Effectiveness of Teachers Training in BRAC Schools

Sania Sultan
Kaisar A Khan
Syeda Rumnaz Imam

Research and Evaluation Division
BRAC

And

Ian Harrison

Centre for Formative Assessment Studies
School of Education
University of Manchester

March 1999

Executive Summary

The study attempted to evaluate the newly designed training module for teachers who are teaching English in class three, four, and five of BRAC NFPE schools. With the knowledge of BRAC graduates' relative weakness in English when they join the Government Formal Schools, the Materials Development Unit (MDU) has made a concerted effort in addressing this issue concerning English teaching. Also, MDU's goal entailed a plan to break away from the top down model of training, traditionally followed. The study aimed to see how much of these goals have been met, what are the problems involved, and how to address those.

A teachers guide has been developed based on the Class III Textbook, which delineates six steps in teaching English. The guide provides step by step instruction in teaching English. The study was undertaken at the initial stage of the training process. MDU has been selecting and training a group of Master Trainers. The Master Trainers then have been training the field staff, and finally the field staff have been providing the same to the teachers through the monthly refreshers.

Since the training schedule involved several stages, the most important issue was to find out how much of the dissemination has been happening in a standardized way, and the impact of training on the trainees, particularly the teachers, who are the gatekeepers of successful implementation. The impact of training can be generally located in two domains, i.e., cognitive and affective. Training helps to improve the knowledge base of a subject, and also the trainees do have an emotional response towards the training. The study attempted to explore both the domains.

By using a variety of instruments like opinion questionnaires, group discussions, observations, and tests, the researchers tried to derive the impact of this training on all concerned, particularly the teachers, who are the final recipients and gatekeepers of successful implementation.

The initial findings suggested that the MDU has been doing a commendable job in creating an efficient group of Master Trainers (MT). The MT selection and training sessions were found to be extremely satisfactory. However, due to differences in levels of education of the Master Trainers, the staff, and the teachers and differences in each group's class room experiences suggested that the dissemination of the new teaching techniques is still not occurring

in a standardized fashion. The observation schedules indicated and supported this finding. The test results also suggested considerable variations in the cognitive domain of the recipients of the training. The teachers were found to be not implementing the new techniques and resorting to their previous ways of teaching, and they appeared apprehensive about the guide. The group discussions helped to incur information directly from trainee's field experience.

The varieties of findings indicated and also prompted the researchers to ask the question, "has the aim of breaking away from top down model been achieved?" If not, why? However, the study provided important feedback for the Material Developers which, if incorporated, will help address the limitations inherent in the module.

Some of the suggestions included, simplification of the guide, specific problems related to the six steps, increase in time duration of the teachers' training, increase time duration of English instruction in classrooms, teachers receiving training directly from the Master Trainers, creating more Master Trainers, improvisation of effective school supervision techniques and so on. The findings and suggestions are expected to help the Material Developers to address the problems that came out through the study. Some of the issues have already been taken into account and addressed adequately by the respective programme personnel.

Table of contents

Page

Appendices

25

IV

1. Acknowledgements

2. Introduction

BRAC (1997) has decided to introduce grades IV and V in BRAC schools as soon as possible as a consequence of government policy guidelines requiring providers of education in Bangladesh to implement a five-year primary education cycle. In addition, there is an increasing recognition on the part of the government about the need for Non-Formal Primary Education (NFPE) in the education system and BRAC (1997) states its commitment to work closely with the government to achieve the goal of *"Education for All."* Furthermore, to improve the quality and reach of primary education in Bangladesh, an Institute of Education will be established to cater to the needs related to teachers training, management training, pedagogy, and research.

Active collaboration between BRAC and the School of Education, University of Manchester has been in existence for some years. In 1996 under BRIP, funded by the Overseas Development Agency (UK) and BRAC, Professor Tom Christie and Professor Gajendra K. Verma acting as consultants have undertaken specific duties. One of these duties was to submit a paper making proposals for the development of a framework for educational research (Verma and Christie, 1996a). A second duty in association with Dr. Feroza Begum, Ms. Shaheen Akter and Mrs. Pauline Macaulay (Education Researchers, RED) was to undertake a specific research study on the mainstreaming of BRAC/NFPE students into government formal schools (Verma and Christie, 1996b).

More recently in 1997, a HE Link programme between BRAC and the School of Education, University of Manchester was established. This programme is funded by the Department for International Development (DFID) and managed on its behalf by the British Council.

Mr. Ian Harrison, research fellow in the School of Education, Manchester visited BRAC Centre in August 1998. The Terms of Reference under the broad remit of the *"quality of education"* for his study visit are appended. During his visit the research team of Dr. Sania Sultan, Ms. Rumnaz Imam Mr. Kaisar Ali Khan and Mr. Ian Harrison was established and assigned to conduct a research study on the "effectiveness of teacher training".

27

3. Background to the research study

Since January 1998, extension of the current three-year NFPE programme into Grade IV is being implemented in one thousand schools as part of BRAC's Phase 2 development plan. These one thousand schools were randomly selected.

BRAC has identified teachers' abilities to teach Grade IV effectively as the most important factor in determining the success of the implementation process.

In order to promote effective implementation of the extension to Grade IV therefore, the Materials Development Unit (MDU) of the NFPE programme has developed a programme to train and support teachers.

The training process is continuous and ongoing and the in-service training is to be delivered as follows:

i.   Initially, Master Trainers will be selected and trained at Head Office;

ii.   The Master Trainers will then train the field-level staff;

iii.   The field-level staff, in turn, will train the teachers gradually through the monthly refresher programme.

<u>Master Trainers</u>

Research evidence to date (Akter, S. 1996; Khan and Chowdhury, 1992) indicates that on entry to the formal primary school system BRAC graduates under perform in English and Mathematics. These subjects have therefore been prioritised in planning the development of the training programme. Training for the teaching of Bangla and Social Studies is planned to follow.

MDU has addressed subject-specific issues during the development of the training for potential Master Trainers by requiring additional criteria for each subject. For example, animated reading, lesson presentation and participation for English, these plus the addition of questioning technique in Maths.

The new plan started to materialise towards the end of 1997. The implementation process at the teachers' level started to take place towards the end of the first quarter of 1998. Therefore, this whole process is at a very rudimentary stage in its implementation process.

MDU's initiative emphasised quality while designing and conducting the training sessions for the Master Trainers. According to MDU, the earlier system of training used to be too structured and methodical, and thus, was inappropriate for the dissemination of the innovative curriculum produced and for the participatory techniques designed for the classrooms by MDU.

This model for delivery was developed because of MDU's belief that the "cascade" model was ineffective and because of the perceived need for direct

28

2

interaction between MDU and the trainers. The model of classroom teaching followed a more top down process. As the programme has expanded over the years, the gap between the different units widened, affecting the teachers in the most negative way. Therefore, MDU decided to have a skilled group of trainers at the mid-level who will be responsible for training the teachers directly.

According to NFPE 1997 report, the eventual goal of MDU is to have a Master Trainer in all areas for each subject "empowered to exercise their good judgement in a flexible pedagogy" (P.15). These trainers will have received several training after going through a rigorous selection process. The same trainers will maintain the liaison between the field and the Head Office.

The criteria used to select "Master Trainers" include their:

i.   acceptance in the field;

ii.   communication skills;

iii.   presentation skills;

iv.   temperament;

v.   common-sense;

vi.   subject knowledge.

It is considered of vital importance that Master Trainers possess these qualities for the following reasons -

i.   MDU judged the original training materials to be "too prescriptive" and therefore the new materials are more flexible. Master Trainers therefore not only have to be adaptable and flexible as individuals but must also demonstrate these qualities as they conduct the training.

ii.   Master Trainers are expected not only to satisfy the requirement to be capable trainers as regards their communication and presentation skills but are also expected to serve a support function in facilitating implementation and therefore require the additional attributes of acceptance in the field, temperament, common sense, etc.

The selection of Master Trainers is verified by liaison and consultation with the appropriate BRAC field officers and by field visits conducted by MDU.

4. Project specification

The duration of this research project was specified to be for a period of three months commencing in August to be completed in December 1998. It was proposed that, owing to the relatively short duration of the project, the aims of the project were to evaluate the effectiveness of the training provided for teaching Grade 4 English.

It was further proposed that the project examined two key issues: (i.) 'standardisation" of dissemination; and, (ii.) the impact of the training upon the teachers, both on their cognitive and affective domains.

30

5. Initial research design

'Standardisation' of dissemination

The Master Trainers' training programme is clearly of fundamental importance - the foundation upon which the successful implementation of the extension to Grade IV requires to be built. If there is a lack of consistency and consensus in the skills, knowledge and understanding that the Master Trainers have acquired as outcomes of their training then it may be predicted that the resulting variation will become increasingly wide as the training is further disseminated to field staff and then to teachers.

Furthermore, such variation once it begins to permeate the system following the training of teachers will be both increasingly difficult to monitor and hence to identify in order to take appropriate remedial action. However, this should not be taken to imply the expectation that teachers should teach precisely the same way from school to school. The *'art'* of teaching requires teachers to adapt their teaching and the learning environment that they provide to the needs of their students, their community and the locality.

MDU themselves have identified this need for adaptation by stressing the requirement for flexibility to be incorporated in their training programme. The **critical** issue is one of ensuring a balance between informing and training teachers of the requirements for teaching Grade IV so as to establish common boundaries within which they may be adaptable and flexible.

'Standardisation' of dissemination therefore refers to an investigation of the degree to which the training 'standardises' communication and dissemination of the requirements for teaching Grade IV English from MDU to the Master Trainers whilst promoting and facilitating the required degree of flexibility.

Impact of the training upon teachers

Teachers themselves, as the final recipients of the training programme, must be considered as the *'gatekeepers'* of successful implementation. As Fullan (1993) states:

> *"Educational change depends upon what teachers do and say*
> *in the classroom - it's as simple as that!"*

(Fullan, M. 1993. The new meaning of educational change.)

The literature of educational evaluation is full of examples where educational policy has failed to achieve the desired changes in teachers' performance and classroom practice, e.g. Hord (1987). Consequently perhaps the most important *'performance indicator'* or *'output measure'* that can be used to judge the effectiveness of the training is its impact upon teachers.

Research studies, for example, Harrison (1994), demonstrate that training intervention impact upon teachers in both the cognitive and affective domains. Such impacts interact with other, external factors such as the degree of external support and

31

facilitation, collaboration with other teachers, characteristics of the organisation and management structure within the educational system to condition the degree to which individual teachers modify and adapt their current practice.

Recently the radical changes taking place in the UK educational system provides clear testimony of the effect of teachers' emotional responses upon their implementation of educational change. The situation in BRAC and its schools is clearly very different and there is no intention to draw parallels from the contemporary situation in the UK except to point out that BRAC teachers' attitudes should be a major focus of the research project.

It was proposed therefore that teachers would be interviewed to explore the impact of the training in the affective domain. The impact of the training upon teacher' affects/emotions will be a function in part of the degree to which the appropriate trainers have created a positive, non-threatening climate in which the teachers are able to participate, contribute and are motivated to acquire the required learning outcomes.

Teachers' acquisition of new learning as an outcome of the training programme was to be measured by the administration of a test, designed to test their knowledge and improvement in their cognitive base.

Observation schedule was also to be developed to observe the training sessions and the classrooms in order to compare the teaching styles and learning activities of the trainers and the teachers.

Research into the impact of the training upon teachers therefore refers to studies designed to explore the effects upon teachers of the training in both the cognitive and affective domains and upon their teaching practice.

