International Journal of Research Studies in Education
2022 Volume 11 Number 12, 103-124

Milieu of English language use in industrial-technical classrooms: Implication for intervention and policy formulation

Azarias, Ranec A. ✉
Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College, Philippines (azariasranec@ispsc.edu.ph)

ISSN: 2243-7703
Online ISSN: 2243-7711

Received: 10 June 2022
Revised: 21 June 2022
Accepted: 30 June 2022
OPEN ACCESS
Available Online: 30 June 2022
DOI: 10.5861/ijrse.2022.332

Abstract

Using English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) has gained attention in language and pedagogical researches. Reviewed literature revealed a dearth of studies on the use of EMI in industrial-technical education. In such light, this qualitative case study was conceptualized to identify the language needs of industrial-technical teachers in using EMI. Through analyses of the observation transcripts and related documents, the study revealed that the language needs (LNs) of the participants are questioning technique retooling, formulating questions with correct language mechanics, using praise words, using transitional markers, minimizing verbal fillers, giving feedback, giving instructions, constructing test items with correct language mechanics, and producing the sounds of [θ], [ð]and [æ]. Finally, the study concludes that equipping industrial-technical teachers with pedagogical English language skills and knowledge is vital as they act as content teachers and language teachers. Hence, a continuous perusal of institutions' faculty development programs should allow multi-disciplinary opportunities.

Keywords: English as Medium of Instruction, English language use, industrial-technical education, language needs, qualitative approach

Milieu of English language use in industrial-technical classrooms: Implication for intervention and policy formulation

1. Introduction

In the global communication, the English language is one of the most widely spoken languages. In fact, English has also become the international lingua franca and the main communication tool within higher education (Dafouz, 2015). This gave birth to different language policies among educational institutions; English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) is among these. EMI is defined as the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (other than English itself) in countries or jurisdictions where the first language of the majority of the population is not English (Macaro *et al.*, 2018).

Globally, more and more universities are caught up in the rush to offer both undergraduate and postgraduate programs through the medium of English (Earls, 2016; Lasagabaster *et al*., 2014). In the European Union (EU), the sharp rise in EMI programs in tertiary education can be attributed to the Bologna Process, a series of multi-national educational reforms initiated with the Bologna Declaration in 1999 (Council of Europe, 2014; Dafouz *et al.,*2014). EMI has also emerged in Asian countries (Naun, 2003). However, unlike in Europe, researchers have yet to thoroughly document EMI implementation in Asian countries (Byun *et al*., 2011).

In the Philippines, the study of the history and role of English, including its use as a medium of instruction (MOI) by Bernardo (2004) revealed that despite conflicting opinions, Filipino students and teachers have clear preference for the use of English in education, with the preference being largely based on the perceived usefulness of English for learning, communication, and advancement. More recent studies on English as MOI such as those by Vizconde (2006b; 2011) were conducted, but the focus was on the dynamics of language instruction in the Philippines and the impact of language policy on education in general. In fact, the area of MOI seems to be under-researched in the Philippine setting even though it is apparent that the old problems have remained (Gaerlan, 2016).

Evidently, available and retrievable EMI studies in the Philippines focused on the language needs of learners (Pareja, 2015), the language practices of teachers and students (Visconde, 2011), the attitude of student teachers towards EMI in science and mathematics (Visconde, 2006a), and the context of English language instruction in the Philippine basic education program (Visconde, 2006b). As such, more investigations are needed on the use of the English language in classrooms. Specifically, the reviewed literature revealed a dearth of critical studies on EMI in the context of industrial-technical classrooms focusing on the language needs of teachers. The need to study EMI in the Philippine context, especially in multilingual classrooms is vital as it provides a clearer picture of EMI. Also, the results of studies could yield better language policies not only for higher education institutions but also for basic education institutions

Meanwhile, the Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College (ISPSC) Santiago campus is among the eight campuses of the college where industrial-technical classrooms abound, thus, allowing the offering of industrial-technical courses. Notably, Azarias (2022) underscored that industrial-technical classrooms are those classrooms that train and educate students on technical skills and knowledge in areas such as food technology, automotive technology, computer technology, digital technology, electrical technology, electronics technology, apparel technology and other allied engineering fields. Accordingly, these classrooms subject students to national assessments by the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA) to get national certificates for different competencies in their respective major fields.

Moreover, in these industrial-technical classrooms English has been the medium of instruction. With the use of English in these classrooms, teachers being at the forefront in the delivery of industrial-technical education and training are expected to use English as their medium of instruction. However, it has been observed that Ilokano

and Filipino languages are being used sparingly with English in discussing lessons which transpire different styles of using English in the class. In language use, Liang (2009) posited that use the first language (L1) is imperative to explain vocabulary, syntax and text rather than using EMI. Kiss *et al*. (2012) stated that using English as the language of wider communication in post-colonial countries, like the Philippines, has resulted in different styles of English; EMI is one of the domains where Standard English is enforced by professional organizations and policy makers. Accordingly, teachers may not see the need to use this formal style in their everyday communication, which creates a professional dilemma of language use. It is to note however that English language input is critical in ensuring the quality and effectiveness of business English teaching (Huang, 2009).

Despite using L1 and English alternately or sparingly, it is undeniable that the role and scope of English have grown immensely during the past few decades due to globalization and the concomitant increase in personal mobility and intercultural exchanges (Byun *et al.,* 2011). English fulfills the need for an international medium of communication. Thus, it deepens its global influence and dominance as the preeminent language.

Due to the advent of globalization, communication skills have become crucial for many professions, and teaching is not an exception (Thiruvengadam, 2016) regardless of the courses being handled by teachers. The language reservoir of teachers plays a vital role in effective communication between and among all the stakeholders. Through language, teachers can deliver their lessons. In other words, optimal learning can be achieved when it is assisted or well-scaffolded through how the teacher uses language appropriately in the classroom (Canh & Renandya, 2017). As such, it is imperative to study the how teachers use English in their classrooms and to identify their language needs that requires intervention actions.

Enthused by the present scenario of EMI as studies revealed and the need to conduct a study in the Philippine setting, this study was conceptualized to describe English language use in the different industrial-technical degree programs of a state college in Ilocos Sur, Philippines. In this study, the language needs of teachers in industrial-technical classrooms in using the English language were explored as bases in formulating a language training program and a language policy for industrial-technical degree programs of the said state college.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research design

This study employed case study as its research design. Case study is a design of inquiry found in many fields, especially evaluation; the researcher develops an in-depth analysis of a case, often a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals (Creswell, 2014). It explores the study of an issue through one or more cases within bounded systems (Creswell, 2013). Also, it seeks to provide an in-depth understanding of the cases in which in the case of this study, the language needs of teachers in industrial-technical degree programs. As such, the design was found appropriate.

2.2 Selection and study site

This study was conducted in a state college in Ilocos Sur, Philippines. The participants are the teachers who are teaching major courses under the Bachelor of Science in Industrial Technology, Bachelor of Technical-Vocational Teacher Education, Bachelor of Science in Mechatronics Technology, and Senior High School Industrial Arts Strand. They were chosen using criterion sampling in which two criteria are set. First, they have been teaching major courses for at least five (5) years. Second, they are willing to participate in the study. With these criteria, 13 participants participated in the study.

2.3 Data gathering instrument and procedure

In conducting the study, the researcher used an observation protocol developed based on *a priori* codes. These

a priori codes were used in observing the pertinent areas to determine the language needs of the participants (Azarias, 2022; Azarias *et al.*, 2020; Azarias & Capistrano, 2019). To get the permission of the participants to participate in the study, the researcher let them sign a consent form. Finally, a r*obotfoto* was utilized during the preliminary survey of the study to get the demographic profile of the participants. With this, the participants were identified.

