CHAPTER THREE: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the conceptual framework of the study. It is divided into seven sections. Section one presents the aims of EPEETSEM model. Section two provides the quality of PEFLTEPs. Section three explains the framework of EPEETSEM model. Section four explains testing EPEETSEM model. Section five provides rational for designing a new model. Section six explains the validity of the evaluation model standards of PEFLTEP. Finally, section seven concludes the chapter.

3.2 Aims of EPEETSEM Model

This model aims to:
- investigate the extent to which the PEFLTEPs’ components are successful in helping the EFL student-teachers to gain these competencies.
- diagonise strong and weak points of the PEFLTEPs.
- identify the extent to which this evaluation model standards are available in the PEFLTEPs.

3.3 Quality of PEFLTEPs

The purpose of this model is to present standards to assist researchers in this field to identify the strengths and weaknesses of PEFLTEPs. This model provides a set of
standards to be used in evaluating the quality of PEFLTEPs and their effectiveness. These standards identify important domains that programmes evaluators may address in the best possible manner and then are not intended as mandatory standards. The standards are listed below to provide the framework for evaluating the effectiveness of the PEFLTEPs, which may serve as a guide to help facilitate this process.

3.4 Framework of EPEETSEM Model

The purpose of designing this model is to identify the strengths and weaknesses of PEFLTEPs. It is based on the curriculum components of the PEFLTEPs in evaluating the effectiveness of the programmes.

This model is adopted by reviewing literature on some previous evaluation models and studies related to evaluating the PELTEPs.

In designing this model, the researcher follows Peacock’s (2009) procedure consists of five steps as follows:

1. Review the literature and produce a set of standards.
2. Establish appropriate sources of data in your setting.
3. Choose and design data collection methods and instruments.
4. Collect and analyse each set of data against your questions.
5. Construct an account by relating each interpretation to the others.
Figure 3-1 Domains of Evaluation of PEFLTEP Curriculum According EPEETSEM Model
Figure 3-2 Frame Work for EPEETSEM Model
The framework for this model consists of four domains and 10 standards distributed among them. These four domains are as follows:

1. Educational purposes,
2. Educational experiences,
3. Teaching strategies and

The first domain is educational purposes. It is an important part of the educational process assisting in clarifying the relationship between the student and the educator. It assists educators in designing course content, teaching strategies or processes, and selecting appropriate assessment methods.

This domain can be divided into three types:

The first type, *aims*, is general and non-specific like strategy. They guide the student-teachers to what is expected from them and help them to study important information. They are general statements that provide direction or intent to educational action. They are usually written in amorphous terms using words like: learn, know, understand, appreciate, and these are not directly measurable. Aims may serve as organised principles of educational direction for more than one grade. These organised principles may encompass the continuum of educational direction for the entire programmes, subject areas or the district. For example:

*Students will understand and become proficient in identifying the different types of spoken English.*
The second type, *Goals*, is statements of educational intention which are more specific than aims. Goals also may encompass an entire programme, subject area, or multiple grade levels. They may be either in amorphous language or in specific behavioural terms. For example:

*Students will be able to identify and use American slang terms and phrases.*

This example is a sub-set of the aim above, but the area becomes more specific. This goal moves from generic spoken English to the more detailed area of American slang. One verb used is still “identify” although this goal does not specify how students are to identify, and the verb “use” has been added. The objectives related to this goal should specify how the students will identify and use new knowledge.

The third type, *Instructional or behavioural objectives*, is clear, specific like tactics, consistent, achievable, and broad learning outcomes. They assist the student in studying more efficiently. Objectives are usually specific statements of educational intention which delineate either general or specific outcomes. There are advantages and disadvantages to different types of objectives.

- Behavioural objectives.
- Holistic objectives.
- Non-behavioural objectives.
- Problem solving objectives.
- Expressive activities that lead to expressive outcomes.
Objectives can be written in many ways. Currently, most of the objectives are written in behavioural terms. Behavioural objectives usually employ observable verbiage and can be divided into three specific domains: cognitive (knowing), psychomotor (doing) and affective (feeling).

1. **Cognitive:** *Students will identify and list 6 slang terms they have heard from their peers.*

2. **Psychomotor:** *Students will create expressive gestures to go with their favourite slang terms.*

3. **Affective:** *Student will choose 4 of the most offensive slang terms from a list developed by the entire class.*

These types of objectives are the majority of ones used in creating today’s lesson plans, and they usually specify behaviours of students must demonstrate to indicate that learning has occurred.