32

6. Project objectives

To provide feedback to the NFPE programme division and MDU personnel relating to the effectiveness of the training programme in relation to:

1.   Standardisation of dissemination;

2.   Impact of the training upon teachers in relation to the implementation of changes in teaching practice and provision of learning activities, the development of knowledge, skills and understanding and emotional 'health';

so as to inform them regarding the identification of issues which may require resolution such as the revision and modification of existing and development of new materials, identified needs for additional support, facilitation and a further research agenda.

to enable the education research team to explore the use of a variety of evaluation tools so as to identify an evaluation model appropriate to BRAC's needs and contexts for use in future research projects of this type.

to promote an effective means of communication between education research (RED), MDU and NFPE programme personnel so that potential evaluation strategies can become embedded in future development processes.

33

7. Research Methodology

The original project schedule developed in August 1998 and presented to BRAC by the research team was planned to begin with an initial phase in which the training sessions provided by the Materials Development Unit (MDU) to the prospective Master Trainers were to be observed in the beginning of September. However, the devastating floods of 1998 and its prolonged duration delayed the commencement of data collection process until the middle of October 1998.

This training module is very new and its implementation process is in a rudimentary stage. Hence, the research on this particular training's effectiveness had to be exploratory and the research plans were tailored accordingly as the data collection process commenced and proceeded.

Therefore, the research was not conducted on a completed process, but on a continuous one, and thus, a definite plan could not be chalked out beforehand, and new improvisation was done simultaneously as the training progressed at different levels. The research team planned to achieve the project objectives by developing a range of different instruments -

1. A schedule to observe the training sessions to monitor how effective the training materials had been in communicating to trainees the teaching requirements.

2. A questionnaire administered at the end of the training sessions to identify participants' attitudes and opinions towards the programme and its demands upon them in the classroom.

3. A schedule to observe teachers in the classroom to monitor how effective the training materials had been in promoting the desired "teaching style" and "teacher/learner" interaction.

4. Participants were given the opportunity to express their views by means of group discussions following the training sessions.

5. A test administered to participants on completion of their training designed to measure their knowledge.

An initial exploratory visit was made by the in-country researchers to observe a training session given by Master Trainers to a group of field staff comprising Program Organizers (PO), Programme Organizer-5 (PO-5), Team in Charge (TI), and Resource Teachers (RT). The area was Bogra, and a two-day long training session was observed from October 10th to October 12th, 1998.

The initial stage of research plan included the investigation of the trainees' opinion and judgement of the training that they have started to receive. This procedure was followed also to find out the impact of the training on their affective domain, and their emotional response to it. Opinion questionnaires (Appendix 1) were administered among all the trainees, starting from the master trainers to the

teachers. The questions covered a broad range of issues like achievement of new skills, perceptions of the training, trainees' feedback and so forth. All the opinion questionnaires were field-tested.

The opinion questionnaire for the Master Trainers included 10 questions and a total of thirty-one (31) trainers responded. The questionnaire for the field staff consisted of 34 questions. The questionnaire was administered among 62 staff during the three training sessions (MT to Staff) attended observed by the researchers in three areas. The questionnaire for the teachers included 10 questions and was administered among 39 teachers during the three refreshers attended and observed by the researchers.

All the observation sessions (N=6) were followed by group discussions.

The observation of Staff training (three), teachers' refreshers (three), and the administration of the opinion questionnaires took place between the middle of October to the middle of December 1998. An MDU to MT training session was attended and observed by the researchers at the end of December, 1998.

A field-test was carried out immediately after, in the beginning of January, on a test (Appendix 2) developed by the researchers based on the curriculum and the guide to measure the cognitive/knowledge base of the teachers and the field staff *(who serve as trainers)*.

Three areas were selected in which to conduct the tests. Two teams from each (totalling six teams) area were selected. A total of 111 teachers and 28 field staff completed the test from the six teams. The tests were administered until mid-January 1999. The information coming from the tests were statistically analysed using SPSS.

In addition, during the field visits a total of seven schools were observed, 4 from two areas where the field test was conducted, and three from a different area. All of the above procedures were carried out and the schools were selected from diverse areas so as to take into account any regional variations.

8. Classroom observations

A total of seven (7) schools were visited and the researchers observed the teacher's English instruction time for the full duration. It must be taken into account here that the teachers, while the researchers were collecting data, have not received the training on all twenty-two lessons of the textbook or the teaching guide. Unlike the Master Trainers and the field staff, the teachers have been trained gradually through the monthly refreshers, when the study was conducted. The aspects that were emphasised during the observations included,

a) to what extent were the teachers following the guide and the six steps of teaching English as delineated by the training module. The teachers were observed while they taught. Besides the lesson of the day that the teacher taught, she was also requested to teach specific lessons chosen by the researchers. And particularly, those lessons were chosen which were frequently demonstrated during the different training sessions that the researchers observed so that valid comparison could be achieved.

b) The students were requested to respond to various questions and exercises both verbally and by writing. These questions and exercises also came from the lessons that the teacher taught, and also chosen randomly from different lessons that the teacher previously taught. The researchers made sure that the teacher received training on the lessons from which questions and exercises were derived for the students to respond.

The following is a description of the general trend observed in the classrooms. Also, a later section will address specific linguistic and grammatical issues that were observed, which will hopefully help the material developers to change or modify the guide and the training module accordingly.

The general trend:

The researchers, while attending and observing classrooms, did not disclose to the teachers in the beginning that they were cognizant of the training and the new methods introduced. Nowhere in the above mentioned seven schools, were teachers found to be using the guide, or following the six steps of teaching English according to the guide. As mentioned earlier, these schools included both the well-performing and not well performing ones. When requested to demonstrate a particular aspect of a lesson, the teacher always resorted to her old ways of teaching.

However, when the researchers eventually brought up the discussion on the new methods and the guide rather tactfully, towards the end of the observation session. The teachers' response clearly reflected their overall emotional response towards this new introduction. The teachers appeared to be in a state of denial. They needed to be probed in order for them to talk about the training and the guide. Also, they appeared to be apprehensive even talking about it.

The seven teachers, at the point of when the data was being collected in the month of January 1999, were not implementing the new method in their respective classrooms, and the guide was kept inside the trunk or on the shelves. When probed

36

about the training, the teachers did acknowledge that they were receiving it, but did not provide a clear response as to why they were not instructing according to the new method. The only information that came out through their response was that they felt more at ease with their previous methods of teaching.

The following section presents the specific practices observed in the classrooms. The section includes, the ways in which a teacher taught a particular aspect of a lesson (reading or spelling) as requested by the researchers, students' responses to different questions and exercises and so on. The exact depiction, with probable explanation when possible, shall hopefully help the programme with a greater understanding on what actually is occurring in the classrooms, so that appropriate measures can be undertaken and new guidelines can be incorporated.

Specific issues:

The following were the exact steps typically followed by the teachers when asked to teach a lesson. As mentioned earlier, the lessons most of the time included both, the one that she was currently teaching, and a specific one given by a researcher.

1. The teacher first read the whole lesson, giving the Bengali meaning at the end of each English sentence. She then repeated several times, and asked the students to read and repeat after her. Both the teachers and the students read the lessons with the Bengali meaning line by line for at least ten times.

2. She then wrote the new and difficult words on the board with the word meanings.

3. Next she taught those word meanings and their spellings.

4. The students were then asked to write down those words on their slates, which she later checked by walking around the classroom, and checking individual slates.

5. Finally, the teacher asked individual students one by one to read the lesson with the Bengali meaning.

The above method of teaching English lessons used to be followed previously.

Following is an exact depiction of how a teacher read a paragraph from a lesson when requested by a researcher.

How teachers read paragraphs

The Paragraph	how the teacher read
Is Hasan old?	Is Hasans old.

37

11

No, he is not. He is young.	No, she is not. She is young.
Is his grandfather young?	Is she grand father young?
How old is he?	Who old is he?
What class is he in?	What class he is in?
Is Mina tall?	She is Rana tall.

In one of the schools, the teacher asked the students to write down a few spellings. The following chart shows the words and the diverse ways in which the students responded.

How the students spelled different words

Word	Spellings written by students				
Eight	earg	legh			
Housewife	housn	heache	hosg		
Years	ser	yeurse	yesns	yeare	yerse
Farmer	fermer	frmer	farfmr	famer	farmar
Happy	heppy	yap	hppey	hppeila	happl

It has also been found that a teacher could not write the spellings herself without looking at the book. One teacher wrote the spelling of eight as 'iegh' and farmer as 'fermer'. Eventually she corrected the spellings by consulting the book.

38

Writing Activities

Asked to write	**way the students wrote**
That is an umbrella.	That is a vmrlla.
My name is Anis Ahmed.	My Anis Ahmed
Is this Mina's doll?	Is This Mina's doll/This is Mina's doll.

Asked to write	**way the teachers wrote**
This is Mina's doll	She is Mina's doll.
His name is Jamal.	His name Jamal.

It was observed that both the students and the teachers could not differentiate between questions and statements. It was both a problem of comprehension in some cases, and also the problems with intonation while reading, even if the comprehension was clear. In the three schools, while the teachers and the students were asked to give the meaning of 'Is this Mina's doll?' and 'This is Mina's doll'. Both the students and the teachers gave the same meaning for both the sentences in all three schools.

While teaching the concepts of in, under, or on, one teacher started by asking, "what's this"? The teacher taught the answer as; "the book is under the table". First, the teacher did not use any gesture for the students to understand what 'under' meant. Also, she had skipped the response "this is a book" after asking, "what is this", resulting in teaching an incorrect response to the question. Also, the teacher did not use gestures.

According to the guide, the statements with which the teacher introduced the activity were wrong. This is not to imply that the book has to be followed exactly. MDU have rightly expressed their concern that the training should not be 'prescriptive'. The critical issue in this context is that the teacher was not using appropriate gesture to help her students' learning rather than the fact that she was not following the book precisely.

In one of the schools the students were inquired about the use of 'a' and 'an'. Their response was that 'a' described something that was near and similarly 'an' for something distant.

Confusions regarding the usage of an apostrophe (') repeatedly came up among both the teachers and the students. Most of the time, when inquired, both the teachers and the students took it for a shortened form of 'is' when it meant possession, and then took it for possession when it meant the shortened form of 'is'.

Confusions were also observed in the usage of pronouns. Both the teachers and the students made mistakes in differentiating between 'he' and 'she', and 'his' and 'her'.

When asked the meaning of 'she has a pen' in Bengali, their Bengali response meant 'it is a pen' or ' she is a pen'.

In one of the schools, the teacher was requested to demonstrate the 'practice'

part of the six steps. She attempted to conduct a 'chain drill' with her students. The drill started with "this is Sumi's khata", changed to "this is a Jamal's pen" in between, and eventually ended up in "she is Aklima's pen". The important point here is that the teacher failed to keep a track and correct the students while they carried out the chain drill.

The new training module, and the English instruction based on that, discourages the teachers to give Bengali meanings to individual words. The Bangla meaning of an English paragraph is given in a comprehensive way. Students read a paragraph in English over and over again and then the Bangla meaning after that repeatedly. The children write individual words on their slates as part of their writing exercise, and at that point they are told meaning of the words. The retention of word meanings was therefore found to be minimal.

It was noted that when asked the meaning of the sentence "we are a happy family", a student's reply meant, "they are a happy family". While teaching the lesson on "Sabina's family" it was observed that the teacher explained the meaning of the story in a summary form. The children were therefore not taught the meaning of each word in the correct context.