Prior to the conduct of the study, approval to conduct the study was sought from appropriate college officials. Upon the approval of the study, the observation protocol was constructed based on *a priori* codes. After that, the participants were identified using the set criteria that were embedded in the *robotfoto*. Their consent was sought using the consent form in which they were oriented to the nature of the study. Then, the online classroom observations were set based on the convenience of the participants. The observations were done during the limited face-to-face classes of the participants. It is to note that online classes were also done. The class sessions shall be audio or video recorded to get the main data of the study. After each class observation, the researcher transcribed the recorded class sessions to arrive at extended texts. For the accuracy of data, spot-checking was undertaken.

Finally, follow up interviews and observations, checking the extended texts, and dissemination of results were followed as member checking procedures (Azarias, 2022). Also, triangulation and substantiation of data were through interviews with students and document analysis of instructional materials of the participants. Last, the researcher employed cool and warm analyses in analyzing the data.

2.4 Mode of analysis

The observation recordings were transcribed to arrive at extended texts. The extended texts were subjected to cool and warm analyses. In the cool analyses, significant statements were identified to facilitate data categorization. In the warm analyses, data were categorized to facilitate the identification of themes which shall encapsulate the corpora of the study. Also, member checking procedures were employed to achieve the truthfulness, veracity, and accuracy of the data and the findings. Finally, the study used the transcription symbols compiled by Atkinson and Heritage (1984), Sacks *et al.* (1974), and Seedhouse (2004) in transcribing the recorded observations.

=	Indicates continuous stretch of talk
[ ]	Indicates simultaneous/overlapped speech
yea:h	The colon indicates lengthening of sound
↑	Indicates a pitch going up
↓	Indicates a pitch going down
(.)	Indicates untimed perceptible pause
:::	Colon/s indicate sound lengthening
,	Indicate falling intonation
<>	Slowed speech
><	Quickened speech
$	Indicates laughing while talking
(( ))	Non-verbal actions or transcriber's comments
(guess)	Transcriber's uncertainty
(…….)	Indicates talk that is not clearly audible
italics	English translation of a word/non-English utterance
?	Rising intonation
WORD	Words that are in capital letters indicate loud utterance.
0 0	Indicates noticeably quiet utterance
/*ey*/	Phonemic transcription

3. Results and discussion

In this study, the industrial-technical classrooms were observed to identify the language needs (LNs) of teachers who are teaching industrial-technical courses. Most of the classroom observations took place in the laboratory rooms. This is because of the nature and scope of the lessons that required the teacher to show the actual tools, machines, facility, and equipment. The identified LNs include questioning technique retooling, formulating questions with correct language mechanics, using praise words, using transitional markers, minimizing verbal

fillers, giving feedback, giving instructions, constructing test items with correct language mechanics, and producing the sounds of [θ], [ð]and [æ].

Questioning technique retooling. Results of the classroom observations revealed that the common ways the participants (Ps) engaged students (Ss) in classroom discussion is through asking questions. Although questioning has long been thought of as an important aspect of education, more recent research studies indicate it has been brought to the forefront as a critical component of effective teaching (Hannel, 2009). Consequently, it increases curiosity, piques interest, and causes increased motivation when teachers use questioning effectively (Caram & Davis, 2005). In asking questions, this study revealed that the participants need to be equipped or retooled with questioning techniques that shall further elicit participation among students evident in their responses. In this study, the questioning technique refers to LN of teachers in terms of the level of questions they usually ask their students. Teachers and students' interactions below reflect the claim.

P1: what IS a tumbler,

S: (It) used to serve the water,

P2: Okay, for channel 1, the frequency is 44 to 50 megahertz, How about channel 2?

Ss: [54 to 60 sir,]

P2: okay, so 54 to 60 megahertz, FOR channel 3?

S: 60 to 66,

P10: what should be the material of the scraper,

S: made from plastic,

P13: What method of processing that you are going to do, in order THAT you can make those kind OF food,

S: Meal, ((The answer should be curing.))

P11: so what are the: ah: across body measurements?

S: shoulders

P5: How are you going to↑ convert picofarad↓ to microfarad, 10000 picofarad is equal to how many microfarad?

S: 0.01 ((The teacher asked how the students got 0.01.))

Evidently, the questions elicited answers limited to short answers or responses, single words, and short phrases. This implies that lower level questions are commonly being asked in industrial-technical classrooms. Low-level questions require students to remember, reiterate or find information that is within the text (Tienken *et al.*, 2010; Vogler, 2005). These types of questions do not encourage students to use high-level thinking, but rather require them just to recall what they have read or learned in a manner which produces a "correct" or "incorrect" response (Tienken *et al.*, 2010; Walsh & Sattes, 2005). It is to note that higher-level questions do not have one correct answer but encourage students to engage in critical thinking (Nappi, 2017); most of the questions that were asked, however required otherwise. As such, teachers need to develop their skills in asking higher-level questions. After all, Caram and Davis (2005) posited that questioning is often a characteristic of a good teaching not developed in teacher education and teacher training programs.

The findings also conform to Nappi's (2017) articulation that classroom teachers frequently pose questions that require lower-order thinking or basic recall. Accordingly, questions that are limited to asking students to recall

information obstruct the promotion of higher-order, critical thinking that is necessary for students to be successful in life. This also suggests a low participation level. Clearly, lower-level questions are easier for teachers to produce but do not encourage students to engage in higher-level or higher-order thinking (Tienken *et al*., 2010). Notably, in a world that is increasingly fast-paced and action-packed, students require more excitement, prompting and inspiration to be fully engaged in the learning process (Caram & Davis, 2005). Hence, teachers need to ask high-level questions that shall allow the students to actively express their ideas in terms of the practical applications of their lessons.

Finally, higher-level questioning that requires students analyze, synthesize, evaluate, categorize, and/or apply information has been found to be particularly advantageous to student learning, yet higher-level questions are rarely used (Peterson & Taylor, 2012; Tienken *et al*., 2010) which is the case of industrial-technical classrooms that were observed. When teachers create a classroom culture that requires students' continuous participation through answering complex, high-level questions at their cognitive level, it leaves them no choice but to be engaged (Hannel, 2009; Walsh & Sattes, 2005). Apparently, using variety of techniques for questioning, such as planning for and scaffolding questions, stimulates student achievement and growth in the classroom (Phillips, 2013). As such, good questioning techniques need to be modelled in order for students to become skilled in both thinking and questioning; because questioning leads to problem-solving, quality questions will lead to quality decisions (Nappi, 2017).

Formulating questions with correct language mechanics. Formulating questions in order to engage students in classroom discussion is vital. Strategically structuring questioning in the classroom through careful planning and implementation benefit both teachers and students (Peterson & Taylor, 2012). However, observation transcripts revealed that the participants committed errors in formulating questions. Hence, the theme refers to the errors committed by the participants when they asked questions to their students. These include errors of omission, misinformation, errors of addition, and misordering (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). Though classified according to error categories, these errors that teachers committed were considered to be mistakes since they were able to point these out during the member checking procedures. In fact, Muhsin (2016) accounted that a mistake is a fault made by the learner, and they can make a correction. Despite being classified as a mistake, there is a need to address this LN for the students to be exposed to the correct pattern and mechanics of formulating questions.

Errors of omission were committed when the participants omitted verbs and articles in their questions. According to Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005), errors of omission are when the learner has left out a word, while misinformation or substitution is when the learner uses the wrong form of a morpheme or structure. These errors were reflected in the following:

> P1: have you seen overhead hack?
>
> (P1 committed the error when the article 'an' was omitted before the word overhead hack.)
>
> P10: what other ingredients?
>
> (Though the students understood the question, error was committed when P11 failed to insert 'are the' between the words what and other.)
>
> P11: what (is the) other body measurement needed?
>
> (P11 omitted 'is' and 'the' between what and other.)
>
> P9: how (do) they keep your engine last,
>
> (The omission of 'do' between how and they made the sentence erroneous.)
>
> P13: What (are the) other meats that we are eating,

(The question is erroneous since P13 failed to insert 'are the' between what and other.)