The difference between an aim and an instructional objective is that an aim is a statement of the intended general outcome of an instructional unit or a programme. An aim statement describes a more global instructional outcome. In other words, aims are broad, generalised statements about what is to be learnt. In addition, aims are appropriate for an entire course or a curriculum of study. An instructional objective is a statement of one or several specific performances and the achievement of which contributes to the attainment of the aim. That is, instructional objectives describe the skills, knowledge, abilities or attitudes that students should possess or demonstrate.
after they complete the training. Moreover, they are written for individual units of study. A single aim may have many specific subordinate instructional objectives.

In addition, instructional objectives are guides for the selection of content, development of an instructional strategy, development and selection of instructional materials and construction of tests and other instruments for evaluating and then evaluating student’s instructional outcomes.

In general, clear aims and objectives benefit students in many ways. They may include abstract concepts such as 'professional qualities' or 'appreciation of the classics', learning that may be difficult to measure but which is nevertheless important. Objectives are usually more specific statements of the learning occurring, generally within a subject, lecture or a task. Objectives are not statements of content or topics and not statements of the intended teaching strategies; rather, they are statements of what a student is expected to know and be able to do upon completion of the learning exercise. Instructional objectives do not include the word 'know' or 'understand'. They do include active verbs such as 'state', 'explain', 'outline', 'list' or 'describe'. They are statements of what the teacher wants his/her students to do.

More challenging objectives might ask students to apply or use knowledge in a particular context. Higher levels of objectives ask students to solve complex problems. This might involve gathering information, researching and analysing, or using knowledge to create something in a different context (e.g. use knowledge of making an apple pie to design a different filling).
The second domain, *Educational experiences*, refers to what teacher-educators need to know about what they teach (including what they know about language teaching itself) and constitutes knowledge that would not be shared by teachers of other subject areas. This domain consists of courses in language analysis, learning theory, methodology and a teaching practicum, but the practical skills of language teaching are often undervalued (Richards, 2001). It aims at evaluating and analysing content of curriculum. In addition, identify resources available in how they are used and the procedures followed in revising periodically curriculum.

The educational experience distinguishes among three kinds of knowledge as follows:

1. **Disciplinary knowledge (DK)** is a part of professional education and does not translate into practical skills. It refers to knowledge that presents a basis for the language teaching profession. Such knowledge is acquired by special training and possessing knowledge of this kind leads to professional recognition and status. It could include the course work in areas such as history of language teaching methods, language acquisition, sociolinguistics, phonology and syntax, discourse analysis, theories of language, critical applied linguistics and so on.

2. **Pedagogical Content Knowledge** (PCK) is a knowledge that is drawn from the study of language teaching and language learning itself and which can be applied in different ways to the resolution of practical issues in language teaching. Moreover, it refers to knowledge that provides a basis for language
teaching. It could include course work in areas such as curriculum planning, assessment, reflective teaching, classroom management, teaching children, teaching the four basic skills, and so on.

3. Cultural Content knowledge (CCK) is a knowledge that provides student-teachers with general information in science education and discipline-culture structure of theory. It could include course work in areas such as application computer, history of education, school management, philosophy and so on.

Third domain, teaching strategies, refers to the strategies or processes used in implementing curriculum. It aims to identify how well general aims are translated into actions to achieve specific learning objectives for daily lessons. Curriculum authorities have the responsibility to look at ways to improve the arrangement of course content and skills to be covered at all levels.

The last domain, evaluation methods, aims at identifying the evaluation methods used to achieve the educational objectives in which the programme aims is attained. This domain guides the teacher-educators/teachers to make decisions in connection with the learning process as well as the student-teachers to get information on their progress.

Methods of obtaining student-teacher feedback may be formal or informal, structured, semi-structured or unstructured. They include surveys, minute papers, focus groups and student consultations. These methods are usually objective and require the use of standardised measures so that varying perspectives and experiences
can fit into a limited number of predetermined response categories. These methods are usually easier to summarise and compare than the qualitative methods.

This evaluation is conducted at the whole programme level.

3.4.1 Educational Purposes Domain

This domain includes 4 standards which are as follows:

Standard 1: Challenging, Clarity and specification

This standard consists of five indicators are as follows:

Indicator “A”: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum aims are stated clearly.

Indicator “B”: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives are observable and measurable.

Indicator “C”: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives include only one general learning outcome.

Indicator “D”: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives are focused only on the student-teachers’ performance.

Indicator “E”: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives focus on terminal behaviour.
**Standard 2: Consistency**

This standard has four indicators which are as follows:

- **Indicator “A”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives are consistent with teaching practices in the classrooms.

- **Indicator “B”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives are consistent with the programme’s aims.

- **Indicator “D”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives are consistent with the evaluation processes.

- **Indicator “E”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives are formulated depending on the needs analysis.

**Standard 3: Achievement:**

This standard includes only two indicators. They are as follows:

- **Indicator “A”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives are tractable/time-bound.

