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ABSTRACT

In response to the growing importance attached to mastering English, the Indonesia’s 2006 English Curriculum has as one of its goals the development of secondary school students’ communicative competence. However, several studies have demonstrated that secondary school graduates lack competence in communicating in English. To understand how this situation has arisen, the current study made a detailed examination of interaction in EFL classrooms. Classroom interaction is particularly important because it gives students the opportunity to develop oral fluency in English. Prior to the current study, there have been no studies examining effective classroom interaction strategies in lower secondary schools in Indonesia. The current study adopted a mixed approach containing both quantitative and qualitative elements to elicit data from teachers and students.

The survey to students examined students’ reports of interaction with their teachers and with their peers, their attitudes to studying English, and the factors that hinder their participation in classroom interaction. Interviews with teachers provided teachers’ perspectives on their use of interaction strategies, their language choices, and factors influencing their approach to classroom interaction. Classroom observations provided a comprehensive understanding of current interaction strategies.

On the basis of the research findings, a new model for classroom interaction is proposed as a means to enhance students’ oral communicative competence. The model includes the following features: Interactive Modelling, Interactive Dialogue, Interactive Collaboration, and Interactive Performance. The model has the potential to improve EFL teaching in Indonesia. School graduates need highly developed English communication skills if they are to be successful in the global community.
Chapter One

Introduction to the Study

1.1 Introduction

When English is taught as a foreign language in a non-English speaking country, there is always the issue of how to assure the quality of teaching and learning. The issue can be related to pedagogical and cultural questions such as “what is the pedagogical approach to teaching English in that country?” and “What is the reaction from students with specific cultural backgrounds?” High quality of teaching and learning depends on effective classroom interaction between teachers and students. In Indonesia, establishing effective classroom interaction to enhance the teaching and learning of English has been emphasized by education authorities.

In this introductory chapter three fundamental elements of this study of EFL classroom interaction will be discussed. First, the context and background of the study will be explained through a brief overview of research in relevant areas in Indonesia. Second, a thorough examination of the current state of EFL teaching and learning in Indonesia will result in the key research question about teaching English in Indonesian lower secondary schools. On the basis of this key question, a number of associated sub-questions will be identified. Third, the potential significance of the research and implications for the practice of teaching English will be discussed, followed by a diagram setting out the structure of the whole thesis.
1.2 Background of the Research

Indonesia is the largest archipelago country in the world; it consists of more than 17,000 islands. The total area of Indonesia is 1.9 million square kilometres. It has 33 provinces, 440 districts or municipalities, 5641 sub-districts, and 71,555 villages (Alwasilah and Furqon, 2010). The country is the fourth largest nation in the world with a population of almost 240 million people (BPS, 2013). Furthermore, although Indonesia is not an Islamic country, it has the largest Muslim population in the world. The linguistic diversity is also marked; it is currently estimated to have 737 living indigenous languages and Bahasa Indonesia as the official national language (Gordon, 2005).

Formal education in Indonesia consists of primary education, secondary education, and higher education. Primary education lasts for six years. Secondary education comprises two levels: lower secondary which lasts three years and upper secondary which lasts for another three years. Higher education comes after secondary education and consists of diploma, bachelor, master and doctorate programs. There are two Ministries involved in managing education in Indonesia: the Ministry of National Education (MONE) and the Ministry of Religion Affairs (MORA). MONE is responsible for managing the general education, whereas MORA is responsible for managing Islamic educational institutions.

In Indonesia, students begin to learn English as a Foreign Language (EFL) at the secondary level. English has been a compulsory foreign language subject throughout Indonesia at the secondary level (Launder, 2008). The importance of
teaching of English as a Foreign Language at the secondary level has been acknowledged by the Indonesian government since the 1950’s. The government’s decision to select English as the first foreign language to be taught in Indonesia was made shortly after the country gained independence (Nur, 2003). The decision was taken in 1950 when the government had to make a choice between English and Dutch as the priority foreign language in the nation-wide school system (Nur, 2003).

The emphasis on the importance of English and the teaching of English has been expressed in official documents. The Competence-Based Curriculum published by the Ministry of National Education of Indonesia (Ministry of National Education, 2001) states that English has a significant role as a global language. Apart from being the language for science, technology and the arts, English is an important tool for achieving economic goals, fostering closer relationships among countries, promoting socio-cultural initiatives, education, and career development. Mastery of English can be considered a major requirement for the success of individuals and for the nation as it faces the challenge of raising its profile within the global community.

The Directorate General for Vocational Secondary Schools confirmed the significance of English in Indonesia, releasing a policy on the development of English communicative competence for vocational school graduates (Emilia, 2005). The policy required that all vocational students master English. To enhance the quality of English teaching and to help students achieve significantly higher English learning
outcomes, a Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) program has been implemented in a number of secondary vocational schools. When launching this program, the Director General of Secondary Education indicated that one of the key competences for competing in the global job market is the capability to communicate in foreign languages, especially English (Emilia, 2005).

Other authorities have raised similar points about the need for English. The Director of Secondary Education, Professor Hamid Muhammad (2012) states that “in Indonesia, English is deemed as a foreign language instead of a second language. However as our local communities are becoming more global, coupled with our country’s booming economy, learning and mastering English for communication has become a must” (p.21). Alwasilah (2000), one of Indonesia’s best known researchers, agrees that mastering English benefits the individual in social and economic ways: those who master English for communication tend to be more respected and get more economic privileges than those who do not. Alwasilah (2000) further argues that English also functions as a source language in the process of transferring technology from one country to another “the more people who master English, the more textbooks and publications in bahasa Indonesia will be” (2000, p. 15).

In response to the growing importance of mastering English, the decree of the Minister of National Education No. 060/U/1993 was released, outlining the position of English in primary education (cited in Kasihani, 2000). English can be taught on primary education level (grades 1-6). English is not explicitly stated as a
compulsory subject but encouraged in schools as a local content subject. This means that primary schools can select English as a local content subject. Kasihani (2000) reports that English as a local content subject has been implemented in primary schools by MONE authorities in West Java, Special District Jogjakarta and East Java Provinces.

Based on the decree of the Minister of National Education No:061/U/1993, in lower secondary level (grades 7-9) English is taught in four teaching periods per week. Each teaching period lasts 40 minutes. In upper secondary schools (grades 10-12), English is taught in four teaching periods a week. In grade 12, English gets five teaching periods a week. Students taking a language program have eleven English teaching periods a week. If English is also selected as a subject for local content in primary schools, the number of teaching periods for English is higher. It means some students start to learn English at an earlier age and have a longer exposure in the classroom to English.

The most recent curriculum reform at the secondary level is the 2006 English Curriculum (Ministry of National Education, 2006). This Curriculum adopts communicative competence as its model of competence (MONE, 2006). Communicative competence can be summarized as the skills needed for communication and consists of four components: grammatical/linguistic competence, sociocultural competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence (Celce-Murcia, Dornyevi & Thurrell, 1995). It is a competence-based curriculum in which, according to this document (p.278), the goals of teaching
English in lower secondary level are: (1) to develop student communicative competence in both oral and written modes at the functional literacy level; (2) to increase student awareness of the importance of mastering the English language to be able to compete in the global community; and (3) to develop student understanding of the close relationship between language and culture.

The 2006 English Curriculum also specifies the scope of English teaching at the lower secondary level. Its aims are: (1) development of student ability to understand and create texts in oral and written modes through the integration of the four language skills, that is, listening, speaking, reading and writing to achieve the functional literacy level; (2) development of student ability to understand and create various texts in the forms of procedure, description, recount, narrative and report (teaching materials should reflect gradation in the use of vocabulary, grammar, and rhetorical items; and (3) development of linguistic competence, socio-cultural competence, and strategic competence to support student communicative competence.

The goal of teaching English at the lower secondary level is for students to achieve communicative competence in English in oral and written modes. According to Yuwono (2005), the following approach is recommended:

- Fluency and acceptable language is the primary goal. To achieve this goal, teachers should be fluent speakers of English.

- Students are expected to interact with the teacher and with each other in order to communicate in the target language. To achieve this goal,
teachers should provide tasks which are designed for pair work or group work. Communicative activities such as role plays and problem solving tasks are highly recommended.

- Students should be exposed to authentic language; therefore, authentic materials are recommended for English classrooms.

- The teacher’s role is that of a facilitator of communication. This requires the teacher to manage the amount of teacher talk to ensure there are opportunities for students to use the target language.

- The use of students’ native language should be minimised with English used most of the time.

In summary, the aim is to achieve communicative competence. Teachers should teach beyond basic mastery of linguistic structures in isolated contexts. They should provide communicative situations in which learners need to perform with a focus on meaning with personal relevance (Littlewood, 2000). Since meaning is the primary concern, classroom activities should involve real communicative activities. The instructions and materials therefore are in the form of tasks for learners to carry out through use of the target language. This approach should provide a purpose and meaning for language use, thereby enhancing relevant communicative competence (Musthafa, 2001).

The teachers’ role in communicative competence based learning is different from other ways of learning a language. It emphasizes student-centred language
teaching (Littlewood, 2000; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Students are expected to be active participants, communicating among themselves and with the teacher, taking responsibility for their own learning, trying to make themselves understood as well as understanding other people (Freeman, 2003). Opportunities to increase teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction to enhance communicative language practice need to be explored.

According to the decree of Ministry of Education no 24/2006, English teachers within a school or in cooperation with English teachers from other schools are expected to develop the school-based English syllabi, on the basis of the 2006 English Curriculum, and to produce teaching materials and lesson plans for teaching in lower secondary schools. A teacher forum, which is called Kelompok Kerja Guru and Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran (KKG/MGMP), has been established in most cities or districts. In this forum, teachers are encouraged to work in collaboration with their colleagues to implement the curriculum. They have regular meetings to discuss curriculum matters or to undertake professional development.

However, despite these government initiatives, several studies have demonstrated that the teaching of English in Indonesian schools has not been a success ((Yeom et.al, 2002, Lengkanawati, 2005; Suherdi, 2011; Setiyadi, cited in Adi Putra, 2012). Lengkanawati (2005) reports upper secondary student leavers and even university graduates fail to gain mastery of oral and written production. This is evidenced by only a small percentage (18.18%) of students who achieved the TOEFL equivalence of 500 in the entrance test required to enrol in graduate
programs in a university in West Java. Suherdi (2011) reports that, despite having learnt English for at least six years in lower and upper secondary schools, “students are still not able to communicate in English”. This finding is supported by Setiyadi (cited in Adi Putra, 2012) who confirms that upper secondary school graduates are not competent in communicating in English.

Improving students’ oral communicative competence in English language is difficult in Indonesia because English is a foreign language and is not used in daily conversation in the community. Students’ exposure to English is limited and the classroom usually is the only place where English is spoken. As a result, English classroom interaction is particularly important. When students listen to the teacher’s instructions and explanations, when they express their views, answer questions and carry out activities, they are not only learning about the structure of the language but also they are learning how to use the language for communication. Where a target language is seldom used outside the classroom, input and language use in classroom interaction especially in teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction are vital.

Classroom interaction in an EFL context is defined as all communication which refers to “not only to those exchanges involving authentic communication but to every oral exchange that occurs in the classroom, including those that arise in the course of formal drilling” (Ellis, 1990, p.12). If effective classroom interaction strategies can be employed to enhance students’ communicative competence, students’ performance should increase. There are studies in Indonesian context
which deal with EFL classroom interaction, but they tend to cover only specific strategy of classroom interaction. Little attention has been paid to implementing effective classroom interaction strategies in teacher-student and student-student interaction.

Some studies focus only on one strategy such as teacher questions. A study by Tulung (2004) on teacher talk in an EFL undergraduate course in a university in North Sulawesi revealed that teacher talk was dominated by teachers asking display questions rather than referential questions. The reason of this, according to Tulung (2004), is that teachers are insecure about the free discussion that referential questions can generate. Instead they made use of display questions which focus on comprehension of a written text.

Similar findings emerged in Rohmah (2002) who investigated teachers’ questions in an Indonesian Islamic upper secondary school. She found that open questions that invited students to think aloud to generate sequences of thought and to explore implications were significantly fewer than closed ones. Display questions occurred more than twice as much as referential questions. Most of the teachers’ questions were to check students’ comprehension and to recall facts. Very few of them involved the students’ ability to make inferences and judgements (Rohmah, 2002). However, questioning is only one strategy of classroom interaction. The effectiveness of other classroom interaction strategies remains relatively unexplored.
Other studies focus on student interaction, for example, studies conducted by Kurnia (2005) and Maulidawati (2006). Based on her observation of lower secondary school English classrooms in Malang, Kurnia (2005, p.55) concluded that the teacher “dominates the floor of speaking throughout the classroom session and students simply sit and listen.” Maulidawati (2006) demonstrated that teachers are much more active than the students and students have little opportunity to produce any English of their own. To overcome the domination of teacher talk, both researchers used jigsaw task in their action research to increase students’ opportunity to use English. The results indicated that jigsaw task did enhance students’ opportunity to use the target language (Kurnia, 2005; Maulidawati, 2006). However, the term classroom interaction covers both teacher-student and student-student interaction. It would be useful to investigate how teachers organize classroom interaction as a whole. What strategies of teacher-student and student-student interaction are effective?

Some studies focus on students’ behaviour in classroom interaction (for example, Lengkanawati, 2004; Exley, 2005). Lengkanawati (2004) reported a lack of social learning strategies by Indonesian tertiary students. These strategies included asking for clarification or verification, asking for correction, cooperating with peers, and cooperating with proficient users of the target language. The first two strategies, asking for clarification or verification and asking for correction, are rarely used by EFL students. Very few respondents admitted putting a question to a teacher. One of the respondents indicated that she would try to solve her problems by herself rather than ask her peer or her teacher. Exley (2005)
confirms these findings. A common finding is the dominance of students’ passivity, shyness, and quietness. These studies examined the behaviour of Indonesian tertiary students. There is no research evidence about the behaviour of lower secondary school students in English classrooms.

Examination of EFL classroom interaction, both teacher-student and student-student, at the lower secondary level in Indonesia is very limited. What is the nature of teacher-student interaction? What strategies of interaction support or hinder student communicative competence? What types of task require student-student interaction? What socio-cultural aspects contribute to interaction patterns in schools in Indonesia? The current research has been designed to add to our understanding of EFL classroom interaction in Indonesia and its effects on students’ communicative competence.

In summary, the study of English as a foreign language is compulsory in secondary education in Indonesia. It is acknowledged by Indonesian authorities that interaction is central to the communicative language approach. Professional development activities and syllabi point to the importance of students developing communicative competence. However, student performance continues to be poor. To understand why performance is not improving, the nature of EFL classrooms needs examination, in particular, what is the nature of classroom interaction? Examination of the nature of interaction in EFL lower secondary classrooms in Indonesia is the basis of the current study.
1.3 Research Questions

To explore teachers’ role in promoting classroom interaction that enhances students’ oral communicative competence in English, the main research question is the following:

*Does the current state of classroom interaction enhance or hinder students’ oral English communicative competence in lower secondary schools in Indonesia?*

To answer this key question, there are five sub-questions which will be addressed individually although they are inter-related:

1. What are students’ perceptions of current classroom interaction and preferences for future classroom interaction?
2. What are teachers’ perceptions of classroom interaction?
3. What is the nature of existing teacher-student interaction?
4. What is the nature of existing student-student interaction?
5. Based on an investigation on current practice, is it possible to design a more effective classroom interaction framework to promote students’ oral English communicative competence in lower secondary schools in Indonesia? (Suryati, 2010).

The research will be conducted in EFL classes in General Lower Secondary Schools (SMP) and Islamic Lower Secondary Schools (MTS) in Malang, East Java, Indonesia.
The first sub-question investigates General and Islamic Lower Secondary students’ perceptions of classroom interaction. The investigation covers students’ perceptions of their participation in teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction, the kind of classroom interaction strategies they experience, and hindrances to effective teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction. The data about the students’ perceptions are collected through use of a survey.

The second sub-question explores General and Islamic Lower Secondary teachers’ perceptions of their current practice of classroom interaction. It includes teachers’ view of the aims of classroom interaction, the strategies of preferred teacher-student interaction, their preference for tasks for student-student interaction, and perceived hindrances to teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction. Data about the teachers’ perceptions will be collected through in-depth interviews.

To answer the third and fourth sub-questions, classroom observations will be undertaken. Classroom observations to examine the nature of teacher-student and student-student interaction will be conducted in EFL classes of General Lower Secondary Schools (SMP) and Islamic Lower Secondary Schools (MTS) in Malang, East Java Indonesia.

A response to the fifth sub-question (is it possible to design a framework to enhance communicative competence in EFL classrooms) will depend on the data collected in response to sub-questions 1, 2, 3, and 4.
The current study employs Walsh’s (2006, 2011) framework for the analysis of interaction strategies. Walsh (2006, 2011) identifies interaction strategies which can promote or hinder students’ use of the target language. This framework is suitable for the present study on a number of levels: it is intended by Walsh to be used in EFL/ESL settings; it is relatively up-to-date and more comprehensive than similar frameworks; and it has not been used to date in the Indonesian context.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study has the potential to improve the teaching of English to students at the lower secondary school level in East Java, Indonesia. In addition, the findings of the study may have important implications for the teaching of foreign languages in general. With a better understanding of classroom interaction processes, teachers may improve the quality of their teaching and thereby improve students’ learning. The quality of training of EFL teachers, both pre-service and in-service, could improve. English teacher training institutions in Indonesia may use the findings to design more effective curricula.

The present study will investigate classroom interaction at the lower secondary school level. The potential population is limited to the city of Malang in East Java. There are 33 cities or districts in East Java Province, Indonesia. Obviously the application and relevance of findings may be limited by the context of the study. Further research using broader populations and different cultural contexts may enhance the generalizability of the findings. In addition, studies examining classroom interaction at different education levels, that is, the primary level and
the higher education level, may enhance generalizability of the findings. A report of the Indonesian EFL experience may be of use to other Asian countries where English is taught as a foreign language.

1.5 The Organization of the Thesis

The thesis contains seven chapters, as shown in Diagram 1.1. Chapter One identifies the research problem in the cultural context of teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesian secondary schools. It includes the aims of the research, the potential significance of the research, and the framework of the study.

Chapter Two is a review of relevant literature. Research on the teaching of English in Indonesian secondary schools will be scrutinized. The review will explore whether or not there are well-established classroom interaction frameworks which promote oral communicative competence of secondary level students.

Chapter Three explores classroom interaction in practice. To provide empirical evidence of current patterns of classroom interaction, and the extent to which they promote students’ oral English communicative competence, fieldwork was conducted in two types of secondary schools. The chapter will justify why a mixed methods approach was selected for the study, including a survey for students, interviews with teachers, and classroom observation.
Chapters Four, Five, and Six will report the outcomes of the survey, the interviews, and the classroom observation. In Chapter Four there is a focus on the quantitative findings from the student survey. In Chapter Five analyses of the interviews with teachers are reported. In Chapter Six analyses of the classroom observations of teacher-student and student-student interaction are reported.

Based on these analyses, a proposal for establishing a new classroom interaction framework to promote oral English communicative competence of secondary school students, general conclusion, recommendations are presented in Chapter Seven. This framework draws together the theoretical and empirical findings from this study. The links among each chapter of the thesis are summarized graphically in Diagram 1.1 on page 18.

1.6 Summary
This chapter has presented background information relevant for the current study. It has provided an overview of the study and justified the research aim. The next chapter will provide a critical review of literature on EFL teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction first in an international context and then in an Indonesian context.
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Chapter Two

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

In Chapter One, the background of the research, the research questions and the significance of the research have been described. Using a critical review of the literature about classroom interaction, this chapter focuses on two types of classroom interaction, teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction undertaken in a second/foreign language (ESL/EFL) classroom. The chapter concludes with a summary of research into classroom interaction in English language teaching in an Indonesian context.

2.2 Teacher-Student Interaction in Second/Foreign Language Classrooms

Classroom interaction is a critical aspect of the teaching and learning process because students benefit from it both socially and academically (Beyazkurk and Kesner, 2005). Classroom interaction that occurs in a second or foreign language classes is of a particular nature and has a range of functions including teachers’ formal instruction, students’ whole class, pair or group work, and teacher-student communication in task management. In this study, the term “classroom interaction” encompasses everything that happens in the classroom that involves communication and is defined broadly to include “… not only to those exchanges involving authentic communication but to every oral exchange that occurs in the
classroom, including those that arise in the course of formal drilling” (Ellis, 1990, p.12).

For many years researchers have indicated the importance of effective classroom interaction strategies to promote student language development. For example, Kramsch (1986) suggests that to achieve student communicative competence, students must be given opportunities to interact with both the teacher and fellow students through turn-taking, to receive feedback, to ask for clarification, and to initiate communication. Rivers (1987) argued that to promote effective classroom interaction, teachers should avoid dominating one-way talk, should be cooperative, and should consider student affective variables.

Mackey (1999) highlights the importance of students’ active participation in classroom interaction, suggesting that teachers should construct interactive learning environments in which students can communicate with each other to generate meaning in the target language. In other words, teachers need to orchestrate classroom interaction to allow students to participate actively in classroom interaction through turn-taking, feedback, clarification requests, and negotiation to allow students to produce the target language.

The most common form of classroom interaction is between the teacher and the whole class students, termed teacher-student interaction. This interaction is usually initiated and controlled by the teacher. According to van Lier (1996), teacher-student interaction presents different opportunities for negotiation
compared to student-student interaction and each type needs to be evaluated within its particular context. This literature review considers these types of interaction separately.

Research on teacher-student interaction covers two main areas: research on specific strategies of interaction which promotes or hinders interaction; and cultural aspects which shape teacher-student interaction. Many studies of classroom interaction focus on specific strategies of classroom interaction, including patterns of interaction, teacher questions, teacher corrective feedback, teacher scaffolding, and teacher target language use. These studies are discussed below.

2.2.1 Pattern of teacher-student interaction

The pattern of interaction is one strategy of teacher-student interaction of interest to many researchers, for example, studies by Hardman et al, (2003), Abd Kadir & Hardman (2007), Vaish (2008), and Wedin (2009). These studies find that the IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) pattern of teacher-student interaction dominated the classroom interaction and limits students’ ability to contribute to classroom activities (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975,1992). This pattern of interaction does not achieve the communicative goals of English language instruction (Hardman et al., 2003; Abd Kadir & Hardman,2007; and Vaish, 2008).

In Europe, Hardman et al. (2003) investigated the interactive and discourse styles of a sample of primary teachers (N=70) to explore the impact of the official
endorsement of “interactive whole class teaching”. Using a computerised observation schedule and discourse analysis system, Hardman et al. (2003) concluded that whole class teaching was dominated by teacher-led recitation. They reported that their discourse style reflected IRF pattern of interaction, where teachers were far from encouraging and extending students’ contributions to promote higher levels of interaction and engagement. In addition, Hardman et al. (2003) add that most teachers’ questions were closed and often required convergent factual answers and student display of known information. These styles of questioning sought predictable correct answers, and only rarely were teachers’ questions used to assist students to give more complete or elaborated ideas.

In Africa, Abd Kadir & Hardman (2007) report similar findings to those of Hardman et al. (2003). Investigating the discourse of teacher-student interaction in Kenyan and Nigerian English lessons, they found that IRF patterns were dominant. Teacher questions were mainly closed, requiring recall of information and teacher follow up. Where teacher follow up occurred, it often consisted of a low level evaluation of a student response, thereby limiting the opportunities for student participation in the classroom discourse and development of higher order thinking.

In Asia, Vaish (2008) investigated 273 English lessons in grade 5 to grade 9 in Singapore’s schools. She found the IRF pattern of interaction structure with closed questions was dominant, whereas whole class elicitation and discussion of
open ended questions occurred only 6% of the time. Vaish concluded that there was a mismatch between the goals of the Singapore English language syllabus, which encouraged critical thinking and language for social interaction through extended oral narratives on the part of the students, and pedagogic practice which restricted such interaction. Vaish’s findings are consistent with findings of Hardman et al. (2003) and Abd Kadir & Hardman (2007).

Although many researchers have shown that the IRF structure is ubiquitous in language classrooms in many countries, other researchers have shed light on how to modify the IRF pattern to invite students’ contribution (Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Cullen, 2002). Nassaji & Wells (2000) argue that the IRF pattern function also has a positive pedagogic function if teachers made good use of the third part of this pattern, for example, by asking a follow-up question to elaborate, exemplify, justify, or repair contributions. If teachers use more of the *negotiatory* type questions rather than the known information type of questions, not to close the discussion but to invite other students to contribute, then this dialogue can result in fruitful co-constructions of knowledge (Nassaji & Wells, 2000).

In summary, the IRF pattern is still dominant in many ESL/EFL classrooms. This pattern usually does not support students’ extended contribution and does not promote interaction and inquiry.
2.2.2 Teacher Questions

Related to the IRF pattern are the teacher questions that are a prominent strategy of classroom interaction. Teacher questions are the focus of many studies. One of the most common ways of analysing teacher questions is to classify the questions that the teacher asks into the closed/display and open/referential question type (Long and Sato 1983; Nunan, 1987). The categorization of teacher questions is shown in the following table.

Table 2.1 Categories of Teacher Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of teacher questions</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed or Display</td>
<td>Questions which:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ask for answers the teacher already knows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prompt short, simple responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Often require limited, sometimes one word answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allow students to display knowledge acquired within the classroom context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open or Referential</td>
<td>Questions which:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are purely exploratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ask for answers which the teacher genuinely wants to know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have no right or wrong answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote interaction resembling non-classroom settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stimulates complex and lengthy language output from students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ho (2005)

There are many studies on teacher questions which focus on the frequency of different types of questions, for example, Shoomoshi (2004), Husin (2006) and Tan (2007). In Shoomoshi’s (2004) study participants were five EFL instructors
from two universities in Teheran and Iranian students of an English program. Shoomoshi showed that out of total 1628 questions, 1335 were display (82%) and 293 were referential (18%). He compared the interaction that resulted from these different types of questions. He reported that the mean time of display questions was 0.62 minutes while the mean time of referential questions was 2.83 minutes. Shoomoshi’s finding indicates that the amount of classroom interaction caused by referential questions is greater than that caused by display questions.

In Malaysia, Hussin (2006) reports that the majority of questions set by EFL teachers were low level and factual with the purpose of preparing students for the National Examination. The questions were not designed to encourage critical thinking. Hussin (2006) concludes that there was a mismatch between what was stipulated by their national curriculum and teachers’ teaching practice. In Chinese University EFL classrooms, Tan (2007) reports that many of the questions asked were lower cognitive questions and that they were mostly answered in chorus or by teacher nomination. The function of questions was to check text comprehension, hold students’ attention to the text, to maintain discipline, and to establish teacher authority.

Display questions tend to hinder teacher-student interaction. Teachers should balance the type of questions they use. Teachers should be wary of display questions which stress low-level factual knowledge. They should ask referential or exploratory questions which cultivate students’ use of the target language and promote students’ learning.
2.2.3 Teacher Corrective Feedback

Teacher corrective feedback has received a great deal of attention. Research can be grouped into two aspects: corrective feedback and linguistic development, and types of corrective feedback. Studies show teacher corrective feedback during teacher-student interaction contributes to the students’ language development, for example studies by Mackey and Silver (2005), McDonough (2005), McDonough & Mackey (2008).

These studies have demonstrated that corrective feedback has contributed to the learning of the target language. Mackey & Silver (2005) reports that Chinese immigrant children in Singapore who received corrective feedback in response to their problems with question forms, produced higher level of questions (64%) and showed more development in terms of questioning than the control group. McDonough (2005) reports that output produced in response to corrective feedback was a significant predictor of ESL question development.

McDonough & Mackey (2008) showed there was a relationship between syntactic priming and ESL question development. Syntactic priming was a learner's production of a new utterance using the syntactic structure model in an interlocutor's recast (implicit reformulations of learners' non target utterances). Their finding indicates that participants who frequently produced developmentally advanced questions after hearing interlocutors’ recast moved to a higher stage of ESL questions.
The effectiveness of the types of teacher corrective feedback for student learning was investigated by Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam (2006), Varnosvadrani & Basturkmen (2009), and Nassaji (2009). Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam (2006) investigated whether adult international students who were studying in a private language school in New Zealand learn more from one type of corrective feedback than from another type. Their findings indicate that explicit feedback in the form of metalinguistic feedback (teacher repeats the error and then supplies metalinguistic information) was more effective than implicit feedback in the form of recasts.

Varnosvadrani & Basturkmen (2009) compared the effectiveness of implicit and explicit error correction on adult Iranian learners’ performance. They found that explicit correction was significantly more effective than implicit correction. They argue that explicit correction creates attention. Implicit correction was less clear. Students saw explicit error correction as feedback that required them to correct their errors. Also, immediate corrections have a greater effect on learning than delayed error correction.

Nassaji (2009) confirms the effectiveness of explicit corrective feedback. He investigated the effects of two categories of interactional feedback: recast and elicitations, on learning linguistic forms that arose incidentally in dyadic interaction. Forty two adult ESL learners who participated in a task-based interaction with two native ESL teachers in a dyad received recast or elicitation feedback for their errors. In both cases the more explicit forms of each feedback
type led to higher rates of immediate and delayed post-interaction correction than implicit feedback.

It can be concluded that teacher corrective feedback is beneficial for students’ target language development. Teacher corrective feedback can be implicit or explicit. However, ESL/EFL teachers are encouraged to use more explicit feedback than implicit feedback because by receiving explicit feedback students notice the errors and can correct them. Teachers are also encouraged to give the correction immediately rather delaying it because immediate corrections are more effective than delayed corrections for students’ learning.

2.2.4 Teacher Negotiation Moves

According to Lyster (2002), negotiation in EFL classrooms can be meaning-focused and form-focused. The negotiation of meaning serves a conversational function which aims “to work toward mutual comprehension” (Lyster, 2002, p.238). Form focused negotiation has a didactic function, that is, “… the provision of corrective feedback that encourages self-repair involving accuracy and precision and not just comprehensibility” (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p.42). Lyster (2001, 2002) identifies four form-focused negotiation moves that teachers can use to push students to improve the accuracy of their non-target language: clarification request, repetition, metalinguistic clues, and elicitation. Three studies which demonstrate the contribution of form focused negotiation to the language teaching are now reviewed.
Lyster (2001) compared the extent to which teachers use negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction to respond to specific errors types, and then examined which types of errors were immediately repaired as a result of each type of feedback. Findings indicate that teachers tended to recast grammatical and phonological errors and to negotiate lexical errors. He also found that phonological repairs tended to follow recast whereas grammatical and lexical repairs tended to follow negotiation of form. He suggested that teachers were on the right track in their decision to recast phonological errors and to negotiate lexical errors. However, teachers could draw more frequently on the negotiation form in response to grammatical errors, because almost two-thirds of all grammatical repairs resulted from this negotiation of form feedback.

Panova and Lyster (2002) examined the types of feedback used by Canadian ESL teachers and their relationship to repair of errors. Recast and L1 translation were the dominant corrective techniques. They accounted for 77% of the total number of teacher feedback turns, clarification request, 11%; metalinguistic feedback, 5%; elicitation, 4%; explicit correction, 2%; repetition, 1%. The highest rates of learner uptake (100%) occurred with clarification requests, elicitation, and repetition.

Metalinguistic feedback was the next prominent indicator of learner uptake; 71% of the feedback moves with metalinguistic feedback resulted in learner uptake. When the teacher recast or explicitly corrected an error by providing the target form, uptake was lower, at 40% and 33% of the total number of these feedback
types. Lowest rate of uptake occurred when the teacher translated learner L1 utterances (21%). With respect to learner repair, rates of repair following recasts, translation, and explicit correction were the lowest, at 13%, 4%, and 0%, respectively. As for the less frequently used types of feedback, teacher turns with repetition and elicitation resulted in the highest rate of learner repair (83% and 73%, respectively), followed by feedback moves with metalinguistic feedback (29%) and clarification requests (23%).

According to Panova and Lyster, these lower rates of uptake repairs generated the most frequently used types of feedback, namely, recasts and L1 translation. This was because the function of both recasts and translations is to reformulate learner utterances by providing the correct model. They do not necessarily require student responses. In contrast, other feedback types, such as repetitions, clarification requests, elicitation, and metalinguistic feedback, are generally more successful at leading to immediate repair of learner errors and are able to prompt peer and self-repair.

From these studies there are two conclusions. First, negotiation of form feedback generates a high percentage of student uptake and lead to repairs. The reason for this uptake and repair is active participation by students (Lyster, 2002). Second, teachers should not use only one type of feedback but need to orchestrate, in accordance with their students' language ability and content familiarity, a wide range of feedback types.
2.2.5 Teacher scaffolding

In addition to study of teacher feedback in teacher-classroom interaction, how teachers use talk to scaffold student learning has been studied (McCormick and Donato, 2000; Myhill and Warren, 2005; Walqui, 2006, Gerakopoulou, 2011). Myhill and Warren (2005) define teacher scaffold as “support [given] to learners while they acquire the necessary skills and understanding to operate independently, therefore effective scaffolding requires that pedagogic attention be paid to helping learners move toward independence” (p.58).

There are various scaffold techniques identified. McCormick and Donato (2000) used questions to serve as teacher scaffold. They investigated types of questions that served to scaffold learning during interaction of teacher-fronted activities in an integrated ESL class in a university setting in USA. They found that teachers’ use of questions reflected the characteristics and functions of scaffolding. The questions created supportive conditions for comprehension, comprehensibility, and participation of students.

Two kinds of questions: “Reduction in degrees of freedom” (questions to simplify or limit the task demands), and “Marking critical strategies” (questions to call the novice’s attention to important aspects of the task) are reported to help students during difficulties with complex classroom tasks, whereas “Direction maintenance” (questions to maintain motivation and progress toward the goal of the task) help students focus on the task and guide students through the comprehension of the texts. When students struggle to express themselves, the
teacher's question serves to increase comprehensibility by asking for clarification, expansion, and elaboration. When breakdowns occurred, “Marking critical strategies” and “Reduction in degrees of freedom” questions operated as repair tools. The teacher selectively chose questions to build participation. “Direction maintenance” questions were frequently used as a means to keep discussions alive. The authors conclude that scaffolding functions of the questions appear to match the teacher’s planned tasks and reported goals for the course.

Myhill and Warren (2005) used “critical moment” when investigating teacher scaffold in England. They define critical moment as “a discourse unit where the teacher’s utterance is significant either in supporting the development of a child understanding or in hindering it, or where an opportunity to build on a child’s response was missed” (p.59). They found three categories of critical moments: those which caused confusion for students; those which steered the discourse heavily along a predetermined path; and those which were responsive to student learning. They found that teacher talk is frequently structured to enable students to achieve a correct answer, to meet a particular curriculum objective. They conclude that teacher scaffold becomes a set of prompts to elicit a particular response, which reflects the IRF pattern. They concluded that teacher scaffolds are rare because teacher talk is not designed to facilitate it.

Gerakopoulou (2011) employed the scaffolding techniques developed by Sharpe (2001) and Walqui (2006) to investigate nine Dutch teachers scaffolding oral interaction in secondary education classrooms. Using classroom observation and
video to record classroom discourse, Gerakopoulou found that teachers tend to use different forms of body language and contextualising to support their instruction, especially with younger learners. Another significant result was that students’ participation is encouraged when teachers lead students to the production of language through the technique of elicitation, that is, elicit responses that draw students along a line of reasoning, which leads to a *meta-statement*, a kind of summary of what has been said.

In summary, the findings reveal some techniques of teacher scaffold which can improve teacher-student interaction, lead to student use of the target language, and promote learning: questions to simplify or limit the task demands, questions to call the novice’s attention to important aspects of the task, questions to maintain motivation and progress toward the goal of the task, different forms of body language, and contextualization and elicitation. However, critical moments which steer the discourse too heavily along a predetermined path do not encourage student interaction.

### 2.2.6 Teacher Language Choice

Many researchers have explored the purposes of L1 in FL classrooms. The most common use of the L1 is for vocabulary, particularly administrative vocabulary (Kraemer, 2006; White and Storch, 2012). For example, Kramer (2006) finds that teachers often used L1 for classroom management and administration. White and Storch (2012) report that L1 was used for a variety of purposes, most notably explanations of vocabulary and explanations of tasks. Rolin-ianziti & Brownlie
(2002) shows that L1 was most often used to translate vocabulary. Another commonly found use of L1 was explaining grammar (Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie, 2002; Kim and Elder 2005). Another use of L1 is to explain complex notions of language and culture (Celik, 2003; Cook, 2001). In summary, L1 plays an important role in FL classroom interaction.

Apart from the amount and the purpose of the use of L1, researchers also have explored other factors associating with their decision to use one language or the other. One factor is type of task. Kim and Elder (2005) report that task-based activities are more conducive to TL use than grammar focused exercises. Another factor is teachers’ pedagogical beliefs and goals. Kraemer (2006) finds that the amount of L1 use was related to the teachers’ teaching experience: teachers with more experience used less L1 than those with less experience. Another factor is student unease or anxiety about use of the target language.

Oguro (2011) reported that teachers’ use of the target language cannot be achieved by ignoring a powerful resource available for communication, learners’ L1. Oguro argues that teachers used L1 to reduce student frustration and to build student confidence. Teachers addressed students’ concerns about not understanding the language by telling them that they do not need to comprehend all that they hear. Teachers give students the opportunity to confirm understanding and highlight the value of being exposed to the target language. Teachers also could maintain student interests and save time (Kang, 2008; Rezvani 2011). For example, in EFL classrooms in Korea, Kang (2008) reports that to maintain
students’ interests, full L2 use is not always beneficial because of large class sizes, mixed ability among students, the need to maintain discipline, and the need to enhance student comprehension. In addition, teachers use L1 when students lack English proficiency and when the teachers themselves lack confidence in engaging communication in English (Littlewood, 2007).

