

An Evaluation of English Training Materials for Mathematics Teachers of the Bilingual Program at Junior High Schools

Rr. Hasti Robiasih and Mursid Saleh
Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa University
hasty_ust@yahoo.com

Abstract: *This paper aims at evaluating the quality of English training materials prepared by two institutions as in-service instructional English training material for mathematics teachers of bilingual program. The evaluation of the textbook focused on the internal accountability of the materials. The evaluation was conducted using Mcdonough and Shaw approach namely external and internal evaluation. Results show that the materials are similar in terms of the coverage of language component and language skills but they differ in the proportion of their presentation. However, the training materials are not fully appropriate for math teachers of bilingual program. It needs some adjustment to meet the need of math teachers in structuring instructional classroom discourse.*

Keywords: *internal-external evaluation, training materials, mathematics teachers, bilingual program*

INTRODUCTION

Bilingual program is believed to be an effective way to promote learners cognitive and language development. In its implementation, some content subjects are supposed to be delivered in English; mathematics, science, and ICT besides English subjects. It is expected that by running the program, learning content through language, will improve academic content and language knowledge simultaneously. Therefore, content teachers are urged to use English as medium of instruction in teaching math.

Considering that content teachers have not yet sufficiently mastered English as medium of instruction, therefore, they have to undergo series of in-service English training offered by private or formal institutions. However, in classroom practices, teachers are still struggling in executing their instructional tasks using English.

The success of training depends much on the materials used during the program. Huchitson and Torres (1996) said that materials become framework that guides teachers and students to organize their learning during teaching learning process. Materials enable them to work faster and easier in promoting trainees language competence. Materials are usually used by teachers and learners to facilitate learning to take place and isdeliberately used to develop learners' knowledge and experience of the language. Material is also the substance based on which learning experiences in a classroom are developed. The selection of the contents or materials and learning experiences are geared to the achievement of the objectives of the program/course (Richards, 2006).

Dunkin and Biddle cited in Dick, et. al (2005) suggest that in addition to the availability of good curriculum, proficient teachers, motivated students, the available of good learning

materials or textbook contributes to the success of the learning program. Teaching materials, for inexperienced teachers, provide ideas on how to plan and teach lessons as well as formats that teachers can use. Regardless of diverse definitions of what language teaching materials are (Dick, et. al, 2005: 241; Tomlinson, 2003: 2), the experts are in agreement of their role to support the learning process.

Similarly Richards (2002: 251) argues “Teaching materials are a key component in most language program. ... instructional materials generally serve as the basis for much of the language input learners receive and language practice that occurs in the classroom”. Else where Richards and Rogers (2002: 30) state “the role of instructional materials within a method or instructional system will reflect decisions concerning the primary goals of materials (e.g. to present content, to practice content, to facilitate communication between learners, or to enable learners to practice contents without help of teachers).” All these quotations suggest the importance of the role of the learning material to support the success of any (foreign) language teaching and training. Tomlinson (2003) said materials used to refer to anything which is used by teachers or learners to facilitate the learning of a language. In other words, they can be anything which is deliberately used to increase the learners' knowledge and/or experience of the language. In this context he put the emphasis on the function of the deliberate attempt to use such materials in the instructional program to increase the language proficiency of the learners.

Realizing the importance of training materials, therefore, efforts of providing English training to Mathematics teachers teaching in bilingual program is very strategic in supporting the development of their communicative competence. Without teaching materials any attempts of language instruction deprived from the rich potentials for learners to practice or learn to communicate. Advocating the above quotations, the availability of the teaching materials in teaching English as a foreign language will bring positive effect in achieving the instructional goal.

In context of training materials for mathematics teachers of bilingual program, the use of appropriate English training material is very strategic in that as the purpose of this program defines the educational goals to be attained, the teacher has to use English as medium of instruction in bilingual math classes for the attainment of the predefined goals.

