way in which EIA-endorsed

practices have become embedded in classroom routines, and the use of English in regular and predictable lesson structures shows English employed with communicative purpose. Teachers are not allowing what could be seen as 'ready-made' audio lessons to take control away from them.

Some elements of EIA are already widespread in use and are firmly embedded in the practice of many teachers, while others are being adopted more warily and selectively. This is to be expected. There can, however, be no doubt that EIA is making a difference to the teaching and learning in these classrooms.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary - 2b Practice	i
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 EIA logframe and relationship to other EIA studies	1
2. Methodology	3
3. Cross-case analysis	4
3.1 Introduction and methodology	4
3.2 Findings	4
3.2.1 <i>Using materials</i>	5
3.2.2 <i>Features of the structure of lessons</i>	5
3.2.3 <i>Teacher-led activity</i>	6
3.2.4 <i>Student-focused activity</i>	7
3.2.5 <i>Responding to learning</i>	8
3.3 Reflection on findings	9
4. Case studies	11
4.1 Introduction and methodology	11
4.2 Findings – case studies as a group	11
References	15
Acknowledgements	15
List of Tables	
Table 1 Overview of the case studies reported in Report 3	14

1. Introduction

The 2b Practice reports bring together evidence from a qualitative observation study of English language teaching (ELT) aspects in a sample of EIA lessons. The lessons analysed for this study were conducted by teachers who were participating in the pilot phase of the EIA intervention and had undergone English in Action (EIA) training for nine months. As a qualitative study, the focus of the 2b Practice study was on *how* teachers were implementing approaches they had been learning through the EIA project.

This report (2b Practice, Report 1 Synopsis) brings together the two other 2b Practice reports: Report 2: Cross-case analysis, and Report 3: Case studies; EIA 2011c). Together these report the nature of ELT aspects evident in a sample of lessons of teachers participating in the EIA project.

1.1 Background

The EIA baseline studies showed classrooms devoid of the use of English, little student activity or interaction, and consequently little chance for students to use English. The large-scale quantitative observation study of classrooms (Study 2a, see EIA 2011a), carried out after three months of the teachers being introduced to EIA approaches and materials, indicated a transformation in this situation. The study showed improved i) Student talk (mostly in English), with this brought about in part by the use of pair and group work; and ii) that teacher talk was in English. Although there were some differences between Primary and Secondary lessons observed, the changes were similar in both. In addition, the study of teacher and student perceptions of the teaching and learning of English (Study 2b3b Part 1, see EIA 2011d) showed there was a positive response to the ideas and activities of the EIA approach. The study also indicated that there were some areas where the project had yet to win over students, and, to a slightly lesser extent, teachers, in particular with regard to dealing with error correction, repetition and grammar.

This qualitative observation study intended to give the EIA project more information about both the kinds of activities observed in quantitative Study 2a, and the way in which the attitudes of students and teachers were evident in their classroom practices. Thus, the project needed to understand the *nature* of classroom activity and, in particular, what the English used by both students and teachers was focused on, whether or not students understood the teachers' use of English, what pair and group work involved, whether or not grammar was a focus of lessons, how errors were dealt with, and the nature of repetition.

1.2 EIA logframe and relationship to other EIA studies

The EIA Logframe specifies the requirements for the investigation of classroom practice via Indicator 2:

Indicator 2: Practice – the numbers of teachers evidencing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approaches in their classroom practice.

The Logframe also states, again through an examination of classroom practice, that evidence on English language competence is required through Indicator 3:

Indicator 3: EL Competence – the numbers of teachers and pupils with demonstrable competence in communicative English Language.

Both indicators apply to both Output 1 (Primary intervention) and Output 3 (Secondary intervention). Both of these require an investigation of the classrooms to reveal the way in which teachers and students' experience of English language teaching affects them and their use of English.

