

Analyzing an Inspector-Teacher's Discourse from the Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective

Rashad Fairouz and Dr. Zahra Al-Saqqaf

Department of English,
Faculty of Education, Aden University,
Yemen

Copyright © 2014 ISSR Journals. This is an open access article distributed under the **Creative Commons Attribution License**, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ABSTRACT: This study aimed at identifying the type of power relations in the inspector-teacher discursive discussion during an inspection visit. The data obtained from the critically analysis of a video-recorded speech of a discursive inspector-teacher discussion. The findings revealed that there were two types of power relations practiced by the inspector over his visited teacher, namely the power of authority and power of knowledge. These powers were usually accepted and rarely resisted by the teacher. Finally, the study recommended a training course for all inspectors of English to re-think of their inspecting job for helping teachers rather than terrifying them.

KEYWORDS: School inspection, inspectors, EFL teachers, CDA.

1 INTRODUCTION

Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) is a complex and eclectic method as it sometimes indulges two or more disciplines together for the sake of displaying an unavoidable and interrelated relationship between them. This relationship clarifies the type of power relations of authority knowledge, fame, social status, gender, race, etc. to reveal *on the one hand* the source of power, abuse, dominance, inequality and bias. On the other, it attempts to study how these sources are initiated, reproduced, maintained, resisted, transformed within specific social and political contexts (Van Dijk, 1988). For these merits, CDA embraces different types of sciences to be its interests such as commerce, media, gender, sociology, education, linguistics, psychology, sociology, policy, etc. to critically study, *on the one hand*, how each discipline affects the other and how it finds a base of knowledge to be consulted and resolutions for any problem may arise. On the other, CDA attempts to separate all these sciences as one part and brings another could-be effective part (i.e., language) to study how it affects each discipline a time to be an interdisciplinary approach called the '*Critical Linguistics*'. This approach aims at studying the language behavior critically in natural speech contexts of social relevance (Wodak, 1989).

However, Fairclough (2000) identifies three pivotal tenets of CDA namely, *social structure* (e.g. age, status, education, identity, class, ethnic and gender); *culture* (i.e., traditions, habits, norms, behavior, etc.); and *discourse* (i.e., the words we use whether spoken or written). These merits help scholars mix between CDA and other disciplines to produce hybrid studies such as this one in hand. So, education is one of those disciplines which indulges with CDA to be analyzed critically in order to do its job in the society properly.

2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The majority, *if not all*, of inspectors of English think highly of their inspection job when they supervise teachers of English in the classroom in the Yemeni secondary schools. The naturalness of their speech might be declined when they talk with these teachers especially when the latter do not do well in the classroom. When they visit teachers, they try to show their power of knowledge and authority over them and address them in front of their students; they do not care about the

negative attitude the students may get towards their lovable teachers. They forget that they are educational helpers, supporters, and guides to these teachers and their job, *in essence*, is to help and support teachers in what they actually need. These inspectors, *however*, feel snobbish when they talk to teachers about their own mistakes, *if any*, in language and methodology during presenting lessons. They, *in fact*, want to send an indirect message that they have knowledge in language as well as in language learning/teaching. Similarly, the same actions are repeated when they sit with teachers alone outside the classroom to instruct and address them to the right merits of education. Again, they try to address them in a way that reflects their power of knowledge and authority. They think that they are better than them in all language aspects, methods, etc. They talk to them as if they are *only* students; knowing, *as they mistakenly think*, little about language and its other aspects. Reactively, some teachers accept this kind of behavior and listen to their inspectors while some others do not. They refuse to be criticized and addressed in front of their students as well as alone even if their inspectors are right. They, *in other words*, resist this type of hegemony and power at any cost.

3 QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY

Many questions arise justifying the need to conduct the present study. These questions are the following:

- Is there any type of power relations existed in the way the inspectors talk to the teachers of English? If so, what type is it?
- Why do inspectors of English show this type of power relations?
- Do teachers accept, resist, or comply with this power?
- What are the possible solutions for this problem?

4 AIMS OF THE STUDY

- Identifying the type of power relations in the inspector-teacher's (of English) discourse.
- Finding the main causes behind the inspectors' use of this type of discourse.
- Assessing the state of the visited teachers whether they resist, accept, or comply with their visitor's power.
- Finding possible solutions for this problem.

5 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study limits itself within three boundaries: the topic of research, the setting, and time. *First*, the topic of the study will deal with the field of CDA to discuss one factor, i.e., the power relations, *and specifically that of authority and knowledge*, ignoring the other factors such as racism, gender, fame, etc. to be beyond the aim of the study. However, the study will discuss how the powers of authority and knowledge affect the inspector-teacher's discourse ignoring the other factors such as behavior, relationship, experiences, etc. *Second*, the setting of the current study will be at Sana Secondary School for Girls, AL-Mashana District, Ibb City, Yemen, and not in any other educational institutions. *Finally*, the study will limit itself to happen on December, 22nd, of the year 2013-2014, the last visit of inspectors of English to the secondary schools of/in the city.

6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The importance of this study emanates from the fact that CDA is the only enduring discipline which tries to emerge itself in every corner of life for the sake of changing, improving, and affecting the other areas and *in fact* it does. This discipline becomes, *by definition*, the interest of all types of people: educationalists, practitioners, politics, activists, etc. for utilizing what is enhanced by it to be reflected in each group's discipline. Thus, CDA becomes visible in every discipline.

As being an educationalist myself, CDA affects education immensely in all its constituents such as teachers, students, inspectors, curricula, etc. and makes a change, *whether positively or negatively*, in the way these people talk and deal consciously or subconsciously with *either* their equals *or* the outsiders in the society.