In the context of English training for math teachers of bilingual program, language course content or materials should be related to the purposes for which trainees are expected to be able to use the language in structuring instructional practices. Krashen said that teachers must provide comprehensible input as well as structured opportunities for students to produce academic language in the content class. This will enable English learners to negotiate meaning through confirming and disconfirming their understanding while they work and interact with others (Krashen, 2003). More detailed, he said that language acquisition will take place if there is an interaction between teacher and learners. Through interaction, teacher provides input and they are engaged in negotiating meaning, output and interactional feedback.

To accomplish the tasks, mathematics teachers have to master academic vocabulary (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short 2010: 4) which has three aspects as follows:

- 1) Content words such as key vocabulary words, terms and concepts associated with a particular topic.
- 2) Process/Functions words which refer to word or phrases that have to do with functional language use. Such as how to restate the problem, justify opinions, state conclusion, works backwards, summarize, question, interpret and so forth. All those

functions words also close related to tasks that students are to accomplish during the lesson, list, paraphrase, identify, create, define, and share with your partner etc.

- 3) Words or word parts that teach English structure which refer to words and words parts enable students to learn new vocabulary, primarily based on English morphology. They are certain words which have affixes which have to be repeatedly reinforced. By doing so in school life students' mastery of English will be accelerated.

To understand Mathematical concepts, it has to be associated with a word or a phrase. Perry and Dockett (in Haylock, 2007) reported their research on the development of mathematic concluded that 'without sufficient language to communicate the ideas being developed, children will be at a loss to interact with their peers and their teachers and therefore will have their mathematical development seriously curtailed.'

Therefore, it can be explicitly said that to have effective bilingual classroom instruction math teachers are required firstly, to have sufficient language acquisition in terms of academic language vocabulary. Secondly, having an interaction using the language to provide students with comprehensible language input which in turns will facilitate students to do meaning negotiation. Doing so, students will maximally develop simultaneously the content and language knowledge.

Therefore, there is an urgent need to evaluate currently used training materials. Firstly, the evaluation will help program developer in making decisions on selecting the appropriate English training materials. Furthermore, evaluation will inform us the weaknesses and strengths of it to enable trainers to make appropriate adaptations to the material in their future instruction. By doing so, we would be able to identify the language knowledge and skills trainees have already possessed. Based on the finding, the development of more appropriate training materials could be realized. Therefore, the main focus of the paper is revealing the quality of the English training materials for mathematics teachers on bilingual program in terms of the objectives, course content, tasks and activities, approach and method of teaching as well as the assessment.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research belongs to evaluation research. It aims at describing and analyzing the content of training materials. In this research, by using the criteria of textbook evaluation of McDonough & Shaw the writer analyzed two of English materials English used for training for Mathematics teachers of bilingual program at junior high school. The materials are Teacher's Self-Learning Materials of English for Mathematics (TSLMOEFM) and "Pengenalan Bahasa Inggris Untuk Pembelajaran Matematika SMP Paket Fasilitas Pemberdayaan KKG/MGMP Matematika" (PGBIUPMS). To collect the data, the writer used technique of document analysis to reveal the quality of the existing English training materials for Mathematics teachers of bilingual program. The researcher also explored literatures related to the field under study, be they from printed or electronic materials downloaded from internet. Some of the documents to be explored were the materials that the teachers got during the preparatory English training and also textbooks used in providing similar preparatory English courses for bilingual teachers. To analyze the data the writer employed two criteria of evaluating materials proposed by McDonough and Shaw namely:

- 1) External Evaluation (structure): consisting of a brief scan to find out whether the blurbs and the claims of the authors match the content of the books
- 2) Internal Evaluation (content): a deeper analysis on the content of the books with the following criteria: (a) rationale, (b) the language, namely its sequence and presentation, (c) authenticity, (d) appropriateness, and (e) methodology.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section will describe a comprehensive description of the research finding to answer the research questions namely; the quality of the English training materials for Mathematics teachers of bilingual program at junior high school and the strengths and weaknesses of the training materials in term of helping mathematics teachers perform their instructional practices using English.

