Revisiting the effectiveness of drilling for the Malaysian ESL classroom

Nurul Ain Johar[1], Melor Md Yunus[2]
Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia,
43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia

Abstract

Language drilling, derived from audiolingual method is undesirable among L2 learners and teachers, as it is acknowledged as old-fashioned compared to 21st century language learning approaches. Known to be associated with behaviourism, language drilling is far lacking and considered negative in language learning. However, the once used to be famous method has now been neglected by linguists when it comes to language learning. Yet, some teachers would still apply language drilling in low-proficiency classroom whenever necessary to familiarise students with new vocabulary, sentence structure, as well as pronunciation. Such method is still effective and it is seen as a relevant method in language learning, regardless of the limited studies conducted on the topic. The study aims at revisiting the effectiveness of drilling for the Malaysian ESL classroom. The study consisted of 20 Form 1 low-proficiency rural secondary school students and 3 teachers. Data was collected via quasi-experimental design on students' pre-and-post test results. A semi-structured interview was also utilised for teachers on i) their experience of using language drilling and ii) perceptions towards using the method. The findings revealed positive perceptions from the participants on the use of language drilling in classroom. The non-autonomous learning method helped low-proficiency students to practise correct pronunciation and to be able to use acceptable sentence structure, both in speaking and writing. The results are integral for Malaysian secondary English teachers as utilising language drilling in low-proficiency classroom does enhance the students' English proficiency level.

*Keywords***:** Drilling; Audiolingual method; Behaviourism; Language learning; Language teaching.

Corresponding Author: joharanurul@gmail.com

Introduction

Aligning to the 21st century teaching and learning approaches and methods, task-based learning, communicative language teaching and technology-acceptance-model based strategies are some approaches and methods introduced to teach language. Despite the current trends of teaching and learning, language drilling is still a useful and can be a fundamental method to teach a language. From English being taught as Foreign Language (EFL) to English as Second Language (ESL), drilling is not a taboo in English education.

National Education Blueprint (2013 – 2025) has introduced 11 shifts in transforming our education system. The second shift that is on ensuring that every child is proficient in both Bahasa Malaysia and English is highly related to the study. It also relates to the students' aspiration outlined in the blueprint (Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia, 2013). Malaysian students are expected to be proficient bilingually: both Bahasa Malaysia and English. One of the key elements underpinning the 'Student Aspirations' in the blueprint is bilingual proficiency emphasising that,

> "Every child will be, at minimum, operationally proficient in Bahasa Malaysia as the national language and language of unity, and in English as the international language of communication. This means that upon leaving school, the student should be able to work in both a Bahasa Malaysia and English language environment" (2012, p. 10).

The need to be proficient in English is significant and efforts have been made to produce students who use English in their real lives. Although year 2020 is fast approaching, the students' performance in reading continues to suffer, with low performance for reading skills in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2009 elucidating this (Chen, 2013). When it comes to speaking and pronouncing correct words, Malaysian students are still weak at it (Shak, Lee, & Stephen, 2016). In similar vein, those with very limited and minimal exposure on English, speaking the language is something that they would consciously avoid.

One of the criteria of being a 21st century learner is to be actively and independently involved in a lesson. This goal might not resonate with drilling as a teaching practice as to some extent, drilling works to enhance students' English proficiency level in both written and spoken through habit formation. Despite the effectiveness of drilling, not many teachers especially in the Malaysian secondary schools prefer using drills to teach students language skills and vocabulary. Scrivener (2005) states that many teachers do not use drilling, thinking that it is an outdated method of teaching language and by neglecting drilling, it would "deprive their learners of some important chances to learn" (p. 255). Drilling is a problem solver to tackle the grammar, pronunciation and language skills problems through the set of utterances. Ramesh et. al (2017, p. 27) highlight the reality of language teaching in Malaysian classroom that "though pronunciation is an aspect of language that is difficult to acquire, the reality is that in many English language classrooms, teaching pronunciation is granted the least attention". As stated by Thirusanku and Yunus (2014, p. 256), "getting Malaysians to master English is a priority for the government, according to the Deputy Prime Minister Tan Sri Muhyiddin Yassin, stressing that the language has played a significant role in nation building'. With the current linguistic development worldwide, Malaysia aims at increasing the English competency level among students, covering all levels of students, including the remedial ones.