Once the researchers picked up a line from a rhyme which stated that "the wall is made of bricks", and the meaning of this sentence was given by the students as, "the wall is broken".

The observations conducted in BRAC classrooms provide clear evidence of the relationship between teachers' own knowledge, experience, and competence in English language and their competencies in teaching their students and providing meaningful learning activities. It was also evident that in many aspects there clearly existed a lack of learning in a uniform 'standardized' way.

MDU is clearly aware of this relationship and have attempted to produce a training programme to improve both teachers' knowledge and their classroom practice. The next section of this report details the research outcomes in relation to the training programme itself.

40

9. Observations of the training sessions

The research team observed English training sessions of both the staff and the teachers held at Training and Resource Centres (TARC), and Team Offices (TO). Also a session of Master Trainer training and selection process was observed at the Head Office. The research team observed the sessions for their full duration using observation checklists.

The training of Master Trainers

The training of Master Trainers (MT) takes place at the Head Office and is provided directly by the trainers from the Materials Development Unit (MDU), frequently aided by experienced Master Trainers. It must be mentioned here that this is not only a training session, it is also a selection session of prospective Master Trainers. At the end of the training, only the best performers are selected to be the future Master Trainers.

A highly selective group of field-staff is brought in for the purpose (a group of 25 to 30 participants on average at a time). Initially, only the Team in Charge were selected for English training, but eventually Programme Organisers and Resource Teachers were also included. They receive a weeklong thorough training on English teaching based on the new module. They receive training on all the lessons. All the participants have to demonstrate elaborately in front of the trainers, and they are selected after being scrutinised very carefully.

According to the Material Development Unit, English instruction in a typical classroom must ideally reflect what transpires during the MDU to MT training sessions. Therefore, as an end result, a teacher must be able to give to his/her students exactly what the Master Trainers are learning, particularly in respect to teaching styles.

Observation of MT training session

The researchers observed a full session of MT training. Four members of the Materials Development Unit, with one trained and experienced Master Trainer available to help, facilitated the training. The following provides a brief description of the researchers' observations of the session.

Initially the participants are given a detailed understanding of what is expected of them. That involves an elaborate description and explanation of the guide and the six steps of teaching English, and all the required criteria and qualities needed for the desired teaching style. Then a trainer demonstrates a specific lesson to the whole group. Consequently, several lessons are demonstrated during a session. The demonstration part is typically followed by a discussion/evaluation session, during which time the trainer clarifies concerns and questions raised by a trainee, about the demonstration, or anything specific about the instructions in the guide.

Finally, after demonstrating several times over, and after covering several lessons, the trainer divides the lessons among the trainees, upon which the respective trainee shall prepare his/her presentation based on the given lesson. It is the trainees' turn, during the following session, to demonstrate in front of the whole group. Later both the trainer and the rest of the participants do his or her evaluation. A trainee is asked to repeat several times until he or she has perfected his/her demonstration skills.

The training session for the Master Trainers takes place for a whole workweek. It is very detailed, and long time is allotted for both the trainer's and the trainee's demonstration, which enables the participants to practice repeatedly. The trainer has the time and the opportunity to bring each trainee to the desirable level of perfection. The trainees also have the opportunity to verify their concerns and confusions from the experts. Since the prospective Master Trainers, initially were selected from senior field staff, they possessed relatively better educational background, experience, and therefore higher self-confidence. All of these help them perform better, and pick up new skills easily.

Observation of Staff training session

A total of three staff training sessions were observed, given by Master Trainers, for their full duration. These sessions took place in different Training and Resource Centres (TARC), and three sessions were selected from three different regions.

Staff (PO, PO-5, and Resource Teachers) from different teams of that particular area; receive training from the respective Master Trainer. These training sessions are six-day long, but only two days are allotted for English. An average of twenty-five staff participates. These sessions also follow the similar format, like the one followed by the MDU at the Head Office.

The Master Trainer starts off by demonstrating a particular lesson by following the six-steps. Then a few trainees are asked to present. Later, the Master Trainer divides different lessons to the participants, on the basis of which they would prepare their demonstration.

Due to shorter duration of the sessions, the Master Trainers frequently need to cut short his own demonstration part, occasionally skipping one or more steps, like spelling, book reading and even sometimes the practice or the evaluation part. It becomes difficult to finish the session on time, and the session extends up to late evenings. This situation allows very little time for the staff to prepare their assignments for the next day. The second day starts of with the trainees' demonstration. The time constraint does not allow the staff to demonstrate a lesson totally. Therefore, hardly anyone can demonstrate all the six steps. Each trainee is evaluated by the whole group, and after the demonstration, is provided with feedback from his or her co-trainees.

The level of education of the staff varied considerably. Also position-wise, this is a more heterogeneous group of participants. Therefore, varied outcomes, as far as performance was concerned, were observed. Some grasped the content of the training very well, and some did not. Some had higher level of confidence and self-esteem, while others did not. In fact, a good number of them appeared to be extremely intimidated by the whole process, i.e., a sophisticated teaching method, strong scrutiny by the trainer, pressure to perform well. This predicament was frequently exacerbated due to short time duration within which they had to learn and perform highly specialised skills.

The above situation automatically creates a group of trainers who may not have earned new skills in a 'standardised' fashion.

42

The observation of teacher refresher

Specialized English subject-based training is disseminated to the teachers through the monthly refreshers. A staff who has received the TARC-based training from the Master Trainers conducts this training. The monthly refreshers is a daylong event, during which time teachers are trained on all the subjects they teach at school. Only two hours are allotted for English. Therefore, the dissemination of this new training module up to the teachers' level is taking place gradually, lesson by lesson through the monthly refreshers. As a result, none of the teachers, when the data was being collected for this study has received training on all the lessons.

It was also observed that the skills of the respective staff who conducted the refreshers varied considerably. As mentioned in the section above, the staff, for a number of reasons, are not learning or achieving the new skills in a standardized way. Therefore, when the responsibility comes on them as trainers, their performance also varies significantly.

Teachers' lower levels of education – combined with a staff's possible inadequate or faulty depiction of the six steps, as desired by the MDU or the Master Trainers work as a deterrent towards the teachers' proper understanding and grasping of the required skills. Although teachers appeared to have a better presentation skills (animation, confidence, ability of being at ease) compared to the staff, their weak cognitive base made it difficult for them to understand the guide well. The same reason made it difficult for teachers to use flexibility and creativity, particularly when unusual and interesting examples and new vocabularies were required to teach, according the guide. They remained too preoccupied with remembering the specific rules and instructions.

By the time the teachers were trained, the concept giving, practice and evaluation steps were not followed as required by the guide, since the staffs were found to be not teaching these skills well. Therefore, by the time the researchers observed the teachers' training, the dissemination of the training module deviated significantly.

The training rooms at BRAC Centre and at the TARC were large and had sufficient space and logistic supplies to accommodate at least 30 participants. The trainers conducting the training sessions could move easily and could organise the practice and evaluation sessions, and extra-curricular activities more efficiently. In contrast, the training rooms at the team offices had limited space and logistic supplies and had fewer facilities. It may be predicted therefore that differences in the physical environment and accommodation at BRAC Centre and the TARC compared with the field level training centres may have an impact upon the relative effectiveness of the training.

In retrospect it may have been useful to ask the participants for their views and opinions regarding the accommodation in the training centres.

The provision for adequate and appropriate logistics is an important aspect for not only teachers training but also all kinds of training in all areas. It was observed that the teachers' training sessions had space problems, inadequate and proper seating arrangements. The kinds of exercises and movements involved in this training require larger space and furniture (at least the participants must sit on chairs). In the teachers'

43

basic training sessions (pre-service training), each participant is usually provided with a teacher's guide book and text book on related subjects, but the participants attending the specialised English training were given fewer guide books and text books than required. Many times those needed to be shared among two or more of the trainees.

The training centres and the training environment

In general it can be said of the training sessions that the trainees' performance may depend on a number of independent variables, such as their job experience, subject knowledge, number of training sessions attended and so forth. As far as trainees' performance was concerned, the teachers were considerably more at ease compared to the staff while presenting lessons, but their weaker cognitive base, however, affects their grasping of the content of the training and the methods by which the contents should be presented. Also, teachers' weaker cognitive base deters teachers' use of creativity and flexibility. Whereas, while most of the staff had higher levels of education, their lack of teaching and public speaking experience hampers their presentation and lesson demonstration. They usually lack in confidence, are unanimated, and therefore, find it difficult to demonstrate lessons with confidence and animation.

It must be reiterated here again that this new module of English training requires a considerable knowledge base, flexibility, use of common-sense and creativity, animated presentation of lessons. The practice and evaluation part of the six steps particularly requires lots of movement and animated spoken ability.

It was observed that some staff and teachers were weak in capturing techniques thus failed to demonstrate lessons properly. Although some of them performed well, a majority of them could not follow systematically the six steps (concept giving, book reading, spelling, practice, evaluation and writing). Some of them were found to be following different styles and made a number of mistakes or taught wrong things in the training sessions.

As mentioned above, the duration of the specialised training on English was not the same for all levels of trainees. Training given by MDU to MT was scheduled for 6 days whereas it was 2 days for the staff. The teachers attend a daylong refresher course once a month at their respective team offices (TO), where they get a maximum of 2-3 hours because besides English other subjects are covered on the same day.

Since, the duration of training especially for the staff was limited, all twenty-two lessons could not be covered adequately in the scheduled time. Consequently, the training sessions had to be continued from early morning up until 8-9 in the evening. During this time very short rest intervals were given.

The duration of refreshers course for the teachers also seemed to be limited. It was observed that all the subjects are covered in a day. The observers realised that the teachers could not therefore become perfect in teaching lessons in the classroom in such a short length of time.

44

It is of significance perhaps that a number of trainees, particularly the field level staff, expressed some concern as to the duration of the training in their opinion interviews.

The relationship between the facilitator and the participants is an important factor in fruitful learning. MDU emphasise communication skills, presentation skills and temperament as important criteria for the selection of Master Trainers. In the training sessions observed by the researchers, the relationship between MT and staff, team-in-charges and teachers was generally found to be positive with one exception. In one session, the MT failed to create a congenial, non-threatening atmosphere. The trainees in that session were observed to be intimated by the Master Trainer's often hostile and unfriendly gestures. The participants very rarely asked any questions even when they did not understand something. The environment also affected their lesson demonstration/presentation skills.

Active participation in all kinds of learning processes is considered as one of the important factors for successful outcomes. The role of the facilitators in most of the sessions was observed to be active, ensuring higher level of participation from the trainees. The training module was developed in such a way that each participant had to be involved in the classroom activities which included practice, a variety of different games, evaluation and extra curricular activities.

Practice, the fifth step of the six, in a training session is a most significant method for understanding and absorbing the techniques. After providing the concept on a particular aspect, the facilitator asks the participants to take part in a practice session that usually is organised in one of three different ways, i.e., chain drill, drill in two groups and drill in three groups. The methods for practice to be used in a particular aspect depend on the facilitator's common sense. However, it was observed that among the three methods for practice drill in three groups was seemed to be the complex method for all categories of respondents. It was also more complex to the learners in the schools.

A most significant method used in the training courses is that the sessions attempt to simulate school classrooms in which the facilitators adopt the role of the teacher and the participants adopt the role of student. Unfortunately, it was observed that in a number of cases participants did not fulfil their role as requested. In many cases they acted their usual role as staff or teacher) and therefore knew many aspects of different lessons before they had been taught. Consequently, they reduced the opportunities for learning about future potential problems that they may have to face in the practical, real-life classroom situations. This lack of willingness to participate in role-play is not uncommon in in-service training courses conducted in the UK and elsewhere and perhaps may reflect trainee's lack of confidence in 'performing' in front of their peers.

