

RELUCTANT TEACHERS, RUSTIC STUDENTS AND THE REMOTENESS OF ENGLISH

Abdul Rashid Mohamed, Sabariah Morad and Shaik Malik Mohamed Ismail

School of Educational Studies, Universiti Sains Malaysia,
11800 USM Pulau Pinang, Malaysia

Hamzah Omar

School of Educational and Social Development, Universiti Malaysia Sabah,
88999 Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia

Wan Rose Eliza Abdul Rahman

School of Humanities, Universiti Sains Malaysia,
11800 USM Pulau Pinang, Malaysia

Abstract: Initially this study started with the main objective of examining the English language environment available to the learners in a remote locality. However, when it was realized that there was no English language environment outside the English language classroom, the issue was approached from the perspective of the instructors and their instructions as they were the main source of English language exposure which the learners received. The main subjects of this study were a group of 25 pupils and three English language teachers in School A. Qualitative approach was used to gather data through observation, interviews and documents. Field and formal analysis were carried out using interpretative and descriptive statistics. In order to validate the findings, cross checking and triangulation were carried out. The study revealed that subjects received very minimal English language exposure. Whatever little exposure they received in class were of poor quality. The teacher was the only source of exposure through their English language class. As such, the English language teachers had a vital role to play. However, the "qualified" teachers were not motivated to teach. They treated School A as a temporary posting while awaiting a more permanent posting to a school or district of their choice. While they "buy" their time teaching was not very close to their heart. Thus, could these teachers motivate their students to learn? When they did teach they were hardly ever prepared and made numerous errors in English. Whatever little homework given was seldom returned by the students and if completed and handed in, the work was hardly looked at. In short the findings suggest that the reluctance of the English language teachers in the milieu of the rustic learners has resulted in the remoteness of English language in School A.

Abstrak: Pada peringkat awal, kajian ini dikendalikan dengan objektif utama untuk mengkaji persekitaran bahasa Inggeris yang sedia ada bagi pelajar-pelajar di kawasan pedalaman. Walau bagaimanapun, setelah mendapat maklumat awal bahawa persekitaran bahasa Inggeris tidak wujud selain di dalam bilik darjah, maka kajian ini beralih kepada perspektif pengajar dan pengajaran bahasa Inggeris di dalam bilik darjah. Kajian ini mendapati bahawa guru bahasa Inggeris merupakan sumber pendedahan utama bahasa itu bagi subjek kajian ini. Subjek-subjek terdiri daripada sekumpulan 25 orang pelajar dan 3

orang guru bahasa Inggeris di Sekolah A. Pendekatan kualitatif digunakan untuk mengumpul data melalui pemerhatian, temu duga dan dokumen. Analisis lapangan dan formal dilakukan melalui kaedah interpretasi dan statistik deskriptif. Pengesahan dapatan dilakukan melalui proses pemeriksaan rentas dan triangulasi. Kajian ini juga menunjukkan bahawa subjek menerima pendedahan bahasa Inggeris yang amat terhad. Segala pendedahan hanya terhad di dalam bilik darjah pada kualiti yang amat rendah. Oleh kerana guru merupakan satu-satunya sumber utama pendedahan bahasa Inggeris melalui kelas mereka, maka peranan mereka amat penting. Malangnya guru-guru ini tidak mahir dan tidak bermotivasi untuk mengajar. Semua guru menganggap bahawa Sekolah A sebagai *posting* sementara sambil menunggu *posting* pilihan mereka yang lebih tetap. Maka tidak hairanlah semasa mengajar guru-guru tersebut lazimnya tidak bersedia terlebih dahulu dan melakukan banyak kesalahan bahasa Inggeris. Apa sahaja kerja rumah yang diberi kepada murid jarang dilengkapkan dan jika disudahkan dan dikembalikan kepada guru jarang pula disemak oleh guru-guru tersebut. Ringkasnya, kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa guru bahasa Inggeris yang cetek kemahiran dan ilmu menjadi salah satu punca kepinggiran bahasa Inggeris di Sekolah A.

INTRODUCTION

The Malaysian Government English Language Policy is clear and simple. English is to be taught as an effective second language. In order to achieve this objective, this policy is implemented very early in the school system. This means English is taught in Year One for national schools and in Year Three for national type schools. The teaching of English at the early stage in the elementary schools was supposed to play a decisive role and to enable students to listen, speak, read and write English well in the later years. This policy was further reinforced with the implementation of the teaching of mathematics and science in English. In implementing the English language policy, exposure to the language is seen as a very vital factor.