This qualitative observation study (2b Practice) adds to the evidence from the large-scale quantitative observation study (Study 2a, see EIA 2011a), by providing insight into *how* teachers' practices have changed as a result of EIA. It is also a direct follow-up to EIA Baseline Study 3 – *An observation study of English lessons in Primary and Secondary schools in Bangladesh* (EIA 2009a). The 2b Practice study reports changes in the *nature* of lessons as a result of teachers adopting project approaches.

2. Methodology

The 2b Practice study was qualitative and used direct observation, video recording, photographs and diagrams, and interviews. The findings reported focus was on the notes taken by observers during lessons; the other data sources and methods were used to substantiate these notes or add context.

The data was largely collected by researchers from the Institute of Education and Research (IER), University of Dhaka. The researchers adopted an independent stance and recorded as much classroom behaviour as possible, without forming a view of what they saw. The IER researchers observed 90 teachers (60 Primary and 30 Secondary); these observations were supplemented with 12 by Open University (OU) staff. The observations were undertaken in Primary and Secondary schools during late October 2010.

3. Cross-case analysis

3.1 Introduction and methodology

The second 2b Practice report (Report 2 – Cross-case analysis; EIA 2011b) considers various aspects of ELT promoted by EIA and the way teachers and students used and participated in these in a sample of observed lessons. The cross-case analysis is a general attempt to gauge the extent of the ELT aspects relative to each other. The report provides a general picture of the progress of teachers in implementing the EIA approach.

A sample of 46 lessons (28 Primary and 18 Secondary) was analysed, focusing on those which provided the most detail on classroom behaviour. Given this sampling, the lessons analysed cannot be taken as representative of all EIA teachers; therefore, any data on frequency of practices should be treated with caution.

The teacher and the students' actions and interactions (recorded in the classroom observation notes) were analysed in relation to largely predetermined categories (nodes) to understand the nature of the pedagogy in a particular lesson.

A cross-case analysis of the sampled lessons was undertaken to obtain a general view of the ELT strategies observed and recorded. The analysis consisted of three steps: 1) agreeing the codes (based on ELT aspects); 2) coding the lessons using NVIVO software; and 3) performing a secondary analysis of particular codes.

The focus of the secondary analysis was to understand the nature of the various behaviours that make up each of the ELT aspects covered by the codes, and to estimate how much of each was observed. This analysis is the basis of the findings reported here in Subsection 3.2 and in 2b Practice Report 2 (EIA 2011b).

Note that the focus of this cross-case analysis was validity and this was maximised by relating particular types of behaviour represented by the codes of ELT. Nevertheless, the coding derivation and discussion served to maintain a level of reliability. The main threat to validity was in fact the details that were often missing from the observers' notes.

3.2 Findings

The cross-case analysis findings have been structured around groupings of the codes:

- using materials
- lesson structure
- teacher-led activity
- student-focused activity
- responding to learning.

Note that whenever a statement is made about the frequency of any activities, it is made clear whether it refers to the number of *lessons* or the total number of *incidents*. As indicated earlier, such statements are made with caution.

3.2.1 Using materials

EIA Primary classroom resources comprise audios, posters, flashcards and figurines for all year groups (classes), whereas EIA Secondary classroom resources comprise audios for use with the *English for Today (EfT)* textbooks for all classes. The fact that three quarters of Primary and a quarter of Secondary lessons used EIA materials reflects the balance of provision.

EIA audio material was used in two-thirds of Primary lessons, but only a quarter of Secondary lessons. EIA posters were found in half of Primary lessons.

The textbook represented the main non-EIA material used by teachers, but real objects and pictures were also used. Non-EIA materials, apart from the textbook, were used in less than a fifth of Primary lessons and only a few Secondary lessons.

Songs were the most popular audio in Primary lessons, with positive responses from students, including clapping. When dialogues or stories were played, teachers sometimes prepared students' understanding, used the pause signal to check understanding, explained the language, reinforced the language content, and ensured that a question asked on the audio is answered. In Secondary lessons the audio was used to enable choral dialogue and to provide information to students to complete a table or diagram.