45

10. Trainees attitudes and opinions about the training

The in-country research team developed a questionnaire consisting of 34 questions designed to obtain information about trainees' attitudes and opinions towards the training programme. Three different versions of the questionnaire were adapted for use by teachers, field level staff, and Master Trainers. Copies of the questionnaires are available for reference in Appendix One.

Participants were asked to complete the questionnaires at the end of the training. Following completion of the questionnaires, the participants were also invited to take part in a group discussion to enable them to express their views orally.

The respondents' answers were divided into three general categories. Their perception of achieved of new skills, their opinion, or judgement of the training session and the module, and their feedback on issues that can be changed or done differently. The following is a brief description of responses by three groups of respondents. First the teachers, then the staff, and finally the Master Trainers.

Teachers
Skills

A total of 39 teachers filled out the opinion questionnaires. Among this group of respondents, sixteen (41%) mentioned the six steps or new methods of teaching English as delineated by the module as their newly learnt skills. Twenty-one (54%) of these respondents mentioned different aspects of English grammar, and teaching techniques as new skills. In this case, the responses ranged from conversational skills, group participation to use of articles, apostrophe, and methods of teaching spelling.

Judgement

While judging the training session and the module, seventeen (44%) mentioned the six steps of the module, and ten (26%) respondents mentioned the guide specifically as the positive aspect of the new training procedure. Seventeen (44%) of the respondents claimed that they like everything about the training. Eleven of the respondents (28%) emphasized grammar, the extra-curricular activities (use of fun and games) as positive aspects of the training.

Feedback

Five of the respondents (13%) suggested that time duration of English class must be increased in order to make this new way of teaching English effective. The rest, thirty-four (87%) of them addressed specific aspects of the module that needs to be looked at.

Field-staff

46

Skills

A total of sixty-two staff was requested to fill out the opinion questionnaires. Among them, approximately 26% (16) mentioned the steps of teaching English according to the new guide as their new skills. About 23% (14) mentioned spoken ability as their new skills. 32% (20) mentioned their ability to demonstrate in front of the teachers or the classroom as new skills. Another 32% (20) mentioned specific grammatical or stylistic issues as newly acquired skills, such as spelling, pronunciation, vocabulary and so forth.

Judgement

Approximately 23% (14) mentioned the provision for demonstrating in front of a large group of people was a positive aspect of the training. Close to 31% of them positively evaluated the fact that it gave them an opportunity to correct mistakes ((8), helped overall learning (9), and that the sessions were participatory (8).

Approximately 55% (34) of the field-staff thought that there was too much time constraints during the training sessions they attended. Eleven of them perceived that the training sessions were very short given the content.

Feedback

Forty- percent (25) of the staff emphasized the increase in the time duration of the training sessions, particularly the ones at the field level. Some of the other important feedback that came from the staff included, addressing the particular weaknesses of individual staff and teachers. These weaknesses usually are difficult to address within larger forum. Also, the need for an MT at all teams was reiterated. The staff also suggested that the guide could be made simpler. The staff also suggested that there could be provisions for Master Trainers' participation in school supervision.

Master Trainers

Judgement

A total of 31 Master Trainers evaluated this training schedule positively, by specifically mentioning staff development as a positive outcome of this training. In order to be a good and efficient master trainer, 22 (71%) of them thought that having the subject knowledge is one of the most important factors. An equal number of them also suggested that lively presentation and demonstration skill as very important. Almost 48% (15) emphasized confidence.

Feedback

The feedback from Master Trainers included the following issues. Once again, the issue related to time constraint came up from the Master Trainers as well. One specifically mentioned that it becomes difficult for the staff to grasp the steps involved in the new method within the short duration of the staff training session. They reiterated that the steps could be made simpler so that the staff and the teachers can grasp the content well. This, in other words, is addressing the complexity of the guide, which the staff and the teachers were finding to be difficult.

The Master Trainers suggested occasional refresher for them, so that review of their own learning can take place, and they can clear away their confusions. Also, the staff, according to the Master trainers, must receive specific instructions on school supervision. While the new method is already difficult for them to grasp and then to disseminate to teachers, the added burden of proper supervision must be taken into account. Otherwise proper follow-up will be hindered significantly.

Almost one-fourth of the Master Trainers (8) in this study suggested frequent workshops for the Master Trainers. The Master Trainers also touched the point on the differential capabilities of the staff when they come for the training. It is not easy for the Master Trainers to address the specific weaknesses and limitations of individual members due to the time constraint. Therefore, some of the staff performs very well, and others do not. The above predicament leaves some members inadequately trained.

Group Discussions

As mentioned earlier, all the training observation sessions were followed by group discussions. The following section lists the major issues that were raised by the participants during the group discussions.

The students start English from the end of the second year with alphabets only; the English textbook is introduced in the third year. Therefore, it becomes very difficult for the students to cope.

Students are taught the spellings which are given in the guide only. Students are weak in spelling.

There is no translation or word-meaning content in the book. So they do not understand the meaning in a comprehensive way, which makes addressing a specific question difficult, or putting the exact idea in context. Reading comprehension could be introduced in the English curriculum.

Time constraints. The time given for English class is not sufficient Proper concept giving makes teaching easier, but time does not allow the full process as delineated by the new module.

Time allotted:
Concept and book reading: 1 day
Practice and evaluation: 1 day

The grammar section of the guide should be in more detail. Because we are not in touch for a long time we have forgotten many basic things. We need a kind of

48

revision. For example number (singular /plural), gender, person, pronoun, tense etc should be in more detail.

Scarcity of books came out as a significant deterrent towards students' proper learning.

It takes a lot of time if we follow the guide. That is why we use our own method.

There is no workbook though the guide says to follow the workbook.

It's encouraged by the module not to provide Bangla word meanings directly, which also causes major problems. Students do not understand the meanings, which creates a problem in recalling the lesson.

11. Trainees' cognitive development and knowledge acquisition

Participants' responses from the opinion questionnaires delineated the respondents' newly learned skills in teaching, their opinion and judgement of the training and the module, and their suggestions and feedback for change and improvements, if required. However, successful implementation of such a module and teaching method on which the training is given, the cognitive knowledge base of the participants involved is very important. In this regard, both the existence of a strong knowledge base, and the acquisition of knowledge after the training are very important. It appeared that cognitive knowledge must be a prerequisite in order to grasp and internalize the new method of instruction. Also, by the same token, it could have been assumed that the training itself increased and enriched the trainees' knowledge of the subject. In view of the above, the researchers developed a test based on the curriculum, guide, and the module.

The test items were taken from the Class III textbook that is published by the Textbook Board Bangladesh. The book has also been introduced into BRAC schools and contains twenty-two lessons. The contents of the test particularly included those aspects of the curriculum and the module, which have been covered during the various training sessions, as observed by the researchers. Also, the sections in the test were divided into easy, moderately difficult, and very difficult parts. The initial draft was field-tested in two teams and then later modified before final data collection.

The objective of the following part of this paper is to analyse the items of the test instrument operated on field-staff and the teachers in order to assess their knowledge base. The text book covers some simple aspects of English, e.g., articles, 's, tenses, translations, making sentences and learning different words with meaning and spelling. It has been mentioned earlier in this paper that, following the textbook, NFPE's MDU has developed a guidebook for teachers, which covers all the lessons of the textbook. The training for the teachers as well as staff is directly based on the guidebook. The ultimate aim of the training is to develop the pedagogical skills of the teachers, and thus emphasise is given on teaching techniques.

Table 2 presents respondents' knowledge about selected articles and uses of the same, and it was found that the knowledge of the respondents (staff and teachers) on articles was similar, based on the given test. It shows that more than 66.0% of the staff and 68.0% of the teachers could correctly explain where the article 'a' should be used in sentences. Similarly, more than 61.0% of the staff and 64.0% of the teachers could correctly explain where the article 'an' must be used in sentences. The Table also shows that knowledge of the respondents about practical uses of the articles is also similar.

The same Table (Table 2) also shows the respondents' knowledge about apostrophe ('). The Table indicates that the respondents' (Staff and teachers) performance on the use and application of apostrophe was not similar. The Table shows that the knowledge on apostrophe was much higher among the Staff than the teachers. Majority (72.2%) of the staff could correctly explain the reason why 's is used after someone's name. On the other hand less than 17.0% of the staff could correctly explain that it is used in sentences as a short form of 'is'. In an another exercise[1], about 89.0% of the staff could correctly mention why an 's has been used to indicate

---

[1] Four sentences showing practical use of 's were given in the test (Table -1)

possession, while only 33.3% and 38.9 % of the staff respectively could correctly mention why it has been used as a shortened form of 'is'. The table further shows that knowledge of the teachers about apostrophe was very poor (see table 2). Very few teachers knew that (') is used in sentences as a short form of 'is' (17.1% after 'It' and 11.7% after 'There'.

Table 2
Proportion of respondents answered questions on articles and apostrophe correctly

Explanatory variables	% Staff (n=18)	% Teachers (n=111)
Explain where the articles 'a' and 'an' are used in sentences		
a) a	66.7	68.5
b) an	61.1	64.0
Fill up the blanks using the articles a and an	88.9	89.2
a) This is ----------- airplane	94.4	93.7
b) This is ---------- vase		
Explain when an apostrophe (') is used		
a) To explain possession	72.2	29.7
b) Shortened form of 'is'	16.7	10.8
Mention why an (') and an 's has been used in the following sentences		
a) This is Mina's doll	88.9	57.7
b) It's raining	33.3	17.1
c) BRAC's schools are beautiful	88.9	27.9
d) There's a book on the table	38.9	11.7

Table 3 shows that the majority of the respondents could write the correct meaning of the majority of the words. It is revealed, however, from the answer sheets that among the selected words, 'butcher', 'weaver' and 'buried' were the most unanswered ones, showing the respondents' unfamiliarity with the words. On the other hand, 'grandfather', 'family', 'young' were found to be the most familiar words to the respondents. The Table also indicates that the spelling of some selected words, i.e., 'housewife', 'doll', 'happy' seemed to be easier for the respondents. In contrast, the spelling of 'nephew', 'businessman' and 'daughter' were found to be difficult words for both the groups of respondents (see table 3).

51

Table 3
Proportion of respondents who could give the meaning
and spelling of some selected words correctly

Selected words for meaning and spelling	Staff (n=18)	Teacher (n=111)
Word meaning		
a) Grandfather	100.0	96.4
b) Family	100.0	97.3
c) Thin	88.9	73.0
d) Leaf	88.9	83.8
e) Butcher	61.1	20.7
f) Bricks	88.9	76.6
g) Young	94.4	87.4
h) Weaver	66.7	23.4
I) Pan	83.3	78.4
J) Buried	61.7	27.0
Spelling		
a) Housewife	88.9	60.4
b) Doll	100.0	91.9
c) Forty	88.9	18.0
d) Happy	100.0	87.4
e) Tuesday	72.2	41.4
f) Businessman	38.9	3.6
g) Colour	83.3	38.7
h) Postman	83.3	42.3
I) Daughter	44.4	34.2
j) Nephew	33.3	-

Table 4 presents respondents' abilities in translating sentences of some selected grammatical items (order/request, general, present continuous and interrogative type sentences) from Bangla to English. It appears from the Table that among all these items, translations of interrogative sentences seemed to be the hardest to answer for both the groups of respondents. Among the general sentences, however, translations of the negative sentences were found to be the hardest sentences. The Table shows only 11.1% of the staff and 1.8% of the teachers could translate 'they do not have a house'. Similarly, none of the staff could translate the sentence 'Fatema does not have a book', which was answered correctly by 3.6% of the teachers.