Exposure is of crucial importance in enhancing first language (L1) acquisition and holds equally true for second language (L2) learning. Testament from the words of Lado (1964: 57), Jarvis (1968: 336), Krashen and Seliger (1975: 173–183), Krashen (1976: 157–168), Swain and Allen (1984: 5–8), Stern (1992: 180), Cummins (1994: 47), Spolsky (1998: 148) and Milton et al. (2000: 2–13), it is obvious that exposure to the target language (TL) is not only necessary, but also vital to the acquisition of the target language. If children are exposed to the L2 in the same way as they are exposed to the L1, greater success will be achieved. This is because in the natural L2 learning situations, the pressure to acquire the TL is tremendous. Exposure enhances language learning. The more the learners listen to the TL, the more they read and speak in the language. Thus, the higher the degree of contact to the TL they receive, the more competent they are likely to become in the language. In other words, it should be further stressed that the

higher the exposure to the TL, the higher the chances the pupils will be competent in the TL. Unfortunately, the pupils are very often not,

... exposed to 'primary linguistic data' in the sense that an L1 learner is, but rather to carefully graded language items presented in smaller doses for a few hours a week. (Ravem in Chandrasegaran, 1979: 132)

Chandrasegaran (1979), in a study on Malay-medium learners of English as a second language (ESL) in Johor, noticed a definite link between the degree of exposure to English and competence in the language. She found that urban pupils tend to be better at English than rural pupils. However, she ruled out the factor of socioeconomic status as the reason since 90 percent of the pupils in her sample, both rural and urban, came from working class families. She also dismissed the factor of quality of instruction in rural schools as being inferior since all government schools followed the same curriculum and were staffed by teachers of similar qualifications. Nor were urban pupils more strongly motivated or more favorable in attitude towards English than rural pupils. The possibility was that urban pupils, by living in an environment where the opportunity for hearing and reading English was more readily available, experienced wider contact with English and so became more competent in the language.

As such, how much exposure does the pupils of School A received and what kind of exposure have they been receiving? Ideally, exposure to English language may be explored in three areas such as exposure gained in class, outside the class (but still within the school compound) and outside the school in the surrounding milieu. The preliminary study showed that there was very little English language used in the surrounding milieu and even in the school. It is perhaps expecting too much from a sleepy wallow like *Island X* to be buzzing with English! Thus, the objective of this research was refocused to concentrate mainly on English language exposure in the classroom. This involved gathering data with regard to the quantity and quality of exposure the subjects received.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The foreshadow problem was the English language performance as displayed in the last few years of the Ujian Penilaian Sekolah Rendah (UPSR) results. The low achievements led to the issue of the quantity and quality of exposure given and received by the pupils in School A. This is a chronicle of a remote primary school and the quality of English language exposure of its 100 percent Malay pupils. School A is located on a small island with a population of more than 4,000 inhabitants who were mainly fishermen. It is important that the researchers try to reveal exactly what had transpired from the study to allow readers to view

the situation as vividly as possible. In order to do that, we believed that we need to keep the name of people and places anonymous to safeguard the identity of the people involved. There were three government schools (one secondary and two primary schools) on this small island. It only took a quick check for us to realize that English not a second language here – it is more of a foreign language to the inhabitants of this island. This led to the issue of quantity of exposure received by the pupils in School A. As it was clear that exposure to English language could only come from the classroom, the study was refocused to look for the quality of exposure in the classroom instead.

The main subjects for this study were a group of 25 pupils and three English language teachers. Qualitative techniques were used to gather data through observations, interviews and documents. However, this was essentially a case study. Adelman, Jenkins, & Kemmis (1983: 2) defines case study as the "focus of an enquiry around an instance" while according to Schostak (1990: 23), case study "portrays people and action within enough of a context to understand them". The case study is emphasized because it draws attention to the question of what specifically can be learned from a single case rather than generalization. Stake in Denzin and Lincoln (1998: 88) points out that case studies should be labeled when *the object of study is specific and unique*. The researchers also believe that case studies can be used to provide basic information on the complexity of the little understood social processes. It is a way to study systems or organizations that give an in-depth view. Field and formal analysis were conducted using interpretative analysis and descriptive statistics. The findings were validated through cross-checking and triangulation techniques.