The rationale of the study is to revisit the effectiveness of drilling or pattern-practised in ESL classroom and, to identify to what extent it helps low proficiency students in developing their speaking skills. Husin, Maarof and D'Cruz (2017) noted that that the drilling approach does not lead to mastery of the language in the long-run. Likewise, Lee, Ab Rahim, Mohd Yusof and Ahmad (2018) underlined that drilling as an outdated conventional method that is dull and lacks creativity. However, Azmi (2015) highlighted drilling is an effective cognitive learning strategy as it enabled the learners to internalize language structure. In light

of this, it can be postulated that drilling can be highly functional and at its optimum usage if it is applied to the right students, levels and language aspects. Parallel with that, the limited amount of research articles in recent years exploring drilling as a language learning strategy is also one of the impetus to this study.

The following research question guides the present study:

1. Is language drilling still effective for the ESL Malaysian classroom?

Literature Review

Drilling is defined as a controlled practice consisting of set of dialogues and sentences. Drilling has sometimes been referred to as an outdated and old-fashioned teaching method. However, there appears to be a renewed interest in drilling and its potential for effective language teaching in classroom, particularly in a Malaysian context.

In much of the literature, drilling is regarded as a unfashionable practice associated with several methods no longer useful in classrooms. In the view of some experts, drilling seems to be greatly attacked as being a too controlled method of teaching language and some people would reject the use of drilling in the language classroom. Since the past few decades, a shift has been made from teacher-centred approaches to a more student-centred instruction, where students are given autonomy and become active participants in their learning, rejecting the theory of behaviourism that took place before the 21st century (Zaki & Yunus, 2014). With regard on the need of the current education context, language drilling which comes directly from the theory of behaviourism is still in need. Students, especially the remedial ones, are ought to be drilled for an effective ESL lesson in order to increase retention rate and to effectively achieve the language components taught.

Behaviourism Approach
Alqahtani (2005) states that drilling "is employed to make learners get accustomed to the word form especially to how it sounds" (p. 30). Similarly, this is aligned to Thornbury's point (2002) stating that clear language drilling makes students have better familiarity with words. Drilling plays a major part in learners' lives, even it is just a little. As this section further explains, drilling has been used as a technique to teach second or foreign language for many years. It can also be applied in native language lessons or first language lessons for weak and needy students to improve their language skills.

Setting in the 1950s and 1960s, the language learning world was introduced with audiolingual method, emphasising the "behaviouristic drilling of sound contrasts and word pairs, and the articulation of individual sounds" (Nair et al., 2017, p. 28). It was criticised for not focussing on the rhythm, intonation as well as realistic sentences construction and conversations. Drilling is highly associated with the renowned Skinner's theory which is behaviourist (behavioural psychology). Behaviourist theory incorporates action to simulated response for good habit formation. This is supported by Skinner (1957) and Brown (1980 as cited in Richards and Rodgers, 2001) that behaviourism consists of three important elements in learning which are: "i. a stimulus, which serves elicit behaviour, ii. a response triggered by a stimulus and iii, reinforcement which serves to mark the response as being appropriate or inappropriate and encourage the repetition or suppression of the response in the future" (p. 56). Reinforcement functions as a feedback to the stimulus-response action that is vital to keep the students on track. As stated by Larsen-Freeman (2000, p. 35), "it was thought that the way to acquire the sentence patterns of the target language was through conditioning", which by all means is "through shaping and reinforcement" in aiding students to produce correct responses. She also reviews drilling and dialogue as a way to introduce language because it seems that using drills push the students to be able to memorise the given set of dialogue. However, habit-formation is not viewed positively by some linguists. Harmer (2007) explains that "behaviourism is sometimes derided and its contribution to language teaching practice is heavily criticised" (p. 52).