52

Table 4.
Proportion of respondents who could translate a variety of sentences from Bangla to English correctly

Different types of sentences	% Staff (n=18	% Teacher (n=111)
Order/ request Good morning. Please sit down	94.4	67.6
Take your pen	72.2	34.2
Close your exercise book	94.4	43.2
Write your name on the blackboard	72.2	21.6
Take the duster	83.3	50.5
Clean the blackboard	72.2	56.8
General sentences This is your Chair	88.9	51.4
Nasima has a pen	61.1	26.1
They have a cow	61.1	34.2
They don't have house	11.1	1.8
Fatema doesn't have a book	-	3.6
That is Rahman's chair	77.8	42.3
No, it is not	94.4	43.2
This is Kalam's father's pen	61.1	37.0
Present continuous I am swimming	83.3	49.5
Rahim, Karim, Latif and Fatema are playing	50.0	22.5
You are laughing	72.2	21.6
She is washing cloth	66.7	9.9
They are eating	83.3	60.4
Interrogative Sentences What is your father's name?	61.1	30.6
What is he?	44.4	25.2
Is this Rahman's exercise book?	50.0	22.5
Does he have book?	27.8	3.6
What colour is your shirt?	38.9	19.8

Respondents' abilities in using verbs in its correct form were also assessed by this test. In the test instrument, a few selected infinitive verbs were given in brackets and places of verbs to be put were kept blank. Table 5 however shows that the majority of the staff could fill up the blanks with the verbs in present continuous form. The majority of the respondents from both the groups of respondents could not use the correct form of verb after third person singular number. In using the correct form of auxiliary verb in interrogative sentences, the field staff performed far better than the teachers. It appears from the table that overall performance of the teachers especially in using the correct form of verbs in different type of sentences was found to be poor compared to the staff.

Table 5 also shows similar results in the use of the auxiliary verb in sentences. It

53

shows that about 78.0% and 55.5% of the staff respectively could put the correct form of auxiliary verb into two interrogative sentences. For teachers, the respective figures were 23.4% and 14.4%.

Table 5
Proportion of respondents who correctly completed the blanks by using the correct form of verb taking from brackets and auxiliary verbs

Explanatory variables	Staff (n=18)	Teacher (n=111)
My mother is ------------ rice (cook)	72.2	32.4
You are ------------- a picture (draw)	61.1	36.9
He -------------- to school (walk)	33.3	1.8
They---------------- every morning (run)	44.4	20.7
We ------National Anthem every day (sing)	55.5	15.3
Do they ------------- a television?	77.8	23.4
------------ he have a radio?	55.5	14.4

Table 6 shows the distribution of respondents who could correctly translate sentences from English to Bangla. The Table shows that of the selected three sentences (two were simple and one was interrogative) almost all the staff could translate two simple sentences correctly. Among the staff, about 89.0% could translate the interrogative sentence correctly. On the other hand, more than 76.0% of the teachers could translate the sentence "This is a red rose" correctly. The remaining two sentences were correctly translated by approximately 50.0% of the teachers.

Table 6
Proportion of respondents who could translate selected sentences from English to Bangla correctly

Explanatory variables	Staff (n=18)	Teacher (n=111)
He is Hasan's mother's father	100.0	50.5
This is a red rose	100.0	76.6
Is the teacher's bag white?	88.9	52.3

To assess the writing ability of the respondents, an open-ended writing exercise was given in the test. The respondents were asked to write a total of five English sentences about themselves. Table 7 presents the distribution of respondents by the number of sentences that were written by them about themselves. The table shows that the highest proportion (44.5%) of the staff could write four sentences about themselves and 27.8% could write five sentences. On the other hand, the highest proportion (36.9%) of the teachers could not write at least one sentence about themselves. About 12.0% of the teachers could write five sentences.

Table 7
Proportion of respondents by number of sentences which were written about themselves.

Number of sentences	Staff	Teacher

54

	(n=18)	(n=111)
00	11.1	36.9
1	-	3.6
2	11.1	18.9
3	05.5	9.9
4	44.5	18.9
5	27.8	11.7
Total	100.0	100.0

An attempt was also made in this study to determine the variance in the respondents' performance in their cognitive domain, by some of their background variables. Some of the variables included, their job experience, years of schooling, numbers of training received, numbers of lessons covered by training sessions and the numbers of lessons taught in school.

Table 8 shows that the mean of years of schooling (13.9), number of lessons covered by training sessions (21.7), training received in hour (14.0 hours) and test scores of the staff (67.4) were higher than the teachers. On the other hand the mean job experience of the teachers (4.9) was higher in comparison to the field staff. It should be mentioned here that the teachers are given training through the process of refresher courses held once a month, during which time, only two hours is allotted for English as other subjects are covered in a day. Thus, the teachers get no more than two hours a day on English. In contrast, field staff is usually given special training on English for two days.

Table 8
Mean of some variables by category of respondents

	Staff (n=18)		Teachers (n=111)		
Exploratory variables	**Mean**	**sd**	**Mean**	**sd**	**Sign.**
Job experience	4.2	1.4	4.9	2.7	ns
Year of schooling	13.9	1.1	10.1	.80	<.0001
Training received (hour)	14.0	8.5	10.0	5.3	<.0001
No. of lessons covered in training	21.7	1.2	10.4	6.7	<.0001
Test score	67.4	17.8	39.8	19.1	<.0001

Table 9 presents the distribution of respondents by score band obtained by them on the test. The Table shows that more than 83.0% of the field staff and more than 26.0% of the teachers (cumulative figure) obtained a score of more than 50.0. The table also shows that 50.0% of the staff and less than 4.0% of the teachers obtained a score greater than 70.0. Tables 2 and 3 however clearly indicated earlier that the field staff performed better in the test than the teachers.

Table 9
Distribution of respondents by score band

55

Score band	Staff (n=18)	Teacher (n=111)
0 - 30	5.6 (1)	37.8 (42)
31 - 50	11.1 (2)	36.0 (42)
51 - 70	33.3 (6)	22.5 (25)
71 + above	50.0 (9)	3.8 (4)
All	100.0 (11)	100.0 (111)

Figures in parentheses indicate number of staff and teachers

Table 10 analyses the mean score of the respondents by a number of independent variables, i.e., years of schooling, job experience, training received in hour, and number of lessons covered by the training. The table shows that most of the field staff (15 out of 18) had 14 or more years of schooling. On the other hand, the majority of the teachers (86 out of 111) had 10 years of schooling, 13 had twelve and above years of schooling and the remaining 12 teachers had less than 10 years of schooling. The Table indicates that the mean score has a close relationship with years of schooling, i.e., test score increases with increasing years of schooling.

Data on the job experience also shows that there is a relationship between the test scores and the length of job experience. The table shows test scores increased with longer job experience.

Data on the training received in hour shows that most of all the field staff had received training more than eight hour, especially on English. On the other hand, about 44 teachers had received training less than eight hours. The Table further shows that test score of field staff is higher specially who received more hour training. On the other hand this finding contradicts with the test score of the teachers by training received in hour. Result shows that test score of the teachers specially who received 16 hour training obtained 36 score which is lower (36.0) than the test score who received less than nine hours training. The difference is not significant. It does not mean that test scores do not have any relationship with training hour. A correlation analysis (Table 11) indicates that training hour and test score of the respondents is correlated (<.10 level). r

Data on the number of lessons covered by the training reveals that out of a total of 22 lessons in the text book, almost all the field staff and 33 teachers received training at least up to lesson 16. It is also shown in Table 10 that the majority of the teachers (60 out of total 111 teachers) had received training that had covered no more than 10 lessons. The Table also shows that the mean scores gradually increase with an increase in the number of lessons covered by the training sessions.

Finally, Table 10 shows the mean score obtained by teachers by the number of lessons they taught in their respective schools. It shows that 61 out of 111 teachers taught no more than 10 lessons and only 30 of them taught 16 or more lessons in their respective schools. Data showing the distribution of scores by number of lessons taught in schools reveals that the scores gradually increase with the numbers of lessons taught.

Table 10
Mean score of the respondents by their job related background

56

	Field staff (n=18)		Teachers (n=111)	
Explanatory Variables	**Mean**	**sd.**	**Mean**	**sd.**
Year of schooling				
8-9 years	-	-	23.4 (12)	10.3
10 years	-	-	40.1 (86)	18.7
12 years	64.7 (3)	18.2	51.2 (12)	18.2
14+ years	68.0 (15)	18.3	67.0 (1)	-
Job experience (year)				
1-3 years	59.0 (5)	24.1	37.8 (46)	19.6
4-6 years	69.9 (12)	15.0	40.0 (37)	20.6
7 + years	80.0 (1)	-	42.6 (28)	16.0
Training hour				
1 - 8 hour	-	-	40.3 (44)	21.2
9 - 15 "	64.9 (14)	18.7	41.2 (44)	18.5
16 +	76.2 (4)	12.3	36.0 (23)	15.9
No. of lessons covered in training				
1-10 lessons				
11-15 lessons	-	-	37.8 (60)	19.9
16-22 lessons	-	-	45.3 (18)	17.0
No. of lessons taught in school	67.4 (18)	17.8	40.3 (33)	18.4
1-10 lessons				
11-15 lesson	-	-	38.4 (61)	20.2
16-22 lessons	-	-	40.8 (20)	18.9
	-	-	41.9 (30)	17.2

Figures in parentheses indicate number of respondents.

The previous section of this chapter attempted to present some selected job related background information of the respondents that may have an impact on the effectiveness of the training. The main focus was to analyse scores obtained by the respondents and their relationship with the background variables.

The test reveals that the field staff performed significantly better in the test compared to the teachers (p<.001). The aim of this analysis was not to show comparison between the two groups (field staff and teachers) but to examine the influence of the different variables in the test.

However it is evident from the analyses that of the background variables, years of schooling of the respondents was the most significant determinant for obtaining a higher score. It was expected that the scores of respondents who had received higher numbers of training sessions and/or covered a higher number of lessons in the training would be higher compared with the scores of respondents who had received fewer number training. However, the results do not indicate the same. The Table shows that the mean scores were slightly lower for those respondents who had received lower and higher numbers of training sessions and/or covered a higher and lower number of lessons. These findings thus strongly do not indicate that training appears to have less influence upon the development of subject knowledge as may expected. It should also be mentioned again that as the researchers observed, subject knowledge is not directly associated with pedagogical skills. For example, the teaching skills and classroom demonstrations of the teachers were generally better than those of the field staff.

57

Correlation between background variables and subject knowledge

The correlation between participants' subject knowledge as measured by their score obtained on the test with selected independent, background variables was examined. A bi-variate correlation analysis (Table 11) shows that among the selected variables, years of schooling and number of lessons covered by training sessions had a positive correlation to subject knowledge which is statistically significant ($p<.001$). Although the table also shows that the job experience of the respondents was also positively correlated to subject knowledge the relationship was not significant

The correlation table shows surprising results in that designation of the respondents and number of training sessions received by them was negatively correlated to subject knowledge. This can be explained by the fact that the average years of schooling of JPOs is similar to that of POs and their subject knowledge as measured by the mean test scores was also very similar. Finally, the table shows, training received in hour had a positive correlation to test score which is statistically significant at $p< 0.10$ level.