In order to shed light on the merits of CDA in education, it is demanding to discuss one factor of the educational process, i.e., inspection and more specifically the inspectors' discourse with their visited teachers in order to identify the type of the discourse occurs between the two parties. Whether or not there are some powers of authority and knowledge shown by inspectors and *if so* to find the reasons behind these practices. Moreover, the study will try to find appropriate solutions to these practices and recommend the relevant parties with the appropriate ways of getting rid of this problem.

7 LITERATURE REVIEW

7.1 TERMS IN FOCUS

It sounds demanding to pinpoint some significant terminologies the study will go around to disambiguate vagueness, if any, through the whole study. As stated earlier, the study will discuss an issue of education, i.e., inspector's talk to his visited teacher from the CDA perspective. So, the following lines will explore the meaning of the concepts of both areas to be identified throughout this study.

First, understanding the concept of CDA can easily be done if the involved terms are clearly known. According to Rogers (2004), the term '*critical*' in CDA goes in the opposite line of '*naturalness*', viz, nothing occurs naturally without any hidden or obvious power. It puts '*why*' and '*how*' questions as the main titles when studying phenomena. However, Corson (2000) argues that the word '*critical*' means to describe, interpret, and explain the relationship between *form* (i.e., grammar, phonology, semantics, syntax, and pragmatics) and *function* (i.e., how people use language to achieve a certain purpose) of language.

Regarding the term '*discourse*', it means '*language above the sentence or clause level*' (Stubbs, 1983: 1). That is, it goes beyond the surface structure of sentences or clauses to reach to the purpose beyond saying such sentences and/or clauses. So, it is the use of language by itself which is seen as a type of social practices (Fairclough, 1992a).

Thus, the meaning of CDA terms collectively is an analysis of not only what is said but also what is left out – not only what is present but also what is absent (Rogers, 2004). Moreover, CDA is more concerned with studying and analyzing words or sentences (i.e., text) to reveal the source of power, abuse, dominance, inequality, bias, etc. and how these sources are resisted, maintained, reproduced in the social, economic, and political context(s) (Van Dijk, 1988).

Second, education is a broad term which aims at developing the desired behaviors in learners. It, however, involves informal and formal education. The former refers to the non-systematized learning and/or teaching for all types of learners which does not subject to the supervision and control of government. It can be practiced by individuals at their special institutions such as homes, mosques, etc. This type of education will NOT be considered at all in the current study. By contrast, formal education is the one which is systemized and subjected to the supervision and control of government whether in schools or universities. The current study will deal with the type of education in schools only due to the presence of inspection in such institutions ignoring the other ones because they are to be beyond the scope of this study.

Owing to the significance of the term '*inspection*' in this study as the inspectors' speech will be analyzed critically, it is crucially important to unfold the exact meaning of such a term which the current study will deal with. Strictly speaking, there is misconception found between the terms '*inspection*', '*observation*' and '*supervision*'. This ambiguity baffles a lot of scholars as well as researchers, *including me*, to use the three terms interchangeably in their scholarships. To explore such confusion, Ogunsaju (1983) points out that '*inspection*' is the process of monitoring the performance of school staff, noting both merits and demerits they show in the classroom in addition to the use of appropriate techniques to achieve the educational objectives. However, Adepoju (1998) argues that '*inspection*' is a process of improving the instruction in the classroom by working with those who work with pupils, i.e., teachers for helping them achieve excellence in teaching. Supervision, by contrast, is the critical evaluation of schools as a place of learning. Supervisors may pay frequent visits to schools to check both learning and teaching processes in that they go in a good manner and have not any obstacles that could deter the school from delivering its message to the society. Such visits are registered in a special report at the school itself (Ojelabi, 1981).

However, '*observation*' refers to the process of watching pupils in the classroom for the sake of evaluating their teacher's performance. In this sense, '*observation*' can always be associated with '*inspection*' in that the inspector observes both teacher and pupils in the classroom to see to what extent the course objectives are achieved.

To conclude this argument, '*inspection*', '*supervision*' and '*observation*' are distinct terms; each one means (something) different from the other and this dissimilarity compels the researcher to clarify them all and affirm that the appropriate and accurate term for his study is '*inspection*' as inspectors - and not supervisors - deal with teachers (i.e., language teachers) themselves inside and outside the classroom, which is the objective of the current study.

8 SCHOOL INSPECTION

Inspection is aimed at determining whether plans and practices of both learning and teaching processes are actualized or not. It attempts to correct the possible deficiencies during such processes and identify strategies for ensuring the continuous

development of schools and their staff (Kantos, 2012). In addition, by the inspection process, educators are given suggestions about whether the practices are matched with the goals, the resources, the principals, and the objectives that are framed by the education policy. Furthermore, by the help of inspection, educators can determine whether the practices are accurate, regular, efficient, economic, valid, and reliable. That is, a school teacher is visited by an inspection team to guide, motivate, encourage, and stimulate him for developing the educational process. Similarly, a language teacher, *EFL teacher is an example*, can be visited by his/her inspector for the same purposes. However, Adewole and Olaniyi (1992) argue that inspection is important because it: **a)** improves teaching and learning; **b)** helps students understand themselves and monitors their own behavior; **c)** help teachers develop themselves educationally and academically; **d)** creates confidence in competent teachers; and **e)** examines the application of the subject instructional goals.

However, inspection is of **three** types, namely: **a) routine visits:** they are short visits in which inspectors check the teachers' punctuality and what is happening in the classroom; **b) follow-up visits:** they are done when inspectors want to see whether their recommendations, corrections, suggestions they make during the previous visit have been carried out; and **c) rare visits:** they are done when there is a problem happening to the teacher either a personal problem with his colleagues or an academic one when there is a vague in the goals or the like.

