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Abstract

This study seeks to examine and document the language use of both teachers and students in English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) classrooms in an Indonesian bilingual elementary school. Qualitative data were collected from sixteen classrooms in the form of an observation tool, video recording, and informal interviews. Research focused on the quantity and nature of each of the two languages used, including why and when codeswitching occurred. Data were analyzed and charted, providing a picture of the realities of EMI instruction in Indonesia, and the challenges faced. The findings revealed that, despite being EMI classrooms, a high percentage of native language use occurred among both teachers and students. The findings of this study may serve to analyze the needs of teachers and students in contexts such as Indonesia, and be used to provide recommendations for more effective educational practices in Indonesia.
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Chapter I: Review of Literature

History of English in Indonesia

Indonesia is a country of over 17,000 islands which stretch over 3,200 miles between the Indian and Pacific Ocean. Of the 17,000 islands, 11,000 of them are inhabited with over 220 million people, making it the fourth most populated country in the world ("Indonesia facts, Indonesia flag -- National Geographic," n.d.). There are diverse cultures, ethnicities and languages, creating unique challenges for the Indonesian educational system. Indonesia is currently estimated to have over 737 living languages with Indonesian, or Bahasa Indonesian, having a privileged position (Lamb & Coleman, 2008). Next to Bahasa Indonesian, the most widely used local language is Javanese. In addition to the 737 indigenous languages, there are three languages which originate outside Indonesia and also play a significant role. These are Arabic, Chinese and English (Lamb & Coleman, 2008). According to Lamb and Coleman (2008) in their article Literacy in English and the Transformation of Self and Society in Post-Soeharto Indonesia,

English was formally identified as the ‘first foreign language’ of Indonesia shortly after independence in 1945. In this way the former colonial languages of Dutch and Japanese were explicitly rejected. English thus became a compulsory subject in the secondary school curriculum from the early years of independence and it continues to be a subject which is considered to be of major significance (p. 192).

English has now become a predominant influence in many of the larger cities and urban areas in Indonesia. Billboards display English words, advertisements feature white-skinned western models, and stores and restaurants play western pop music over their loud speakers.
Even in remote areas of the country, televisions broadcast English into the most rural areas. English is valued as a commodity in the work force. “The evolving labour market puts a high value on proficiency in English. English has assumed a gate-keeping role in diverse work environments” (Lamb & Coleman, 2008, p. 192).

With the country’s emphasis on the English language comes the need to implement English teaching curriculum, train teachers, find appropriate means of assessment, and analyze current teaching methods. The Indonesian Ministry of National Education has been attempting to reform English instruction at junior and senior high schools around the country for several decades (Musthafa, 2001). Author Bachrudin Musthafa (2001) outlined the challenges facing Indonesian schools in his article, *Communicative Language Teaching in Indonesia: Issues of Theoretical Assumptions and Challenges in the Classroom Practice*. He stated, “The most serious challenge facing our English teachers is the absence of-or insufficient amount of-exposure to real-life English use” (p. 6). He also indicated that the national English tests given to students focus primarily on knowledge of syntax and grammatical items which is counterproductive to developing students’ communicative competence. Many Indonesian teachers of English have also publicly admitted that English is seldom used in the classrooms, as teachers tend to use *Bahasa Indonesian* to carry out their English lessons (Musthafa, 2001). Reformation in the areas of teacher training, assessment, English use in the classroom, curriculum, and teaching methods are challenges the Indonesian government faces as English proficiency becomes vital to a growing nation. Authors Mappiasse & Sihes (2014) traced the evolution of English as a foreign language in Indonesia and made the following statement:
The adoption of English language by Indonesia has brought tremendous change in the educational policies of the country. Consequently, some pedagogy relating to English language teaching, namely the methodology, curriculum and evaluation is being given substantial attention so as to improve the competency of its usage in the country. The ability of the teachers who are non-native speakers to disseminate instructions to students effectively is a key factor in the effective learning of the language (p 113).

The present position of the English language in the Indonesian language sector indicates that English is a compulsory subject in schools in Indonesia. That said, the system is fraught with problems. Some of the identified problems, according to Mappiasse & Sihes (2014) in their article *Evaluation of English as a Foreign Language and Its Curriculum in Indonesia: A Review*, included allocation of inadequate time for English lessons, lack of resources and instructional materials, and a lack of motivation by the stakeholders. Teachers are also faced with overcrowded classrooms and inadequate training.

**Teacher Training and Professional Development in Indonesia**

Like many other countries, Indonesia has experienced numerous educational reforms. Some of these reforms include curriculum decentralization, school-based management, education standardization through national examination, and new laws on teacher professionalism (Yuwono & Harbon, n.d.). Continuing to improve the quality of education in order commensurate with other developing countries, the Indonesian government has made various changes, and continues to review the implementation of education in Indonesia. The National Education Standards of Indonesia (BSNP) had regulated through Government Regulation (PP) No. 19 Year 2005 and set eight contents of the Standards of Education
("national curriculum of Indonesia and its changes," n.d.). In 2006 the KTSP curriculum was introduced with the intention of curriculum change in the context of regional autonomy and decentralization of education programmed by the government of Indonesia. In 2013 a new curriculum was born as “an answer to the numerous deficiencies in the previous education in particular and the shortcomings in various areas of life in general (Nugraheni, 2015, p. 56). This new curriculum, Curriculum 2013, was for the purpose of applying educational standards and creating competency standards for graduating students. However, according to Nugraheni (2015) in his article, *Controversy a Policy Change in the Curriculum in Indonesian in Terms of the Point of View of Indonesian Language Subject*, the Curriculum 2013’s implementation has not been effective because the concept is being presented to schools and teachers in varying manners, without consistency, without utilization of textbooks, and without funding for the curriculum. Constant educational policy changes without training for implementation and lack of funding make it difficult for Indonesian teachers.

How well are teachers prepared for their profession, specifically those teaching English? What type of support and professional development is provided for Indonesian teachers? Herlina Wati (2011) seeks to answer these questions in her study, *The Effectiveness of Indonesian English Teachers Training Programs in Improving Confidence and Motivation*. In this study she stated, “Nowadays the demand for a qualified English teacher has becoming [sic] a serious problem in educational sector since there is unsuccessful educational development. Some teachers even do not know how to teach English well” (p. 82). Wati’s study involved elementary and secondary teachers of the Rokan Hulu District. These teachers attended an English teacher training suggested by the Local Education Official. This training was short term,
(seven to ten days) and aimed at giving basic knowledge and understanding of teaching English, English curriculum, and English methodology to teachers to prepare them to teach English and to have official elementary school teaching certificates. Most of these teachers had very little experience or no direct contact with proficient English speakers in a professional context. In her conclusion Wati (2011) stated,

The findings of this study have answered the research question that the effectiveness of English teacher training program in Rokan Hulu District was high in terms of improving teachers’ confidence and motivation. But in terms of improving basic English knowledge as the most important aspect for being effective EFL teachers, was still not effective yet (p. 99).

Other research, and my own personal observations, support these findings. Elementary English teachers in Indonesia follow two basic educational tracts, either that of Primary School Teacher Education (PSTE), or the English Language Education Program (Zein, 2015). “The graduates of PSTE will have acquired knowledge and skills related to teaching young learners, approaches and methods of teaching, educational philosophies, teaching practicum, testing and assessment, but their exposure to English is limited” (Zein, 2015, p. 105). Those graduating from the English Language Education Program will have acquired strong English language proficiency, but it is not a program designed for teaching English at an elementary level (Zein, 2015). In his study, *Preparing Elementary English Teachers: Innovations at Pre-service Level*, author Mochamad Zein (2015) stated that the main issue with elementary school English teaching in Indonesia is a huge shortage of competent and qualified English teachers. These teachers not only have limited English proficiency, but also have limited skills in pronunciation, spelling, use
of technology in language teaching, and classroom management. He concluded that the root of the problem could be traced back to the role of pre-service education in the professional development of English teachers at the elementary level. His study, done through semi-structured interviews, using two groups of teachers, those who had no tertiary English qualification, and those who had tertiary English qualifications, resulted in suggestions for redesigning pre-service curricula, specific preparation for elementary English teachers, and training for teacher educators (Zein, 2015).

Defining and Analyzing English Language Instruction Methods and Terminology

English language instruction uses many different methods. These methods have their own terminology which can be confusing to those unfamiliar with Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). The following section identifies, defines, and describes several common methods and the terminology used, and how they function in English language instruction. Studies which use these methods and terminology are reviewed and language instruction effectiveness analyzed.

**Bilingual education.** Bilingual education refers to instruction in two languages. Typically, bilingual education is offered in the societal language and in another language (often English) ("Types of programs," n.d.).

**Transitional bilingual education.** Transitional Bilingual Education is offered to English Language Learners (ELLs) in the elementary grades. Students receive some amount of native language instruction so they do not fall behind as they are acquiring English. Once they exit the program they are placed in all-English immersion programs. Late exit bilingual programs provide a more gradual transition into all English programs. Students learn literacy and content
areas in their native language as they are taught ESL ("Types of programs," n.d.). The goal is to eventually be placed in all-English classrooms and no longer need bilingual education services.

**Dual language education.** “In dual language (DL) programs, children from two different language backgrounds are integrated with the goals of developing bilingualism and biliteracy in the target languages. Because at different points throughout the day, students in DL programs are immersed in a language in which they may not yet be proficient, the role of the DL teacher is particularly complex and challenging” (Gort & Pontier, 2013, p. 223). Instruction is presented in two languages, usually English and the native language of the ELLs. Ideally one teacher should be fluent in both languages, although that is not always necessary. A second option is using a pair of teachers, each speaking one of the languages. Within the dual language model are one-way and two-way language education programs. In the one-way program only one language group is being schooled through two languages, most commonly the native language and English. Two-way dual language programs have students from both languages learning together in the classroom. “Two way programs have the demographics to invite native-English-speaking students to join their bi-lingual and ELL peers in an integrated bilingual classroom” (Collier & Thomas, 2004, p. 3). Authors Collier & Thomas (2004) are strong proponents of the dual language model. In their article, *The Astounding Effectiveness of Dual Language Education for All*, Collier and Thomas define the model in the following way.