In describing the quality of the in-service English training materials the researchers analyzed the materials in terms of 5 aspects covered namely: (a) rationale, (b) the language: its sequence and presentation, (c) authenticity, (d) appropriateness, (e) methodology. The following are the results of the analysis.

External Evaluation:

This Teacher's Self-Learning Materials of English for Mathematics (TSLMOEFM) was published by Ministry of National Education Directorate General Management of Primary and Secondary Education Directorate of Junior High School Development in Jakarta at 2007.

The book consists of 20 units and in each unit, it consists of five parts. The book does not contain any introduction. It begins with objectives of learning in terms of the expected language competencies mathematics teachers should possess after learning each unit. The formulation of its competencies is implicitly built based on theories of language learning and teaching. It is stated that mathematics teachers have to have sufficient linguistic knowledge and ability to use it (the knowledge) in their classroom instructional practices.

The competencies are stated in Indonesian covering 4 aspects which are organized on topic based. It means that the objectives of each unit are the same but the difference lies on the topic. To achieve the objectives, the book offers various tasks and activities. In the first part, "Language in Use", it begins with Listening and Reading activities. It is followed by "Language Focus" which covers Grammar, Vocabulary and Pronunciation. It is continued by "Classroom English" section covering Listening and Speaking activities. To check learners' comprehension there is also assessment section which is mostly carried out in oral channel.

Glossary section is also offered as the final presentation of each unit. It presents list of vocabularies with their phonetic transcription, class of words and their meanings.

The book is part of a package that includes a teacher's book, students' book, listening transcript, key answers, however, the writer failed to find references section while its existence is mentioned in the table of content. It addresses specific audience – mathematics teachers of bilingual program – who are supposed to teach math using English. Therefore, it reflects its objectives to improve language proficiency of mathematics teachers of bilingual program at junior high school.

The second book "Pengenalan Bahasa Inggris untuk Pembelajaran Matematika SMP Paket Fasilitasi Pemberdayaan KKG/MGMP Matematika" (PGBIUPMS) was published by Development Centre and Empowerment of Mathematics Teachers and Education Personnel (P4TK). The book consists of 5 chapters and in each chapter it covers four parts. In chapter I, the introduction section elaborates the rationale and background, aims, coverage of contents and how to use the book. It is followed by the most important parts

of the book: the presentation of the materials needed by mathematics teachers of bilingual program. In the organization of those materials, the writer begins with the topic discussed and then followed by the objectives, problems faced by mathematics teachers in teaching using English, the solution of the problem, and ends with tasks accommodating the result of the TNA. Therefore, the book cover a general classroom language expressions and specific terms (math vocabularies) and translating of mathematical discourse. This book addresses specific audience – mathematics teachers of bilingual program who are supposed to teach math using English.

Internal Evaluation:

1. The language

This part will discuss the content of the book in terms of the content coverage, tasks and activities, space or portion provided for each language content and how the content are organized. The detailed information will be elaborated in the followings two sections.

1.1 The Presentation

The criteria applied in this analysis are (1) What skills are covered? (2) How the language and exercises are presented? and (3) How much space is given?

The book has a special concern on developing mathematics teachers' English language proficiency in terms of grammatical and vocabulary mastery, pronunciation and ability in using classroom language in teaching Math using English.

On "Language Use" the book claims that it is organized to develop learners' listening and reading ability. However, listening skills got a minimum portion as the task is only in the form of listening to instructor drilling a list of specific mathematics terms (which is varied, sometimes it consists of 3, or 5 words but it happens only one word). Meanwhile, reading gets more space than the other skills. The reading section provides the learners with a mathematics reading text preceded by pre-reading questions and accompanied with a task to check math teachers reading comprehension.

On Language Focus section, grammar is presented in Indonesian in the form of the patterns of noun phrase and sentence structure. It begins with the formula of specified noun phrase followed by examples of the noun phrase with their meaning in bahasa Indonesia. The grammar task is in the form of finding the meaning of the noun phrase.

