

THE MOBILITY OF URBAN-REGION BENINESE EFL TEACHERS AND ITS INFLUENCE ON RURAL LEARNERS' SPOKEN ENGLISH

L'INFLUENCE DE LA MOBILITÉ DES ENSEIGNANTS BÉNINOIS DE L'ANGLAIS COMME LANGUE ÉTRANGÈRE DES ZONES URBAINES SUR LE PARLER DES APPRENANTS RURAUX

Evariste Assogba KOTTIN

University of Abomey-Calavi, Republic of Benin

kottinevariste@yahoo.fr

Résumé : Plusieurs personnes préfèrent la vie en zones urbaines à celles rurales; et cela est le cas des enseignants d'anglais, langue étrangère, qui veulent souvent travailler en villes pour diverses raisons. La plupart du temps, il y a un manque de matériels didactiques adéquats aussi bien que les locaux. Par conséquent, l'opinion de Brown (2003) est qu'un enseignant rural doit être doté de plusieurs tâches pour enseigner à plusieurs niveaux, planifier des activités extracurriculaires et convenables à l'environnement éducationnel. Les enseignants d'anglais, langue étrangère des cours secondaires du Bénin rencontrent d'habitude des difficultés semblables dans les zones rurales. C'est pourquoi ils choisissent de servir dans des zones urbaines où ces genres de problèmes ont une probabilité existentielle réduite. L'objectif fondamental de la présente étude est de mettre en exergue comment des enseignants et apprenants privilégiés dans des zones urbaines sont au détriment des régions rurales des types subséquents de mobilité qui l'accompagnent: la mobilité des enseignants d'anglais d'école en école en vue d'obtenir beaucoup d'argent; mobilité due à leur affectation légale de leur établissement habituel au nouvel établissement (d'un établissement urbain à celui rural et vice versa ou d'un établissement urbain à un autre établissement urbain et vice versa) et finalement, la mobilité des enseignants d'anglais à l'étranger et vice versa. Les instruments utilisés dans le cadre de ces investigations sont des questionnaires adressés à 33 enseignants d'anglais parmi lesquels 28 furent collectés, 20 sélectionnés. 67 apprenants furent également interrogés, desquels 66 furent collectés, 60 sélectionnés en plus des interviews conduites avec 14 éducateurs en anglais. La plupart des participants qui ont donné leurs résultats reconnaissent que l'enseignement et l'apprentissage de l'anglais offrent plus d'opportunités dans les villes que dans les villages. Leurs résultats ont révélé que les enseignants d'anglais ruraux sont le plus souvent taquinés. C'est la raison par laquelle ils souhaitent être affectés dans les contrées urbaines. Et il est nécessaire d'arriver à savoir qu'une mosaïque de défis ont besoin d'être relevés par les acteurs internes et externes du système éducatif du Bénin afin d'encourager les enseignants d'anglais urbains aussi bien que ruraux.

Mots clés: Anglais; influence; mobilité; rural; urbain.

Abstract : Several people prefer living in urban areas to rural ones; and that is the case of EFL teachers who usually want to work in towns for a variety of reasons. Most of the time, there is lack of adequate teaching materials as well as classrooms. Consequently, the opinion of Brown (2003) is that a rural teacher has to be multitasking to teach multiple grades, plan extracurricular activities and fit in the educational environment. EFL teachers of Beninese secondary schools often come across similar difficulties in rural areas. That is why they choose to serve in urban areas where these kinds of problems have a reduced likelihood of occurrence.

The fundamental objective of the current study is to point out how privileged teachers and learners in urban areas are to the detriment of rural regions and the subsequent types of mobility that go along with it: EFL teachers' mobility from school to school in order to get a lot of money; mobility due to their legal transfer from their habitual school to a new one (from an urban school to a rural one and vice versa or from an urban school to another urban one and vice versa); and finally, EFL teachers' mobility abroad and vice versa. The instruments used for my investigations are questionnaires addressed to 33 EFL teachers among whom 28 were collected, and 20 selected. I also questioned 67 learners of whom 66 were collected, 60 selected in addition to interviews conducted with 14 EFL educators. Most participants who have provided me with their results recognise that EFL teaching and learning offer more opportunities in towns than in villages. Their results have revealed that rural EFL teachers are often teased. That is the reason why they wish to be transferred to urban areas. And it is necessary to get to know that a mosaic of challenges need to be taken up by internal and external actors of Beninese educational system in order to encourage urban EFL teachers and learners as well as rural ones.