FINDINGS

Altogether, the researchers made six visits to the island. On our first visit we saw: **KEEP XXX ISLANDS CLEAN** in bold capital letters written on a crumbling signboard near a house beside the main road on the island. We were excited to see the signboard and expected to see more. English must be thriving here, we thought! Apparently, the signboard provides more shade than anything else.

The study was conducted in stages and based on the initial research questions, the following were the preliminary findings:

- i. The teachers, including the English language teachers and the pupils, communicate in Malay almost all the time outside the classroom. There were no labels or signs in the school or outside the school to suggest that English language is being used.

- ii. Very few English words were uttered outside the classroom except for commonly used English words such as "class – kelas", "clinic – klinik" and "glass – gelas". However, certain English words such as "book", "spoon" and "shirt" were used during conversation in Malay. It, however, was not enough to be considered as code-switching.
- iii. The main source of spoken English was the English teachers as nobody else spoke the language on the island.
- iv. All the pupils in School A were from the Malay ethnic group and of low Social Economic Status (SES) and whose parents were mostly fishermen.
- v. All three English language teachers were qualified teachers but only two were trained as English teachers from teacher training colleges.

Based on these findings, the research was redirected to the exposure of English in the classroom. This meant that we had to realign the initial research questions. When we started to conduct the classroom observation, we got this feeling that the teachers were putting up a show for us. We followed this "gut feeling" by cross referencing with the pupils. Teaching was done but whether learning took place was a different matter. This is not to suggest that the teachers were dishonest. However, they seemed "lost" when they were teaching because the steps in the teaching did not seem to flow naturally. There were times when they did not know what to do next after a certain activity was completed. For example, in one of the English language lesson, the students were made to read aloud passages from the school textbook in a drill manner. Often what was read was inaudible and intelligible. The teachers seldom check mistakes or mispronunciation but when they did it neither did nor make much difference to the learners.

There were procedures and processes that showed that teaching was done such as preparing the annual, weekly and daily scheme of work in their record books. In other words, the tangible things were done. The record books were filled, the exercise books were graded (sometimes), the teachers entered the class and lessons were conducted. The job was done. So, what was wrong?

In the case of School A, the data revealed that a lot of things were being seen to be done. This remote school has sufficient teachers to run the school. The administrators did what is expected of them. The Local District Education (LDE) officers were very concerned especially with regards to the pupils' performance in the English language. In several unanticipated outcomes, the data revealed that the LDE officers even sent a specialist teacher from another school to aid the English language teachers in School A – something which had never been done before with any other schools in the district. During our study, an official visit

was organized and carried out. The big question that rose at this juncture was – why were all these done then? But more importantly – what were the outcomes?

In spite of the list of what had been done, this study revealed the following findings:

- i. Teachers – fresh graduates from teacher training colleges with very little experience in teaching, poor competence and not motivated to teach in a rural setting were posted to School A.
- ii. Administrators – perceived School A as a transit for a more permanent posting later.
- iii. LDE officers – perceived teaching in School A as a very difficult task.
- iv. Pupils – from low SES with almost no English language exposure.
- v. The School - a small remote school lacking of facilities and materials for teaching.

The Instructors

Who are the instructors?

It is only logical to ask who the instructors were because almost all exposure the subjects received were in school. In such a situation, the instructors were the main source of exposure. The researchers found out that there are only three trained teachers but only two are ESL trained. The other teacher was "converted" to an ESL teacher after undergoing a 14-week English Conversion Course in one of the teacher training colleges. Most of the teachers in the school lived there for at least three years, some even eight years. They were not happy to be there and they have poor command of the language.

What kind of qualification and experience did they possess?

All the English language teachers possess Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia (SPM) qualifications and were trained in local Malaysian teaching colleges. The qualification they possessed did not reflect their true abilities in their classroom performance. However, apart from their qualification, teaching experience should have played an eminent role in their teaching because what was taught was not just a matter of theories learnt in teaching colleges. Teachers with no or very little experience would feel vulnerable and exposed in much the same way as an inexperienced entertainer or performer. Skinner (1968: 254) asserts that "experience would assist teachers to better achieve a wide range of goals deriving

from a wide range of conditions". Experienced teachers normally have better control in classroom management and in delivering the instruction.