- **Indicator “B”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives are realistic and attainable focus on terminal behaviour.

**Standard 4: Broadness:**

This standard consists of six indicators which are as follows:

- **Indicator “A”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives reflect a combination of theory and practice.
**Indicator “B”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives focus on new approaches of teaching.

**Indicator “C”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives focus on new approaches of curriculum.

**Indicator “D”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives focus on cognitive development.

**Indicator “E”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives focus on emotional growth towards the teaching profession.

**Indicator “F”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum objectives focus on social development.

### 3.4.2 Educational Experiences Domain

This domain includes 3 standards which are as follows:

**Standard 5: Disciplinary Knowledge**

In this standard, there are three indicators which are as follows:

**Indicator “A”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents adequately develop communicative English language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing).

**Indicator “B”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents provide the student-teachers with the knowledge of components of language (Phonological, morphological, syntactic and/or semantic systems).
Indicator “C”: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum content provides the student-teachers with American/British English literature.

Standard 6: Pedagogical Content Knowledge

This standard includes six indicators. They are as follows:

Indicator “A”: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents give the student-teachers opportunity to practise what they learnt in their pre-service classes.

Indicator “B”: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents provide the student-teachers with the basic concepts of the ELT.

Indicator “C”: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents provide the student-teachers with methods of classroom management.

Indicator “D”: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents prepare the student-teachers to teach English language effectively.

Indicator “E”: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents provide the student-teachers with different modern theories of teaching.

Indicator “F”: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents provide the student-teachers with different modern theories of curriculum.
Standard 7: Cultural Content Knowledge

This standard contains three indicators which are as follows:

**Indicator “A”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents prepare the student teachers for self-research and research in teaching issues.

**Indicator “B”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents prepare the student teacher for English proficiency tests such as TOEFL or IELTS, or further study abroad.

**Indicator “C”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents encourage the student-teachers to apply English in other subjects.

Standard 8: Current Trends in Curriculum

This standard comprises four indicators which are as follows:

**Indicator “A”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents are in line with the aims.

**Indicator “B”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents meet the student-teachers’ needs.

**Indicator “C”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents are periodically revised.

**Indicator “D”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum contents include up-to-date information in the concerned field.
3.4.3 Teaching Strategies Domain

This domain includes one standard which is as follow:

**Standard 9: Student–centeredness**

This standard consists of seven indicators which are as follows:

- **Indicator “A”:** In the PEFLTEP, curriculum teaching strategies encourage student-teachers to reflect on what they learnt and how they learnt it.

- **Indicator “B”:** In the PEFLTEP, teaching strategies motivate student teachers by giving them some control over learning processes.

- **Indicator “C”:** In the PEFLTEP, teaching strategies encourage the student-teachers to use role-play, short plays, dramas, games, and songs in the teaching.

- **Indicator “D”:** In the PEFLTEP, teaching strategies develop the student-teachers’ critical thinking ability by questioning, challenging and problem-solving.

- **Indicator “E”:** In the PEFLTEP, teaching strategies encourage the student teachers to express their ideas freely and frankly in different contexts.

- **Indicator “F”:** In the PEFLTEP, teaching strategies encourage the student teachers to use audio-visual aids such as videotape and transparencies in teaching.
Indicator “H”: In the PEFLTEP, teaching strategies employ authentic materials in teaching such as menus, newspapers, magazines and advertisements.

3.4.4 Evaluation Methods

This domain includes one standard which is as follows:

**Standard 10: Planning and Designing Evaluation**

In this standard, there are four indicators which are follows:

- **Indicator “A”**: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum evaluation methods provide feedback to the student-teachers on their progress.

- **Indicator “B”**: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum evaluation methods enhance the student-teacher learning through various methods of evaluation such as continuous, formative and summative.

- **Indicator “C”**: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum evaluation methods probe the student teachers’ abilities to demonstrate depth, flexibility, and application of learning.

- **Indicator “D”**: In the PEFLTEP, curriculum evaluation methods are aligned with the objectives and aims.
3.5 Rationale for designing a new evaluation model

The traditional curriculum design is based on the theories of Tyler (1942) who proposes the developing model for curriculum, suggesting that the curriculum design and its development should take four questions into account: what are the goals for language teaching that the school means to achieve? What kind of teaching experience is needed to realise the goals? How could the teaching experience be organised effectively? And how can we be sure that these goals are being achieved?

White (1988) categorises views on traditional curriculum design into three types. The first view compares curriculum design to a house building plan which emphasises the objectives and content; the second one takes it as a plan of how to build the house, in which objectives, content and teaching methods are included; and the last one is evaluation.