It can be observed that the noun phrases offered belong to general English which is rarely found in mathematics contexts. It would be better if it is integrated with the previous reading text.

The sentence structures are taken from the reading text. Therefore, they facilitate math teachers to get more understanding on the use of these constructions. However, the noun phrases and sentence structure are not closely related in term of the use of real world life of mathematics contexts. The first is general English and the second one is mathematics sentence construction.

On vocabulary section, very often it discusses words or phrases of mathematics, however, the task offered is sometimes different from what is presented.

From the above presentation, it can be observed that vocabulary is developed through conventional style that is familiarizing learners with the lists of words and then finding the

function of the words and its meaning in Indonesia. Moreover, they are arranged in context-free. It means that mathematics teachers do not have sufficient opportunities to get more practice on using the words in real communication.

On “Classroom Language” section, mathematics teachers are supposed to listen and then read or repeat the items learnt. Those can be in the form of lists or a dialogue using the language items. The tasks offered is more on developing mathematics teachers’ speaking skill than writing skill. However, it is limited on individual assignment.

The assessment section is realized in varied activities. It covers checking comprehension on grammar, vocabulary, sentence construction and mostly on translating Indonesian mathematic expressions into English thus, the type of assessment do not fully measure mathematics teachers language performance by means of which we can observe the real use of their linguistic knowledge. However, in the last five chapters (Ch. 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20), teachers are supposed to write paragraphs on the topic they are going to teach.

In contrast, PGIMUS has a special concern on speaking and reading and which are spread within three chapters. In the first chapter, it contains the introduction which elaborates the importance of writing this book and introduces the topics covered. It is hoped that by using the book mathematics teachers will gain some benefits in terms of handling their difficulties in teaching math using English. However, the writer confessed that the book is still very simple and needs development some innovations in the classroom implementation. He also hopes that mathematics teachers get the willingness to discuss and continually develop the materials and the most importance one is practicing those in their teaching learning process.

The book mostly focuses on developing mathematics teachers’ speaking skills on the second chapter while in the third, it deals with reading and comprehending mathematical symbols and terms, and the fourth chapter puts the emphasis on developing mathematics teachers’ translation skills. The last chapter presents the review section for the three chapters discussed previously. It does not any offer grammar section.

As already mentioned earlier, the book consists of 5 chapters, the three chapters in the middle are the most important parts as the first one becomes the introduction and the last one is the conclusion section. The language item is presented at the beginning followed by the tasks. In the presentation of the materials, the writer provides the audience with lists of language expressions, mathematical symbols and terms and texts on math. Doing so, learners will be familiar with target language items.

On the exercise section, the learners are assigned to work in pairs or group to discuss the tasks. It sounds good in term of developing students speaking skill – especially in the second chapter – however, it is not consistent with the way the materials are presented. If the learners are supposed to be able to use the target language, the presentation should also show how the language items are used naturally in real context. Providing examples in the form of dialogue will be more meaningful for them as they need a model to be able to execute the tasks provided.

In brief, it can be said that instead of listing the classroom language learnt it would be much more effective in assisting learners to use the language items if the writer provides learners a model/example of dialogue. In that way, mathematics teachers could identify the appropriate use of the classroom language.

1.2 The Sequence

This part is answering how the content or the materials of the book is organized addressing the distribution of it throughout the course. Sequencing could be based on the following criteria: simple to complex, chronology, and need.

In TSLMOEFM, within each unit the language items are arranged on the basis of the topic. They are organized chronologically or in linear mode, from the easiest to the most difficult. Therefore, to comprehend each unit, sometimes teachers need to review or preview other units especially on mathematics terms.

As stated previously in the introduction, the book is developed as a respond to the TNA. The need of Mathematics teachers is presented in the form of percentage ranging from 54.9% for strategies of translating math resources, 53.7% for saying Mathematical Symbols and Terms, and 50% for Greeting, Encouraging, and Closing conversation. In the presentation, the writer prefers to put it in vice versa. It is understandable since that classroom language is easier to be acquired and chronologically, they emerge in the first stage of structuring classroom discourse. Within each chapter, the language items are arranged chronologically. In brief, it can be said that the materials are organized in linear mode, from the easiest to the most difficult though the chapters are not cross-referenced. To comprehend each unit, we do not need to review or preview other chapter.