Posters were used in half of Primary lessons, usually with the audio. In general, teachers used posters with the whole class, asking questions such as 'What is this?' to elicit single words. Flashcards and figurines were rarely used, but where they were, again, this was usually to elicit words.

Non-EIA materials are encouraged by the EIA approach, particularly real objects. These (including common classroom objects) made up half of such materials used in Primary classrooms. In both Primary and Secondary lessons there were a few examples of teachers using cards and pictures they found or made themselves.

In many instances, EIA materials were observed to be underpinning communicative practices by setting the *EfT* language into meaningful contexts and with communicative purpose. For example, teachers frequently used a poster and audio together to reinforce students' understanding of the meaning of the EIA stories and hence the language of the *EfT* textbook. Questioning and expository activities before listening prepare students to be active listeners, enabling them to make sense of the language as they hear it.

There seemed to be little evidence of the audio 'taking over' the class from the teacher. Most teachers seemed firmly in control of the teaching and learning processes, playing the audio when they had prepared their students to understand it, pausing it to ask questions to check understanding and extend learning, and often using it as the basis for further language use. This underscores the value of the materials as a vehicle for teachers' professional development, rather than simply as a classroom teaching aid.

3.2.2 Features of the structure of lessons

Warm-up activity, setting the scene, ending the lesson

Three-quarters of lessons for both Primary and Secondary had incidents of a *warm-up activity*: in Primary lessons the introductory song (EIA audio) and greetings in English were used mostly; Secondary lessons

focused on greetings in English (no EIA song is available). Greetings in English were recorded in Baseline Study 3 (EIA 2009a), whereas the songs are an addition provided by EIA. Classroom routines (e.g. register, writing up the date), which provide opportunities for purposeful, contextualised talk, were found in under half of Primary and only a quarter of Secondary lessons. *Scene setting* occurred in a third of Primary lessons and under half of Secondary lessons, where it was more sophisticated.

With regards to *ending the lesson*, around three-quarters of Primary lessons used the EIA 'goodbye' song. Many Secondary teachers used a short 'thank you and goodbye' routine. Reviewing the lesson, or linking to the next, happened rarely. In half of Secondary lessons homework was set.

These parts of the lesson are generally not vehicles for formal English teaching. However, there were instances of grammar in context, and integrating skills of literacy and oracy.

There were simple examples of authentic use of English in routine openings and endings, greetings and classroom routines (e.g. taking the register). More complex examples (mostly in Secondary) included teachers asking questions, sometimes of individuals, about homework they (should) have done and what happened in the previous lesson. Homework setting requires students to listen carefully. There was one example of real engagement with the curriculum through the medium of English.

Most interaction was at the whole-class level. There were few examples of teachers addressing individuals or of personalisation to suggest a student-centred approach. However, there was a high degree of student participation.

Teachers' efforts to bring communicative practices into the structured parts of their lessons were, for the most part, at best, incipient. But these sections of the lesson prepare students for learning by encouraging enthusiastic participation.

3.2.3 Teacher-led activity

Teacher presenting, teacher instruction, teacher questions, body language, modelling, repetition, eliciting, choral dialogue

Baseline Study 3 (EIA 2009a) showed classrooms in which the teacher was leading and central to all teaching and learning activities. Although activities in this category come closest to traditional pedagogy, there were examples of at least the beginnings of communicative practices within the lessons analysed.

Most of the incidents of *teacher presentation* were teachers talking briefly. In Secondary examples, the communicative aim of the presentation was generally clearer. The reading examples mostly involved the teacher simply reading a passage or even a few words from the textbook. In both Primary and Secondary lessons there were examples of teachers' successfully presenting elements of language in ways that had at least some communicative aspects.

Three quarters of all lessons contained incidents of *teacher instructions* (English or Bangla). In Primary and especially Secondary, English task instructions were being used and understood, but observers often did not record students' responses.