Habit-formation can be acceptable yet some linguists tend to argue that this is not a relevant way to teach students language. It does not give independence to them to discover the language themselves. Among linguists that are against the behaviourist theory of language teaching is Chomsky (1966) as he argues that "language is not a habit structure. Ordinary linguistic behaviour characteristically involves innovation, formation of new sentences and patterns in accordance with rules of great abstractness and intricacy" (p. 153). He adds that such theory is not how we, humans, learn language which is through repetition of words and phrases. Human beings are not robots to obey everything instructed without having to make any mistakes. Griffith and Parr (2001) further support that making mistakes is a part of students' development. Corder (1967) supports that the development on students' linguistic competence is indicated by their own language errors and this eventually redirect them into organising their linguistic input. It is good that students make mistake as it shows that they are learning and make effort towards learning the language. Different students do have different language learning strategies which help them to learn language better and somehow among the strategies, repetition (Weng, Yunus, & Embi, 2014) is one of them. Repeating words or sentences help students in learning a language better. For example, in using a certain vocabulary that is newly gained, a student may have to repeat the word for a few times via speaking or writing. The habit formation technique on memorising the particular vocabulary would help him or her to master it.

Drilling Provides Teachers with a Framework and Students with Equal Chance of Speaking
Drilling is a straightforward way of teaching that provides the teacher a clear and prepared framework to work with. It is the second reason why drilling is said to be effective. The influence of set of drills or also known as pattern-practised is widely spread throughout language classroom teaching since Cook (2008) highlights that the drill is felt 'comfortable' to be used by many teachers as they know what they are supposed to be doing. She adds that drilling gives teachers outline of what to work with and this is why "it remains an approach that many teachers fall back on or dip into from time to time" (Hall, 2011, p. 89). One thing that the teacher should be concerned of is regarding the students' response.

During drilling, the students just repeat the stimulus exactly, in the form of utterances said by the teacher, which is entirely in English. Drilling gives them equal chance to speak in English where there is no one who can dominate the control-practice exercise. Everyone speaks at the same time with equal tempo and speed. Harmer (2007) adds that drilling provides "all students a chance to speak together rather than being possibly shown up individually" (p. 206). In plays for example, there would be students who would speak more and students who turn out to be very passive and less dominant. At this point, drilling is given a merit, as it requires students to speak at the same time through most of the drilling process. No one is left out when drilling takes place.

Looking from the teachers' perspective, Kumaran (2017) reveals that teachers in Malaysia feel that drilling is a favourable way to teach students speaking skills. The students, as according to Kumaran (2017), speak more English in drilling as compared to when in pair work or group work where mother tongue dominates over the L2. In Malaysia, it seems that drilling is the only time where teachers can see students speaking in English, especially to those students who really depend on the teachers to learn and improve their L2. Language drilling may tackle the problem of low speaking proficiency as one of the underlying factors would be the peer discouragement (Rusli, Yunus, & Hashim, 2018). Through drilling, the students would be repeating the same thing at the same time which would further minimise the chance of being mocked by their peers.

Examination-oriented System
According to Normazidah et al.'s (2012) research paper, examination-oriented system is heavily emphasised in Malaysia. There is a mix of teaching methods and approaches applied by the teachers, except method on language drilling; words or sentences drills. Based on recent research in Malaysia, using correct English grammar in writings appears to be a huge difficulty among the Malaysian students particularly in

the area of morphology and syntax (Normazidah et al. 2012). They are used to using Malay grammar structure that it has become a habit to be applying the same rule into their English writings. Subject-verb-agreement and relative pronouns are also some apparent major problems faced by the students. Although students in Malaysia generally start learning English at the age of 7, they could hardly master the basic grammatical structures when they reach Form 5 by the age of 17, which further leads to students failing in their English exam paper. 21st century learning methods and approaches, like task-based language teaching and communicative language teaching, might be helpful to improve the language proficiency among good and proficient students, but not necessarily for low proficiency students. Drilling is used among limited proficiency students and their level is very poor: they cannot write even in using the simplest English through the use of minimal vocabulary and basic grammar, and to pronounce words well. Drilling a technique that allows and helps the students in writing because they are exposed to lessons that are drill-and-practice based on hierarchical skill sequence with few extended writing opportunities.

With the examination-oriented system, many students have problems with their speaking skills which include their pronunciation skills. Mahareya (2014) highlights that many graduates in Malaysia are generally pretty weak in terms of communicating in the language. Words are wrongly uttered and sometimes misunderstood. Fluency is also affected.