Despite Programme Evaluation and Foreign Language Teacher Education (FLTE) are extensive, the literature contains very few descriptions of a procedure for the overall evaluation of FLTEPs (Peacock, 2009). In literature, many evaluation models are used to evaluate PTEPs. Selection of one of these approaches or models depends greatly on the aim of the evaluation, participants, procedure used in evaluating results, time and duration of evaluation. That is, the evaluation process is not limited to such models. Since each evaluation is a unique, choosing or combining concepts from different evaluation models to develop an eclectic model according to the evaluation context or designing a new model is always possible.
This study presents a new model for evaluating PEFLTEPs based on principles of programme evaluation and foreign language teacher (FLT) programmes models. This EPEETSEM model (Educational Purposes, Educational Experiences, Teaching Strategies and Evaluation Methods) is designed based on the review of literature on programme evaluation and procedures of ELTEPs using recognised methods of evaluation programme to evaluate ELTEPs.

This model focuses on the strengths and weaknesses of the programme and the extent to which the model standards are available in PEFLTEPs. It is conducted to test the effectiveness of PEFLTEPs by collecting data from the student-teachers and teacher-educators using questionnaires, open-ended questions, interviews, essay questions and analysis of programme courses contents.

The idea behind designing this model is to evaluate the effectiveness of the PEFLTEPs.

Modern curricula are designed on the basis of these theories. Stern (1992) criticises the content of language curricula because it focuses too narrowly on linguistic content. In addition, he argues that the content should normally be multidimensional, particularly in language courses taught at school or university, and that foreign language learning should include the cognitive goal (such as linguistic knowledge and cultural knowledge) and the affection goal (the acquisition of language learning skills, the perception ability to language and culture, and the development of positive attitudes towards language and culture study). Since there are very few detailed descriptions of how to conduct overall evaluation of PEFLTEPs, it needs to
diagnose the effectiveness of the PEFLTEPs for internal programme evaluation; including a mechanism for obtaining and using feedback on whole programme and not on individual courses from student-teachers and teacher educators. Consequently, the researcher designs a new evaluation model. Another important reason for conducting programme evaluation is to contribute to PEFLTEPs improvement in particular and PESLTEPs improvement in general.

This is a step towards the professionalisation in the field of English language teaching and makes a useful contribution to theory. This new model may be of value because it is designed on the basis of modern curricula theories which focus on designing curricula on the basis of these theories and the model may facilitate and encourage the evaluation of other teacher-education programmes elsewhere. The model could be useful for other programmes. The researcher argues that his model can make a unique contribution to the researchers interested in developing and improving educational programmes.

3.6 Testing EPEETSEM Model

This model is tested through an evaluation of five PEFLTEPs. Data are collected from student-teachers and teacher-educators through interviews, questionnaires, open-ended questions and essay questions. Then, the whole curriculum content is analysed. The student-teachers are on the fourth year B.A and their teacher-educators attending the PEFLTEPs in the colleges of education at Aden University.
This model focuses on programme strengths and weaknesses in the PEFLTEPs by answering six main research questions:

1. What are the standards that should be followed in evaluating the PEFLTEPs?

2. To what extent the educational purposes standards are available in the aims and objectives of the PEFLTEPs curriculum at Aden University?

3. To what extent the educational experiences standards are available in the curriculum contents of the PEFLTEP at Aden University?

4. To what extent the teaching strategies standards are available in the teaching methods used in the PEFLTEPs at Aden University?

5. To what extent the evaluation methods standard is available in the evaluation procedures used in the PEFLTEPs?

6. What is an appropriate balance among these four components: Linguistic, ELT Methodology, Literature and General Education?

3.7 **Validity of the evaluation model standards of PEFLTEP**

The standards of evaluation model of PEFLTEP are given to a jury of specialised EFL teacher-educators and professors in ELE and applied linguistics for offering their comments, suggestions and opinions. Preparing first draft of standards are included 10 standards and 47 indicators under each standard (Appendix I: The first draft). There is an amend of wording some indicators in the final draft which has 10 standards and 45 indicators listed under these standards (appendix II).
These ten standards are distributed among four domains. Educational Purposes include four standards, Teaching Experiences consist of four standards, Teaching Strategies comprise one standard and Evaluation Methods contain one standard. The questionnaire consists of 45 items or indicators distributed among the ten standards. Finally, these indicators are distributed to the teacher-educators and the student-teachers as a questionnaire tool without identifying the domains and standards these indicators belong to.

3.8 Conclusion

After modifying wording some indicators in the first draft, the final draft of the (EPEETSEM) model of PEFLTEP consists of 10 standards and 45 indicators distributed on four domains for evaluating PEFLTEPs, (see appendix1I). Educational Purposes Domain includes four standards, four standards in Educational Experiences Domain, only one standard in Teaching Strategies and one standard in Evaluation Methods Domain.