With regards to *teacher questions*, over two-thirds of all lessons teachers used closed questions to check vocabulary, provide stimulus, and build from the textbook. 'What is this?' was a common question on posters, textbooks and audio. The incidence of open questions is very limited.

Body language is likely to have been substantially under-reported. It was observed in a quarter of all lessons, mostly for communicative purposes. Some instances were associated with EIA songs or games, others demonstrated meaning (e.g. when counting fingers; 'in' v 'on') or indicated to students what to do.

Less than a quarter of Primary lessons included *modelling*, which is mainly related to language items and structures. In Secondary lessons, teachers modelled activities (e.g. a game). A small number of teachers deployed the strategy in a communicative way.

Half of Primary lessons and a quarter of the Secondary lessons included incidents of *repetition*; in Primary this was mainly choral. Examples found included: reciting a rhyme, practising new language (e.g. vocabulary, numbers), or checking student understanding.

Eliciting involves a range of techniques through which learners produce the target language without teachers directly supplying it. This was observed in half of Primary and three-quarters of Secondary classes. *Choral dialogue* whereby a class is divided into groups, each taking a role in performing a scripted dialogue was found in only three Secondary lessons (but no Primary lessons). Each case related to an *Eft* lesson on the diary of Anne Frank, the example used in the Secondary EIA materials.

The most frequently-observed teacher-led activities were in categories where there is clear teacher control (e.g. 'teacher presenting' and 'teacher instruction'). This is sometimes evidence of a traditional approach, but not where students are expected to give a communicative response. Teachers' questions and elicitations can be the first stage of an interactive sequence, while their body language and subsequent utterances may encourage and scaffold students' contributions. Even instructions, presentation of information and the modelling of language may provide a context in which students can participate actively. Eliciting and (the admittedly rare) instances of open questioning force the initiative onto the individual student. These are signs of at least a degree of student-centredness.

There were several examples of teacher language being used for a communicative purpose in the context of action (e.g. a verb form illustrated by closing a door; a teacher asks students to give her various objects).

Although the evidence for communicative practices is not overwhelming, it is clear that there is more going on than imitation and repetition of the teacher; there are emerging signs of various elements of communicative practice. Teacher-led practices can be the first step towards greater student autonomy.

3.2.4 Student-focused activity

Student initiative, student presentation, pair and group work, expansion, individual work

Only four incidents of *student initiative* (contributing to a lesson without prompting) were recorded (three Secondary, one Primary). *Student presentation* was slightly more common, with Primary instances being mainly the student reading their own work, and Secondary, mostly prepared dialogue.

Pair and group work are more common, and were found in over three quarters of Primary and Secondary lessons. Most cases involved the students interacting with each other, the most common form of such being choral dialogue, individual dialogue (one person from one group with one in the other group), or asking questions. Pair work was varied, with students: discussing a text or other materials; preparing for writing; drafting material or rearranging words.

Expansions to personalise or develop a task were found in just under a quarter of all lessons. Primary examples of personalisation were mainly around home and family topics. The primary examples of developing the task are by extending the reference of a language pattern (e.g. using different nouns to complete a sentence). In Secondary there were two examples of development of task (e.g. after reading about a kitchen fire to then write about a new cooker for homework) and two of personalisation (e.g. write your own biography or diary). The Secondary examples asked students to apply textbook knowledge to a different context.

Individual working was observed in less than a quarter of lessons. Writing was observed more frequently than reading. All but one of the Primary writing tasks dealt with meaning at some level (e.g. write something after reading from textbook). Secondary writing incidents were *EfT* exercises, or based on the EIA audio. In Secondary incidents only, teachers were observed giving some focus or questions for the reading.

Although most of these activities were instanced in only a quarter or so of lessons, there was some evidence of a significant shift in teacher outlook from the pre-EIA situation; for example teachers using English at the level of textual understanding. The application of learning in new contexts could not be achieved by repetition and rote learning; it relies on student understanding and willingness to be creative. Many of the examples of individual work depended on teachers' expectation that students would be able to transfer meaning from one medium into another.