Drilling Does Focus on Meaning
While the drilling is taking place, the learners are able to slowly develop their understanding on the meaning of words in the utterances which might seem unclear. Cook (1994) has taken an example of song drilling. As the song is being practised on young children, they might not know some of the meaning of words in the song but "it is perhaps only when the form has been assimilated through repetition, that both grammar and meaning may begin to emerge" (Cook, 1994, p. 136). This is where new lexis or vocabulary can be learnt together with its correct pronunciation. Similarly, in understanding the grammar rule of the dialogues drilled by the teacher, learners would later understand the meaning of words that they might not know. In terms of practising pronunciation, only through drilling the correct pronunciation of words can be achieved. According to Cook (2008), by the use of prepared and compared dialogues from the dialogues has put great emphasis on students pronouncing and speaking the spoken (L2) language.

Methodology

Based on quantitative research, this study used quasi-experiment which was on pre-and-post testing. Quasi-experiment can be defined by an empirical study to approximate the fundamental impact of a research on the target sample, or a target group of people. The research design included a few measuring tools which were the students' performance (i.e. their test result, documents or records) and their behaviour as well as attitude observed. Pre and post-testing were conducted. The testing was on written task or activity set on the students. Quasi-experiment was found fit for this study as compared to its under-the-same-quantitative ally, survey. One of the controls used to test the validity of the research design is called manipulation. Manipulation can improve the internal and external validity aspect of a design and it can be achieved only in quasi-experiment and not survey. A powerful factor of a study lies in its level of validity. Hence, in undertaking the steps to validate the study, quasi-experiment was chosen.

20 Form 1 students from a rural secondary school were selected to participate in the study. They come from a mixed-ability classroom. Some students could be at a high intermediate level and most would fall under the low intermediate to elementary level. The students were divided into two groups: Treatment and Control Group. 10 students in Treatment Group and another 10 in Control Group. During the pre-test, the students were given a set of spelling test. The results were collected. During the intervention phase, only students in Treatment Group had the language drilling. They were drilled on spelling vocabulary. Then, after a few lessons, both groups of students had another similar spelling test. The results during the post-test were collected.

The research instruments used were results of the pre-test and post-test, as well as the responses from five teachers in a semi-structured interview. The rationale of utilising semi-structured universities is to enable flexibility when prompting authentic responses without going off topic (Newton, 2010). The interviews with the teachers lasted for 45 to 60 minutes with English as the main mode of communication. The interviews were recorded, transcribed verbatim and analysed thematically to identify emerging patterns.

Findings

Overall Pre-Test and Post-Test Results

Table 4.1.1 shows result of Pre-Test and Post-Test for Treatment Group on spelling errors

Respondents	Pre-test	Post-test	Difference
Respondent A	7/10	2/10	+5
Respondent B	8/10	2/10	+6
Respondent C	6/10	1/10	+5
Respondent D	5/10	0/10	+5
Respondent E	7/10	3/10	+4
Respondent F	5/10	1/10	+4
Respondent G	4/10	0/10	+4
Respondent H	8/10	2/10	+6
Respondent I	8/10	3/10	+5
Respondent J	6/10	1/10	+5

Table 4.1.2 shows result of Pre-Test and Post-Test for Control Group on spelling errors

Respondents	Pre-test	Post-test	Difference
Respondent 1	6/10	7/10	-1
Respondent 2	7/10	5/10	+2
Respondent 3	8/10	5/10	+3
Respondent 4	4/10	4/10	0
Respondent 5	8/10	7/10	-1
Respondent 6	5/10	5/10	0
Respondent 7	7/10	6/10	+1
Respondent 8	8/10	6/10	+2
Respondent 9	7/10	7/10	0
Respondent 10	6/10	5/10	+1

Table 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 show the results of pre-test and post-test for both Treatment and Control Group on spelling errors of two similar spelling tests. Table 4.1.1 revealed that the spelling errors found in their spelling test during the post-test decreased due to the language drilling intervention practised on them. The highest decrement of spelling errors could be seen from Respondent B and H with eight words that were spelt correctly and there were only 2 words were misspelt. During these students' pre-test, they had eight words wrongly spelt out of 10 words. This shows how language drilling can work effectively in reducing errors in writing among students. As for Respondent D, he had five words misspelt during the pre-test and had no misspelt word during the post-test. Among all of the respondents, there were at least another four words correctly spelt during the post-test.