Key words: English; influence; mobility; rural; urban.

Introductory Sections

Teaching English in urban and rural areas does not require exactly the same efforts or zeal mainly the teaching of oral communication in this language but more efforts and zeal occur in rural places than urban regions. This problem is exacerbated in Beninese educational system since English has been taught and learnt as a foreign language in this country. The purpose of this study is to identify advantages justifying EFL teachers' preference to work downtown instead of rural places, to determine three types of mobility and examine the influence of these different kinds of mobility on EFL learners' spoken ability. As empirical evidence is required in this study to explain the occurrence of English speaking teaching prominence and the related challenges, quantitative research questions have been framed in addition to three research hypotheses and are presented as follows:

RQ1: What are challenges awaiting EFL teachers in Beninese rural and urban schools related to speaking teaching and learning?

RQ2: How can EFL teachers' mobility affect learners' communicative performance in EFL classes?

RQ3: Why can EFL teachers prefer to work in urban schools rather than in rural ones?

RH1: Rural EFL teachers are likely to face more challenges related to speaking, teaching and learning than urban EFL teachers.

RH2: Rural EFL teachers gain learners' poor communicative performance whereas urban teachers gain learners' better performance in EFL classes.

RH3: EFL teachers expect teaching conditions in urban schools to improve more easily than in rural ones.

1. Literature Review

There may be several types of mobility but the current study distinguishes three particular types: First, there is EFL teachers' mobility from school to school. Second, there is also mobility due to their legal transfer from their initial school to a new one.

Third, EFL teachers' mobility abroad and vice versa. These types of mobility are likely to determine these workers' motivation which is core of any skill's teaching and learning success. "According to the research", Rahmat and Akbar (2019) have cited Williams, (2003, p. 160),

"community involvement and community opportunities, is the most prevalent difference between rural and urban middle school education. Urban communities tend to be stronger in many ways. They are united by students, school pride and community values. While rural schools can have a great sense of community, they usually lack the opportunities that result from accessibility to universities and colleges. Likewise, museums and libraries are not easily accessible to rural students. Due to distance and funding gaps, visitations from authors, large newspaper, technology centers and other organizations are less available to rural schools."

This point of view from the authors appears logical because urban teachers and learners will be more involved in the process of EFL teaching and learning. In addition to more considerable and unlimited opportunities they get than rural teachers and learners. These authors may appear to be right that urban communities tend to be stronger. Urban communities can be united by students, school pride and community values as they have stated, but this may not always be a reality. Division and misunderstanding may strongly occur between urban communities. They have argued that rural schools can have a great sense of community, which may not be right because the whole world is full of hatred nowadays. It can be true that rural communities usually lack the opportunities that result from accessibility to universities and colleges, museums, and libraries. Consequently, rural EFL teachers and learners do not have enough opportunities related to EFL teaching and learning. It is true that distance and funding gaps prevent visitations from authors, large newspaper, technology centers and other organizations to rural schools. This means that teachers and learners do not witness much reality in almost any field.

Rahmat and Akbar, (2019, p. 160) comment some authors' viewpoints:

"However, the research literature suggests that the economic status of rural areas is frequently lower than that of urban areas. Research overwhelmingly indicates "socioeconomic status is the strongest correlate of standardized test scores, and rural poverty rates are highest in areas with large concentration of people of color" (Williams, 2003). So even though rural students appear to be keeping up with urban students in test scores, in actuality not all rural students are gaining the knowledge necessary to compete with their urban counterparts. In all subjects "poorer rural students scored considerably lower on citizenship and social studies tests than did students from upper socioeconomic urban communities" (Young, 1998). Even with these statistics, the debate of rural schools versus urban schools endures and possibly always will."