It is not surprising that *student presentation* and *student initiative* were not strongly present, since Baseline Study 3 (EIA 2009a) showed that students had virtually no opportunity to speak in lessons. In the present study it was those interactive activities which left the teacher in control which were most commonly found. Student presentation is a relatively simple strategy for teachers to manage, and one with some potential for increasing interactivity within a lesson in a 'safe' way.

Student presentation may have been under-represented because it has received relatively little attention in the EIA training materials and face-to-face sessions. This hypothesis gets some support from the relatively strong showing of pair and group work, which features prominently in most elements of EIA and was observed in around half of all lessons. As with other categories of student-focused activity, the use of strategies which take group and pair work into the realms of meaningful language use is an encouraging sign.

3.2.5 Responding to learning

Checking understanding, monitoring, dealing with errors, giving positive feedback

Tokenistic *checking of understanding* (e.g. 'Do you understand?') was found in around a quarter of all lessons. Real checking (e.g. questions about the audio, checking pronunciation) was found in a quarter of Primary lessons. Secondary incidents (in almost a third of lessons) included a teacher asking one student to comment on another's response ('Is it true or false?') and using pairs to check each other's work (peer assessment). Real checking involves meaningful interaction between the students and the teachers. Instances of real checking were not sustained and so did not enable a teacher to gauge the understanding of the class.

A third of Primary lessons and half of Secondary lessons involved *monitoring* at the level of simple supervision; a smaller proportion of lessons involved interacting with students (e.g. through questions,

facilitating, scaffolding). It was always the teacher who initiated interaction. There was one example of a teacher using monitoring in a communicative way.

There were few recorded instances of teachers *dealing with errors*. Incidents of teachers ignoring errors or offering a simple correction were found in only two Primary lessons and one Secondary. Thus, although we know that teachers think it is important to correct errors (EIA 2011d), little is being recorded which suggests under-reporting. In only one Primary lesson was an error followed by an effort on the part of the teachers to engage with, and support, a student's learning.

Positive feedback was found in around half of both Primary and Secondary lessons. This was done most obviously by the teacher confirming a correct response (e.g. 'thank you', or 'very good') or repeating the students' response.

It is not surprising that the incidence of the pedagogical strategies involved in responding to learning was low or very low, given that these make the greatest demands of teachers whose background is traditional. However, such pedagogies are beginning to emerge in both Primary and Secondary classrooms. Understanding how well students are learning is essential to a student-centred approach: an approach which takes each individual's current level of attainment as the starting point for their learning. This is achieved through planned monitoring and questions that check understanding explicitly, asked by teachers who know how to interpret unexpected answers and turn them into teaching opportunities.

Teachers' and students' attitudes to errors are fundamental to language teaching and learning. Over-attention to accuracy will always be an enemy of fluency, while tolerance of errors will encourage interaction and participation. Perhaps the most significant finding on 'responding to learning' is a negative one: that, contrary to teachers' expressed opinion that error correction is very important, the incidence of attention to students' errors is low. However, the practices are beginning to take root in some classrooms and is a hopeful sign.

3.3 Reflection on findings

Prior to the EIA intervention, most teaching 'did not encourage a communicative approach to learning English' (EIA 2009a, p. 7). Teachers dominated the lessons, doing almost all of the talking. In two-thirds of lessons observed the majority of language spoken was Bangla, opportunities for students to participate were low, and very few students spoke in English during a lesson. In most classes students were 'not interactive at all' (EIA 2009a, p. 8).

The findings of the cross-case analysis include evidence of some important changes emerging across a sizeable number of classrooms. The areas in which there has been the greatest degree of change are those where teachers remain very much in control (lesson structure, teacher-led activities and use of EIA materials). Nonetheless, there is evidence of more student-focused activities; some, notably pair and group work, are strongly represented. These 'safe' strategies may be a stepping stone to other communicative practices for many teachers.