In contrast to remedial programs that offer “watered down” instruction in a “special” curriculum focused on one small step at a time, dual language enrichment models are the curricular mainstream taught through two languages....With no translation and no
repeated lessons in the other language, separation of the two languages is a key component of this model (p2).

Based on research conducted in 23 large and small school districts from 15 states in the United States, spanning the time frame from 1985-2004, Collier & Thomas (2004) analyzed the long-term databases collected by school districts in all regions of the U.S. during these 18 years. This large sample size allowed analysis of over 2 million student records collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. They focused on research findings from program evaluations of one-way and two-way dual language programs. Their findings showed that dual language programs “reach much higher achievement levels than transitional bilingual programs because primary language grade-level schooling is continued for more years in dual language programs, and this is the key to accelerated growth in English in the long term” (p. 15). It is important to note, however, this research was done only in the United States in the context of the U.S. public school system ESL educational model. The implications of these findings, however, are relevant for understanding other language educational programs in schools around the world. Other studies have addressed the issues of language use and choices in bilingual education. Authors Gort & Pointer (2013) presented an analysis of dual language (DL) preschool teachers and how they chose to mediate their bilingual interactions. The study took place in two preschool classrooms with a Spanish/English DL program in a multilingual and multicultural community in the southeastern United States. Their findings, which contradicted Collier & Thomas’s promotion of the separation of the two languages, stated,

Our findings corroborate previous research that suggest that a strict language separation approach, as traditionally implemented in DL programs, may be at odds with
the natural social interactions of bilinguals, who typically draw on a number of communicative strategies, including translating, to construct meaning. Findings support the notion that the integration of two languages can be a useful pedagogic practice in promoting the DL development of emergent bilinguals (p. 240).

**Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL).** CLIL is defined by researchers in varying ways. Dr. Yuen Yi Lo (2014) of the University of Hong Kong stated in her research, *How much L1 is too much? Teachers’ language use in response to students’ abilities and classroom interaction in Content and Language Integrated Learning*, “Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is defined as an education approach in which various language-supportive methodologies are used which lead to dual-focused form of instruction where attention is given both to the language and the content” (p. 270). Using a more expanded context is the definition by author Tarja Nikula (2007) who stated, “Instead of being a clearly defined education model, CLIL can be regarded as an umbrella term referring to a wide range of different ways to use a foreign language as a medium of instruction” (p. 208). The term itself, however, implies both content and language instruction, not simply using the foreign language as a medium of instruction. With CLIL comes the “questions of educational policy and issues relating to teacher qualifications, suitable teaching materials, and the impact of CLIL on subject matter mastery and mother tongue development” (Nikula, 2007, p. 206). All of these questions are relevant to bilingual education in Indonesia. Nikula’s research of CLIL in Finnish schools focused on social and interpersonal aspects of language use as opposed to the formal aspects of English used by the student and teacher. Her article, *Speaking English in Finnish content-
based classrooms, described her findings in lessons in biology and physics, given in English to Finnish speaking students. She concluded,

When there is no explicit focus on students’ language skills, they seem to use English quite willingly. This does not mean the CLIL could replace formal language teaching in schools, On the contrary, it is probably the high level of Finnish EFL education that makes it possible for students to participate in CLIL instruction at the level of fluency evident in the data studied.....CLIL contexts create opportunities to combine foreign language use with subject learning, hence providing a different perspective on what it means to know a foreign language (p. 221).

Nukila’s (2007) observation that it was the probable high English proficiency level of her Finnish students which made the CLIL model effective is supported by a study done by Dr. Yeun Yi Lo (2015). Dr. Lo researched CLIL classrooms in five secondary schools in Hong Kong. Within these classroom the English proficiency levels varied greatly. After observing twelve teachers teaching content subjects for 20 different sessions, data was analyzed for the proportion of L1 and L2 use by both the teachers and the students. Dr. Lo then stated, “Many students do not reach the threshold level of English proficiency to benefit from the programmes. Consequently, while they enjoy certain benefits in L2 learning, they may lag behind in academic and cognitive development, when compared with their peers learning through the first language” (p. 271).

Other literature on the subject of CLIL and its effectiveness state similar findings. (Wannagat, 2007; Gan, 2013; Nikula, 2007; Owu-Ewie & Eshun, 2015).

**English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI).** While under the umbrella of CLIL, EMI focuses on content instruction. Author Ulrich Wannagat (2007) stated,
Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and learning through English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) both share the same pedagogical objective: they aim to improve students’ L2 proficiency by teaching subject matter through L2. They show, however, significant differences in their conceptual and actual realization (p. 663).

Wannagat (2007) conducted research into immersion education in Germany and Hong Kong. The German model was that of CLIL, while the Hong Kong school context was an EMI system. Wannagat then focused on the following research question, “In which ways do the variables teacher-talk, student-talk and code switching affect learning processes in a CLIL and EMI setting” (p. 667)? He concluded,

The experience of the Hong Kong EMI system demonstrates that only exposure is not sufficient. Students learning in the EMI context are exposed to L2 in most content subjects. Even when we consider that only 50% of classroom discourse may be conducted in L2 due to a mixed-code tradition, the exposure to L2 is much higher than in the German CLIL system where only two to three content subjects are taught through L2. An explanation, why the CLIL example seems to be more successful can be found in SLA theories that refer to the constructive processes of learning....It seems that an advantage of learning in the CLIL context is the increased opportunity for learners to develop their constructive abilities in L2 (p. 678).

It is interesting to note that at the time of this study, done in 2007, EMI use in the Hong Kong secondary schools had dropped dramatically. During the colonial British rule in Hong Kong, over 90% of secondary school students there received their education in English-medium schools. In contrast, with the return of sovereignty to China in 1997, mother-tongue education
was strongly promoted. Since 1998 only about 20% of Hong Kong secondary schools have been permitted to use English as a medium of instruction (Wannagat, 2007). This change of educational policy has implications toward the English proficiency level of the Chinese students and language use in the classrooms.

According to Wannagat (2007) the CLIL approach recognizes language learning as part of the general learning process and provides a planned approach to language and content, while the EMI approach may take language issues into account but does not consistently plan for them and language issues are largely ignored in curriculum development and teacher training.

Some countries, such as Ghana, face the situation of having English as the national language (L1), yet there are many Ghanaian languages. The conflict then arises as to which language should be the language of education. “Most multilingual nations have adopted bilingual education systems that recognize the child’s native language and a second language, which in most cases is the official language of the nation. Ghana, like many African countries has a problem selecting a language for education and ensuring its successful implementation because of her own multilingual nature” (Owu-Ewie & Eshun, 2015, p. 72). Charles Owu-Ewie & Emma Eshun (2015) addressed the issue of the use of EMI in their research, *The Use of English as a Medium of Instruction at the Upper Basic Level in Ghana: From Theory to Practice*. Their findings indicated that while the government has instituted an official language policy, “most teachers disregard the language policy and do what they think is appropriate to them in the classroom. Teachers use English where the policy states that Ghanaian language should be used and do the contrary when they are to use English as the medium of instruction” (p. 73). The data from their observation indicated that there was no single classroom in the schools
participating in the study which used English as the sole medium of instruction, and in most cases the Ghanaian language use was more frequent despite the fact that English was supposed to be the language of instruction (Owu-Ewie & Eshun, 2015).

It was identified that in theory, Ghana has a language policy that uses English as a medium of instruction from Primary Four (P4) to JHS and beyond, but in practice, this language policy of education is violated....The main reason found to be the cause of the present situation is the students’ lack of proficiency in the use of English in the classroom (Owu-Ewie & Eshun, 2015, p. 81).

**Codeswitching**

Codeswitching (CS), or translanguaging, can be defined as the systematic altering use of two languages within a single conversation or utterance and is a characteristic feature of bilinguals’ speech. Codeswitching has been shown to serve both discourse functions and participant-related functions (Lo, 2014). The practice of codeswitching raises many questions among researchers. Under what circumstances is it used? How often is it done? What is the language proficiency level of those using it? What are the expectations of both students and teachers? Is it beneficial or harmful to the learning of the target language? These are just a few of the questions raised and researched in the last decades.

Some of the studies targeted codeswitching in content based classrooms using the target language as the medium of instruction and others specifically targeted codeswitching in English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms.

**Content based classrooms.** Tension exists between policy makers and educators on the role of translanguaging. Teachers that are instructed to use a target language, such as English,
as the medium of instruction for content based classes such as mathematics and science are often left needing to switch languages due to the language proficiency levels of their students, or even themselves. In fact, the clash between what happens in practice at the classroom level, and the policies imposed from policy makers has led to many conflicts and tensions in the way codeswitching in the classroom is perceived (Wei & Martin, 2009). In Wei & Martin’s (2009) article, *Conflicts and Tensions in Classroom Codeswitching: An Introduction*, the authors stated, 

Whereas codeswitching in community contexts is regarded as acceptable bilingual talk, in many classroom contexts codeswitching is deemed inappropriate or unacceptable, and as a deficit or dysfunctional mode of interaction. So much so that codeswitching is often ‘prohibited’ (p. 117).

One study, done in the Kelantan State of Malaysia, focused specifically on codeswitching in mathematics classrooms. In Malaysia, the implementation of the Teaching and Learning of Science and Mathematics in English, or better known as the PPSMI, set the policy that the medium of instruction of math and science in national primary schools is to be English, a language which is not the mother tongue of the majority of the students. Although the Malaysian teachers comply with the official language policy, the students’ first languages are still used, leading to codeswitching in the classroom (Neo & Heng, 2012). Neo & Heng (2012) who conducted the study used classroom observations and interviews to focus on the teachers’ bilingual utterances, especially the moment and way they used translanguaging for cognitive, conversation, social, and managerial purposes. Sixteen classes from two types of primary schools, rural and urban, participated in this study. Standard 2 (grade 2) and Standard 5 (grade 5) were observed. Within each grade level a “good” class was chosen and a “weak” class was
chosen, indicating students’ performance levels. At the end of the study the authors concluded that “the types of classes (good vs weak) and the level of classes (Standard 5 vs Standard 2) are two important factors that would be considered by the school mathematics teachers while resorting to L1 in mathematics teaching” (p. 648).