In terms of errors of omission, the participants unconsciously omitted content and function words or grammatical morphemes. Articles 'a' and 'the', which are considered function words, along with 'is' and 'are' were omitted during the production of question. Dulay *et al.* (1982) underscored that language learners omit grammatical morphemes much more frequently than content words. Accordingly, if content words are omitted in second language, it is usually caused by lack of vocabulary, and learners usually indicate their awareness of the missing constituent. Interestingly, this is not the case among the participants. Hence, the finding implies that the participants, who were second language learners, still possess vocabulary reservoirs despite their errors of omission; these reservoirs allow them to communicate their lessons and ideas to the students.

In terms of the misinformation errors of the participants, these errors were evident in Subject-Verb Agreement (SVA) area. Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) stated that misinformation or substitution is committed when wrong form of a morpheme or structure is used. Such kind of errors is evident in the following:

P1: what is other physical requirements,

(P1 should have used 'are' since the subject is 'physical requirements' which is in plural form.)

P5: What are the capacitance rating?

(P5 should have used 'is' since the subject is capacitance rating which is in singular form.)

P6: How does the diameter, diameter *no*? and the LENGTH of the wire? hmm? Affects (affect)? the resistance,

(P6 should have used 'do' since the subjects are diameter and length that are considered to be plural.)

The finding supports Stapa and Izahar (2010) who revealed that most respondents, who were teachers, committed errors in subject-verb agreement especially in SVA of number. Similarly, Surina and Kamarulzaman (2009) claimed that majority of the respondents still had problems with their subject-verb agreement in their writing. The finding implies that participants are still confused in making the verb and the subject agree when they formulate questions due to the difference in the structure between declarative and interrogative sentences. Hence, a revisit of their SVA rules in formulating question is imperative. In so doing, retooling on the part of the participants is an integral part of language learning not only for them but also for the students.

On the other hand, the participants committed errors of addition. Errors of addition are committed when one has added a word or an ending to another word which is grammatically incorrect (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). These errors are shown in the following:

P2: What are these informations,

(The question committed an error when suffix '-s' was added in the word 'information'. The word itself is considered plural.)

P9: how: does a gas engine operates,

(The error was committed when P9 added suffix '-s' in the verb 'operate'. The verb 'does' already took the subject-verb agreement; hence, the root word of the next verb should have been used.)

P10: Why are those ah: tools and equipments are being classified (.) according to their uses,

(The question of P10 committed the error when the verb phrase 'are being' was added. Another addition error was committed when suffix '-s' was added in the word 'equipment'.)

P12: how are you going to costing your product?

(In the question of P12, an error was evident in the infinitive 'to costing'. The suffix '-ing' should have been omitted. P12 may have stated, "how are you going to compute the cost of your product.")

The findings accentuate some of the major findings of Katiya *et al.* (2015) which are faulty generalization (P2 and P9's errors) and failure to learn conditions under which rules apply (P10 and P12's errors). Similarly, errors of addition were revealed by Tizazu (2014). These errors were categorized into simple addition (P12), double-marking (P9), and regularization errors (P2 and P10). Meanwhile, the finding negates that of Zheng and Park (2013) who revealed that adding unnecessary words was the most frequent error. In this study, addition of bound morphemes is the commonly observed error of the participants. The findings clearly show confusion among participants in terms of applying some grammatical rules that were violated in the mentioned errors.

The last errors committed by the participants are classified as misordering. Misordering is when one places a morpheme incorrectly in a grammatical construction (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). The following questions justify:

P10: if you have the whole bar of butter, what you will do?

P11: why we are going to divide this into four,

P12: what kind of business they are performing,

Errors are evident in how the participants ordered or placed the verbs in their questions. In P10's question, 'will' should have been placed between what and you. In P11's, 'are' should be placed between why and we. In P12's, 'are' are should have been placed between business and they. The finding supports the study of Masruddin and Karmila (2018) that revealed that one of the errors committed to constructing wh-questions is misordering. Clearly, misordering errors are caused by incorrect placement of a morpheme or group of morphemes in a given utterance (Tizazu, 2014). The finding suggests that the participants over-generalized word order in constructing declarative sentence in constructing interrogative sentences. As such, there is an indication that they did not seem to master the grammar aspect well, thus resulting in errors committed in their English compositions (Abdullah, 2013).

Meanwhile, the participants were observed to be enthusiastic despite the limited participation of the students. In fact, calling the names of students one after the other is one of their ways to break the monotony in the classroom especially if only few recite and participate during the class discussion. Displaying positive emotions, such as enthusiasm, confidence, and self-assurance, also helps promote student engagement (Zhang & Zhang, 2013). In doing so, the participants create a learning milieu that is safe and comforting. In fact, Mottet *et al.* (2004) suggested ways to create a safe learning milieu for students that include employing verbal approach messages such as humor, personal recognition, and care to develop relationships with students. Notably, LN of the participants in displaying positive emotions that needs to be addressed is on the use of praise words.

Using praise words. In the teaching and learning process, establishing a positive learning milieu is imperative through utilizing confirming behaviors. In fact, Sidelinger and Booth-Butterfield (2010) forwarded that utilizing confirming behaviors such as positive responses to student questions and interest in student learning is encouraged as both of these behaviors have been linked to a positive classroom climate. One of these confirming behaviors is the use of praise words. The term 'praise' is derived from the Latin verb *pretiare*, which means to value highly (Shepell, 2000), and involves commending the worth of an individual or expressing admiration or approval (Blote, 1995). Teacher praise contains positive affect and is a more intense, detailed response to student behavior than feedback (Blote, 1995).

Through the result of the classroom observations and the analyses of the observation transcripts, the participants evidently addressed the questions and answers of the students. However, they were limited only to saying very good, good, okay, and yes or no. In some instances of the classroom observations, responses to students' wrong answers were done through rephrasing or translating the questions, and giving the correct answers. The following conversations illustrate the observations:

P2: How?↑ paano↑ paano niya icapture? yung ano ah: motion pictures and sound,

Student: direct (…….)

P5: *paano naging* good, *Paano mo nasabing* good *yong* (.) capacitor, *ania ti naobserve mo ayan ti* tester pointer, (How did you say it is good? What did you observe?)

Student: ah: when I test the capacitor (.) the pointer (.) pointer go right and (.) back to initial position,

P5: okay (.) very good↓ Next,

P6: May varnish insulation ↑*siya (*It has a varnish insulation)

Student: *Ata* sir *nakaruwar* Sir? (Sir, is it the thing you brought out?)

P6: Yes, *Subukan nating* ↑*tanggalin* (Yes, let's try to remove)

P13: SO uh: what food did you eat?

Student: Noodles,

P13: All right, good and okay,

In most instances, the participants continued with the discussion or class recitation without saying any praise words or any affirming and negating word. At some point, students had limited interaction as manifested by them giving short answers to questions and by the teacher-talk's amount of time. To illustrate the claims, the extract is presented below.

P5: so we have the electrolytic, mylar and? ceramic capacitors, So those are the most commonly used (.) types of capacitors, now what is an electrolytic capacitor? What is an electrolytic capacitor? >Yes, Mr.<

Student: polarized

P5: so an electrolytic capacitor is a polarized capacitor (.)… How about the mylar capacitor? What is a mylar or the ceramic capacitor? R_____l, what is a ceramic or mylar capacitor?

Student: non-polarized Ma'am,

P5: so the mylar and ceramic capacitor are non?polarized capacitor,

In such light, the finding implies the need for teachers to address the lack of praise words when dealing with students' answers. Most people desire acknowledgement for their activities, outcomes or performance and it can be a great motivation to drive people further in whatever capacity or domain they are focusing on (Mathis *et al.,* 2013). Research even showed that college students would rather receive praises than eat their favorite food or receive a paycheck (Bushman *et al*., 2012). The statements imply that learners, as the active processors of learning, need acknowledgments of the achievements they are making inside the classroom. After all, effective praise was thought to occur when the teacher positively acknowledged students' work (Hitz & Driscoll, 1989).

Using transitional markers. As observed, the industrial-technical classrooms are teacher-talk dominated. This is evident in all the observation transcripts in which long statements from the teachers were transcribed. The same also revealed that most of the teachers did not have clear transition showing the shifting of the procedures from preliminary parts of the lesson to the giving of assignments.