Table 4.1.2 revealed that the spelling errors found in the respondents' spelling test during the post-test varied. Some respondents had more words correctly spelt, some had no change and the rest had made more spelling error than the one in the pre-test. This control group of respondents was not drilled after the pre-test. Thus, the post-test consisted different result.

Interview Responses

Table 4.2: Teachers' responses in the interview

Questions	Responses
Q1: How and how often have you used language drilling?	T1: I have been using language drilling for a very long time. It's traditional of course but it is useful for teaching the low level learners in all skills.
	T2: Ever since there is OPS English, I tend to use language drilling often. When it comes to pronunciation, nothing beats drilling! Well, I think drilling is still extremely useful in language teaching and learning.
	T3: I don't drill my students but I think I may have done it once in a while, maybe in teaching pronunciation or speaking. I forgot. It is an outdated technique as compared to other new 21st century teaching methods, but it should not be erased from our system.
Q2: What do you think of language drilling?	T1: Helpful. It works in line with the current TBLT, CLT, constructivist teaching methods and many more to mention. To use in every lesson, I think that is not okay. It depends really. To some aspects of language teaching, I do think drilling works better.
	T2: Useful. I have been taught by using the same technique and so, I believe that it works.
	T3: It is a very traditional, old method of teaching. Somehow, it is still practical to be used. After all, teachers have a choice on how they want to teach their students whether it's the old or new method, they vary it and pick what they deem best for each lesson.

The responses revealed that language drilling is still a useful method for Malaysian ESL classroom. The teachers did admit that the language drilling is an old and traditional teaching method but they found out it was indispensable not to use it. All the teachers stated that they have been using language drilling and it worked depending on the skills and lesson they wanted to focus on.

Discussions

From the literature and research explored, it appears that drilling has a set of principles that makes it an effective way of teaching the target second language. These principles would give a clear view on what and how drilling should look like and be performed.

Principle 1: Meaningful
The first principle of drilling is it should be meaningful and relevant to the context in the lesson. The topic for the drills should be related to the relevant context that suits the students and are purposeful to be learned. Drilling should be related to the topics that seem beneficial to be used by the students whether in writing, reading, speaking or listening. Teachers would not teach the students things or subjects that would not be used in real-life situation because it would be redundant and waste both time and energy. Something that is

felt useful like repeating the correct pronunciation of particular words that have been a problem for the students can be an effective and meaningful drilling. Meaningful drilling according to Spratt (1999) should have teacher being very observant on how good the learning takes place. Through the drilling process, the teacher should observe the students' learning from the drills to achieve the goal set and guide the students when needed. Motivation from the students is a vital factor that leads to drilling being a meaningful way to teach students the specific areas of the target language. It would be much easier to grasp the knowledge on the language if the meaningful drilling is incorporated with the students' interest.

Principle 2: Drilling when needed
The second drilling principle is to drill when necessary. Drilling should not be performed too much because it can lead to redundancy. Harmer (1991) states that the appropriate time to practise drilling in language lesson is when necessary, and not always. He adds that drilling "should not be used for too long or too frequently" (p. 52), and "use them sparingly" (p. 54). The students might not feel encouraged or interested to repeat something that is not on their focus. In general, there are many aspects of language teaching that should be focussed on in classroom, such as language skills and system through a wide variety of teaching methods and approaches. Drilling takes up only a small part in those methods. Drilling can take place where the teacher feels the need to drill the students. Opportunistic drilling for example, takes place when the teacher finds opportunities to drill the students, such as when she or he encounters a particular grammar mistake made by them. In the Malaysian secondary classroom, the period for English language session takes about three to five hours per week and about less than one hour can be spared for drilling session. Imagine if the drilling session takes up to three hours per week, what would happen to group work, dialogic teaching, individual work or any other skills or system focussed task? The English syllabus would never come close to an end. It would be a 'disaster'.