Perhaps in qualification and time on task, the ESL teachers in School X were at par with other teachers elsewhere in the country but,

TC: Experience?!..., I'll tell you my experience... I had fallen into the sea... on my way to school... and that is an experience... my Nokia 3210 was ruined.

TC had fallen into the sea a few months earlier while traveling on a boat to School A. Due to the strong current, he and a few other passengers in front and at the sides of the boat, except the boatman and a few others seated at the back, were thrown into the sea. He was saved but some of his belongings were ruined. The question here is how did these kinds of experiences affect their teaching? At a glance, this experience did not fit into the English language teaching process but deeper analysis showed the connections. TC later revealed that this kind of experience de-motivate him from teaching English in School A. He questioned his safety and that of his family, especially his infant baby. These plus other "hardship" in their daily routines did not argue well for his motivation to teach. As a matter of fact, experiences like these made him more adamant to be transferred out of School A.

What are their attitudes towards ESL, teaching and learners in School A?

Generally, we expected that these young teachers to start their careers with a favorable attitude towards their profession and their students. However, these were what we found out:

TA: It's bad here, no entertainment... no night life... slow learners... no motivation, no spark at all.

TB: What would you expect? Well... beggars... can't be choosers... we are the grassroots... We don't have cables (influential people)... to block our posting... or... our transfer here.

TC: (While at a family clinic – bringing his infant for medical treatment) Teaching is okay, but when it's time like this, it sucks. ...I was in Mayang Gedang... a remote school in Sarawak... half Dayak... half Malay community... You see... some of the old folks in the long-houses, they are mostly fishermen... they can communicate in English... the pupils are better of (in terms of English language) there than in School A.

All the teachers believed that the pupils were quite slow in catching up with the language as compared to the other primary school students back on the mainland. They suggested that one of the main reasons was due to lack of exposure in the language itself. The situation also meant that the teachers in School A have very little opportunity to use and practice the language. The only time they use the language was during the English lessons, which were usually taught through the translation method with Malay as its medium. This seemed to us like the chicken and egg issue – which comes first? If there was no teaching, where was the language to come from? If there was no language, where was teaching to take off from?

What do they think of their pupils?

While in terms of guidance, the three teachers agreed that their pupils were not prepared to be given autonomy in pursuing educational tasks. They felt that their pupils need a lot of guidance and supervision. The teachers strongly believe that their pupils' interests were important. Therefore, English language tasks and activities must be suitable and interesting enough for the pupils. Did they practise what they preached? Apparently not, even though they did have the materials to do so.

TA: ... I asked them to buy the exercise books... only three bought...

TB: ... all the materials we have at the school were outdated...

TC: ... I am not competent enough to prepare my own materials...

The researchers also noticed that very few of the teachers made full use of the extra time in the afternoon and evening to mix around with the pupils and locals or to get themselves involved in sports activities or other academic activities, except during school hours or during the compulsory night classes for the year six pupils to prepare them for the UPSR exam. When asked, many cited the lack of interest as the reason. The locals on the other hand often mentioned that they were shy to make the first move. This situation meant that there was very little contact between the locals and the teachers. Nevertheless, the researchers found that the locals were very hospitable and always willing to offer a helping hand in any situation if needed.

How motivated are the teachers to teach in School A?

Some were motivated by the uniqueness of the island but none were interested in the school or the teaching. On one of our visits to School A, we discovered that most of the teachers including the headmaster have filled in forms asking for transfer out of the island.

- TA: I realize what the contract says... we must stay at least five years... who would want to wait that long. I'm still not used to the place...its hard to adjust...once... I was down with food poisoning early one night, I had to wait the next day to go to a clinic on the mainland. By that time, I was vomiting green... and no strength even to pull a muscle. I thought I was dying... it was so scary. I pray it won't happen again.
- TA: I love seafood. There are tons of it here... fresh fish, crabs, prawns...sometimes... given FOC by parents of pupils. Now I'm diagnosed with gout... got to control myself now... doctor asks me to take more green vegetables... those are scarce here. Guess I should start planting some.
- TB: One of the motivation of teaching in Langkawi is because of its duty-free status... cheap cars, electrical appliances, interesting places, etc. What do we have here... so near yet so out of reach... that makes it even more depressing.
- TC: I'm mad about fishing. There's ample fishing spots... and I've build my *tukun* also... orchids... you should see the orchids, some are very rare species, very expensive and hard to get... got to climb those hills at the back (of the school). There's some that I've planted in the school compound... have a look sometimes... we have got quite a collection... my favorite is sugar-cane orchid, the one near to the gate...