A second study was conducted in an English medium school in South Africa. The participants were 9th graders whose L1 was predominately Zulu. The study was published in the International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism under the title, Codeswitching in the Multilingual English First Language Classroom. Focusing on the role of codeswitching, the author, Moodley (2007), explored the languages of English learners during group work in the language, literacy and communication: English (LLCE classroom). Moodley (2007) proposed that “the strategic use of codeswitching (CS) in the classroom will not only foster multilingualism..., but also promote the acquisition of English as a first language” (708). In Moodley’s (2007) concluding remarks he stated,

The findings show that CS during group work in the classroom is a natural phenomenon that occurs in the speech patterns of those who have the linguistic repertoire to do so...More specifically, the strategic use of CS contributes to the achievement of the various outcomes of LLCE (p. 718).

EFL classrooms. Research from Kuwait, to Bangladesh, to Turkey to China have focused on codeswitching in EFL classrooms. Literature reviewed in this paper examines CS in terms of function, contributing factors, perception, and frequency.

In their article, English Teachers’ Use of Learners’ L1 (Arabic) in College Classrooms in Kuwait, authors Alrbah, Wu, Abdullah & Aldaihani (2016) documented their study which
observed teachers’ use of their students’ first language (Arabic) during English language lessons in Kuwait. The authors investigated in which context L1 might be used. “For example, L1 could be used to check for comprehension, give instructions, organize tasks, maintain discipline, build rapport and explain difficult lexical items and grammatical rules and concepts” (p. 2). Collecting data from five colleges in Kuwait, the researchers recorded over 15 hours of teacher interviews collected over a two month period. The results showed several functions for which L1 was employed in the classrooms. These included: (a) as a teaching tool to explain difficult words, (b) to make comparisons between L1 and L2, (c) for classroom management functions, (d) class discipline, and (e) taking attendance (Alrabah, Wu, Alotaibi, & Aldaihani, 2015). A second aim of the study was to discover the factors that contributed to the EFL college-level teachers’ use of L1. These factors included students’ display of anxiety, fear and frustration for not being able to follow what the teacher was saying in English, having a language in common with their students, thereby enabling them to identify better with their students, and the language proficiency of their students.

Another EFL codeswitching study was conducted in Bangladesh by researchers Mirza, Mahmud & Jabbar (2012). Their article, Use of Other Languages in English Language Teaching at Tertiary Level: A Case Study on Bangladesh, stated, “The objective of the research is to find out if Bangla is used in the English language teaching class. If used, to what extent and in which situation is it used. The study also wanted to discover whether the use of Bangla facilitates the learning of English in the context of Bangladesh” (p. 73). Class observation, unstructured interviews, and a questionnaire were the tools used to collect data.
From the class observation it was found out that the teachers often use L1 in the class especially to discuss difficult grammatical items, to explain meanings of unknown words, and to give instructions... From the interviews, it was discovered that they use Bangla to explain difficult English words because this saves the learners from being confused...

From the questionnaire, class observation and teachers’ interview, it is evident that teachers of tertiary level in Bangladesh use Bangla in teaching English (Golam Hoshain Mirza, Mahmud, & Jabbar, 2012, p. 75).

Many EFL classrooms maintain an English Only policy. There is much controversy surrounding this approach, and while it may often be the official language policy in theory, the realities in the classroom are far different. “In literature on bilingual teaching, different perspectives exist for and against the use of first language (L1) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. Numerous studies have been conducted on this topic, but no clear consensus exists on whether L1 should be banned or its inclusion in EFL classrooms should be allowed” (#6, p. 148). Researches Debreli & Oyman (2016) in their article, *Students’ Preference on the Use of Mother Tongue in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms: Is it the Time to Re-examine English-only Policies?* examined student’s perceptions toward L1 use in relation to their proficiency in L2. Using the research question, “Regarding the proficiency level of the students and their past experiences in learning English, what are the students’ perceptions toward the use of Turkish in their EFL classrooms?” (p. 150). They then collected data in Northern Cyprus through questionnaires. They concluded the following:

This study investigated EFL students’ perceptions toward using L1 in their English classrooms and revealed that their educational background and English proficiency level
impacted their perceptions. This study found that the majority of the students preferred L1 to be used in their English classrooms (Debreli & Oyman, 2015, p. 158).

A final study was done in English major courses in Chinese universities. Authors Van Der Meij & Zhao (2010) conducted extensive research into the frequency of teacher codeswitching, making a distinction between believed practice and actual practice. In their article, *Codeswitching in English Courses in Chinese Universities*, the authors detailed their research. Research questions included teachers’ views on codeswitching, students’ views on codeswitching, and accurate perceptions of CS use. Forty teachers from two Chinese universities filled out the Teacher Codeswitching Questionnaire. Four hundred and fifty students from ten classrooms responded to the Student Codeswitching Questionnaire. Eight lessons were then recorded and all moments of codeswitching timed and classified. Van Der Meiji & Zhao (2010) recorded the following results:

The teachers’ opinion was one of satisfaction with current practices. They felt they were switching back and forth between language with just the right frequency and for just the right amount of time…Students perceived codeswitching as being more frequent and longer in duration than did the teachers. On top of these already higher estimates, they expressed a desire for more…Another noteworthy finding in our study is the teachers’ lack of accuracy. Teachers seriously underestimated the use of codeswitching, a point that has also been made by other researchers (p. 405-407).

**Literature Review Conclusion**

English language instruction varies in both theory and practice. The literature highlights researchers’ study of English language instruction in varying contexts and factors which
contribute to effective EFL learning. Several themes found within this literature are: (a) teacher training and development and its relationship to English language instruction, (b) models of English language instruction and the nature of bilingual dual language (DL), CLIL, and EMI classrooms, and (c) the context and use of codewitching in the classroom. While extensive research has been done on English language teacher training, types of English language instruction classrooms, and codeswitching in various contexts, my research specifically addresses the use of translanguaging in a bilingual school in Indonesia and how English is used by teachers and students in both EMI content classrooms and EFL classrooms in that school. With the continual reforms in the Indonesian educational curriculum and the growing emphasis in Indonesia on English proficiency in order to compete globally, this research can contribute to the development of effective practices for English language instruction in Indonesia.
Chapter II: Methodology

Research Design

This is qualitative research aimed at examining the use of English and Indonesian language by both students and teachers in a bilingual school in Indonesia. Purposeful sampling was used in the selection of individuals and the site in order to provide an “information rich” environment (Creswell, 2015). The research was designed as a case study, defined by Creswell (2015) as “an in-depth exploration of a bounded system (e.g. activity, event, process or individuals) based on extensive data collection. Bounded means that the case is separated out for research in terms of time, place, or some physical boundaries” (p. 465).

Setting

This study was conducted in the city of Malang in East Java, Indonesia. The school selected had an elementary and high school campus. The mission of the school is that “all students learn to speak, read, listen and write in English so that they will have access to the global language” (“Charis National Academy: Shaping future leaders,” n.d.). The school is considered a bilingual school as it teaches academic content in both English and the native language of Indonesian, locally known as “Bahasa Indonesia”. Research was done in grades four, five and six in the content classrooms using English as a medium of instruction, as well as EFL classrooms.

Participants

The first group of participants in this research were Indonesian students (both male and female) in grades four, five and six. They were selected for observation due to their participation in content classrooms which used English as a medium of instruction, as well as
two EFL classrooms. Consent forms, translated into Indonesian, were issued to both the students and their parents. The second group of participants were seven Indonesian teachers (both male and female) of fourth, fifth, and sixth grades. The process of recruitment came through an email from the elementary school principal requesting voluntary participation in the study. All teachers were native Indonesian speakers using both English and Indonesian for classroom instruction. Two fourth grade teachers were observed teaching social studies and math classes and an EFL class. Two fifth grade teachers were observed teaching Bible, math and science classes. And three sixth grade teachers were observed teaching social studies, Bible and math classes and an EFL class.

Data Collection

Data collection procedure. The data were collected through class observation. Sixteen classroom teaching periods, each lasting approximately 40 minutes, were observed over the course of four days. Fourteen of the classes were content classes in the following subjects: Bible, social studies, math, and science. These subjects were chosen because they were designated as classes to be taught through the medium of English. The last two classes observed were specifically English language classes. Data were collected using two methods, an observation tool and video recording. Two researchers collected data in each classroom setting, each using the same observation tool, in order to increase reliability. Results were later compared for accuracy. Both sets of the observation tool were compared to validate the data being analyzed. Accuracy could also be checked through examination of the video recording. The researchers sat in the back of the classroom with the video camera stationary on a tripod so as to cause the least amount of disruption possible. The video material was later reviewed.
It was able to contribute to the findings of the study in two ways. The duration of the English responses used became clear on the video. The observation tool was unable to differentiate between English responses of short duration, such as English numerals or short phrases, and more complex sentences. Video documentation was used to contribute to that observation. Secondly, the video was able to show clearly the pattern of the student-teacher language relationship. This involved the language choice of the teachers, either English or Bahasa Indonesia, and the corresponding language choice of the students in relationship to the teachers’ choice.

Some of the teachers, although not all, had been told by the administration that researchers would be in their rooms. The teachers had all, however, signed consent forms to allow researchers to observe their classrooms. Before observation of each class, permission was always asked of the teacher to video record the class session. We found that the teachers did not know the purpose of our presence or what our research entailed. In an attempt to maintain the “normalcy” of the classroom, and not affect the teachers’ or students’ language use, we did not inform the teachers of the purpose of our research until the research had been conducted.