The studies reviewed above show that teachers use L1 to some extent in the FL classrooms for a variety of pedagogical purposes. This has implications for the quality and effectiveness of classroom interaction.

The research on strategies of teacher-student interaction are beneficial for the current research because they point to strategies that hinder or support interaction to promote student communicative competence. The next section considers cultural factors that affect teacher-student interaction.

2.2.7 Research on cultural factors affecting teacher-student interaction

Many studies have been conducted on the influence of cultural factors on classroom interaction. In a Brazilian context, Consolo (2000) reports that there was greater teacher-student interaction and more student contributions to classroom discourse when teachers paid attention to students' verbal contributions and developed the topic in line with students' opinions. According to Consolo, the contributing factors for quantity and quality of students' contribution to discourse may include the level of students' involvement with the topic of interaction and the teachers' ability, in both topic management and rhetorical strategies to
acknowledge students' contribution, to motivate participation. In the case of Brazil where people were immersed in a culture that emphasizes informality in both verbal and nonverbal behaviour, EFL students may respond well to teachers whose speech style matches the cultural characteristics of oral interaction in their first language.

Mitchell and Lee (2003) compared the characteristics of English language classroom interaction in classrooms in the United Kingdom and Korea. There were similarities. Both classrooms were strongly teacher-led and focused on practical activity and oral interaction. The British teacher wanted the target language to be used for authentic activities. Her classroom interaction was egalitarian. More able students were not singled out as models or mentors for the rest. This suggested a norm of individual responsibility for learning, although in a teacher-led classroom.

The Korean teacher kept more closely to a ready-made language script sourced from a classroom video. This reflected her awareness that she was a role model and considered controlled input was best for early learning. She recognized publicly the more able students as language models and mentors for the rest of the class. Her objective was to ensure that all would learn. Students participated in this way of working, for example, complaining if group leaders are weak or absent, or if group achievement is unbalanced. This model of differentiated students roles and group responsibility is different from the equal treatment seen in the British classroom. The Korean teacher’s behaviour can be seen to reflect an
Asian collectivist culture. In addition, she may have made some practical management decisions when coping with a large class.

Luk and Lin (2006) compared EFL classroom interactions initiated by NETs (Native English Teachers) and LETs (Local English Teachers) in Hong Kong secondary classes. To engage students in a dialogic learning process and to help them develop into speakers of English required two approaches: not only the expertise in the target language possessed by the NETs but also the resources of students’ experience in the local education system and local socio-cultural upbringing possessed by the LETs.

Eng and Kumar (2009) investigated classroom interaction in Malaysian schools. Findings reveal that meaning and knowledge are not verbally co-constructed through the active inference, nor there is a high degree of interpersonal connection between teachers and students. The teacher is an authority on knowledge being imparted. Rarely is there a co-construction of knowledge as it is viewed in the western world. This does not mean that learning does not take place, only that the conventions of teaching and learning are different. These are traditional ways in Chinese and Islamic Malay communities which hold teachers in high regard as dispensers of knowledge and wisdom. The Islamic Malay community regards the teaching profession as a noble one.

Although there were many studies undertaken on cultural aspects of teacher-student interaction and teacher-student interaction, studies of this kind are very limited in the Indonesian context. Indonesia has a unique culture. This study will
contribute to the knowledge base by exploring classroom interaction in Indonesia, an interaction shaped by its social-cultural underpinnings.

2.3. Student-Student Interaction in Second/Foreign Language Classrooms

Research into student-student interaction has examined the benefits of student-student interaction to promote target language production, patterns of interaction, type of tasks, Language Related Episodes (LREs), and student language choice.

2.3.1 Benefits of student-student interaction

Studies that have investigated the benefits of student-student interaction to promote more student language production include Rong (2000), McDonough (2004), and Adams (2007). Rong (2000) reports that task-centred group activities increase quantity of student talk in terms of longer interactive episodes, more exchanges of utterances among speakers, wider variety of information contributed by all participants, and provide more opportunity to produce purposeful language.

In line with Rong’s findings, McDonough (2004) reports learners with more participation in corrective feedback and modified output episodes during pair and small group activities showed significant improvement in their immediate production of real conditionals, and their immediate and delayed production of unreal conditionals. Learners with less participation showed significant improvement in their immediate production. Adams (2007) also reports that participants who received feedback during pair interaction sessions showed moderate to high rates of learning for all structures included in the tailor-made
post test. Evidence of learning occurred most often on past tense items. These findings lend support for classroom practices that promote pair and group-work.

2.3.2 Patterns of student-student interaction

The influence of social affective factors during student-student interaction was the focus of research by Storch (2001, 2002a, 2002b). She identifies four main patterns of interactions. The most prevalent pattern in Storch’s studies is a collaborative relationship which balanced equality and mutuality and produced a high degree of negotiated interaction. The other three patterns are dominant/dominant, dominant/passive, and expert/novice.

Dominant/dominant relationships are high in equality but low on mutuality and were characterised by engagement via explicit peer repairs rather than requests and collaborative completion. Dominant/passive relationships are low on both equality and mutuality and result in a monologic form of exchange produced exclusively by the dominant partner. The expert/novice relationship emphasizes mutuality rather than equality and is characterized by the ‘expert’ partner assuming a leadership role and helping the ‘novice’ partner without monopolising interaction. Storch (2001) concludes that when the patterns of student interaction were collaborative or expert/novice, they are likely to scaffold each other.

Affective factors during student-student interaction also are the focus of a study by Morris and Tarone (2003). They investigated interactions of three dyads of learners engaged in collaborative work in EFL classrooms. Their findings
indicate that interpersonal conflict and negative attribution did emerge. Post test scores indicate that on those occasions in which feedback was provided but included overt negative attributions or was immediately followed by interpersonal conflict, it seemed to interfere with the acquisition of the item that was recast. Being negatively evaluated socially by their partners led them to perceive mockery. When this occurred, they did not acquire the recast form. The authors suggest that to maximize the efficacy of pair work, teachers need to be aware of what is happening and to design activities in which more proficient learners are given a less dominant role in interaction. In this way, less proficient learners are more inclined to participate in the interaction and contribute to the communicative task.

Considering affective factors during interaction, Yoshida (2008) also makes an important contribution. She investigated learners’ responses after their partners’ corrective feedback during pair work. Learners’ responses to corrective feedback showed that corrective feedback had been noticed but not necessarily understood, even when learners had responded by reformulating their errors. Factors affecting understanding of corrective feedback in pair work include a lack of collective scaffolding, influenced by differences in cognitive styles and dissatisfaction with their roles in pair work. When learners are not satisfied with their roles, they cannot benefit much from interaction. Yoshida suggests that teachers should monitor student interaction patterns in pair work and encourage dominant-dominant pattern or dominant-passive to change their patterns to an expert-novice
pattern or a collaborative pattern. Teachers should ask learners acting as experts to wait for their partners’ answers and let them to take more initiative.

In summary, social and affective factors influence the pattern of student-student interaction. A collaborative type of interaction is likely to support student interaction and facilitate learning while a non-collaborative pattern is likely to hinder student interaction and discourage learning.

2.3.3 Language Related Episodes (LREs)

Apart from patterns of student-student interaction, Language Related Episodes (LREs) have been investigated in many studies in student-student interaction. Language Related Episodes (LREs) are defined as any part of the dialogue where students talk about the language they are producing, question their language use or correct themselves or others (Swain and Lapkin, 1998). According to Swain and Lapkin, 1998), the focus of LREs can be lexical (related to vocabulary items), form (related to aspects of grammar items), or discourse (related to how text is structured, sequenced, and shaped). Research on LREs reveals that aspects such as proficiency level and pattern of student-student interaction may affect the LREs produced by students during interaction (Lesser 2004; Watanabe and Swain, 2007).

Lesser (2004) investigated the effect on the number, type and outcome of LREs produced by proficiency grouped learner dyads (H-H; H-L; L-L) when completing “dictogloss” tasks. Her findings indicate that a comparison of the number, type of
outcome of the LREs produced by the three proficiency groupings demonstrated that the number, type and outcome of LREs increased with proficiency. The H-H dyads produced more LREs than the other two groups, had more LREs with a grammatical focus, and more often correctly resolved linguistic problems. The H-L dyads performed similarly with respect to the L-L dyads. More specifically, the superiority of the H-H dyads compared to the other two groupings was statistically significant on all three measures (amount, type, and outcome) while that of the H-L dyads compared to the L-L dyads was statistically significant only for correct resolution of linguistic problems.

Watanabe and Swain (2007) investigated the effects of second language (L2) proficiency differences in pairs and patterns of interaction on L2 learning. The subjects were 12 Japanese learners in ESL program at a Canadian university. They designed the study in which four different core participants interacted with higher and lower proficiency non-core participants. They analysed each pair’s collaborative dialogue in terms of language related episodes and patterns of pair interaction and participant individual post-test score.

Their findings reveal that the high pairs produced a greater frequency of LREs than low pairs. High participants achieved higher post test-test scores when working with their lower proficiency partners than their high proficiency partners. Pairs with collaborative orientation (collaborative, novice-expert) produced more LRE than pairs with a non-collaborative orientation (dominant/passive and expert passive). The pair with the most LREs was found to be collaborative pairs, while
pairs with the least LREs were found to be non-collaborative, expert/passive pairs. The patterns of pair interaction influenced the frequency of Language Related Episodes (LRE) and post-test performance. When the pairs engaged in a collaborative pattern of interaction, they were likely to achieve higher post-test scores regardless of their partner’s proficiency level.

In summary, the findings suggest that for high frequency of LREs to be produced during student-student interaction, mixing high ability students with low ability students and asking them to adopt a collaborative pattern of student-student interaction should be encouraged.

### 2.3.4 Types of task

There has been research on tasks which produce LREs (Mayo, 2002; Mackey, Kanganas, & Oliver, 2007; Kim, 2009). For example, Mayo (2002) investigated the use of form-focused activities: cloze, multiple choices, dictogloss, text reconstruction, and text editing which require learners to produce output collaboratively. Students’ interaction was codified and LREs were calculated. Except for dictogloss, all the remaining activities generated a high amount of attention. These tasks are reported to elicit discussion and reflection on the use of language and they seemed to push learners to reflect on their language choices by hypothesis testing strategies which are important for language development. Mayo reported that very few LREs was generated from dictogloss because of lack of familiarity of the learners with dictoglos procedures.
Kim (2009) explored the impact of task complexity on the occurrence of LREs during task based interaction. Using an experimental design, ESL learners were grouped into low and high proficiency to complete four tasks: picture narration – reasoning (simple); picture narration + reasoning (complex); picture difference + few elements (simple); picture difference - few elements (complex). Results indicate that for picture narration tasks, the low group had significantly more LREs during simple picture narration than the complex picture narration task.

The high group produced significantly more LREs during the complex picture different than simple picture narration. For the picture difference tasks, significantly more LREs were produced during the complex picture difference task than the simple picture difference task by the low group, whereas no difference was found for the high group. In terms of the resolutions of the LREs, a similar pattern was found during the tasks regardless of task complexity in the two task types, showing that slightly more LREs were resolved correctly during the complex version of the tasks.

Kim (2009) argues that findings partly supported the Cognition Hypothesis. It was hypothesized that increasing task complexity along resource directing dimensions would facilitate more interaction and promote noticing and L2 learning opportunities (Robinson, 2005). The low group learners produced significantly more LREs during the simple picture narration task than the complex picture narration task. This did not fit the Cognition Hypothesis. The high group learners had significantly more LREs during the complex picture narration task.
than simple picture narration task, which provided support for the Cognition Hypothesis.

The findings provide evidence for manipulating tasks to promote student interaction to produce the target language. Providing students with familiar tasks will create opportunities for student interaction to produce LREs. Manipulating the difficulty of the task and providing information resources or linguistic supports with the tasks will produce high LREs during student interaction.

2.3.5 Student language choice during student-student interaction

The use of L1 is common in EFL classes during student-student interaction. The dominant view of the use of L1 in L2 classes was that it should be strongly discouraged because use of L1 would interfere with the development of L2 (e.g. Odlin, 1989; Kellerman, 1995). However current thinking (for example, Orland-Barak & Yinon, 2005; Carless, 2008) has indicated that the use of L1 in the L2 classroom may be desirable. The use of L1 can be considered as a constructive tool in teaching and class management. Students are also reported to appreciate the use of their L1 in L2 classes (Brooks-Lewis, 2009).

Scott and Fuente (2008) found that L1 plays an important role in the process of second language acquisition. Using consciousness-raising, form-focused grammar tasks, which were administered to two groups of foreign language learners, one with and the other without permission to use L1, Scott and Fuente found that those learners who were allowed to use their L1 worked collaboratively in a
balanced and coherent way. Those who had been required to use only the target language showed fragmented interaction and little evidence of collaboration. They argued that exclusive use of the L2 during such tasks may impose excessive cognitive demands on learners that have a negative impact on language acquisition.

Storch and Aldosari (2010) confirm Scott and Fuente’s findings. They report that EFL learners used their L1 to a fairly limited extent. L1 words formed only 7% of the total number of words produced and L1 turns accounted for only 16% of the total number of turns. They also note that task type seemed to affect L1 use but mainly of L–L pairs. That is, L–L pairs used more L1 than H–H and H–L pairs, but only when completing the editing task. There was little difference in the amount of L1 used by the three proficiency groups on the other two tasks (jigsaw and composition).

The study also finds that the L1, when used, served a number of important functions, but that the predominant function across all tasks and proficiency groupings was task management (45% of all L1 turns). This was followed by deliberations over vocabulary (26% of all L1 turns). The data of the pair talk show that when the L1 was used for task management, it afforded learners an opportunity to gain a joint understanding of the task requirements, particularly for novel tasks (jigsaw) or difficult tasks (editing) and thereby complete them. When used in deliberations over vocabulary, it enabled learners to give and receive
timely assistance about word meaning and word searches, thus facilitating L2 learning.

Rayati and Yaqubi (2012), in their experimental study, report that those learners who were allowed to use their L1 in carrying out editing tasks in pairs produced more LREs than those in L1-not-allowed pairs. Though the differences in the number of LREs produced in the two classes were not statistically significant in all three tasks, the trend was generally in favour of the L1-allowed group. In other words, those learners who had the permission to use their L1 were engaged in more peer-peer interaction to find solutions to their linguistic problems. Unlike the students in the L1-allowed class, those in L1 not allowed class opted more for quick, individual resolution of the problems. It appears that L1 can be of benefit, in L2 learning.

In summary, these studies provide evidence that allowing L1 use to certain extent during student-student interaction gives learners the opportunity to use an important tool that promotes interaction and learning.

2.4 Research of classroom interaction in an Indonesian context

Research on classroom interaction in an Indonesian context covers two aspects: teacher-student interaction, and student-student interaction.

An earlier study by Lewis (1997) looked at teacher-student interaction in the secondary level. His findings revealed that English lessons were teacher-centred
and textbook driven. The textbooks presented units that followed a structured syllabus with graded reading passages and dialogues. Teachers typically explained new grammatical structures and required students to memorise grammar rules and new vocabulary. Lessons were taken up with teacher talk. Students were tested on their translation of new vocabulary and understanding of grammar.

Students sometimes worked in pairs, completing the reading comprehension, vocabulary, or grammar exercises. Students were silent, but occasionally they would do pronunciation drills with the teacher and answer questions on the readings or grammatical exercises. Many students reported that much class time was spent copying from the blackboard and translating texts or vocabulary from English to Indonesian. Students complained that their teachers’ proficiency in English was poor.

Domination of teacher’ talk in EFL classes is confirmed by Lestari (1999). Lestari cites Astika’s study (1996) on Indonesian EFL classroom in primary schools. She reports teachers dominated classroom time. Teachers’ talk consisted of 54.22%; students only occupied 14.9% and the rest 30% was occupied by silence and confusion. She reports that students were mostly passive and did not respond to teachers’ presentation. She argues that students behaved that way because they did not want to be considered arrogant. Javanese children are trained to be obedient to parents and teachers. Lestari suggests that teachers should provide opportunities to students to use the language and make students speak in English.
using games, songs and riddles. Teachers should provide more feedback to correct students’ mistakes.

Milal’s (2011) study also reports on teacher domination of teacher-student interaction. His findings indicate that teachers dominated the classroom discourse with 341 utterances; students produced only 104 individual utterances, and 31 choral responses. Among those teacher utterances, 198 were directive acts which requested services such as instructing, nominating, commanding, ordering, requesting, stimulating, calling attention, asking for repetition, drilling, correcting pronunciation. In addition the directive acts included eliciting, asking, prompting, checking comprehension, checking knowledge, and asking for confirmation.

Milal argues that teachers hold control over the flow of discourse by initiating interaction, dominating the turn taking of the IRF pattern, controlling the topic, determining what to discuss at every point of the lesson. Learners followed and responded. He adds that asymmetry of the power relation between teacher and learners also is indicated by the teacher’s role of questioner. Most teacher questions were closed type. This is an indicator of the practice of power because with that type of questions learners become more controlled and their contribution becomes limited. High level questions or “why” questions that is subjective gives greater freedom to students.

The ineffectiveness of EFL primary school classroom interaction is reported by Rachmayanti (2008). She examined the effect of time of learning English, English
teachers’ characteristics, teaching and learning processes, socioeconomic status, and students’ characteristics on achievement in English. Rahmayanti (2008) argues that teachers lack the competence to enhance student motivation and to promote effective classroom interaction.

Other studies have explored teacher questioning in Indonesian EFL classrooms (Tulung, 2006; Rohmah, 2002; Arifin, 2012). For example Tulung (2006) reports that teachers’ questions were dominated by display questions. Rohmah (2002) confirms Tulung’s finding. Her findings reveal that open questions that invited students to think aloud to generate sequences of thought and to explore implications were significantly fewer than closed ones. Display questions take place more than twice as much as referential questions. Most of the teachers’ questions check students’ comprehension and recall facts. Very few of them ask students to give inferences and judgements. The most common strategy that teachers use is to repeat questions (Rohmah, 2010). Arifin’s findings (2012) on teacher questions in lower secondary context fit with Rohmah’s and Tulung’s findings. He reported that teachers used 66.7% of display questions and 33.3% referential questions. Students’ responses were mostly verbal, consisting of a few words or simple sentences.

A recent study on teacher-student interaction was conducted by Maulana, Opdenakker, Stroet, and Bosker (2012). Their findings reveal that Indonesian teachers spent most of their time lecturing in front of the class. There is hardly any interaction with students. Most teachers showed little awareness of their
students’ learning process. They did not pay much attention to students’ mistakes and misconceptions. Although Indonesian teachers have been given more autonomy in implementing more active teaching learning practices, many of them have not taken up this opportunity. They are concerned that this might increase their workload because this approach demands more of teachers than whole class lecturing.

There is little research on student-student interaction in the Indonesian context. Studies of student-student interaction focus on promoting opportunities for students’ use of the target language. For examples, Kurnia (2005) and Maulidawati (2006) both report that the jigsaw task did enhance students’ interaction and use of the target language in lower secondary schools. Tamah (2011) also used the jigsaw task to improve student interaction in using target language at the primary level. Her findings indicate that students are engaged much more in the on-task oriented discussion which is relevant to the subject content than in the off-task one. This study also reveals that students interact with each other to provide assistance. The students make use of simple referential questions as well as clarification requests and confirmation checks.

Yufrizal (2001) studied student-student interaction which focused on negotiation. He investigated negotiation of meaning among Indonesian learners of EFL and to examined which type of tasks stimulated learners to negotiate meaning. Forty undergraduate students were involved. Information gap, Jigsaw, and Role-play tasks were given to students in dyadic interactions. The results show that the
information gap tasks were more productive than the other two types of tasks. The study also showed that more interaction and negotiation of meaning were produced by the learners in the same gender group and the same proficiency dyads when they were assigned the information gap and jigsaw tasks.

The findings of studies in Indonesia show that EFL teacher-student interaction remains unsatisfactory. Teacher-student interaction is still dominated by teacher talk with little opportunity for student language production. However no study to date investigates how teachers organize classroom interaction as a whole. What strategies of teacher-student and student-student interaction can be demonstrated to be effective for learning English?

Furthermore, this literature review has demonstrated that research on classroom interaction contains few studies that provide a framework for effective classroom interaction. There are no studies addressing teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction in conventional English classes in secondary schools in Indonesia. The current study will explore classroom interaction in an Indonesian setting. It will examine existing strategies of teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction at lower secondary school level where the students have low proficiency of English language. It will explore teachers’ and students’ views of classroom interaction and various aspects that contribute to classroom interaction. The intention is to develop a classroom interaction framework to promote students’ English communicative competence.
2.5 Summary

This literature review has considered research in three areas: teacher-student interaction in EFL/ESL classrooms; student-student interaction at the international level; and EFL classroom interaction in the Indonesian context. There are three conclusions drawn from this review.

First, studies of teacher-student interaction have provided insights into strategies which promote and hinder teacher-student interaction. Studies on teacher-student interaction have highlighted the importance of context in teacher-student interaction.

Second, studies on student-student interaction have shown that students are able to negotiate with each other, asking each other questions, and provide feedback. Language Related Episodes (LREs) are used to identify students’ talk about language. The frequency of Language Related Episodes (LREs) that students produce during student interaction depends on communicative task characteristics, student proficiency, and pattern of interaction.

Third, as evidenced from studies of classroom interaction in the Indonesian context, the quality of Indonesian classroom interaction has not improved in the last decade. Although the 2006 English Curriculum which aims to develop student communicative competence has been implemented, little has been done to improve classroom interaction to facilitate student communicative competence. There are problems with teacher-student interaction and student-student
interaction in Indonesian English classes. A current research project has been designed to investigate effective classroom interaction strategies that promote student communicative competence. The design and methodology of this project are discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter Three

Research Design and Methodology

3.1 Introduction

Chapter Two provided an overview of classroom interaction in EFL/ESL teaching in both international and Indonesian contexts. There appears to be little research in the Indonesian context that explores classroom interaction in the English classroom. Research described in Chapter Two pointed to teacher talk dominating the classroom in Indonesia and passive students failing to initiate language in EFL classrooms. The intention of this research project is to construct an effective classroom framework to promote students’ oral English communicative competence.

The research design and methodology are discussed in this chapter. First, the location of the current study will be discussed. The researcher examines a framework for assessing classroom interaction in Indonesian lower secondary schools. Based on this framework, the researcher has adopted a mixed methods approach containing both quantitative and qualitative elements to elicit data from teachers and students. In developing methodological triangulation as a means of enhancing the study’s reliability and validity, three types of data collection are used to cross-check the findings: student survey, teacher in-depth interview, and classroom observation. Ethical concerns with gathering data also are considered.
3.2. Location of the Current Study

The sites of the current study were lower secondary schools situated in the city of Malang in East Java Province, Indonesia. In Indonesian lower secondary schools, grades cross three years, starting from grade 7 to grade 9, as a continuation of students’ six years of primary education. The total number of lower secondary schools in Malang is 120 and the student population is 22,000 (Malang City Education Database, 2010). Of the 120 schools, 90 were General Lower Secondary Schools and 30 were Islamic Lower Secondary Schools.

General Lower Secondary Schools are managed by the Ministry of National Education (MONE). They cater for students with various religious backgrounds. This type of school includes both state and private schools. To enter the State General Lower Secondary Schools, students must have high passing scores on the National Examination of General Primary Education. They adopt the curriculum prescribed by MONE which consists of 12 subjects, including English. The aim of the General Lower Secondary Schools is: to develop students’ intellectual capacity, knowledge, personality, good conduct, and to enhance student’ skills to live independently and to further their education (Ministry of Education, 2006).

Islamic Lower Secondary Schools are managed by the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA). They cater only for students with an Islamic background. This type of school includes both state and private schools. To enter the State Islamic Lower Secondary Schools, students must also have high passing scores on the National Examination of Islamic Primary Education. The schools adopt not only
the curriculum prescribed by MONE which consists of 12 subjects, including English, but also the prescribed curriculum of MORA which contains five additional subjects containing Islamic teaching: The Noble Quran and Hadith of Prophet Muhammad SAW; Islamic Belief and Islamic Manners; Islamic Jurisprudence; Islamic History, Arabic Language; and Islamic Personality Development. The aim of Islamic Lower Secondary Schools is to nurture students to be a strong believer to God (Allah SWT), develop students’ knowledge, understanding, internalisation and application of Islamic teachings, who have good character, develop students’ knowledge of science and technology and who can actualize positively in social life.

For both types of schools, English is a compulsory foreign language subject and both types of schools implement the same English Curriculum. English is taught in four teaching periods a week. The most recent curriculum is the English Curriculum 2006 (Department of National Education, 2006, p.278) which lists the goals of teaching English in lower secondary school level: to develop student communicative competence in both oral and written modes at functional literacy level; to increase student awareness of the importance of mastering English language to be able to compete in the global community; and to develop student understanding of the close relationship between language and culture.

The English Curriculum 2006 (p.278) also specifies the scope of English teaching in lower secondary school level: the development of students’ ability to understand and create texts in oral and written modes through the use of the
integration of the four language skills of, listening, speaking, reading and writing, to achieve functional literacy; the development of students’ ability to understand and create various texts (including procedure, description, recount, narrative and report) with teaching materials reflecting gradation in the use of vocabulary, grammar and rhetoric items; and the development of linguistic competence, socio-cultural competence, and strategic competence to support student communicative competence.

The teachers of English in both types of schools are local people and non-native speakers of English. Most of them are local East Java teachers who have been trained in local teacher training institutions. Only a few have received masters degrees. Both types of schools have local students from Malang. It is common practice for students from both types of schools have additional English tuition outside their schools. If students come from well to do families, the parents are aware of the importance of the social and economic benefits of mastering English.

3.3. Adoption of a mixed methods approach

The current study used a mixed methods approach, taking advantages of the strengths of a combined quantitative and qualitative investigation (Creswell, 2008, 2009). The mixed methods design, also called a two-phase model (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007), was employed. The design consisted first of collecting quantitative data and then collecting qualitative data to help explain and elaborate on the quantitative results. The researcher can capture the best of both quantitative and qualitative data, that is, to obtain quantitative results from a large
sample population in the first phase, and to elaborate these findings through an in-depth qualitative exploration in the second phase.

The use of a mixed method design, in this case using three sources of data, addresses some threats to validity. Data collected from three different sources (student survey, interviews, and classroom observation) were used to understand EFL classroom interaction in its natural setting. Triangulation can confirm and improve the clarity and precision of research. It provides an accurate means for explaining phenomena in EFL classroom interaction.

**3.4 Quantitative Investigation**

A student survey was used as first data collection procedure. Survey research is defined as a procedure in which the researcher administers a survey to a sample or to the entire population of people to describe attitudes, opinions, or behaviours (Creswell, 2008). Survey research involves getting reactions to questions or other stimuli from a representative sample of the target group to be able to generalize to the wider population (Gass & Mackey, 2007). Survey research was selected because it was an effective means of gathering information from a relatively large group of students about their attitudes to EFL classroom interaction.

A questionnaire was selected as a means of data collection. The questionnaire is generally a written instrument that presents all participants with the same series of questions or statements, which the participants then react to, either through
providing a written answer, making Likert-style judgments, or selecting options from a series of statements (Gass & Mackey, 2007).

For the current study a student survey was designed to gain an understanding of students’ perception of classroom interaction of students from General and Islamic Lower Secondary Schools. The survey was designed to examine students’ perception of their participation in classroom interaction and the use of particular strategies of teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction. One of the advantages of a survey is that it requires less time and fewer resources but can accommodate a large number of participants. It took 15 to 20 minutes for students to complete the survey. A limitation of a questionnaire is that it makes use of participants’ self-report. Self-reports by a person about his or her behaviour may be at odds with how the person actually behaves. To check the veracity of the self-report data about what happens in EFL classrooms, the survey data was accompanied by classroom observation and interviews with teachers.

Students in grades 7-9 of General and Islamic Lower Secondary Schools formed the population of the student survey. The researcher used 24 schools (20% of the total school population) located in the city of Malang (Education Database, Ministry of Education, 2010). Because this research is generally descriptive, a 20% sample of the population is sufficient (Charles and Mertler, 2002, p.154). Selection of schools was based on a multi-stage cluster sampling method, and then a random sampling method (Fowler, 2009). The schools were organised into a general lower school cluster (75% of the total school) and an Islamic lower...
secondary school cluster (25% of the total schools). Individual schools then were randomly selected from within each cluster. As a result, 18 general lower secondary schools and 6 Islamic lower secondary schools were selected. The targeted students for each school were 30 students, which consisted of 10 students for each grade. The total student sample size was 720 students.

The student survey items were constructed with reference to the literature and in line with the research questions. The student questionnaire has five parts: “Personal Background”, “Teacher-student Interaction”, “Student-student Interaction”, “Attitudes to Classroom Interaction”, and “Motivation to Master English Communicative Competence” (refer to Appendix 8).

Part One of the student survey is designed to acquire personal information about each student (types of school, gender, grade level, length of English study, and enrolment in private English tuition. This background information is used as variables in the analysis. Part Two explores students’ reported participation in teacher-student classroom interaction, identified strategies of teacher-student interaction, and barriers to participating in teacher-student interaction. Participation in teacher-student interaction items were adapted from Legger and Storch’s (2009) study. Items to do with classroom interaction strategies were adapted from the SETT Instrument (Self Evaluation Teacher Talk) developed by Walsh (2006). Items about constraints to speaking out were adapted from Tomlinson and Dat’s (2004) study.
SETT Instrument that characterises teacher-student interaction, developed by Walsh (2006), has been adapted for the student survey. According to Walsh (2006), there are 14 interaction strategies: scaffolding, direct repair, content feedback, extended wait time, referential questions, seeking clarification, extended learner turn, teacher echo, teacher interruption, extended teacher turn, turn completion, display questions, form focused feedback, and confirmation check.

1. Scaffolding is defined as reformulation (rephrasing a learner’s contribution), or extension (extending a learner’s contribution) or modelling (providing an example for learner).

2. Direct repair is defined as correcting an error quickly and directly.

3. Content feedback is defined as giving feedback to the message rather than to the words.

4. Extended wait-time is defined as allowing sufficient time (several seconds) for students to respond or formulate a response.

5. A referential question is defined as a genuine question to which the teacher does not know the answer.

6. In seeking clarification the teacher asks a student to clarify something the student has said or the student asks the teacher to clarify something the teacher has said.

7. Extended learner turn is defined as a learner turn of more than one utterance.

8. Teacher echo is defined as teacher repeating the teacher’s previous utterance or teacher repeating a learner’s contribution.
9. Teacher interruption is defined as interrupting a learners’ contribution.

10. Extended teacher turn is a teacher turn of more than one utterance.

11. Turn completion is the teacher completing a learner’s contribution for the learner.

12. A display question is asking questions to which the teacher knows the answer.

13. Form-focused feedback is giving feedback on the words used, not the message.

14. Confirmation checks are confirming understanding of a student’s or teacher’s contribution.

The reason for adopting this framework is its comprehensive nature. It does more than focus on the IRF (initiation, response, feedback) pattern of interaction. Walsh (2006) criticised the IRF pattern because it did not cover all the interaction that took place in the classroom. According to Walsh, the strategies of an interaction can construct or obstruct opportunities for students to learn. This framework has not previously been applied in the Indonesian EFL context.

In addition, Walsh’s framework is guided by a socio-cultural perspective which stresses the social nature of learning and the way it is mediated by use of the symbolic tool of language (Lantolf, 2000). This derives from Vygotsky’s (1978) argument that all higher mental abilities are enacted twice in individuals, first on the social level where the individual relies on another person or cultural artefact for learning and then individual level where people rely on their own
psychological capacities (Lantolf, 2000). Thus language learning (first language
and subsequent languages) proceeds from other-regulation (dependence on the
support of another person or cultural artefact) to self-regulation (ability to act
alone).

In accordance with the socio-cultural theory developed by Vygotsky (1978), the
zone of proximal development (ZPD), the conceptual space where the learner
moves from other-regulation to self-regulation, is where learning occurs. This
tory considers how “the expert” (teacher, more able peer, other adults) supports
or scaffolds the learner’s attempts at language mastery.

Part Three of the survey explores students’ reported participation in student-
student interaction, identification of communicative tasks used in the classroom,
and barriers to student-student interaction. Part Four measures students’ attitudes
to classroom interaction, and Part Five taps the students’ motivation to master
English Communicative Competence. Items on student participation during
student-student interaction were adapted from Swain & Lapkin’s Related
Language Episodes (2002) study. Items to do with communicative tasks were
adapted from Ellis’s (2001) study. Items to do with motivation and attitudes were
adapted from Mantiri’s (2006) study.

For student-student interaction, classification of tasks proposed by Ellis (2001) is
adopted for the student survey. According to Ellis (2001), there are two different
kinds of tasks: functional language practice tasks and focused communicative
Ellis (2001, p. 20) defines functional language practice (FLP) as “instructional materials that provide learners with the opportunity to practice producing the target structure in some kind of situational context” and notes that, although the activities involved appear to concentrate on meaning, “the primary focus remains on form, and learners are aware that the purpose is to master accurate use through repeated use of the target feature.”

Ellis considered focused communicative tasks (CT) to be “designed to elicit production of a specific target feature in the context of performing a communicative task” (Ellis 2001, p. 21). Focused communicative tasks differ from communicative tasks, in general, in that learners are required to use some feature of language that has been specifically targeted. What distinguishes them from functional language practice activities is their primary focus on meaning rather than on form.

Ellis (2001) divided FLP into three types of activities:

- **FLP1**: Pair or group work where students ask each other questions on a predetermined topic such as daily routines - in other words, question and answer practice using targeted vocabulary and structures, including survey type activities.
- **FLP2**: Pair or group work where students describe an item, person, or a picture to each other using targeted vocabulary and/or structures.
• FLP3: Pair or group work where students engage in role play either based on a model dialogue or involving a situation which requires them to use familiar and well-rehearsed language.

In addition, there are two types of CT:

• CT1: Pair work where students engage in one or two-way information gap tasks.

• CT2: Pair or group work where students work collaboratively to construct text, for example, list questions to ask exchange students who will visit the class in the future; develop an argument for their side for a debate; create a role play; prepare part of a procedural text such as a recipe; or list the ingredients of an imaginary dish.

The majority of questions in the survey are selected-response items. There is a four-point Likert scale with 4 representing “Always” and 1 representing “Never” for the participant to respond to questions like “How often do you ask questions in English during teacher-student interaction?” Participants are also asked to indicate their agreement on barriers to teacher-student interaction, attitudes to classroom interaction, and motivation to master English Communicative competence on another four-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

There were several open-ended items to which participants could respond, for example “What suggestions do you have to improve interaction of teacher and
students?" There was a decision to use a mix of items - fixed responses and open ended responses. Fixed items have the advantage of providing consistent responses and enabling statistical analyses. Open ended items can tap participants’ feeling, opinions, and attitude which are not covered in the fixed items.

The student survey covers content that is consistent with the research topic and it also includes students’ attitudes. It is necessary to include items pertaining to students’ attitudes towards classroom interaction because students’ motivation affects pedagogical strategies (Altrichter, 2000). Failure to acknowledge this has led to problems in initiating projects because the projects have imposed practices that have promoted inappropriate social behaviour in the classroom (Shamim, 1996; Karavas-Doukas, 1998). Learners who are pushed to behave in ways that they find uncomfortable are unlikely to be successful (Karavas-Doukas, 1998).

The student survey was first written in English and then translated into Indonesian to ensure that students had a clear understanding of the items. There were three steps in the translation process: back translation; evaluation of the translation and preparation for use; and testing of the translated version.

**Back translation**

The questionnaire was given to three Indonesian bilingual translators for translation from English into Indonesian. The three Indonesian translators were lecturers from different universities who were doctoral students at The University of Newcastle, Australia, all of whom were fluent in English and Indonesian. They
independently translated the questionnaire from English into Indonesian. They then met to compare the translations. All translated items were similar in meaning although different words were used. The three translators worked together to unify the questionnaire before the Indonesian versions were given to two other translators.

Two other lecturers at The State University of Malang, who were fluent in English and Indonesian, independently translated the Indonesian version of the questionnaire back into English. Their translation was compared with the original form. They reported that all items on the student questionnaire were similar in meaning to the original although sometimes synonyms were employed.

*Evaluation of the translation and preparation for use*

In this stage, three bilingual translators, two senior lecturers of The State University of Malang, Indonesia and the researcher, were involved in an evaluation of the translations. The original English version, the English version created from the Indonesian version, and the Indonesian version of the questionnaire were compared. The translators reported that all items had similar meanings, but different terms were used. Therefore, terms were revised for consistency in the Indonesian version.
Testing of the translated version

The main purpose of pilot testing the questionnaire was to identify any confusing and ambiguous language. A group of lower secondary school students was selected. The group consisted of a typical class of students. Thirty students were invited to complete the Indonesian version of the student questionnaire. After obtaining consent from the school, the English teacher, and the students, the students completed the questionnaire. There were no ambiguous items found in the student questionnaire (See Appendix 9)

3.5. Qualitative Investigation

To strengthen the research design, qualitative investigation is also employed in this research. According to Creswell (2009), qualitative investigation is an interpretive inquiry form in which researchers interpret the phenomena which they have observed, heard, and understood. Qualitative investigation requires the researcher to collect data naturalistically at the site. The data collection involves multiple sources of data including observation, interviews with participants, or document analysis (Creswell, 2009). Researchers can capture a comprehensive and holistic overview of participants by observing participants’ behaviour at the site, interviewing the participants, and reviewing related documents.