On other visits, the researchers had witnessed the teachers filling in forms seeking places in the local universities and teaching colleges to further their studies. When approached, TA responded, "I'm not that motivated to learn... one way or the other... I just want out..."

The Instruction

How did the teacher planned their instructions?

A plan of instruction means what we have thought about what we are going to do in class during a particular period of lesson(s). According to Fisher (1995: 32) "a plan is a set of steps or sequence of thoughts and activities that we believe will lead to success in a task." Some researchers regard planning as the most important of cognitive methods that can be used in the classroom. However, a plan does not need to be an elaborate sets of steps. Planning helps teachers to be best prepared and helps pupils to deal with any exposure in an organized and systematic way. In planning, teachers consciously recognize that certain actions

are necessary to achieve a goal. As such plans are an important classroom "blueprints". So, how did teachers in School A plan their instruction?

TA: As instructed by the Ministry... we use the syllabus, we do yearly plan... weekly summaries and daily records... they are all in the record book.

TB: I copied the plans from the previous teacher... the syllabus is the same after all.

TC: ... why do you need plan.... I used the guidebook... that is my plan...and the exam question samples.

In planning their instruction, English teachers in School A were aware of the following – who is to be taught, what is to be taught and, how much is to be taught. They claimed that they planned their instruction according to the syllabus and the materials in the guidebook. Generally, the teachers had a positive view of the syllabus. They see it as flexible, up-to-date and relevant. They felt that the syllabus gave due emphasis on skills and pupils existing knowledge as well as providing pupils with basic knowledge. They, however, believed that it was impossible to deliver the content of the whole syllabus within the stipulated time frame. It was evident that these teachers were trying to legitimize their rush to cover the syllabus, which resulted in the chalk and talk approach. More often than not, what was written in their record books were not transferable to their classroom teaching.

Undoubtedly, planning is a key process for effective teaching and it should involve a systematic application of a sequence of thoughts and activities. Clearly, the data revealed that the teachers' teaching plans did not reflect the conscious effort to develop plans. To be fair, the teachers were aware of the importance of planning but the activities they carried in the classroom did not reflect this awareness.

What were the stages in their instructional process?

In the Case School, the researchers were given the privilege by the administrators to observe as many lessons as they wanted. From the data gathered, the researchers found several patterns in the instructional method used:

- i. Tasks were given to the pupils through textbooks or worksheets.
- ii. Teachers read the task given in English and doubled up further explanation in Malay.
- iii. Pupils copied exercises written on the board to the exercise books.

- iv. Pupils were often asked to take turns to read (at sentence, paragraph or passage levels) aloud the exercises given.

The data also show that stages in the instructional process of a single period (30 minutes) English lesson were generally carried out as illustrated in the Table 1.

The teachers tried to organize the lesson into several segments. However, the timing of each segments were not very clear. In one lesson, they seemed to talk too long and never seem to go beyond the set-induction stage, while in others there seemed to be no set-induction or presentation at all. Often they entered the classroom and asked the pupils to continue yesterday's exercise.

Table 1. Typical example in the instructional process

Characters	Start (5 minutes)	Introduction (10 minutes)	Practice (10 minutes)	Evaluation (5 minutes)
Teacher	Class management (checking attendance, cleaning the board)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduces tasks • Explains what is to be done • Gives models of what is expected 	Instructs pupils to do the given tasks	Discussion on the given tasks
Pupils	Seating; very high concentration level	Watching with high degree of intensity; quiet	Some quietly carrying out the tasks; some restlessly whispering and some copying friends work	Restricted to very few pupils while the rest are unresponsive
Materials used		Blackboard	Textbooks and other materials	Textbooks and other materials

What influence their choice of instructional approach?

According to the teachers, the most important consideration that influenced their choice of approach was the pupils' level of proficiency.

TA: Discovery learning? Bahh... forget it... they don't have vocabulary.

TB: As usual, teacher delivers... pupils do... some would do... some would copy... some were not interested at all... a lot not interested.