The same point of view may be shared as these authors that "the economic status of rural areas is frequently lower than that of urban areas." In this case, the living conditions in rural areas will not be so comfortable, and there will be many problems that will be sources of disappointment, beginning by lack of food. If "rural poverty rates are highest in areas with large concentration of people of colour" (Williams, 2003), and poverty not being approved, competent and well-trained EFL teachers will not prefer to stay in these rural areas. Stating that "rural students appear to be keeping

up with urban students in test scores" is not much true because of a certain number of teaching and learning materials as well as other interesting things rural teachers and learners do not have. It is imaginable that "In actuality not all rural students are gaining the knowledge necessary to compete with their urban counterparts." It is then difficult for rural learners to perform better than urban learners and even rural EFL teachers do not perform more easily than the ones living in urban areas. Furthermore, they are right to say that in all subjects "poorer rural students scored considerably lower on citizenship and social studies tests than did students from upper socioeconomic urban communities" (Edington, 1987, p. 2), because there may exist really poorer students in both rural and urban areas who are unable to afford the cheapest learning material or unable to access the least information necessary for their EFL learning success.

"...methods to develop student interest include experiential activities and field trips, which create authentic learning opportunities for students, regardless of the content area. However, experiential activities and field trips do not simply happen, teachers need to understand that such activities require organization, planning, and student reflection to minimize the learning experience, the same as classroom-based experiential learning. The purpose of this paper is to examine literature concerning experiential learning activities and field trips, focusing on science-related field trips and the role of the classroom teacher prior to, during and after the field experience."

Behrendt, M. & Franklin, T. (2014, p. 236)

According to these authors I can be understood that teachers are indispensable in education and in instruction or schooling and must not be neglected. The writers have declared that teachers must be listened to and they ought to search for learners' interest and motivation to learning continually. The reason for this is that all that they say is related to experience from their training and daily research towards students' opportunities frequently created in classroom settings and outside. Teachers spend much time struggling for the improvement of their condition of teaching through effective planning. It is noticed that the great reputation of educators in teaching initiatives, contrariwise, is not remunerated. The compensation by amounts of experiential trainings inspects instructors' speeches or opinions, particularly in rural teachers. They seem to mean that no matter the efforts these educators make, they are not compensated equally. And this ungratefulness raises teachers' anger and they are frequently eager to make their voice perceptible to the government, to the country, and to the world for justice to be established. They also said that the problems and challenges rural-area teachers are faced with are not well-known. They added that those who witness these difficulties are the only ones to feel what they are really enduring. This can imply that teaching English spoken language in rural schools is harder than teaching in urban areas because of lack of appropriate materials and school equipment.

Holguín (2019, p. 213) has stated:

"Isolation, cultural adaptation, misconceptions that rural families have about education, motivation, infrastructure, and violence are some of the shortcomings which inhibit English teachers from working in rural areas. First, isolation in both, a social and a professional context, plays an important role when choosing a place to work. Most teachers come from urban areas and it is very difficult for them to adapt

to the sometimes very isolated environment of rural areas; also, some of them will miss having stimulating academic interactions with peers."

This author argues that rural English teachers are isolated, confronted with cultural difficulty because they must get adapted to new culture, sensitise rural families about the importance of education, especially the English language. They are not motivated, they lack infrastructure, and may use violence to demonstrate opportunities of English in rural areas. The writer explains deeper that rural English teachers are socially and professionally isolated and do not succeed in "having stimulating academic interactions with peers."

Akbaria (2015, p. 395) pens in illustration:

"It is important to identify the problems the Iranian students encounter in the process of learning English. The main obstacle for learning English is that there is no environment that makes them familiar with the original language. In other words, there is no active role for English outside the classroom. So, they do not feel the immediate need to learn English. And the educational system should bring about such need."

The writer says that Iranian students come up with difficulties in the process of learning English. The reason underpinning such premise is that learners do not find appropriate environment to become familiar with normative English. This is what happens in rural areas as experienced and qualified teachers are scarce. By way of illustration, the teacher predicates that English is hardly spoken outside classroom environment.

Akbaria (2015, p. 396) bears out saying:

"Furthermore, the students in English classes do not have common background knowledge because some of them are trained in rural areas in which un-qualified English teachers teach them while other students are taught in urban areas having access to a lot of classroom facilities to gain advantage of. While some of the students take advantage of using satellite programs, VCD and video tapes, and go to private language schools, most of the students just have their textbooks as the only source of learning English. Under such circumstances, there is no placement test to put students into different groups homogeneously based on their language proficiency levels. This makes the situation even much worse for the weak students and they resort to guide books."