In the current research, the focus is teachers’ perception of classroom interaction in EFL classes in lower secondary schools as well as observation of actual classroom interaction. Interview and classroom observation were employed to obtain evidence of classroom interaction from multiple sources.
1) **In-depth Interviews**

In-depth interviews were selected as the first step of the qualitative investigations. According to Minichiello et al. (2008), an advantage of an interview is that it “enables the participants to describe what is meaningful or important to them using their own words rather than being restricted to predetermined categories; thus participants may feel more relaxed and candid” (p.70). In the current research, interviews were used to gain an understanding of teachers’ perceptions of teacher-student interaction, student-student interaction, and barriers of classroom interaction.

There are three types of interviews: structured, unstructured, and semi structured (Minichiello et al.2008). In a structured interview, questions are carefully ordered and worded in a detailed schedule. It usually consists of close ended questions. In an unstructured interview, the interviewer does not rely on a formal schedule or ordering of questions. The interview often takes on the appearance of an everyday conversation where the control is minimal but still geared to keep the participants’ attention to the research questions. In a semi structured interview, the interviewer has an outline of questions to be covered but is free to vary the wording and order of questions, at least to some extent.

For the current study, the semi structured interview was selected. It allowed flexibility for the researcher to encourage participants to express their opinions freely. The interview duration and direction were controlled by the researcher who could judge if the interview should be extended or shortened. Questions could be
reordered to suit the flow of the interview. The wording also could be modified to achieve a flow of information. Probes could be used to obtain more clarity and additional information (Johnson & Christensen, 2004).

Twenty four teachers (18 from General Lower Secondary and 6 from Islamic Lower Secondary) were interviewed for this study. The interviews took place at a time chosen by the teachers. All interviews were conducted in room at the school. They were audio taped for the purposes of transcription, with the consent of the interviewees. The interviews were face-to-face, one-on-one interviews where the researcher asked questions and provided freedom for the interviewees to articulate their views. Each interview took approximately 30 minutes.

The language used depended on the preference of the teachers. All teachers could speak English but some were more proficient than others. To make the interviewees feel comfortable and to ensure the interview would run smoothly, the researcher used both English and Indonesian at the request of the interviewees.

An interview protocol (Appendix 10) was designed to gain a holistic understanding of teachers’ experiences, perspectives, and practices in classroom interaction. Components included a heading (date, venue, time, name of interviewee), questions pertaining to the background information of the interviewee, content questions, and final acknowledgment to thank the interviewees.
The first part of the interview opened the conversation. It began with the purpose of the interview and the interviewee’s origin, preference for language use, length of teaching experience, highest degree earned, and their major of study as well as the university from which they graduated. The second part explored teachers’ ideas about teacher-student interaction. Teachers were encouraged to speak about teacher-student interaction, language use for teacher-student interaction, strategies of teacher-student interaction, and barriers to student-teacher interaction. The third part was concerned with student-student interaction. The questions related to teachers’ use of interaction strategies were adapted from SETT instruments developed by Walsh (2006). The final part involved asking teachers if they had any questions before finishing the interview and thanking them for their participation.

2) Classroom Observation

Observation is defined as “methods of generating data which involved the researcher immersing [herself or himself] in a research setting, and systematically observing dimension of that setting, interaction relationships, actions, events and so on, within it” (Mason, 1996, p.60, cited in Gass and Mackey, 2007, p.165). In the current study, classroom observation was selected because it allowed the researcher to gather detailed data on teacher-student interactions, and student-student interaction within particular foreign and second language classrooms in their natural contexts. The researcher selected direct observation without being a participant in the context. According to Creswell (2008), such a participant is a “non-participant observer”. Direct observation gives one the ability to stay
“uninvolved” but still be present at the context in which action takes place (Trochim, 2001).

Classroom observation in the current study involved twenty four teachers (18 General Lower Secondary Teachers and 6 Islamic Lower Secondary Teachers) for one or two lesson observations (1 lesson was 70-80 minutes in duration). By observing multiple lessons, the researcher was able to watch classroom interaction in different types of lessons. In addition, undesirable consequences resulting from changes in behaviour by participants due to their awareness of being observed, could be reduced.

The researcher used video recording and audio recording as well as observational protocols (Appendix 11) to capture the classroom interaction for both teacher-student and student-student interaction. There were three parts of the observation manuals. Part One describes when and where the observation took place. Part Two recorded the teacher-student interaction. There were three sub-sections: the interaction structure, strategies of teacher-student interaction strategies using the SETT instrument developed by Walsh (2006) and teachers’ language choices. The strategies of teacher-student evaluation were analysed using a framework devised by Walsh (2006) which he identified as Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) that used spoken content to identify different modes of the discourse in classroom interaction. According to Walsh (2006), the aim of SETT was to understand more fully the relationship between the teacher talk and interaction and learning.
SETT was used in the observation protocol because it was a useful instrument to establish the structural format of the lesson. In the SETT instrument, there are four modes: managerial, material, skill and systems and classroom context. The SETT modes related to the pedagogic goals in the classroom and the language that the teacher used to achieve them. Walsh (2006) defines mode as “an L2 classroom micro context that has a clearly defined pedagogic goal and distinctive interactional strategies determined largely by the teacher’s use of the language” (Walsh, 2006, p.62). The teacher language choice part was used to capture the use of target language, in this case, English (L2), or the mother tongue (L1), or mixture of the target language and the mother tongue (Tognini, 2007).

Part Three is concerned with the student-student interaction observation protocol. It consists of three sub-parts: kind of task, language related episodes, and student language choices. The tasks that students do during student-student interaction are classified according to two categories proposed by Ellis (2001): functional language practice and focused communicative tasks.

Student language production during pair or group work was captured using the LRE form. Language-Related Episodes (LREs) are defined as segments of learner interaction in which learners either talk about or question their own or others’ language use within the context of carrying out a given task in the L2 (Swain, 1998; Swain & Lapkin, 2002). LREs include instances in which learners may: (a) question the meaning of a linguistic item; (b) question the correctness of the spelling/pronunciation of a word; (c) question the correctness of a grammatical
form; or (d) implicitly or explicitly correct their own or another’s usage of a word, form or structure (Swain, 1998). LREs can be categorised into three outcomes: outcome 1 is when the problem or question was solved correctly; outcome 2 is when LREs were left unresolved or abandoned; outcome 3 is when LREs were resolved incorrectly. The student language choice form was used to capture the use of target language (L2) or the mother tongue (L1) or a mixture of the target language and the mother tongue (Tognini, 2007).

The observation protocols were consistent with the research questions. The use of video and audio recordings and observation protocols would enable the researcher witness the whole picture of teacher-student and student-student interaction. The results of the observation would be used in conjunction with data from the interviews and student surveys. This is a means of triangulation of the data to increase reliability and validity of the research.

3.6. Ethical Clearance

The research is designed to investigate teacher-student as well as student-student interactions occurring in English classrooms in two types of schools in Malang. Since the research uses human participants, ethical clearance was required before data gathering could begin.

The proposed research required approval by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Newcastle. There were four steps involved. After the Human Research Ethics Committee approved the proposed research, official
letters (Appendix 1) were sent by the researcher’s principal supervisor to the Head of Education Department of Malang City and the Head of Religious Affairs Department of Malang City to request their consent to invite lower secondary school teachers and students to participate in the study. After the letters of consent were received, an information statement for school principals was sent and signed consent forms were returned (Appendices 2 & 3).

After receiving the approval from school principals, an information statement was sent to English teachers. Teachers returned the signed consent forms (Appendices 4 & 5) if they wished to participate in the project. Teachers would be invited to participate in an interview and classroom observation and to distribute the information statement together with the consent forms to their students to seek their parents’ consent for their children to complete the student questionnaire (Appendices 6 & 7). Once permission was granted, the researcher began data collection. After obtaining ethics approval from the University of Newcastle and the Education authority of Malang city, the on-site field work was conducted smoothly.

3.7. Procedures

For the student questionnaire, once permission was obtained from the school principal, the researcher requested permission from teachers to let the researcher administer the survey in their classrooms for 20 minutes. The researcher administered the questionnaire to 720 respondents in 24 schools. Respondents were informed that the questionnaire was anonymous unless they chose to identify
themselves. The respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire by themselves in one sitting.

For the teacher interview and classroom observation, once official permission was obtained from the teachers, the researcher visited each of the teachers. The teacher interview took place before the commencement of the lesson observations, at a time chosen by the teacher. All interviews were conducted in an appropriate venue in the school. Teacher interviews were audio taped for the purposes of transcription. Teachers may select English or Indonesian language as a means of communication in the interview.

Once the teacher interview was completed, a schedule of classroom observations was organized for each teacher and it involved preliminary observation. This preliminary observation session had several purposes. It enabled the researcher to get a feeling for the dynamics of classroom interaction, to collect information about the school, and to become familiar with the classroom layout as part of planning for the audio and video recording. The researcher also used this visit to explain the study to the students, her role as a non-participant observer, and the purpose of the audio and video recordings and to provide this information in written form to students. The issue of confidentiality was discussed and the ways in which students’ confidentiality would be protected was outlined.

One of the aims of the study was to investigate the classroom interaction as it occurred in lessons typically conducted as part of the teaching program. In the
briefing section before the observations of lessons, this intention was explained to the teachers. They were not required to prepare special lessons for observation. The role of the researcher, as non-participant observer taking field notes, was also explained, along with the use of video and audio recorders for the purposes of transcription and further analysis.

At the commencement of each observation lesson, the main tape recorder was usually placed on a student desk in the centre of the classroom. The video recorder was mounted on a tripod and positioned at the back of the classroom to get the best footage of the teacher. When students were working in pairs or groups, another tape recorder was used to record a randomly selected pair and group work. The reason for extra equipment was explained to students and a member of the group whose interaction was being recorded was asked to operate the tape recorder.

3.8. Data Analysis

1) **Data analysis of student survey**

The data from student survey were analysed using the following statistical methods. Descriptive statistics were provided for all items and all scales. T-tests and one-way analyses of variance were performed to examine differences within the sample as a whole and differences between groups within the sample. The Statistical Package for Social Science (PASW version 17) for Windows was used for all analyses (PASW Inc., 2009).
2) Data analysis of the interviews

The analysis of the interviews involved the following steps: transcribing the audio-taped interviews; reading the transcripts to identify categories of responses; testing the tentative categories for classifying responses; using final categories to code all responses; and tallying coded responses (Glatthorn & Joyner, 2005).

Transcribing the Interviews

To create data from the recorded interviews with teachers, the researcher transcribed the interviews. The researcher then translated the interviews into English, eliminating hesitations and repetitions in the participants’ speech. Finally the researcher made grammatical corrections while remaining “respectful of the content and the intended meaning of the participants’ words” (Furderich, 1995, p32, cited in Seidman, 2006). After the transcribing was completed, the researcher gave the transcripts to the teachers for them to confirm and amend details if necessary.

Reading the transcripts to identify tentative categories

During this process of reading and marking the transcripts, the researcher began to label notable strategies. After reading and indicating interesting passages in the interviews of two or three teachers, the researcher considered tentative labels, asking herself the following questions: What is the subject of the marked passages? Are there words or a phrase that seems to describe them? Is there a word within the passage itself that suggests a category into which the passage might fit? This process of noting what is interesting, labelling it, and putting it
into appropriate files is referred to as “classifying” or coding data (Seidman, 2006). The researcher utilized NVivo software to help classify, sort, file, and reconnect interview data.

Testing tentative categories

At this stage, the researcher re-examined the tentative categories to determine how they were linked. As the researcher continued to read and mark interview transcripts, other passages emerged and connected to the same categories. Some categories that seemed promising early in the process lost their usefulness. New ones emerged. Straus and Corbin (1990) refer to this process as axial coding. During the coding, the researcher decided whether the initial coding categories identified in interview transcripts had to be revised. To check for accuracy, the researcher referred to the audiotape. Final categories then were established.

Interpreting the responses

To interpret teachers’ responses, the researcher asked herself the following questions, as suggested by Seidman (2006): What can be learnt from the interviews? What connective threads are there among the experiences of the teachers? What is understood now that is not understood before the interviews? How are the interviews consistent or inconsistent with the literature?

3) Data analysis of classroom observation

After the final lesson observation of each teacher, the researcher reviewed her lesson observation notes and her comprehensive audio and video transcriptions.
Of the 39 lessons observed, all were fully transcribed. The data from the lesson transcripts involving teacher-student interaction were analysed in two ways. The first level of analysis sought to identify time was devoted to teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction. The second level of analysis sought to identify the modes, the frequency interaction strategies used using the SETT framework and the frequency of the type of teachers’ language use (refer to Appendix 11).

Analysis of student-student interaction transcripts was informed by the type of task involved. Pair and group work activities and tasks were classified and according to two categories taken from Ellis (2001) and their frequency of occurrences were counted:

• functional language practice activities; and,

• focused communicative tasks.

The student-student interaction transcripts were also analysed to identify the frequency of occurrences of the type of LREs using the following coding: 1 correctly resolved; 2 unresolved or abandoned; 3 incorrectly resolved (Swain & Lapkin, 2002), the type of linguistic items generated from students LREs and the type of students’ language use using a framework adapted from Tognini (2007).

The coding of the data for both teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction was undertaken by the researcher and a second trained rater who is fluent in English and Indonesian. The reliability of the coding was calculated.
using simple percentage agreement (i.e., the coding of the two raters was compared) for each of the categories. The results for the teacher-student interaction data were 88% and 98% for student-student interaction.

3.9. Summary

This chapter has elaborated the methodological framework for the current research. The decision to use mixed methods designed to investigate classroom interaction has been supported with a justification for each part. The research employed both quantitative and qualitative investigation in on-site locations in the City of Malang in Indonesia. The choice of student survey, semi structured interview and classroom observation was described in detail as well as the reasons for the selection. It was envisaged that the multiple data sources would improve the reliability and validity of the research. In the following three chapters, the findings from the three data sources will be analysed.
Chapter Four

Analysis of Survey Data

4.1 Introduction

In Chapter Three, the reasons why mixed methods were employed in this study were justified. To start with the field work, a comprehensive quantitative student survey (Appendix 8) was designed for students in lower secondary schools in Malang. The survey was designed to explore students’ perception of classroom interaction and to identify the existing teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction. In this chapter, the results of the student surveys are described and analysed. This chapter is organised in the following manner.

1. Students who responded to the survey are described.

2. The types of schools attended by the students are described.

3. The sections of the survey are described.

4. Students’ responses to the 56 items requiring a response using a Likert scale are examined by school type, grouped in the following way:

   - students’ reports of the level of teacher-student interaction in the classroom;

   - students’ reports of the strategies of teacher-student interaction;

   - students’ reported barriers to teacher-student interaction;
• students’ suggestions for ways to enhance teacher-student interaction;

• students’ reports of the level of student-student interaction;

• students’ reports of the strategies of student-student interaction in the classroom;

• students’ reports of barriers to student-student interaction;

• students’ suggestions for ways to enhance student-student interaction;

• students’ attitudes to interacting in the English classroom;

• students’ motivation to study English.

5. Using factor analyses, four scales are created: Motivation to learn communicative competence: Participation in teacher-student interaction; Participation in student-student interaction; and Attitudes to Classroom Interaction.

6. These scales were used to test for differences among students in terms of the following: grade level, funding of schools students attended (state versus private funding), length of time studying English, and enrolment in English private tuition.
4.2 The Participants

Twenty percent of the total Lower Secondary Schools (90 General and 30 Islamic Schools) participated in this study. Table 4.1 and Table 4.2 present the sample schools and the proportion of sample students in the study. Table 4.1 shows 18 sample schools from the General Lower Secondary sector participated in the study. Fifty percent of these were state-funded lower secondary schools, while the other 50% were private general lower secondary schools. Table 4.2 shows 6 sample schools from the Islamic Lower Secondary sector. There were only two state Islamic lower secondary schools and the remaining 67% were private. The total number of students in the sample was 720, which consisted of 540 from General Schools and 180 from Islamic Schools.

Table 4.1 General lower secondary schools surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Student sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SMPN 1 Malang</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMPN 2 Malang</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SMPN 3 Malang</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SMPN 4 Malang</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SMPN 5 Malang</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SMPN 6 Malang</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SMPN 8 Malang</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SMPN 9 Malang</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SMPN 19 Malang</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SMP Salahudin</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SMP Nasional</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SMP Muhamadiyah I</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SMP Laboratorium UM</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SMP Kartika IV-8</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SMP Maarif 02</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SMP Sriwedari</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SMP Cor Yesu</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SMP Taman Dewasa</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>540</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 Islamic lower secondary schools surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Student Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MTSN 1 Malang</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MTSN 2 Malang</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MTS Surya Buana</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MTS Khadijah</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MTS Hasyim Asyari</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MTS Sunan Kalijaga</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 720 students sampled, 720 returned the questionnaires given to them. In other words, the response rate was 100%. The English teachers and the researcher asked the students to fill in the survey. In Indonesia, the students are generally obedient to their teachers and so complied with the request. Table 4.3 summarizes background information of the students.

Table 4.3 shows that 75% the participants were public lower secondary school students and 25% were Islamic lower secondary school students. The female students comprised 62.7% of the sample, while the male students comprised 37.3% of the sample. Thirty three point three percent of the students were in grade nine, while 33.3% were in grade eight, and the remaining 33.3% were in grade seven. It was noted that 99.5% of the participants received English lessons in primary schools. The grades at which students commenced English lessons varied. Most participants (62.1%) commenced English lesson in grade 1, followed by commencing in kindergarten (11.75%), in grade 3 (11.3%), in grade 4 (8.2%) and in grade 2 (6.5%).
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Table 4.3 Students surveyed in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Islamic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English lessons in primary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade in which English lessons commenced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in English private tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of English study in private tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1-2 years</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 years</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English private tuition is common in Malang. More than half of the students (52.5%) are currently enrolled in English private tuition. Thirty seven point eight percent (37.8%) of the students have been studying in English private tuition for less than a year, with 33.6% for around 1 to two years, and the rest (28.7%) for
more than two years. English private tuitions are English lessons offered by commercial institutions outside schools. English tuition providers in Malang include English First (EF), The British Institute, LIA, and many others. The students have to pay a substantial amount of money to study English in a commercial institution. They offer 4-6 hours of English lessons per week. Enrolment in private English tuition is the students’ choice. There is no obligation from the school for students to enrol. Usually students who come from a well to do family will undertake private tuition.

4.3 Results from Student Survey

All the participants responded to the Student Survey (shown in Appendix 9). The data were processed by SPSS software to generate means and standard deviations. T-tests were conducted to look for differences in responses between the two types of lower secondary schools. With regard to grades, the length of exposure to English in primary schools and additional exposure to English in private tuition also was analysed to look for differences.

4.3.1 Teacher-student interaction

1) Students’ reported participation in teacher-student interaction

This section of the survey was designed to investigate students’ reported participation in classroom interaction. Table 4.4 summarizes the responses from the participants. The items include statements in relation to interaction with the English teacher. Each student was asked to give his or her opinions, indicating
their response on a four-point Likert scale from 1 (never), 2 (seldom), 3 (often) and 4 (always). The questions for teacher-student interaction include: (1) I present my opinions in English voluntarily; (2) I initiate questions to the teacher in English; (3) I answer my teacher’s questions in English when I am called upon; (4) I ask for clarification to the teacher in English.

Table 4.4 Students’ reported participation in teacher-student interaction by school type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student participation</th>
<th>General (n=540)</th>
<th>Islamic (n=180)</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For General schools, the frequency of giving opinions in English, asking questions to the teacher in English, answering questions in English, and asking for clarification in English during teacher-student interaction was rated low. For Islamic schools, the same items were rated even lower.

There was one item which was rated more highly than two (seldom): answering my teacher’s questions in English during teacher-student interaction. The t-test value was t=3.08, p<0.05. There was a significant difference between the school
types. The general school students reported answering teachers’ questions in English more during teacher-student interaction than Islamic school students.

It can be concluded that students of both school types reported low participation in teacher-student interaction, but students of General Schools reported higher participation in answering questions in English.

2) Reported strategies of interaction in teacher-student interaction

This section of the survey was designed to investigate specific strategies of teacher-student interaction. Table 4.5 summarizes the responses from students in terms of strategies of teacher-student interaction. Students were asked to respond on a four-point Likert scale from 1 (never), 2 (seldom), 3 (often) and 4 (always). The strategies of teacher-student interaction were grouped into: scaffolding and questioning, feedback provision, negotiation, and turn completion.

Scaffolding and questioning items:

(5) When I have difficulty presenting a response in English, my teacher reformulates, or extend, or give a model of expression for me;

(6) My teacher asks me referential questions (genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer), for example: “What is your aspiration for your future career?” “Why do you want to pursue this career?”;
(7) My teacher asks display questions (questions to which the teacher knows the answer), for example, asking questions to check my knowledge of English grammar or my comprehension of a reading text.

Feedback items:

(8) When I make speaking mistakes, the teacher corrects my error quickly and directly;

(9) When I perform speaking activities, the teacher gives me content feedback (feedback about the content of my utterance not the words that I use);

(10) My teacher provides form-focused feedback (feedback about the words I use in my English utterances).

Negotiation items and provision of time to respond:

(11) My teacher asks me to clarify something that I have said;

(12) My teacher makes confirmation checks to confirm his or her understanding of my response;

(13) When I formulate a response in English, the teacher allows me sufficient time (several seconds) to respond.

Speaking turn and language use items:

(14) My teacher has extended turns when speaking in class;

(15) My teacher provides an extended turn to me where I can practise to speak English in class;

(16) My teacher uses English about 80% of the time in classroom interaction.

Turn completion item:

(17) My teacher repeats his or her teacher’s previous utterance or repeats my responses;
(18) My teacher interrupts me when I am presenting a response;
(19) My teacher completes my response when I am presenting it.

Table 4.5 Strategies of students’ reported teacher-student interaction by school type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>General (n=540)</th>
<th>Islamic (n=180)</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding &amp; questioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I5</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I6</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I7</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I8</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I9</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I10</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation &amp; time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I11</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I12</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I13</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking turn &amp; language use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I14</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I15</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I16</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn completion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I17</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I18</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I19</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the General students and the Islamic students rated the frequency for giving scaffolding to students, and asking referential questions low. Only the frequency of display questions was rated high by both groups. Although there were no statistically significant differences, the General group rated higher than the Islamic students for frequency of scaffolding, referential questions, and display questions.

In terms of feedback, both for general schools and Islamic schools there was a low rating for frequency of content focus and direct correction, but frequency of form focus feedback was rated high. Although there were no statistically significant differences found, the General group rated higher than the Islamic students for frequency of direct repair, content, and form focus feedback.

Table 4.5 also shows that negotiation items are rated low by both groups. Both General and Islamic students indicated that clarification request and confirmation check seldom happened. Similarly, both groups of students reported that they were seldom given sufficient time to formulate responses.
Furthermore Table 4.5 shows that, in terms of extended teachers’ turn, both group rated around 3.0 (often), whereas student extended turn was rated around 2.0 (seldom). A significant difference was found on the use of English in classroom interaction. The General students indicated a higher frequency of English than the Islamic students. The t-test was $t=3.45$, $p<.01$.

Finally, both General students and Islamic student rated the frequency of repeating their own or other students’ response as $M=2.54$ and $M=2.50$ respectively. This indicated that the teachers often repeat their utterances and students’ responses. However interruption and completion of students’ responses were rated low (seldom).

3) Students’ reported barriers to teacher-student interaction

Items 20 to 32 surveyed students’ reported barriers to participating in classroom interaction. The questions were in three sub sections: anxiety, linguistic incompetence, and teaching approach. The students rated these items on four-point Likert scales from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Items 20 -24 tapped into students’ anxiety:

(20) I feel uncomfortable if I have to speak English in front of my class.

(21) It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English class.

(22) I don’t like to speak often in English class because I’m afraid that the teacher will think I’m not a good student.
(23) *I am afraid other students will laugh at me when I make mistakes in speaking English.*

(24) *I keep silent because I don’t want others to know that I don’t understand.*

Table 4.6 Students’ responses to anxiety items by school type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>General (n=540)</th>
<th>Islamic (n=180)</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I20: feeling uncomfortable when speaking English in front of my class</td>
<td>3.28 ± 0.65</td>
<td>3.30 ± 0.60</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I21: feeling afraid other students will laugh when making mistakes in speaking English</td>
<td>2.92 ± 0.82</td>
<td>3.00 ± 0.64</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I22: It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English class</td>
<td>2.77 ± 0.80</td>
<td>2.89 ± 0.87</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I23: I don’t like to speak often in English class because I’m afraid that the teacher will think I’m not a good student</td>
<td>3.21 ± 0.61</td>
<td>3.18 ± 0.55</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I24: I keep silent because I don’t want others to know that I don’t understand</td>
<td>2.50 ± 0.74</td>
<td>2.54 ± 0.76</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 shows the overall picture of students’ anxiety barriers to interacting in English. The numbers shown in the table indicate their agreement to the anxiety items. The General student group perceived ‘feeling uncomfortable when speaking English in front of my class’ (M= 3.28) as the highest barrier, followed by feeling afraid other students will laugh when making mistakes in speaking English (M=3.21), ‘It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English class (M=2.92); ‘I don’t like to speak often in English class because I’m afraid that the teacher will think I’m not a good student’ (M=2.89); and I keep silent because I don’t want others to know that I don’t understand (M=2.54).

The Islamic students made similar responses, placing ‘feeling uncomfortable when speaking English in front of my class’ (M= 3.28) as the highest barrier, followed
by ‘feeling afraid other students will laugh when speaking English’ (M=3.18), ‘It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English class’ (M=3.0); ‘I don’t like to speak often in English class because I’m afraid that the teacher will think I’m not a good student’ (M=2.77); and ‘I keep silent because I don’t want others to know that I don’t understand’ (M=2.50).

Although there was no striking difference between the General and Islamic students’ responses about anxiety, the Islamic students rated slightly higher than the General students to most of these items. This provides evidence that both groups feel anxious when speaking English in class, they are afraid of being thought of as not a good student, afraid of being laughed at, and they prefer to keep silent.

The students then responded to Items 25-28 which required them to report when linguistic incompetence became barriers for their interaction in English. Their responses were on a four-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree):

(25) My vocabulary is limited.

(26) I’m not confident with my English grammar.

(27) My English pronunciation is poor.

(28) I’m not confident in my listening comprehension.

Table 4.7 provides their responses.
Table 4.7 Students’ responses to Linguistic Incompetence items by school type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic incompetence</th>
<th>General (n=540)</th>
<th>Islamic (n=180)</th>
<th>T-Test (Sig)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I25</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I26</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I27</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I28</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows that the ratings were around three (Agree). There were no significant differences between the two groups, except for Item 28. The General students saw English grammar (M=3.49) as the highest barrier, followed by difficulty in English pronunciation (M=3.42); limited vocabulary (M=3.35), and low listening comprehension skills (M=3.19). Similarly, the Islamic students saw lack of confidence of English grammar as the highest barrier (M=3.49), followed by difficulty in English pronunciation (M=3.48), limited vocabulary (M=3.39), and low listening comprehension skills (M=3.37). There was a significant gap between the two types of schools, t=-2.68, for listening skills. The Islamic students reported less confident in listening skills than the General students.

Students responded to Items 29 to 32 about current teaching approaches:

(29) In my English class, the teacher does most of the talking and the students only answer when they are called upon.
(30) *In my English class, there are limited opportunities to practise speaking English in group work and pair work.*

(31) *In my English class, the focus of learning is not for students to communicate.*

(32) *I am bored because my English class activities are organized in a monotonous manner.*

Students responded on four-point Likert scales from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Table 4.8 shows the results.

**Table 4.8 Students’ responses to teaching approach items by school type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching approach</th>
<th>General (n=540)</th>
<th>Islamic (n=180)</th>
<th>T-Test (Sig)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, there was no notable difference between General students and Islamic students.

The General students saw “*focus of learning is not for students to be able to communicate*” as highest barrier (M=3.35), followed by “*there are limited opportunities to practise speaking English in group work and pair work*” (M=3.33), “*the teacher does most of the talking and the students only answer when they are called upon*” (M=2.93), and “*in my English class activities are*
organized in a monotonous manner” (M=2.92). The Islamic students saw “there are limited opportunities to practise speaking English in group work and pair work” (M=3.42); followed by “focus of learning is not for students to be able to communicate” (M=3.39); “my English class activities are organized in a monotonous manner” (M=3.0), and “the teacher does most of the talking and the students only answer when they are called upon” (M=2.90).

4) Students’ reports of other barriers to teacher-student interaction by school type

Table 4.9 shows General students’ open-ended responses of other barriers to effective teacher-student interaction.

Table 4.9 General school students’ responses to other barriers to teacher-student interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Classification</th>
<th>Examples of responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Linguistic incompetence</td>
<td>I have limited vocabulary. My pronunciation is not good. I have difficulty in responding, asking questions or making comments in English.</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Incomprehensible input</td>
<td>I don’t understand the English teacher’s utterances. Teachers use complicated words/sentences.</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anxiety</td>
<td>I am shy and not confident, afraid of making mistakes and being laughed at.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not used to participate in teacher-student interaction in English</td>
<td>I am not used to having interaction with my English teacher in English.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No problems</td>
<td>I don’t have any problem speaking English with the teacher. I enjoy it.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>492</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not all students responded to the open ended questions. From the total of 540 students in General schools, 91% answered the open ended questions. The open-ended responses on barriers to participate in teacher-student interaction from General school and Islamic school students were consistent with the results of the structured items. In the General schools, 30.7% of participants mentioned lack of confidence in their linguistic competence, 28% perceived difficulty in understanding the teacher’s utterances, 19.3% wrote anxiety as a barrier, 15.5% claimed that they were not used to participating in teacher-student interaction in English, and the 6.5% wrote that they did not have any problems participating in teacher-student interaction in English.

Table 4.10 shows open-ended questions of other barriers effective teacher-student interaction of Islamic students.

**Table 4.10 Islamic students’ responses to other barriers to teacher-student interaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response classification</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Linguistic incompetence</td>
<td>My grammar is not accurate.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Incomprehensible input</td>
<td>Teacher often used difficult words. Teacher uses complicated English language.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anxiety</td>
<td>Shy, afraid of being laughed at.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not used to interacting with teacher in English</td>
<td>If the teacher did not ask me I did not volunteer to speak.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No opportunities Total</td>
<td>I don’t have a turn to speak.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Islamic schools, 31% of participants mentioned lack of confidence in their linguistic competence, 28% perceived difficulty in understanding the teacher’s utterances, 19.4% wrote anxiety as a barrier, 10.6% claimed that they were not used to participating in teacher-student interaction in English, and 10% wrote that they did not have any opportunities to participate in teacher-student interaction in English.

5) Suggestions to improve teacher-student interaction

Table 4.11 displays responses of General students to suggestions to improve participation in teacher-student interaction. In General schools, 38.4% of students wrote that teachers and students should improve interaction in English, 25.4% suggested that the teacher should add more communication activities, 15.2% suggested that the teacher should use simple English with clear pronunciation, 14.1% suggested that the teacher should improve students’ vocabulary, and 6.9% wrote that teacher should encourage students to ask more questions and to participate in classroom interaction.
### Table 4.11 General school students’ suggestions for ways to improve teacher-student interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Classification</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher and student improve interaction in English</td>
<td>Students should practise speaking English with the teachers often.</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Add more communication activities</td>
<td>Teacher varies the learning activities so that students are motivated to learn English, communication activities please.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher should use simple English with clear pronunciation</td>
<td>Speak clearly. Use simple English that students can understand.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improve students’ vocabulary</td>
<td>More vocabulary practice</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Encourage students to ask more questions and to participate in classroom interaction</td>
<td>Teacher encourages students to ask questions in English.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>492</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Islamic schools, shown in Table 4.12, 27.2% of participants wrote that increasing two way communication in English between teacher and students should be implemented, 23.9% suggested that teacher should include various learning activities including more communication activities, 16.1% suggested that teachers should not use LKS (student written worksheets) all the time, 12.7% wanted teachers to provide more corrections, and 11.7% wrote that teacher should use simple English with clear pronunciation, and 8.3% suggested that teachers should improve students’ vocabulary.
Table 4.12 Islamic school students’ suggestions for ways to improve interaction with the English teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response classification</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase two way communication in English between teacher and students</td>
<td>Teacher should interact more often with students</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Include various learning activities, include more communication activities</td>
<td>Practise speaking English, using games to avoid students’ boredom.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No LKS (student written worksheets)</td>
<td>Don’t always ask students to fill written worksheet.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provide more corrections</td>
<td>Teacher guides and corrects students’ mistakes.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use simple English with clear pronunciation</td>
<td>Teacher speaks slowly and clearly.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improve students’ vocabulary</td>
<td>Provide students with vocabulary exercises.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Student-student interaction

1) Students’ reported participation in student-student interaction

Items 35 to 40 asked participants to state how often they interacted with their peers. Items asked students to give their responses on a four-point Likert scale from 1 (never), 2 (seldom), 3 (often), and 4 (always).

(35) I present my opinion in English when working in pair/group.
(36) I ask questions to my peers in English when working in pair/group.

(37) I answer my peers’ questions in English when working in pair/group.

(38) I correct my peers’ errors when working in pair/group.

(39) I receive correction from my peers when I make mistakes.

(40) I ask for clarification from my peers when working in pair/group.

The results are shown in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13 Students’ participation in pair/group work by school type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>General (n=540)</th>
<th>Islamic (n=180)</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I35</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I36</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I37</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I38</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I39</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I40</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 shows responses were low. Both General and Islamic students rarely state their opinion in English when working in pair/group; ask questions to peers in English; answer peers’ questions in English; correct peers’ errors; receive correction from peers when they make mistakes; and ask peers for clarification.
The t-tests demonstrated that there was no significant difference between the school types.

2) Reported types of student task for student-student interaction

This section of the survey investigated the types of tasks undertaken by students during student-student interaction. Responses were made on four-point Likert scales from 1 (never), 2 (seldom), 3 (often) and 4 (always).

(41) I work in pair/group work where I ask each other questions on a predetermined topic such as daily routines - in other words, question and answer practice using targeted vocabulary and structures, including survey type activities.

(42) I work in pair/group where I describe an item, person or a picture to each other using targeted vocabulary and/or structures;

(43) I work in pair/group where I engage in role play either based on a model dialogue or involving a situation which requires me to use familiar and well-rehearsed language;

(44) I work in pair/group where I engage in one or two-way information gap tasks;

(45) I work in pair/group where I work collaboratively to construct text e.g., list questions to ask exchange students who will visit the class in the future, develop an argument for their side for a debate, create a role play, and prepare part of a procedural text such as a recipe.
Table 4.14 provides the results.

**Table 4.14 Tasks for student-student interaction by school type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>General (n=540)</th>
<th>Islamic (n=180)</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I41</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I42</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I43</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I44</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I45</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 shows scores were low. This indicates that students from both school types seldom experience these communication activities. There were no significant differences between the school types.

3) **Students’ reported barriers to student-student interaction**

Table 4.15 shows General students’ responses to barriers to interacting with peers. They reported linguistic incompetence (31.5%) as the main barrier, followed by anxiety (23.8%), incomprehensible input (18.5%), not used to interacting in English with peers (15%), and peers not responding to or responding in Indonesian (11.2%).
Table 4.15 General school students’ reported barriers to student-student interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response classification</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Linguistic incompetence</td>
<td>Limited vocabulary so I cannot understand English words quickly.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Anxiety</td>
<td>I feel too shy to ask questions</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Incomprehensible input</td>
<td>I don’t understand classmates’ sentences.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not used to interacting in English with peers</td>
<td>I never use English with friends when working in group/pair</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Peer did not respond or responded in L1</td>
<td>If I am asked questions in English, I don’t know how to answer, so I use Indonesian language.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>492</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 shows Islamic students’ reported barriers to interacting with peers. They reported linguistic incompetence (30%) as the main barrier, followed by not used to interacting in English with peers (23.9%), anxiety (21.7%), incomprehensible input (17.2%), and no problems interacting in English with peers (7.2%).
Table 4.16 Islamic school students’ reported barriers to student-student interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response classification</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Linguistic incompetence</td>
<td>My English pronunciation is not good; therefore I don’t want to speak English.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Not used to interact in English with peers</td>
<td>Not used to interacting in English with friends when working in pair/group. I am used to interacting in Indonesian or Javanese when working in group/pair.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anxiety</td>
<td>I am embarrassed because they will make fun of me if I can't say English words correctly.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Incomprehensible input from peer</td>
<td>My friend speaks too fast.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No problems interacting in English with peers</td>
<td>No problems. Interacting with friends is more enjoyable than with the teacher.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Students’ suggestions for ways to improve student-student interaction

Table 4.17 shows General students’ suggestions for ways to improve participation in student-student interaction. The main suggestion was providing more communication activities to practise speaking English with peers (65.5%), followed by overcoming feelings of anxiety (20%), improving students’ vocabulary (13%), and correcting each others’ mistakes (10.5%).
Table 4.17 General school students’ suggestions for ways to improve student-student interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response classification</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide more communication activities to practise speaking English with peers</td>
<td>Provide group work to practise speaking English.</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overcome feelings of anxiety</td>
<td>Students do not need to feel shy or afraid of being laughed at.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improve students’ vocabulary</td>
<td>Friend should improve their vocabulary so that they can understand and can communicate in English.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Correct each others’ speaking mistakes</td>
<td>Correct each other’s mistakes and support friends’ learning.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18 shows responses for suggestions to improve participation in student-student interaction. Islamic students indicated similar suggestions to General students, but they added one more suggestion. The major suggestion was to provide more communication activities to practise speaking English with peers (55.5%), followed by overcoming feelings of anxiety (16.7%), correcting each others’ mistakes (10%), improving students’ vocabulary (9.4%), and providing up-to-date topics for student-student interaction (8.9%).
Table 4.18 Islamic school students’ suggestions for ways to improve student-student interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response classification</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide more communication activities to practise speaking English with peers</td>
<td>Provide more conversation practice in pair/group.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overcome feeling anxiety</td>
<td>Friends should be brave and speak English, and others should not make fun. Don’t be shy to practise speaking English with peers.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Correct each other’s speaking mistakes</td>
<td>Correct friends’ pronunciation and word choice mistakes.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improve students’ vocabulary</td>
<td>Provide more vocabulary practice.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provide up-to-date topics for student-student interaction.</td>
<td>Provide popular topics like soccer or music for speaking practice in pair/group work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3 Attitudes and Motivation

1) Students’ attitudes to interaction using English in the class

Items 48 to 51 examined students’ attitudes to classroom interaction in English:

(48) Using English for teacher-student and student-student interaction during English lessons is important for students’ English language development.