58

Table 11
Correlation of some selected independent variables to subject knowledge

	DESG	EDUN	JEXP	TRHR	LSST	SCORE
DESG	1.000	-.8324 P< .001	.0973 ns	-.2403 P< 0.10	-.5356 P< .001	-.4553 P< .001
EDUN		1.000	-.0607 ns	.2428 P< 0.10	.4722 P< .001	.5368 P< .001
JEXP			1.000	.1758 P.<05	.1567 P< 0.10	.0229 ns
TRHR				1.000	.5944 P< .001	-.2312 P< 0.10
LSST					1.000	.4039 P< .001
SCORE						1.000

Codes

DESG	=	designation
EDUN	=	years of schooling
JEXP	=	job experience
TRHR	=	training received in hour
LSST	=	number of lessons covered by training sessions
SCORE	=	score achieved on test

59

33

12. Error analysis

In the previous section of the report, participants' answers to the achievement test designed to measure their knowledge and understanding in English language were analysed in relation to a number of background variables. These analyses demonstrated that different groups of respondents categorised by a number of variables, e.g., years of schooling, type of employment and so on demonstrated different levels of performance on the test.

Such differential performance can be expected in any similar type of test because the groups, especially the field staff compared with the teachers enter the training programme with different educational backgrounds. Their knowledge base is therefore different even before the training programme. Ideally the test should therefore be administered before and after the respondents had attended the training sessions. Alternatively, the test could have been administered to a group of field staff and teachers who had not received the training. This group could have served as the control group. The field staff and the teachers who had attended the training and completed the test would have been the experimental group.

The differences in achievement between the two sets of scores from the same respondents obtained from test administration before and after the test would have enabled the effectiveness of the training programme to be more accurately measured in terms of improvements in respondents' knowledge. Analyses of the differences between the test scores of the control and experimental groups would have served a similar purpose. Time constraints with regard to the time allocated for the research project did not allow for these more rigorous methods to be utilised. These are activities that may be useful to incorporate in any follow up studies designed to measure the training programme as it continues over time.

The test data can, however, be used to provide evidence to directly inform the NFPE programme, particularly the MDU. The errors that respondents made in answering the specific items may provide information that can be used to review and modify the existing contents.

The following section of the report therefore includes error analyses in a series of tables which identify the common mistakes made by respondents and which may suggest to MDU areas in the training which need to be revised in order to help participants overcome these common problems.

From the total of 129 sample, 70 answer sheets were randomly selected for the error analysis. Their responses to the test questions were noted and a number of common errors were calculated. The following Tables are sorted in descending order of frequencies and percentages.

60

Item 3. When do we use an apostrophe (')

Response	Frequency	%
No response	31	44.3
Indicate any person or object specifically	9	12.9
Instead of is	6	8.6
Because of Bengali 'r'	6	8.6
Plural sense	5	7.1
Ownership	5	7.1
To shorten the sentence	4	5.7
Ownership and instead of is	4	5.7

* A great majority do not appear to know where and when to use an (') (44.3%)
* The common error is that they think it should be used to indicate a person or an object specifically (12.9%)
* Only (5.7%) could answer correctly.
* 11 variation was found in the answers given by the respondents, which means that there exists significant confusions.

4. Please mention when and why 's' is used in the following sentences.
a. This is Mina's doll

Response	frequency	%
Ownership of a person	22	31.4
makes no sense	14	20.0
Missing	11	15.6
to specify something	10	14.3
at the end of name	4	5.7
to indicate Mina	3	4.3
it is only Mina's doll	2	2.9
Indicate one thing only	2	2.9
for the Bengali alphabet 'r'	2	2.9

* Most of them (35.6%) could not explain. That is they have no idea. Missing (15.6%) and no sense (20.0%)
* The common error was 'to specify something' (14.3%)
*31.4% could explain correctly
* 10 variations

61

b. It's raining

Response	frequency	%
Missing	30	42.9
Instead of 'is'	12	17.1
to shorten the sentence	5	7.1
makes no sense	5	7.1
Indicate somebody or something	4	5.7
to mean running	3	4.2
to mean certain period of time	2	2.9
Specify	2	2.9
Ownership	2	2.9
Because of Bengali 'r'.	2	2.9
to mean present continuous tense	1	1.4
to mean one thing only	1	1.4
plural sense	1	1.4

*Most of them (42.9%) have failed to explain

*Common error (7.1%) was to shorten the sentence
*Only (17.1%) could answer correctly.
* 13 variations

c. BRAC's schools are very beautiful.

Response	frequency	%
Missing	39	55.7
Specify	8	11.4
no sense	8	11.4
Ownership	7	10.0
Plural	5	7.1
Because of Bengali 'r'	2	3.0
to indicate one school only	1	1.4

*Most of them (67.1%) failed to explain. Missing (55.7%) and no sense (11.4%).
*Common error was 'to specify something' (11.4%)
*Only (10.0%) could answer correctly
*7 variations

62

d. There's a book on the table.

Response	frequency	%
Missing	39	55.7
no sense	8	11.4
Despite is	7	10.0
Specify	4	5.8
Because of the Bengali alphabet 'r'	4	5.8
mean their	2	2.9
to shorten the sentence	1	1.4
to mean 'on'	1	1.4
to indicate the number of things	1	1.4
to indicate one thing only	1	1.4
Plural	1	1.4
Ownership	1	1.4

*Most of them (67.1%) failed to explain. Missing (55.7%) and no sense (11.4%).
*Common error was 'to specify something' (5.8%).
* Only (10%) could answer correctly.
* 12 variations

8. Translate into English:
a. Please go to your seat.

Response	Frequency	%
Good morning, please sit down.	49	70.0
Missing	15	21.4
Please go to seat	2	2.9
Good morning, please your seat.	2	2.9
Suprovat, please sit down.	1	1.4
Good morning, it is your seat.	1	1.4

*Common error (70.0%) was 'Good morning, please sit down.'
* 21.3% could not answer
* No one could answer perfectly but only 2.9% was close to the right answer.
*6 variations

63

b. This is your chair

Response	frequency	%
This is your chair	20	28.6
That is chair	15	21.4
It's your chair	15	21.4
Missing	6	8.6
This is my chair	5	7.1
This is a chair	3	4.4
It is your chair	2	2.9
We are chair	1	1.4
This is his chair.	1	1.4
This is a your chair	1	1.4
That the your chair	1	1.4

* Common error was 'It's your chair' (21.4%) and 'That is chair' (21.4%)
* 28.6% could answer correctly.
* 8.6% couldn't answer.
*11 variations

c. That is Rahman's seat.

Response	frequency	%
Missing	16	22.8
That is Rahman's tool	15	21.4
This is Rahman chair	10	14.3
This is Rahman's chair	5	7.1
That is Rahmans seat	5	7.1
That Raman's seat	4	5.7
It is Rahman seat	2	3.0
That the Rahman's seat	1	1.4
That is Rahman's? Rahman	1	1.4
That is Rahman's seat	1	1.4

* Most of them (22.8%) could not explain correctly
*Common error (14.3%) was 'This is Rahman chair'
*Only (1.4%) could answer perfectly and (21.4%) were near perfection.
*10 variations

6 4

d. Take your pen

Response	Frequency	%
Missing	28	40.0
Take your pen	25	35.7
Bring the pen	6	8.5
Your pen	2	2.8
Take you pen	2	2.8
Take the pen	2	2.8
Your pen's take	1	1.4
There are pen	1	1.4
That is pen	1	1.4
Take the my pen	1	1.4
Take his pen	1	1.4
No sense	1	1.4

* Most of them (40.0%) could not explain
*35.7% could answer correctly.
* Common error was ' take the pen' (2.8%), 'your pen' (2.8%) and 'Take you pen' (2.8%)
*12 variations

e. Is that Rahman's exercise book?

Response	Frequency	%
Missing	30	42.8
Is that Rahman's khata	14	20.0
That is Rahman's khata	8	11.4
Is that Rahman's Khata	6	8.5
what is that Rashman's khata	3	4.2
That is what Rahman's Khata	2	2.8
That is Rahman's khata	2	2.8
Is the Rakman khata	2	2.9
That is Rahman's khata what	1	1.4
That is Rahman	1	1.4
Is this khata Rahman's?	1	1.4

* Most of them (42.8%) could not answer
*20.0% could answer correctly.
*Common error (11.4%) was 'That is Rahman's khata
*12 variations

f. No, it is not.

Response	Frequency	%
No, it is not	29	41.5
Missing	19	27.2
No, it her not	6	8.6
No, he is not	4	5.7
No this are no her	3	4.3
No, it is does not.	2	2.9
On, it is his on.	1	1.4
No, they are not	1	1.4
No, the your not	1	1.4
No, it is not they	1	1.4
No, it is not a not	1	1.4
No, her	1	1.4
No, he doesn't	1	1.4

41.5% could answer correctly.
*27.2% couldn't answer.
*The common error (8.6%) was 'No, it her not'
* 13 variations

g. Close your khata.

Response	Frequency	%
Close your khata	33	47.1
missing	23	32.9
close the khata	4	5.7
The khata is close	3	4.3
Your khata close	2	2.9
There is khata open	1	1.4
Open your khata	1	1.4
It is close khata	1	1.4
He close the khata	1	1.4
Close your the khata	1	1.4

* 47.1% could answer correctly.
*32.9% could not answer.
* Common error (5.7%) was 'close the khata'. Though the error was negligible.
*10 variations

66

h. Write your name on the blackboard

Response	Frequency	%
Missing	36	51.4
Write your name on the blackboard	11	15.7
Your name writing blackboard	4	5.7
Write your name blackboard	4	5.7
My name's your blackboard	3	4.2
Write your name in the blackboard	2	2.9
The blackboard your name	2	2.9
Take your name blackboard	2	2.9
What your name blackboard	1	1.4
There are blackboard your name	1	1.4
Read your name on the black board	1	1.4
My name is blackboard	1	1.4
His name is blackboard	1	1.4
Go to the blackboard	1	1.4

* Most of them (51.4%) could not answer
*15.7% could answer correctly
*Common error was 'Your name writing blackboard' (5.7%) and 'Write your name blackboard' (5.7%).
*14 variations

6 7

i. Take the duster

Response	Frequency	%
Take the duster	33	47.1
Missing	21	30.1
It is duster	8	11.4
There are duster	2	2.9
Take the duster	2	2.9
The duster give	1	1.4
Take your the blackboard	1	1.4
Take your duster	1	1.4
Go to the duster	1	1.4

* 30.1.1% could not answer
* 47.1% could answer correctly
*Common error (11.4%) was 'It is duster'
*9 variations

f. Clean the blackboard

Response	Frequency	%
Clean the blackboard	52	74.3
Missing	15	21.4
The blackboard clean	2	2.9
Take the duster	1	1.4

* Most of them (74.3%) could answer correctly
* 21.4% couldn't answer
*Though negligible yet the common error (2.9%) was 'The blackboard clean'
*4 variations

g. Nasima has a pen.

Response	Frequency	%
Nasima have a pen	23	32.8
Nasima has a pen	18	25.7
Nasima's has a pen	8	1.4
Missing	7	10.1
This is a Nasiam's pen	4	5.7
Nasima is a pen	4	5.7
Nasima's have a pen	2	2.9
They have a Nasima's pen	1	1.4
Nasima not a pen	1	1.4
Nasima at the pen	1	1.4
I have Nasima's pen	1	1.4

* A large number did a common mistake (32.8%). It was 'Nasima have a pen'
*25.7% could respond correctly.
* 10.1% couldn't answer.
*11 variations

h. They have a cow.