Due to the complex job of inspection, as it is incorporated in developing both learning and teaching processes, it can be associated with some problems. The first problem lies in the possible clashes between the curricula plans and what the inspectors believe (Fidler et al., 1998). Sometimes, curricula have a certain type of a syllabus which is not accepted by inspectors irrespective of who is right or wrong. This clash affects the inspection process in that they (inspectors) visit their relevant teachers with opposing ideas to the syllabi of the curricula themselves and some of them, if not all, want to impose their ideas upon teachers to be followed. This may lead to another clash between inspectors and their visited teachers, as a result. The second problem is brought when some (good) teachers get nervous from their inspectors as the latter come to evaluate and pinpoint the former's errors to show their deficiencies in teaching. This negative feeling affects the inspection process as it gets resisted by teachers (Macnab, 2001). In the same vein, Standaert (2000) provides another problem represented in the scarcity of inspectors saying: *'The number of inspectors in the field of second languages ...is rather scarce'* which means that there is a deficiency in the field of inspection as the majority of teachers are not guided, encouraged, and assessed.

9 QUALITIES OF INSPECTORS

9.1 GENERAL QUALITIES OF INSPECTORS

Emanating from the fact that inspectors are watching foreign language teachers in the classroom, it is claimed that such inspectors should *generally* enjoy with three types of qualities, namely *academic*, *educational* and *interpersonal*. Regarding the academic qualities, a foreign language inspector is seen as proficient in the foreign language (e.g. English), knowledgeable in a variety of English Language Teaching (ELT) methods, approaches, old and new, and able to evaluate methodologies to provide the novice teachers with what is new about them. They, *however*, model effective teaching using good lesson formats, activities, and appropriate techniques to help teachers develop English competencies. On the other hand, inspectors are seen as helpers to their visited teachers so as to provide them with relevant websites that enable them to search for knowledge. If teachers are in need to certain knowledge about any single point of language, inspectors should help them know this knowledge.

Regarding the educational qualities, inspectors have to pre-observe teachers in a manner that makes them expect what areas will be observed in the classroom. After observation, they should provide teachers with effective, clear, and meaningful notes that help address their professional and developmental objectives and needs. No matter if teachers get informed about their strengths and pitfalls of their performance in the classroom. Ogunsaju (1983) views that both strengths and pitfalls should be told (i.e. feedback) to them to reinforce the former and minimize the latter. When they comment, they should introduce their comment in an informative way, i.e., to provide them with information they already know, rather than a corrective way which makes them feel less knowledgeable and experienced than their inspectors. It is also preferable if inspectors introduce their comments in the form of asking questions in that they want to know more about them from the teachers themselves rather than imposing their recommended feedback in an aggressive way to make the other part feel less knowledgeable and less powerful. These merits may guide teachers primarily to use a facilitative style to 'self-assess' themselves in the back of inspectors. In addition, inspectors can generate, *in partnership with teachers*, a realistic plan for a strategic professional development for improvement and on-going learning. Finally, they can prepare a final inspection *report* which is by its nature *formative* rather than *summative* which *in essence* could help teachers utilize in the long run.

Finally, the interpersonal or social qualities of inspectors are the ones which differentiate between inspectors. To put it simply, how do inspectors introduce comments to teachers? In what manner do inspectors introduce their comments? Should they be aggressive or collaborative? These questions may evoke the interpersonal qualities the inspectors should enjoy. According to Fidler et al. (1998), an inspector should make his visited teacher feel comfortable and confident when he sits with him. He should *not* make him feel that he comes to evaluate his performance in the classroom whether it is good or bad. Standaert (2000) adds that the inspector should not make the teacher feel that he comes for identifying his errors. To ensure that inspection is productive and beneficial, it is important that inspectors establish and maintain an appropriate working relationship based on courtesy and professional behavior with teachers as well as the school management. It is well-recommended if inspectors greet teachers warmly and express their feeling that they love them and come only to visit them (ibid.). These etiquettes affect the teachers positively and make them feel that they are proficient and being visited for the sake of being in touch rather than of being evaluated.

9.2 QUALITIES OF INSPECTORS DURING THE INSPECTION VISITS

Inspection is a process where it goes through **three** stages: pre-inspection, during-inspection, and post-inspection. At the *pre-inspection* stage, the inspector is required to inform his head teacher in advance about the time of his visit and the criteria of his evaluation in order to be ready psychologically and mentally (Adepoju, 1998). However, many inspectors, by contrast, try to make their visit abrupt for terrifying teachers which in turn affects them negatively (Ogunsaju, 1983).

At the *during-inspection* stage, i.e., observation, the inspector is required to sit among students in a way that puts him in need to information the teacher provides – not as the one who is very alert to the possible errors coming from him (Standaert, 2000). If he, for instance, finds any problem, he should not stop the teacher and correct that mistake, rather, he should write notes. In case of the error being suggestive, he has the right to correct it at once but in a way that reflects courtesy and modesty. Fidler et al. (1998) mention in this respect that the inspector is required to show his wonder and enthusiasm to the teacher's behavior, language, ideas, etc. he presents.

At the post-inspection stage, which is done after watching the teacher in the classroom, the inspector attempts to comment on the teacher's behavior practiced in the classroom. He should reinforce him positively upon the good things he does in the classroom but he should not rebuke him upon the unsuitable behavior he does while teaching. Ogunsaju (1983) argues that the inspector should introduce his comments politely and kindly to the teacher and not to be aggressive or snobbish. Moreover, he is required to allow the teacher to express himself in front of him, introduce ideas, defend himself, justify, explain anything he wants whether it is right or wrong. In other words, he should not be a dictator as he has power over this teacher (ibid.).

10 QUALITIES OF LANGUAGE TEACHERS

10.1 WHO IS A LANGUAGE TEACHER?

A language teacher is the person who teaches a language, whether L₁, L₂ or a foreign language. In our Yemeni schools context, there are two types of language teachers, namely the 1st language teachers, i.e., Arabic teachers and the foreign language, i.e., English.