The EIA programme appears to be helping some teachers to give the learning of individual students a more prominent place. The instances of monitoring, checking understanding, dealing with errors and feedback all show a concern for student learning. This reveals the underlying understanding that effective teaching is not simply a matter of transmitting the right information, but depends on interaction

between student and teacher. It will certainly be important to support the development of this aspect of teachers' repertoire as the project develops.

At present a great deal of interaction is at the level of teachers relating to whole classes, or to individuals within the class. However, in several episodes there is a progression to group and pair activities, which both increase participation and give each student much greater experience of speaking English.

The motivating qualities of EIA resources are increasing participation. Students are listening attentively to spoken audio, and the levels of physical and vocal participation show that songs and rhymes are a popular feature. Teachers are using the resources in ways that promotes meaningful use of language by providing both context and ways into interactive activities. Songs are one way in which EIA-endorsed practices have become embedded in classroom routines, and the use of English in regular and predictable lesson structures shows English employed with communicative purpose. Teachers are not allowing what could be seen as 'ready-made' audio lessons to take control away from them.

Most of the lessons analysed show evidence of teachers who are able to use some aspects of ELT pedagogy, and some teachers who are able to use several aspects and do so in a purposeful way. Some elements of EIA are already widespread in use and are firmly embedded in the practice of many teachers, while others are being adopted more warily and selectively. This is to be expected. There can, however, be no doubt that EIA is making a difference to the teaching and learning in these classrooms.

A weakness of the methodology is that if an aspect of pedagogy is *not* noted, it cannot be taken as evidence that it did not appear in the lesson. This resulted in some areas (e.g. pair work) having insufficient detail.

4. Case studies

4.1 Introduction and methodology

The third 2b Practice report (Report 3 – Case studies; EIA 2011c) provides an account of a small number of ‘cases’ with the intention of showing how particular lessons were implemented. These synopses of the observations, in the form of seven case studies (four Primary and three Secondary), pick out the features of the lessons and relate these to a communicative approach to teaching and learning, which underlies the EIA approach to ELT. The cases were not chosen to be representative or typical of all EIA lessons, but rather as informative of how a whole lesson is put together by teachers and experienced by students.

The cases were considered in terms of: 1) the general environment of the classrooms, 2) the topics covered, 3) the material used by teacher, 4) the general pedagogy and in particular the extent of student focus, and 5) the communicative approach achieved in the lesson. Some of these categories reflect the ELT principles upon which the EIA project draws (EIA 2009b, p. 3):

- communicative purpose
- student-centredness
- interaction
- participation (of all students)
- integrated skills
- grammar in context.

These, in large part, would probably be accepted as elements of general ‘good’ pedagogy, i.e. pedagogy that builds on our understanding of how children learn in classrooms. Some specifically express elements of ELT aspects (examined in detail Report 2).

4.2 Findings – case studies as a group

Full details on the *environment of the classroom* were not recorded for all cases explored. However, in general, the Primary case study lessons were depicted as noisy and cramped as a result of their small size relative to the number of students (although none of the case studies had classes of approaching 100, something that has been observed). In one case, the environment was described as ‘dull’ (i.e. poorly lit). Another, in contrast, was described as spacious, bright and sunny. The Secondary classrooms depicted were quieter, and in one case, the classroom layout and relatively small class size enabled the teacher to approach all the students. Although classroom environment is not within the direct remit of the project, any approaches have to be conducted within these constraints.

From the cases explored it is evident that, despite the sometimes difficult conditions, none represented insurmountable barriers for teachers and/or students. Indeed, with cramped conditions and large classes, teachers were still able to organise many kinds of activity that enabled students to participate in the lesson activities, including speaking, listening, reading and writing.

All the case study lessons had clear *topics*, and most had a clear language aim. For example, in a Primary Class 1 lesson the topic was clearly directed to questions around using ‘in’ and ‘on’ (‘Where is the cow? ... in the field.’). Although all lessons related to *English for Today (EfT)*, some did not always have a clear

objective or language feature; for example in Secondary Class 7 lesson, despite dealing with the content in *EfT*, Unit 4, Lesson 1 (on Rafiq and his pen friend in Mongolia), there was no evident language feature.