Principle 3: Habit through repetition
Based on the limited collected sources on how drilling is performed, habit through repetition is the third principle of drilling. The students repeat after the teacher's utterances or stimulus given for several times which leads them to learn and remember them better. The student should respond to it by repeating the exact sentence that is cued by the teacher. Larsen-Freeman (2000) states that "the more often something is repeated, the stronger the habit" (p. 43) and thus the learning of the target language can take place better and effective.

The teacher should provide a good stimulus with correct pronunciation, intonation and grammar to the students so that they would be able to repeat and imitate exactly and learn the correct sentence on how it is constructed and should sound. A good model in drilling can also come from the teacher's teaching aid like the tape recording from the coursebook. Through different types of drilling, the stimulus does not necessarily require the students to repeat the exact utterances said by the teacher, but to follow how the teacher wants them to say them. It is true that some students would remember sentences or dialogues accurately through drilling without knowing what they are saying and later, the understanding on the set of sentences that are can be developed and would slowly come into mind (Cook, 1994). "Repetition is a cognitive strategy" as stated by Hedge (2000, p. 78) in which according to BBC is a "type of learning that students use to learn more successfully" (Hedge, 2000, p 78). It is common for people to learn from repeating something over and over again. To whom learning style is based on repetition and memorisation, drills is the best to be applied.

The process of learning L2 should be the same as acquiring the L1. Larsen-Freeman (2000) highlights a stand in which memorising rules of sentence construction should be avoided. For example, 'Mary rides a bicycle' sentence only needs students to repeat the sentence and try to remember the structure of the sentence to be used by the students either through writing or speaking. The teacher would not explain the structure of subject-verb-agreement concept that makes up the 'Mary rides a bicycle' sentence to the students through drilling process. Yet, through some similar sentence structures, students would be able to construct correct sentences with correct grammar. Drilling does not teach students grammar rules, yet

"grammatical points" through sentences with correct grammar are taught through drilling" (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p. 44).

Principle 4: Giving positive reinforcement
The fourth principle of drilling is to give positive feedback or reinforcement. After the response given by the students based on the stimulus, the teacher should give feedback or reinforcement which is either positive or negative according to the level of accuracy from the response given by the students. Positive feedback and praises are given if the utterances repeated and said by the student are correct. Even if the response given by the students is wrong or slightly incorrect, still, positive feedback should be given instead of punishment. Positive reinforcement is given by the teacher helps to "develop correct habits" in the students (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p. 43). When the teacher praises the students for their correct repetition and response, at the same time students feel motivated to try and continue producing more correct responses.

Principle 5: Vary drilling
The fifth and final principle of drilling is to vary drilling types. Instead of using one type of drill throughout the language lesson, teachers might vary types of drill used in the classroom to make the session interesting by conducting substitution drill, transformation drill, chain drill or other drills that the teacher finds suitable. Using only one type of drill is uninteresting and dreary. One reason why the students are bored with drilling is due to the unchanged type of drill which is the commonly-used repetition drill in the classroom. For example, the teacher says, 'the news has been appalling'. The utterance is followed by the students saying it as correct as possible, 'the news has been appalling'. The same sentence is repeated for a few times until everyone can say it out correctly. Then, the teacher says another utterance, 'John went to see his dentist yesterday with his mother'. The students say the sentence out loud. Each utterance in this process of drilling does not seem coherent and this makes it hard for the students to make connections between the lines and to remember them well. Using different types of drills can also provide varying degree of challenges to the students. Despite using only simple repetition drill, the teacher may run different types of drill which able to draw the students' attention including a quick cue-response drill that would challenge students to produce quick correct responses.

Besides, actions can be added to the variation of drills to captivate students' attention. A good drilling embeds meaning to aid students' understanding which would definitely strengthen their grasp on the particular words and sentences, and language as a whole.