(49) The more students interact orally in English with the teacher and peers, the better students will be at communicating in English.

(50) I support maximum interaction between the teacher and students and between student and student in English.
I support lessons where there are a lot of communication activities so that I can interact actively with the teacher and peers.

Students responded four-point Likerts scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Table 4.19 shows the results.

Table 4.19 Students’ preferences for classroom interaction in English by school type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Attitudes</th>
<th>General (n=540)</th>
<th>Islamic (n=180)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I48</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I49</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I50</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I51</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, there was no notable difference between the schools. Both groups of participants rated strongly agree and agree to the items.

2) Students’ reported motivation in learning English for communication

Table 4.20 shows students’ motivation for learning English for communication. There were five items on a four-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

52) I like learning English for communication.

53). Learning to communicate in English is a challenge that I enjoy.
54) *Communication activities are a waste of time, because I only need to learn what is necessary to pass the national examination.*

55) *I want to be able to communicate in English so that I can get a good job.*

56) *I want to be able to speak English so that I can study in a good upper secondary school and university.*

Table 4.20 Students’ motivation for learning English for communication by school type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Motivation</th>
<th>General (n=540)</th>
<th>Islamic (n=180)</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I52</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I53</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I54</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I55</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I56</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no differences by school type for the items except for Item 52 *I like learning English for communication* (t=3.58, p<.01). General students indicate they enjoy learning English for communication more than Islamic students.

4.3.4 Development of scales

Four scales related to students’ participation in classroom interaction were developed using factor analyses with varimax rotation (SPSS statistical package): Motivation to learn communicative competence: Participation in teacher-student
interaction; Participation in student-student interaction; and Attitudes to Classroom Interaction. Items were eliminated if they failed to load strongly on to one factor (.40 and above). Table 4.21 shows the factor loadings and Cronbach alpha reliability score for each scale.

Table 4.21 Factor Analyses to develop four scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation in teacher-student interaction scale (Cronbach alpha .81)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I present my opinions in English voluntarily</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I initiate questions to the teacher in English</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I answer my teacher’s questions in English when I am called upon.</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask for clarification to the teacher in English.</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation in student-student interaction scale (Cronbach alpha .90)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I present my opinion in English when working in pair/groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask questions to my peers in English when working in pair/groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I answer my peers’ questions in English when working in pair/groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I correct my peers’ mistakes in English when working in pair/groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive corrections from my peers in English when working in pair/groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask for clarification to my peers in English when working in pair/groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.21 Continues

### Attitudes to Classroom Interaction Scale (Cronbach alpha .81)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication in English during English lessons is important for students’ development in English communicative competence.</td>
<td>0.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more students interact orally in English with the teacher and other students, the better students will be at communicating in English.</td>
<td>0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support maximum interaction in English between the teacher and students and between students.</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support lessons where there are a lot of communication activities so that I can interact actively with my classmates.</td>
<td>0.777</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Motivation Scale (Cronbach alpha .70)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like learning English for communication.</td>
<td>0.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to communicate in English is a challenge that I enjoy.</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be able to communicate in English so that I can get a good job.</td>
<td>0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be able to speak English so that I can study in a good upper secondary school and university.</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent T-tests and a series of one-way analyses of variances (ANOVAs) explored whether students’ responses differed according to grade level, status of schools (state funded and privately funded), length of time studying English, and enrolment in English private tuition.
A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to see if students’ grade levels affected their responses to the four scales. In Indonesia, the lower secondary school consists of three grade levels: seven, eight and nine. As shown in Table 4.22, there were no statistically significant differences among the three grade levels for all scales.

**Table 4.22 Students’ responses to scales by grade level (grades 7, 8, and 9)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participation in teacher-student interaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participation in student-student interaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attitudes to classroom interaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Motivation to master communicative competence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23 shows that there were no significant differences between responses of students in state-funded schools and students in privately-funded schools in terms of participation in teacher-student interaction, participation in student-student interaction, and motivation in learning communicative competence. However, there was a significant difference in terms of attitudes to classroom interaction. Students from state-funded schools reported a more positive attitude to classroom interaction activities ($t=4.27$, $p<.05$) than students from private schools.
### Table 4.23 Students’ responses to scales by state or private funding of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>State funded (n=330)</th>
<th>Private (n=390)</th>
<th>T-Test (Sig)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Participation in teacher-student interaction</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participation in student-student interaction</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attitudes to classroom interaction</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Motivation to master communicative competence</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.24 shows students’ responses to scales by length of study English in primary school level. A one-way analysis of variance was also conducted to see if students’ length of study English in primary school affected their responses to the four scales. The students were grouped into three: Group 1 (students who began studying English at kindergarten or grade 1), Group 2 (students who started from grade 2 and grade 3), Group 3 (students who started from grade 4 and 5). As shown in Table 4.24, there were no statistically significant differences among the grades at which students began to study English.
Table 4.24 Students’ responses to scales by length of study English in primary school level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Participation in teacher-student interaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participation in student-student interaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attitudes to classroom interaction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Motivation to master communicative competence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.25 shows that students with private English tuition reported more participation in teacher-student interaction \( (t=6.76, \ p<.01) \), and with their peers \( (t=5.15, \ p<.01) \) than students with no private tuition. Students with private tuition reported a more positive attitude to classroom interaction activities \( (t=3.28, \ p<.01) \) and higher motivation \( (t=3.59, \ p<.01) \) than students with no private tuition.

Table 4.25 Students’ responses to scales by private English tuition or no private English tuition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>English tuition (n=268)</th>
<th>No English tuition (n=452)</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Participation in teacher-student interaction</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Participation in student-student interaction</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attitudes to classroom interaction</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Motivation to master communicative competence</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Discussion of Findings from Student Survey

The analyses of the survey data produced five notable findings. First, most students report low oral participation in teacher-student interaction. General school students indicated that they had limited participation in teacher-student interaction. Interaction strategies seldom appeared in the teacher-student interaction, except for a few, for example display questions and teacher extended turn. The Islamic school students indicated even less participation in interaction in the classroom than the General students.

Second, most students report low oral participation in student-student interaction. General school students indicated that they had limited participation in student-student interaction and limited communication tasks for student-student interaction. The Islamic school students indicated even more limited participation in student-student interaction.

Third, both General school and Islamic school students reported similar barriers to speaking English in class: lack of competency in speaking English; a teaching approach that does not emphasize communicative activities; anxiety about speaking English; incomprehensible English input; and lack of experience in interacting with teachers and peers in the English class.

Fourth, students from both General and Islamic schools indicated a preference for more teacher-student and student-student interaction. In terms of motivation,
General school students indicated a higher motivation than Islamic school students to master English communicative competence.

Fifth, students from General schools and Islamic schools who receive English private tuition indicated higher motivation to learn English, higher levels of interaction with teacher and peers, and reported more positive attitudes to classroom interaction than students who did not take receive English private tuition. There were no significant differences for three scales (motivation, teacher-student interaction, student-student interaction, and attitude to interaction) by grade level or length of study of English in primary schools. For state funded versus privately funded schools, the students in publicly funded schools had a more positive attitude towards classroom interaction.

These findings are examined in detail in the following sections.

1) **Limited participation in teacher-student interaction**

The results indicated that students had limited interactions in English with their teachers. Answering the teacher’s questions was the item rated highest. This unwillingness to interact in the English classroom may come from their cultural experience as traditional learners. The role of the student in Indonesia is to receive knowledge and the role of the teacher is to transmit knowledge. Students are expected to listen carefully to the teacher’s explanation and to answer the teacher’s questions when called upon. The problem of low interaction was more
pronounced in the Islamic schools. This is perhaps due to the culture of Islamic schools which are regarded as more traditional than General schools.

Students’ reports of little involvement in whole class interaction support other studies which noted Asian students’ passivity in EFL classroom interaction, for example, studies by Tsui (1996), Song (1995), Liu and Littlewood (1997) and Lee (2009). Tsui (1996) found that Hong Kong students were reluctant to participate in classroom interaction because they feared being laughed at when they made mistakes. Song (1995) found that East Asian students experienced anxiety at the thought of asking questions in English in whole class discussion. Liu and Littlewood (1997) found that 43% of students in their study felt uncomfortable when speaking English in whole class discussions. Similarly, Lee (2009) found that Korean students failed to participate in whole class discussion because of cultural barriers.

2) Limited level of interaction with their peers

The results indicated that students reported even lower interaction with their peers than interaction with their teachers. There were few tasks provided for student-student interaction which were clearly designed to develop communicative competence.

Limited interaction with peers may be the result of class organisation. It may be physically difficult for students to work collaboratively with their peers. Most
classes are structured with the teacher directing activities from the front of the class. Many English language teachers in Indonesia still maintain the traditional orientation of knowledge oriented teaching. The teachers feel responsible for speaking and explaining the content of the class, and checking students’ understanding by asking questions.

In addition, teachers may be reluctant to prepare new communicative tasks because of their lack of experience in designing different sorts of tasks and their limited time and resources. It is easier for teachers to conduct teacher directed lessons with some whole class interaction. Here teachers interact with the whole class and use students’ text-book as the main and often the only classroom resource. To prepare communicative tasks, teachers need access to more resources. Developing new tasks requires skills and time. Teachers may be reluctant to devise new tasks because most school are not equipped with additional resources. In addition, teachers have many teaching hours and may have at least 45 students in each class.

3) **Barriers of interaction were revealed: students’ lack of confidence in their linguistic competence, the teaching approach, anxiety in speaking English, incomprehensible input, and lack of experience in interacting with teacher and peers in English**

Students reported a lack of confidence in their linguistic competency and this discouraged them from speaking in English. Although students have learnt
English since primary school, most only have English lessons for two hours a week and these lessons usually are focused on grammar and written work. As a result, most students are not accustomed to speaking in English.

Teachers’ selection of the teaching activities resulted in very limited periods of teacher-student and student-student interaction. The highest rating item was students agreeing that the focus of learning was not developing communicative competence. The teacher may be focusing on the other skills, for example, reading comprehension. Reading skills are particularly important because students have to sit the National Examination. National Examination items are developed nationally and normally consist of various reading texts/genres followed by comprehension questions or questions related to texts. Students want to do well in the National Examination because it will guarantee their passing lower secondary school and moving to the next level of schooling. As a result, reading skills are emphasized more than oral communication skills.

Many students feel anxious when speaking in English in the classroom. This anxiety may stem from a cultural trait. ‘Losing face’ and ‘being modest’ are two important traits in Indonesia. It is important to maintain dignity and to avoid embarrassing oneself or others. Therefore students were hesitant to speak English because they did not want to speak English in a social situation and embarrass themselves. Modesty also is being observed. Students should not show off what they have mastered or acquired. These attitudes may explain why students feel shy and nervous about communicating in the classroom.
4) **Positive attitudes to more oral interaction in English and motivation of students to learn English for communication**

Both General and Islamic students indicated they wanted more oral interaction with both teachers and peers. In terms of motivation, General school students indicated higher motivation than Islamic school students. The results show that students see the importance of practising oral communication through interaction and the desire to master communicative competence.

In the Indonesian context, competence in English enhances one’s reputation. It points to better education and better career opportunities. Many students in the current study reported that they had private English tuition. These students indicated their desire to master English for communication. English communicative competence is one of the requirements to enter a prestigious secondary school. Mastery of English communication can also enhance their future career. It is a sought-after attribute for the professional workforce.

In general, students’ relatively high level of motivation to learn English for communication fits with Mantiri’s (2006) study which examined the factors affecting ELT in Northern Sulawesi Province, Indonesia. Mantiri found that upper secondary students had high motivation to learn English for communication. Positive attitudes to learning spoken English as a means of improving career prospects were seen in university students in Hong Kong (Liu & Littlewood, 1997).
5) Differences were found between students who did or did not have private tuition in English. No significant differences emerged based on grade level, length of English study in primary level, and funding of schools.

Students who have private English tuition indicate higher motivation to learn English, higher interaction with teachers and peers, more confidence in their language competence, and more positive attitudes to classroom interaction activities than students who did not take have private English tuition. This finding probably reflects in socio-economic status of families. Students with English private tuition normally come from higher socio-economic backgrounds. Because of their family background, these students are aware of the advantages of having communicative competence in English.

The results showed no significant difference among Year 7, Year 8 and Year 9 students in terms of their motivation, reported interaction with teachers and peers, and attitudes to interactive activities. This result may be attributed the influence of national examinations in Indonesia. Teachers see their role as preparing students for national examinations. Examination focuses on reading comprehension. As a result teachers spend more classroom time on reading and writing in English and less time on developing students’ speaking skills.
4.5 Summary and conclusions

This chapter has been concerned with the student survey. The student survey was conducted for the purpose of determining students’ perceptions of classroom interaction in their EFL classes. The questionnaire which consisted of 56 items served as the instrument for collecting data. In 2011, there were 120 Lower Secondary Schools in Malang City which consisted of 90 General Lower Secondary Schools and 30 Islamic Lower Secondary schools. Twenty percent of these schools were selected as the participants of the study; they were 18 General Secondary Schools and 6 Islamic Secondary Schools. Then from these 18 General Secondary Schools, 540 students participated in the study; whereas from 6 Islamic Lower Secondary Schools 180 students were the respondents. The student survey was conducted during the school year 2011.

The findings show that students of both school types reported low participation in presenting opinions in English voluntarily; initiating questions to the teacher in English; asking for clarification to the teacher in English, but students of General Schools reported significantly higher participation in answering questions in English.

In terms of interaction strategies, both the General students and the Islamic students rated the frequency for giving scaffolding to students, referential questions, content focus feedback and direct correction low. Only the frequency of giving display questions and form focus feedback were rated high by both
groups. Although there were no statistically significant differences found, the General group rated higher than the Islamic students for frequency of all items.

Furthermore, both General and Islamic students indicated that clarification request and confirmation check and giving sufficient time to formulate responses and student extended turn and interruption and completion of students’ responses seldom happened, whereas both groups of students rated extended teachers’ turn and teachers’ repeating their own or students’ response high. A significant difference was found on the use of English in classroom interaction. The General students indicated a higher frequency of English than the Islamic students. The t-test was $t=3.45$, $p<.01$.

In terms of speaking barriers, both groups were reported to feel anxious when speaking English in class and to have low confidence in English grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. There was a significant gap between the two types of schools, $t=-2.68$, for listening skills. The Islamic students reported less confident in listening skills than the General students. Both groups rated high frequency for traditional teaching approach which placed little focus on communicative competence.

Both groups were reported to have even lower participation in student-student interaction items. Similarly, both groups indicated that they have low frequency of various communicative activities such as pair or group work to practice asking
question and answer using targeted vocabulary and structures, describing an item, a person or a picture to each other using targeted vocabulary and/or structures; role playing either based on a model dialogue, having one or two-way information gap tasks; and working collaboratively to construct texts.

Although both groups were reported to have low participation in teacher-student and student-student interaction, to have low confidence in their linguistic competence and to be seldom exposed to various communicative activities, both groups were reported to have very positive attitudes towards interactive English classroom and to have quite high motivation to master English communicative competence and want more varied and interactive classes to improve their oral English. There is a statistically significant difference in a motivation item in which the General students rated the enjoyment of learning English for communication higher than the Islamic students (t=3.58, p<.01).

Finally, comparisons were made between students’ responses to participation in teacher-student interaction, student-student interaction, attitudes to English interactive class and motivation to master English communicative competence scales by status of schools, length of study English at schools grade levels, and enrolment in English private tuition. Results indicate that there are significant differences. Students from state-funded schools reported a more positive attitude to classroom interaction activities (t=4.27, p<.05) than students from private schools. Students with private English tuition reported more participation in teacher-student interaction (t=6.76, p<.01), and with their peers (t=5.15, p<.01)
than students with no private tuition. Students with private tuition reported a more positive attitude to classroom interaction activities ($t=3.28$, $p<.01$) and higher motivation ($t=3.59$, $p<.01$) than students with no private tuition.

In conclusions, it seems that there are many similarities of General and Islamic students’ perceptions on their English classroom interaction. First, both groups similarly reported to have low participation in teacher-student interaction, seldom exposed to interaction strategies, except for being asked display questions and being given form-focused feedback and to feel anxious when speaking, to have low confidence in their linguistic competence and to be more exposed to traditional approach of English learning. Second, both groups similarly reported to have low level of participation in peer interaction and to be rarely exposed to various communicative activities for pair or group work. Third, both groups expressed very positive attitude towards more interactive classroom and have very high motivation to master English oral communicative competence.

In addition to some similarities discussed above, a few differences can also be found. First, the General students reported to have higher participation in answering teacher’s questions in English than the Islamic students. Second, General students reported to have higher frequency of English use by their teacher than the Islamic students. Third, the General students indicate higher enjoyment of learning English for communication. Fourth, the Islamic students indicate less confident in their listening ability than the General students.
In other words, it can be said that both groups of students tend to be not quite active in teacher-student interaction. They participate in teacher-student interaction when they are called upon to answer the teacher’s questions and the General students are more active to answer the questions than the Islamic students. Both groups of students learn English in a whole class manner, where the teacher controls and directs the learning from the front of the class, as students are rarely assigned to communicative activities in pair or group-work. Display questions and form-focused feedback seem to be teachers’ favourite interaction strategies. Both groups of students seem not to be happy with this learning situation. They want to master English for communication and want more interactive class with various communicative activities. In Islamic schools the teachers seem to be less fluent in as indicated by English in classroom interaction less frequently than teachers in General schools.

To extend and confirm these findings, interviews with EFL teachers were conducted. These interviews were designed to examine teachers’ perceptions towards interactive English classrooms and ask them about their current teaching practices. The results of the interviews are presented in the next chapter.
Chapter Five

Interview Data: Findings and Discussion

5.1 Introduction

In Chapter Four, data gathered from the Student Survey were described and analysed. The results provided evidence of students’ perspectives on classroom interaction. In addition to Student Surveys, in-depth interviews with teachers were employed to confirm the findings of the Student Survey. Interviews with teachers focused on their perception of interactions in their classrooms. They were conducted using an interview protocol (Appendix 10). In this chapter, an analysis of the interview data will be conducted followed by a discussion of the findings.

5.2 Participants

A purposeful sampling technique was used to find interviewees. Twenty four English teachers accepted the invitation to participate in the interviews and allow classroom observation. They all belonged to the Javanese ethnic group. For confidentiality, each participant was coded with a number and an abbreviation “GE” for teachers from General schools and “IS” for teachers from Islamic schools.

Table 5.1 shows participants from General Lower Secondary Schools. The total number of participants from General schools was 18, consisting of 14 females and 4 males. Seventy percent had a qualification of Bachelors degree in English
teaching, while 28% held a Masters degree in English teaching. All qualifications came from local universities in Indonesia. Regarding their teaching experience, 50% had more than 20 years’ experience, 22% had more than 10 years, 5.5% had between 5-10 years, and 5.5% had less than 5 years’ experience.

Table 5.1 General School Teachers Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GE1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>M.A. (English Education)</td>
<td>26 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>33 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>27 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>M.A. (English Education)</td>
<td>23 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>M.A. (English Education)</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE9</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE10</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>33 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE11</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE12</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>M.A. (English Education)</td>
<td>22 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE13</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>M.A. (English Education)</td>
<td>25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE14</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE15</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE16</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE17</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE18</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 shows the participants from Islamic Lower Secondary School. There were six teachers, consisting of two females and four males. Sixty seven percent of them had a Bachelors degree of English teaching while 33% had a non-English teaching qualification such as a translation qualification. They were graduands of local universities in Indonesia. Regarding their teaching experience, 33% of the participants had more than 10 year experience, and 67% had less than 10 year experience.
Table 5.2 Islamic School Teachers Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS19</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B.Ed (Non-English Education)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS20</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS21</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS22</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS23</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B.Ed (English Education)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B.Ed (Non-English Education)</td>
<td>18 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers from general schools and Islamic schools were interviewed individually for approximately 30 to 40 minutes. To articulate their viewpoints clearly, informants could choose their preferred language. Most interviews were conducted in Indonesian while two were conducted in English. They were digitally recorded and transcribed *verbatim*. The interviews in Indonesian were translated into English transcripts. To reduce validity and reliability threats, the researcher sent completed transcripts to the participants for clarification.

5.3 Findings of the interviews

The semi-structured interview was guided by an interview protocol (reproduced in Appendix 10). Analysis of the interview data identified two main areas of interest: teachers’ perceptions of teacher-student classroom interactions; and teachers’ perceptions student-student classroom interaction.
5.3.1 Teacher-student interaction

a) Teachers’ attitudes to interacting with students in English during teacher-student interactions

Teachers were asked: “Do you like interacting with students in English?” The majority of GE teachers responded that they liked interacting with their students. The reasons for liking interacting were various. Fifty six percent of GE teachers stated that interaction was important because they could check students’ understanding of learning materials. It also could be used to motivate students to have the courage to ask questions about difficult material:

Yes, I think it is very important to have such kind of interaction…. Because we encourage students to be brave, but not to challenge their teachers. To be brave here means that the students dare to raise their hand to ask questions of the material that they don’t understand and give opinions about something. Teachers are pleased to know that their students understand the material and they are brave enough to speak. All we have to do is “season” it. If they have understood we can continue (GE11, April 2011).

Thirty three percent of GE teachers pointed out that interaction in English was important to familiarize students with English vocabulary:

Yes, I like interacting with my students. The purpose is to make my students better in English. Interaction between student and teacher means….students’ knowledge of vocabulary will increase. But we must be patient, because if we use only English, they will not understand at all. (GE10, April 2011).

Eleven percent of GE teachers asserted that interaction made English lessons interesting:
Of course, communication and interaction are very substantial because it can make the students interested in the lesson. That’s what I thought. If they are interested in the lesson, they can absorb the lesson well. If there is no interaction, I think students will be afraid or uncomfortable and they will not be active during the class (GE 13, May 2011).

In the Islamic school site, 66% of IS teachers also indicated that interacting with their students allowed them to check students’ understanding:

Yes, I like interacting with my students, but we must be patient, because if we only use English, they will not understand at all. It means that I should use Bahasa Indonesia more often than English. My personal goal is make them understand what I teach to them. So ask questions to check their understanding of the reading texts. Sometimes they forget, even for the simplest thing, like vocabulary items. (IS21, May 2011).

The rest of IS of teachers made similar comments to GE teachers about the importance of interaction: familiarizing students with listening and speaking in English:

In my opinion, English is not like mathematics, is it? I make my students get used to listening to English because if we teach English but we never or seldom listen to English sentences, it is not desirable. I deliberately make my students speak in English if they want to be excused from the class. This is one of the methods of insisting my students interact using English. But we have to know our students’ level. If they have a good understanding, we can communicate well. The fact is their understanding here is low, so we have to guide them slowly and gradually (IS23, May 2011).

The majority of GE and IS teachers report using classroom interaction to check students’ mastery of material and to secure students’ interest in lessons rather than to build students’ competence in speaking English. The rest of the teachers
indicated that the purpose of classroom interaction was to get students into the habit of listening to English and trying to speak in English.

**b) Activities for teacher-student interaction**

When asked about the kind activities GE teachers use for classroom interaction, the most frequent answer was “question and answer sessions” and discussion after reading activities (61%), followed by class presentations (17%), asking students’ opinions (11%), and daily routines spoken in English (11%).

The following is a typical response from a GE teacher, regarding question and answer sessions and discussions after reading activities for generating interaction:

_I used more reading activities. After students read the text, I usually give them oral questions, and they listen and then answer the questions. I also ask them to make questions in English and ask other students to answer (GE2, April)._  

Seventeen percent of GE teachers identified the activity of asking students to do class presentations as a means of classroom interaction. Eleven percent of GE teachers used daily routines in English to invite students to speak in teacher-student interaction, for example asking students to use English if they want permission to do something.
IS teachers gave similar responses. Eighty three percent referred to question and answer sessions and discussions after reading activities. Eleven percent of them noted the importance of giving rewards to students who ask questions in English after reading activities.

*I think there should be questions and answers and then discussion on the topics of the reading texts. I will of course make the students ask [questions] not only to me but also to their friends and I give points to students who ask questions in English* (IS22, May 2011).

The majority of GE and IS teachers use reading comprehension followed by question-answer sessions, and discussion activities after reading texts as activities for teacher-student interaction.

c) Teachers’ language choice during teacher-student interaction

When asked whether they use only English (L2) or English mixed with Indonesian (L1) in their classroom interaction, all GE teachers favoured mixing Indonesian and English in their classroom interaction. Fifty percent of GE teachers claimed to use English more than 50% of the time. The reasons for using Indonesian varied. Sixty seven percent said that Indonesian was used to explain difficult vocabulary:

*Because sometimes not all words have similarity with English words so that I have to explain them in Indonesia because the students found difficulties in translating them. Maybe it is something that should be understood by the student. In the end I use Indonesian, and the students are relieved. If they aren’t sure what the teacher means, it put a burden on them, so it is better to find the correct answer quickly. It’s usually for difficult vocabulary that I use the Indonesian language to help the students.* (GE1, March 2011).
Sixty seven percent GE teachers stated that Indonesian was used to explain grammatical items because they feel more comfortable using Indonesian to ensure students’ understanding. Fifty five percent of GE teachers use Indonesian for instructions. After the English version, they translated it into Indonesian.

Half the GE teachers indicated they used English less than 50% of the time. Indonesian was used more than English:

I use ....maybe 70% of Bahasa Indonesia in my classes ...I have an A class but not all of them are good at English. They are in an A class not only because they are good in English ... maybe their other subjects are good so their English may not be good. So I tend to use Bahasa Indonesia most of the time. After that, after they know what I am asking them, I would try to translate it into English. When I finish explaining in Bahasa Indonesia sometimes I forget to translate it into English (GE18, May 2011).

Eighty three percent of IS teachers indicated they used less than 50% of English in their classes, while 16% used English more than 50% of the time. That is, most IS teachers used more Indonesian than English in their interactions with students.

I love using mixed languages, but I use more Indonesian than English. I teach students to be familiar with English. Usually I start with English followed by an Indonesian translation, otherwise they will not understand and there will be no response (IS22, April 2011).

The responses show that teachers in General schools and Islamic schools used both L1 and L2 during classroom interaction. Half of the GE teachers claimed to use L2 (English) more than 50% of the time while the other half used English less than 50% of the time. The GE group use Indonesian to explain vocabulary, grammar, or instructions. The GE group with lesser use of English said that they have to translate many English expressions into Indonesian. In Islamic schools,
the majority of them report using English less than 50% of the time. This suggests that English is not being used sufficiently in teacher-student interaction in GE classes and even less so in IS classes.

d) **Teacher training in conducting teacher-student interaction**

All GE teachers said they had no in-service training in conducting teacher-student interaction. For example:

*No never. I only attended training about student accelerated learning. You know we have accelerated classes here, where students only study for two years instead of three years so the training was about how to organize the time and materials for the accelerated classes. I also attended two weeks of training about international school standard* (GE1, March 2011).

None of the IS teachers had in-service training on effective teacher-student interaction. However, IS teachers seemed to have a somewhat different focus in their in-service teacher trainings. Fifty percent stated a school syllabus development called KTSP (*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan* or Operational Syllabus developed and implemented by individual school):

*No, never. The training I attended related to KTSP. It happens pretty often in school ...we cooperated with the university, invited lecturers, speakers, often, and also were given guidance specifically for developing KTSP* (IS22, April 2011).

There has been no in-service training which focused on how to conduct effective classroom interaction. Teachers were not familiar with the concept of using effective teacher-student interaction strategies to build students’ oral communicative competence.
e) Interaction strategies that teachers used

It was revealed that 89% of GE teachers use display questions frequently:

Yes, I think this display question is important. I use it often when guiding students to read and to understand as well to produce various text types, like procedure, narrative and others (GE10, April 2011).

There was use of referential questions in interacting with students, with 44% of GE teachers noting this:

I ask referential questions especially in the opening of the lesson, but not so many, just a few questions. The purpose of asking referential questions is to relate the topic of the lesson to the students’ experience during the brainstorming session, so that the students are motivated to learn the topic if they can relate it with their lives (GE1, March 2011).

Regarding oral corrective feedback, 78% of GE teachers reported that they often corrected students’ mistakes in using words, but seldom corrected the contents of students’ utterances. Half of them directly corrected the errors, while the other half delayed this until later:

I prefer to give feedback directly ... yesterday when reading aloud, many words were pronounced wrongly. I corrected it at the time, “You should pronounce it like this”. I tried to correct them without sounding like I blame them, “Oh that is wrong.” It is very discouraging. Usually I correct it, but in a quiet way so that the student won’t feel exposed. After I corrected it, I wrote in the board. Then I asked the class to read together, and then one by one, so the student who mispronounced the words would not feel embarrassed. I usually correct mistakes directly, so that it won’t be forgotten (GE2, March 2011).

I delay giving feedback to the students. I usually make a list of students’ mistakes and then at the end of the lesson I discuss them with the students in general without pointing who made the mistakes. The reason to get all students to notice and learn by making mistakes; they won’t repeat the same mistakes (GE17, April 2011).
When asked about the use of scaffolding strategy, only 33% of GE teachers claimed that they often scaffold students’ utterances and they would do it if required. Limited time was a factor which prevented the other 67% of GE teachers from reformulating, extending or giving model sentences to students’ utterances. They reported only giving model sentences to the whole class:

_The class will ask me whenever they encounter difficulties. They will ask for the structure formula. Then I help them to combine word by word to become a model sentence. They are usually very happy with that. I will try to use it again next time and finally they will remember the structure. I’m so glad if I can help them. I think the “habit-forming” really works (GE13, April 2011)._  

Regarding negotiation moves (asking students to clarify and confirm his or her understanding of students’ response), 22% of GE teachers reported that often use negotiation moves, while 78% seldom employed these strategies because students seldom use English:

_Students seldom initiate English to me. That is the first reason. The second one is because I give well actually honestly I give little chance for oral competence development. Most of my activity is about reading and writing. Well, honestly…. the students in my class are so many. It’s very difficult for me to focus on their speaking ability for all of the forty eight students at one time (GE9, April 2011)._  

When asked about speak turn strategy, all GE teachers mentioned they had extended turn frequently in the teacher-student interaction. They felt an obligation to explain the teaching materials to students for example, grammar points or characteristics of texts, or difficult words that students were reading at the time:
Yes, it’s the teachers’ job to explain the lessons to students. Like today, we discussed descriptive text, about a girl’s unusual hobby. I have to explain or remind students again about the present simple tense pattern and make sure students understand so they can apply the rule to their own sentences (GE2, March 2011).

When asked whether they gave extended turns to students to express themselves in English by relating lessons to personal experiences or making a reflection of the lesson, only 22.2% of GE teachers said they often did this, while the other 78.8% replied that they seldom gave students the chance to have extended turns:

_I think I seldom give this kind of activity because normally we run out of time. Maybe for homework, yes, I asked them to write or make sentences or find from the internet their favourite sports figure if the text we discussed was about sports_ (GE12, May 2011)

When asked about whether they completed students’ turn, interrupted students’ turn, or repeated students’ turn, 67% of GE teachers indicated that they seldom completed or interrupted students’ turn because they wanted to have less-stressed students and they wanted to ensure smoothness of communication. In contrast, 72% of GE teachers said they often repeated students’ contribution or repeated the student’s statement themselves so that students could hear a correct response:

_I think I often repeated students’ answer. The reason is to reinforce the correct answer_ (GE13, April 2011).

Thus, repetition was favoured as a strategy while completion or interruption was not.

Finally, 67% GE teachers reported that they gave time (several seconds) for students to formulate their contribution:
Yes, I often allow them time to give a chance them to think properly. They have the courage to express their answer (GE16, May 2011).

The data show that there were strategies of teacher-student interaction which often appeared in GE classes, according to the interviewees among these were: display questions, form-focused feedback, extended teacher turn, and teachers repeating students’ contribution, and allowing students to formulate their contribution.

In the Islamic site, all IS teachers indicated that they employed display questions while 50% said they used referential questions:

*I like asking display questions. I check my students’ understanding of the teaching materials using this kind of questions. Referential questions? Yes, I ask my students a few of these at the beginning of the lessons just to motivate my students. For example, the reading topic was about an ‘embarrassing experience.’ I asked them about their embarrassing experience. (IS20, April 2011)*

With scaffolding, 33% of IS teachers claimed that they often reformulated, extended, or gave model expression to their students. Sixty percent claimed that they seldom do it because their students seldom produce lengthy utterances. They corrected students’ answers if they used the wrong verbs or mispronounced words:

*I think the students’ answers usually are simple. They cannot make complicated sentences, so I seldom have to do reformulation, extension, or modelling. What students did was to use incorrect verbs or mispronouncing words, so I think I did more correcting mistakes rather than what you called scaffolding (IS19, April 2011).*
With a negotiation move (asking students to clarify and confirming understanding of students’ response), 17% of GE teachers reported to often use it, while 83% reported that they seldom used this strategy. They said this was because students rarely initiated a communication in English with teachers:

*I think I use it very rarely, because it is only 2 or 5 percent of students who try to communicate in English. If they communicate with me in English, I will use English as well.* (IS21, April 2011)

In addition, 83% of IS teachers reported that they often corrected students’ mistakes which related to their use of words, but seldom corrected the contents of students’ utterances. All claimed the selection of strategies (direct correction or delay until later) they used depended on the type of mistakes that students made:

*For me, during teaching, sometimes I correct students’ mistakes directly. Sometimes I do it at the end of the reading. I tell them: “you read this, and it is supposed to be spelled like this.” It depends. Sometimes, if there is only one person who spells it incorrectly, I will correct it right away, but if the mistakes are related to sentence construction in their written paragraph or texts, I need special time to discuss it. I will discuss and explain the mistake one by one to the whole class. They can improve their English from their mistakes* (IS19, April 2011).

IS teachers and GE teachers showed similar responses for extended teacher turns and extended student turns. Most IS teachers claimed they had to speak at length to ensure students’ understanding of the various texts, using questioning and explaining. Eighty three percent of IS teachers said they did not have time to give students an opportunity to express themselves in English by relating lessons to their personal experiences or making a reflection of the lesson.
When asked about whether they completed students’ turn, interrupted students’ turn, or repeated students’ turn, 83% of IS teachers said they seldom completed or interrupted students’ turn because they wanted to give students the opportunity to present their responses in English. In contrast, 50% of IS teachers said they often repeated students’ contribution or repeated his or her own statement to ensure that the statements are heard by all students. Finally, 83% IS teachers reported they give time (several seconds) for students to formulate their contribution to find or to retrieve English words from their minds.

To sum up, in IS schools reported strategies included display questions, form-focused feedback, extended teacher turn, repeating students’ contribution, teachers repeating their own statement, and allowing students to formulate a contribution.

f) **Barriers to conducting teacher-student interaction in English**

Teachers encountered three major barriers. The first barrier was concern about the National Examination. As a result, most GE and IS teachers gave little attention to building students’ oral communicative competence:

*There isn’t any speaking test in the National Examination. It seems we still have little interaction or communication in classrooms. We can play communication games in grade 7 and at the beginning of grade 8. After that, we, both the teachers and students, only focus on teaching students reading and understanding various text types. We are too afraid to try anything that does not relate to the national exam, because it will take our time. (IS24, March 2011).*
Almost all GE and IS teachers pointed out the importance of students’ doing well in the National Examination. For example, here is a typical response by GE5:

There is a society demand, where the standard of success is laid down by the National Examination. We start to leave the communicative approach behind. They are more focused on the National Examination; the focus is how to make students successful in the National Examination (GE5, April 2011).

An obvious conclusion is that the Indonesian Ministry of Education dictates what happens in EFL classrooms. Teachers concentrated on equipping students with the skills required for the National Examination, mainly reading skills, as it is clear that good results in the National Examination are highly desirable.

The second barrier, reported by 50% of GE and 83% of IS teachers, is teachers’ lack of fluency in English. Because all the teachers interviewed graduated from local institutions, and 33% of IS teachers did not hold a degree with a major in English teaching, their oral English was not proficient:

Yesterday, a student said, ma’am, let’s speak in English only, so we make a commitment. But there are students who protest when I speak in English only. It is not easy for me, either. Maybe there are English words that I forget, so it is also easy for me. I think that they will understand more if I speak in Indonesian (GE2, March 2011).