**Data collection instrument.** In this study, the observation form was the main instrument for data collection. This form (see appendix) was comprised of two sections, one for observation of students and one for observation of teachers. The form was divided into time increments, with each section representing one minute of time. Teacher data were recorded according to language used (English or Indonesian), and context of language use (content instruction, language instruction, giving directions, classroom management, clarification). Student data were also recorded according to language use (English or Indonesian) and context
of language use (social, response, clarification, group work). Using a stopwatch, two researchers recorded English and Indonesian language use by the students and teachers in one minute increments. A new observation form was used for each classroom observation session and labeled with the date, time, grade, subject, teacher and researcher. A video camera was also used to record the class sessions for comparison purposes.

**Data analysis.** The data obtained from the observation form were then given a preliminary exploratory analysis. As suggested by Creswell (2015) the observation forms were read in their entirety several times, notes and memos were written with initial thoughts and observations, and a sense of the whole was reflected upon and recorded. Data were analyzed and categorized in many different formats. The aim was to determine how teachers used language, both English and Indonesian in the classroom setting. Language use was categorized by function and then subcategorized by subject. Classroom observation, using the observation tool created by the researchers, was the primary source of this information. From there a coding process was used to make sense of the data, dividing it into themes that became evident as the material was analyzed. Those themes were (a) giving directions, (b) classroom management, (c) content instruction, and (d) language. The data were first broken into two headings: teachers’ language use and students’ language use. Looking first at teachers’ language use, the information was coded first by the function. The functions consisted of instruction, and (e) clarification. Each function was then categorized by teacher to analyze the language use of each teacher, across all of their subjects taught, in each function. Each teacher’s classes were analyzed according to how many instances they spoke in English and how many instances they spoke in Indonesian. The data were able to provide information on
each individual teacher’s language use and in what function they used that language. The same
data were then reconstructed to be analyzed by subject. Within each subject, the functions
were categorized and the language use for each function recorded. The data were able to
provided information on each academic subject and the language use within that subject
according to the function. The second heading, that of students’ language use, was categorized
according to function. These function were: (a) student response, (b) student socialization, and
(c) student clarification. Data were collected recording student language use, first according to
function, and then according to teacher. This information enabled the researcher to see
student’s language use, according to function, within each teacher’s classroom. The data were
then analyzed a second time, according to function, within each academic subject. This allowed
the researcher to see student’s language use in each function within each academic subject
Each specific use of language (English or Indonesian) by both teachers and students was
categorized and patterns of language use emerged. Results of the observation data were
charted according to these patterns.

Methodology Conclusion

Care was taken throughout the preparation and gathering of research to ensure validity,
reliability, and consistency. Permission was acquired from all subjects involved, data was
obtained by two individual researchers and compared for accuracy, and classroom sessions
were video recorded should further data be required. Analysis of data was done both by hand
and through the excel computer program to ensure accuracy. Information was then
categorized, summarized, and placed in graphs to display the findings in the following section.
Chapter III: Findings

The findings of this study were guided by the following research question and the accompanying sub questions.

How are English and Indonesian used in English speaking classrooms in a bilingual school in Indonesia?

- What language is used by teachers and for what purpose?
- What language is used by students and for what purpose?
- In what circumstances do students and teachers code switch?

Demographic Information of Teachers Used in this Study

Seven teachers voluntarily participated in this study. They were both male and female. Each of them was a native Indonesian speaker and spoke English as a foreign language. Time spent in classroom observation and conversation with the teachers indicated a variance in English proficiency levels among the teachers. The teachers taught various subjects and grade levels as seen on the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>4A, 4B,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4A, 4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>6B6A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5A, 5B,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>6A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>6A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>5B5B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>6B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Information of Students Used in this Study

Students who participated in this study were in grade levels 4, 5, or 6. They were both male and female. Time spent in classroom observation and conversation with the students indicated a variance in English proficiency levels among the students. A sampling of students was taken from each of the three grade levels (4, 5, 6) to indicate the amount of time the students had been enrolled at this bilingual school. The information is provided on the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years Attended</th>
<th>Total of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sampling indicates that the majority of students in these grades are not recent arrivals to the school, but have been in the school 3.5 or more years. The elementary school principal confirmed that this sampling is a good representation of the students as a whole.
Teachers’ Use of Language

The aim of these findings was to determine the purposes for which teachers used language, both English and Indonesian, in the classroom setting. Data were collected for teachers’ language use in (a) giving directions, (b) classroom management, (c) content instruction, (d) English language instruction, and (e) clarification of information. Language use was categorized by function and then subcategorized by subject. Data were analyzed and coded. Classroom observation, using the observation tool created by the researchers, was the primary source of this information. Video was also used to record the classroom sessions.

Following are the various language functions observed: giving directions, classroom management, content instruction, language instruction, and clarification.

Giving directions. This section of data documented the teachers’ use of language while giving directions. These directions included commands such as, “Take out your books and notebooks” or, “Copy down the notes from the board.” The amount of times these commands were spoken in English in comparison to the amount of time directions were given on a whole was analyzed. Each class/subject was looked at individually, and the subject as a whole was analyzed. Findings indicated that in every subject (except for one individual Bible class) directions were given to the students overwhelmingly in English. When averaging the English use while giving directions in all Bible classes, directions were given in English 74% of the time, although individual classes varied. In EFL classes, directions were given in English 100% of the time. When averaging the English use while giving directions in math classes, directions were given in English 79% of the time and in science class directions were given in English 84% of the time. Lastly, when averaging the English use while giving directions in social studies classes,
directions were given in English 90% of the time. The data showed that, as a whole, across all subjects involved, teachers gave directions in English 84% of the time. The following chart displays this information.

**Classroom management.** This section of data documented the teachers’ use of language for classroom management. Classroom management included phrases such as, “You need to stop talking” or, “Pay attention.” These injunctions could have been directed at individuals or the class as a whole. The number of times these commands were spoken in English, in comparison to the number of times management phrases were issued as a whole, was analyzed. Each class/subject was looked at individually, and the academic subject as a whole was analyzed. Findings indicated that while EFL displayed a 100% use of English for classroom management language, other subjects varied in the dominant language. Only one
Bible class used English as the primary means to communicate with the students in this function. The rest of the Bible classes primarily used Indonesian. When using language for classroom management, Bible classes used English only 41% of the time, and Indonesian 59% of the time. While there were several math classes that indicated no use of classroom management language during the class period, the use of management language in math was primarily English. Indonesian was only used 13% of the time. Only one science class used classroom management language, showing a ratio of 50% English and 50% Indonesian. Lastly, in social studies, classroom management language was conducted in English 92% of the time, leaving only 8% in Indonesian. In the final conclusion, findings show that English was the primary language used by teachers for classroom management. The following chart displays this information.
**Content instruction.** This section of data documented the teachers’ use of language for content instruction. This instruction related to the academic subject of the class (e.g. science, math, social studies). Findings showed that the amount of English related to the amount of Indonesian used in content instruction varied from subject to subject. In Bible class, language use in the area of content instruction was fairly evenly divided between English and Indonesian. Bible content instruction was conducted 53% of the time in English and 47% of the time in Indonesian. Math content instruction was conducted in English 66% of the time and Indonesian 33% of the time. Science displayed a high percentage of content instruction in English, that of 77%, yet it must be noted that in the classes observed, a video filmed in English was used for content instruction. The video lasted for six minutes. On the observation form this was recorded as English instruction, however it was not instruction that was spoken directly by the teacher. Lastly, social studies content instruction was conducted 51% of the time in English and 49% of the time in Indonesian. As an average (all subjects included), teachers taught in English 65% of the time. It must be noted, however, that this average included the EFL classes in which English was used 100% of the time. The following chart displays this information.
English language instruction. While we, as researchers, had the intent of observing each class period for both content instruction and English language instruction, we discovered English language instruction occurred primarily in the EFL classes. While content instruction teachers may have occasionally been involved in language instruction by such practices as introducing new vocabulary in English that was relevant to their lesson, their focus was on teaching the content, not teaching the English language. During informal interviews with the teachers, content teachers commented that they did not consider English language instruction as part of their role, and indicated they preferred to leave that to the EFL teachers. Because of this, our data concerning English language instruction is only drawn from the two EFL classes observed. As the chart indicates, all (100%) English language instruction was done in English.
Teacher clarification. This section of data documented the teachers’ use of language for teacher clarification. Teacher clarification refers to language use by teachers in communicating with students, either individually or as a class, for the purpose of clarifying or explaining information, both content information and information pertaining to directions and assignments. In the case of a student needing additional help, needing further instruction, needing clarification of information, or any type of communication with the teacher asking for clarification concerning content, directions, or classroom management, the language used by the teacher in response was recorded. The findings show that, except for the case of the EFL classes, teachers preferred to use their native language of Indonesian to speak with the students in this context. In Bible classes the teachers clarified information in English only 31% of the time, while they spoke in Indonesian 69% of the time. In math, English was used only
41% of the time and Indonesian 59%. Science displayed English language use by teachers clarifying information at only a 25% rate, while Indonesian was used 75% of the time. Lastly, social studies continued the trend of heavy use of Indonesian with teachers clarifying information using the English language only 25% of the time. Overall, the study showed that Indonesian was used at a much higher rate by the teachers in all different subject areas (except EFL) when needing to clarify information. The findings are shown on the graph below.

In summary, these charts give us a clear picture of the teachers’ choice of language for different purposes within the classroom period. English was chosen most often for the purposes of giving directions and classroom management. Content instruction was conducted in both English and Indonesian at a fairly even ratio, and Indonesian was the primary language...
of choice when teachers were explaining and clarifying information. We next examine the students’ use of language within the classroom.

**Students’ Use of Language**

The aim of these findings was to determine the purposes for which students used language, both English and Indonesian, in the classroom setting. Data were collected for students’ language use in (a) responding to the teacher, (b) asking for clarification from the teacher or clarifying information with another student, and (c) social conversation with other students or the teacher. Language use was categorized by function and then subcategorized by subject. Classroom observation, using the observation tool created by the researchers, was the primary source of this information.