Conclusion and Implications

In conclusion, drilling is formed through the stimulus given by the teacher which is repeated by the students. It includes the positive feedback given by the teacher. There are five principles of drilling highlighted for an effective drilling to take place. The effective drilling should be meaningful and necessary, develop good habit through repetition, have positive reinforcement given by the teacher and also should consist of different types of drills. Despite the negative attitudes towards the drilling which seem unfavourable to some people, drilling can be an effective way of teaching a language. It does provide a quite number of reasons to why teachers should practise the drills inside the language classroom. Drilling leads to effectiveness especially in improving the students' language development in both language skills and systems such as speaking skills, listening skills, grammar, pronunciation and also vocabulary which are a great help to the Malaysian ESL classroom.

The findings show that language drilling can be effective when it is used well and appropriately. Not just in writing, drilling is helpful in speaking, listening, reading and other skills like pronunciation. Despite the effectiveness of other new, 21st century-based approaches and methods, drilling still plays an important part in language teaching and learning. This has significantly led to the better language learning and to achieve the shift and aspiration outlined by the nation. At the same time, educators and policymakers can further

explore new teaching methods and approaches, and improve on the current established teaching techniques to help students learn language more effectively.

References

[1] Allwright, D. (2014). Observation in the language classroom. Routledge.

[2] Alqahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. International Journal of Teaching and Education, 3(3), 21-34.

[3] Armstrong, T. (2009). Multiple intelligences in classroom. (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

[4] Azman Che Mat, and Goh, Y.S. (2010) Grammar in the classroom: students' expectations and reality the case of Arabic and Mandarin. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, *4*(1), 51-63.

[5] Baker, A. (2014). Exploring teachers' knowledge of second language pronunciation techniques: teacher cognitions, observed classroom practices, and student perceptions. *Tesol Quarterly*, *48*(1), 136-163.

[6] Byrnes, H., & Manchón, R. M. (Eds.). (2014). *Task-based language learning–Insights from and for L2 writing* (Vol. 7). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[7] Castagnaro, P.J. (2006) Audiolingual Method and Behaviourism: from misunderstanding to myth. *Applied Linguistics*, *27*(3), 519 - 526.

[8] Chen, K.S. (2013, December 8). Poor show in PISA rankings. *The Star.* Retrieved from https://www.thestar.com.my/News/Education/2013/12/08/Poor-show-in-Pisa-rankings/

[9] Chomsky, N. (1966) Linguistic theory. Reprinted in J. P.B. Allen and P. Van Buren (eds), *Chomsky: Selected Readings*. London: Oxford University Press.

[10] Clark, R. (1987). *Language Teaching Techniques*. Brattleboro, VT: Pro Lingua Associates.

[11] Cook, G. (1994). Repetition and learning by heart: an aspect of intimate discourse, and its implications. *ELT Journal*, *48*, 133 - 141.

[12] Cook, V. (2008) *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. (4th ed.). London: Hodder Education.

[13] Davies, P. & Pearse, E. (2000) *Success in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[14] Foster, P. (2001). Rules and routines: A consideration of their role in the task-based language production of native and non-native speakers In Bygate M, Skehan P, & Swain M (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: second language learning, teaching, and testing* (pp. 75–93). Harlow, UK: Longman.

[15] Griffith, C. and Parr, J.M. (2001). Language-learning strategies: theory and perception. *ELT Journal*, *53*(3), 247-254.

[16] Hall, G. (2011). *Exploring English Language Teaching*. Oxon: Routledge.

[17] Hammerly, D. (1991). *Fluency and accuracy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

[18] Harmer, J. (1991). *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* London: Longman.

[19] Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. (4th ed.) Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

[20] Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[21] Howatt, A.P.R. and Widdowson, H.G. (2004). *A History of ELT*. (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[22] Hussin, S., Maarof, N., & D'cruz, J. V. (2001). Sustaining an interest in learning English and increasing the motivation to learn English: An enrichment program. *The Internet TESL Journal, 7*(5), 1-7.

[23] James, C. (2013). *Errors in language learning and use: exploring error analysis*. Routledge.

[24] Jayapalan, K., & Pillai, S. (2016). The state of teaching and learning English pronunciation in Malaysia: A preliminary study. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, *7*(2), 19.

[25] Johnson, K. (2008). *An Introduction to Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. (2nd ed.) Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

[26] Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. (2013). *Malaysian education blueprint 2013-2025*. Putrajaya: Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. Retrieved from http://www.moe.gov.my/cms/upload_files/articlefile/2013/articlefile_file_003108

[27] Kumaran, S.R. (2017). Benefits and shortcomings of role-play as a speaking activity in English language classrooms. *The English Teacher*, *39*(1), 72 - 93.