The commonly used transition markers are so, okay, all right, and next. These markers appeared to be verbal fillers because of their frequent appearance in every sentence that the participants uttered. To illustrate the claims, the excerpts from the observation transcripts are presented below.

P2: **So** meaning↑ once↑ the current passes↓ assuming current will come from here, **okay**?=
So the (.) this local oscillator is a simple electronic component, **okay?** … **okay, so** this is the ah: LAW regulating body for =

P10: **Okay**, the baking tools and equipments … **Next** we have also the timer,=

P12: **okay** tailoring shop, in tailoring shop what kind of business they are performing=
so *siya mismo yung gumagawa ng* product (She is personally making the product.)

P1: **so** this is an organizational chart (.) as you can see in the board *nandiyan yong* different↑ personel ah: in a bar, **so** this is ahm: **so:** choose here the connection of the different personnel in the bar (……..) **so** we have the first is the bar manager the bar manager is↑ the one↓=

P13: **So**, most of us, we prepare *sabi niyo kanina,* we prepare (.) the cured one=
All ↑right, what else, aside from that?
Easier for you to throw away your garbage after preparing the? Food, **All ↑right**

The finding implies the need for the participants need to be retooled with transition markers in order to establish continuity of the lesson delivery and to guide learners of the flow of the lesson. In fact, Smith (2019) underscored that a vital part of any lecture is 'transitioning' (moving on) to a new section; this helps the listener understand the structure and follow the main points. This can be done with the use of signaling or transition words, which show audience how the presentation is structured and how ideas relate to each other (RMIT University, 2014). If these transition words that function as hints of the next activity of the class or part of the lesson are missing, confusion among learners may occur. Parts of the class session should be introduced one after the other using transition words. Transition words help sentences flow together and form a story (MacPherson, 2017), thereby connecting one idea to another (MonMouth University, 2011).

Minimizing verbal fillers. During class discussion, the participants were observed to be having verbal fillers. Verbal fillers are words or phrases used during speaking, particularly public speaking, to fill in a moment of silence between connecting thoughts or ideas (Clark, 2015). In some literature and researches, these verbal fillers are not considered discourse markers or transition markers as supported by Fraser (1999). He suggested that "pause markers" such as 'well' and 'um' and interjections such as 'wow!' are not discourse markers. The extracts below present the statements of the participants that contain verbal fillers.

P1: **so** it is necessary (.) in the service or in the beverage service, and also in the preparation and production of (.) mixed drinks (.) **So** we have, of course, the different equipment that are used in the bar: We have num (.) we have the overhead rack, **So** have you seen overhead hack?

P2: **okay**? **So** the (.) this local oscillator is a simple electronic component, **okay**? I (.) Unfortunately I **ah**: I cannot **ah**: give you an example or show you an example or picture of that because that is an exclusive part that comes only FROM the NTC National

Telecommunication Commission **okay**, **so** this is the **ah**: LAW regulating body for ALL the radio

P5: **so** we have the electrolytic, mylar and? ceramic capacitors, **so** those are the most commonly used (.) types of capacitors,

P6: It made of laminated iron sheets with silicon, **'no**? With silicon, **so** (.) we have = **Okay**? What do you think will be the resistance of the secondary? ***'no*?** As I've said the primary has more turns, **So** what will happen with the resistance?

P10: **So**, we need to sift first the all-purpose (.) flour before we (.) measure (.) and with the purpose of removing the: what? Removing the ***ah****: (.)* some foreign ***ah****:* objects, So this is the right way of measuring the ***ah****:* the flour or all-purpose↑ flour↓

As observed, these verbal fillers appeared when the participants seemed to think of the next words to utter. Cohen (2012) posited that verbal fillers such as 'um', 'uh' or 'ah' are being used in order for someone to think verbally. However, the frequent occurrence of such verbal fillers affects the focus of students. In some classes that were observed, some students were counting the 'so', 'um', 'ah', 'isn't it', 'okay', and 'no' of their teachers. As such, teachers need to minimize them to not distract students from understanding the lesson.

Giving feedback. In this study, giving of feedback refers to how teaches redirect or guide students' responses to facilitate further discussion of the subject matter. In the teaching-learning process, feedback is one of the vital elements that allow learners to monitor his/her progress. In the case of the industrial-technical classes, the teacher-response-evaluation (IRE) discourse pattern pervades. This is characterized by the teacher discussing the lesson and asking questions to students, the students giving responses, and the teacher giving a direct evaluation of the students' responses. This happens when the teachers ask factual questions to which they know the answer (Myhill, 2006). The following classroom observation excerpts justify:

P1: Then we have, okay↑ *ito marami sa bahay, It iyong ginagamit natin sa bahay* (We have many of these at home. This is what we use at home), this is what we call the: what?

Ss: Soda glass,

P1: *Parehas sila* (they are the same), these are the old fashioned glass, OLD fashioned glass or: the rock glass, = ◊ and next we have: okay tumbler first tumbler, Used↑ for serving what? Tumbler is used for serving?

Ss: Water

P2: Just like the television, in the television system, >the antenna of the tv cannot receive the signal coming from tower of the cellular phone< Isn't it?

Ss: Yes sir,

P2: Why? ◊ Because it is not designed to receive that kind of signal ◊ Isn't it?=

P10: What about the pastry wheel, we don't have a pastry wheel, A pastry wheel is ah: the one using those selling:

S: pizza Ma'am,

P10: wen selling pies, pizza: that has ((rolling her fingers)) a rotary (.) blade, When you: you move that, it will easily cut (.) the dough, Okay, what else?

S: Pastry blender,

P10: Pastry blender,

P11: Final: pattern, so we are going to start↑ From (.) the foundation? pattern, Now in drafting CLASS you need: ((The teacher shows a hip curve.)) drafting tools, in drafting, Okay? so you need: hip curve, what is the use of the hip curve?

S: (…….)

P11: To shape the?

S: To shape the,

P11: Hip line? The size of the blouse, and also the? bottom lead, you need also the? triangle, ((The teacher shows the triangle.)) what is the use of the triangle?

S: (……..)

P11: Draws↑ straight line↓ Okay? Then you need also? French curve, use to? ((No one answers))

P11: >We have already finished< the ah: tools (.) that are needed in drafting, *di ba*? Okay↓ so what is the use of this? ((The teacher shows the French curve.)) or what is this, ,

S: French curve,

The extracts show that the teachers know the answer to their questions. As shown in the extracts, answers are limited to single words and phrases. In some instances and as presented in the extracts, the participants lead the students to get the correct answer. When the students are able to get the correct answer, the participants just say all right, okay, or repeat the correct answer. If the participants cannot understand or misheard the students' answers, they clarify. These suggest that teachers in industrial-technical classrooms use a direct comment or straightforward evaluation to the answers of students. Hashamdar (2012), Mendez and Cruz (2012), and Neal (2008) supported the claim when they underscored that other forms of teacher's evaluation may be a straightforward evaluation or explicit correction that involves direct comment on whether the student's answer is right or wrong or providing right answer to the students; clarification requests, which involves asking learners to repeat their utterance for clarity.

In this kind of giving feedback, engagement in classroom interaction cannot be expected from students. The extensive use of evaluative feedback in IRE pattern in the classroom inhibits the students' further elaboration and clarification, thereby limiting their opportunity to engage in pragmatically appropriate conversations with instructors and with other students (Pessoa *et al*., 2007). This means teachers need to vary their techniques in facilitating students' answers for more classroom interaction. In so doing, non-evaluative forms of feedback should be given. These include asking students to expand their responses by justifying or clarifying their opinions (Thoms, 2012). This also allows the students to co-construct a response with their teacher and their peers (Simich-Dudgeon, 1998). Hence, learners have more interactional space and freedom in what they say and when they say it when the teacher's comments are non-evaluative.