Therefore, who is a teacher of English? Or who should teach English in the Yemeni schools? There are two types of English teachers in the Yemeni schools, namely B.A. and Diploma holders. The 1st type refers to those who study English language for four years in the departments of English at the faculties of Education and are rewarded a B.A. in English. These teachers teach only the secondary school students. However, the 2nd type refers to those who study English at higher institutes, English major, for two years and get diploma in English and sent to schools to teach at the preparatory levels.

10.2 GENERAL QUALITIES OF A FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHER

Like inspectors, an English teacher has three main qualities, i.e., *academic*, *educational* and *interpersonal*. The *academic* qualities of the English teacher refer to the ability to use English efficiently inside and outside the classroom. This comes when the teacher manages the main skills of English in addition to some knowledge of pragmatics to know when and how to use the language utterances (Ojelabi, 1981). However, the *educational* qualities refer to the teacher's behavior in the classroom beginning with the type of methodology, approaches, techniques, etc. and ending with the manner he/she deals with students in the classroom represented in accepting their opinions, allowing them to express themselves, etc. In other words, he should be modest, simple, collaborative, helpful, and a facilitator. In case of the *interpersonal* qualities of the

teacher, he should be social in that he makes relationship with his students outside the classroom. In other words, the teacher should not make his students feel hesitated when he talks to them. Moreover, it is preferable if the teacher enlarges his relationship to reach his students' parents.

10.3 QUALITIES OF A FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHER DURING INSPECTION

In the beginning, a language teacher is required to be aware of the exact schedules of his inspector's visit. In so doing, he will be aware of the time of the visit to get ready. This idea may enable him to introduce his views before inspection about inspection and what should be focused and what should not be (Adepoju, 1998). If puzzled things discussed before inspection, he can do well when he is observed by his lead inspector. In this case, the teacher allows the inspector, while inspection, to do his work honestly in that he could follow up the procedures of inspection either outside or inside the classroom. However, the teacher is required to deal with the lead inspector smoothly and kindly and *rather* (he) should bear in mind that he is not only an evaluator; rather, he is a helpful guest (Fidler et al., 1998). When they are engaged in discussions, mostly dialogues, he should make the dialogue or discussion more purposeful not merely a meaningless talk (Ogunsaju, 1983). When the lead inspector comments and presents his ideas, the teacher should listen well to him until he finishes and then comments or adds information but politely. Standaert (2000) argues in this regard that the teacher is required to conceal his knowledge in front of the inspector especially when the latter talks about it in some detail. In so doing, the inspector feels that he provides new information to the teacher that could help him. Moreover, he should not interrupt the inspector when he knows such information; this manner will have a negative image on the part of the inspector.

All in all, a good language teacher is the one who makes his inspector feel that he is more knowledgeable than him, *even the converse is true*, and he is in need to his valuable advices and recommendations.

11 CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (CDA)

According to Van Dijk (1998), CDA aims at exploring the mutual relationship between discursive practices, events, texts and the political, cultural and social settings to determine the power relations, dominance, inequality, racism, hegemony, bias, etc. *on the one hand* and how these discursive issues are maintained, reproduced, or resisted, *on the other*. However, Fairclough (1995) on his part argues that CDA intends to investigate how such discursive practices affect discourse, whether spoken or written, in the cultural, social, and historical contexts. CDA can be best defined by O'Halloran (2003:11) as '*a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context*'.

CDA is derived from Critical Linguistics in the late 1970s which (the latter) was developed to achieve three main functions: ideational, interpersonal, and textual (Fairclough, 1995). The ideational function refers to the speakers' experience about the world represented in knowing what is going on around them which could help them in anticipating phenomena. However, the interpersonal function is the effect of one's attitudes and perceptions on judging the in-question phenomena. Finally, the textual function refers to the ability of producing a text as it is understood by the listener (*ibid.*). The last function is the one which is determined by practitioners, researchers, etc. of CDA as it deals with discursive texts through the utilization of the other two functions. In other words, analyzing a discursive text requires adopting the three functions collaboratively and integratively.

According to Fairclough (*ibid.*), CDA excels the aforementioned virtues and penetrates into the other disciplines such as human sciences, literature, industry, management, education, etc. and tries to analyze the discourse *critically* in such disciplines to become a *cross-disciplinary* field, however. As an interdisciplinary field, CDA attempts to put its thumbs on every field to interpret and analyze massive discursive phenomena that seem very pervasive among people.

12 CDA IN EDUCATION

As we all know, education is an umbrella for many sciences such as psychology linguistics, social sciences, humanities, etc. which can be gained in schools as well as in universities. When these sciences are subjected to learning, they can be studied in the form of texts, manuals, textbooks, instructions, classroom dialogue, etc. Intuitively speaking, such texts are the main focus of CDA as an interdisciplinary field which aims at explicating abuses of power promoted by those texts, through analyzing linguistic/semiotic details in light of the larger social and political contexts in which those texts circulate. When it emerges into education for interpreting and analyzing them *systematically* to show the power relations these texts could associate. For these merits, many education researchers around the globe turned to study the educational problems from the CDA perspective as the latter is considered as the way to interpret, explain, and describe such problems. They attempt

massively to study such educational phenomena with the help of finding the main causes of creating such problems through analyzing language texts (spoken, written, digital), dialogues, spontaneous speech, and social problems, however.

13 METHODOLOGY

13.1 THE INSTRUMENT

The instrument of this study is the inspector-teacher discourse/discussion. It underwent a four-stage process. *First*, the researcher surveyed related literature. *Second*, a visit paid to the General Education Office of Ibb City to see the time of the team inspectors' visit to schools in general and to Sana Secondary School for Girls in particular. *Third*, the researcher went with the inspectors team to tape the discursive talk of the inspector of English and his visited teacher. *Fourth*, the researcher used his *LT₉ mobile* to tape the inspector-teacher discourse in the administration room of the school after the inspector had watched the teacher in the classroom.

13.2 THE PARTICIPANTS

The participants of the study were non-natives speakers of English represented in an inspector and a teacher¹ of English. Both were males and having long experiences in inspection and teaching English as a foreign language, respectively.