What can also affect EFL teaching process is that learners' EFL speaking learning undergoes some obstacles: "the students in English classes do not have common background knowledge because some of them are trained in rural areas in which un-qualified English teachers teach them while other students are taught in urban areas having access to a lot of classroom facilities to gain advantage of." Urban EFL learners habitually "use satellite programs, VCD and video tapes, in their classes." In the same way, urban EFL teachers are lucky to use such teaching materials in their classes and the outputs of their learners can never be the same as the ones rural EFL teachers can get. He also adds that urban EFL learners go to private language schools whereas "most of the students just have their textbooks as the only source of learning English." Akbaria (2015, p. 396) observes:

“As classes are crowded, most of the students do not have enough practice in English and do not overcome language learning problems and are not proficient enough to communicate in the foreign language. Because in the limited hours of instruction, they normally could not have the chance of learning English especially the most favored skills of listening and speaking. There is no place for group work discussion. To acquire the target language effectively, learners need to engage actively in processing the meanings of whatever they hear and read.

Most of the time, the lack of schools together with the scarcity of teachers account for the existence of plethoric classrooms. Consequently, classes are crowded, and “most of the students do not have enough practice in English and do not overcome language learning problems and are not proficient enough to communicate in the foreign language.” Rural EFL teachers and learners' hours of instruction is limited. They are not taught listening and speaking for the reason that the teaching of these skills needs more attention and more language teaching and learning equipment.

Akbaria (2015, p. 396) ascertains that:

“Not all students have the same motivation or purpose for learning English. Some of them look at English just as a course that should be passed and do not understand its importance as a means of communication with which they can adapt themselves to new improvements in technology and other sciences. For most learners, learning English is a duty – something that they have to, but don't want to do. They don't see pleasure in learning English. These students have low motivation to participate in class, and they simply try to get a passing mark to get rid of the course.”

The writer has thought that some learners are not interested in EFL learners whereas others are very fond of this language learning and “do not understand its importance as a means of communication with which they can adapt themselves to new improvements in technology and other sciences.” According to the author, some learners are compelled to learn English against their will. These learners are not interested in the learning process and do not participate in class.

2. Research Methodology

It is known that research methodology is the specific procedures or techniques used to identify, select, process, and analyze information about a topic. In order to get overall validity and reliability of my study, questionnaire sheets are addressed to 33 EFL teachers. From the latter respondents, 28 sheets are collected. From 67 learners, 66 sheets are collected. 20 EFL teacher respondents' results are selected. There are 60 learner respondents' results, as well as interviews conducted with 14 EFL personalities.

2.1. Questionnaires

The questionnaire addressed to EFL teachers is composed of six (6) main questions. They are split into prompts completed accordingly. In addition, there are five (5) main questions for learners' questionnaire.

2.1.1. EFL Teachers' Questionnaire

Through these questions and prompts, the twenty (20) EFL teacher respondents selected are expected first of all to give the reasons why they like teaching in rural areas. Second, they are expected to say what they dislike in rural secondary schools about EFL speaking teaching. Thirdly, they have to say whether EFL teachers can teach speaking easily in their classes. The fourth question enables them to know whether EFL teachers' mobility can affect their teaching. The fifth question asks whether rural learners can improve their speaking ability or not. Finally, the sixth question is to know whether they think rural learners may perform in EFL speaking better than urban learners or not.

2.1.2. Learners' Questionnaire

60 learner respondents selected answered questions. The first question is to know if their school is located in a rural or an urban region. The second question is to enquire if their English teacher teach speaking in his or her classes. The third question is to get informed of their way of speaking English with their classmates in class. The fourth question requests whether they speak English with their classmates outside the classroom after the English classes whereas the fifth question has permitted to determine the reasons why they prefer learning either in a rural or an urban school.

2.2. Interview to EFL Teachers

The fourteen interviewed teachers explained the reasons for their mobility and said that it can affect their learners' communicative performance in their classes or not. Next, they accounted for their teaching procedures, techniques and methodologies. Third, they confirmed or negated the usefulness of the English language for learners in social interaction. Finally, they gave their preference between teaching in rural school or urban school.