**Student response.** In this section, data was obtained from the observation tool and analyzed to make calculations concerning student response. Student response specifically represented language spoken by the student in response to the teacher’s questions, any type of class discussion concerning academic content, and any reading aloud done by the students. Responses took the form of single words, short phrases, answers to display questions, vocabulary words, numerals, and read-aloud passages. Findings indicate that Bible had the lowest quantity of English language use by students for this language function. In responding during Bible class, students used English only 33% of the time, corresponding with using Indonesian 77% of the time. Once again, EFL classes demonstrated almost exclusive use of English, although Indonesian was used occasionally by the students for providing responses. Math had the highest use of English in student response (except for EFL), showing a 68% use of English. It can be noted, however, that many of the students’ responses were done in numeral
form, using English numbers for answers. The two science classes observed showed remarkably different findings. One class displayed students’ use of English occurring only 19% of the time. The other science class showed students’ use of English at 100%. It should be noted, however, that in the specific science period showing English at 100%, there were only two student responses during the entire forty minute class period. Both classes were taught by the same teacher, yet the amount of student interaction was vastly different. The class in which students responded only 19% of the time in English had a total of 17 responses in Indonesian, indicating a fairly high level of discussion. This stands in contrast to the class in which only two student responses were given. Lastly social studies displayed that students responded in English 40% of the time. Taking all classes into consideration, students respond in English 53% of the time and Indonesian 47% of the time. The following graph displays that information.
**Student clarification.** In this section, data was obtained from the observation tool and analyzed to make calculations concerning student clarification. Student clarification refers to language use by students in communicating with the teacher or another student for the purpose of clarifying information. In the case of a student needing additional help, needing further instruction, needing clarification of information, or any type of communication with the teacher or another student asking for clarification concerning content, directions, or classroom management, the language used by the student was recorded. Findings from this data were very revealing as they showed that students seem to be much more comfortable asking for help and clarification in their own native language. Bible classes showed English use at a mere 8%, meaning Indonesian was used 92% of the time for this function. EFL, which, up until this point, had an almost 100% English use, dropped to only a 44% English use. Math showed the English language being used only 10% of the time. During the two science classes, even though students asked for clarification on 23 different occasions, findings showed a startling 0% of English being used by students during these interactions. Lastly, social studies displayed English being used only 14% of the time. When needing to clarify information, students overwhelmingly chose their native language. The chart below displays these findings.
Student social conversation. In this section, data was obtained from the observation tool and analyzed to make calculations concerning student socialization. Student social conversation refers to the language use by students during conversation with other students (or the teacher). This conversation was for the purpose of socializing as opposed to discussion of academic content, the need for clarification, or responding to questions posed by the teacher. Findings showed that students almost exclusively used their native language to socialize with one another. Only in one EFL class and one social studies class was English used by the students, and even that with minimal occurrence. On the average, across all academic classrooms, students chose to use the Indonesian language in which to socialize 98% of the
Cumulative Classroom Language Use

The findings above represent language data collected and analyzed according to specific academic subjects and specific classroom functions. Of interest to me, after hours of observation, was to note how much English was used in all of the cumulative classes in relation to the amount of Indonesian language used. Along with that was an interest in a pattern I observed concerning the timing of the language use within the classroom period. To find the information I totaled the instances of English used (by both teachers and students) in all sixteen classes observed, as well as the total amount of Indonesian used (by both teachers and students). I then plotted those figures according to the minutes in the classroom period. I chose to end the period at 35 minutes, although some of the classes extended slightly longer. The
data confirmed my observation that the quantity of English spoken at the beginning of the class was higher, and as the class period progressed, Indonesian language use became more predominant. The chart below displays this data. One can also see that, with the exception of minutes 12-18, the more one language was spoken, the less the other was used.

![Cumulative Classroom Language Use By Minute](image)

**Teacher-Student Language Comparison**

Another piece of information I analyzed was that of the teacher-student language comparison. What was the quantity of English language used by the teachers? By the students? How did those two figures compare with each other? Using raw data, I calculated the total occurrences of English use across all 16 classrooms by all teachers. I then found the percentage of English use by dividing that data by all language spoken, both English and Indonesian, throughout the 16 class periods. Using the same parameters, I calculated the percentage of English use by the students. The findings below show an interesting statistic. Even though the
classrooms were to be conducted in English as part of a bilingual program, the teachers only spoke in English 63% of the time. Students only used English 26% of the time, relying far more on their native Indonesian language. These figures include the EFL classes which had a very high rate of English spoken by both teachers and students. If the EFL classes were extracted from the data and only content classes were analyzed, the amount of English use dropped to 60% by teachers and 19% by students, as seen in the second chart. Data confirms that the amount of English spoken by the students in their EMI content classes was minimal.
Translanguaging or code-switching is the use of two languages in a single conversation. Part of this research was to discover under what circumstances this occurred. Findings from the charts above and personal observations in the classrooms have highlighted patterns of code-switching in the context of this research. Both teachers and students used translanguaging.

The data shows that teachers reverted to their native Indonesian language more often when needing to clarify information to the students. My personal observations also noted a trend in teachers’ language use, that of teachers beginning the content instruction of the lesson in English, but as the lesson introduced new materials, or became more in-depth, the teachers switched to Indonesian. I questioned the teachers informally about this trend and they indicated that they felt the need to switch languages to ensure the students understood the materials and were prepared for the Indonesian national exams in that content area.
Students also, according to the data analyzed, switched from English to Indonesian more frequently when needing clarification of information. Another interesting finding was that students used Indonesian more in responses during Bible classes than any other classes (except EFL). It was also noted that students almost exclusively chose to use Indonesian for their social language, even in an exclusively English speaking classroom such as EFL. Lastly, one other observation made was, in instances when teachers tended to codeswitch, that is transfer from one language to another, the students followed their pattern. When teachers spoke to a student in English, the student usually responded in the same manner. When a teacher spoke in Indonesian, for example clarifying information, the students almost exclusively communicated back in the same language. This information was verified through the 16 hours of video recordings taken of the classroom lessons as well as my own personal observations.

As the findings indicate, both teachers and students codeswitch for varying reasons and often in relationship to each other.

The above findings display the data analysis after documentation and coding of the information. This information will be expounded upon further in the next section of this paper, reexamining and discussing the major findings, as well as looking at the implications and recommendations that accompany this study.
Chapter IV: Discussion

Major Findings

After examining the data, analyzing the information, and viewing the video, there are several major findings I concluded from this study. These findings fall into the categories of (a) teachers’ use of language, (b) students’ use of language, and (c) the teacher-student language relationship.

Teachers’ use of language. This study was designed to answer the following question in the context of an Indonesian bilingual school: What language is used by teachers and for what purpose? The data were gathered and analyzed according to those two themes: language and purpose.

While the school at which this research was conducted, (which I will call Hope School), was known in the community as a bilingual school, and the classes I observed were to be taught with English as the medium of instruction, in reality, the teachers’ use of English in the classroom fell short of best practice for an English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) classroom. This pattern of L1 use in the EMI classroom, which I observed and documented, was also studied by other researchers in both Indonesia and other countries, and similar findings were reported. Author Bachrudin Musthafa (2001) in his article, Communicative Language Teaching in Indonesia: Issues of Theoretical Assumptions and Challenges in the Classroom Practice, stated,

Many Indonesian teachers of English have publicly admitted in seminars-and this has also been supported by my personal observation in many different contexts-that English is seldom used in the classroom as the teachers tend to use Bahasa Indonesia to carry
out their English lessons in the classroom—except perhaps, when greeting students before the sessions get started, and then, when they get dismissed” (p. 6).

We find the same tendency in other research. Several studies (e.g. Rabbige & Chapell, 2014) have shown that teachers of English from different language backgrounds used L1 for more than 40% of actual class speaking time (Alrabah & Wu, 2015). A study done in Hong Kong by Yuen Yi Lo (2014) cited the statistic of L1 use in an EMI classroom in which teachers in that specific school used Chinese for about 80% of the lesson. In China, research done by Van der Meij & Zhao (2010) documented that almost a fourth of the lesson time in an English major course at a Chinese university was spent talking in the L1. And lastly, in Ghana, despite the language policy which stipulated that English should be the medium of instruction, researchers Owe-Ewie & Eshun discovered,

the data from the observation and the interview indicated that there was no single classroom in the schools used in the study in the upper basic level which used English as the sole medium of instruction. In most classrooms, the percentage use of Ghanaian language (Fante) was more than English, which is supposed to be the medium of instruction...Both teachers and learners were culprits (p. 76).

So, the struggle to consistently use English seems to be one that is wide-spread in EFL settings. As seen from my data, teachers in the classrooms I observed at Hope School (excluding EFL classes) used English only 60% of the time, code switching to their native Indonesian the other 40% of the time. The question to be asked then is, why? Informal discussions were held with some of the teachers at the conclusion of the data gathering and the use of the English language was discussed. The following reasons were communicated: (a) the teachers’ feelings
of inadequacy with the English language, (b) the students’ lack of English proficiency, and (c) the Indonesian National Exams. Each of these reasons will be discussed below.

Several of the teachers, including one of the EFL teachers, expressed their feelings of inadequacy concerning their English proficiency level. As an observer, I noticed that, while the teachers’ use of English vocabulary was usually correct, often times the grammatical structure and syntax of the English sentences were incorrect. The social studies teacher described how much extra time it took to prepare her lessons if she wanted to teach them entirely in English. She had to look up the English terms that correlated with the content she was teaching. The social studies lessons I observed were focused on Indonesian history, culture, and religion. To translate much of that information into English verbiage took time and effort for the teacher. She commented on the fact that she worked full time and had two young children at home, making it more difficult for her to spend the time preparing to teach in English. Other researchers have found that teachers’ lack of English proficiency is a factor in English speaking classrooms. Grace Yuwono (2010) wrote in her article, *English Teacher Professionalism and Professional Development: Some Common Issues in Indonesia*, “With regard to English teachers, recent studies on the conditions of ELT practices and English teachers in Indonesia, conducted in Java, show surprising if not worrying facts from English classrooms, which indicate that English teachers have not themselves mastered the language they are teaching” (p. 149). I observed the teachers in my study, and as they began moving from the opening comments, which usually involved those of giving directions or review of material, to more content based instruction, they often moved from solely English to a mixture of English and Indonesian, codeswitching as the content became more difficult. While the teachers did this in part to
enhance student understanding, by some teachers’ own admission in our discussions, they chose to codeswitch because of their perceived inability to teach difficult content in English. Clearly there is a relationship between translanguaging and the teachers’ English proficiency level.