13.3 CDA TECHNIQUE

The researcher will analyze an extract of the transcript from the inspector-teacher's discourse which was spontaneous because it was done after watching the teacher in the classroom. The moves of both participants were authentic as they were engaged in their responsibility work to comment, *on the part of the inspector*, and to response, *on the part of the teacher*. In fact, the focus of analysis was primarily on both participants' moves about the way the lesson was presented by the teacher. The researcher undertook the analysis following Fairclough's model represented in the three-stage approach of *description, interpretation and explanation* (Kettle, 2005).

Regarding the *description* stage, the researcher-analyst will identify and label both linguistic (e.g. vocabulary and grammar) and paralinguistic (e.g. rising volume and intonation) features of the moves as social issues used by people in social settings. However, at the *interpretation* stage, the participants' moves will be interpreted in terms of linguistic choices that really show their meanings and understandings of beliefs and attitudes towards the natural, social worlds and values. *Finally*, the researcher-analyst will *explain* the participants' linguistic and paralinguistic choices which are determined by social, cultural and institutional structures that either resist, challenge or or induce power relations (Fairclough 2001 cited in Kettle, 2005).

14 DATA ANALYSIS

14.1 THE DIALOGUE TRANSCRIPT

Inspector: Mr. Naji, first of all, I thank you so much indeed from the bottom of my heart for the a a a what you have done. Can can I mention some points that I have taken during, I mean your teaching. See, you have also right?

Teacher: [Nodding his head]

Inspector: You have used a picture, that is wonderful

Teacher: I collected some pictures on the other part

Inspector: Yeah, yeah, that is wonderful. I think this picture that you have used, right?

Teacher: Yeah, students they have to guess: where are these people? What are their jobs? What are they saying ...

Inspector:[looking at his notes]

Teacher: ... a lot of patience and then how they talk about the pictures.

¹ The inspector's name is Ameen Al-Kamil who has been an inspector of English for 10 years.
The teacher's name is Naji Al-Qaderi who has been teaching in Sana School for Girls for 11 years.

- Inspector:** Well, you were wonderful, but I want to tell you something that you have neglected. I see that you didn't use of the board, well, you use random writing. I found you write randomly like ... how long ...
- Teacher:** the the the the the jobs and places only I found the places they don't know ...
- Inspector:** In the board?
- Teacher:** Yes, I write some words which they don't know.
- Inspector:** But what what what you tell is not well-organized. That's why
- Teacher:** yeah, yeah
- Inspector:** That's why you attracted my attention ...
- Teacher:** Yeah, but I cleaned the board before enter to the class, not not ...
- Inspector:** the date?
- Teacher:** not important because ...
- Inspector:** of course. The date ...
- Teacher:** Aha aha aha I always write the date because I don't know that you come to the class [hhhhhhhh]. In my teaching, I write a lot on the board ...
- Inspector:** ok but I am talking about the organization ...
- Teacher:** yeah, yeah, yes, I get it, I get it.
- Inspector:** That's wonders me! An an and ok I think mmmm a a I think you accept some answers from all students mmmm those not .. you know ... you don't ...
- Teacher:** I tell students to speak English as well as much as they can. I can't say to my students 'you are wrong and
- Inspector:** Why, ok ok ... there should be a question when you ask students why do you do like this why or hadn't you know that there is a word like this? What are the signs ...
- Teacher:** you you need to use the present simple and past simple...
- Inspector:** No, no, don't tell me about tenses. I am just asking you students they read the picture and you tell them that they learn well. Why don't you ask the students I mean at that time why don't you ask students to tell you about it like that. This is what I want to tell you. I noticed you didn't do that. You didn't, I mean, take your lesson plan.
- Teacher:** you just ask me where is your lesson plan. It is in my bag.
- Inspector:** you did not show me.
- Teacher:** you did not ask me.
- Inspector:** Are you sure?!!
- Teacher:** in my bag
- Inspector:** ok . you don't give students reinforcement ok? Reinforcement like 'good', 'excellent' to motivate them.
- Teacher:** teacher Ameen, there is something called Teacher Taking Time. I allow students to talk. I follow the Student Taking Time ...
- Inspector:** Ok, ok, you haven't understood me. What I want to tell you is that to encourage them. Tell them 'very good', 'excellent'.
- Teacher:** I give them more.
- Inspector:** I notice .. let me also tell you something I noticed that you stay in one place and the preferable to you to move a little a bit from a place to a place, students we hope to focus.
- Teacher:** if they are boys, I will do, but they are girls ... you know [smiling]
- Inspector:** you have place to walk. You should do like this [standing and walking] to attract their attention.

14.2 DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

According to the discursive speech of both the inspector and teacher, the dialogue was initiated by the inspector starting thanking and mentioning his visited teacher's name for what he had done in the classroom. This gratitude indicated that the inspector adopted the right educational and inspecting way of welcoming a visited teacher using a very suggestive expression '*from the bottom of my heart*' which was used to make the teacher so happy as it came from someone who had an authority on the other. After finishing the 1st gratitude statements, he constructed another statement in the form of an enquiry for allowing him to mention some points he had already noted them during watching the teacher in the classroom. His enquiry started with the modal verb '*can*' which indicated that the inspector seemed polite and simple. When he finished requesting, he reminded him of the lesson he had presented in that it was a reading lesson. When we look critically at the way he constructed the introduction, he used *three* different grammatical statements: affirmative, interrogative, and a question-tag. His use of various statements had a purpose. He started calling him by his name and title 'Mr.' and thanked him for what he had done and forgot that he was his inspector who had a higher position than him. This feeling made him constructing a question immediately for mapping out his first gratitude statement as it should not be said to the teacher and reminding both of being an evaluator, *on the part of the inspector*, and erroneous, *on the part of the teacher*. Then, he immediately composed a tag-question statement to remind the teacher of the topic of the lesson in order to start commenting *on the one hand* and showing that he was *not* in need to anyone to remind him of the topic, *on the other*; that is, he had a good memory to remember things for a long time. This argument can be supported by his *falling* intonation to the word '*right*' (see the video tape) which means that the inspector did not need the teacher's response as he was sure of his ideas and confident of

his memory; unlike the *raising* ones which indicate the speaker's need to the listener's response to support or refute him (Yule, 2010). This behavior indicated that the inspector showed some power over his poor visited teacher.