Giving instructions. In the teaching-learning process, giving instructions is an important aspect that allows the learners and the teachers to maintain smooth lesson flow and help establish continuity. In so doing, the time allotted for every lesson or activity is maximized and managed. While good instruction-giving is an essential part of an effective lesson and an important part of classroom management, it is a skill that is often overlooked in teacher-training programs and classrooms (Sowell, 2017). To illustrate how the participants gave instructions during performance tasks and written or oral tests, the following excerpts are presented:

P1: So I'm going to arrange this glasses and I'm going to pick up one and identify the glass,

and then the use of each glass, Okay, so from these glasses will you classify (…….) classify (…….) put the different (…….) classify the different types of glass, So there are four types of glass then classify them according to? *sa* classification *nia* ◊ tumbler, stem ware, footed ware and mug ◊ Okay *sino ang gagawa*? Okay *gawin mo yong, gawin mo yong yong 'yong*: footed, Classify where are the footed, So, we have tumbler, we have footed, we have mug. and we have stem ware, ((Additional instructions were given during the activitiy.))

P3: *Dapat yong* one-fourth *lang at* ballpen *ang: makikita sa* arm *ng* chair, *Hindi makikita yong mga* notes, *paglandagan, awan*↑ *Uray tay selpon, Awan ti nakasab-it dita,* (I want to see only your one fourth sheet of paper and ballpoint pen on your desk. No note, cellular phones or anything on your desk.) ((A question was raised by a student.))

Dapat yong nasa lapag lang yong one-fourth↑ (Your one fourth should be the only thing on your desk.) *Oh sige na sige na*↑ Number one↑ number one↑ ((The teacher checks whether the students are ready or not.))

Number one↑ to five↓ Wrong spelling↑ wrong↑ … *Amin nga agkopya agpangkis, Di ba parati kong sinsabi sa inyo,* practice 5S, (All who will copy will become cross-eyed. I always tell you to practive 5 s) =

P10: Once that you hold a baking tool here or baking utensil, be sure to: name it, yes? You have to name it, Ah: you come now here↑ J___↓ can you come here now, ((J_____ goes to the side where baking tools and utensils are placed)) If you cannot identify them all (.) ah: E___ and W___ will just help you later, ((The activity continued. Then additional instructions were given.)) >You separate the tools that you already identified.<

Some instances in the case of the observed industrial-technical classrooms reveal that not all instructions are given before the activities. In some instances, instructions were given while activities were being performed by the learners. Consequently, the students kept on asking for clarifications that disrupted the assessment flow. Instruction-giving has a direct effect on learning; a lesson or activity becomes chaotic and fails when students do not understand what they are supposed to do (Sowell, 2017). Likewise, Scrivener (2012) stated that it is important to plan instructions until one feels confident that he/she can deliver good instructions without preplanning. Accordingly, to let students know that one has finished giving instructions and that the activity can begin, he/she should give students a clear starting signal such as 'Okay, let's begin'. Furthermore, some of the participants used Filipino or Ilokano language for the students to understand the instructions. The finding supports Atkinson (1987), Auerbach (1993), and Macaro (1997) who agreed that instruction-giving is an occasion that warrants the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom. Also, both Ur (1996) and Cook (2016) believed that some use of the mother tongue might be necessary. After all, Scrivener (2012) posited that teachers should stick with familiar words to their students.

Finally, Salaberri (1995) and Gardner and Gardner (2000) asserted that students should be introduced to the use of English from the first class; doing so helps students understand that foreign languages are not only subjects to be studied but also, and more importantly, means of communication. Therefore, teachers should strive to incorporate the L2 needed for instruction-giving right from the beginning of a course (Salaberri, 1995). In doing so, students are exposed to a learning environment that warrants unconscious learning of the English language.

Constructing test items with correct language mechanics. Besides performance tasks, the participants gave written tests to assess knowledge absorption among students. These tests were given as quizzes or term exams. Most quizzes were given orally, while term tests were administered through printed term examination papers. Document analyses revealed errors of the participants in constructing test items. These errors are classified as misinformation or substitution. Specifically, subject-verb agreement (SVA) errors were committed in which most errors appear on the verb within a dependent clause. The following justify:

P4: A device that convert(s) mechanical energy from the engine into electrical energy.

It is an electrical circuit component which connect(s) the sources and the other components in the circuit to provide a path for the electric current

P7: How does (do) the diameter and the length of the wire affects (affect) the resistance?

P9: An engine device that allows and stop(s) the flow of air-fuel mixture to enter the engine cylinders.

P6: A device that connects and disconnect(s) the flow of the electric current in the circuit.

A control operation which do (does) not require human intervention.

P13: Picking and washing of fruits and vegetables is (are) a (remove 'a') part(s) of food processing.

It is a kind of nutrient that provide(s) the body with fuel. Why is (are) cleanliness and sanitation necessary in the food laboratory?

Clearly, the participants failed to consider the number of the noun before the relative pronouns that or which like in the case of '*A control operation which do (does) not require human intervention'* and *'A device that convert(s) mechanical energy from the engine into electrical energy'*. In those items, the participant used the plural form of the verbs instead of their singular forms. Stapa and Izahar (2010) revealed that post-graduate teacher trainees committed errors in five types of SVAs: SVA of person, SVA of number, agreement with coordinated subject, agreement with indefinite expression of amount and also notional agreement and proximity. Hoshino *et al*. (2009) stated that what makes SVA difficult is that sometimes the grammatical number and the conceptual number do not match. Furthermore, the finding supports Sufian and Harun (2018) who revealed that their respondents hardly noticed the subjects while using verbs in the sentences. Accordingly, that is the reason why they did not use 's' or 'es' with the singular subject. They hardly noticed the number of the subject, which is also evident among the students. Norrby (2006) also stated that SVA errors are a result of the overgeneralization of rules of the target language, in this case English.

Interestingly, these errors of the participants seem to appear as lapses since the participants were able to point out their errors during the member checking procedure. This implies that they possess knowledge of grammatical rules but, at some point, fails to apply them during the production of the language. Nevertheless, SVA is very vital in language and consequently, in communication and depicts the extent to which a user of the language in both speaking and writing media has internalized the rule (Tafida & Okunade, 2016). Meanwhile, finding revealed that participants use fragments when constructing test items. When the tests were given orally, the items became fragments when the participants repeated the items. When the tests were administered using test papers, fragment items were evident in the enumeration tests. Some were evident in identification and multiple-choice tests. A fragment is an incomplete sentence, and it fails to express a complete idea (Gaetz & Phadke, 2006). The following excerpts present fragment test items:

P1: A utensil used for washing raw materials and the likes.

A utensil used to place ingredients during food preparation.

Refers to the preparation or treatment of food products.

P3: meaning *ng* (of) 5S↑ FOUR shop safety rules

P5: Number eight. If the tester pointer will not deflect at all.

Number nine, If the tester pointer deflects to 0 ohm?

A capacitor shed like disc.

A device composed of two electrodes, the anode and the cathode.

P6: Types of forms

An electrical measuring instrument used to measure the insulation resistance.

Unit of electric current.

Closed from open loop.

P7: A single strand of copper or aluminum.

An electrical safety device that operates to provide overcurrent protection of a current circuit

P8: device use for controlling the flow of ◊ electric current in an electrical circuit ◊ number one.

Number six↓ the most common wires usually used or number of wires usually used for household wiring, Most commonly used number of wires,

P9: Ten factors that can contribute (to) driving risk.

Five tips for new drivers driving at night.

Five tips for new drivers on how to fight fatigue.

P10: Okay, this one ((shows again a rolling pin and students answer)) Number two ((shows a tube pan)) THREE ((shows a weighing scale)) ((shows a measuring glass)) four, ((shows a baking paper)) Fi:ve six ((shows a pastry blender)) ((shows a sieve)) SEVEN EIGHT ((shows a wooden spatula)) ((shows a measuring cup)) nine ((shows a baking pan)) TEN ten?

A similar finding is revealed in Sermsook *et al*. (2017) in which one of the most frequently committed errors of their respondents is fragment. Malaca-Sistoza (2016) also revealed that errors in writing include fragments. Likewise, the study of Runkati (2013) revealed that one of the errors at the sentential level is fragment. Other errors include run-ons, subject-verb agreement, word order, tenses, capital letters and punctuation.