A second reason teachers gave for returning to their L1 was to enhance the comprehension of their students. In reviewing the video documentation of the lessons, it was clear that as the discourse developed beyond the introductory part of the lesson, the teachers added Indonesian to their instruction, alongside the English, in response to cues from the students displaying their lack of understanding. During some lessons, especially social studies, the teachers switched entirely to Indonesian. Speaking both languages alongside each other is not uncommon in EMI classrooms. Returning to the study in Ghana done by Owu-Ewi & Eshun (2015) they documented similar patterns in their research.

From the data, it was found that the teachers used four main strategies. These included translation. Almost everything was said and explained in both Fante (local language) and English. Everything was said twice for the benefit of the pupils...It was realized that most of the students did not pay attention when the explanation is transmitted in English because they know the same thing will be said in Fante (p. 78).

Saddhono & Rohmadi (2014) noticed a similar pattern in their research conducted on the use of Javanese and Indonesian in schools in Central Java. They stated, the “Teacher has to balance student’s language skills so that (the) student can better understand the information delivered by the teacher. (The) teacher understands that student’s skill in Indonesian language is still low, so she performs a mixing language, Indonesian and Javanese language. Students
who do not understand the language performed by the teacher will be passive” (p. 27). Similar findings occurred in other schools worldwide. In a study done in Bangladesh the researchers observed that the teachers often used Bangla to explain difficult English words, to discuss difficult grammatical items and to explain the meaning of unknown words because it saved the learners from being confused. (Mirza & Mahmud, 2012). Van de Meij & Zhao (2010), in their study of English courses in China, stated, “A student factor that is likely to influence teacher codeswitching behavior is language proficiency. It seems fair to expect that more switches will take place when students are less knowledgeable or skilled” (p. 406).

The Indonesian educational system requires all students to attend nine years of schooling with the medium of instruction in those public schools to be Bahasa Indonesian, the national language. English is a compulsory subject in junior-high and high school (Coleman & British Council, 2011). Interestingly enough, in recent years Indonesia has sought to establish an “International Standard School.” These schools aim to have quality indicators stating “Science, mathematics and core vocational subjects are taught using English...In primary schools teaching science and mathematics through English begins in Year 4” (Coleman & British Council, 2011, p. 7). The use of English in these schools and private bilingual schools such as the school researched in my study, creates a tension between the need for students to learn content area in Indonesian for the Indonesian National Exams, and the need to teach content through English. Teachers feel this tension and it influences their choices of language as they teach. In speaking with the teachers, they expressed their frustration in needing to prepare their students to perform well on the national exams, given in Indonesian, and yet to promote English in their classrooms. One Bible class observed spent the entire lesson discussing how to
get the highest possible score on the national exam. While language use in relationship to the Indonesian National Exams is not a focus of this study, it is an influential factor and contributes to the teachers’ decisions for language usage in the classroom.

Examining the data produced some interesting findings concerning the function and purposes of language use by the teachers. The functions researched were (a) giving directions, (b) content instruction, (c) classroom management, and (d) clarifying information. Some functions were done almost entirely in English, while others were done almost entirely in Indonesian.

In every one of the sixteen classrooms observed, the teachers began the class period using English. Much of that consisted of giving directions, as well as introducing material. The data showed that giving directions was done in English 84% of the time. I later questioned some of the teachers as to their heavy use of English in giving directions as compared to other areas of language use. Their responses indicated that this practice was part of school policy which was communicated by the school administration. Not only were the classrooms begun in English, they almost always concluded in English, once again for the purpose of giving directions such as “close your books”, or giving a brief summary of the lesson. While doing comparative research, I found this practice mentioned in other research and labeled ‘framing the lesson”. Author Cincotta-Segi (2011) noted this phenomenon in her research in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic where the Education Law states that Lao is the official language among the 230 languages spoken. In her data she gave this quote:
When the teacher speaks, at first [I/we] use Lao, but in the middle [I/we] go back and forth, [I/we] use both languages. Then at the end, when we’re about to finish, most of the time it’s Lao (p.24).

It is interesting to note that Cincotta-Segi then gave her explanation as to why the framing occurred. She stated that, by providing lesson or activity frames, the teacher is creating an impression of teaching in Lao, thereby maintaining his commitment to the status of the language as the central medium of instruction and signaling that his language choices are consistent with the expectations of Lao education officials (2011). In the charting of my research (Cumulative Classroom Use by Minute) we can see that English is the primary language spoken for the first twelve minutes of class. What the chart is unable to show was the use of English during the last two minutes of class as each class ended at a different time. Of the sixteen classes observed, fifteen of them began the class time speaking in English and fifteen of them also closed the class time speaking in English.

Content instruction was found to be done in both languages and varied according to the difficulty of the material, the comprehension of the students, and the intention of the teacher. The research showed that the highest concentration of English used during content instruction was in science class (77%). However, when one looks at the video, it shows that about a third of the class instructional time was spent watching a video that was in English. My observation is that this did not give an accurate reading of the teachers’ language use in science. Math class showed a high concentration of English use (66%) in content instruction although it was noted that much of the English used was in the form of numerals and mathematical terms such as “greater than” “divide by” etc. As mentioned previously, teachers tended to begin their
classroom instruction time in English and then codeswitched, often to provide comprehensible input for their students. The chart, Cumulative Classroom Use by Minute, documents this teaching pattern.

The frequency of English use for the purpose of classroom management was unexpected. Because it was outside the realm of content area or giving directions, and fell into more what I would consider social language, I expected it to be conducted in Indonesian. Instead results showed it was done 68% of the time in English. Students had no trouble understanding the expectations of the teachers and classroom rules were written and posted on classroom walls in English.

Codeswitching was often used by teachers for giving clarification and providing explanations. If a student was confused, needed a question answered, or needed one on one help, the teachers often switched to Indonesian. Data shows this was done 59% of the time. Research done in South Africa by V. Moodley (2007) examined the purposes of codeswitching, looking specifically at codeswitching for seeking clarification and providing explanations. After observation and analysis, she concluded, “The use of CS for clarification and explanation purposes clears the way for the group to continue with their discussion. This is significant in that once the barrier of a lack of understanding is removed, learners can engage in a deeper level thinking” (p. 715). This also seemed to be the case in the classrooms I observed. As the teachers clarified information for the students in their native language, it enhanced the students’ understanding, enabling them to learn.
Students’ use of language. A second part of this research was designed to answer the following question: What language is used by students and for what purpose? The data were gathered and analyzed according to those two themes: language and purpose.

What language did students primarily use in the classroom? How often did they use English? Did they tend to use their native language in one subject more often than another? These are question that were answered by data collected. Research showed that the students tended to use very little spoken English during their class periods. While English existed around the classroom in the written form of bulletin boards, posters, class notes written on the board, and workbook assignments, English spoken by the students was minimal. In fact, when all of the spoken language was documented and analyzed, students only spoke English 19% of the time (excluding EFL classes). The one exception to this was the two EFL classes observed. In these classrooms, taught by two different teachers, the research showed the students spoke English spoken a startling 98% when they were responding to their teacher. These figures seem to indicate that, while students could use English, they chose not to unless they were in an environment in which English was the only language being used, which was the case in the EFL classes. The second highest use of English in the classroom by students occurred in the mathematics class. According to the documentation, students used English in their responses to the teacher 68% of the time. It should be noted, however, that these English responses were in the form of numerals or math terminology such as “plus” or “minus” and not in any type of full sentence structure. Interestingly enough, this mirrors a similar study done in primary school math classes in Malaysia. Researchers Neo & Heng (2012) investigated what languages were used in a total of 16 primary mathematics classrooms in the Kelantan State of Malaysia. The
classrooms were observed and recorded and the data analyzed as to the types of languages used as well as their proportion of use. According to their data, 63.8% of the language used in the classroom by the students was in the form of English and they too noted the type of short utterance responses.

While math class had the highest percentage of English spoken of the content classes, Bible classes showed the lowest amount of spoken English by the students. Reasons for that can be surmised through personal observation. Students used their Bibles during class lessons and these Bibles were written in Indonesian. In one class the teacher had the students stand up and read aloud a passage from the Bible, which was all done in Indonesian. In another Bible class period the students performed a small drama based on a story from the Bible. Once again, the Bible passage they were reading was written in Indonesian, hence the drama they performed was also in Indonesian. Another of the Bible classes held a discussion on character qualities such as patience, love, kindness, self-control etc. Seemingly because these were abstract concepts, the teachers spoke first in English and then translated to Indonesian. The students’ participation in the discussion was done almost exclusively in Indonesian, perhaps due to the abstract nature of the conversation. Whatever the reasons for the low English use, Bible classes, which were designated to be taught in English, stood in marked contrast to the other subject classes for student use of the English language.

The purpose or function of language use by students was also a part of this study. Research was done on student language use for the purpose of (a) responding to the teacher, (b) asking for clarification, and (c) socializing.
It was shown that, except for the case of EFL classes and math classes, students responded to the teachers more often in Indonesian than in English. In reviewing the video documentation, it should be noted that responses were often simply one word answers to questions, sometimes even in the form of supplying the letter for a multiple choice question. Teachers tended to ask display questions which evoked simple, short responses. This raises the question as to the spoken English proficiency level of the students and their capability to formulate more complex language structures. To answer this I went to the videos of the EFL classes which had a higher frequency of English spoken. In that setting, the English proficiency level of the individual students became much clearer. Some students raised their hands continuously, answering questions with a fairly high level of proficiency. Answers tended to be given more often in full sentence form. For example, in the discussion of where the students would like to visit, the response was stated, “I want to go to America” instead of just the one word, “America”. The teacher in the classroom also asked “why” questions which elicited more complex answers. However, some other students sat quietly, never voluntarily responding, and when occasionally called upon, needed the question repeated and simplified before giving a simple response. It became obvious that there was a wide discrepancy in the English level of the students. I later reviewed the English proficiency test scores from a sampling (ten students each) in each of the grades (4\textsuperscript{th}, 5\textsuperscript{th} and 6\textsuperscript{th}). This testing had been done in-house by myself and my partner researcher in order to gauge the language level of the students we were observing. We tested speaking, listening, writing, and reading skills. Although the scores could not be recorded as official language proficiency scores due to the nature of the testing, they did give us a general picture of the language proficiency level of the students. Within the thirty students
tested, 26% of them fell into the high-intermediate category. The intermediate level accounted for about 43% of the students and 23% were considered low-intermediate or high beginners. Two additional students had very low scores. These findings were consistent with my classroom observation in that, while a number of the students had fairly high English levels, there were some with very low English proficiency levels.