Again, he wanted to attract the teacher's attention to the picture he used in the classroom by the same style that showed his confidence of his ideas presented. He did *not* start the question with a question particle (e.g., have, do) to avoid the teacher's response of 'yes' for the same purpose that he had a good a memory and did not need any one to remind him. He *then* commented on the teacher's use of the picture by saying '*wonderful*'; it was not said for reinforcing the teacher; rather, it was said to show his power of knowledge with regards to teaching methods in that he knew more about the effectiveness of using such realia in the classroom and had (using picture) to be appreciated. He wanted to continue commenting on the use of pictures and may be the other realia but the teacher felt happy with his inspector's appreciation as he did not expect it from him; he directly interrupted him to indicate the source of bringing the picture but he could not continue as he is interrupted by the inspector. This interruption aimed at suppressing the teacher in order not to indicate the source of bringing the picture and show his power of knowledge of the ability to select a suitable and relevant picture. This was clear from the inspector's repetition of the expression '*that is wonderful*'; as if he wanted to say '*you have to listen to me only, I appreciated it earlier and no need to elaborate*'. This unspoken utterance shows the inspector's power of authority over his poor teacher. But frankly, the teacher did not subject to him and be silent; he resisted his inspector's power and elaborated for some while to indicate the purpose of bringing the picture in a reading lesson such as '*guessing the topic involved in the picture*', '*knowing the place and jobs of people*', '*the idea they carry*', etc. The teacher wanted to show his power of knowledge he had in order to resist the assaulting power of knowledge of his inspector. Saying this by the teacher while the inspector was looking at his notebook. That is to say, the inspector did not listen to the teacher when he justified the use of the picture because he knew the purpose of the picture in advance and no need for hearing it from the teacher. This behavior showed his power of knowledge in knowing purposes of bringing pictures into the classroom. Again the teacher tried to resist that power by continuing listing the purposes of bringing the picture in his next move. This behavior can be interpreted as the teacher wanted to seize the opportunity to continue listing purposes, i.e., to resist, when the inspector looked at his notebook in order to avoid listening to him.

After a long silence by the inspector looking at his notebook, he appreciated the teacher by saying '*you were wonderful*', which is educationally demanding, to refrain him from showing his power of knowledge and he immediately, *in the same sentence*, informed him that he had another comment about the use of the board. According to the inspector, the teacher did not use the board effectively and when he sometimes used it, he used it randomly. When we look at the verbs he used, we find that he used the verbs '*see*', '*found*' which express certainty (Lyons, 1995). In other words, he was sure of what he commented and no way for argument. This behavior indicated some power of authority in that his comments could never be rejected or even modified. Not only that, but he started, *at the end of the same statement*, forming a wh-question of '*how long ...*', asking the teacher a personal question relevant to this problem but he did not complete it due to the teacher's interruption. The presupposed question could be '*how long have you been using the board in this (bad) way?*' as it was understood from the context. The desire of asking this question and specially using '*how long*' was that he wanted to attract the teacher's attention to his long novice experience in dealing with boards. In other words, he wanted to tell the teacher that he used to practice this experience (of writing on the board) for a long time, which was not really welcomed. This is what the inspector was going to say if he was not interrupted by the teacher's interrupted sentence '*the the the the the jobs and places only I found the places they don't know*'. The structure of this move is so weak as some words were repeated such as '*the*' for five times with no purpose followed by broken and fragmented clauses. This indicates that the teacher was not confident in what he justified to his inspector due to the irrelevant justification to what the inspector commented *on the one hand* and the fear from the inspector's power, *on the other*.

However, the inspector understood what the teacher meant although the justification was irrelevant and asked him another question, i.e., '*In the board?*', related to his previous comment in order to see how the teacher would answer the question although he (inspector) knew the answer in that he did not write them on the board. This behavior showed that the inspector wanted only to prove that the teacher's way of using the board was wrong while he was *always* right. This interpretation is supported by the facial expressions he made to show his snobbish way of using his inspection authority over the teacher. Here, the teacher responded that he used the board for writing some words. That is, he tried to resist the inspector's false belief represented in the lack of using the board effectively. This resistance evoked the inspector and/to comment that the teacher's use was not '*well-organized*'. This means that the inspector did not say that the teacher neglected the board as he commented earlier but the only problem was that the teacher's writing was not organized. From the CDA point of view, the inspector seemed to use his authority to homogenize the teacher over anything irrespective of whether it was right or wrong. But what about the teacher? Did he accept or resist that massive insistence (of being wrong) of his inspector? The teacher's response of '*yeah, yeah,...*' showed his weakness, i.e., acceptance, in front of a man of a higher position than him. This acceptance sensitized the inspector to say '*That's why you attracted my attention*' to point out that he

was always right in all what he commented. This in turn showed that the inspector used two types of powers: the *power of authority* when he insisted on introducing ideas that could never be changed and the *power of knowledge* when he said that his attention was attracted because of the wrong use of board by the teacher, which was considered as a crime in ELT, as he implied.