3. Result Presentation

3.1. EFL Teachers' Questionnaire Results

Table 1: Respondents 1 (20=100%)

Investigated Items	Positive Answers-%	Negative Answers-%	Total-100%
EFL teachers like teaching in rural areas	02-10%	18-90%	20-100%
They hate many things in rural secondary schools about EFL speaking teaching	20-100%	00-00%	20-100%
EFL teachers can teach speaking easily in their classes	08-40%	12-60%	20-100%
EFL teachers' mobility can affect their teaching	19-95%	01-05%	20-100%
Rural learners can improve their speaking ability	03-15%	17-85%	20-100%
Rural learners may perform in EFL speaking better than urban learners	05-25%	15-75%	20-100%

Table 1 shows that only two (02) respondents, 10%, have said that EFL teachers like teaching in rural areas whereas eighteen (18) of them, 90%, have objected to that statement. All those twenty (20) respondents, 100% have said that they hate many things in rural secondary schools about EFL speaking teaching. Eight (08) participants, 40%, have agreed that EFL teachers can teach speaking easily in their classes whereas twelve of them (12), 60%, have disagreed. Nineteen (19) participants, 95%, have accepted that EFL teachers' mobility can affect their teaching against only one (01), 5%, has rejected. Only three (03) participants, 15%, have said that rural learners can improve their speaking ability against seventeen (17), 85%. Five (05) participants, 25%, have agreed that rural learners may perform in EFL speaking better than urban learners against fifteen (15), 75%.

3.2. Learners' Questionnaire Results

Table 2: Respondents 2 (60=100%)

Investigated Items	Answers Type 1-%	Answers Type 2-%	Total=60-100%
Schools in a rural region or an urban region	Rural region Yes=21-35%	Urban region Yes=39-65%	60-100%
English teachers teach speaking in their classes	Yes=15-25%	No=45-75%	60-100%
Learners who speak English with their classmates in class	Yes=11-18.33%	No=49-81.66%	60-100%
Learners who speak English with their classmates outside the classroom after the English classes	Yes=02-03.33%	No=58-96.66%	60-100%
Learners who prefer learning in a rural or an urban school	Rural region Yes=07-11.66%	Urban region Yes=53-88.33%	60-100%

Table 2 shows that twenty-one (21) learner respondents, 35% have said that they attend rural schools whereas thirty-nine (39) learner respondents, 65% attend urban schools. While fifteen (15) learner respondents, 25%, have said that their English teachers teach speaking in their classes, forty-five (45) learner respondents, 75% have refused. Eleven (11) learner respondents, 18.33%, are learners who speak English with their classmates in class but forty-nine (49) learner respondents, 81.66%, do not use the target language. Only two (02) learner respondents, 03.33%, have said that they speak English with their classmates outside the classroom after the English classes whereas fifty-eight (58) learner respondents, 96.66%, have refused. Learner respondents who prefer learning in rural schools are seven (07), 11.66% and those who prefer urban schools are 53, 88.33%.

3.3. EFL Teacher Interview Results

Table 3: Respondents 3 (14=100%)

Research Items	Positive Answers-%	Negative Answers-%	Total-14-100%
EFL teachers' mobility can affect their learners' communicative performance	14-100%	00-00%	14-100%
Speaking Well-taught in EFL classes	04-28.57%	10-71.42%	14-100%
Learners use the English language outside their classes	00-00%	14-100%	14-100%
Teaching in urban schools is better	12-85.71%	02-14.28%	14-100%

Fourteen (14) respondents, 100%, have accepted that EFL teachers' mobility can affect their learners' communicative performance. Four (04) respondents, 28.57%, have argued that speaking is well-taught in EFL classes whereas ten (10), 71.42%, have doubted. All of them (14), 100%, have confessed that learners do not use the English language outside their classes. At last, while twelve interviewees (12), 85.71%, have argued that teaching in urban schools is better, only two (02), 14.28%, have refused.

4. Data Discussion

The research problem investigated in the current study states that Beninese EFL teachers in secondary schools are usually faced with several difficulties mainly in rural schools more than urban educational centres. These disadvantages compel them to express their high needs to live and teach in urban regions. The first research question enables us to landmark challenges in store for EFL teachers in Beninese rural and urban schools related to speaking teaching and learning. These trials being numerous and varied, rural EFL teachers have to witness learners' poverty through their frequent lack of appropriate learning materials more than those of urban schools. Moreover, since these materials are not of the least, the ones used for teaching EFL speaking, a lot of means are required to afford their learning materials.

The second research question is to enquire about the way EFL teachers' mobility can affect learners' communicative performance in EFL classes. When teachers working in urban schools endowed with true basic amenities are now transferred to rural localities surely lack motivation that impacts their professional performance'. Teachers are more frustrated in rural regions than in towns for many reasons. Primo, rural teachers will be short of information. Segundo, they will drive behind their colleagues in terms of information delivery and reception. The absence of a high degree and quality of information means may account for this.