[28] Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. (2nd ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[29] Lee, N. A. A., Ab Rahim, S., Mohd Yusof, N. L., & Ahmad, B. S. (2018). Using songs in teaching and learning in an ESL classroom. In R. Aboo Bakar, S. Ab Rahim, & F. N. Tazijan (Ed.) *Creativity in teaching and learning: A blueprint for success* (pp. 23-28). Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Pulau Pinang: Academy of Language Studies Publication Unit

[30] Mahavera, S. (2014). Low quality Malaysian education more alarming than household debt, says World Bank economist. *The Malaysian Insider*. Retrieved from http://www.themalaysianinsider.com/malaysia/article/low-quality-of-malaysian-education-more-alarming-than-household-debt-says-w

[31] Nair, R., Krishnasamy, R., & De Mello, G. (2017). Rethinking the teaching of pronunciation in the ESL classroom. *The English Teacher*, 14.

[32] Newton, N. (2010). *Exploring qualitative methods: The use of semi-structured interviews. Exploring Qualitative Methods.* University of Bristol. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1037/e546562006-001

[33] Normazidah Che Musa, Koo, Y.L. and Hazita Azman, (2012). Exploring English language learning and teaching in Malaysia. *GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies*, *12*(1) 35-51.

[34] Pinter, A. (2017). *Teaching young language learners*. Oxford University Press.

[35] Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[36] Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[37] Rusli, R., Yunus, M.M., & Hashim, H. (Eds.). (2018). Proceedings from Persidangan Antarabangsa Sains Sosial dan Kemanusiaan: *Low speaking proficiency among the Malaysian undergraduates: why and how?*. Kolej Universiti Islam Antarabangsa: Selangor. Retrieved from http://conference.kuis.edu.my/pasak3/images/eprosiding1/PASAK3_2220.pdf

[38] Saito, H. (2008) A framework for goal-driven pair drills. *ELT Journal*, *62*(1)*,* 56 - 65.

[39] Scrivener, J. (2005) *Learning Teaching*. (2nd ed.) Oxford: Macmillan Publishers Limited.

[40] Shak, P., Lee, C. S., & Stephen, J. (2016). Pronunciation problems: a case study on English pronunciation errors of low proficient students. *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics*, *4*.

[41] Spratt, M. (1991). "The Practice Stage, Discourse Chains." In *At the Chalkface: Practical Techniques in Language Teaching,* eds. A. Matthews, M. Spratt, and L.Dangerfield. Walton-on-Thames, UK: Thomas Nelson.

[42] Swanto, S., & Din, W. A. (2014). Employing drilling technique in teaching English writing skills to a group of rural Malaysian students. *Developing Country Studies*, *4*(14), 73-82.

[43] Thirusanku, J., & Yunus, M. M. (2014). Status of English in Malaysia. *Asian Social Science*, *10*(14), 254. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n14p254.Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to teach vocabulary.* England: Pearson Education Limited.

[44] Thornbury, S. (2009). *D is for Drills*. Retrieved from http://scottthornbury.wordpress.com/2009/12/08/d-is-for-drills/

[45] Thornbury, S. (2012). *A is for Automaticity*. Retrieved from http://scottthornbury.wordpress.com/2012/02/26/a-is-for-automaticity/

[46] Weng, P. L. P., Yunus, M. M., & Embi, M. A. B. (2016). SUCCESSFUL LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES USED BY SUCCESSFUL YEAR 5 ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (ESL) LEARNERS. *Proceedings of the ICECRS*, *1*(1).

[47] Wickham, R. (2011). *Teaching English Grammar in Malaysian Primary Schools*. Retrieved from http://ktf2012.weebly.com/uploads/8/7/6/1/8761106/manual_grammar.pdf

[48] Williams, M. & Burden, R. L. (1997) *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[49] Zaki, A. A., & Yunus, M. M. (2014). *Strategies Used By Local ESL Teachers in Malaysia to Create a Constructivist Classroom*.