The following response shows a teacher’s lack of confidence because of an inappropriate qualification:

Actually my qualification is computing and IT. I am assigned to teach English because we lack of English teachers. The reason I was chosen was because of my interest in English. I suppose I am not as proficient speaker as the ones who graduated from university majoring in English. (IS19, March 2011).
The last barrier that inhibits teacher-student interaction is class size. Sixty seven percent of GE and 50% of IS teachers commented that they had classes of 40 to 48 students. They were unable to interact with all their students:

Well, actually it’s not very easy for me because the number of the students is too many in this class. I have 48 students... I am never able to ask a question directly to a student. So I give the questions to all of the students and let students answer the questions. So maybe one-third or one-half of the students is active in the classroom interaction. (GE9, April 2011)

It seems apparent that barriers to building oral communication competence are both external and internal. External factors are heavily influenced by the policy of Education Ministry which has mandated that the National Examination will be centrally controlled. The internal factors are teachers’ own lack of English fluency and difficulties in handling large numbers of students in most classrooms.

**g) Barriers for students in interacting in English**

In general, both GE and IS teachers felt that their students encountered many barriers participating in teacher-student interaction in English. These barriers can be categorised broadly into four groups: linguistic incompetence, anxiety, culture, and supporting environment. Linguistic incompetence includes students’ lack of vocabulary and poor pronunciation. The responses shown below describe these barriers.

Fifty six percent of GE teachers mentioned inadequate vocabulary as a factor that affected students’ interaction. Students cannot communicate well with a teacher without sufficient vocabulary:
I know they do not know the words in English because they are too lazy to memorize vocabulary. (GE9, April 2011)

In addition to a lack of vocabulary, 56% of GE teachers indicated that their students had difficulty because of problems with pronunciation:

Then, about students’ pronunciation, they often mispronounce words. Why so? It is because students seldom practise how to pronounce. Often when they have new vocabulary items, they try to use them by writing them in compositions but do not know how to pronounce them. Although we teachers have drilled them, still the students forget and so that they are afraid to speak. (GE11, April 2011)

Apart from linguistic incompetence, 67% of GE teachers considered their students had anxiety problems when they have to interact in English:

They also are afraid to speak, especially when their friends laugh at them. They need to be encouraged more. They are also afraid in making conversation. They have to think a long time before starting conversation. They often made mistakes in diction. That’s why I explain to the students that when they make mistakes I will correct them. If they are being laughed at by their friends, why don’t they make fun of their mistakes as well? They can all laugh together. (GE8, March 2011)

Another barrier mentioned by 78% of GE teachers is the influence of Javanese culture, in particular, the impetus to be respectful and obedient to parents and to teachers and not to show off. GE5 commented on the upbringing of children, stressing the importance of being respectful and obedient to elders:

One of the factors is, I think, our culture. I have taught for more than twenty years now, and I see but one thing. Students lack the courage to interact with teachers. It is probably our culture which tells us to do so. Let’s see our culture. Students, when they are at home, have to be polite and obedient to parents. Never challenge parents and teachers. Listen to what they have to say. It has quite an impact in the class. They are so silent. I still feel the same. So I do many things to motivate them to speak. I
just want them to spit it out. It is undeniable that 75% of our students are like that, that is, lacking courage. (GE5, March 2011)

GE2 was concerned about students not trying to speak English to avoid being seen as a show off:

They are afraid that their friends might call them a show off. Yes, some kids call them “keminggris” (actions which imitate westerners or English people), although some students are really interested in speaking English. For example, students suggest that they only speak English in the class ... I think this shows that they had the intention, when their friends speak in Indonesian, to say, “hey, in English”. But some students are reluctant to do so ... to avoid being called “keminggris.” (GE2, March 2011)

The last barrier mentioned by 67% of GE teachers is English is only a foreign language in Indonesia; therefore, students are not used to express their ideas in English as it is not spoken in the society:

Students are not used to express their ideas through spoken language especially English. There is little chance to interact with the teacher because of time limitations and the big number of students in a class, and also because they are not in the habit of giving spontaneous responses. I think it takes time for students to think and give responses. They don’t have an opportunity to practise speaking English outside the class. They can’t speak it with their family or with their circle of friends (GE3, March 2011).

In Islamic school site, 83% of IS teachers indicated students’ lack of confidence of vocabulary, grammar skills, and pronunciation.

I think they don’t have enough vocabulary. Actually, vocabulary for Lower Secondary students is not that difficult, but we only have two lessons in a
week ... Without enough vocabulary, students will not succeed (IS 22, April 2011)

The problem is their English pronunciation. They are afraid to mispronounce the words, but that is understandable. They also have grammar problems: they use wrong tenses when they speak (IS 20, March 2011).

Apart from linguistic incompetence, 83% of IS teachers considered their students have anxiety problems when they have to interact in English:

They are afraid to make mistakes, afraid to be laughed at. When they are right, their friends still make fun of them, like saying ‘Hey, genius’. (IS21, April 2011)

Students were anxious to participate in classroom interaction with their teachers because they did not want to lose face in front of many students. It is a common problem among Asian students. It is important to maintain one’s dignity. Students will be reluctant to involve themselves in an embarrassing situation. To avoid this, it is safer not to try.

All of IS teachers also noted respect and obedience to parents and teachers as important factors which inhibits students’ classroom participation. IS19 emphasized the importance of being polite to elders. In Javanese culture, it is impolite for students to speak without first being spoken to:

I think it is influenced by Javanese culture. From a young age, they are taught to be respectful and to obey their leaders, and teachers are leaders. Students will not speak unless they are spoken to because it is considered impolite. (IS19, March 2011)
According to GE and IS teachers, students’ reluctance to participate or initiate a turn in the English classroom can be attributed to the following: a lack of confidence in their linguistic competence; cultural barriers; a sense of anxiety; and a non-supportive environment, that is, English is not a medium of instruction nor is it an official language in Indonesia.

h) Teachers’ suggestions for ways to increase teacher-student interaction

Both of GE and IS teachers’ suggestions for ways to increase interaction can be categorised as out-of-school and within-school suggestions. The former focuses on the Ministry of Education and the National Examination policy. The latter includes proposals for increasing students’ turns in small talk, reducing the number of students in a class, using appropriate media, selecting interesting topics, and motivating students.

The first suggestion stated by 78% of GE teachers and 83% of IS teachers referred to the National Examination. This response is a typical response:

*The general focus is how to make students successful in UNAS. What students know is that success equals a good NEM (Raw National Examination Scores). Maybe if they change the policy of the National Examination, I think then we will not put aside other language skills including competence in oral language.* (GE5, April 2011)
Teachers from both school sites pointed to the National Examination policy. The impetus is to train students to pass the examination rather than developing students’ skill in using English for communication.

In terms of barriers from within schools, 67% of GE teachers suggested that they should engage more students in small talk:

I think I should have more small talk with students. I invite them to use English. For example, this week I will focus on some students. Next week I will focus on other students. I am supposed to speak more and not be focused on the students who can answer my questions. (GE3, March 2011)

GE3 pointed to large numbers of students in a classroom. Classes mostly consist of more than 40 students. Suggestions to reduce the number of students was voiced by a 67% of GE and 83% of IS teachers:

I really want to have a small class. I mean not about 48 or more but only about 20 because this is a language class. It’s very difficult for the teacher to interact with one class that has about 40 or 48 students. So it will be meaningless because the number of the students is too many. They will have limited opportunities. The number of the students should be reduced because you know the teachers are limited with their time. (GE9, April 2011)

The next suggestion, mentioned by 56% of GE teachers, was to motivate students to participate actively in classroom interaction and not to be afraid of making mistakes as making mistakes in language learning is quite normal:

I motivate my students continuously. First, students must realize that it is not our language. Why are we so afraid to make mistakes? Never be afraid to say the words incorrectly, wrong spelling, and all... Do not be afraid of that all that. Just spit it out. The most important thing is that students have the courage to speak (GE11, April 2011)
Other suggestions related to the use of media, such as LCD, pictures, and songs to increase students’ participation, and selecting topics which were interesting for students such as sport activities or music were stated by 50% of IS teachers.

5.3.2 Teachers’ perceptions of student–student interaction

The data indicated differences among teachers about student-student interaction. Half liked student-student interaction while another half did not.

a) Teachers’ preference to student-students interaction

Teachers were asked: “Do you like providing an opportunity for student-student interaction so that they can practice their English?” Sixty seven percent of GE teachers like giving time for student-student interaction in the form of pair or group work because they see this as beneficial for students’ language development:

“Yes, I think so, because they can use it to make their English fluent, especially speaking and listening skills. Maybe they can also be braver speaking in small groups than in class situation. So they will be brave by having a mindset of “Oh it means that I have to speak.” I think it is different when they are with their friends. (GE12, May 2011)

Another 33% of teachers dislike allowing student-student interaction in the form of pair or group work because they say it does not encourage equal participation.

“No. Actually, I really hate groups because some of the students didn’t do the job properly. Sometimes they are only sitting and doing nothing. I ask them to work individually. (GE17, May 2011)
Half of IS teachers liked giving chances for student-student interaction, while the other half did not. The following citation shows IS teachers who wanted to give an opportunity for student-student interaction:

*Many of my activities are in groups, whether it is group work or pair work. I like them to discuss among themselves because maybe they feel more comfortable if they discuss it with their friends. So, usually they ask me when they really have difficult words or a linguistic aspect, for example, how to say it in English. It is difficult for them so they ask to translate it from Indonesian into English.* (IS19, May 2011)

Thirty three percent IS teachers indicated that classroom arrangements are not designed for group work. Classrooms become noisy and unmanageable when students interact with their peers:

*I am not very fond of it. I prefer whole class teaching. It is noisy and can disturb other classes if they work in groups or pairs. You can see our class. It is not sound proof. I prefer to ask them to do exercises individually.* (IS21, May 2011)

From the above description, at least half of GE and IS teachers appear to have positive attitudes to providing opportunity for student-student interaction.

**b) Activities for student-student interaction**

When the teachers were asked about types of activities they provided for student-student interaction, 61% of GE teachers nominated question-answer and discussion after reading activities, 22% role plays and dialogue, 5.5% surveys, 5.5% puzzles, and 5.5% nominated encouraging students to give opinions.

Sixty seven percent of GE teachers agreed that group/peer question and answer following a reading text could promote student-student interaction. These
responses point to the potential of question and answer sessions after reading a text:

_I just do group work. Sometimes I make a group like this. After we’ve read a text, we discuss it, and then I form, for example, Group 1, Group 2 and so on. Then I ask Group 1 to make questions for Group 2 ... And then each group makes questions for other groups ... in this way students interact with other students in the class._ (GE10, May 2011)

Twenty-two percent of GE teachers pointed out that they used modelling of dialogue and role plays for student-student interaction. These responses show the potential of role plays for student-student interaction:

_I have done role-play for group-work activity. The topic was shopping. I turned the classroom into a mini market. I also gave the students some specific roles such as cashiers, buyers, and shopkeepers. So they were given model dialogue and they had to adjust the dialogue. Before the performance I checked and corrected it. They also had to memorize their dialogue. I used role play to make them more enthusiastic about the lesson and it worked._ (GE13, May 2011)

Only 5.5% of GE teachers implemented surveys activities for student-student interaction. Another 5.5% of GE teacher noted that crossword puzzles were a strategy she used to promote interaction with peers. Apart from puzzles, 5.5% of GE teachers also mentioned asking and giving opinions.

In contrast, IS teachers’ responses to tasks for student-student interaction were limited to two types. Question-answer and discussion after reading activities were identified by 67% of participants. Role plays and dialogue were nominated by
33% of teachers. The following responses describe questions and answers after reading a text and practising dialogue:

After reading activities, I usually group my students when it comes to reading comprehension because some students can motivate the other members of the group... yeah...it works...after reading I ask them to make questions with the rest of the group. Then I ask them to exchange the questions with other groups. (IS19, March 2011)

I usually give them a dialogue that they can copy. Students repeat the dialogue. Students usually practise what is in the dialogue. Then working in their group, they add more sentences. From one sentence, it could be two or more sentences. Sometimes they create sentences that we, the teachers, have never heard before. They are words in Indonesian language that are translated into English. Then they act the dialogue in front of the class. I think that this can provide practice and will make their English better. (IS20, March 2011)

Question-answer and discussion after reading texts are favoured activities of teachers at both General and Islamic Schools. Communication activities for student-student interaction appear to be more varied in General schools than in Islamic schools.

c) Grouping techniques teachers use to encourage student-student interaction

When asked about the grouping strategies, the most popular response by GE teachers was putting students with different abilities to speak and write in English in the same group (50%), followed by putting the high achieving students with the low achieving students (30%), and grouping talkative and quiet students together (20%). These responses describe attitudes to grouping:
I choose with the assumption that the smart ones must teach the less smart ones. Sometimes the kids don’t like to be given groups with struggling students, but I said, this is a good deed. If you’re willing to help the not so smart student, you will get a big reward. So you guide him or her, do this and that. With such an approach students are happy to do it. I arrange things like that, the not so smart ones grouped with the smart ones to create interaction and sharing. (GE1, March 2011)

In contrast, all IS teachers who preferred to provide chances for student-student interaction are more practical in their decision to grouping or pairing their students:

For instance after reading aloud activity, I usually group my students when it comes to reading comprehension because some students can motivate the other members of the group, so I ask them to work with their partner who sits with him or her. Or if they have to work in groups, I ask them to work with four students. Students just turn around and face each other, no need to move these students’ desks. It is as simple as that. (IS20, March 2011)

From the above description, it can be concluded that there are differences in regard to grouping strategies: General teachers preferred mixing students with different abilities, while Islamic preferred proximity where students sat in their classroom.

d) Teachers’ training on student-student interaction

When asked whether they had in-service training in conducting effective student-student interaction, including developing of communicative tasks, 72.2% of GE teachers said no. It is noted that GE teachers who were familiar with promoting student-student interaction were the ones who held Master degrees:
My thesis was about student-student interaction through cooperative learning. So I am very familiar with the concept. My study was action research and I tried cooperative learning in my own class. I think student-student interaction is the key word for improving students’ speaking skills. (GE13, April 2011)

The majority of IS teachers reported they did not have any in-service training on it. Only 16% of IS teachers indicated that they were informed of effective student-student interaction in a workshop initiated by a university. The data show little in-service training specifically designed for effective student-student interaction. Most teachers do not know how to conduct student-student interaction to build students’ oral communication. Teachers who upgraded to a Masters level who reported be gained more skills in conducting student-student interaction.

e) Barriers to student-student interaction

Seventy two percent of GE and 83% of IS teachers noted barriers to promoting student-student interaction: students were more comfortable speaking Indonesian rather than English; students were reluctant to ‘show off’ in front of their peers; and students felt shy when speaking in English.

The weakness is that they do not use English in interacting between each other .... In a discussion of questions of a reading text, they hardly use English. When I ask them to use English they become silent. They often use Indonesian although I ask them questions in English. (GE12, May 2011)
Sixty seven percent of GE and 83% of IS teachers revealed that students were afraid to be called a show off and so did not want to use English in group or pair work:

_I want students to speak English actively, but it has not worked - because sometimes when they are talking in English, their friends insult them, call them a show-off._ (GE17, March 2011)

Seventy two percent of GE and 67% IS teachers mentioned shyness as a barrier:

_Maybe shyness is a reason ... when they speak in front of the class and everyone watches them, they suddenly do not know what to say. Because of shyness, they probably forget the English words or what they are going to say in English._ (IS21, May 2011)

From the above description, it can be concluded that General and Islamic School teachers regarded anxiety as a problem of speaking English in student-student interaction. The pressure is even greater when students have to do it in front of the class.

**f) Teachers’ suggestions to increase student-student interactions**

Most GE and IS teachers’ suggestions can be classified into two types: monitoring students’ performance during student-student interaction; and encouraging students to keep using English. These responses point to the importance of both activities:

_I think monitoring is very important. That’s why I have to get close. I have to get around to see what’s happening. If the communication is in English I reward them. So they know they get appreciation. I want them to speak English spontaneously._ (GE10, March 2011)
The teachers have to encourage students to keep using English. ... They are not in the habit of doing it ... they are not accustomed to it. I said to my students, “If your friend can ask questions and answers in English, you can do that too.” So I give encouragement all the time to motivate them to try. (IS 22, April 2011)

In the next section, the data drawn from interviews with teachers is discussed.

5.4 Overview of the interview data

From the interviews with teachers a number of conclusions can be drawn. First, teaching in both GE and IS schools are designed to prepare students for the National Examination. Second, many GE and IS teachers lack knowledge and skills in applying effective classroom interaction strategies. They have received little training in effective teacher-student interaction. Third, there were few tasks provided for student-student interaction. Fourth, linguistic incompetence and cultural factors inhibit students from participating in classroom interaction. Fifth, English was not used to maximum effect in classroom interaction. These findings now are examined in more detail.

1. Oral communicative competence in English is not a priority

Both GE and IS teachers point out that oral communicative competence is not a priority in teaching English in lower secondary schools in Malang. Reading comprehension of various texts is valued because it prepares students for the National Examination which stresses reading comprehension. Oral communicative language proficiency has not been emphasized in the National Examination so that it is not surprising that English teachers have paid more
attention to students’ reading comprehension. Their belief of their classroom interaction practice seems to be influenced by the external factors (the Education Ministry policy). This finding echoes Breen’s (1998) and Lacorte’s (2005) study, that the principles of what content to teach and how they see their role as a teacher were most influenced by situational factors such as assessment requirements and nature of the students.

2. Limited range of teacher-student interaction strategies

The majority of GE and IS teachers employed a small range of strategies. The relatively popular strategies used by most teachers were display questions, extended teacher turn, form focused feedback, and teacher echo. Other strategies were mentioned rarely. These included reference questions, negotiation moves, scaffolding, extended student turn, and content focus feedback.

Use of a limited range of strategies for interaction was mainly was the result of teachers’ lack of knowledge of effective strategies. Teachers were more familiar with their traditional role as knowledge transmitters. Teachers indicated that they used display questions to check students’ mastery of the knowledge they provided. Extended teachers’ turn was also employed to transmit knowledge.

Teachers paid little attention to the following strategies: scaffolding, negotiation moves, student extended turn, referential questions, and content focused feedback. It appears that many teachers are not aware of these strategies. The classroom
interaction they devise is based on their own ideas or drawn from their own experiences. Teachers’ lack of knowledge and skills in using strategies for interaction can be attributed to the focus of their in-service training that they receive.

In-service training offered by the Ministry of Education focuses on current trends in the Indonesian education system, for example, accelerated classes or international standard classes where English has been used as a medium of instruction for mathematics and integrated science (biology, chemistry, and physics). Training in use of classroom interaction strategies in English classes is not a priority and gets little attention.

3. **Limited tasks designed for student-student interaction**

Tasks focused mainly on questions and answers based on reading texts. Only a small number of teachers reported providing communicative tasks for student-student interaction. There appear to be several causes of limited student-student interaction. First, teachers do not realize its benefits. Teachers were not aware of the potential of student-student interaction to promote students’ oral language.

The second reason was that most teachers do not have the skills to design communicative tasks for student-student interaction. Only, a few teachers who had Masters degree claimed to be have knowledge about communicative tasks which promote student-student interaction. As a result, most teachers were
comfortable with the tasks which were prescribed and available in the students’ textbooks. These tasks mostly related to reading comprehension, grammar, and vocabulary items. Teachers’ lack of skills in promoting student centred learning echoes Maulana et.al’s study (2012).

4. English (L2) is not used to maximum effect in classroom interaction

Both GE and IS teachers use a mixture of Indonesian and English in their classrooms. The majority of IS teachers indicated that they used English less than 50% of class time. These findings may be explained in terms of teachers’ experience as well as the communicative competence of the teacher and their students.

More experienced English teachers (with more than 20 years’ experience) learned their English via grammar translation methods. They memorised grammatical patterns through direct instruction. Communicative teaching activities were not cultivated at the time they learned English. As a result, their grammatical knowledge was excellent but they were not confident with their oral communication. Using a mixture of English and Indonesian may suit more experienced teachers.

Another reason is low communicative competence of the teachers. There has been a relatively recent report on teacher communicative competence published by the Director of Quality Improvement for Academic and Non-academic, Ministry of Education, Surya Dharma, MPA, PhD, (Surya Dharma, 2009). It
revealed that teachers of secondary schools who were involved in teaching into international standard programs have low communicative competence, as indicated by their low score on the Test of English for International Communication (ToEIC). Similar finding is also indicated by Lengkanawati’s study (2005) and Hamid’s study (2001).

The last reason for the use of both English and Indonesian is students’ poor linguistic competence in English. Some schools have students with high English proficiency. These students usually came from well-to-do families who provide private tuition in English. Other schools may have many students who lack English proficiency because they cannot afford private tuition. In the former, teachers are likely to use more English because the students understand English. In the latter schools, teachers would use more Indonesian because their students understand little English.

5. Linguistic incompetence and cultural factors inhibit students from participating in classroom interaction

Most GE and IS teachers reported that students have lack of confidence in their linguistics competence. This finding is line with the findings of the Student Survey discussed in Chapter 4. Lack of confidence in their linguistic competence echoes studies conducted by Liu & Littlewood (1997) and Tomlinson & Dat (2004) and
Most of GE and IS teachers stated that students were not active in classroom interaction, they tended to be shy and opted not to try to experiment with their English language in classroom interaction. According to GE and IS teachers cultural factors, such as being complete obedient and complete respectful to elders (parents, teachers, community leaders) influenced the students’ behaviour in the classroom. Students were brought up to be polite, not to initiate to speak to elders unless they are spoken to, not to challenge the elders by asking critical questions and to do what the elders ask them to do without any protests (Lestari, 1999). The result of this upbringing is passive students. Students did not respond to the teacher presentation or questions unless they are assigned to do so. Students’ passivity emerged in studies by Astika (1996), Tutyandari (2005) and Marchellino (2008).

5.5 Summary and conclusions

This chapter has been concerned with the teacher interview. The teacher interview was conducted for the purpose of determining teachers’ perceptions of classroom interaction in their EFL classes. The interview protocol which consisted of 9 items related to teacher-student interaction and 7 items related to student-student interaction served as the instrument for collecting data. In 2011, there were 120 Lower Secondary Schools in Malang City which consisted of 90 General Lower Secondary Schools and 30 Islamic Lower Secondary schools. Twenty percent of these schools were selected as the participants of the study; they were 18 General Secondary Schools and 6 Islamic Secondary Schools. Then from these 18 General Secondary Schools, the total teachers participated in the
study was 18 teachers, whereas from 6 Islamic Lower Secondary Schools 6 teachers were the respondents. The teacher interview was conducted during the school year 2011.

Findings show that most teachers, 56% of GE teachers and 66% of IS teachers, like to interact with their students in English for the purpose of checking students’ understanding of the learning materials. Reading comprehension question and answer is the most mentioned activity for teacher-student interaction. It is stated by 61% of GE teachers and 83% of IS teachers.

The language choice for teacher-student interaction, 50% of GE teachers reported to use English more than 50%; while 83% of IS teachers use it less than 50%. None of GE and IS teachers have attended in-service training about effective classroom interaction.

The most popular teacher-student interaction strategies mentioned by GE teachers are teacher extended turn (100%), asking display questions (89%), giving form-focused feedback (70%), repeating own utterances or student utterances (72%), giving time for students to formulate their answers (67%), asking referential questions (44%), scaffolding (33%), completing/interrupting student responses (33%), negotiation (22%), and student extended turn (22%), respectively.

Interaction strategies that IS teachers often use include extended turn (100%), asking display questions (100%), giving form-focused feedback (83%), giving
time for students to formulate their answers (83%), repeating own utterances or student utterances (50%), asking referential questions (50%), scaffolding (33%), completing/interrupting student responses (17%), negotiation (17%), and student extended turn (17%).

There are three major barriers faced by teachers in conducting classroom interaction in English: the National Examination (mentioned by 83% of GE teachers and 100% of IS teachers), lack of fluency (stated by 50% of GE teachers and 83% of IS teachers), large classes (stated by 67% teachers and 50% of IS teachers) and teachers graduating from non English Language Teaching as indicated by 33% of IS teachers.

Furthermore there are four barriers faced by students when participating in classroom interaction in English reported by both groups of teachers. The first barrier mentioned by 78% GE teachers and 100% IS teachers is cultural factor which influences how students behave in classroom, followed by anxiety, lack of vocabulary and pronunciation, and English is an official language in Indonesia (mentioned by 67% GE teachers).

In terms of student-student interaction, 67% of GE teachers and 50% of IS teachers like giving time for student-student interaction. Sixty one percent of GE teachers nominated question-answer and discussion after reading activities for promoting student-student interaction. Similarly, 67% of IS teachers are reported to use the same activity.
Most teachers (72.2% GE teachers and 84% IS teachers) state that they did not 
have any in-service training on how to conduct effective student-student 
interaction to build students’ oral communication. A small number of teachers 
who upgraded to a Masters level are reported to gain more skills in conducting 
student-student interaction.

Most teachers report that students had problem using English during student-
student interaction due to anxiety (mentioned by 67% GE and 83% IS teachers) 
and shyness (stated by 72% of GE and 67% IS teachers). Most teachers from both 
groups also agree that strategies to improve students’ use of English during 
student-student interaction are to keep monitoring and motivating students.

From the findings, it can be concluded that majority of GE and IS teachers did not 
emphasise on developing students’ English oral communicative competence. 
Both groups of teachers perceive teacher-student interaction as a means of 
checking student mastery of learning materials. The learning materials are very 
often in the form of reading texts, thus teachers use interaction to check 
comprehension of the texts. Reading comprehension skill is emphasised because 
it is required to pass the National Examination.

Students in GE schools are more exposed to English in classroom interaction 
because more teachers in GE schools use English than teachers in IS schools. IS
teachers are less confident with their oral communicative competence because some of them do not hold English teaching degree.

Both group of teachers’ use of teacher-student interaction strategies are unbalanced. They focus more on employing interaction strategies which represent teachers’ domination of classroom interaction. This is due to the fact that most GE and IS teachers have not received any in-service training on conducting effective classroom interaction.

The tasks designed by majority of GE and IS teachers for student-student interaction are not focused on communicative activities to promote students’ communicative competence. Student engagement with their peers focused on activities related to discussion of reading comprehension questions. The reason for this limitation seems to be related to the teachers’ lack of skills because most of them have never been exposed to in-service training on conducting effective student-student interaction.

Most of GE and IS teachers perceive that students were not active in classroom interaction, they tended to be shy and opted not to try to experiment with their English language in classroom interaction. According to GE and IS teachers students are not confident with their linguistic competence and also are impeded by cultural factors. As a result, students’ participation in classroom interaction is limited.
The interview data presented in this chapter provides teachers’ perspectives on classroom interaction: teacher-student interaction, student-student interaction, how they conduct classroom interaction, and the barriers that impede their use of classroom interaction. The interview data are consistent with the data gathered in the survey to students examined in the previous chapter.

To confirm the reliability and validity of findings of the interview data, classroom observation was used to witness the process of interaction in person. In the next chapter, classroom observation data that recorded teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction will be presented and discussed.
Chapter Six
Classroom observation: Findings and discussion

6.1 Introduction

In Chapter Five, findings from the interview were analysed and discussed. The interview results provided teachers’ perspectives on classroom interaction. In addition to surveys to students and interviews with teachers, classroom observation data were obtained. As discussed in Chapter Three, classroom observations were made using observation protocols (see Appendix 11) and transcriptions from video recordings of classrooms. The findings are presented in this chapter.

6.2 Observed Lessons

Class observation took place in both General and Islamic Lower Secondary Schools in Malang, East Java, Indonesia. Class observation covered one or two lessons per teacher. Total observed lessons were thirty nine. These consisted of thirty lessons taught by eighteen teachers at General Lower Secondary Schools and nine lessons taught by six teachers at Islamic Lower Secondary Schools. The approximate number of students in each class observed was 42. The duration of a lesson lasted for approximately 70-80 minutes. Tables 6.1 and 6.2 provide a summary of the number of lessons and topics that were observed in the English classes.
Table 6.1: Summary of Lesson Observations at General Lower Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>No. of Lessons</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GE1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading: Sport</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking: Talking about Profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading: Unusual Hobbies</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grammar: Adjective Clause</td>
<td>Nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: Narrative Text</td>
<td>Nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grammar: Tenses</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: Gardening</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Singing &amp; Talking about a Song ‘Nobody’s Child’</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading: Narrative text</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading: Procedure Text</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar: Commands</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading: Interesting places</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: Hercules</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grammar: Past Continuous Tense</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading: Going to the Beach (Class A)</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: Going to the Beach (Class B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading: Exciting Trip</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: Notice</td>
<td>Nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading: Food</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: Narrative Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading: The Weather (Class A)</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: The Weather (Class B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grammar: Tenses (Class A)</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar: Tenses (Class B)</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading: Procedure Text</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: Weather Forecast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading: Narrative Text</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading: Narrative Text</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading: Invitation</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing: Short Messages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30 lessons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In General schools, most observed grade level was grade level 8 (50%), followed by grade level 7 (37%) and grade level 9 (13%). Most of the lessons focused on reading (70%), followed by grammar (20%), listening & speaking (6.7%) and writing (3.3%).

Table 6.2: Summary of Lesson Observations at Islamic Lower Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>No. of Lessons</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading: Public Places</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: Going to the Doctor</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading: Procedure Text</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: An Embarrassing experience</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading: Announcement (Class A)</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading: Announcement (Class B)</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speaking: Asking for information</td>
<td>Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading: Describing people</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading: Sports</td>
<td>Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 lessons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Islamic school site, the most observed grade level was grade level 8 (56%), followed by grade level 7 (44%). Grade level 9 was not available for observation because students were attending an intensive program to prepare for the National Examination. Most of the lessons focused on reading (89%), followed by speaking (11%).
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The results of classroom observations are organized into three parts: classroom organization, teacher-student interaction, and student-student interaction. Within teacher-class interaction, two subcategories were identified: strategies of teacher-student interaction and teacher language choices. Within student-student interaction, three subcategories were identified: types of task, Language Related Episodes (LREs), and students’ language choices.

6.3 Classroom Organization

Two main types of classroom structures appeared in the observations: teacher fronted interaction and student-student interactions. The teacher fronted interaction is an interaction where the teacher worked with the whole class and typically interacted with a succession of individuals, while expecting the attention of the rest of the class. This interaction is initiated and controlled by the teacher. This is referred to as teacher-student interaction (T-S).

The second form involved interaction among students when they are working in pairs or in a group. This type of interaction is labelled student-student interaction (S-S). There was also another form of interaction where the teacher interacted with group of students when they were doing their pair work or small group work. This kind of interaction happened rarely because the teacher usually moved around the class to check on students while they were working. It was not possible to provide a meaningful percentage for the amount of time spent on teacher-student group interaction. Table 6.3 shows the time spent on types of participation at General and Islamic Lower Secondary Schools.
Table 6.3 Time spent on Teacher-Class and Student-Student at General and Islamic Lower Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time spent on type of interaction</th>
<th>Minutes (General)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Minutes (Islamic)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total teaching time</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td></td>
<td>720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Time spent on T-S</td>
<td>2232</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Time spent on S-S</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3 shows the time devoted to each type of interaction for 24 teachers over 39 lesson observations. The proportion of time spent on Teacher-Students (T-S) compared to Student-Student (S-S) interaction does not vary between General and Islamic schools. The dominant type of interaction is teacher-student interaction. Teacher-student interaction occupied 93% of the time while the S-S interaction occupied 7% of the time at the General schools. In Islamic schools, the proportion of time spent on teacher-student interaction was slightly higher with T-S occupying 94.4% of the time.

The dominant use of teacher–student interaction was consistent with the teaching activities recorded on the observation notes and video recording. Below is an example extracted from video recording and observation notes from a General School site:

**Excerpt 1(GE1, Lesson: Reading: Sports)**

The topic of this lesson was Sport. The teacher began the lesson by asking questions to the class about the kind of sport they usually played, when they played the sport, why they liked this sport. The teacher asked one student after another to answer to these questions, there were 6 students who were asked and responded. Then the teacher displayed some pictures...
about marathons using in-focus presentation. The teacher asked questions related to the pictures and the appointed students gave their responses. The teacher asked the students to read a text in their handout about ‘Marathon Kids’ followed by a question and answer session about the texts and some exercises related to it. In the last 10 minutes the students were asked to work in pairs to construct a dialogue related to a sport that they usually played, using the vocabulary items discussed in the reading text. (Structure of participation: Teacher-student and Student-Student Interaction)

Another example shows that teacher-student interaction was often used in classroom interaction in Islamic schools. This lesson focused on a procedure text. It equipped students with the skills for creating a procedural text, that is, necessary strategies, vocabulary items, and grammar.

**Excerpt 2 (IS20, Reading: Procedure Text)**

*The topic of this lesson was How to Make Ginger Coffee. The teacher began the lesson by asking questions about steps for drawing money from an ATM. Then the teacher held another question and answer session about how to make a cup of normal coffee. The teacher showed pictures and written texts of the recipe using in-focus presentation on ‘How to make Ginger Coffee’. The teacher asked the class to write down the title, materials and the steps involved. The teacher asked the class questions about the procedural text. The teacher assigned the class to work in pairs and make questions related to ingredients and steps to make ginger coffee. Finally, the teacher appointed several students to read their questions and appointed others to give responses. (Structure of participation: Teacher-Student and Student-Student Interaction).*

To sum up, two structures of class organization, Teacher-Student interaction and Student-Student interaction occur in both General and Islamic schools. There is little difference in the percentage time spent on Teacher-Student interaction. Teacher-Student interaction in both General and Islamic schools occupies more than 90% of the total teaching time; less than 10 % is spent on S-S interaction.
6.4 Teacher-Student Interaction

6.4.1 Strategies of teacher-class interaction

The strategies of teacher-student interaction were analysed using a framework called the SETT (Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk) instrument developed by Walsh (2006). Walsh posits that language use and interaction are the main basis for language teaching and learning. The aim of SETT is to understand more fully the relationship between teacher talk interaction and learning. SETT has four modes: managerial, materials, skill and system, and classroom context.

The aim of the managerial mode is to transmit information related to the management of the learning; material mode is to provide language practice around a specific piece of material; skill and system mode is to provide language practice in relation to particular language system or skills; and classroom context mode is to enable students to express feelings, experiences, attitudes and so on to promote oral fluency. Interactional strategies and the frequency of occurrence of each mode in the observed lessons can be seen in Table 6.4.
### Table 6.4 Teacher-student interaction strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode and Pedagogic goals</th>
<th>Interactional strategies</th>
<th>General Schools</th>
<th>Islamic Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managerial:</strong></td>
<td>A single, extended teacher turn which uses explanations and/or instructions</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation (clarification request and Confirmation checks)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*IRF /Non IRF patterns</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Display /Referential Questions</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form-focused feedback</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation (clarification request and Confirmation checks)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct repair</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials:</strong></td>
<td>To provide language practice around a specific piece of material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*IRF/Non IRF Pattern</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Display / Referential Questions</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extended teacher turns</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s echo/ completion/ interruption</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form focused feedback</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation (clarification request and Confirmation checks)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct repair</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom context:</th>
<th>Extended learner turn</th>
<th>Short teacher turn</th>
<th>Direct repair</th>
<th>Content feedback</th>
<th>Referential questions</th>
<th>Scaffolding</th>
<th>Negotiation (clarification request and Confirmation checks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enable students to express themselves about feelings, experience, attitudes etc to promote oral fluency</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The IRF/non IRF patterns are not added to the total number of teacher talk because they have been counted already in display/referential questions.

Table 6.4 showed that, in the Managerial mode, extended teacher turn in which teachers provided explanations and/or instructions in the beginning of the lessons constituted of 7.3% in General Schools and 6.8% in Islamic Schools. All teachers seemed to be comfortable talking about aspect of management in their classroom as evidenced by the amount of teacher talk that occurred. Teachers were transmitting information, introducing activities, organising the environment, and referring students to materials. In Excerpt 3, GE5 used extended turn to refer students to material and organise the environment of the class and allow students to act on his instructions:
Excerpt 3 (GE5, Singing and Talking about a Song ‘Nobody’s Child’)

T: Today, we will do a singing activity first.
SS: Yes.
T: Do you still remember about the last meeting, I gave you a song. Do you still remember that?
SS: Yes.
T: Okay, today I will give you a handout (the teacher distributes handouts to students). All right, who is absent today?
SS: Nobody.
T: Nobody is absent. All right, now look at your paper and check your notes based on the handout, okay. Last time you heard the song and you made notes on what you heard. Maybe there are words that are grammatically wrong or misspelled. Here we can check which words are written wrongly or spelled improperly. Okay now would you please check? If yours is wrong then you can correct it.
SS: Yes.
T: Are you feeling hot?
SS: Yes.
T: Okay, there is no AC in this classroom. Why don’t you open the windows to let in the fresh air. Can you open the windows, please? (One student opens the windows). Okay now, would you please make notes on your paper? Everyone please look at your handout. How many verses are there? 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Five verses?
SS: Yes

Clarification request and confirmation checks managerial mode were not found in both General and Islamic classes.

Materials mode appears to be popular as the majority of both General and Islamic teachers’ talk revolve around the materials the students were using. The majority of students’ materials were reading texts. Much of the interaction demonstrated the IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) pattern (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975). The total IRF pattern identified at General Schools was 308, while in Islamic Schools it was 95. Students’ responses were evaluated immediately as demonstrated in Excerpt 4:
Excerpt 4 (GE13, Reading: The Weather)
T: Have many seasons are there in Indonesia? Long answer please.
S1: There are two seasons.
T: Very good. What are they, Siti?
S2: They are rainy and dry season.
T: Okay, are you ready. How is it today Cahya?
S3: Today is sunny.
T: Okay. Today is sunny. Thank you. Elsa now. Where do Nina and Rita go?
S4: To the beach.
T: To the beach. Yes. Number five are you ready? When is the rainy season in Indonesia?
S5: November to April.
T: Good, number 6 now.