The next move showed that the teacher again wanted to resist this false belief to say that he cleaned the tidy work from the board before he came. In other words, the teacher wanted to say that he knew all things that the inspector knew with regards to the way of presenting information to learners on the board or through any other tool. To put it simply, the teacher wanted to say the well-organized work was cleaned before the inspector came. But, the inspector did not accept it from him and wanted to prove him wrong, asking him '*The date?*'. He wanted to say that if the organized work had been cleaned as the teacher proclaimed, what about the absence of date?! Was it cleaned too?! So, the teacher wanted to cast another comment about the date in that it was absent which should appear on the board. This move showed that the inspector used his authority to prove the teacher guilty at any cost. This made the teacher felt frustrated as he responded wrongly in that the date was not important to be written on the board. This wrong comment helped the inspector to show his power of knowledge again to *imply* the necessity of writing the date on the board. This implication made the teacher accepted, *and not resisted*, his inspector's comment, starting laughing and claiming that he *always* wrote it on the board except the day of the inspector's visit. In other words, the teacher felt sorry because he did not know that the inspector would come to watch him; if he knew, he would write the date on the board instead of being guilty in front of him. This implication admitted the inspector's power over his visited teacher in a way or another.

The next move of the inspector '*Ok but I am talking about the organization ...*' showed the wobbly comments he used to suppress the teacher relaying blindly on his power. Why did he resume talking about the organization after discussing it extensively with his teacher?! This means that he felt that he had power over him which legitimated any comments he used to say. And this was clarified by the response of the teacher '*yeah, yeah, yes, I get it, I get it*' which means that no need for repeating it again and again. Critically speaking, this response was not easy/simple to be said from those of lower ranks to those of higher ranks. That's why the inspector justified his repetition by saying '*that's wonders me!*' to point out that he never repeated and asserted things unless they were worth noting. This, in turn, showed some power of knowledge in that he knew when to assert points and when not. He had a power of knowledge represented in the ability to differentiate between important points and trivial ones.

However, in the same statement, he composed another question starting commenting on the teacher in accepting some wrong answers from students. When looking at the structure of the inspector's sentence, one will find that it is full of '*an, mmm, ok, you know*' which indicates that the inspector still thinking of what to comment the teacher. There were no ready questions in his mind which he thought they were necessary for his visited teacher. This showed the inspector's insistence of using his power of authority over the teacher. In this regard, the teacher knew what the inspector was going to say and immediately responded that he allowed his students to speak English as much as they could. He continued saying that he never stopped his students and said they were wrong. This move indicated that the teacher tried to show his power of knowledge represented in knowing how the negative reinforcement or feedback affected the students' interaction in the classroom. He said that for two purposes: *first*, he wanted to show his knowledge to his inspector because he was his evaluator; and *second* to resist his inspector's power of knowledge in order not to excel him, *rather*, to be *at least* somehow equal.

In the next move, the inspector tried to find another comment to the teacher with regards to the signs of tenses to show his power of knowledge of, i.e., of grammar. Immediately, he tried to avoid his comment by admitting that the students needed present and past tenses to know. This move indicated that the teacher wanted to show his power of knowledge represented in showing the inspector that he knew his students' needs in their current level. This move sensitized the inspector and made him resisted this power, *as being from lower to higher*, by saying '*No, no, don't tell me about tenses. I am just asking you...*' which showed the greater power of authority the inspector practiced it over the teacher. The rest of his move showed that the teacher misunderstood him of what he intended to say; that is, the inspector intended talking about the picture whereas the teacher thought of the use of tenses. This showed that the inspector showed his power of authority over the teacher represented in stopping him even impolitely and showed the power of knowledge represented in refusing the idea of tenses at all as being irrelevant to the goal of the lesson. But in the end of the move, he tried to change the theme of the question into asking him about his lesson plan in that it was not available with him. Putting this idea at the end of his comment, after murmuring some interrupted sentences, pointed out the extensive searching for more comments to downgrade the teacher for the sake of satisfying his authority of power as an inspector-evaluator.

In response to this comment, the teacher admitted that it was found in his bag and it was the inspector's problem when he did not ask for it in the classroom. This move did not make the inspector feel well as being mistaken by the teacher whom

he thought that he was lower. Immediately, he said ' *you did not show me!*' to be far away from being wrong. He always blamed the teacher for anything while he, *as an inspector*, could never be blamed by anyone. He tried to point out that he was always right and perfect. With regards to this point, Adepoju, (1998) argues that a lesson plan should always be associative with the teacher and presented to the inspector while teaching; if not, the inspector himself should ask for it to follow up the teacher in the classroom. In our context, it was clear that the teacher forgot to present it to the inspector, so no matter if the inspector asked for it to see how the teacher applied the plan he did. But, what happened was that the inspector did not admit at all that asking lesson plans was part of his duty. In this regard, the teacher tried to resist his power and insist on making his inspector the wrong-doer. His insistence made the inspector uttered this question ' *Are you sure?!!*' with raising intonation which echoed the sense of dissatisfaction with all what had been argued. Here, the teacher responded saying ' *in my bag.*' in which the inspector's question did not, in essence, need an answer because he did not ask for answer, but to stop argument. These moves enhanced the availability of some power (i.e., of authority) on the part of the inspector and some resistance to this power on the part of the teacher.

As stated earlier, the inspector wanted to stop such argument and, *in his next move*, he started commenting by using ' *ok*' to end this argument and cast another missile towards the teacher represented in the lack of reinforcements in the classroom. He said that the teacher did not use any kind of reinforcement such as ' *good*' or ' *excellent*' for motivating his students. This move indicated that the inspector *again* tried to show his power of knowledge represented in two implications. The *first* implication is that he wanted to tell the teacher about the words that indicated reinforcement while the *second one*, to tell the teacher how reinforcements were very motivative and encouraging to students.