The third research question permits to identify the reasons why EFL teachers can prefer to work in urban schools rather than rural ones. These reasons of preference are predicated upon the good equipment urban schools are provided with in comparison to rural institutions. They have more opportunities to increase their teaching knowledge and experience. This is the case of EFL teachers who are likely to encounter native speakers; which is not the case of those working in rural settings. The research

hypotheses I have used need also to be scrutinised so as to render this study more scientific, valid and reliable.

Indeed, according to the first research hypothesis, rural EFL teachers are likely to be faced with more challenges related to speaking, teaching and learning than urban EFL teachers. Considering so many difficulties rural employees are most of the time confronted with, it is commonly noticed that urban workers' living and working conditions seem to be more pleasant. This point of view may not always be substantiated at all levels but the opposite side of argumentation appears less strong enough to be believed.

The conjecture of the second research hypothesis is that rural EFL teachers' gain learners' poor communicative performance. Whereas urban teachers gain learners' better performance in EFL classes. This supposition is right to some extent but the contrary can also occur. When EFL teachers do not seize the opportunities offered to them in urban areas, they can never reach their learners' performance in any skills taught to them. Consequently, rural teachers who are better organised are able to train talented and bright learners to the detriment of knocked out urban teachers. All the same, knocked out rural EFL teachers have nothing to gain in the target language teaching and learning process better than conscious urban teachers. Thus, conscious urban EFL teachers can easily get learners' communicative performance.

Through the third hypothesis that EFL teachers expect teaching conditions in urban schools to improve more easily than in rural ones, it is supposed to be believed that urban areas are much wealthier to provide their schools with more sophisticated teaching materials than rural regions. The more available adequate teaching materials are the more relevant strategies and procedures used. The more communicative performance EFL learners gain the better their actual communication in real situations. These teaching materials may be sophisticated and relevant strategies and procedures used. Nevertheless, the responsibility of EFL teachers in the use of these materials and strategies is required. They need to be used appropriately and in the right ways and conditions, for this communicative performance to be gained easily.

Through table 1, one can notice that the majority of EFL teachers like teaching in urban educational centres. Transferring this category of educators to rural areas by force is demotivating them, and they are not really interested anymore in their teaching job, like in their former urban areas. All participants have said that they hate the lack of several relevant teaching materials in rural secondary schools about EFL speaking teaching. This situation explains that in rural areas, things are not admirable in terms of the EFL speaking teaching materials availability. And this will surely negatively affect learners' speaking performance accordingly. In addition, as the majority of these respondents think that teachers cannot teach speaking easily in their classes, this auguries that a lot of efforts still deserve to be made in this direction.

Since most respondents have accepted that EFL teachers' mobility can affect their teaching, one may think that teachers' workplaces must be comfortable to live or work in for adequate teaching and learning. However, this priority, when given to teachers, may be overexploited and the educational system affected due to some teachers' irresponsibility. Very few participants have said that rural learners can improve their speaking ability. This result can explain the way rural teachers are overexploited. It is obvious that the results expected are exactly the same as the ones expected in urban

regions. That is what is expected in a given country's educational system because people want both rural and urban learners to perform excellently. Furthermore, since only five participants have agreed that rural learners may perform in EFL speaking better than urban learners, it can be stated that urban regions are usually more rated than rural places.

According to table 2, one can notice that learners attend both rural and urban schools. Some of these learners have said that their English teachers teach speaking in their classes, whereas forty-five learner respondents have refused. On account of this, we can conclude that many EFL teachers still do not teach all language skills in their classes. So, their learners are not to be blamed for their poor performance since they are not really taught. Nevertheless, No difference should be made between these learners and those who have actually been taught. They will be assessed on the basis of the same examination conditions.

Few learner respondents have recognised that they speak English with their classmates in class whereas forty-nine of them have said that they do not use the target language. A language which is spoken neither inside the classroom nor outside cannot be well-mastered and spoken. Moreover, a language which is not used or mastered is supposed not to have been learnt. Consequently, more learner respondents prefer learning in urban areas than in rural schools. Which means that learners who are sent to rural schools against their will, cannot perform well.