In these exchanges, the teacher was asking comprehension questions after the students listened to the text about the weather read by the teacher. The response made by each student is the first part of each sequence. This is followed by feedback by the teacher which consists of non corrective repetition, often accompanied by reinforcement. Feedback of this kind does not require further responses from the students, so in each case the interaction concludes at the third turn. The Non-IRF pattern in this material mode is found when teachers modify the F-move for elaborating the answer. The total non-IRF pattern in General School is 48 whereas in Islamic it is 12. This pattern occurs when teachers ask questions to relate the topic to students’ experience:

Excerpt 5 (GE16, Reading: Narrative Text)
T: Have you heard of Cinderella story?
S1: yes
T: What do you think of this Cinderella story?
S1: nice
T: Why is it nice?
S1: happy ending
Within the *materials mode*, there is an extensive use of display questions. Display questions are questions to which the teacher knows the answer. In General School site, the occurrence of display questions is 18%. In Islamic School site the occurrence is higher at 21.5%:

*Excerpt 6 (GE2 Reading: Unusual Hobby)*

*T:* Okay. Stop reading. Let’s discuss the text. Where does she come from?
*Ss:* Australia.
*T:* How do you know she is from Australia?
*Ss:* She lives in Brisbane.
*T:* Okay. She lives in Brisbane. What is Julia Beggar’s hobby?
*Ss:* Flying a helicopter.
*T:* Flying a helicopter. She has an unusual hobby. Okay so I want one of you to read it again loudly.

Compared to display questions, referential questions were less popular. Referential questions are questions in which the teacher does not know the answers. In General Schools, the occurrence of referential questions is 4.3%. In Islamic Schools, the occurrence is higher at 5.3%. Below are examples of referential questions. Teachers used them at the beginning of the lesson to introduce the topic:

*Excerpt 7 (GE1, Speaking: Talking about Profession)*

*T:* Okay. Who wants to be a teacher? Tasya?
*S:* Yes.
*T:* Do you have a reason why you want to be a teacher?
*S1:* because teaching is a nice job.
*T:* Because teaching is a good job. Give applause to Tasya. Anyone wants to be a doctor? Who wants to be a doctor?
*SS:* Ari Ma’am.
*T:* Ari, why do you want to be a doctor?
*S2:* To help sick people.
*T:* Okay, give applause to Ari.
Form focus feedback is feedback that focuses on word usage rather than the message itself. Form focus feedback occurred in both General and Islamic schools. In General Schools, the occurrence of form focus feedback is 3.8%, while in Islamic Schools it is 2.8%. Form focused feedback offered by the teachers tended to be accompanied by an explanation generally given in L1. Most of the explicit corrective feedback focused on grammatical errors, such as the use of tenses, sentence structures, and vocabulary items. The following excerpts are examples of this:

**Excerpt 8 (GE1, Speaking: Talking about a Profession)**

T: What is the definition of a teacher, Natasya?
S: A teacher is someone who teach.
T: Kalau satu orang, jangan lupa kata kerjanya di tambah s/es.
   (if the subject is singular, don’t forget to add s/es to the verb.
S: A teacher is someone who teach eh.. teaches.

**Excerpt 9 (IS22, Speaking: Asking for information)**

T: Make a question for asking information.
S: Can you tell me where Candi Badut is?
T: Candi itu temple. Can you tell me where Badut Temple is?
S: Can you tell me where Badut Temple is?

Scaffolding is rare in *material mode*. Walsh (2006) maintains that scaffolding which involves the ‘feeding in’ of essential language as it is needed plays an important part in assisting learners to express themselves and acquire new language. In General schools, the occurrence of scaffolding was 0.9%, while in Islamic schools it was 0.8%. Below are examples of scaffolding taken from both sites. In first example, the teacher reformulates the student’s contribution and the student repeats the sentence. In the second example, the teacher extends the student’s answer by giving a clue.
Excerpt 10 (IS24, Reading: Sports)
T: Why do you like swimming?
S: my body strong.
T: It makes your body strong.
S: Yes. It makes my body strong.

Excerpt 11 (GE1 Speaking: Talking about Profession)
T: Aziz wants to be a lecturer. What is the definition of a lecturer, Azis?
S: someone who teaches ...
T: is it in primary school or in university?
S: in university.
T: Ok. Are you ready to face university students?
S: Yes.

Negotiation moves (clarification requests and confirmation checks) are valuable in promoting opportunities for learning since they ‘compel’ learners to reformulate their contribution by rephrasing or paraphrasing. When learners clarify a contribution it is central to the acquisition process (Long, 1996). Although negotiation moves are vital, they were not common in the schools. In General schools there was only 0.7% negotiation moves and 1.0% in Islamic schools.

Excerpt 12 (GE18, Reading: Invitation)
T: What is your plan on Sunday?
S1: to my grandma’s house.
T: Pardon
S1: Go to my grandma’s house.

Direct repair, which involves a short and quick correction, is a useful interactional strategy since it has minimal effect on the exchange structure. This strategy was not common. There was 0.6% of occurrence of direct repair at both General and Islamic schools. The excerpt below demonstrates how the teacher repaired incorrect pronunciation of the word ‘discusses’: 
Excerpt 13 (GE11, Reading: Exciting Trip)

T: What does the text mainly discuss?
S1: The text mainly discusses the writer’s experience in Europe.
T: discusses
S1: The text mainly discusses the writer’s experience in Europe.

In the skills and system mode, pedagogic goals are focussed on providing language practice in relation to a particular language system (phonology, grammar, vocabulary, discourse) or language skill (reading, listening, writing and speaking). Pedagogic goals are oriented towards accuracy rather than fluency. The intention is to get the learners to produce strings of accurate linguistic forms and to manipulate the target language (Walsh, 2006, p.74).

In this study, the data in Table 6.4 show that the IRF pattern and display questions were dominant. In General schools, there was a 321 IRF pattern, while in Islamic schools there was a 176 IRF pattern. In General school site, the occurrence of display questions was 20%, while in Islamic schools it was 26%.

The IRF interaction and the display questions mainly focused on grammar used in the reading texts, followed by vocabulary or other exercises related to the texts. The exercises were normally already available and printed in the students’ book. Below is an example of interaction within the skill and system mode, in which the emphasis is on the use of present simple tense:

Excerpt 14 (GE2, Reading: Unusual Hobbies)

S1: My friends hate sport. Gak pake ‘s’
T: With or without ‘s’?
S1: No ‘s’
T: karena Subjectnya ‘my friends’. Okay number 3
S2: You paint nice pictures
T: Yes, you paint nice pictures. Okay subject I, you, we and they without ‘s’. Okay number 4. Ima, number 4.
S3: He writes his emails on my computer
T: He writes his emails on my computer. Number 5, Tia.
S4: Pete and Sandra play tennis on Monday.
T: Yes, Pete and Sandra play tennis on Monday. Okay, Fandi on six.
S5: My mum reads a lot of books.
T: Yes, a lot of books. My mum reads a lot of books. Okay Odi
S6: We get up at 8.30 in the morning.
T: Very good. We get up at 8.30 in the morning. Okay C now. Number 2,
   Rega Pratama
S7: I hate banana.
T: I hate banana.

The occurrence of a Non IRF pattern in this mode is not common: in General schools 51 are identified while in Islamic schools it is 12. A non IRF pattern occurs in this mode particularly when teachers ask follow up questions, asking students to repair their responses:

Excerpt 15 (GE5, Singing & Talking about a Song ‘Nobody’s Child’)
T: Come on, can you describe it in English? What is an orphan?
S1: A children has no parents.
T: Pardon. A child who?
S1: A child who has no parents.

Another common feature in the skills and system mode was extended teacher turns. They were used to establish the extent of students’ knowledge and were demonstrated throughout this mode. In General schools, the occurrence of extended teacher turn was 18.7%, while in Islamic schools it was 14.2%. The excerpt below is an example of an extended teacher’s turn which functioned to
strengthen students’ knowledge of the past form of the verbs and how to read them:

**Excerpt 16 (GE1 Reading: Sports)**

T: attacked
SS: attacked
T: repeated
SS: repeated
T: Okay. Sometimes the ‘ed’ is voiceless. Jadi ‘ed’ tidak dibaca, seperti kata helped, attacked, looked. Some other verbs you have to read the ‘ed’, seperti kata repeated, started. Now let’s continue. Repeat after me ‘watched’
SS: watched

The next feature which also a common feature in the skills and system mode was teacher echo which is used to display students’ contribution by repeating it. In General schools, the occurrence of teacher echo was 17.3%, while in Islamic schools it was 12.4%. The excerpts below were examples of teacher echo:

**Excerpt 17 (GE3, Grammar: Adjectival Clause)**

T: Number 3, Wili
S1: Hospital is a place where patients are healed
T: Hospital is a place where patients are healed. next....
S2: What is the meaning of a bank, a bank is where we save money..
T: What is the meaning of a bank, a bank is where we save money. Next 5 Afif.
S3: ATM is a place where we withdraw cash money
T: yes....ATM is a place where we withdraw cash money. Number 7.
S4: He is the boy whom the mother gave money.
T: he is the boy whom, so...what does the mother do last week...what does the mother do last week? Give some money to the boy. So the boy is the object. And the mother is the subject who gave the money. Next number 8. Risa!
S5: Warnet is a place where we can browse the internet.
T: Yes.....Warnet is a place where we can browse the internet. Yes, the last one, Dina!
S6: a receptionist is someone who welcomes the man.
T: a receptionist is someone who welcomes the man. Thank you. Next part...
Form focussed feedback was common in both schools, although not frequent in the *skill and system mode*. In General schools, the total form focused feedback was 4.1% while in the Islamic schools it was 3.2%. Most of the form focused feedback was on tenses or S-V agreement:

Excerpt 18 (IS23, Reading: Describing People)
S: You smart.
T: karena smart bukan kata kerja, jadi butuh bantuan to be ‘are”. Jadi you are smart.
S: You are smart.

Excerpt 19 (GE17, Reading Narrative Text)
T: Okay, your turn.
S: The prince fell sad after Cinderella left the party.
S: The Prince felt sad after Cinderella left the party.

Scaffolding, direct repair, and negotiation moves were not common in the skill and system mode. In General schools, the total amount of scaffolding was 0.9%, direct repair was 0.5%, and negotiation moves were 0.8%. In the Islamic schools, the percentages were 1%, 0.6%, and 1.8% respectively.

Examples of negotiation moves focussed on meaning and form are presented below:

Excerpt 20 (GE12, Reading: Exotic Food)
T: Do you like snake?
S: Yes.
T: Snake yes? How do you cook it, fry or..?
S: Snake? Oh no no no I don’t like snake.
T: okay.
Excerpt 21 (GE13, Reading, The Weather)

T: Can you change this sentence ‘I will go to Europe’. Use ‘to be going to’
S: I am going to Europe.
T: Is that right? Can you repeat?
S: I am going to go to Europe.
T: Okay, thank you.

In classroom context mode the pedagogic goal is to give opportunities to students to personalise the lesson by talking about their feelings or their experiences. This mode was not demonstrated in the current data. The focus of this mode is students’ language production. The total student extended turn in General schools was 1.2% whereas in Islamic schools it was 0.7%. Only a few student extended turns were identified, demonstrating the rarity of this classroom context mode. It can be concluded that extended learners’ turn, direct repair, content feedback, referential questions, clarification requests, and confirmation checks are rare in Indonesian EFL classes.

The excerpt below is one of a few which demonstrated this mode. A student was assigned to speak in front of the class. He was given an opportunity to personalise the lesson by talking about his experience of visiting a favourite place because the topic of the reading text was ‘Interesting Places’:

Excerpt 22 (GE8, Reading: Interesting Places)

S: I like Balekambang Beach in Malang. Many tourism ....
T: tourists
S: Many tourists like to go to there.
S: The sand is very white and the wave is very wavy.
T: very big.
S: yes very big. We can do many things in Balekambang Beach, for examples sun-bathing, surfing or taking pictures.
T: Okay, thank you. Give applause for Adit. Any questions?
SS: No.
It can be concluded that much of the teacher-student interaction in both General and Islamic schools centred on the material mode and skill and system mode. The most frequent strategies were IRF patterns, display questions, teacher echo, and extended teacher turn. Form focused feedback was also demonstrated although not frequently. Scaffolding and negotiation moves were rare. The classroom context was not apparent. Students were not given the opportunity to practise oral language production to personalise information or to connect their learning to their own experiences.

6.4.2 Teachers’ language choices

Table 6.5 shows the teacher language choices observed in teacher-class interaction in the 39 lessons. The category of language choices is adapted from Tognini (2006). ‘Mainly L1’ is defined as use of L1 80% or more in the exchange; ‘Mainly L2’ is defined as use of L2 80% or more in the exchange; and ‘Mixture of L1 and L2’ as use of equivalent L1 and L2 in the exchange (Tognini, 2006). The scores were calculated based on simple frequency of occurrence of the language choices in the exchanges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language choice</th>
<th>Total exchanges (General schools)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total exchanges (Islamic Schools)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mainly L1</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mainly L2</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. L1&amp;L2</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For General schools, “Mainly L2” occupied the largest proportion of teachers’ language choice (49.8%), followed by a “Mixture of L1 and L2” (29.7%), and “Mainly L1” (20.5%). For Islamic schools, “Mixture of L1 and L2” occupied the largest proportion of teachers’ language choice (43.2%), followed by “Mainly L2” (30.8%), and “Mainly L1” (26%).

For both General and Islamic schools, it was common for teachers to use a mixture of L1 and L2 to ensure students’ understanding. The following excerpt is an example of this:

**Excerpt 23 (IS20, Reading, An Embarrassing Experience)**

*T:* Good, read paragraph 3, Nuha
*S1:* Suddenly I found myself a behind young boy. I was really sure that he was my classmate. I pinched him a little and called his name, Andi. The boy was surprised. When he turned around I finally realized that he was not my classmate. I couldn’t say a word. That moment was just embarrassing.
*T:* Yes, Suddenly I found myself behind a young boy. Young boy. Young boy?
*SS:* Anak muda
*T:* Young lawan katanya apa? (What is the opposite of ‘young’)?
*SS:* Old
*T:* Old. I was really sure. Sure?
*SS:* Saya sangat yakin. (Indonesian word for ‘really sure’)
*T:* Okay, I was really sure that he was my classmate.
*SS:* bahwa dia teman sekolah saya (Indonesian words for ‘classmate’)
*T:* Good, his name?
*SS:* Andi
*T:* Namanya siapa? (Indonesian words for ‘what is his name?’)
*SS:* Andi
*T:* I pinched him. Pinched?
*SS:* mencubit (Indonesian word for ‘pinched’)
*T:* and called him?
*SS:* memanggil namanya (Indonesian words for ‘called him’)
*T:* Okay, memanggil namanya. The boy was surprised. Surprised?
*SS:* Terkejut (Indonesian word for ‘surprised’)
*T:* Why? kenapa?
*SS:* Dicubit (pinched)
In the extract, the teacher used a mixture of English and Indonesian. The teacher was asking the meaning of almost every word in the reading text and the students provided answers with the Indonesian equivalent. Then the teacher confirmed students’ answers by echoing them.

“Mostly L1” was apparent when teachers elicited English sentences, correcting students’ mistakes and then explaining the correct use of vocabulary, pronunciation, or grammar rules:

**Excerpt 24 (GE7, Reading: Procedure Text)**

*T:* kamu coba sebutkan langkah pertama membuat fruit juice? Sebutkan dulu terus nanti kamu tulis di papan tulis ya.
*S1:* First, plug in the blender.
*T:* bukan plug ya bacanya tapi ‘plΛg’.
*S1:* eh plug in the blender.
*S2:* Put in the fruits.
*T:* ya betul sekarang tambah air? Apa tambah, kata yang tepat?
*SS:* add water
*T:* ya betul Add some water. Terus apa? Nyalakan blendernya ya? Ayo siapa mau jawab?
*SS:* Push on the power
*T:* Kurang tepat. Apa verb yang tepat? Bukan push on tapi ‘turn on’
*SS:* Turn on the power.
*S3:* Bu kok gak ditutup Bu?
*T:* Oh iya lupa. Tutup dulu ya nanti berantakan. Tutup apa?
*SS:* Close Bu.
*T:* Wah tidak dibaca ya bukunya. Semua ada di bukumu. Bukan close tapi put on the lid. Ulangi ‘Put on the lid’
*SS:* Put on the lid.

It is evident from the data that teachers are more comfortable using a mixture of Indonesian and English than using mainly English. The percentage of teachers using a mixture of Indonesian (L1) and English (L2) and mainly Indonesian (L1)
in Islamic schools (69.2%) was greater than that in General schools (50.2%). This impacts on the quality of teacher-student interaction because students do not have maximum exposure to English in their classrooms. This limits students’ opportunity to practise English. They have limited opportunity to develop communicative competence in English by engaging in teacher-student interaction.

6.5 Student-student interaction

6.5.1 Types of task

Table 6.9 presents the frequency of type of tasks that students did in student-student interaction. Of the 39 lessons observed, ten included student-student interaction. As mentioned in Chapter Three, an observation framework developed by Ellis (2001) was used. There were two kinds of tasks: functional language practice; and focused communicative tasks. Ellis defines functional language practice (FLP) as “instructional materials that provide learners with the opportunity to practice producing the target structure in some kind of situational context” (p. 20). Ellis described focused communicative tasks (CT) as “designed to elicit production of a specific target feature in the context of performing a communicative task” (p. 21). Table 6.6 shows frequency of type of tasks in student-student interaction in both schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of task</th>
<th>Total (General Schools)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total (Islamic Schools)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLP1: Pair or group work where students ask each other questions on a predetermined topic such as daily routines - in other words, question and answer practice using targeted vocabulary and structures, including survey type activities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLP2: Pair or group work where students describe an item, person or a picture to each other using targeted vocabulary and/or structures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLP3: Pair or group work where students engage in role play either based on a model dialogue or involving a situation which requires them to use familiar and well-rehearsed language.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT1: Pair work where students engage in one or two-way information gap tasks.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT2: Pair or group work where students work collaboratively to construct text e.g., list questions to ask exchange students who will visit the class in the future; develop an argument for their side for a debate; create a role play; prepare part of a procedural text such as a recipe; list the ingredients of an imaginary dish.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (as found in fieldwork): 1. Pair work: answering/making reading comprehension questions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Group-work: reading a story in turns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group-work: rearranging a reading story</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pair work: grammar exercise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In General schools, eight tasks were identified. They mainly related to reading comprehension (62.5%), followed by functional language practice tasks (25%), and grammar exercise tasks (12.5%). In Islamic schools, two tasks were identified, a role play and a task to devise questions based on a text.

6.5.2 Language-Related Episodes (LREs)

Language-Related Episodes (LREs) are segments of learner interaction in which learners either talk about or question their own or others’ language use within the context of carrying out a task in the L2 (Swain, 1998; Swain & Lapkin, 2001). LREs include instances in which learners may do the following: (a) question the meaning of a linguistic item; (b) question the correctness of the spelling or pronunciation of a word; (c) question the correctness of a grammatical form; or (d) implicitly or explicitly correct their own or another’s usage of a word, form or structure (Swain, 1998). In addition, LREs may include the use of metalinguistic terminology or the articulation of a rule (Swain, 1998).

During the observed lessons, one group or pair was randomly selected, then their discussions were audio-recorded. After listening to the recording, the LREs were identified, transcribed, and later coded according to their outcomes. According to Swain (1998), LREs fall into one of three outcomes: Outcome 1 is when the problem or question is resolved correctly; Outcome 2 is when the problem or question is left unresolved or abandoned; and Outcome 3 is when the problem or question is resolved incorrectly. Table 6.7 shows the number of LREs generated by different tasks in General Schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Tasks</th>
<th>Correctly resolved</th>
<th>Unresolved/abandoned</th>
<th>Incorrectly resolved</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLP2:</strong> Pair or group work where students describe an item, person or a picture to each other using targeted vocabulary and/or structures: <em>(Lesson: Speaking: Talking about Profession)</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLP3:</strong> Pair or group work where students engage in role play either based on a model dialogue or involving a situation which requires them to use familiar and well-rehearsed language: <em>(Lesson: Reading: Sport)</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair work:</strong> answering/making comprehension questions: <em>(Lessons: Talking about a Song ‘Nobody’s Child’; Reading: Narrative Texts; Going to the Beach)</em></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group-work:</strong> reading a story in turns <em>(Reading: Narrative)</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group-work:</strong> rearranging 3 paragraphs into a reading text <em>(Reading: Hercules)</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair work:</strong> grammar exercises <em>(Lesson: Tenses)</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown on Table 6.7, the number of LREs produced by student-student interaction was 86. Of the total, 48.8% are resolved correctly, 32.6% are resolved incorrectly, and 18.6% are left abandoned or unresolved. It is noted that the total LREs which are resolved incorrectly or abandoned/unresolved are more than half the total (51.2%).

The following excerpts are examples of LREs from General schools. The first excerpt focuses on vocabulary and the problem is correctly resolved:

**Excerpt 25 (Lesson: Talking about Professions)**
S1: He is a barber?
S2: Ya (yes), someone who cuts the hair, ya? apa pelanggan bahasa Inggrisnya? (What is ‘pelanggan’ in English)?
S1: customer’s hair, rambutnya customer.
S2: Jadi (thus) a barber is someone who cuts customers’ hair.

The next excerpt is an example of abandoned/unresolved problem where both students could not write a definition of ‘firefighter’ because of limitations in their English vocabulary. The problem was left unresolved:

**Excerpt 26 (Lesson: Talking about Professions)**
S1: umm, firefighter, fireman, fireworker?
S2: firefighter mungkin. (Maybe a firefighter). Someone who helps orang yang terkena api. Apa bahasa Inggrisnya, terkena api? (What is ‘terkena api’ in English)?
S1: I don’t know. Yang ini susah (this is difficult)
S2: Yo wis teruskan gambar berikut ae. (Let’s continue with the other pictures)

The final excerpt is an example of incorrectly resolved problem, in this case, tenses:

**Excerpt 27 (Reading: Narrative Texts)**
S1: What did Snow White look like?
S2: she is a beautiful girl, she has pure white skin and jet black hair and blood red lips.
Table 6.8 shows the distribution of LREs based on the linguistic items in General Schools.

**Table 6.8 Distribution of Linguistic Items in General Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Correctly resolved</th>
<th>Unresolved/Abandoned</th>
<th>Incorrectly resolved</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-V Agreement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LREs focused on vocabulary (47.7%), S-V agreement (23.3%), and tenses (16.2%). This suggests that students’ focus was lexical meaning rather than syntax.

Tables 6.9 and 6.10 show LREs and linguistic focus in Islamic Schools during student-student interaction.
Table 6.9 Distribution of LREs in Islamic Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Tasks</th>
<th>Correctly resolved</th>
<th>Unresolved/abandoned</th>
<th>Incorrectly resolved</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLP3: Pair or group work where students engage in role play either based on a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model dialogue or involving a situation which requires them to use familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and well-rehearsed language: <em>(Reading: Public Places)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair work: answering/making reading comprehension questions: <em>(Lesson Reading: Procedure Text)</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by Table 6.9, the number of LREs generated by different tasks in Islamic Schools produced by student-students interaction was 26. Of the total, 38.5% were resolved correctly, 46.1% were resolved incorrectly, and 15.4% were left abandoned or unresolved. The total number of LREs resolved incorrectly and abandoned/unresolved is more than half (61.5%), and higher than the percentage for General schools which was 51.2%.

Table 6.10 shows the distribution of LREs based on the linguistic items in the Islamic schools.
Using Table 6.10 which shows the distribution of LREs based on the linguistic items, it can be concluded that LREs in Islamic schools mostly focus on vocabulary (46.2%), S-V agreement (23%), tenses (15.4%), and pronunciation (15.4%). This breakdown is similar to that of the General schools with a focus on lexical matters.

The following excerpts are examples of LREs from the Islamic schools. The first excerpt focuses on vocabulary. The problem was correctly resolved:

Excerpt 28 (Lesson: Reading: Public Places)

S1: Ayo mulai. Where is Mr Indra?
S2: Mr Indra is at the railway station. He is menjemput his mother? Apa menjemput.
S1: picking up.
S2: bener ya, picking up?
S1: ya
The next excerpt is an example of abandoned/unresolved problem where both students were unable to remember the English word for ‘crush’ and the problem was left unresolved:

**Excerpt 29 (Lesson: Reading: Procedure Text)**

S1: Jahenya diapakan ini?
S2: cuci, kupas dan geprek. Wash, peel and geprek.
S1: geprek?
S2: Iya, lupa tadi apa ya?

The final excerpt is an example of an incorrectly resolved problem. The focus is sentence structure:

**Excerpt 30**

**Excerpt 29 (Lesson: Reading: Procedure Text)**

S1: Berapa gula yang dibutuhkan?
S2: How much sugar
S1: How much sugar when you make hot ginger coffee?
S2: Iya.

### 6.5.3 Students’ language choices

Table 6.11 shows student language choices observed during student-student interaction. The categories of language choices are adapted from Tognini (2006).

**Table 6.11 Students’ language choices during student-student interaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language choice</th>
<th>Total exchanges (General schools)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total exchanges (Islamic Schools)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mainly L1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mainly L2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. L1&amp;L2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For General schools, ‘Mainly L2’ occupies only 16% of students’ language choice in student-student interaction. There are similar percentages for the use of a ‘Mixture of L1 and L2’ (42%), and ‘Mainly L1’ (42%). For Islamic schools, the use of ‘Mainly L1’ occupies the largest proportion of students’ language choice (46.1%), followed by a ‘Mixture of L1 and L2’ (38.5%), and ‘Mainly L2’ (15.4%).

For General schools, eight lessons out of 30 observed (27%) provided tasks for student-student interaction. The LREs produced were 86, of which half were incorrectly resolved or left unresolved or abandoned. During student-student interaction, the use of ‘Mainly L1’ and a ‘Mixture of L1 and L2’ was high (84%). In the Islamic schools, there are two lessons out of nine (22%) which provide tasks for student-student interaction. The LREs produced were 26. More than 60% of them were incorrectly resolved and left unresolved or abandoned. In Islamic school site, the use of ‘Mainly L1’ and a ‘Mixture of L1 and L2’ was slightly higher than for General school students (84.6%).

6.6 Discussion of findings from classroom observation

In the previous section, selected observation notes and video transcriptions were cited to provide an overall picture of the results of the classroom observation. Four significant findings emerge.
First, of the classroom interaction strategies proposed by Walsh (2006), some are used more frequently than others. The strategies of IRF pattern and display questions are frequently used by both GE and IS teachers, while the strategies of scaffolding, content-focused feedback, clarification requests, referential questions, and extended students’ turn are rare.

Second, there is little evidence that use of interaction strategies was considered intentionally to promote oral communicative competence. The majority of GE and IS teachers do not appear to be aware of different kind of strategies that promote oral English communication. That is, there was little evidence of teachers employing appropriate interaction strategies to promote students’ English oral communicative competence.

Third, GE and IS teachers are not using the target language to maximum capacity.

Fourth, a teacher-fronted structure dominates classroom interaction in both General schools and Islamic schools. This structure occupies 90% of total teaching time and as a result student-student interaction is very limited. There is a limited variety of tasks in both schools.

The results from classroom observation are consistent with the findings from the student survey described in Chapter Four and the findings from the interviews with teachers described in Chapter Five. The findings of classroom observations are discussed in more detail in the following section.
1. Use of Interaction Strategies in General and Islamic schools

Classroom observation has revealed that some strategies are used more frequently than others. As shown in Table 6.4, IRF pattern and displays questions, extended teacher turns, and teacher echoes were observed frequently in English lessons in both types of school. Form-focused feedback was employed by GE and IS teachers although this did not occur often. Other strategies including scaffolding, content-focused feedback, clarification requests, referential questions and extended students’ turn were observed rarely.

Most GE and IS teachers use a combination of reading text and grammar lessons. For example, teachers would start with a question and answer session about the topic of the reading then would ask students to read the text, followed by comprehension questions. Then students would be asked to complete grammar exercises. These activities were conducted in teacher-student interaction format. Only a few of GE and IS teachers provided communicative tasks for student-student interaction.

The focus of the lessons is students’ comprehension of various text types and mastery of grammar. Most of the IRF patterns and display questions required student responses about vocabulary in the text and their understanding of the text. The prevalence of the IRF pattern in Indonesian EFL classrooms is similar to findings of international researchers including Hardman et al. (2003), Abd Kadir & Hardman (2007), Vaish (2008), and Wedin (2009). The dominance of
teachers’ display questions confirms findings by Rohmah (2002), Tulung (2006), and Arifin (2012).

These findings reflect teachers’ preoccupation with students’ acquiring reading comprehension skills and grammar skills. Note the interview findings discussed in Chapter 5. One possible explanation for this is the National Examination. The National examination has a wash-back effect on teaching content and classroom interaction, as discussed by Sukyadi and Mardiani (2011). It is not surprising that GE and IS teachers would adapt their teaching to the demands of the National Examination. This is evident in research by Sukyadi and Mardiani (2011) and Pranoto (2012).

The over-emphasis on IRF pattern, display questions, extended teacher turns, and teacher echoes does not support the development of students’ communicative competence because there is little opportunity for students to use English in classroom interaction. Students are allowed to give very limited responses to questions from teachers. There is no space for students to give responses in English that generate extended sequences of thought.

2. Limited Opportunities for Student Language Production to Promote Communicative Competence in Oral English

It was noted that the interaction strategies were employed without considering opportunities for students to develop oral communicative competence. A combination of managerial, materials, and system and skills modes was a
common practice in GE and IS schools, as demonstrated in Table 6.4. The *classroom context* which is designed to enable students to express their feelings and attitudes and thereby develop oral competence is very limited. Consequently, the interaction strategies of this mode, that is, *extended learner turn, short teacher turn, minimal repair, content feedback, referential questions, scaffolding, and clarification requests*, were rarely observed. Only a few teachers implemented this mode in their teaching. Students have few opportunities to exercise their target language in an elaborated way.

The limited occurrence of *classroom context mode* may suggest that GE and IS teachers do not know how to sequence lessons and manage classroom talk by employing appropriate interaction strategies. In the interviews, the majority of GE and IS teachers said they had lacked training in organising interaction strategies which promote students’ language production. This finding echoes Howard’s (2010) study, that classroom context mode is not exercised fully by teachers.

### 3. English is not exercised fully in classroom interaction

Findings related to GE and IS teachers’ choice of language are consistent with the findings of the survey discussed in Chapter Four and the findings of the interviews discussed in Chapter 5. It emerged that General school teachers used the target language 49.8% of the time and Islamic school teachers used the target language 31.8% of the time. This limited use of English impacts on the quality of teacher-student interaction. Students have little exposure to English in the
classroom and even lesser in Islamic schools. This is a significant problem because English is as a foreign language in Indonesia and is not spoken as an official language. Students have limited opportunities to communicate in English with the teacher, to receive corrective feedback, to negotiate, and to be scaffolded in English. These are important strategies of teacher-students interaction which support student communicative competence (Walsh, 2006).

A possible reason for this deficiency in the use of the target language may be related to GE and IS teachers’ communicative competence. In Islamic schools the reason is also due the fact that some teachers do not hold English Teaching degree. Furthermore, there has been a relatively recent report on teacher communicative competence published by the Director of Quality Improvement for Academic and Non-academic, Ministry of Education (Surya Dharma, 2009). It revealed that teachers of secondary schools who were involved in teaching into international standard programs have low communicative competence, as indicated by their low score on the Test of English for International Communication (ToEIC).

4. Limited Student-Student Interaction

Consistent with the survey findings discussed in Chapter Four, inadequate attention to student-student interaction has meant that GE and IS teachers do not give students the strategies to work collaboratively with their peers as a means of promoting English oral communicative competence. Only a few of GE and IS teachers could clearly identify the advantages of students interacting with their
peers. Most GE and IS teachers seem unaware of communicative tasks to give to students, tasks where students interact with their peers and thereby develop their oral communicative competence. Most students tended to work by themselves. As a result, useful interaction strategies, such as giving feedback, clarification requests, confirmation checks, scaffolding in student-student interaction in pairs or in groups, were detected rarely in LREs.

Most GE and IS teachers seem to be comfortable with the IRF pattern of interaction and asking display questions, using extended teacher turns to ensure transmission of knowledge. They were less concerned about student-student interaction, especially pair or group work that allowed students to engage in communicative tasks. Two possible reasons for this emerge.

GE and IS teachers may be giving little priority to oral communication skills. This view emerged with many of the interviewed teachers who said they prefer students to work individually to comprehend the text (oral and written, but mostly written). When students were assigned to work in groups, some students would do the task but some others would not contribute to the group discussion, which resulted in a lack of learning.

A second reason may be a lack of skill in preparing communicative tasks. As found in the interviews, many GE and IS teachers reported they had not trained to promote student-student interaction. A lack of skills emerged in Maulana et al.’s study (2012).
6.6 Summary and conclusions

This chapter has been concerned with the classroom observation. The classroom observation was conducted for the purpose of determining the current practice of classroom interaction in EFL classes at the lower secondary schools level. The classroom observation protocol which tapped the teacher-student and student-student interaction served as the instrument for collecting data. In 2011, there were 120 Lower Secondary Schools in Malang City which consisted of 90 General Lower Secondary Schools and 30 Islamic Lower Secondary schools. Twenty percent of these schools were selected as the participants of the study; they were 18 General Secondary Schools and 6 Islamic Secondary Schools. Then from these 18 General Secondary Schools, 18 teachers participated in the study whereas from 6 Islamic Lower Secondary Schools 6 teachers were the respondents. The teachers were observed once or twice. There were 30 classes observed in General Schools and 9 classes in Islamic Schools, thus the total classroom observation was 39. The classroom observation was conducted during the school year 2011.

The findings show that GE teachers spent 93% of their teaching time for teacher-student interaction and 7% for student-student interaction; while IS teachers spent 94.4% of their teaching time for teacher-student interaction and 5.6% for student-student interaction.

In GE school site, during teacher-student interaction, the most popular interaction strategies are asking display questions (38%), followed teacher extended turn
(27.2%), teacher echo (17.3%), giving form-focused feedback (7.9%), asking referential questions (4.6%), scaffolding (1.8%), negotiation (1.5%) and direct repair (1.3%). In IS school site, the teachers’ favourite interaction strategies are asking display questions (47.5%), followed teacher extended turn (21.7%), teacher echo (14.2%), giving form-focused feedback (6%), asking referential questions (5.3%), negotiation (2.3%) scaffolding (1.8%), and direct repair (1.5%). The IRF patterns dominate teacher-student interaction in both sites. In GE school site, there are 629 IRF patterns while non-IRF patterns are only 99 occurrences. In IS school site, there are 216 IRF patterns while non-IRF patterns are only 24 occurrences.

In GE school site, 49.8% teachers used L2 English only for teacher-student interaction, 29.7% used mixed English and Indonesian and 20.5% used Indonesian only. In IS school site, 30.8% teachers used L2 English only for teacher-student interaction, 43.2% used mixed English and Indonesian and 26% used Indonesian only.

In terms of student-student interaction, there are only 8 pair/group-works observed in GE school site. The task type for pair/group works consist of question and answer and activities related to a reading text (62.5%), role-play (25%) and grammar exercises (12.5%). In IS school site, there are 2 group works. The tasks are question and answer activity after reading a text and a role play activity.
The total Language Related Episodes (LREs) produced by GE students is 86 in which 48.8% of LREs were resolved correctly, 32.6% were resolved incorrectly and 18.6% were abandoned. The focus of the LREs of GE students was vocabulary (47.7%), followed by S-V agreement (23.3%) tenses (16.2%), and pronunciation (7%).

The total Language Related Episodes (LREs) produced by IS students is 26 in which 38% of LREs were resolved correctly, 46% were resolved incorrectly and 15% were abandoned. The focus of the LREs of IS students was vocabulary (46.2%), followed by S-V agreement (23%), tenses (15%), and pronunciation (15%).

During the student-student interaction, For General schools, ‘Mainly L2’ occupies only 16% of students’ language choice in student-student interaction. There are similar percentages for the use of a ‘Mixture of L1 and L2’ (42%), and ‘Mainly L1’ (42%). For Islamic schools, the use of ‘Mainly L1’ occupies the largest proportion of students’ language choice (46.1%), followed by a ‘Mixture of L1 and L2’ (38.5%), and ‘Mainly L2’ (15.4%).

From the above findings, it can be concluded that because GE and IS teachers dominate the classroom interaction. They favour interaction strategies such as teachers’ extended turn, asking display questions, echoing students’ answer or their own statements, giving form-focused feedback although they it did not occur very often and employ IRF format, students have limited opportunities to
participate in teacher-student interaction and to practice speaking English in class. Moreover, interaction strategies such as extended learner turn, short teacher turn, minimal repair, content feedback, referential questions, scaffolding, and clarification requests were rarely observed, consequently students have little opportunities to exercise their oral English in an elaborated way.

Students do not have maximum exposure to English in the classroom and even lesser in Islamic schools. Exposure to oral English in the classroom is considered to be very important as English is not spoken as an official language. Therefore, students have limited opportunities to communicate in English with the teacher, to receive corrective feedback, to negotiate, and to be scaffolded in English.