2. Authenticity

In the context of authenticity, it concerns with the following criteria: (1) Do the tasks exploit language in a communicative or 'real-world' way? (2) If not, are the texts unacceptably simplified or artificial (for instance, in the use of whole-sentence dialogues)?

The tasks in TSLMOEFM were organized more or less in the same mode. In each unit, mathematic teachers are assigned to have listening and speaking practice and reading comprehension on "Language in Use" section. While in "Language Focus" they are supposed to have grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation practice (only offered up to unit 5). On "Classroom Language" section, listening and speaking are offered. Mathematics teachers have to listen to the instructor reading the list of classroom language learnt and then they are supposed to practice.

In PGBIUPMS In each chapter, the writer organized different mode of tasks. In the second chapter for example, he assigned mathematics teachers to form a group to execute the tasks. From the three items offered, they indicate different competencies to be achieved by the teachers. For number 1, teachers in group of 3 are supposed to practice using the expressions of how to greet the students and introducing herself.

While two members of the group are practicing the task, the other one has to make a note on what is expressed or discussed. On number 2, the writer provides the teachers with a situation "*Misalkan dalam satu kelas ada seorang siswa yang bertanya, coba kembangkan percakapan pendek sekitar 2-3 menit terkait dengan hal tersebut...*" based on which they have to create a short dialogue. In short, it can be said that the tasks are encourage mathematics teachers to perform monologue and dialogue. However, the situation provided in number 2 is not sufficient to scaffold the teachers to create a dialogue in 2 or 3 minutes length. In addition, the example of dialogue provided in the book only covers a very short dialogue consisting of turn taking only.

As the example, on exercise number 3 (p.11), teachers are supposed to practice closing the lesson. In this stage, the activities should cover summarizing, giving feedback,

mentioning plan for the next meeting and leave taking. However, in this number, it deals only with leave taking and giving homework, two expressions that most teachers are already familiar with. It could be briefly said that the tasks do not maximally exploit language in a communicative or 'real-world' way of mathematics classroom context.

The presentation of tasks on chapter 3 is similar to those of chapter 2 in which three items are offered. They are 1) Writing and then reading aloud mathematical expression into English, 2) Explaining/ defining mathematical terms.3) Matching mathematical terms with the meaning in Indonesia. Those tasks are not designed communicatively as mathematics teachers need to be able to use those terms in structuring classroom interaction therefore the task should encourage teachers to use those mathematical terms in their classroom delivery. In that way, they will get a lot of opportunities to practice using them in real context. The tasks are not arranged in linear mode from difficult to easier but vice versa.

The tasks in chapter 4 are aiming at developing mathematics teachers' competencies in explaining mathematical concepts. The writer provides math teachers with two types of tasks: (1) describing figures. In this task, he provided them with a figure of square and a circle. Math teachers are supposed to describe the properties of those figures. (2) translating in group. In this task, math teachers are free to choose the previously discussed text to be translated into Indonesia. They have to do peer correction on the result after the works done.

On the first task, it is not very much clear whether math teachers have to do it in the form of group or individual. It was also not mentioned what channel math teachers have to employ, either oral or written one. Commonly, teachers prefer a written mode to avoid oral performance that is more observable in showing their weaknesses. By observing those two tasks, it can be concluded that, again, the room for math teachers to practice speaking competency is not maximally promoted.

3. Appropriateness

Appropriateness refers to the extent to which (1) the material substantial enough or interesting enough to hold the attention of learners, (2) Is it pitched at the right level of maturity and language, and (particularly in the case of ESP situations), at the right conceptual level?