68

Response	Frequency	%
They have a cow	27	38.6
There are have a cow	7	10.0
Missing	7	10.0
He is a cow	7	10.0
They has a cow	5	7.1
There are has a cow	3	4.3
We at the cow	2	2.9
They are is a cow	2	2.9
They are a cow	2	2.9
There's have a cow	2	2.9
Your's have a cow	1	1.4
We are the cow	1	1.4
This is a cow	1	1.4
They is has a cow	1	1.4
They are had a cow	1	1.4
There is a cow	1	1.4

* 38.6% could answer correctly
*10.0% could not answer
*Common errors were 'There are have a cow' (10.0%) and 'He is a cow (10.0%).
*16 variations

I.   Fatema has no book

Response	Frequency	%
Missing	21	30.0
Fatema not book	12	17.1
Fatema is not book	8	11.4
Fatema's no book	6	8.6
Fatema's haven't book	4	5.7
Fatema's don't book	3	4.3
Fatema has no book	3	4.3
Fatema doesn't book	3	4.3
Fatemar on book	2	2.9
Fatema have no book	2	2.9
Does not Ftaema book	2	2.9
Fatema's has no book	1	1.4
Fatema's doesn't book	1	1.4
Fatema have don't book.	1	1.4
Fatema has a no book	1	1.4

*30.0% could not answer correctly. * Common errors were 'Fatema not book' (17.1%)
and 'Fatema is not book' (11.4%). *Only 3 could answer correctly.   * A large number of
variation (15) came up. That means they have more confusion in the concept.
 Does he have books?

Response	Frequency	%
Missing	27	38.6
Is his book/is he book/ is has book/ Is it his	6	8.7

book		
What are have book/ What they have book	3	4.4
What is book	2	2.9
They have no book	2	2.9
They have book	2	2.9
Is this book	2	2.9
Have he a book	2	2.9
Has his a book	2	2.9
Has he a book	2	2.9
What they has a book/what they have a book	1	1.4
They what book	1	1.4
They has book	1	1.4
They has a book	1	1.4
They does he book	1	1.4
That is your book	1	1.4
Is they have book	1	1.4
Her has book	1	1.4
He has a book	1	1.4
Have what they book	1	1.4
Have they book	1	1.4
Have his a book	1	1.4
Has he a book	1	1.4
Don't he book	1	1.4
Does they have a book	1	1.4
Does his son read a book	1	1.4
Does his son have book	1	1.4
Do you have a book	1	1.4
Do he has a book	1	1.4
Are they have book	1	1.4

*A large number of variations (27 types of answers) came up, which may explain that that they have confusions regarding this concept.
* 38.6% could not answer.
*Common error (8.7%) was 'Is his book/is he book/ is has book/ Is it his book'
* Unfortunately no one could answer in the expected manner that is 'Does he have books?' Only 1 could answer like this ' Has he a book' which is also correct.

Fill up the blanks below using verbs given in the brackets in proper from.

1. My mother is----------------- rice (cook)

Response	Frequency	%
c. cooking	28	40.0
a. cook	17	24.3
i. missing	15	21.5
d. cooked	3	4.3
b. cooks	3	4.3
h. a	1	1.4
g. the	1	1.4
f. missing	1	1.4
e. cook's	1	1.4

* 40.0% could answer correctly
*Common error was 'cook' (24.3%).
*(21.5%) could not answer.
* 9 types of answers were found from the respondents.

2. You are -------------a picture (draw).

Responses	Frequency	%
Drawing	30	42.9
Missing	18	25.7
draw	13	18.6
Draws	9	12.8

*A large number could answer correctly (42.9%). *25.7% could not answer
*Common error (18.6%) was ' draw'

3.He --------------to school (walk).

Response	Frequency	%
Walking	22	31.4
missing	17	24.3
Walk	16	22.9
is walking	5	7.1
Walked	3	4.3
Walk's	3	4.3
is walk	2	2.9
Is ago	1	1.4
go	1	1.4

* Common errors were ' walking' (31.4%) and ' walk (22.9%). *24.3% could not answer
* None could answer correctly. *9 types of answer were found.
* Some (4.3%) had confusion between walks and walk's.

71

4. They-------------every morning (run).

Response	Frequency	%
running	17	24.3
Run	17	24.3
missing	17	24.3
are running	10	14.3
Are run	5	7.1
run's	2	2.9
are	2	2.9

*24.3% could answer correctly.
*24.3% could not answer.
*The common error (24.3%) was ' running'
* 7 variations were observed.

5. We------------------National Anthem everyday (sing).

Response	Frequency	%
missing	21	30.0
Sing	11	15.7
singing	8	11.4
are singing	8	11.4
everyday	6	8.6
are sing	5	7.1
sings	3	4.3
are	3	4.3
song	2	2.9
sang	2	2.9
sign's	1	1.4

*30.0% could not answer. *15.7% could answer correctly.
*Common errors were ' are singing' (11.4%) and 'singing' (11.4%).
*11variations.

Translate into English:
1. I am swimming

Response	Frequency	%
I am swimming	28	40.0
Missing	27	38.5
I am swim	5	7.1
I am a swimming	4	5.7
I am sleeping	2	2.8
I am swimming cutting	2	2.8
I am swam	2	2.8

*40% could answer correctly. *38.5% could not answer. *Common errors were 'I am swim' (7.1%) and 'I am a swimming' (5.7%). A negligible number. * 7 variations.

2. Rahim, Karim, Fatema and Latif are playing.

72

Response	Frequency	%
Missing	24	34.3
Rahim, Karim, Fatema and Latif are playing/writing	21	30.0
Rahim, Karim, Fatema and Latif playing	20	28.6
Rahim, Karim, Fatema and Latif is playing/walking/writing	3	4.3
Rahim, Karim, Latif and Fatema play	1	1.4
no sense	1	1.4

* 34.3% could not answer
*30.0% could answer correctly or near correctly
* Common error (28.6%) was 'Rahim Karim, Fatema and Latif playing'
*6 variations

3.You are laughing.

Response	Frequency	%
Missing	36	54.3
You are laughing	19	27.1
You are lough	8	11.4
They are loughing	2	2.9
We are loughing	1	1.4
We are laughing	1	1.4
are you loughing	1	1.4

* A large portion (54.3%) could not answer
*27.1% could answer correctly
*Common error was 'You are laugh'11. 4%
* 7 variations.

She is washing cloth.

Response	Frequency	%
Missing	38	54.3
She is washing cloth.	12	17.1
She is washerman	4	5.8
She is cloth washing	3	4.3
She washing cloth	2	2.9
She dress cloth	2	2.9
She cloth washes	2	2.9
The girl is dress washing	1	1.4
She wash cloth	1	1.4
She dress clean	1	1.4
no sense	1	1.4
Her washing cloths	1	1.4
Her washerman cloth	1	1.4
A girl's clean the cloth	1	1.4

* A large portion (54.3%) could not answer
*17.1% could answer correctly.
* Though negligible yet the common error (5.8%) was 'She is washerman'
* A large number of variation (14) could be seen.

5.They are eating.

Response	Frequency	%
They are eating	45	64.4
missing	11	15.7
They eating/reading/playing	5	7.1
There are eating	3	4.3
He is eating	2	2.9
we it's	1	1.4
They is eating	1	1.4
They eat	1	1.4
no sense	1	1.4

* A large portion (64.4%) could answer correctly
* 15.7% could not answer
*Common errors (7.1%) were 'They eating/reading/playing'
* 9 variations.

6.What is your Father's name? What is he?

Response	Frequency	%
Missing	22	31.4
What's your Father's name? What is he?	10	14.3
No sense	7	10.0
What's your father name. Who is he	5	7.1
What father your name	4	5.7
What your father name? What is he?	3	4.3
What is your father name	3	4.3
What's your father name? What is he?	2	2.9
What's your father name? What is he do?	2	2.9
What's your father name? He is a farmer	2	2.9
What is your father name? He is dor	2	2.9
Your father's name? What is he?	1	1.4
What's your father's name? What do he?	1	1.4
What's your father name? Do he?	1	1.4
What your father's name. What do?	1	1.4
What is your father? What is he	1	1.4
What is your father name? He is doing	1	1.4
What father's name? What is he?	1	1.4
Father your name. He is a farmer	1	1.4

*31.4% could not answer
*14.3% could answer correctly.
*Common error (7.1%) was 'What's your father name. Who is he'
* A large number of variation (19) has come up.

75

7. What is the colour of your dress?

Responses	Frequency	%
Missing	24	34.3
What colour your shirt	12	17.1
What colour is your shirt	10	14.3
What colour is shirt/dress/start/fork	8	11.4
What's your dress's colour	4	5.7
What your colour /dress	2	2.9
What is your shirt colour	2	2.9
Your jamar colour red	1	1.4
Your dress is red	1	1.4
What's your colour dress	1	1.4
What is colour shirt	1	1.4
What colour dress your	1	1.4
Is your dress colour	1	1.4
Is your dress colour	1	1.4
Are you colour shirt	1	1.4

* 34.3% could not answer
*None could answer in the expected way but 14.3% could answer like 'What colour is your shirt' which is also correct.
* Common errors were ' What colour your shirt' (17.1%) and 'What colour is shirt/dress/start/fork' (11.4%).

Translate the following sentences into English:
a. He is Hasan's mother's father.

Response	Frequency	%
He is Hasan's mother's father	38	54.3
He is Hasan's mother and father	13	18.6
Missing	9	12.9
He is Hasan's mother, father	4	5.7
He is Hasan's Father's mother	2	2.9
They are Hasan's mother father	1	1.4
They are Hasan's mother and father	1	1.4
It is Hasan's mother's father	1	1.4
He is Hasan's grandmother	1	1.4

*54.3% could answer correctly. Though the expected answer was 'He is Hasan's grandfather'. It was a trick question. None could answer in the expected manner.
*Common error (18.6%) was 'He is Hasan's mother and father'
* 9 variations were found
*5.7%could not answer.

76

50

b. This is a red rose.

Response	Frequency	%
This is a red rose	60	85.7
This rose is red	4	5.7
missing	3	4.3
This is red rose/flower	2	2.9
The flower is red	1	1.4

* A large proportion (85.7%) could answer correctly
*Common error (5.7%) was 'This rose is red'
*4.3% could not answer
* 5 variations were found

8. Is the teacher's bag white?

Response	Frequency	%
Is the teacher's bag white?	35	50.0
The teacher's bag is white	22	31.4
Missing	6	8.6
Is this teacher's bag	6	8.6
This is a white bag	1	1.4

*50.0% could answer correctly
*Common error (31.4%) 'The teacher's bag is white'
* 8.6% could not answer
*5 variations were found

Fill up the blanks:
a.   Do they --------a television?

Response	Frequency	%
missing	30	43.0
have	18	25.7
are	15	21.4
is	4	5.7
see	1	1.4
no	1	1.4
here	1	1.4

* A large number (43%) could not answer
*25.7% could answer correctly
*Common error was ' are' (21.4%)
* 7 variations were found

77

B. ----------- He have a radio?

Response	Frequency	%
missing	30	42.9
does	14	20.0
is	11	15.7
do	4	5.7
have	2	2.9
has	2	2.9
did	1	2.9
yes	1	1.4
they	1	1.4
the	1	1.4
its	1	1.4
Hasan	1	1.4

* 42.9% could not answer
*20.0% could answer correctly
*Common error (15.7%) was 'is'
* 12 variations.

40. Please write down the six steps of teaching English chronologically.

Out of 70 only 7 that is only 10% could answer correctly.