Both GE and IS students have very limited opportunity to practice the oral language with their peers. There were only a few pair or group-works observed in the classes. When pair or group-work was exercised, the task was only focused on reading comprehension and put less emphasis on communicative activities. Therefore there is limited LREs produced in student-student interaction. They put less emphasis on developing student oral communicative competence.

The problems of teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction are more acute in Islamic Schools as it is evidenced by more time spent on teacher-student format, unbalanced use of interaction strategies, less use of English in classroom by IS teachers, less time spent for student-student interaction, and limited LREs produced by IS students, compared to those of GE classes.
Most of the findings in this chapter are consistent with the results obtained in Chapter Four and Chapter Five. In the survey, students reported limited participation in teacher-student interaction, exposure to limited strategies of interaction, and limited opportunities for practising oral communicative tasks in student-student interaction. In the interviews, reported in Chapter 5, teachers indicated that they did not put priority on developing students’ oral communicative skills.

To maximise students’ opportunity to participate in effective classroom interaction, and thereby improve their oral communicative competence, existing approaches to teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction should be reconfigured. This is an important reform task for English teaching at the lower secondary level in Indonesia.

The results of the student survey, detailed in Chapter Four, the results of teacher interviews, detailed in Chapter Five, as well as the results of classroom observation detailed in the current chapter have presented compelling evidence for designing a new classroom interaction framework. Chapter Seven develops this framework.
Chapter Seven

Designing Effective Interactive EFL Classrooms

7.1 Introduction

In Chapters Four, Five, and Six, the data derived from the survey to students, interviews with teachers, and classroom observations have been described and analysed. There was consistency across the three data sets: classroom interaction in English classes was limited in General Lower Secondary Schools and even more limited in Islamic Lower Secondary Schools.

Students indicated that they had limited interaction with their teachers. Their participation was restricted to answering teachers’ questions. Only rarely did they initiate a question to ask for clarification or present their opinions in English. Students’ participation in student-student interaction was even more limited. Both General and Islamic students seldom gave their opinion in English when working in pairs or groups: they seldom asked questions to peers in English; they seldom answered a peer’s questions in English; they seldom corrected a peer’s errors; they seldom received correction from a peer when they made mistakes; and they seldom asked for clarification from a peer. Students reported that they had little opportunity to work on communicative tasks in pairs or groups.

The reasons for students’ lack of participation in teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction were various. In teacher-student interaction, students
reported that they lacked confidence in speaking English and they felt anxious speaking in front of the class. Teachers were more comfortable with a traditional teaching approach and paid little attention to developing students’ communicative competence. In student-student interaction, students reported that inadequate English was the main barrier, followed by anxiety, not understanding what was being said, lack of experience interacting in English with peers, and few communicative tasks presented by teachers (Suryati, 2012).

Despite limited participation in teacher-student and student-student interaction, the survey revealed that most students wanted more interaction in English with teachers and peers. They indicated motivation to communicate better in English.

From the analyses of interviews with teachers, there was little evidence that classroom interaction was geared towards nurturing students’ communicative competence. Teachers indicated that they interacted with students to check their understanding of texts. Reading skills were a major focus for their English lessons because understanding different types of text would equip students for the National Examination.

Teachers reported a limited set of strategies to encourage interaction. They said they used display questions, extended teacher turn, form focused feedback, and teacher echo. Only a few teachers indicated that they provided extended turn to students in the teacher-student interaction. Only half of teachers indicated they
that provide opportunities for student-student interaction. Most of the tasks they gave to students were reading comprehension tasks.

Teachers reported on their use of Indonesian and English in their classrooms. It appears they did not use English to maximum effect in their interaction with students. Both General and Islamic teachers indicated they used a mixture of Indonesian and English in their classroom interaction. Half the GE teachers indicated that they used English more than 50% of the time, while the majority of IS teachers indicated they used English less than 50% of the time.

Teachers thought the main factors preventing students from participating actively in the classroom interaction were lack of confidence in English and aspects of Javanese culture. Students were expected to be respectful and obedient to teachers (Buchori, 2001). That created passivity among students. They would not initiate interaction with teachers because it was considered impolite for students to speak without first being spoken to. Students would listen to the teacher but would not question the teacher.

The categorisation of interaction strategies, as proposed by Walsh (2006), has never been evaluated in lower secondary schools in Indonesia. In the current study, these interaction strategies were used to examine the strategies of classroom interaction in practice.
Classroom observations revealed most teachers’ activities centred on two modes: Materials, where teachers provided language practice around a specific piece of material, and Skill and systems, where teachers provided language practice in relation to a language system or skills. Teachers’ talk concentrated on an IRF pattern, asking display questions, echoing students’ answers, giving explanations about linguistic items through extended teacher turn, and occasionally giving form focused feedback. Students answered the questions in chorus or individually as assigned by teachers. Typically, there was no construction of knowledge through the use of teacher-student interaction. What was observed in Indonesia fits with classroom interaction practices in many countries (e.g., Hardman et al., 2003; Abd Kadir & Hardman, 2007; Vaish, 2008).

Classroom observation revealed that scaffolding and negotiation moves were rarely found in Material and Skill and system modes. Form-focused feedback did occur in these two modes, but the number of occurrences was limited. It appears that teachers were not aware of the benefits of scaffolding, negotiation moves, correcting students’ errors directly, and providing students with an opportunity to modify their errors. As teachers indicated in the interviews, they never attended any in-service training on effective classroom interaction.

Classroom context mode which functioned to enable students to express their feelings, attitudes, and experiences as a way of enhancing oral fluency occurred rarely. As a result there were few extended student turns. There was limited
opportunity for student-student interaction. Tasks provided for student-student interaction usually did not nurture students’ communication in English.

To conclude, the results derived from the methods of data gathering provide evidence of inadequate teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction in Indonesian schools. There is no evidence of in-service teacher training to improve these aspects of EFL classrooms. The Ministry of Education has not offered training on classroom interaction to General school teachers nor has the Ministry of Religion Affairs offered training to teachers in Islamic schools. In this final chapter, the current study will provide guidelines to improve the quality of classroom interaction.

To improve interaction, it is important for teachers to understand the cultural underpinnings of Indonesian society. Hofstede et al.’s (2010) study provides insights into how cultural dimensions affect the teacher-student relationship. They propose that culture can be examined along a number of dimensions including power distance, individualism-collectivism, and uncertainty avoidance. These dimensions can provide an understanding of culture-specific behaviours and expectations that have a significant impact on the approaches to learning, behaviour of students, and teaching strategies adopted by teachers.
One of the dimensions is power distance. It examines the extent to which less powerful members of a society deal with unequal power distribution (Hofstede et al., 2010). Indonesia is a country where there is large power distance, it has the value index of 78 out of 100 (Hofstede et al., 2010). People follow the rules of hierarchy and build social relationships in terms of this hierarchy. An unequal relationship extends to teacher-student relationships in school.

According to Hofstede et al. (2010), in a large-power-distance country, teachers are treated with respect or even with fear, older teachers more so than younger ones. Students may have to stand when teachers enter the classroom. The educational process is teacher-centred with teachers dictating what happens in the classroom. There is strict order, with the teacher initiating all communication. Students speak only when they are invited to. Teachers are never publicly contradicted or criticized and are treated with deference even outside classrooms or schools.

In this study of schools in the Javanese culture, teachers are considered respectable people, often seen as replacements for parents. Teachers are called guru, which is commonly interpreted with these two words: ‘digugu’ meaning ‘to be obeyed’, and ‘ditiru’ meaning ‘to be copied’ (Hariyono, 1993). Teachers are intellectual, moral, and cultural models for students. Students have to use the highest level of language (“karma”) with their teachers. In the Javanese language, there are three levels of Javanese language, “ngoko”, “madya”, and “karma”
(Hariyono, 1993; Mulder, 2005). Students will follow advice of the teacher and will not challenge the teacher because it is considered an act of disrespect.

In this hierarchical society, it is not surprising that the teacher is the one who initiates classroom communication with students. Students see their role is to listen respectfully and to follow teachers’ orders. Students will speak when they are invited to (Hofstede et al., 2010). It is understandable, then, that students remain dependent on teachers, expect to receive direct instruction, and assume a passive role in classroom interactions.

In small-power distance countries where the Power Distance Index is low, for example, Australia, Germany, and Canada, classroom interaction is very different (Hofstede et al., 2010). Teachers treat students more like equals. The educational process is student centred and students are encouraged to use their own initiative, to find their own learning paths. It is expected that students will make uninvited interventions; they are supposed to ask questions when they do not understand something. They can argue with teachers, can express disagreement with teachers, and not act in a particularly respectful manner with teachers outside school. Two-way communication between students and teacher is established. The schooling system is based on acceptance of students’ growing need for independence.
Individualism-collectivism is another cultural dimension created by Hofstede et al. (2010). They define individualism as “societies in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after him- or herself and his or her immediate family. Collectivism as its opposite pertains to societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, which throughout people lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty” (p. 92). In individualist societies, for example the United States, Britain, and Australia, people are expected to be self-reliant, and to focus on individual achievement. In collectivist societies such as Indonesia, people are expected to maintain group harmony and avoid direct confrontation.

Students’ behaviour is influenced by this dimension of individualism-collectivism. Students from collectivist cultures are hesitant to speak up in large groups, especially if the groups are composed of relative strangers. This may explain why students in this study rarely self-initiated classroom interaction and felt anxious when speaking in front of the classroom.

Indonesia can be characterised as a large power distance and collectivist society. It is difficult for teachers to change these cultural attitudes and behaviours. What teachers may be able to do is modify classroom culture. The classroom culture should encourage students’ oral language use. Teachers should take initiatives to modify current classroom interaction patterns. First teachers should see their role as a facilitator of learning rather than a transmitter of knowledge. Second, the selection of classroom interaction strategies should be less arbitrary. It should be
directed towards maximising students’ talking in English to improve their communicative competence.

Although a framework of interaction strategies has been developed by Walsh (2006), and used in the current study, it cannot be implemented fully in the Indonesian context. Teachers cannot fully exercise the classroom context mode where students are encouraged to speak freely in front of the class about their feelings and experiences related to the topic of the class. One of the key characteristics of a collectivist society is that people are reluctant to speak in front of others, especially in front of someone more powerful such as a teacher.

To reduce power distance and enhance a sense of being a collective, teachers should encourage students’ collaboration using pair work or double pair work. This kind of collaboration would save students from losing face by speaking in front of the whole class and the teacher. Collaboration in pair work or double pair work would increase opportunities for students to use English and to give each other feedback, and scaffold their language output. Pair work or double pair work is also practical in terms of students’ seating arrangement. In pair work, student can work with his or her peer who sits on the same bench. When they have to work in double pairs, one pair can turn around to face another pair.

Teachers should encourage students to be more active in classroom interaction by using effective interaction strategies. The current study has established that both General and Islamic school teachers pay insufficient attention to students’ oral
English communicative competence and ways of improving it. There was little evidence that interaction strategies were employed purposefully by teachers to promote oral English. In this concluding chapter, a classroom interaction framework is proposed to promote students’ oral communicative competence in English language learning in General and Islamic Lower Secondary Schools.

7.2 Proposing an Interactive Classroom Framework to Promote Students’ Communicative Competence

If interaction strategies are to promoting students’ oral communicative competence, then teachers need to move beyond IRF pattern and display questions. Opportunities for students to experiment with English should become the major reason for selecting and using interaction strategies. The interaction strategies used by teachers, as revealed in this study, provide a foundation to develop a dynamic and comprehensive model for using interaction strategies. This means that existing interaction strategies would not be abandoned. Instead, they should be used in a more rational and elaborated way so that they are integrated with each other. It is argued that when teachers use interaction strategies, they should consider the four stages described in the following section.

First, they must have a clear objective of what communication acts students should be able to achieve after the interaction. Then teachers should prepare and
present a model of the communication act. In this Modelling stage, it is important that teachers be aware of students’ linguistic competence, their level of anxiety, and their expectation of classroom interaction. Teachers must pay attention to Interactive Modelling strategies where students should be encouraged to participate in the teacher-student interaction.

Second, when students are familiar with the modelled communication act, the teachers should shift focus to encouraging teacher-student interaction as a way of learning about the language. This promotes interaction between teachers and students in the transition from known to unknown. Teachers move from instruction to negotiating, providing corrective feedback, scaffolding students in learning, and encouraging them to speak in English. This Interactive Dialogue helps students to practise language skills.

Third, teachers should prioritise the Interactive Collaboration in which students are involved in social interaction through working in pairs or double pairs.

Fourth, teachers should promote students’ extended language production. In the last stage, the teachers act as facilitators encouraging students’ language production. Teachers’ attention should be on Interactive Performance. Students are encouraged to express themselves using extended students turns. These four stages are presented in Table 7.1. Each stage is discussed in detail.
Table 7.1 Proposal for EFL Interactive Classrooms in Indonesia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Interaction strategies</th>
<th>Language choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive Modelling:</strong></td>
<td>Teacher-student interaction</td>
<td>Strategies employed by the teacher:</td>
<td>Mostly English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide a model of a communication act</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Balanced of display and exploratory/ referential questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Balanced of IRF and Non-IRF (Modify F-move) pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Explicit and direct corrective feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Negotiation moves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive Dialogues:</strong></td>
<td>Teacher-student interaction</td>
<td>Strategies employed by the teacher:</td>
<td>Mostly English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide guided practice on pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary items, text organization, and socio-cultural aspects of targeted communication act</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Balanced of display and exploratory/ referential questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Balanced of IRF and Non-IRF (Modify F-move) pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Explicit and direct corrective feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Negotiation moves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive Collaboration:</strong></td>
<td>Student-student interaction</td>
<td>Strategies employed by students:</td>
<td>For teacher: mostly English For students: Indonesian allowed to resolve problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide opportunity for students to construct targeted communication act in pairs or double pairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Display/Referential questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Corrective feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Extended student turn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies employed by the teacher:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Direct repair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Short teacher turn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive performance:</strong></td>
<td>Student-student interaction</td>
<td>Strategies employed by students:</td>
<td>Mostly English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide opportunity for students to perform their targeted communication act in pairs/double pairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Extended student turn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies employed by teacher:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Short teacher turn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Direct repair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Content feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Referential questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Negotiation moves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1) Interactive Modelling

In this first stage, teachers must have a clear idea about what communication acts they want to teach. It is important that teachers present a model of the communication act because modelling helps students to understand what skills are expected (Suherdi, 2011). The modelled communication act should be complete, with its components including all linguistic items and cultural components of the communication act.

Modelling can be conducted in many different forms, via a teacher’s presentation or by using media. If teachers are modelling the act themselves, they should present it with a clear voice and correct pronunciation. They should repeat the model several times so that students will have a clear understanding of the communication act. Alternatively, teachers can employ various multimedia which available in their schools. For example, they can use a video that demonstrates the steps. An in-focus presentation is now available in many schools. Teachers can use various media for presenting models of communication act.

Recommendation One:

In preparing to facilitate students’ oral language production, teachers should provide students with a clear model of the communication act. This model defines clear learning objectives, supplies the necessary knowledge, and points out the direction of learning.
To ensure students become familiar with the model of the communication act, teachers should employ interaction strategies: a balance of display and exploratory and referential questions, a balance of IRF and Non-IRF (Modify F-move) patterns, explicit and direct corrective feedback, negotiation moves, and scaffolding.

**A balance of display and exploratory/ referential questions**

Teachers should allocate time for whole-class discussion about the model of the communication act. Effective questioning is an important strategy for eliciting students’ responses. To extend students’ language production, it is important that teachers vary their questions. Teachers should ask exploratory/referential questions as well as display questions. Display questions have a specific and generally agreed-upon answer, while exploratory talk means speaking “without the answer fully intact” (Cazden, 2001, p.170). Teacher can use display questions to confirm their instruction, but teachers should also use exploratory questions to encourage students’ self-expression and refine students’ thinking.

**A balance of IRF and Non-IRF (Modify F-move) patterns**

During a discussion about a model of a communication act, a common exchange is referred to as the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence (Mehan, 1979) or Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequence (Coulthard and Sinclair, 1975, 1992). The IRE/IRF routine may not be particularly useful for students’ learning because it is a convergent process seeking one right answer.
Scholars (e.g., Nassaji & Wells, 2000; Cullen, 2002) have recommended that teachers manipulate the third component of such exchanges (Evaluation/feedback turn). Teachers can do more than praise or evaluate the student’s response. They can extend the Evaluation/Feedback part into additional questions that prompt students to elaborate (expand their responses), justify or clarify their opinions, and make connections to their experience. Such manipulation can achieve a variety of goals: it can clarify, connect, and elaborate the verbal interactions between teacher and students.

_Elaboration and Direct corrective feedback_

When answering teachers’ questions about the model of the communication act, students can make mistakes. It is important that teachers provide corrective feedback at this point. Research has shown that explicit feedback is more effective than implicit feedback because students notice the errors and can modify them. Teachers should give the correction immediately after the error occurs rather delaying it because immediate corrections are more effective than delayed corrections for students’ learning (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Varnosvadrani & Basturkmen, 2009; Nassaji, 2009).

_Negotiation moves_

During a discussion of the communication act, students may give unclear responses. These responses indicate that something needs to be addressed in order for the task to proceed. Teachers need to pay attention to these utterances and use appropriate negotiation moves. For instance, teachers can use negotiation
strategies: asking for clarification (I beg your pardon?), asking for confirmation (Do you mean.....?), and asking for repetition (Could you repeat that .....) so that students are given opportunities to modify their utterances.

Research has revealed that EFL classrooms can be meaning focused but also form focused. Teachers may use negotiation of meaning. This serves as a conversational function which aims “to work toward mutual comprehension” (Lyster, 2002, p.238). Form focused negotiation has a didactic function, that is, “the provision of corrective feedback that encourages self-repair involving accuracy and precision and not just comprehensibility” (Lyster and Ranta, 1997, p.42). Lyster (2001, 2002) identifies four form focused negotiation moves that teachers can use to improve the accuracy of students’ language: clarification request, repetition, metalinguistic clues, and elicitation.

Scaffolding
Students may make responses that are unclear. This may be the result of linguistic problems in students’ utterance or incompleteness of the utterance. After asking questions, teachers should allow sufficient time for students to respond. This includes patient pauses that support students’ need for code switching (thinking or speaking in one language and then switching to English). Repeating the question or prompt to allow more time for processing is important. In addition, teachers should accept phrases and partial answers and then model more complete sentences. Helping students to elaborate their ideas into full
sentences with correct structure and terms will help them to produce correct sentences. Teachers can scaffold students’ responses by reformulation (rephrasing students’ contribution), extension (extending students’ contribution), and modelling (giving a model for students’ contribution) (Walsh, 2006, p.67).

Recommendation Two:

To ensure students understand the model of the communication act, teachers should employ the following interaction strategies: a balance of display and exploratory/referential questions; a balance of IRF and Non-IRF (Modify F-move) patterns; explicit and direct corrective feedback; negotiation moves; and scaffolding.

2) Interactive Dialogue

Presenting a model of a communication act will not be sufficient without teachers working through the act with their students (Suherdi, 2011). Teachers should guide students step by step, providing them with practice in pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary items, text organization, and any important socio-cultural aspect of the act.
Recommendation Three

Teachers should give step by step guidance to students to practise the communication act, including guidance in pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, text organization, and important socio-cultural aspects related to the act.

It is important that teachers guide students’ practice of the targeted communication act, and ensure students incorporate new knowledge about the language into their existing knowledge. Interaction strategies that promote dialogue between teacher and students include: a balance of display and exploratory/ referential questions, a balance of IRF and Non-IRF (Modify F-move) patterns, explicit and direct corrective feedback, negotiation moves, and scaffolding.

To help teacher-student interaction during this stage, teachers can create learning tasks or enabling tasks (Estaire & Zanon, 1994). This type of task focuses on the form of the language (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, sentence structure, text organization, and cultural aspects). The tasks will help students to acquire the language system needed to perform the communicative act.

*Balance of display and exploratory/ referential questions*

During a dialogue of about the language system (pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, text organization and socio-cultural aspects related to the
communication act), teachers should ask exploratory/referential questions as well as display questions. Teachers should ask display questions to get responses about accuracy of phrases or sentences, but also they should ask exploratory questions to build students’ knowledge of the language system.

A balanced of IRF and Non-IRF (Modify F-move) patterns

Teachers should employ both IRF patterns and non-IRF patterns in this dialogue stage. Teachers can do more than praise or evaluate the student’s response. Teachers can extend Evaluation/Feedback into additional questions that prompt students to elaborate, for example, expanding their responses, justifying or clarifying opinions, and making connections to their experience. These actions can achieve a variety of goals. They can clarify, connect, and elaborate verbal interactions between teacher and students and thereby strengthen students’ knowledge of the language system.

Explicit and Direct corrective feedback

Research has shown that explicit feedback is more effective than implicit feedback because students notice the errors and can modify them. Teachers should give the correction immediately after the errors occur rather delaying it because immediate corrections are more effective than delayed corrections (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Varnosvadrani & Basturkmen, 2009; Nassaji, 2009). This can be applied by teachers when correcting students’ errors in pronunciation, grammar, and text organization.
**Negotiation moves**

Negotiation of meaning helps people “to work toward mutual comprehension” (Lyster, 2002, p.238) while form-focused negotiation is “the provision of corrective feedback that encourages self-repair involving accuracy and precision and not just comprehensibility (Lyster and Ranta, 1997, p.42). Negotiation moves can be used in interactive dialogue about pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, text organization, and socio-cultural aspects related to communication act. There are four form-focused negotiation moves: clarification request, repetition, metalinguistic clues, and elicitation (Lyster, 2001, 2002). They can be used to help students improve the accuracy of their English.

**Scaffolding**

According to Rogoff (1990), learning comes about as the result of deliberate guidance of the learner by a more capable other (such as a teacher) or through participation in activities. Teacher scaffold is guidance of the less capable by the more capable. Teachers should scaffold students to help them produce correct sentences. Teachers can scaffold students’ responses by reformulation (rephrasing students’ contribution), extension (extending students’ contribution), and modelling (giving a model of what is expected) (Walsh, 2006, p.67).

Teachers also can apply other techniques identified by Gerakopoulou (2011). For example, teachers can use body language to help students to learn. They can elicit responses from students that draw them along a line of reasoning, leading to a meta-statement or summary of what has been said. Other techniques identified by
McCormick and Donato (2000) also may be helpful. Teachers can ask questions to simplify or limit the demands of the task. They can ask questions to call students’ attention to important aspects of the task. They can ask questions to maintain students’ motivation and progress to finishing the task.

**Recommendation Four:**

Teachers should employ the following interaction strategies to help students master the English language system: a balance of display and exploratory/referential questions; a balance of IRF and Non-IRF (Modify F-move) patterns; explicit and direct corrective feedback; negotiation moves; and scaffolding.

3) **Interactive Collaboration**

In the next stage, Interactive Collaboration, teachers should provide opportunities for students to construct the communication act in pairs or double pairs. This is in line with Hofstede et al.’s (2010) suggestion that to increase classroom participation in a collectivist society, students should work in groups with their peers. Students can provide feedback and respond to feedback during interaction with other students (Adams, 2007).

Pair work or double pair work is the most practical way to enhance students’ interaction to co-construct and perform a communication act. Working in pairs or double pairs means that students are working with their classroom neighbours. It
is a safe place for students to experiment with the language without having to perform in front of the class, and potentially losing face. As revealed in this study, students are hesitant to speak in front of the whole class because they were afraid of being laughed at when making mistakes.

Asking students to co-construct and perform a communication act in pairs or double pairs gives opportunities to all students to talk in English. Teachers with large classes of 40 or more students cannot give all students an opportunity to speak in front of the class. If teachers only invite a few students to perform a communication act in front of the class, it disadvantages the rest of the students who may lose motivation to study English (Suherdi, 2011). This strategy allows meaningful interaction among students rather than isolated language exercises.

Purposeful selection and preparation of a communicative task is vital. A communication task is a task which, as far as possible, resembles activities students carry out in everyday life, thus reproducing the processes of everyday communication (Estaire & Zanon, 1994). The task should be principally focused on meaning rather than form and should also have a sense of completeness, being able to stand alone as a communicative act in its own right (Nunan, 2000).

Teachers should ensure that the communicative task is not too cognitively challenging, so that it does not “overload” students’ limited processing system (Schmidt, 1990). Teachers can manipulate the communicative task by using input
enhancement techniques (Ismail & Samad, 2010). This means the communicative
tasks are loaded by the linguistic items students have to use to construct the
communication act. This way, LREs would be produced through students working
collaboratively.

During student-student interaction, it is likely that students will use Bahasa
Indonesia. It is important that the teachers teach simple transactional phrases in
English that students can use to manage interaction with their peers. Perhaps it
will be difficult at the beginning to use English frequently, but it is important to
build the habit of using English in student interaction. To help everyone learn,
teachers should make a list of common phrases on the board (or on a poster on the
wall) and add additional phrases as the need arises.

Here are examples of transactional phrases that teachers can teach to students to
help them manage interaction with their peers:

Who's going to begin?
Which role are you going to take?
Whose turn is it?
What are we supposed to do?
What do you think?
I didn't hear what you said.
What does this word mean?
Let's ask the teacher about this.

I think we're finished. What should we do now?

**Recommendation Five:**

In using student-student interaction to construct a communication act, teachers should use pairs and double pairs and provide them with an appropriate communicative task. If necessary, the task should be loaded with useful linguistic items, and teachers should provide English transactional phrases to help students manage student-student interaction.

Interaction strategies employed by teachers during pair work/double pair work:

*Direct repair*

During student collaboration to co-construct a communication act, teachers should walk around the class and monitor students’ progress. The main interaction feature that teachers should exercise is extended student turn. While students are working in pairs or double pairs, teachers can listen to each pair for a few moments. Teachers may join in and offer encouragement or suggestions. The teacher turn should be short. Teachers should make a quick direct repair of any linguistic mistakes they hear.

**Recommendation six:**

To ensure that pair or double pair work is progressing, teachers should monitor students in their construction of communication acts, using a
collaborative pattern of interaction. If necessary, teachers should provide direct repair of mistakes and engage in interaction strategies including display and referential/exploratory questions, and corrective feedback.

Interaction strategies employed by students during pair work/double pair work:

Display and referential/exploratory questions

Teacher should teach students questioning skills in English and encourage students to apply these skills in pair/double pair work. Students’ questions to each other can cover the following: (a) question the meaning of a linguistic item; (b) question the correctness of the spelling or pronunciation of a word; (c) question the correctness of a grammatical form, vocabulary, text organization, or cultural aspects of English communication.

Corrective feedback

Teachers should train students to correct each other’s mistakes in pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, text organization, and socio-cultural aspects of language. Students should correct each other because correction will improve the accuracy and communicative success of their language act. Corrective feedback provides an opportunity for students to notice mismatches between their utterances and target language norms (Swain, 1998; Fuji & Mackey, 2009).
According to Fuji and Mackey (2009), the amount, nature, and use of corrective feedback in student-student interaction have been found to vary according to the characteristics of the interlocutor, the context, and other factors. Teachers can introduce different types of corrective feedback to their students, for example, explicit corrective feedback, implicit corrective feedback, or form negotiation moves such as clarification requests, confirmation checks, and repetition.

Teachers should pay attention to the pattern of student-student interaction. As demonstrated by Storch (2001a, 2001b, 2002a, 2002b), a collaborative type of student-student interaction is likely to support student interaction and help learning. Collaborative interaction is interaction in which there is a balanced equality (this refers to the degree of control or authority over the task) and mutuality (this refers to the level of engagement with each other’s contribution). This type of interaction results in a high degree of negotiated interaction (Storch, 2002b). Teachers should encourage students to adopt collaborative interaction, encouraging students working to share control of the task and to pay attention to each other’s contribution.

4) Interactive Performance

In this stage students are given extended turn to act out the communication act. The aim is to practise English for fluency. Teachers should encourage students to rehearse the communication act. Although it takes time, it is important for
students to rehearse because it gives them confidence when they do speak. If a communication act does not go well, teachers should ask the students to repeat it.

Teachers should ask all pairs to perform the communication act in a standing position. They should maintain distances between pairs and ensure all pairs perform the act. Teacher should walk around and spend time listening to the students’ performance. Students should have an equal opportunity to perform (Suherdi 2011). It should be noted that with this strategy, students are not required to perform in front of the whole class.

Teacher should use the following interaction strategies when moving around the classroom to watch the students performing their communication act:

- Short teacher turn
- Direct repair
- Content feedback
- Referential questions
- Scaffolding
- Negotiation moves

Teachers should ensure that their turn is a short one, allowing students to have an extended turn in displaying their language production. The type of feature used by a teacher will depend on the context. When pronunciation or word usage is a
problem, the teacher can make direct repair without interrupting the performance. When the message is not clear, the teacher can provide content feedback to make the message more clear. Referential questions may be asked to encourage students to elaborate their ideas. Scaffolding may be used to help students express their ideas. Negotiation moves (requests for clarification and confirmation checks) may be used to encourage students to produce more accurate utterances.

Recommendation Seven:

To help pairs/double pairs to perform their communication act, teachers should consider using the following interaction strategies: short teacher turn, direct repair, content feedback, referential questions, scaffolding, and negotiation moves.

Finally all interaction strategies for teachers above are recommended to be used in the target language (English). During the class interaction, it is important that teachers use the target language (English) most of the time. The use of the target language is to provide maximum opportunities for students to experience the language for real communication through teacher-student interaction. However, for Interactive Collaboration during student-student interaction, the use of L1 to some extent is allowed so that learners can gain opportunities to undertake a joint understanding of the task requirements (Rayati and Yaqubi, 2012; Storch & Aldosari, 2010).
Interactive Modelling presents a model of a communication act. From the model students can obtain direct, basic, and systematic information and the skills associated with the act. Balanced Display and Referential/Exploratory questions that move beyond the IRF pattern of interaction, direct and explicit corrective feedback, scaffolding, and negotiation moves can be employed to create productive teacher-student interaction. These interaction strategies can develop students’ understanding of the model of the communication act.

Interactive Dialogue comprises teachers’ guidance for students’ practice of grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, text organization, and cultural aspects of language. Interactive Collaboration comprises extended students’ turn in student-student interaction in pair work or double pair work. Student-student interaction should promote a context in which students assist each other to learn by giving each other feedback, scaffolding, negotiation moves, and producing modified output. Interactive Performance strategies students’ extended turns, short teachers’ turns, content feedback, referential questions, scaffolding, and negotiation moves. The aim of Interactive Performance is to promote students’ oral fluency.

A mapping of interactive classroom strategies is provided in Figure 7.1. In the figure, the circle and arrows shows the four stages in selecting and using interaction strategies. Initially, teachers’ emphasis should be on Interactive Modelling where a communication act is modelled for students. In the second
stage, Interactive Dialogue, teachers should focus on strengthening students’ knowledge of form through corrective feedback, scaffolding, and negotiation moves. In the third stage, teachers should focus on Interactive Collaboration which promotes interaction between students in pair work or double pair work. The final stage, Interactive Performance, promotes students’ fluency through extended turns. A set of interaction strategies, along with the seven recommendations described above, is outlined in Figure 7.1.

Figure 7.1 Proposed “Interactive MDCP” of Classroom Interaction
7.3 Implications of the study for Lower Secondary Schools in Malang, East Java, Indonesia

This study used teachers and students in General and Islamic Lower Secondary Schools as research participants. The proposed interaction model has significance for both types of school. What is proposed is a series of interaction strategies to promote oral English communication in students in both General and Islamic Lower Secondary Schools. However, given differences between these two types of school, there may be variations in the model.

As described in previous chapters, General Lower Secondary Schools are supervised by the Ministry of Education and cater for students with various religion backgrounds. In this study, teachers at these schools have indicated that they like interacting with their students and have used English for classroom interaction. However, these teachers have not made much use of interaction strategies to promote students’ oral English.

There appears to be a gap between the current practice and the 2006 English Curriculum Objectives. Teachers give little attention to students’ oral communicative competence. However, the 2006 English Curriculum requires students to master English communicative competence, and, given the survey results, students themselves want to improve their oral English. Teachers should give more attention to developing students’ oral English.
Teachers in General Lower Secondary Schools were more concerned with enhancing students’ reading ability than their productive ability, that is, speaking to communicate. This focus on reading to the detriment of speaking most likely exists in all General Lower Secondary Schools in Malang, East Java.

The proposed “Interactive MDCP” model should provide a base for teachers seeking in-service professional development initiated by the Ministry of Education of Indonesia, and as a part of the English Teacher Forum (MGMP/KKG) in the City of Malang. In the context of globalization, empowering students with English communicative competence is desirable. Teachers should be encouraged to adopt the “Interactive MDCP” model, purposefully using interactive strategies. It is hoped that the proposed interaction framework will provide teachers with ways to improve their EFL pedagogy.

Islamic Lower Secondary Schools are not supervised by the Ministry of Education. They are supervised by the Ministry of Religion. Islamic Lower Secondary Schools educate Islamic students. This study revealed that students at Islamic Lower Secondary Schools reported lesser interaction with teachers and their peers than the General School students, and that the teachers were more inclined to use the Indonesian language for classroom interaction than the General School teachers. No Islamic teachers in the study purposefully employed interaction strategies during teacher-student interaction or during student-student interaction. The interaction strategies in the “Interactive MDCP” model should
provide guidance to Islamic school teachers on ways to promote students’ oral communicative competence.

The study revealed that, compared to General schools, Islamic school teachers used more L1 in English classroom interaction, and students reported little interaction with teachers in English and even lower interaction in English with their peers. This situation probably exists in all Islamic schools in Malang, East Java, Indonesia. The proposed “Interactive MDCP” model should provide a basis for Ministry of Religion in-service training programs and the program for English Teacher Forum of Islamic Schools of Malang City (MGMP/KKG MTs).

Promoting students’ oral English communicative competence is important not only for teachers of lower secondary level but also for teachers in upper secondary, primary, and tertiary levels. Applying “Interactive MDCP” model and using its interactive strategies should benefit all teachers of English in Malang, East Java. The model should be of use to staff in institutions which provide pre-service teacher education and in-service teacher training in Malang, East Java.

To support teachers in adopting the model, some changes to the National Examination should occur. As this study demonstrated, the influence of the National Examination is notable in teachers’ practice (Sukyadi and Mardiani, 2011; Pranoto, 2012). It is recommended that the Education Ministry should include an oral communicative component in the National Examination.
7.4 Limitations of the Study

The Interactive MDCP model put forward in this study has not yet been tested at the lower secondary level in schools. To assess the effectiveness of the model, empirical testing of the model should be the next step.

In addition, because of time limitations, the scope of this study was restricted to lower secondary schools in Malang City, East Java, Indonesia. Ideally, participating schools should have come from the broader region of the District of Malang.

7.5 General Conclusions

This study set out to describe classroom interaction in 24 lower secondary English schools in Malang, East Java, Indonesia. The intention was to document students’ and teachers’ perception of classroom interaction and to observe the current practice of classroom interaction. The research question was as follows:

Does the current state of classroom interaction enhance or hinder students’ oral English communicative competence in lower secondary schools in Indonesia?

The five sub-questions were also addressed:

1. What are students’ perceptions of current classroom interaction and preferences for future classroom interaction?
2 What are teachers’ perceptions of classroom interaction?

3 What is the nature of existing teacher-student interaction?

4 What is the nature of existing student-student interaction?

5 Based on an investigation on current practice, is it possible to design a more effective classroom interaction framework to promote students’ oral English communicative competence in lower secondary schools in Indonesia?

This study adopted a mixed approach using quantitative and qualitative elements to elicit data from teachers and students. To form a methodological triangulation for assuring reliability and validity, three data sets were used: a student survey, interviews with teachers, and classroom observation.

The student survey revealed that students had limited interaction with their teachers. Students’ participation in student-student interaction was more limited. Furthermore, students reported limited opportunity to work in pairs or group work to undertake communicative tasks.

Students reported that they lacked confidence in their linguistic competence, they felt anxious about speaking in front of the class. Teachers who were more comfortable with a direct teaching approach paid little attention to developing students’ communicative competence. Students reported that linguistic incompetence was the main barrier to student-student interaction, followed by
anxiety, incomprehensible input, lack of experience in interacting in English with peers, and limited provision of communicative tasks. However, students reported positive attitudes to more interaction in English with their teachers and with their peers.

From the interviews, teachers indicated that they interacted with students mainly to check students’ understanding of reading texts. Reading skill was a major emphasis for their English lessons because understanding different types of text would equip students for the National Examination. Teachers reported use of limited strategies during interaction: intensive use of display questions, extended teacher turn, form focused feedback, and teacher echo. Extended turn to students was rarely provided. Only half the teachers indicated that they provided an opportunity for student-student interaction, with most tasks related to reading comprehension.

A mixture of Indonesian and English was used in classroom interaction. Half the General school teachers indicated English usage more than 50% of the time. The majority of Islamic school teachers indicated that they used English less than 50% of the time.

According to teachers, factors preventing students from participating actively in the classroom interaction were lack of confidence in their linguistic competence and Javanese cultural orientations. Students were expected to be respectful and
obedient to teachers (Buchori, 2001). Passive students would not initiate interaction with teachers.

Classroom observation revealed that most teachers’ activities centred on two modes: Materials model where teachers provided language practice around a specific piece of material, and Skill and systems mode, where teachers provided language practice in relation to a particular language system or skills. Teachers’ talk concentrated on the IRF pattern and asking display questions, echoing students’ answers, and giving explanations about linguistic items through extended teacher turn, and occasionally giving form focused feedback.