The EIA approach is different for Primary and Secondary classrooms with regard to *materials*. There are more EIA materials for the Primary teachers to use, and this is reflected in the lessons. Consequently, all Primary case study lessons showed some use of materials other than the textbook (*EfT*), and most contained a variety of those available including posters, audios, flashcards, figurines and real objects introduced by the teacher. One Primary teacher used the full range of these materials, including a game, and in another lesson, the teacher introduces real objects to extend the activities. One teacher was also able to operate without a reliance on the audio, including where this is usually routinely used (for opening and closing songs); the teacher was able to get the class to sing these songs without the music from the audio. A different situation was found in the Secondary cases, which is not surprising given the lower provision of, and reliance on, materials in the EIA approach at this level. All three Secondary cases show use of the textbook; one also used the EIA audio, another used non-EIA material in addition to the textbook. All cases nevertheless created interactive activities with opportunities to hear and use English purposefully, as we now go onto discuss.

The *pedagogy* of the cases included interactive elements (with some being fully interactive in their approach) and involved students in using English, mostly through pair or group work. In some of the Primary lessons, despite their size, teachers managed to involve large numbers of students in responding to their questions; one managed to involve approximately a quarter of students in the class. As all used group or pair work, students were given additional chances to practise speaking. Not all of the pair work was so successful in Secondary lessons, with one teacher failing to exploit a good opportunity he set up, reflecting a rather teacher-centred approach through closed questions, but nevertheless creating an interactive, purposeful and coherent lesson. Another Secondary lesson used pair work, but it was insufficiently directed to be as productive as it could have been. Yet this teacher also managed to introduce the idea of involving students in peer assessment, even if it is not exploited adequately because of lack of direction and monitoring. In one class, such was the variety and engagement generated the observer noted the evident enjoyment of the students. This teacher was able to create well-structured and linked activities.

Apart from one Secondary lesson that had no clear objective, there was a learning focus for all activities observed. Although it is possible to find some 'failings' in the pedagogy in all of the lessons, these were usually accompanied by good features, as noted above. In the lesson that might be seen as the most disappointing pedagogically, there was nevertheless praise given to students and some check on understanding, and there were signs of a communicative approach being adopted. Checking student understanding and scaffolding questions, which itself is based on a realisation that the students may not be able to understand, were found in two of the case studies.

All of the lessons featured elements of a *communicative* approach, even if some teachers had not created a communicative language lesson as such. As was noted from the quantitative classroom observation study (Study 2a, see EIA 2011a), English dominated the language used in the class, yet most of the teachers in the case studies used Bangla appropriately to explain instructions and the like. Thus, a Primary or Secondary teacher would use Bangla to clarify an instruction in English, although in one case it was unclear whether the students understood the English when used throughout. Four of the cases showed an integration of all four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing), at least in the sense

that they took place in the same lesson and focused on the same content. In the two cases (one Primary and one Secondary) that did not include all four skills, listening and speaking were integrated. The other features of a communicative approach found in the cases were:

- students responding in phrases or sentences, rather than just single words (Primary and Secondary lessons)
- the teacher asking open-ended questions and, in a question-and-answer pattern, students introduced new questions (a Primary lesson)
- personalised questions or those relating to the real life of the students (a Primary and a Secondary lesson)
- authentic activities (a Secondary lesson)
- pre-listening and pre-reading questions to prepare students for what is to come (a Secondary lesson)
- meaning and understanding stressed (a secondary lesson).

None of the cases exhibited a complete communicative approach but, at this early stage of the intervention, these are real signs of progress in teachers' ELT skills compared to those found the baseline studies. This is enhanced by the general changes in pedagogy, all of which support a communicative approach, building on the methods and the materials of the EIA programme.