When the research was analyzed for the students’ use of English to clarify information, it was found that the percentages of English spoken dropped dramatically. This use of language was student initiated as opposed to a response given to a prompt by the teacher. In every single class, including EFL, the students overwhelmingly chose Indonesian as their language of communication. Students used English for the purpose of clarification and seeking explanations across all 16 classes only 14% of the time. It is clear that students in these classes preferred the use of their native language when initiating communication despite the fact that they were in a bilingual school with English intended to be the medium of instruction in these content classes. Why would this be the case? It could be due to the English level proficiency of the students, except observation and test scores showed that many of the students had at least intermediate levels of English proficiency. It could also be lack of language modeling by the teachers, which we will address in the teacher-student language relationship section. Other researchers have proposed possible reasons for lack of English use in the classrooms in Indonesia. Authors Mappiasse & Sihes (2014) in their article, *Evaluation of English as a Foreign Language and Its Curriculum in Indonesia: A Review* stated:

The aptitude to communicate in English is a very difficult mission in Indonesia because of the emphasis on the national language. The fear of making mistakes has affected the
rate of personal expression so much that not all of the students in an EFL (English as Foreign Language) speaking class have the courage to speak. Many students feel anxious speaking in class (p. 117).

Even more telling was the students’ lack of English use for the purpose of socialization. Students used their native Indonesian language to communicate with each other 98% of the time, with English used only 2%. In informal interviews with the teachers I discovered that the school promoted “English Days.” Every Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday were to be days in which all the students, faculty and staff were to speak English only. This was to include both classroom time and non-classroom time such as lunch or recess. It was obvious from observation and documentation that this did not occur, either inside the classroom or outside. When questioning one of the teachers about the discrepancy between policy and reality she discussed the impossibility of enforcing such a mandate along with the fact that the administration did not model it themselves. Using the data confirming the language of choice by the students in socializing with one another in the classroom, it can be assumed that socialization outside of the classroom followed the same pattern.

**Teacher-student language relationship.** The relationship between teachers’ language choice and students’ language choice is one that emerged as the data was analyzed. The chart labeled Teacher-Student Language Comparison demonstrates what we have already discussed, that teachers used English more than the students did, although still only about two-thirds of the time. Other documentation shows that both the teachers and the students used primarily Indonesian when in actual conversation with each other for the purpose of clarifying information or asking for/providing explanations. During this interaction between student and
teacher, I observed that students tended to ask for clarification in Indonesian, which then produced a reply from the teacher also in Indonesian. In the chart labeled Cumulative Classroom Language by Minute, a visual display showed that there was a time period between minutes 15-19 in which English and Indonesian were used with comparable frequency. The flow of conversation involved both English and Indonesian being spoken in a fairly equal ratio. However, during the rest of the class period, it was obvious that as the amount of spoken English decreased in the classroom, the amount of spoken Indonesian increased. Instead of each language being spoken side by side at a comparable ratio, there was a direct connection between English decreasing and Indonesian increasing. The documentation on my observation tool recorded the amount of English spoken in content instruction for each minute. Taking this information, I then looked at student responses within those same minutes. A very clear pattern emerged. In all but three of the 16 classes, when the teacher conducted the discourse in English, the students responded in English. The exception to the pattern were two social studies classes and one Bible class. The social studies classes were taught by the same teacher to two different groups of students. The subject material was the same, Ancient Kingdoms of Indonesia. The teacher started her lesson in both English and Indonesian, repeating the information in both languages, but the student responses were almost entirely in Indonesian. The content instruction language then became almost entirely Indonesian as the lesson progressed. The other exception was the Bible class. In this class the topic of discussion was how to obtain a perfect score on the upcoming national exams. The teacher spent the first ten minutes of class speaking English, yet the students’ responses were in Indonesian. For the next ten minutes the teacher used an even ratio of English and Indonesian. The last ten minutes of
class were spent in individual discussion with students and that was done almost entirely in Indonesian. In the other 13 classes there was a direct correlation between the language choice of the teacher and the chosen responses of the students. At no time did I observe the teacher instructing a student to speak in one language or the other. In the EFL classes there were no student responses in Indonesian, indicating that there was an understanding by the students, and an expectation by the teacher, that English was to be used. The teachers in the EFL classes spoke entirely in English, although it must be noted, their English was not always grammatically correct. In later discussions with the subject teachers, I inquired if they ever tried to help teach the students English during the course of the lesson. Their response was that it was not their place to teach English and that job was left to the EFL teachers. They did not see themselves as English teachers or having a role in English instruction even though they were to teach their content through the medium of English.
Chapter V: Implications and Recommendations

My findings corroborate previous research that suggest L1 use occurs frequently in EMI classrooms by both teachers and students. The findings of this study may serve to analyze the needs of teachers and students in these contexts.

Meeting the Needs of Teachers

It is clear from this study that the teachers in this context have a need for further training and professional development in the area of EMI instruction. Training focusing on the role of the teachers as both content instructors and English language facilitators would be beneficial. Planned collaboration between content teachers and EFL teachers on classroom expectations, use of English, and differentiation of lessons for varying English level proficiencies could provide consistency in language use during classroom instruction. Teachers also demonstrated a need for further English language training for themselves. Research referenced in this study confirmed the need of more English language development for teachers, especially in the nation of Indonesia. Support and role modeling from school administrators as well as the teachers’ need for understanding their place as role models of language use can be implied from this research. Raising an awareness of the teachers’ role in the classroom to encourage English use and to model English use within the academic content is critical. As we have seen, the teachers had a strong tendency to revert to their native Indonesian as content became more difficult, or as they were explaining or clarifying content information. The implication is that this prohibits the students from gaining English proficiency in the academic language needed for the subject material. This practice of translanguaging by the teachers will not lead to strong Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) on the part of the students.
Meeting the Needs of Students

This study demonstrates that while many students were able to use English when required, as seen in the EFL classes, they primarily chose their native language in classroom communication. It can be implied that they viewed their EFL classes in a different manner than their content classes. It is apparent that they were not held to the same language expectations in the EMI content classes. From the data we see that students overwhelmingly chose to socialize in their native language, even in EFL classes, implying the need to speak freely and comfortably during socialization times. It is apparent, however, because they responded in English during EFL classes, but not nearly to the same extent in content classes, they did not feel the same motivation, or were not held to the same standard in the content classrooms. We could also imply that their English level proficiency in the academic language of the content classrooms was not as high due to the academic nature of the language and the practice of the teachers to revert to their native Indonesian language during content instruction time. There also seems to be a need for an understanding on the students’ part of the importance of English and its possible role in their future. Lamb & Coleman (2008) in their article, Literacy in English and the Transformation of Self and Society in Post-Soeharto Indonesia, made this statement, Learners who understand how English could transform their lives and can envision clearly a future English speaking self are therefore more likely to be motivated to learn the language than those who cannot conceive of themselves in that role. (p. 200).

Giving the students a clear vision for the role English can play in their future could be a helpful motivator for both students and their teachers.
Limitations of the Study and Proposed Future Research

The observation tool, created by the researchers, and used to gather data, was limited to one minute increments of time. Within that one minute, a mark was made as to the language used, that of English or Indonesian, by whom, and for what purpose. The observation tool did not elicit the type of language use, for example one word answers, full sentences, or short phrases, or the duration of the use within that one minute time increment. It also did not specify academic language for the purpose of Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) vs social language, although that could be implied from the function of the language. Further study with the capability to document language use to that extent could give a clearer picture of language use in Indonesian classrooms.

Due to the researchers’ inability to speak the Indonesian language, the intent of Indonesian language use in a given situation (e.g. giving directions, classroom management) was presumed according to context. Further study done by bilingual researchers, fluent in both Indonesian and English, would contribute to the research of language use in Indonesian classrooms.

This study only observed EMI classes in grades 4, 5, and 6. To gain a more complete picture of bilingual educational schools in Indonesia, further research is suggested using similar methods in grades 1-3 and grades 7-12.
Chapter VI: Conclusion

The findings of this study have answered the research question, how are English and Indonesian used in classes which are intended to utilize English-medium instruction in a bilingual school in Indonesia? This paper has explored both teachers’ use of language as well as students’ language use. I documented the choice, extent, and purpose of language use in EMI classrooms in grades four, five and six at Hope School, in Indonesia.

In observing and documenting language choice we saw that teachers chose to codeswitch to their native language due to factors such as their feelings of inadequacy to communicate well in English, their desire to meet the comprehension needs of their students who had varying English proficiency levels, and their awareness of the upcoming Indonesian national exams. We also saw that students primarily chose to speak in their native Indonesian in their content classes. When, however, teachers chose to speak to them in English, students’ language choice in response was more often in English than in Indonesian. It was also noted that when expectations for English speaking occurred, as in the EFL classes, most students were capable of speaking in English and did so.

In the final analysis of the extent of English spoken by both teachers and students, we obtained a clear picture of language use in the classrooms. The findings reported English being used by the teachers 63% of the time. In stark contrast, the extent of English used by the students was charted at 26%. These findings strongly imply a need for instructional practices that further students’ use of the English language.