Interestingly, the test items in fragment form appear to be lapses or mistakes because the participants were able to identify the items as fragment. This indicates that they know the structure of sentences but fail to follow it when constructing test items. These mistakes are the deviation that can be corrected by their producers and are indicative of problem performance (Corder, 1971). Chomsky (1965) also posited that these are unsystematic slips where a learner knows the correct grammatical system but fails to use it properly. This characterizes a natural and inevitable phenomenon among language learners. Apparently, Yankson (2000) admitted that nobody learns a language without committing silly mistakes. After all, the English language has always been a work in progress (Dieter, 2016). Despite these, teachers need to avoid the occurrence of these frequent lapses since students may emulate what they usually see and hear in their industrial-technical classrooms. Hence, the participants need to be retooled with knowledge on constructing test items such that fragment items will be avoided.

Producing the sounds of [θ], [ð]and [æ]. English language learning does not only take place in English language classrooms but also outside these rooms. That is why students should be exposed to an environment that

allows them to learn English consciously or unconsciously. English outside of the classroom refers to all aspects of the English language that the learners are exposed to know the language outside the school (Hameed & Aslam, 2015). In this study, it is the industrial-technical classrooms. It is where students spend most of their time. In fact, the students have 2-hour lectures and 12-hour laboratory classes every week in their major courses. In these classes, analyses revealed that teachers commonly misarticulate the sounds of [θ], [ð]and [æ]. This finding is reflected in the excerpts below.

P1: /dƐn/ (/ðƐn/) for our tools, we /hɑv/ (/hæv/) jigger, You know /dIs/ (/ðIs/) is /di/ (/ðə/) jigger↑

P2: It is based on /fɑks/ (/fæks/), /dɑt/ (/ðæt/) ultra-electromagnetic sword, when we say ultra-electromagnetic sword, it's just like /an/ (/æn/) ANTENNA radiating radio waves, Isn't it? Which can burn↑ and cut /evritIŋ/ (/evriθIŋ/) in in its /pat/ (/pæθ/),

P3: And the /lɑst/ (/læst/) one is? do not /stɑnd/ (/stænd/) directly in /di/ engine /fɑn/ (/fæn/) when it is running, So, do not try to (/stænd/) align /wId/ (/wIθ/) /di/ engine /fɑn/ (/fæn/)

P4: So I /tInk/ (/θIŋk/) you can now execute /di/ actual (……..)
Next (.) draw: a: two bulb (.) on /di/ (/ðə/) right side and /tri/ (/θri/) bulb (.) on /di/ (/ðə/) left side of /di/: (/ðə/) fuse board

P5: How about /dɑ/ (/ðə/) mylar /kɑpɑsitor/ (/kəpæsItər/)? What is a mylar or /di/ (/ðə/) ceramic /kɑpɑsitor/ (/kəpæsItər/)?

P6: Now /dIs/ (/ðIs/) morning, we're going to discuss /di/ (/ðə/) different parts of /trɑnsfɔrmər/ (/trænsfɔrmər/)so /dɑt/ (/ðæt/) later on you will know what are these /dIs/ (/ðiz/) parts and how to assemble /dIs/ (/ðiz/) parts,

P7: design and compute (.) <>design, and compute /di/: (/ðə/) data required, of a given, /trɑnsfɔrmər/ (/trænsfɔrmər/),<>/wid/ (/wIθ/) bolt size,

P8: So, /dis/ (/ðIs/) type of cable is composed of /ɑn/ (/æn/) assembly of TWO or more insulated wires /wid/ (/wIθ/) /ɑn/ (/æn/) outer sheet or cover of moisture-resistant

P9: So, /lɑst/ (/læst/) week, we discussed on /di/ (/ðə/) different types and classifications of? engines and /di/ (/ðə/) definition of engine, We /hɑv/ (/hæv/) discussed /dɑt/ (/ðæt/), And /dƐn/ (/ðƐn/) YESTERDAY we /hɑv/ (/hæv/) also discussed /di/ different? support systems of /an/ engine /dɑt/ (/ðæt/) make your ENGINE function more efficient,

P10: /dɑt/ (/ðæt/) has (rolling her fingers) a rotary (.) blade, When you: you move /dɑt/ (/ðæt/), it will easily cut (.) /di/ (/ðə/) dough, Okay, what else?

P11: For example, if you /hɑv/ (/hæv/) /ɑn/ (/æn/) online business, you are buying a certain product /ɑt/ (/æt/) a smaller price and you will sell it in a higher price↑ right? So, /dɑt/ (/ðæt/) is one business,

P12: so /dər/ are? five basic /patərn/ (/pætərn/), or it is also known as /di/ (/ðə/) foundation patərn/? /di/ (/ðə/) front (.) bodies, the /bɑk/ (/bæk/) bodies, /di/ (/ðə/) sleeve, /dɑ/ (/ðə/) front and /di/? (/ðə/) /bɑk/ (/bæk/) step, now we are going to draft first /di/?(/ðə/) front bodies,

P13: <>/ɑn/ (/æn/) /ɑnimal/ (/ænIməl/) product /dɑt/ (/ðæt/) is use for, use for? <>

As presented in the excerpts, the interdental fricative [ð] sounds were pronounced as [d] like in the case of 'the' and 'that' that were pronounced as /dɑ/ and /dɑt/. Likewise, the interdental fricative [θ] sounded [t] like /tInk/

instead of /θInk/ and /evritIŋ/ instead of /evriθIŋ/. Noticeably, most participants articulated 'the' as /di/ instead of /ðə/ when followed by a consonant sound. The findings mean that the participants have difficulty in producing those interdental fricative sounds; thus, the absence of the sounds in their phonetic inventory. The findings contradict the study of Hameed and Aslam (2015) that revealed that several English consonant sounds (like, [p], [d], [v], [ʧ], [ʒ], and [ŋ]) seemed to be difficult for them to pronounce.

On the other hand, the observation is similar to the findings of Tayao (2004), Dayag (2007), and Bautista and Bolton (2008) that explicitly presented the phonological features of Filipino English, including the following: substitution of the interdental fricative [ð] by the alveolar stop [d] and the interdental fricative [θ] by the alveolar stop [t]. However, the pattern was slightly different in word-initial and word-final positions, where voiced and voiceless fricatives were substituted by voiced plosives in some words and voiceless plosives in others (Flores, 2014). Such is the case among the participants. Meanwhile, the [æ] sound was consistently pronounced as [ɑ]. This error was commonly observed and committed when they uttered 'that', 'have', and 'an'. For example, the determiner 'an' was pronounced at /ɑn/ not /æn/. Have was also pronounced as /hɑv/ not /hæv/. Also, that was pronounced as /dɑt/ not /ðæt/. The absence of [æ] is attributed to the absence of the sound in the vowel sounds of Filipinos.

In fact, Schachter (2008) stated that the Tagalog system has only five simple vowels: [a], [e], [i], [o], and [u]. Similarly, Martinez (1975) stated that the Tagalog speaker will have no difficulty with the vowels [i, e, a, o, u], the Standard Filipino English, since these are found in his language, but, that speaker will experience difficulty with [I, æ , ə, ʊ, and ɔ]. In this study, the participants have difficulty producing the [æ] sound. Overall, in the production of English sounds, the participants' commonly committed errors are in the production of [θ], [ð]and [æ]. Also, the [ɑ] sound is the pervading vowel sound for the morpheme 'a'. The [d] sound is the pervading sound for [θ] and [ð]. The finding implies the absence of [θ], [ð], and [æ] in the phonetic inventory of the participants. As such, the emergence of localized pronunciation in industrial-technical classrooms is evident. The kind of pronunciation that students are exposed to is being carried in their English language classes and even in their other academic classes. However, this pronunciation is still considered intelligible.

Finally, pronunciation has been overlooked, and no serious attempt has been made to indicate its worth to both teachers and learners (Farhat & Dzakiria, 2017). What teachers need is linguistic and pedagogic knowledge and skills that help them to promote international intelligibility in their classes (Thir, 2016) since they are the primary facilitator in their respective classes. After all, English pronunciation is a cognitive skill that all persons can learn if appropriate opportunities are given to them (Gilakjani, 2017). As such, a classroom that practices English provides avenues for learning English.