The training materials of TSLAMOEFM were developed on the basis of the topics that should be taught by the teachers during two semesters, that is why the materials is very substantial for Mathematics teachers teaching at international standard junior high school. It means that students at the correspondence grade have to have sufficient mastery on the topic discussed. Consequently, it will absolutely hold math teachers' attention in order to comprehend the materials by means of which they will be able to facilitate their students in learning the topics.

It cannot also be denied that the training materials is in the right level of math teachers' maturity and conceptual level for the same reasons as above mentioned.

In this context, PGBIGUPMS presents the language items to meet the need of mathematics teachers. Chapter 3 and 4 focus more on mathematics terms while chapter 2 provides mathematics teachers with general classroom English.

4. Rationale

It is answering questions on, (1) Why was the book written in the first place, and what gaps is it intended to fill?, (2) Are you given information about the Needs Analysis or classroom piloting that were undertaken?, (3) Are the objectives spelt out?

TSLMOEFM is developed to meet the need of mathematics teachers of a junior high school who are bilingual program supposed to teach mathematics using English. This is due to belief that mathematics teachers do not have sufficient English language proficiency to perform instructional practices using English. However, there is not any explicit information about math teachers need analysis.

The objectives are clearly mentioned in each unit covering good comprehension on the meaning of related vocabulary, how to pronounce the vocabulary, how to use those vocabularies, showing good ability in comprehending the structure of noun phrases and sentences of the specified mathematics context. The ultimate objectives are math teachers are able to use words, nouns phrases and sentences to express and share their ideas related to the specified mathematics context. They are also able to use English in structuring classroom instruction.

PGBIUPMS is developed as a respond to the need of Mathematics teachers of IJHS relating to their tasks in teaching Math using English. The need of Mathematics teachers is presented in the form of percentage ranging from 54.9% for strategies of translating math resources, 53.7% for saying Mathematical Symbols and Terms, and 50% for Greeting, Encouraging, and Closing conversation. In the introduction section, it is also stated that this book is designed as the form of P4TK's responsibility in developing Math teachers' basic knowledge of their English proficiency in order to be able to teach Math using English effectively. However, the book functions only as an introduction, therefore, Mathematics teachers are supposed to have a discussion to make an extensive development and start practicing those language items in their classroom instruction.

5. Methodology

It can be observed that TOESLAM language teaching methodology applied was not obviously stated. However, it can be said that the writers accommodate naturalistic approach and contextual language teaching as they are shown through the examples of the dialogue and also the nature of the tasks and activities presented in the book.

Similarly in PBIGUMS, it was not obviously stated the teaching methodology applied. However, from the nature of the contents and the tasks developed, it tends to be more organized on structural basis. Though, it is assigning math teachers to work in group cooperatively, however, in term of developing their speaking competency is not in the same direction with the development of the content. Math teachers need more contextual activities, which promote and encourage them to speak. Instead of structuring the tasks in the form mechanical drill, the writer could have activities that are more communicative. It could begin with information gap and led them practicing the gambit or the expressions with pairs, or in groups.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The English training materials for math teachers of bilingual program are varied in terms of the objectives, course content, tasks and activities, methodology and assessment. Those five aspects are interrelated from one to another. It means that the objectives

indirectly inform us about the content, how the content are organized, how the content should be delivered to achieve the objectives, and how to assess learners to measure the learners' achievement. However, in those English training materials the assessment is contradictory to objectives mentioned.

In terms of course content, the coverage is more or less the same in the three books. They cover vocabulary, grammar, language skills and classroom language though they differ in the portion. TSLMOEFM includes more vocabulary on specific math terms, and PGBIUPMS focuses more on translating mathematic expressions.

The tasks and activities are also different. In the first book, TSLMOEFM, the activities are: listening to and repeating teachers' drill on a list of words, reading a text followed by comprehension questions, finding the meaning of specified noun phrases, writing math expression in English, finding the meaning of specified words and listening to and repeating a dialogue. However, it has small portion on classroom language expression. It focuses more on developing mathematics language linearly from vocabulary, syntax and semantics and discourse. It is hoped that mathematics teachers would be able to use the linguistic items related to the specified math topic. Teachers' language competence is assessed through the ability to translate Indonesian mathematics expression into English. It can be said that the book provides an appropriate content-based instruction materials.