Table 1 summarises the main features of each case study using the five categories outlined above (environment, topic, material used, pedagogy, communicative approach).

Table 1: Overview of case studies reported in Report 3.

<i>Case study</i>	<i>Environment</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Material</i>	<i>Pedagogy</i>	<i>Communicative</i>
77 Class 1	Noisy	'in', 'on'; Simple questions: 'where is the cow?'	EIA poster, audio, real object	Clear aim range of activities Group work Many students involved	Use of phrases & sentence Integrated skills
28 Class 3	Noisy, cramped	Asking answering simple questions	EIA poster, figurines	Set scene Interactive: pair & group work Scaffolding	Teacher use of English with appropriate use of Bangla Modelling dialogue Personalising questions
38 Class 3	Noisy, dull (i.e. poorly lit), limited room for teacher to move around	Number work	EIA poster, flashcards, audio	Structured & linked activities Students engaged Group work Variety of students answering	Teacher use of English with appropriate use of Bangla Integrated skills
47 Class 3	Spacious, bright, noisy	At the shop	Poster, audio	Procedural Closed questions (mainly) Scaffolding	Teacher use of English with appropriate use of Bangla Modelling dialogue Students generate new questions
60 Class 9	N/A	Tribal people	Audio	Coherent purpose Teacher talk dominates Closed questions Interactive	Teacher use of English with appropriate use of Bangla Integrated skills Error correction moderated Authentic questions Checking understanding
14 Class 9	Quiet	Mother Teresa	Non-EIA material	Closed questions Well linked activities Pair & group work Students presented Praise	Teacher use of English with appropriate use of Bangla Interactive to single students Integrated skills Personalisation
59 Class 7	Quiet	Pen friend Synonyms		Closed questions Checks understanding Pair work Peer assessment (limited)	Teacher use of English with appropriate use of Bangla Authentic activities Pre-reading & listening questions Use of sentences

References

English in Action (EIA) (2009a) *Baseline Study 3: An Observation Study of English Lessons in Primary and Secondary Schools in Bangladesh*. Dhaka, Bangladesh: EIA.

English in Action (EIA) (2009b) *Professional Development of Secondary English Language Teachers*. Dhaka, Bangladesh: EIA.

English in Action (EIA) (2011a) *The Classroom Practices of Primary and Secondary School Teachers Participating in English in Action (Large-scale quantitative study 2a)*. Dhaka, Bangladesh: EIA.

English in Action (EIA) (2011b) *A Qualitative Observation Study of Primary and Secondary Lessons Conducted by Teachers Participating in English in Action (Study 2b Practice), Report 2: Cross-case analysis*. Dhaka, Bangladesh: EIA.

English in Action (EIA) (2011c) *A Qualitative Observation Study of Primary and Secondary Lessons Conducted by Teachers Participating in English in Action (Study 2b Practice), Report 3: Case studies*. Dhaka, Bangladesh: EIA.

English in Action (EIA) (2011d) *Perceptions of English Language Learning and Teaching among Primary and Secondary School Teachers and Students Participating in English in Action (Study 2b3b, Part 1)*. Dhaka, Bangladesh: EIA.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the researchers from the Institute of Education and Research (IER), University of Dhaka for their support in the collection of data for this study.



English in Action (EIA) is a nine-year English language education programme implemented through a partnership between the UK Government and the Government of Bangladesh. The goal of EIA is to contribute to the economic growth of Bangladesh by providing English language as a tool for better access to the world economy. EIA works to reach a total of 25 million primary and secondary students and adult learners through communicative language learning techniques and the use of ICT, textbooks and supplementary materials in an innovative way.

Implemented by:



Funded by:



Implementing Partners:



English in Action

House 1, Road 80, Gulshan 2
Dhaka-1212, Bangladesh.

Phone: 88-02 8822234

88-02 8822161

Fax: 88-02 8822663

Email: info@eiabd.com

Web: www.eiabd.com

English in Action is funded by UKaid from the Department for International Development