4. Conclusion and recommendation

This study was conducted to describe the use of English as a Medium of Instruction in industrial-technical classrooms of a state college in Ilocos Sur, Philippines. Through the analyses of the extended texts, the language needs of the teachers surfaced. Language needs revolve around questioning technique retooling, formulating questions with correct language mechanics, using praise words, using transitional markers, minimizing verbal fillers, giving feedback, giving instructions, constructing test items with correct language mechanics, and producing the sounds of [θ], [ð]and [æ].

Due to the advent of globalization, communication skills have become crucial for many professions and teaching is not an exception (Thiruvengadam, 2016) regardless of the courses being taught by teachers. The language reservoir of teachers plays a vital role in effective communication between and among all the stakeholders. Through language, teachers are able to deliver their lessons. In other words, optimal learning can be achieved when it is assisted or well-scaffolded through the way the teacher uses language appropriately in the classroom (Canh & Renandya, 2017) like the use of English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI).

In the case of the industrial-technical courses, the language needs of teachers play a vital role in the delivery

of lesson and the knowledge or skill absorption on the part of the learners. Undeniably, the pedagogical language proficiency of teachers affects the teaching and learning process. This is not only true to the industrial-technical courses but also to language courses. Given the fact that EMI is expected to be used in the industrial-technical courses, teachers are expected to possess a certain level of mastery on correct English language mechanics and pedagogical language skills. It is to note that they do not only act as content teachers but also language teachers because the learners spend most of their time under their supervisions. Consequently, the English language need of the teachers could be transferred to the learners through emulation or language acquisition given the hours that the learners spend with them in their stay in the campus. In such context, their proficiency in the use of English is one of the concerns especially that English has become the medium of instruction. Hence, they should enhance not only their industrial-technical skills and knowledge but also their English language pedagogical skills and knowledge.

In the light of the abovementioned matters, the study concludes that although industrial-technical skills and knowledge are emphasized in industrial-technical instruction, industrial-technical teachers need to be equipped with pedagogical English language skills and knowledge in lesson delivery and assessment because these allow students to develop not only their industrial-technical skills and knowledge but also their communication skills. In such context, the school officials may not only focus on sending industrial-technical teachers to series of industrial-technical training and seminars but also to pedagogical English language skills trainings and seminars that are essential in effective industrial-technical instruction. In doing so, the teachers teach and impart not only skills and knowledge in industrial-technical courses but also English language skills and knowledge. It is to note that the students spend more time in their major courses than in their language courses. Moreover, campus-based policies or guidelines should be formulated regarding the use of EMI in the different aspects of teaching like syllabi preparation, instructional material development, and classroom observations by the heads. Finally, more investigations should be conducted on factors that lead to the identified language needs; interventions should also be developed.

5. References

Abdullah, A. T. H. B. (2013). Error Analysis on the use of the simple tense and the simple past tense in writing essays among TESL college students. *International Journal of Education and Research, 1*(12), 1-12.

Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, *41*(4), 241-247.

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English Only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 9–32.

Azarias, A. R., Ballocanag, R., Ramos, A.O., Bambico, L.A.G., Supnet, E.M., Miranda, A.S., Dumot, B.D., & Holmes, M.V.M. (2020). Freewill in pedagogy: Phenomenologizingthe lived experiences of seasoned teachers. *International Academic Journal of Education & Literature, 1*(7), 329-334.

Azarias, R. A. (2022). English as medium of instruction: The case of technology-related classrooms. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Education and Technology (ICETECH 2021), *Advances in Social, Education and Humanities Research, 630*, 301-312.

Azarias, R. A., & Capistrano, F.M. (2019). Pronunciation teaching difficulties and coping: The case of oral communication teachers, *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, *2*(6), 361-373.

Bautista, M. L., & Bolton, K. (2008). *Philippine English: Linguistic and literary*. Hong Kong University Press.

Bernardo, A. B. (2004). McKinley's questionable bequest: Over 100 years of English in Philippine education. *World Englishes*, *23*(1), 17-31.

Blote, A. W. (1995). Students' self-concept in relation to perceived differential teacher treatment. *Learning and Instruction*, *5*, 221–236.

Bushman, B. J., Moeller, S. J., Konrath, S., & Crocker, J. (2012). Investigating the link between liking versus wanting self-esteem and depression in a nationally representative sample of American adults. *Journal of Personality*, *80*(5), 1453-1469.

Byun, K., Chu, H., Kim, M., Park, I., Kimand, S., & Jung J. (2011). English-medium teaching in Korean higher

education: policy debates and reality. *High Educ*, *62*, 431–449.

Canh, L. V., & Renandya, W. A. (2017). Teachers' English proficiency and classroom language use: A conversation analysis study. *SAGE Journals*, *48*(1), 67-81.

Caram, C. A., & Davis, P. B. (2005). Inviting student engagement with questioning. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, *42*(1), 18-23.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Clark, C. (2015). *Verbal fillers in public speaking* (Clemson University Communication Studies Department). Retrieved from https://www.clemson.edu/cbshs/departments/communication/centers/Verbal%20Fillers.pdf

Cohen, S. (2012). *Tips on public speaking: Eliminating the dreaded "Um."* Retrieved from http://www.extension.harvard.edu/hub/blog/extension-blog/tips-public-speaking-eliminating-dreaded-um/

Cook, V. (2016). *Second Language learning and language teaching* (5th ed.). New York: Routledge.

Corder, S. (1971). Mistake vs error. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, *9,* 147-160.

Council of Europe. (2014). *Bologna for pedestrians*. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/28P9Rg

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Dafouz, E. (2015). MásalládelInglés: La competencialingüística multidimensional como estrategiapara la enseñanzaen la universidad internacional. *Educación y Futuro*, *32*, 15-34.

Dafouz, E., Camacho, M., & Urquia, E. (2014). 'Surely they can't do as well': A comparison of business students' academic performance in English-medium and Spanish-as-a-first-language medium programs. *Language and Education*, *28*(3), 223–236.

Dayag, D. T. (2007). *English-language media in the Philippines: Description and research in Philippine English: Linguistic and literary*. Hong Kong University Press.

Dieter, P. (2016). Why do people commit small mistakes in writing? Accessed from https://www.quora.com/Why-do-people-commit-small-mistakes-in-writing

Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. Oxford: Oxford University, Inc.

Earls, C.W. (2016). E*volving Agendas in European English Medium Higher education: Interculturality, Multilingualism and Language Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ellis, R. & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford University Press. UK.

Farhat, P.A., & Dzakiria, H. (2017). Pronunciation barriers and computer assisted language learning (CALL): Coping the demands of 21st century in second language learning classroom in Pakistan. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, *2*(2), 53-62.

Flores, E. (2014). Phonological features of Basilectal Philippine English. An exploratory study. *International Journal of English and Literature*, *5*, 128-140.

Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, *31*(7), 931–952.

Gaerlan, M.J.M. (2016). *Learning in a L2: An analysis of less successful Filipino ESL learners' experiences through consensual qualitative research*. Proceeding of DLSU Research Congress, 4.

Gaetz, L., & Phadke, S. (2006). *The writer's world*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Gardner, B., & Gardner, F. (2000). *Classroom English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gilakjani, A.P. (2017). English pronunciation instruction: Views and recommendations. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *8*(6), 1249-1255.

Hameed, P.F.M., & Aslam, M. S. (2015). Pronunciation as a stumbling block for the Saudi English learners: An analysis of the problems and some remedies. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *5*(8), 1578-1585.

Hannel, I. (2009). Insufficient questioning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(3), 65-69.

Hashamdar, M. (2012). The teacher-student communication patter: A need to follow? *Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, *3*(4).

Hitz, R., & Driscoll, A. (1989). Praise or encouragement? New insights into praise, Implications for early childhood teachers. *Young Children*, *43*, 6-13.