As a response to this comment, the teacher said: ' *Teacher Ameen, there is something called Teacher Taking Time. I allow students to talk. I follow the Student Taking Time ...*'. In this move, the teacher used a technique to sympathize the inspector through using ' *Teacher Ameen*'² at the beginning for two purposes, namely stopping him from any coming comments and making a soft ground for showing some power of knowledge (i.e., talking about the classroom right time of both teacher and student). Both techniques, i.e., *calling him by his title and showing power*, are considered as a kind of resistance to the great powers the inspector practiced them over him along the dialogue. To put it more clearer, the teacher intended to mitigate the inspector's power of authority by saying ' *teacher*' and (mitigate) the power of knowledge by talking about the TTT and STT.

With regards to the inspector, he did not react to these techniques positively; rather, he *instead* accused the teacher of misunderstanding. Then, he tried to clarify his point, meaning the teacher should encourage his students by saying ' *good*' and/or ' *excellent*', nothing more. Again, he did not want in fact to correct the teacher to help him but he wanted to re-show his powers of authority and knowledge simultaneously through using the imperative verb ' *tell*' in ' *Tell them 'very good', 'excellent*' and the repetition of the words ' *good*' and ' *excellent*', respectively. For that, the teacher did not dare to raise his voice to say ' *I give them more*' which indicated that he accepted his inspector's power.

Finally, the inspector found another comment leveled against the teacher in that he stayed in one place in the classroom which was wrong as he implied. He rather advised him to move from one place to another to make his students pay more attention to what he would say. In this move, the teacher showed his power of knowledge represented in knowing about the importance of moving around in the classroom. The teacher, in turn, tried to justify this problem by saying that his situation was special as his students were girls, saying: ' *if they are boys, I will do, ...* '; *but they are girls ... you know [smiling]*'. When we look at this move from both coherently and cohesively point of views, we find that the teacher used ' *substitution*' when he used the auxiliary verb ' *do*' in the place of the verb ' *move*'. His use could be interpreted in two different critically ways. The *first* interpretation is that he accepted his inspector's power represented in ordering him to move around and felt sorry to express it in the sentence for his dissatisfaction. The *second* interpretation is that he wanted to show his power of knowledge through using ' *substitution*' as his use of language would be more eloquent than with the original word itself.

In the second part of his move ' *.... but they are girls...*', the teacher tried to *implicitly* attract the inspector's attention to the purpose behind his sitting in one place in the classroom; which is, the Islamic and Yemeni habits and traditions in dealing with girls. In this move, the teacher used ellipsis which could be presupposed as ' *.... but they are girls...[I cannot do it]*'. He used such a cohesive tie to hide what he supposed to say as being of a lower rank from the listener. The teacher knew well if he used the clause explicitly, the inspector might feel angry and (might) use his power over him and hurt him in his job. So, it is considered as a technique for accepting the power of authority of his inspector, *on the one hand*, and as a type of *linguistic*

It is more appropriate if the teacher uses 'Mr. Ameen' than 'teacher Ameen'.²

resistance to the power of the inspector. The inspector concluded his comments by showing the teacher how to walk and move among students in the classroom. It did not mean that the teacher could not move in the classroom to be taught so by his inspector; rather, he mocked at him in being disable to do his duty, *albeit the classroom movement*, and should be shown this movement practically. Form the CDA point of view, he was conceited by his power and forgot that he was dealing with an experienced teacher like him - if not better than him.

15 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, the researcher has explored the type of power relations induced from the inspector-teacher talk during an inspecting visit. The qualitative/content analysis of the current study, *and for answering the study questions*, showed that there were two types of power relations in the inspector-teacher discourse, i.e., power of authority and power of knowledge practiced by the inspector. As a result, such powers were mostly accepted and rarely resisted by the teacher.

Based on these findings, the researcher suggested training courses for inspectors of English to be done by the Education Office of Ibb City – Inspection Section to train them about the inspection responsibility. In such courses, highly proficient experts in education should be invited to train such inspectors in order to re-think of their job as being facilitators, helpers, cooperators, consolders to the teachers they visit in schools in order to help them achieve the set objectives of the course rather than being horror-causers and authority and power dominants.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adepoju, T. (1998). *Fundamental of school administration, planning and supervision in Nigeria*. Ibadana; Alafas Nigeria at Company
- [2] Adewole, E., & Olaniyi, W. (1992). *School organization and management*. Ondo: Ife-Oluwa Ent. Nig Ltd.
- [3] Corson, D. (2000). Emancipatory leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 3 (2), 93-120.
- [4] Fairclough, N. (1992a). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- [5] Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman
- [6] Fairclough, N. (2000). *Language and Power*. 2nd Edition. New York: Longman
- [7] Fidler, B., Earley, P., Ouston, J., & Davies, J. (1998). Teacher Gradings and OfSTED Inspections: help or hindrance as a management tool?, *School Leadership & Management*, 18(2), 257-270.
- [8] Kantos, Z. (2012). Primary School Students' Perception of Inspectors and Inspection Period in Turkey. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3, 3, (199 -202).
- [9] Kettle, M. (2005). Critical Discourse Analysis and hybrid texts: Analyzing English as a Second Language (ESL). *Melbourne Studies in Education* 46(2):pp. 87-105.
- [10] Lyons, J. (1995). *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Macnab, D. (2001), Curriculum Development and HM Inspection of Schools: a Scottish case- study, *oxford Review of Education*, 27(1).
- [12] Ogunsaju, S. (1983). *Educational Supervision perfectives and practice in Nigeria*. Ile-Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University Press.
- [13] O'Halloran, K. (2003). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [14] Ojelabi, A.(1981). *A guide to school management*. Ibadan :Valuta Educational Publishers
- [15] Rogers, R. (2004). An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis. In R. Rogers (Eds.), *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis*, (pp. 1- 18). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [16] Standaert, R. (2000). *Inspectorates of Education in Europe: A Critical Analysis* (Flanders, Ministry of Education).
- [17] Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistics analysis of natural language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- [18] Van Dijk, T. (1988). *News as Discourse*. Hilsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum
- [19] Wodak, R. (1989). *Language Power and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse*. London: Benjamin Publishing Company
- [20] Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press