TC: We are too old to use teaching aids... they (teaching aids) are for teacher trainees only... or when the inspectorate are around. Otherwise I gave what they can do.

In short, the teachers seemed to observe the "guidebook approach" regardless of its effectiveness or their own ability to employ it. It would seem that they have been programmed not to question the effectiveness of approaches recommended by the Ministry of Education. They seemed interested only to implement what was given alongside the facilities provided. However, the observational data suggested that the teachers' instructions were impromptu, spontaneous and unplanned as observed in Table 2.

In this teaching milieu, the teachers seemed to want control and often get it. A noisy class would indicate that the teacher has lost control of the class and the classes we visited were often very quiet. Reliance on rules and routine were part of the teachers' survival kit here and most pupils seemed to accept that as a matter of fact. This resulted in direct instructions to maintain the teacher's authoritative position. The nature of interaction was indicated very clearly and pupils knew that they have to seek permission to speak or to go out (and they do this very well: "Please teacher may I go out?"). It was obvious that some pupils were more proficient than others but there were no differentiated teaching strategies. Pupils were not encouraged to work at his/her own pace. Here, the whole class process was the norm. There were hardly any group work and the guidance level was very high.

Table 2. A comparison of the planning and implementation of instructional approach

Teachers	What was planned	What was done
TA	Reading – Inferencing	Writing – Copying answers given on blackboard. Teacher did the questioning and provided the answers and pupils copied it out in their exercise books
TB	Writing – Guided writing	Writing – Joining sentences in correct sequence given by teacher. Teacher entered the class, started writing the sentences on the blackboard (took about 15 minutes) and filled up the whole blackboard. Explained in Malay and asked pupils to sequence the sentences in their exercise books
TC	Writing – Guided writing	Reading – Reading out the task to be done (the whole lesson). The writing was to be done the following day, which was not carried out

CONCLUSIONS

In light of the above findings and discussions, exposure in remote schools such as School A deserves further attention and inquiry by educational researchers. Is School A a typical example of a rustic environment, where the teaching of ESL is concerned? We do not know for sure and we are not making that generalization.

But we know that the English Panel of School A, of which all the ESL teachers were part of, had not organized a proper meeting for that year (and it was August then). Obviously, there is need for further research not only on the issue of exposure to the English language but also on other various issues, obscured/concealed/suppressed in the rural schools. This need is even more pressing, now that English language has become the medium of instruction for mathematics and science. Future studies will have to be conducted nationwide, to cover a wider scope of pupils from various age groups before we can make any further generalization of the matter. However, we hope that this study has been an eye-opener especially to academicians and educators to re-evaluate and make changes to their methods, approach and even the philosophy of training and educating teachers to be posted to rural schools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adelman, C., Jenkins, D., and Kemmis, S. (1983). *Rethinking case study: Notes from the Second Cambridge Conference*. In case study: An overview. Case study methods 1 (Series). Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Chandrasegaran, A. (1979). *Problems of learning English in national schools in Johor, Malaysia: An investigation of attitudinal-motivational variables, learning strategies and exposure to English*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Singapore.
- Cummins, J. (1994). *The acquisition of English as a second language*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Denzin, N. K., and Lincoln, Y. S. (1998). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Fisher, R. (1995). *Teaching children to learn*. Cheltenham England: Stanley Thornes.
- Jarvis, G. A. (1968). A behavioral observation system for classroom foreign language skill acquisition activities. *Modern Language Journal*, 52, 336.
- Krashen, S. D. (1976). Formal and informal linguistic environment in language acquisition and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10.
- Krashen, S. D., and Seliger, H. W. (1975). The essential contribution of formal instruction in second language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9.

- Lado, R. (1964). *Language teaching: A scientific approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 57.
- Milton, M., Oliver, R., Breen, M. P., Hird, B., and Thwaite, A. (2000). I do it my way: Where do ESL teachers principles come from. *Modern English Teachers*, 9(2), 7–13.
- Schostak, J. F. (1990). *Qualitative research: A guide to principles and procedures*. Norwich, UK: Unit One, Centre for Applied Research in Education (CARE), University of East Anglia (UEA).
- Skinner, B. F. (1968). *The technology of teaching*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Spolsky, B. (1998). *Conditions for second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 148.
- Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and option in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, J., and Allen, D. (1984). *Learner strategies in language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.