Hoshino, N., Dussias, P. E., & Kroll, J. F. (2009). Processing Subject-Verb Agreement in a Second Language Depends on Proficiency. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *13*(2), 87-98.

Huang, C. (2009). Business English teachers' classroom discourse study and implications. *China Outside School Education*, *5*, 106-107.

Katiya, M., Mtonjeni, T., & Sefalane-Nkohla, P. (2015). Making sense of errors made by analytical chemistry students in their writing. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *6*(3), 490-503.

Kiss, T., Ong, C. T., & Pelly, C. (2012). Student teachers' perception of language use and their professional image. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, *8*(1), 77-118.

Lasagabaster, D., Doiz, A., & Sierra, J. M. (2014). *Motivation: Making connections between theory and practice*. In D. Lasagabaster, A. Doiz& J. M. Sierra (eds.), Motivation and foreign language learning: From theory to practice (pp. 173–183). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Liang, Y. (2009). The application of code switching in business English teaching and outcomes. *Journal of Educational Institute of Jilin Province*, *25*(8), 86-87.

Macaro, E. (1997). *Target Language, collaborative learning and autonomy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education, Lang. Teach, *51*(1), 36–76.

Macpherson, J. (2017). *What transition words do I need to know?* Retrieved from https://toeflspeakingteacher.com/transition-words-need-know/

Malaca-Sistoza, J. (2016). English sentence construction ability of the students of Cagayan State University at Gonzaga, Cagayan. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 5(6), 544-554.

Martinez, N. (1975). *Standard Filipino English pronunciation*. Manila, Philippines: Navotas Press.

Masruddin, M., & Karmila, K. (2018). Constructing WH-Questions through an error analysis at Junior High School of Indonesia. *Langkawi Journal of the Association of Arabic and English*, *4*(2), 123-137.

Mathis, R. L., Jackson, J.H., & S.R. Valentine (2013). Human Resource Management (14th ed.). Stamford, CT, USA: South-Western College Pub.

Monmouth University (2011). *Transitions*. Retrieved from https://www.monmouth.edu/resources-for-writers/documents/transitions.pdf

Mottet, T. P., Martin, M. M., & Myers, S. A. (2004). Relationships among perceived instructor verbal approach and avoidance relational strategies and students' motives for communicating with their instructors. *Communication Education*, *53*, 116-122.

Muhsin, M. A. (2016). Analyzing the students' errors in using simple present (A case study at Junior High School in Makassar). *Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Sciences*, *2*(3), 81-87.

Myhill, D. (2006). Talk, talk, talk: Teaching and learning in whole class discourse. *Research Papers in Education*, *21*(1), 19-41.

Nappi, J. S. (2017). The importance of questioning in developing critical thinking skills. *International Journal for Professional Educators, 84*(1), 30-41.

Naun, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational politicies and practices in the Asia-pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(4), 589–613.

Neal, M. (2008). Look who's talking: Discourse analysis, discussion, and initiation-response-evaluation patterns in college classroom. *Teaching English in Two Year College*, *35*(3), 272-281.

Norrby, C. (2006). PiaKohlmyr "To Err is Human…": An Investigation of Grammatical Errors in Swedish 16-Year-Old Learners' Written Production in English. (Book review). *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *29*(2), 24.

Pareja, T. P. (2015). Language needs assessment of selected Filipino learners in second language classrooms. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*; Cumberland, *8*(2), 479-492.

Pessoa, S., Hendry, H., Donato, R., Tucker, R., & Lee, H. (2007). Content-Based instruction in the foreign

language classroom: A discourse perspective. *Foreign Language Annals*, *40*(1), 102-121.

Peterson, D. S., & Taylor, B.M. (2012). Using higher order questioning to accelerate students' growth in reading. *The Reading Teacher*, *65*(5), 295.

Phillips, E. (2013). A case study of questioning for reading comprehension during guided reading. *Education*, *41*(1),110.

RMIT University. (2014). *Oral presentations: Signaling and transition words*. Retrieved from https://emedia.rmit.edu.au/learninglab/sites/default/files/Oral_presentations_signalling_2014_Accessible.pdf

Runkati, K. (2013). *Organizational patterns and common mistakes in English research abstracts*. Prince of Songkla University, Songkhla, Thailand.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, A.E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, *50*, 696-735.

Salaberri, S. (1995). *Classroom language*. Oxford: Heinemann ELT.

Schachter, P. (2008). Tagalog. In Comrie, B. (Ed), *World's Major Languages* (2nd ed.) Florence, KY: Routledge.

Scrivener, J. (2012). *Classroom management techniques*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture in the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sermsook,K., Jiraporn, L., & Rattaneekorn, P. (2017). An analysis of errors in written English sentences: A Case Study of Thai EFL students. *English Language Teaching*, *10*(3), 101-110.

Shepell, W. (2000). *The power of praise*. Retrieved from http://www.warrenshepell.com/WSI/articles/praise.html

Sidelinger, R. J., & Booth-Butterfield, M. (2010). Co-constructing student involvement: An examination of teacher confirmation and student-to-student connectedness in the college classroom. *Communication Education*, *59*, 165-184.

Simich-Dudgeon, C. (1998). *Classroom strategies for encouraging collaborative discussion*, Directions in Language and Education National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 12.

Smith, S. (2019). *Lecture cues*. Retrieved from https://www.eapfoundation.com/listening/lectures/cues/

Stapa, S. H., & Izahar, M. M. (2010). Analysis of errors in subject-verb agreement among Malaysian ESL learners, 3L The Southeast Asian. *Journal of English Language Studies*, *16*(1), 56-73.

Sufian, M. D., & Harun, M. D. (2018). Errors in subject-verb agreement: A study based on Bangladeshi university students, Green University. *Review of Social Sciences*, *2*(2), 95-106.

Surina, N., & Kamaruzaman, J. (2009). A Study of subject-verb agreement: From novice writers to expert writers. *International Education Studies, 2*(3), 190-194.

Tafida, A. G. T., & Okunade, S. K. (2016). Subject-verb agreement problem among English as second language learners: A Case Study of one hundred level undergraduates of Federal University of Technology. *International Invention Journal of Education and General Studies*, *2*(2), 20-27.

Tayao, M. L. G. (2004). The evolving study of Philippine English phonology. *World Englishes*, *23*, 77-90.

Thir, V. (2016). Rethinking pronunciation teaching in teacher education from an ELF perspective. *Vienna English Working Papers*, *25*, 1-29.

Thiruvengadam, P. (2016). A Study on the language needs of student teachers. *Journal of Literary Aesthetics*, *3*(1), 10-14.

Thoms, J. (2012). Classroom discourse in foreign language classrooms: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals*, *45*(1), 8-27.

Tienken, C. H., Goldberg, S., & Dirocco, D. (2010). Questioning the questions. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review*, *75*(9), 28-32.

Tizazu, Y (2014). A linguistic analysis of errors in learners' compositions: The case of Arba Minch University students. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, *2*(2), 69-101.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vizconde, C. (2006b). English language instruction in the Philippine basic education program. *RELC Journal*, 37(2), 260-273.

Vizconde, C. J. (2006a). Attitudes of student teachers towards the use of English as language of instruction for science and mathematics in the Philippines. *The Linguistic Journal*, *1*(3).

Vizconde, C.J. (2011). When language use doesn't see eye to eye: Language practices of teachers and students in a Philippine comprehensive university. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, *8*(1), 123-141.

Vogler, K. E. (2005). Improve your verbal questioning. *The Clearing House*, *79*(2), 98-103.

Walsh, J., & Sattes, B. (2005). *Quality questioning: Research-based practice to engage every learner*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Yankson, K. M. (2000). *Better English though concord for West African students*. Uruowulu-Obosi, Pacific publishers.

Zhang, Q., & Zhang, J. (2013). Instructors' positive emotions: Effects on student engagement and critical thinking in the U.S. and Chinese classrooms. *Communication Education*, *62*, 395-411.

Zheng, C., & Park, T-J (2013). An analysis of errors in English writing made by Chinese and Korean university students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *3*(8), 1342-1351.