As for table 3, all of the fourteen respondents interviewed have accepted that EFL teachers' mobility can affect their learners' communicative performance. They seem to be right because urban EFL teachers when transferred by force to rural schools, may not be motivated and interested in the teaching process. By the same token, their learners will scarcely succeed in using the target language appropriately. In the same way, rural EFL teachers when transferred to urban schools may be from then on, unfocused and are therefore likely to succumb to useless hobbies. This recklessness may also affect the way of teaching of this category of educators. Only four respondents have argued that speaking is well-taught in EFL classes whereas ten out of fourteen are doubtful. Thus, learners are innocent and are not to blame because good teaching usually leads to successful learning. All of the respondents, fourteen (100%), have confessed that learners do not use the English language outside their classes. This incapacity of using the target language effectively justifies the failure of EFL teaching and learning in Beninese secondary schools so far. This is noticed through the last response of the interviews that the majority prefer, through their argumentation, that teaching in urban regions is much better than teaching in rural schools.

According to Holguín, (2019, p. 212),

"The occupation of rural areas in Colombia has changed over the last few decades. Colombia was, by the middle of the last century, a country with half of its population living in rural areas, whereas now only a fifth of its total population lives in rural settlements. Thus, as rural areas have decreased, most schools' models have been developed with a focus on urban areas, and as Moulton (2001) explains a schooling model developed in an urban context is not always relevant to a rural setting."

This statement means that the work in rural regions of Colombia has changed over the last few decades. And the way it has changed has been specified: "Colombia was, a nation with half of its population living in rural areas, whereas now only a fifth of its total population lives in rural settlements." That is to say that Colombia has developed and this development is worth impacting positively the country's educational system. In Benin, for example, this kind of development when it happens to come true, can positively influence EFL teachers' and learners' process of teaching and learning. Furthermore, the author adds that "as rural areas have decreased, most schools' models have been developed with a focus on urban areas." This decrease of rural areas is profitable to the country. As it can be observed, this is an aspect of a tangible development that may really foster the process of EFL teaching and learning. "And as Moulton (2001) explains a schooling model developed in an urban context is not always relevant to a rural setting." The author seems to insinuate that the process of teaching and learning in urban and rural areas does not present the same realities and cannot be mixed up under any circumstances. The answers given to my research questions, the detailed discussion made about these questions and about the results of the investigations above, have pushed me to make the following recommendations and suggestions.

5. Recommendations and Suggestions

Some recommendations are mainly made on behalf of African governments and especially the Beninese authorities. They ought to take English teaching and learning seriously by integrating this process in their GAP, Government's Action Program ("PAG"). Governments can dare experiment the use of English as the medium of instruction in most countries and gauge how this can work. This priority could enable Benin, for example, to be more open to the whole world and get a lot of opportunities accordingly. The government should invest in the training of EFL teachers and encourage the learning of this language. Below are some suggestions I have made towards EFL teachers, learners, and their parents.

EFL teachers should increase their efforts and zeal as far as the teaching of the target language is concerned. They need to be equipped personally with appropriate teaching materials in order to perform their job in their classes and elsewhere. As for EFL learners, they should be more interested in the learning process by reading and revising their lessons continuously in classrooms, outside, at home, and everywhere. Learners' parents should take more care of their children at home. They must also be watchful of their instruction anywhere and everywhere

Conclusion

The research problem stated in this study is the perpetual challenges EFL teachers are often faced with in rural schools. This seriously affects their teaching process because of the lack of motivation to work in rural areas justifying more desire to teach in towns. Several authors having dealt with this issue have highlighted the difference between rural and urban living conditions. In so doing, they emphasized workers' and teachers' penchant for urban schools. The results recorded reveal the precedence of urban areas over rural areas' discomfort. Without forgetting some

particularities that can change the course of the habitual realities. Governments are required to rate more the EFL teaching and learning by investing a lot. They should also make this language more useful to society. For the fruition of this project, EFL teachers, learners, and learners' parents are invited to play their roles effectively for the success of EFL speaking teaching and learning.