78

Discussions

As mentioned by Alexander (1996), classroom processes are critical to students' performance, still they remain under-explored in school effectiveness studies. It is of utmost importance to investigate the classroom processes prior to introducing anything new to the process, no matter whether it relates to the curriculum or the pedagogy. BRAC NFPE schools should not be any exception.

This study was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of a newly designed training module to teach English for BRAC class three students. The training provided is also meant for schools extended up to class four and five.

The Materials Development Unit (MDU) of NFPE programme has made a serious, sincere, and concerted effort in improving English instruction in BRAC classrooms. Therefore, a new training module has been developed for the purpose. A guidebook delineates six specific steps of English instruction according to the new module. Also the module presupposes the importance and application of flexibility, creativity, and common sense.

Also as mentioned in the beginning, several steps are involved in this training intervention. The Materials Development Unit is creating a highly selective group of trainers through rigorous training and selection process who are called the Master Trainers. These Master Trainers are then training the staff at field level, and the staff eventually trains the teachers. Therefore, the goal of new training module must be reflected in the classroom processes, for to decide if the intervention is being successfully implemented.

As mentioned in the beginning, the study primarily focused on two issues. First, if the dissemination of the requirements of this training was occurring adequately. However, the findings in the study, at this point, suggest that the new method introduced still follows a more top down approach rather than a bottom up one. The training, as planned, has undoubtedly created an efficient group of trainers called Master Trainers. The Master Trainers are trained and selected directly by the MDU. However, it is important to determine how much of the new skills learned by the Master trainers are disseminated up to the classroom level in a standardized fashion. This question actually was the basis of the initial research design.

When the data for the study was being collected from the end of 1998 to the beginning of 1999, the training has been taking place in several steps. The Master Trainers have been training the respective staff at the Training and Resource Centers, and the staff were training the teachers through the monthly refreshers at the team offices. It is important to notice that significant differences exist in educational levels of all the trainees, including the teachers and that the time duration of the training schedules varies by the groups receiving the training.

As mentioned earlier, according to education research literature, training makes an impact on both the cognitive and affective domains of the recipients. Training may improve a trainee's cognitive base, which occurs over a length of time. Again, the trainees develop a distinctive perception of the training that they receive, which is expressed through various behaviors and emotions.

Particularly, when it involves a heterogeneous group of people, like in present context, the impact on both the cognitive and affective domains will be varied, and expressed therein. Therefore, the problems related to a 'standardized dissemination' occur. The present study located some areas obstructing the standardized dissemination, and it has also tried to shed some light on the ways those areas can be addressed. But above everything else, this is an evaluation, which will require continuous examination to inform the developers on ways to modify and change the module.

The impact of level of education makes significant impact on how the recipients will internalize much of the new skills. Although cognitive base is not necessarily an absolute prerequisite for teaching skills in the classroom, but for training programme like the one introduced by MDU definitely requires considerably strong cognitive base. However, a specialized training programme does help to improve the cognitive base. This may be one of the long-term impacts to be measured in the future, which was beyond the scope of this study at this point.

Therefore, when MDU is trying to break away from a highly prescriptive top down model (NFPE report, 1997:16), the process still remains the same at the point when the research team was evaluating the training module. The module emphasizes flexibility and creativity. But as mentioned above, given the teachers' levels of education and socio-environmental orientation, it is being difficult for them to accept this highly sophisticated and specialized way of English instruction. First, the guidebook has clearly defined steps to follow, allowing little room for flexibility. While it was evident during the school visits that the teachers are finding the guidebook difficult to follow, it is no surprise that they would not be improvising new ways to add to what is already in the guidebook. Therefore, the teachers were found to be resorting to their previous ways of teaching they felt comfortable about.

As a result, it can be said of the Master Trainers that they possess both the knowledge, and the presentation skills, and all the other qualities aspired by the programme. Also they are selected through an extremely rigorous process. Their emotional response to such an opportunity to learn and teach was found to be very positive. When the staff are concerned, it must be taken into account that they have diverse background, both in respect to knowledge base and teaching skills. Therefore, when the Master Trainers train them in large groups, the group's opinions also turn out to be quite diversified, thus skills are not learnt by all in a standardized way. Also, as can be expected, their emotional response to the training was also found to be mixed. Some, who grasped things well, were very positive about it, and who could not, felt frustrated, intimidated or threatened. The teachers, as the final recipient of the training, at this point, appeared to be in a state of denial that they are being exposed to a total new way of learning and teaching.

The issue related to time also is a major factor in this regard. The issue of time constraint came up repeatedly from both the staff and the teachers through opinion questionnaires and from group discussions. As observed by the researchers, it has been very difficult for the trainers to follow the exact module given the time frame of the training sessions. It was observed during both the MT to Staff training sessions, and during the refreshers. Therefore, when the researchers observed the classrooms, it was evident that the teachers were failing to follow the procedures in the classroom. Lack of

time played a significant role here in addition to their lack of understanding of the guide and the new methods.

Teachers find the guide difficult and time consuming. For example, out of seven classroom observations, six teachers were found not to be following the steps. In addition, out of 45 respondents only 7 could answer the 'six steps' chronologically. This provides evidence to indicate that teachers are not yet familiar with the required teaching method.

Classroom observation also revealed the fact that the allotted time for teaching English needs to be increased in order for proper implementation of the new method. This brings the issue of the importance taking into account of existing processes before incorporating new methods. The new module could have been tested out before starting the training procedures. A good number of teachers, particularly the well-performing ones or Resource Teachers (RT) could have been consulted, or could have been given trial training on the module in the classrooms to determine if the module was feasible. In preparing the guide resource teachers could be used to provide feedback concerning appropriate teaching methods.

However, owing to the time constraints in which the research project took place, it may be too early to comment on the implementation of the teaching method in the classroom. The research literature on the management of educational change (e.g., Hord, 1987) demonstrates that implementation is a long-term process. Follow up studies to monitor teachers' implementation of the teaching method in the classroom may therefore be required.

Some Suggestions

Master Trainers can deliver the training directly to the teachers. It will be a time consuming process, but MDU may need to be selective across the board when it comes to trainers. Only the ones who can achieve the Master Trainers' level of skills could be kept as trainers, and the Master Trainers could directly train all the teachers.

81

The Material Development Unit, before further proceeding with the training schedule, must address the issues related to time constraints. Problems related to time exist at all stages of the training, and also within the classrooms.

MDU must also take into account of differences that exist in the cognitive domain of respective trainers and the trainees and make appropriate amendments in the teachers' guide.

The programme can improvise new ways of school supervision, particularly on English instruction, so that proper follow-up will be possible.

There may be a provision to ascertain the differential levels of capabilities of trainees. The training sessions could take that into account, which may significantly help 'standardized dissemination'.

The steps of concept giving, practice, and evaluation were found to be the most difficult ones to grasp, therefore, MDU may find out ways to make those steps simpler.

Before proceeding with the guide, the programme may actually try to test it out among the teachers, and within the classrooms, in order to determine how it can be made more acceptable to the teachers.

The creative ways should be introduced to teach vocabularies, and there should be more writing activities.

82

13. References

Alexander, R. (1996) Unfinished Journey: Pedagogy and Discourse in School Effectiveness Research. In Studies on Classroom Processes and School Effectiveness at Primary Stage. NCERT.

BRAC (1997) BRAC Strategy 1998 – 2007 Dhaka: BRAC.

Fullan, M. (1993) The new meaning of educational change. London: Cassell

Harrison, I. (1994) Chapter 4: Facilitating the development of teacher assessment. In Bollen, R. (Ed.) Educational Change: Craftsmanship and Effectiveness - the facilitators' role. Utrecht, Netherlands: APS.

Hord, S. (1987) Evaluating Educational Innovations. London: Croom Helm

Khan and Chowdhury, (1992) Performance of former NFPE students in formal schools. Dhaka: BRAC mimeograph

Verma, G.K. and Christie, T. (1996a) The Development of a framework for educational research for BRAC Manchester: Faculty of Education.

Verma, G.K. and Christie, T. in association with Dr Feroza Begum, Ms. Shaheen Akter and Mrs. Pauline Macaulay (1996b) The Mainstreaming of BRAC/NFPE students Manchester: Faculty of Education.

83

Appendix One

Questionnaire 1a

Questionnaire for the Field-Staff Who Received Training
From the Master Trainers

1. Why do you think you are receiving this specialized training to teach English?

2. Do you think this training is different from any of the training you have received before?

    Yes ☐ No ☐

3. If yes, please say how?

4. Why do you think you were selected to receive this training?

5. Do you think you needed to receive a specialized training to teach English?

    Yes ☐No ☐

6. If yes, please mention why?

7. Have you learned anything new through this Training?

    Yes ☐No ☐

8. If yes, please mention a few things that you have learned, if no why?

9. Do you think this training has been fruitful for you?   Yes ☐No ☐

10. Please give the reason for the response above.

11. Do you think that this training is useful for both you and the NFPE programme?

    Yes ☐No ☐

12. Please explain the response above.

13. Have you learned any new skills from this training?   Yes ☐No ☐

14. If yes, please say what are those skills, and if no, why?

15. Please say, if you had any opportunity to express your opinion/give input on any of the teaching methods introduced in this new module?

    Yes ☐No ☐

16. If yes, did you take the opportunity to voice your opinion/give input?

    Yes ☐No ☐

17. If yes, please mention what those inputs were?

84

18. This new module encourages you to use your commonsense (based on your experience) while demonstrating the steps of **Practice** and **Evaluation**. Please say if, in reality, you could do that while demonstrating in front of the trainer?

    Yes ☐No ☐

19. If no, please explain why?

20. Please mention, what the new things you expected to learn from this training are?

21. Did the training meet your expectations?   Yes ☐No ☐

22. If no, please explain why?

23. Please mention if you still have any problems in English-teaching, even after receiving this training?   Yes ☐ No ☐

24. If yes, please mention what those are?

25. According to your opinion/perception, please mention at least three good points about this training?

26. According to your opinion/perception, please mention at least three negative points about this training?

27. Please mention if you found any of the steps in this new module to be difficult?

    Yes ☐No ☐

28. If yes, please mention what those are?

29. Please give your opinion that can be incorporated in the module to make the training more effective in the future.

30. >From your own experience, please mention a few elements that can hinder the staff and the teachers to implement this training at the grassroots level.

31. Please give your opinion/ suggestion about bringing English-teaching more effectively to the children at the grassroots level?

32. What are some of the more useful English-teaching techniques that can be used for children?

33. Please mention what you think the proper duration of the training should be?

34. Please mention anything else that you may want?

33. What's your father's name? What is he?
34. What is the color of your dress?

Translate the following sentences in to Bengali:

35. He is Hasan's mother's father
36. This is a red rose
37. Is the teacher's bag white?

Fill up the blanks:
38. Do they _____ a television?
39. _____ he have a radio?

40. Please write down five sentences about yourself

41. Please write down the six steps of teaching English chronologically.

90

Appendix Three

Terms of Reference

HE Link Programme
BRAC/School of Education, University of Manchester

Ian Harrison
Centre for Formative Assessment Studies
School of Education
University of Manchester

August 30th - September 6th 1998

1. To visit BRAC NFPE schools to acquire first hand, direct experience of the context in which the proposed research design will be embedded

2. In collaboration with the BRAC research team, to support the development of the research design on *"The effectiveness of teachers' training for the NFPE programme"*

3. To identify further inputs that may help to increase the capability of BRAC's educational research team

4. To submit an end-of-visit report and recommendations for future collaborative work

91