The second book has the following tasks and activities: practicing the expressions learnt, creating a dialogue based on the situation given, writing and reading aloud mathematical terms into English, defining mathematical terms, matching mathematical terms with the meaning in Indonesia, describing figures, and translating texts provided. The assessment employed is objectives test in the form of multiple choice test to measure learners grammar and vocabulary mastery, and the ability to translate mathematics expressions and specific classroom language.

In term of teaching method, the three books mostly applied Grammar Translation Method which accommodates structuralist and behaviouristic. However, on some certain tasks, CTL is also implemented.

It can be concluded that the existing English syllabuses are varied depending on the creativity of materials developers. Therefore, the objectives, teaching methodology, tasks and activities, assessment and the content coverage are also heterogeneous in term of the composition of language skills, classroom language, and language aspects. The English training materials provided during the courses covers sufficient lexico-grammatical components of English needed by these Mathematics teachers in bilingual program. However, most of them could not practice them in their classes. Moreover, the English training materials did not cover classroom language which commonly used in enhancing students' critical thinking.

Based on the above analysis it can be observed that the materials do not really support math teachers' language competence especially on classroom language expressions needed by Mathematics teachers' structure effective instructional practices. Therefore, Math teachers have to make some adjustment when they have to use those expressions in classroom context which turns to be difficult for them as they did not get sufficient real examples of the language functions in real life classroom context.

Based on the above findings, therefore the writer proposes the following suggestions:

1. The English training material provided for math teacher during the training is sufficient. However, it is needed to design an alternative material which is more contextual to meet the need of mathematics teachers – specifically English – to enhance their English proficiency in order that they are able to structure effective instructional Mathematics classroom discourse.
2. Math teachers who already got the training need to make a good adjustment in using the language depending on the context they are engaged in. To be able to do so they are encouraged to get more access to experience others whom they can get maximize their potential.

REFERENCES

- Al Freidan, Abdullah. (2012) *Evaluation of Two ESP Textbooks*. Journal of ELT Vol. 5, No. 6; June 2012. Canadian Center of Science and Education Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n6p43or> www.ccsenet.org/elt
- (2009). *Panduan Penyelenggaraan Program Rintisan SMA Bertaraf Internasional*. (R-SMA-BI)
- Dubin, F and E. Olshtain. (1992). *Course design. Developing programs and material for language learning*. Cambridge. CUP.
- Echevarria, J and Vogt, M and Short, D.J. (2010). *The SIOP Model for Teaching Mathematics to English Learners*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Garcia, Ofelia & Baker, Colin. (1995). *Policy and Practice in Bilingual Education*. Multilingual Matters Ltd. England.
- Haylock & Thangata.(2007). *The Key Concepts in Teaching Primary Mathematics*. SAGE publication. Ltd.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters. A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: A learning-Centered Approach*. Cambridge. CUP
- Krashen, Stephen. (2006). *How Well Are They Doing? The Impact of English Immersion for English Learners in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts*. University of Southern California
- McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and Methods in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Richards, J. C. (2006) *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge. CUP.
- (1999) *Language teaching matrix*. CUP
- (2006). *Designing English Curriculum for Education of Mathematics Teachers for International School*. Teflin conference paper. UKSW
- Robinson, P (1991) *ESP Today: A practitioner's Guide*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall
- Sheldon, L. E. (1988). *Evaluating ELT Textbooks and Materials*. ELT Journal, 37, 237-246 available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/elt/42.4.237>
- Tomlinson, Brian. (2008). *English Language Learning Materials*. Continuum. London.
- White, V. Ronald. (1988) *The ELT Curriculum. Design, Innovation and Management*. Basil Blackwell Inc. New York.
- Widdiharto, Rachmadi. (2008). *Pengenalan Bahasa Inggris untuk Pembelajaran Matematika SMP*. P4TK. Yogyakarta.