References

- Akbaria, Z. (2015). Current challenges in teaching/learning English for EFL learners: The case of junior high school and high school. *ScienceDirect, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 199 (2015) 394 - 401. GlobELT: An International Conference on Teaching and Learning English as an Additional Language, Antalya - Turkey
- Avery, L. M., & Kassam, K. A. (2011). Phronesis: Children's local rural knowledge of science and engineering. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 26(2), 1-18.
- Barley, Z., & Brigham, N. (2005). *Preparing Teachers to Teach in Rural Schools*. United States: The Ball State University.
- Barrera-Osorio, F., & Linden, L. (2009). The use and misuse of computer in education: evidence from a randomized experiment in Colombia. *Policy Research Working Paper Series 4836*, the World Bank.
- Barrera-Osorio, F., Maldonado, D., & Rodríguez, C. (2012). Calidad de la educación básica y media en Colombia: Diagnóstico y propuestas. *Serie Documentos de Trabajo N° 126*. Bogotá, Colombia: Universidad del Rosario.
- Behrendt, M. & Franklin, T. (2014). A Review of research on School Field Trips and Their Value in "Education in International Journal of Environmental & Science Education". 9, 235-245
- Betageri, G. (2013). Impact of English language teaching on the communication skills of rural students. *International Journal on English Language and Literature*, 1(1), 36-49.
- Bhushan, R. (2011). Challenging but enjoyable English Language teaching in rural areas: A case study of BPS Women University, Khanpur Kalan, Haryana. *ELT Voices*, 44-50.
- Bonilla, S., & Cruz-Arcila, F. (2013). Sociocultural factors involved in the teaching of English as a foreign language in rural areas of Colombia: an analysis of the impact on teachers' professional development. *Research in Teacher Education*, 3(2), 28-33.
- Boylan, C., & McSwan, D. (1998). Long-staying rural teachers: Who are they? *Australian Journal of Education*, 42, 49-65.
- Brown, D. L. (2003). *Challenges for Rural America in the 21st Century*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

- Campbell, A. M., & Yates, G. C. R. (2011). "Want to be a country teacher? No, I am too metrocentric". *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 26(4), 1-12.
- Cárdenas, M. L., González, A., & Álvarez, J. (2010). El desarrollo profesional de los docentes de inglés en ejercicio: algunas consideraciones conceptuales para Colombia. *Folio*, 31, 49-68.
- Castle, E. N. (1995). *The Changing American Countryside: Rural People and Places*. Kansas: University Press of Kansas.
- Centro virtual de Noticias de la Educación CVNE (2014). *Docentes del sector rural se forman en inglés como lengua extranjera gracias a estrategia de MinEducación*. Retrieved from: <http://www.mineducacion.gov.co/cvn/1665/w3-article-33971.html>
- Cheers, B. (1992). Some thoughts on multiskilled rural welfare practitioners. *Rural Society*, 2 (1), 25-42.
- Cruz- Arcila, F. (2013). Accounting for difference and diversity in language teaching and learning in Colombia. *Educ. Educ*, 16(1), 80-92. Cuadernos de Lingüística Hispánica n°. 27, Enero-Junio 2016, pp. 209-222 Bertha Ramos Holguín - Jahir Aguirre Morales
- Dane, C. (2014). *dane. Censo General del 2005*. Retrived from: <https://www.dane.gov.co/index.php/poblacion-y-registros-vitales/censos/censo-2005>
- Edington, E. D. (1987). Rural Student Achievement: Elements for Consideration. ERIC Digest. ERIC Identifier: ED289658. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools Las Cruces NM.
- González, A. (2010). *English and English teaching in Colombia: tensions and possibilities in the expanding circle*. *Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. London: Routledge.
- Holguín, B. R. (2019). English Language Teaching in Rural Areas: A New Challenge for English Language Teachers in Colombia. bertha.ramos@uptc.edu.co Jahir Aguirre Morales. jahir.aguirre@uptc.edu.co. Recepción: 30 de marzo de 2015. Aprobación: 18 de septiembre de 2015
- Rahmat, A. and Akbar, M. (2019). A Comparative Analysis of English Learning Motivation Between the Rural and Urban Students. *Metathesis: Journal of English Language Literature and Teaching* Vol. 3, No. 2, October 2019 PP 158-182 DOI: 10.31002/metathesis.v3i2.1740 p-ISSN: 2580-2712 e-ISSN: 2580-2720
- Saiful, J. A., Triyono, S. (2018). EFL Teachers' Reflection in Teaching English to EFL Students of Rural Areas *Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia Muhammadiyah University of Surabaya, Indonesia* Email: jepriali1@gmail.com Email: sulis@uny.ac.id DOI: 10.26858/ijole.v2i2.5637