Based on research from this study we can draw conclusions regarding the purpose for which both English and Indonesian were used in the classroom setting. The study revealed that
while teachers used English primarily for functions such as giving directions and classroom management, codeswitching occurred much more often during content instruction and clarification of information individually to students. The exception to this pattern were the two EFL classes observed. After examining the documentation of student language use, we see that students used English about half the time for the purpose of responding to their teachers, yet when it came to individual conversation with their teachers for the purpose of clarifying information, and conversation for the purpose of socializing with their peers, they far preferred Indonesian. Even in the EFL classes, where English was predominately used in responding to the teacher, the students overwhelmingly reverted to Indonesian in socializing with each other.

In summary, we can see that, despite the growing focus on English instruction in the nation of Indonesia, there is still more work to be done. Further study in several areas would be of benefit. Documenting the type of language used, as in single word answers, short phrases, full sentences, or academic language vs social language would contribute to the research base of English use in Indonesian classrooms. Using bi-lingual researchers who can understand both languages would give a higher degree of accuracy to the research. And conducting this type of research in other grades, both lower elementary and high school, would add to the broader picture of language practices in EMI classrooms in Indonesia. My hope is that the findings in this study can be used to shine a light on the realities of EMI instruction in Indonesia and provide a basis for innovation and change in developing more effective EMI classrooms.
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## Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Directions</th>
<th>Content Instruction</th>
<th>English Instruction</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>:01</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>Content Instruction</td>
<td>English Instruction</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:10</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>Content Instruction</td>
<td>English Instruction</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>Content Instruction</td>
<td>English Instruction</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>Content Instruction</td>
<td>English Instruction</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:30</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
<td>E I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>Content Instruction</td>
<td>English Instruction</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:41</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

Raw data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>English (data)</th>
<th>English %</th>
<th>Indonesian</th>
<th>Indonesian %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C Bible</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Bible</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Bible</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Bible</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F EFL</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G EFL</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Math</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Math</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Math</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Math</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Science</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Science</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Soc. Studies</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Soc. Studies</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Soc. Studies</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Soc. Studies</td>
<td>Class Mgmt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Bible</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Bible</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Bible</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Bible</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F EFL</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G EFL</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Math</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Math</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Math</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Math</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Science</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Science</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Soc. Studies</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Soc. Studies</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Soc. Studies</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Soc. Studies</td>
<td>Content Instruct</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Bible</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Bible</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Bible</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Bible</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F EFL</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G EFL</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Math</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Math</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Math</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>English (data)</td>
<td>English %</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Indonesian %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Soc. Studies</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Soc. Studies</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Soc. Studies</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Soc. Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>EFL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lang. Instruction</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>EFL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lang. Instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>EFL</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>EFL</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Soc. Studies</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Soc. Studies</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Soc. Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Soc. Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Clarification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>EFL</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>EFL</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Soc. Studies</td>
<td>6A</td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Soc. Studies</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Soc. Studies</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Soc. Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Tujuan:

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengeksplorasi pembelajaran yang digunakan para guru di dalam kelas untuk meningkatkan kemampuan Bahasa Inggris. Kami juga ingin mempelajari penggunaan Bahasa Inggris yang digunakan oleh guru dan anak-anak kelas 4-6.

2. Prosedur:


3. Ketidakhadiran dan Resiko:

Tidak akan ada faktor yang akan menciptakan ketidakhadiran dan resiko selama penelitian ini berlangsung.

4. Manfaat:

Tidak ada manfaat secara langsung bagi orang tua. Guru akan mendapatkan informasi untuk membantu mereka mengembangkan pembelajaran di kelas.

5. Duration/Time:

6. **Pernyataan Kerahasiaan:**

   Data guru dan siswa yang didapatkan dalam penelitian ini bersifat rahasia. Data akan disimpan di dalam arsip yang terjaga kerahasiaannya dengan menggunakan kata kunci. Hanya pembimbing dan peneliti yang akan mendapatkan hak akses terhadap semua data. Nama siswa, guru, dan sekolah tidak akan digunakan dalam laporan maupun bentuk publikasi yang lain.

7. **Hak untuk bertanya:**

   Jika ada pertanyaan sehubungan dengan penelitian ini, silahkan menghubungi peneliti maupun pembimbing:

   - **Rachel Rébert**  
     Email: rr1301@messenger.edu  
     Phone: (1-717-957-2715)

   - **Joy Dupree**  
     Email: jr1432@messenger.edu  
     Phone: (1-717-385-4765)

   - **Jan Dormer**  
     Email: jdormer@messenger.edu  
     Phone: (1-717-796-1800, ext. 7053)

   Anda juga bisa menghubungi kami jika anda merasa anak anda dirugikan dalam penelitian ini. Pertanyaan tentang hak sebagai orang tua dari siswa yang terlibat dalam penelitian ini bisa dikirimkan ke kantor Messiah College di provost@messenger.edu atau menghubungi nomer 1-717-766-2511 (x5375).

8. **Partisipasi Suka rela:**

   Ijin yang diberikan bagi anak anda untuk mengambil bagian dalam penelitian ini adalah bersifat sukarela. Anda bisa menghentikan keterlibatan anak anda kapan pun. Jika anda menarik anak anda dari penelitian ini, maka semua data yang didapat sebelumnya yang berhubungan dengan anak anda tidak akan digunakan.

   Jika anda mengijinkan anak anda untuk menghadiri kelas yang akan diobservasi, silahkan menandatangani surat ijin ini dan memberikannya kepada guru kelas.

   Anda akan mendapatkan salinan surat ini.

   ____________________________

   Nama

   ____________________________   ____________________________

   Tanda tangan   Tanggal-Bulan-Tahun
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Waktu: 10-19 Januari 2017

Apa yang akan kami lakukan?

1. Memberimu tes Bahasa Inggris.
4. Membuat beberapa catatan.

Apakah dengan terlibat dalam penelitian ini akan membawa efek negatif atau positif bagiku?

Keterlibatan dalam penelitian ini tidak akan membawa efek negatif bagimu atau upun gurumu. Mereka bahkan akan mendapatkan kesempatan untuk belajar lebih lagi tentang bagaimana mengajar di sekolah yang menggunakan dua bahasa. Kami tidak akan menggunakan namamu atau upun dokumen-dokumenmu dalam laporan kami.

Apakah aku harus mengambil bagian dalam penelitian ini?


Jika kamu ada pertanyaan tentang penelitian yang kami lakukan, kamu bisa bertanya pada gurumu, atau kepada Miss Rachel atau Miss Joy.

Jika kamu mengerti semua pernyataan di atas, silahkan menulis namamu dan menandatangani pernyataan ini.

Nama: ___________________________ Tanggal/Bulan/Tahun: ___________________

Tanda tangan: ___________________________
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Joy Dupree
Graduate Student, Messiah College
152 Seaman Dr, Wilmore, KY 40390
717-385-4765
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Advisor: Jan Dorner, Ed.D.
Associate Professor of TESOL
Messiah College
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Mechanicsburg, PA 17055
717-796-1800, ext. 7053
jdorner@messiah.edu

1. Purpose of the Study:
The purpose of this research is to explore the practices that teachers use in their classes to promote English language learning and to find out about English language use by teachers and students in Grades 4-6.

2. Procedures:
If you participate, in December you will be asked to fill out a questionnaire that will take about 15 – 30 minutes. This questionnaire will be emailed to you. You will complete the questionnaire and then email it back to Rachel Rébert at rr1301@messiah.edu. You might be asked follow-up questions when we visit your school in January.

During January 10 – 19, 2017, we will visit your classes. We will observe your lesson from the back of the class and make written notes during the class. We would like to video record each class if you agree. You will also be asked to participate in a 60-90-minute interview about your thoughts about teaching in English. We would like to audio record the interview if you agree.

Will you allow video recording of your classes? Please check one:
- YES
- NO

Will you allow audio recording for the interview? Please check one:
- YES
- NO
3. **Discomforts and Risks:**

There are no risks beyond those in everyday life. During the interview, you might feel some discomfort when you are talking about your experiences. You will not have to answer any questions if you do not want to.

4. **Benefits:**

We will be happy to share the information after the research is completed. You might get information that will help you with your lessons and teaching. The benefits to your school may include a chance to improve the English language learning at your school.

5. **Duration/Time:**

December, 2016 - A questionnaire will be emailed to you. You will take 15 – 30 minutes to answer this questionnaire. You will complete the questionnaire and email it to Rachel Rébert at rrl301@messiah.edu.

January 10 - 19, 2017 – We will:

- Give the WIDA English language proficiency test to your students.
- Visit your classes and observe the lessons.
- Interview you for 60 – 90 minutes.

February, 2017 – You might be involved in 3 to 5 email messages for follow-up, if needed.

6. **Statement of Confidentiality:**

The data we collect in this research is confidential. The data will be stored in password-protected computer files on the researchers’ (Rachel Rébert, Joy Dupree) laptops. The advisor (Jan Dormer), and the researchers (Rachel Rébert, Joy Dupree) will have access to the data. Messiah College’s Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, and the Department of Health and Human Services’ Office for Human Research Protections may review records related to this research study. All information, including your name, recordings, and questionnaire/interview responses will be kept confidential. Your name and the name of your school will not be used in any reports or publications resulting from this study. You will be identified as “Teacher A” from “A private school in Indonesia.”

7. **Right to Ask Questions:**

If you have questions about this research, please contact the researchers or the advisor:

Rachel Rébert Email: rrl301@messiah.edu  
Phone: (1-717-957-2715)

Joy Dupree email: jrd1432@messiah.edu  
Phone: (1-717-385-4765)

Jan Dormer Email: jdormer@messiah.edu  
Phone: (1-717-796-1800, ext. 7053)

You can also contact us if you are hurt by this study. Questions about your rights as a research participant may be sent to Messiah College’s Office of the Provost at provost@messiah.edu or at (1-717-766-2511 x5375).
8. **Voluntary Participation:**

You are a volunteer in this research. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. If you withdraw from this study none of your data will be used.

You must be at least 18 years old to take part in this research. If you agree to take part in this study, please sign your name and write the date, and then email to Rachel Rébert at rr1301@messiah.edu.

You will get a copy of this form.

______________________________
Printed Name

_________________________  ____________
Signature                      Date