Students answered the questions in chorus or individually as assigned by teachers. Typically, there was no developmental knowledge construction through teacher-student interaction. Scaffolding and negotiation moves were rarely found in Material and Skill and system modes. Form-focused feedback was found in these two modes but the number of occurrences was limited. Classroom context mode, which was designed to enable students to express their feelings and experiences as a means of promoting oral fluency, was rare. The scarcity of classroom context mode prevented students’ extended student turns. There also was limited opportunity for student-student interaction. Tasks provided for student-student interaction did not nurture students’ communicative ability.

Data from the three collection methods provide evidence that current classroom interaction does not enhance student communicative competence. Teachers
cannot use their current strategies for classroom interaction to enhance students’ oral English communicative competence. Selection of interaction strategies should be used in a purposeful manner to maximize students’ oral English communicative competence.

A new model consisting of Interactive Modelling, Interactive Dialogue, Interactive Collaboration, and Interactive Performance is proposed. It is hoped the model will promote oral English communicative competence in General schools and Islamic Lower Secondary School students in East Java, Indonesia. The model is proposed as a way to enhance the teaching and learning of English at the secondary level in Indonesia.
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Appendices

Appendix 1

Invitation Letter to Head of Education Department of Malang City/ Head of Religion Department of Malang City

Dr xxxxxxxx
Head of Education Department of Malang City/ Head of Religion Department of Malang City

Dear Dr xxxxxxxx

I would like to request your permission that my Ph.D student, Ms Nunung Suryati may gather research data from teachers of English and students of General Lower Secondary Schools/Islamic Lower Secondary Schools of Malang City.

Developing a classroom interaction framework to promote junior high school students’ English communicative competence in Malang, East Java, Indonesia
No H-2010-1242

Teachers of English and students are invited to participate in the research identified above which is being conducted by Ms Nunung Suryati from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle, Australia. Ms Nunung Suryati is conducting a research as part of her PhD degree under the supervision of Assoc Prof Shen Chen and Dr. Jennifer Archer from the University of Newcastle, Australia.

Assoc Prof. Shen Chen
School of Education
Faculty of Education and Arts
The University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan,
NSW 2308
Australia

Tel: +61 2 49216705
Fax: +61 2 49216895
**Why is the research being done?**
The purpose of this research is to undertake a comprehensive investigation of interaction in English language classrooms in lower secondary schools in Malang, East Java, Indonesia. The intention is to construct a classroom interaction framework to promote lower secondary school students’ English communicative competence.

**Who can participate in the research?**
**For Survey Research:**
The researcher is seeking 540 students of General Lower Secondary Schools and 180 students from Islamic Lower Secondary Schools in the City of Malang to complete an anonymous questionnaire.

**For Qualitative Research:**
The researcher is seeking 18 teachers of English in General Lower Secondary Schools and 6 teachers of English in Islamic Lower Secondary Schools located in the City of Malang to agree to participate in an interview and to be observed as they teach.

**What choice do you have?**
Participation in this research is entirely the teachers’ and students’ choice. Only those teachers and students who give their informed consent will be included in the project.

**What would you be asked to do?**
**Survey Research**
Students will be asked to complete a questionnaire about classroom interaction. The student questionnaire requests information about students’ attitude towards classroom interaction. It will take about 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

**Qualitative Research**
Teachers of English will be interviewed once and then observed in teaching classroom for 2 teaching periods. In the interview, teachers will be asked about their attitude towards classroom interaction and have the interview recorded. The interview will take about 45 minutes.

The classroom observation will focus on teacher’s English instruction and will be videotaped. The observation time will be agreed upon by the researcher and the teacher participants.

**How will participants’ risk be protected?**
Confidentiality will be maintained at all times. Participants are guaranteed that their privacy and confidentiality will be respected in this research and that no identification of participants will appear in any reports and publications. The research data will be locked in a secured cabinet of the researcher’s office for a minimum of 5 years. Only the project supervisors and the researcher will have access to the information.
**How will the information collected be used?**

The results of the project will be used in the researcher’s thesis for her PhD degree. Analysis of the data and implications for teaching English in Indonesia will be reported in academic journals.

We would be grateful if you would give permission for Ms Nunung Suryati to conduct her research in your schools.

**Further information**

If you would like further information please contact Nunung Suryati (Nunung.Suryati@uon.edu.au) phone number +61 431154835 (Australia) or 62 341 560 600 (Indonesia) or Associate Prof. Shen Chen (Shen.Chen@newcastle.edu.au)

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Project Supervisor
Associate Professor Shen Chen

and

Researcher
Nunung Suryati

**Complaints about this research**

This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No **II-2010-1242**. Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone + **61-2-4921 6333**, email **Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au**.
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Invitation Letter to Principals of General Lower Secondary School and Islamic Lower Secondary School

Assoc Prof. Shen Chen
School of Education
Faculty of Education and Arts
The University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan,
NSW 2308
Australia
Tel: +61 2 49216705
Fax: +61 2 49216895

Mr/Ms xxxxxxxx
Principal of General Lower Secondary School xxx./Principal of Islamic Lower Secondary School xxx.

Dear Mr/Ms xxxxxxxx

I would like to request your permission that my Ph.D student, Ms Nunung Suryati may gather research data from teachers of English and students from your staff and students.

**Developing a classroom interaction framework to promote junior high school students’ English communicative competence in Malang, East Java, Indonesia No H-2010-1242**

Your staff and students are invited to participate in the research identified above which is being conducted by Ms Nunung Suryati from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle, Australia. Ms Nunung Suryati is conducting a research as part of her PhD degree under the supervision of A/ Prof Shen Chen and Dr. Jennifer Archer from The University of Newcastle, Australia.

**Why is the research being done?**
The purpose of this research is to undertake a comprehensive investigation of interaction in English language classrooms in lower secondary schools in Malang, East Java, Indonesia. The intention is to construct a classroom interaction framework to promote lower secondary school students’ English communicative competence.
Who can participate in the research?

For Survey Research:
The researcher is seeking 540 students of General Lower Secondary Schools and 180 students from Islamic Lower Secondary Schools in the City of Malang to complete an anonymous questionnaire.

For Qualitative Research:
The researcher is seeking 18 teachers of English in General Lower Secondary Schools and 6 teachers of English in Islamic Lower Secondary Schools located in the City of Malang to agree to participate in an interview and to be observed as they teach.

What choice do you have?
Participation in this research is entirely the teachers’ and students’ choice. Only those teachers and students who give their informed consent will be included in the project.

What would you be asked to do?
Survey Research
Students will be asked to complete a questionnaire about classroom interaction. The student questionnaire requests information about students’ attitude towards classroom interaction. It will take about 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Qualitative Research
Teachers of English will be interviewed once and then observed in teaching classroom for 2 teaching periods. In the interview, teachers will be asked about their attitude towards classroom interaction and have the interview recorded. The interview will take about 45 minutes.

The classroom observation will focus on teacher’s English instruction and will be videotaped. The observation time will be agreed upon by the researcher and the teacher participants.

How will participants’ risk be protected?
Confidentiality will be maintained at all times. Participants are guaranteed that their privacy and confidentially will be respected in this research and that no identification of participants will appear in any reports and publications. The research data will be locked in a secured cabinet of the researcher’s office for a minimum of 5 years. Only the project supervisors and the researcher will have access to the information.

How will the information collected be used?
The results of the project will be used in the researcher’s thesis for her PhD degree. Analysis of the data and implications for teaching English in Indonesia will be reported in academic journals.

We would be grateful if you would give permission for Ms Nunung Suryati to conduct her research in your schools. Please sign and send the consent form to Ms Nunung Suryati who will contact you and give you relevant document documents for distribution.
Further information
If you would like further information please contact Nunung Suryati (Nunung.Suryati@uon.edu.au) phone number +61 431154835 (Australia) or 62 341 560 600 (Indonesia) or Associate Prof. Shen Chen (Shen.Chen@newcastle.edu.au)

Thank you.
Yours sincerely,

Project Supervisor
Associate Professor Shen Chen

and

Researcher
Nunung Suryati

Complaints about this research
This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No H-2010-1242. Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone (02) 49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au.
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Consent Form for the Principal

Developing a classroom interaction framework to promote junior high school students’ English communicative competence in Malang, East Java, Indonesia (No H-2010-1242)

Researcher: Ms Nunung Suryati

I ______________________ agree/ do not agree that our school will participate in the research described above and give my consent freely.

I understand that the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have retained.

I understand the teachers and students in my school have the right to withdraw from the project at any time and do not have to give any reason for withdrawing.

I understand that data provided by my teachers and students will remain confidential to the researcher and her supervisors. I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.

Print Name : ______________________________
Signature  : ______________________________
Date       : ______________________________
School     : ______________________________
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Information Statement for Teachers

Assoc Prof. Shen Chen
School of Education
Faculty of Education and Arts
The University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan,
NSW 2308
Australia
Tel: +61 2 49216705
Fax: +61 2 49216895

Developing a classroom interaction framework to promote junior high school students’ English communicative competence in Malang, East Java, Indonesia (No H-2010-1242)

Dear English Teachers

You are invited to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Nunung Suryati from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle. Nunung Suryati is conducting a research as part of her PhD degree under the supervision of Assoc Prof Shen Chen from the School of Education at The University of Newcastle, Australia. You are invited to participate in this research because you are currently teaching English at General lower secondary schools (SMP) / Islamic lower secondary schools (MTS) level.

Why is the research being done?
The purpose of this research is to undertake a comprehensive investigation of interaction in English language classrooms in lower secondary schools in Malang, East Java, Indonesia. The intention is to construct a classroom interaction framework to promote lower secondary school students’ English communicative competence.

Who can participate in the research?
The researcher is seeking 18 English teachers from General Lower Secondary Schools and 6 English teachers from Islamic Lower Secondary Schools located in the City of Malang to participate in an interview and to be observed.

What choice do you have?
Participation in this research is entirely your choice. Only those teachers who give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not you decide to participate, your decision will not disadvantage you in any way.
If you do decide to participate, you may withdraw from the project at any time without giving a reason and you have the option of withdrawing any data which identify you.

**What would you be asked to do?**
If you agree to participate in the qualitative research, you will be interviewed once and then will be observed in your classroom for 2 teaching periods. For interview, you will be asked about your attitude towards classroom interaction and have the interview recorded. The interview will take about 45 minutes.

After interview has been completed, the classroom observation will focus on teacher’s English instruction and will be videotaped. The observation time will be agreed upon by the researcher and the teacher participants.

The researcher will transcribe the audio and videotapes as the researcher speaks Indonesian, Javanese and English and the participants will have the right to receive your own recording and transcripts.

**What are the risks and benefits of participating?**
There are no identified risks or benefits to participants or schools for participating in this research. Your answers will not be linked with your name or your school and will not affect your relationship with any organization. Your name and your schools will not be identified in any report of interview and classroom observation.

**How will your risk be protected?**
Confidentiality will be maintained at all times. You are guaranteed that your privacy and confidentiality will be respected in this research and that no identification of you will appear in any reports and publications. The research data will be locked in a secured cabinet of the researcher’s office for a minimum of 5 years. Only the project supervisors and the researcher will have access to the information.

**How will the information collected be used?**
The results of the project will be used in the researcher’s thesis for her PhD degree. Analysis of the data and implications for teaching English in Indonesia will be reported in academic journals.

A summary report of the findings will be available for you if you are interested in getting one. If you wish the summary report sent to you, please email or telephone the researcher.

**What do you need to do to participate?**
Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, please contact the researcher.

If you would like to participate in the interview and classroom observation, please sign the Consent Form and return it in the paid envelope provided. The researcher
will then contact you to arrange a time convenient to you for the classroom observation and interview.

**Further information**
If you would like further information please contact Nunung Suryati (Nunung.Suryati@uon.newcastle.edu.au) phone number +61 431154835 (Australia) or 62 341 560 600 (Indonesia) or Assoc Prof. Shen Chen (Shen.Chen@newcastle.edu.au)

Thank you for considering this invitation.
Yours sincerely,

Shen Chen
Project Supervisor

and

Nunung Suryati
Researcher

**Complaints about this research**
This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No H-2010-1242. Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone +61-2-49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au.
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Consent Form for Teachers

[Signature]

[Date]

Print Name: ________________________________

Signature: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________

Contact details: ________________________________

Developing a classroom interaction framework to promote junior high school students' English communicative competence in Malang, East Java, Indonesia (No H-2010-1242)

Researcher: Ms Nunung Suryati

I ____________________________ agree/ do not agree to participate in a face to face audio taped interview and to allow the researcher to videotape classroom interaction of one or two of my English classes if all students in the class agree.

I understand that the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have retained.

I understand I have the right to withdraw from the project at any time and do not have to give any reason for withdrawing.

I understand that any information I provide will remain confidential to the researcher and her supervisors. I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.
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Information Statement for Parents

Assoc Prof. Shen Chen
School of Education
Faculty of Education and Arts
The University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan,
NSW 2308
Australia
Tel: +61 2 49216705
Fax: +61 2 49216895

Developing a classroom interaction framework to promote lower secondary school students’ English communicative competence in Malang, East Java, Indonesia

Dear Parents/Guardians,

You child is invited to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Nunung Suryati from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle. Nunung Suryati is conducting a research as part of her PhD degree under the supervision of Assoc Prof. Shen Chen from the School of Education at The University of Newcastle, Australia. Your child is invited to participate in this research because your child is currently studying at General Lower Secondary School (SMP) / Islamic Lower Secondary School (MTS) level and your child’s school has been randomly selected to participate in this study.

Why is the research being done?
The purpose of this research is to undertake a comprehensive investigation of the interaction in English language classrooms in junior high schools in Malang, East Java, Indonesia. The intention is to construct a classroom interaction framework to promote lower secondary school students’ English communicative competence.

Who can participate in the research?
The researcher is seeking 540 General Lower Secondary School students and 180 Islamic Lower Secondary School students to complete an anonymous questionnaire.

What choice does your child have?
Participation in this research is entirely your choice. Only those students whose parents/carers give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or
not you allow your child to participate, your decision will not disadvantage your child in any way.

**What would your child be asked to do?**
If you consent, your child will be asked to complete an anonymous questionnaire. The questionnaire requests information about your child’s opinion of classroom interaction during English classes. It will take about 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

**What are the risks and benefits of participating?**
There are no identified risks or benefits to participants or schools from participating in this research. Participants’ answers will not be linked with their name or their school and will not affect their relationship with any organization.

**How will your child’s privacy be protected?**
Confidentiality will be maintained at all times. Your child’s privacy is assured due to the anonymous nature of the questionnaire. Your child will not be asked to provide their name or any identifying information within their response. Your child will not therefore be identifiable in any reports or publications resulting from the research. The research data will be locked in a secured cabinet of the researcher’s office for a minimum of 5 years. Only the project supervisors and the researcher will have access to the information.

**How will the information collected be used?**
The result of the project will be used in the researcher’s thesis for her PhD degree. Analysis of the data and implications for teaching English in Indonesia will be reported in academic journals.

A summary report of the findings will be available for the participants if they are interested in getting one. If you wish the summary report sent to you, please email or telephone the researcher 2011.

**What do you need to do to participate?**
Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent for your child to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, please contact the researcher.

Please discuss this invitation with your child and if you agree for your child to participate in the survey, please complete and return the consent form in the reply paid envelope provided.
Further information
If you would like further information please contact Nunung Suryati (Nunung.Suryati@uon.edu.au) phone number +61 431154835 (Australia) or 62 341 560 600 (Indonesia) or Assoc Prof. Shen Chen (Shen.Chen@newcastle.edu.au)

Thank you for considering this invitation.
Yours sincerely,

Shen Chen  
Project Supervisor

Nunung Suryati  
Researcher

Complaints about this research
This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H-2010-1242. Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone +61-2-49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au
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Consent Form for Parents

Developing a classroom interaction framework to promote junior high school students’ English communicative competence in Malang, East Java, Indonesia
(No H-2010-1242)

Researcher: Ms Nunung Suryati

I ______________________ agree/ do not agree to allow my child to participate in the survey described in the above research project and give my consent freely.

I understand that the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have retained.

I understand my child has the right to withdraw from the project at any time and does not have to give any reason for withdrawing.

I understand that my child’s personal information will remain confidential to the researchers. I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.

Print Name : _____________________________________
Signature : _____________________________________
Date : _____________________________________
Contact details : _____________________________________
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Student Survey (English version)

Project Title:

Developing a classroom interaction framework to promote lower secondary school students’ English communicative competence in Malang, East Java, Indonesia

2010

The University of Newcastle
School of Education

Project Supervisor
A/Prof Shen Chen
School of Education
The University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308
NSW
Australia

Tel: +61 2 49216705
Fax: +61 2 49216895

Researcher
Ms Nunung Suryati
School of Education
The University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308
NSW
Australia

Tel: +61 0431 154 835
STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARDS CLASSROOM INTERACTION

This questionnaire is designed to gather information about how you learn English at your General Lower Secondary School (SMP) or Islamic Lower Secondary School (MTS). Please fill it in honestly. All information gathered from this questionnaire will be kept confidential and anonymous. Your responses will be used for consideration in developing more effective model of EFL teaching and learning.

Part 1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Directions: Please cross (X) the response that matches your situation.

1. What type of school is your school?
   □ General     □ Islamic

2. What is your school status?
   □ State     □ Private

3. What is your gender?
   □ Male     □ Female

4. What is your grade?
   □ Year 7     □ Year 8     □ Year 9

5. Did you study English in primary school?
   □ Yes     □ No

6. If yes, in which grade did you begin to take English lessons?
   ______________________________________________________

7. Have you had English private tuition?
   □ Yes     □ No

8. If yes, how many month/years have you had English private tuition?
   ______________________________________________________
Part 2: TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTION

Directions: You will find statements on teacher-student interaction in English classes. Please read each statement. On the same sheet, cross (X) number 1, 2, 3 or 4 that indicates how you respond to the statements. Use the following scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Participation in Teacher-Student Interaction

1. I present my opinion in English voluntarily.
   1  2  3  4

2. I initiate questions to the teacher in English.
   1  2  3  4

3. I answer my teacher’s questions in English.
   1  2  3  4

4. I ask for clarification to the teacher in English.
   1  2  3  4

B. Strategies in Teacher-Student Interaction

*Scaffolding and questions:*

5. When I have difficulty presenting a response in English, my teacher reformulates, or extends, or gives a model of expression for me.
   1  2  3  4
6. My teacher asks me referential questions (genuine questions to which the
teacher does not know the answer), for example: “What is your aspiration for
your future career?” “Why do you want to pursue this career?”

    1  2  3  4

7. My teacher asks display questions (questions to which the teacher knows the
answer), for example, asking questions to check my knowledge of English
grammar or my comprehension of a reading text.

    1  2  3  4

    Feedback

8. When I make speaking mistakes, the teacher corrects my error quickly and
directly.

    1  2  3  4

9. When I perform speaking activities, the teacher gives me content feedback
(feedback about the content of my utterance not the words that I use).

    1  2  3  4

10. My teacher provides form-focused feedback (feedback about the words I use in
my English utterances).

    1  2  3  4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Negotiation items and provision of time to respond**

11. My teacher asks me to clarify something that I have said.

12. My teacher makes confirmation checks to confirm his or her understanding of my response.

13. When I formulate a response in English, the teacher allows me sufficient time (several seconds) to respond.

**Speaking turn and language use**

14. My teacher has extended turns when speaking in class.

15. My teacher provides an extended turn to me where I can practice to speak English in class.

16. My teacher uses English about 80% of the time in classroom interaction.
**Turn completion**

17. My teacher repeats his or her teacher’s previous utterance or repeats my responses.
   
   1 2 3 4

18. My teacher interrupts me when I am presenting a response.
   
   1 2 3 4

19. My teacher completes my response when I am presenting it.
   
   1 2 3 4

**C. Barriers of teacher-student interaction**

**Directions:** For these sections, please use the following scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. I feel uncomfortable if I have to speak in front of my English class.
   
   1 2 3 4

21. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English class.
   
   1 2 3 4
22. I don’t like to speak often in English class because I’m afraid that the teacher will think I’m not a good student.

1 2 3 4

23. I am afraid other students will laugh at me when I speak English.

1 2 3 4

24. I keep silent because I don’t want others to know that I don’t understand.

1 2 3 4

25. My English vocabulary is limited.

1 2 3 4

26. I’m not confident with my English grammar.

1 2 3 4

27. My English pronunciation is poor.

1 2 3 4

28. I’m not confident in listening comprehension.

1 2 3 4

29. In my English class, the teacher does most of the talking and student only answer when they are called upon.

1 2 3 4
30. In my English class, there are limited opportunities to practice speaking English in group work and pair work.

1  2  3  4

31. In my English class, the focus of learning is NOT for students to communicate.

1  2  3  4

32. I am bored because my English class activities are organized in a monotonous manner.

1  2  3  4

33. What are other barriers that you experience in interaction in English with your teacher?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

34. What are your suggestions to improve your interaction in English with the teacher?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
Part 3: STUDENT-STUDENT INTERACTION

Directions: You will find statements on student-student interaction during pair or group work in English classes. Please read each statement and give your response. Use the following scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Participation in Teacher-Student Interaction

35. I present my opinion in English when working in pair/group.
   1  2  3  4

36. I ask questions to my peers in English when working in pair/group.
   1  2  3  4

37. I answer my peers’ questions in English when working in pair/group.
   1  2  3  4

38. I correct my peers’ errors when working in pair/group.
   1  2  3  4

39. I receive correction from my peers when I make mistakes.
   1  2  3  4

40. I ask for clarification from my peers when working in pair/group.
   1  2  3  4
B. Tasks for Student-Student Interaction

41. I work in pair/group work where I ask each other questions on a predetermined topic such as daily routines - in other words, question and answer practice using targeted vocabulary and structures, including survey type activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. I work in pair/group where I describe an item, person or a picture to each other using targeted vocabulary and/or structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. I work in pair/group where I engage in role play either based on a model dialogue or involving a situation which requires me to use familiar and well-rehearsed language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. I work in pair/group where I engage in one or two-way information gap tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. I work in pair/group where I work collaboratively to construct text e.g., list questions to ask exchange students who will visit the class in the future, develop an argument for their side for a debate, create a role play, and prepare part of a procedural text such as a recipe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
46. What are other barriers that you experience in interaction in English with your peers?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

47. What are your suggestions to improve your interaction in English with the peers?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Part 4: ATTITUDES AND MOTIVATION

Directions: For these sections, please use the following scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Attitudes

48. Using English for teacher-student and student-student interaction during English lessons is important for students’ English language development.

1  2  3  4

49. The more students interact orally in English with the teacher and peers, the better students will be at communicating in English.

1  2  3  4
50. I support maximum interaction between the teacher and students and between
student and student in English.
1 2 3 4

51. I support lessons where there are a lot of communication activities so that I can
interact actively with the teacher and peers in English.
1 2 3 4

**B. Motivation**

52. I like learning English for communication.
1 2 3 4

53. Learning to communicate in English is a challenge that I enjoy.
1 2 3 4

54. Communication activities are a waste of time, because I only need to learn what
is necessary to pass the national examination.
1 2 3 4

55. I want to be able to communicate in English so that I can get a good job.
1 2 3 4

56. I want to be able to speak English so that I can study in a good upper secondary
school and university.
1 2 3 4

**Thank you very much**
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SIKAP SISWA TERHADAP INTERAKSI KELAS BAHASA INGGRIS

Bagian 1 INFORMASI PRIBADI

Petunjuk: Berilah tanda silang (X) pada jawaban yang sesuai.
1. Apakah jenis sekolah anda?
   □ SMP            □ MTS
2. Apakah status sekolah anda?
   □ Negri           □ Swasta
3. Apakah jenis kelamin anda?
   □ Pria             □ Wanita
4. Kelas berapakah anda?
   □ Kelas 7       □ Kelas 8       □ Kelas 9
5. Apakah anda mendapat pelajaran Bahasa Inggris ketika di SD/MI?
   □ Ya             □ Tidak
6. Bila ya, sejak kelas berapa anda mulai mendapat pelajaran bahasa Inggris?
   ________________________________________________________
7. Apakah anda pernah belajar Bahasa Inggris di tempat kursus/les?
   □ Ya             □ Tidak
8. Bila ya, berapa lama anda sudah belajar bahasa Inggris di tempat kursus/les?
   ________________________________________________________
Bagian 2: INTERAKSI GURU-SISWA

Petunjuk: Bacalah setiap pernyataan tentang interaksi guru dan siswa pada pelajaran Bahasa Inggris di bawah ini. Kemudian berikan respon terhadap pernyataan tersebut dengan cara memberi tanda silang (X) pada nomor 1, 2, 3, atau 4 di bawahnya. Gunakan skala berikut:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Tidak pernah</th>
<th>2 Jarang</th>
<th>3 Sering</th>
<th>4 Selalu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A. Partisipasi

1. Saya menyampaikan pendapat secara sukarela dengan memakai Bahasa Inggris.
   1 2 3 4

2. Saya berinisiatif bertanya kepada guru dengan memakai Bahasa Inggris.
   1 2 3 4

3. Saya menjawab pertanyaan guru dengan memakai bahasa Inggris.
   1 2 3 4

4. Saya meminta klarifikasi kepada guru dengan memakai Bahasa Inggris.
   1 2 3 4

B. Strategi Interaksi

  Bantuan dan pertanyaan

5. Ketika saya kesulitan menyampaikan respon dalam bahasa Inggris, guru memberi bantuan dengan cara merumuskan kembali jawaban saya atau menambah jawaban atau memberi model jawaban untuk saya.
   1 2 3 4
6. Guru memberikan jenis pertanyaan yang jawabannya guru belum tahu, contohnya, “Karir apa yang ingin kamu tekuni nanti?” “Mengapa ingin berkarir di bidang itu?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Guru memberikan jenis pertanyaan yang jawabannya guru sudah tahu, yaitu pertanyaan untuk mengecek pemahaman saya tentang tata bahasa, atau pemahaman tentang teks bahasa Inggris.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Feedback**

8. Ketika saya melakukan kesalahan berbicara, guru membetulkan kesalahan saya langsung dan segera.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Guru memberikan feedback mengenai kata-kata bahasa Inggris yang saya gunakan.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
Negosiasi dan waktu untuk menjawab

11. Guru meminta saya untuk mengklarifikasi yang saya katakan dalam bahasa Inggris.

   1 2 3 4


   1 2 3 4

13. Ketika saya merumuskan jawaban bahasa Inggris, guru memberikan waktu yang cukup (beberapa detik) kepada saya.

   1 2 3 4

Giliran berbicara dan penggunaan bahasa Inggris


   1 2 3 4

15. Guru juga memberikan waktu panjang untuk saya berlatih berbicara bahasa Inggris kepada saya di kelas.

   1 2 3 4

16. Guru menggunakan bahasa Inggris sekitar 80% dalam berinteraksi dengan siswa di kelas.

   1 2 3 4
Penyelesaian giliran berbicara

17. Guru mengulang-ulang pernyataannya sendiri atau mengulang-ulang jawaban bahasa Inggris siswa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tidak pernah</td>
<td>Jarang</td>
<td>Sering</td>
<td>Selalu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Guru menginterupsi saya ketika saya berusaha menyampaikan jawaban bahasa Inggris saya.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sangat tidak setuju</td>
<td>Tidak setuju</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>Sangat setuju</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Guru menyelesaikan jawaban bahasa Inggris saya sedang menyampaikan jawaban bahasa Inggris.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sangat tidak setuju</td>
<td>Tidak setuju</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>Sangat setuju</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Hambatan

**Petunjuk:** Untuk bagian ini, gunakan pilihan di bawah ini.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sangat tidak setuju</td>
<td>Tidak setuju</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>Sangat setuju</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Saya tidak nyaman bila harus berbicara bahasa Inggris di depan kelas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sangat tidak setuju</td>
<td>Tidak setuju</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>Sangat setuju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sangat tidak setuju</td>
<td>Tidak setuju</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>Sangat setuju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Saya malu untuk secara sukarela menjawab pertanyaan guru dalam bahasa Inggris.

   1 2 3 4

22. Saya tidak suka sering berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris di kelas karena saya takut guru akan menilai saya siswa yang kurang pintar.

   1 2 3 4

23. Saya takut teman sekelas akan menertawakan saya, bila saya berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris.

   1 2 3 4

24. Saya diam saja karena saya tidak ingin teman sekelas mengetahui bahwa saya tidak mengerti.

   1 2 3 4

25. Kosa kata bahasa Inggris saya terbatas.

   1 2 3 4

26. Saya kurang menguasai tata-bahasa Inggris.

   1 2 3 4

27. Pengucapan bahasa Inggris saya kurang baik.

   1 2 3 4

1 2 3 4

29. Di kelas bahasa Inggris saya, guru yang banyak berbicara, siswa hanya mendengarkan, bila ditanya baru menjawab.

1 2 3 4

30. Di kelas bahasa Inggris saya, kesempatan untuk praktek berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris pada kegiatan kelompok atau berpasangan sangat sedikit.

1 2 3 4

31. Di kelas bahasa Inggris saya, focus pembelajarannya bukan komunikasi lisan dalam bahasa Inggris.

1 2 3 4

32. Di kelas bahasa Inggris saya, kegiatan pembelajaran monoton kurang bervariasi sehingga saya bosan.

1 2 3 4

33. Sebutkan hambatan lain yang anda alami ketika berinteraksi dalam bahasa Inggris dengan guru?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

34. Sebutkan saran anda untuk meningkatkan interaksi anda dalam bahasa Inggris dengan guru?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Bagian 3: INTERAKSI SISWA DENGAN SISWA

Petunjuk: Bacalah setiap pernyataan tentang interaksi siswa dengan siswa pada kegiatan pasangan atau kelompok dalam pelajaran Bahasa Inggris di bawah ini. Kemudian berikan respon terhadap pernyataan tersebut dengan cara memberi tanda silang (X) pada nomor 1, 2, 3, atau 4 di bawahnya. Gunakan skala berikut:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Tidak pernah</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Jarang</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Sering</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Selalu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A. Partisipasi dalam interaksi siswa-siswa

35. Saya menyampaikan pendapat dalam bahasa Inggris ketika bekerja dalam pasangan/kelompok.

   1  2  3  4

36. Saya bertanya kepada teman dalam bahasa Inggris ketika bekerja dalam pasangan/kelompok.

   1  2  3  4

37. Saya menjawab pertanyaan teman saya dalam bahasa Inggris ketika bekerja dalam pasangan/kelompok.

   1  2  3  4
38. Saya memperbaiki kesalahan teman saya ketika bekerja dalam pasangan/kelompok.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

39. Saya menerima koreksi dari teman saya ketika bekerja dalam pasangan/kelompok.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

40. Saya meminta klasifikasi dari teman saya ketika bekerja dalam pasangan/kelompok.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. Tugas untuk Interaksi Siswa-siswa

41. Saya bekerja dalam pasangan/kelompok dan tugas yang saya kerjakan adalah saling bertanya dengan teman tentang topic yang sudah ditentukan, seperti kebiasaan sehari-hari. Dengan kata lain tugas kami bertanya jawab menggunakan kosa kata dan tatabahasa yang dilatihkan, termasuk tugas melakukan survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

42. Saya bekerja dalam pasangan/kelompok dan tugas mendeskripsikan suatu benda, seseorang, atau gambar kepada teman saya menggunakan kosa kata dan tatabahasa yang dilatihkan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
43. Saya bekerja dalam pasangan/kelompok dan tugas saya bermain peran berdasarkan dialog model atau situasi yang mengharuskan saya menggunakan ungkapan yang sudah dikenal dan dihafalkan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tidak pernah</td>
<td>Jarang</td>
<td>Sering</td>
<td>Selalu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Saya bekerja dalam pasangan/kelompok dan tugas saya melakukan *one* atau *two* *information gap* (jenis tugas dimana siswa 1 memiliki informasi berbeda dengan informasi yang dimiliki siswa 2).

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

45. Saya bekerja dalam pasangan/kelompok dan tugas saya bekerja sama membuat text baru, contohnya membuat daftar pertanyaan kepada siswa dari luar negri yang akan berkunjung ke kelas, membuat argument untuk debat, membuat text procedure seperti resep.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

46. Sebutkan hambatan yang anda alami ketika berinteraksi dalam bahasa Inggris dengan teman?

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________
47. Sebutkan saran anda untuk meningkatkan interaksi anda dalam bahasa Inggris dengan teman?


Part 4: SIKAP DAN MOTIVASI

Petunjuk: Untuk bagian ini, gunakan skala berikut:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sangat tidak setuju</td>
<td>Tidak setuju</td>
<td>Setuju</td>
<td>Sangat setuju</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Sikap

48. Penggunaan bahasa Inggris dalam interaksi guru-siswa and interaksi siswa-siswa selama pembelajaran bahasa Inggris penting untuk membangun kompetensi bahasa Inggris siswa.

1 2 3 4

49. Semakin sering siswa berinteraksi menggunakan bahasa Inggris dengan guru dan siswa lainnya, semakin baik kemampuan berkomunikasi bahasa Inggris.

1 2 3 4
50. Saya mendukung terjadinya interaksi yang maksimal antara guru dengan siswa dan siswa dengan siswa dalam bahasa Inggris.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\end{array}
\]

51. Saya mendukung pembelajaran bahasa Inggris yang memberikan banyak aktifitas komunikasi sehingga saya dapat berinteraksi dengan aktif dengan guru dan teman dalam bahasa Inggris.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\end{array}
\]

**B. Motivasi**

52. Saya senang belajar bahasa Inggris sebagai alat untuk berkomunikasi.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\end{array}
\]

53. Belajar berkomunikasi dalam bahasa Inggris adalah tantangan yang menyenangkan.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\end{array}
\]

54. Kegiatan berkomunikasi merupakan kegiatan yang membuang waktu karena saya hanya perlu mempelajari apa yang diperlukan untuk ujian nasional bahasa Inggris.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\end{array}
\]

55. Saya ingin dapat berkomunikasi dalam bahasa Inggris agar saya mendapatkan pekerjaan yang lebih baik.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\end{array}
\]
56. Saya ingin dapat berkomunikasi dalam bahasa Inggris agar saya dapat meneruskan ke SMA dan universitas yang bagus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sangat tidak setuju</th>
<th>Tidak setuju</th>
<th>Setuju</th>
<th>Sangat setuju</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terima kasih
Appendix 10
Teacher Interview Protocol

Project Title:
Developing a classroom interaction framework to promote lower secondary school students' oral English communicative competence in Malang, East Java, Indonesia

Start & End time of interview: ________________________________
Venue of interview: ___________________________________
Interviewee’s name: _____________________________________

A. General Introduction
1. Thank the interviewee for agreeing to the interview.
2. To increase rapport and make the interview go smoothly, the researcher will switch language use (Indonesian, Javanese, or English) to communicate easily with each participant.
3. The primary focus of the interview is the participant’s perspective on classroom interaction.
4. Ask the interviewee if he/she has any queries before interview begins.
5. Ask the interviewee to tell about her/his current work as a teacher of English in this lower secondary school?
   Probe sub-questions related to each participant’s background, for example?
   a. How long has the interviewee been an EFL teacher in this school?
   b. What is the interviewee’s highest qualification and what is the area of specification?
   c. Which university did the interviewee graduate from?

B. Teacher Student Interaction
1. Do you like interacting with your students in English?
2. Why do you like/dislike interacting with your student in English?
3. What kind of activities do you have for teacher-student interaction?
4. Do you use English all the time or mixed with Indonesian? Can you give percentage of your language use?
5. Have you got any in-service training on how to conduct effective teacher – student interactions?

6. What kind of interaction strategies do you normally use?
   a. Asking display/referential questions?
   b. Giving Scaffolding?
   c. Corrective feedback
   d. Negotiation moves
   e. Teacher/student extended turn
   f. Turn completion

7. What barriers do you have in conducting teacher-student interaction in English?

8. What barriers do your students have in participating in teacher-student interaction in English?

9. What suggestions do you have to improve teacher-student interaction in English?

C. Student-student Interaction

1. Do you like providing opportunity for student-student interaction?
2. Why do you like/dislike providing opportunity for student-student interaction?
3. What kind of activities do you have for student-student interaction?
4. What grouping technique do you use for student-student interaction?
5. Have you got any in-service training on how to conduct effective student – student interactions?
6. What barriers do your students have in student-student interaction in English?
7. What suggestions do you have to improve student-student interaction in English?

D. Closing

1. Thank the interviewee for his/her time and participation.
2. Ask the participant if she/he has any questions.
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Classroom Observation Protocol

A. Background Information

Name of school: ________________________________
Name of Teacher: _______________________________
Topic of Lesson: _________________________________
Total Number of Students: _________________________
Grade Level: _________________________________
Date of Observation: ___________________________
Start time: _________________________________
End time: _________________________________

B. Teacher-student Interaction

1) Classroom structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time spent on type of interaction</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total teaching time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Time spent on T-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Time spent on S-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2). Teacher-student interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode and Pedagogic goals</th>
<th>Interactional features</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managerial:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To transmit information related to the management of the learning</td>
<td>A single, extended teacher turn which uses explanations and/or instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation (clarification request and Confirmation checks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide language practice around a specific piece of material</td>
<td>IRF /Non IRF patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Display /Referential Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form-focused feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation (clarification request and Confirmation checks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill and systems:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide language practice in relation to particular language system or skills</td>
<td>IRF/Non IRF Pattern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Display / Referential Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extended teacher turns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s echo/completion/interruption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form focused feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation (clarification request and Confirmation checks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom context:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enable students to express themselves about feelings, experience, attitudes etc to promote oral fluency</td>
<td>Extended learner turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short teacher turn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referential questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation (clarification request and Confirmation checks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

309
3) Teacher language choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language choice</th>
<th>Total exchanges</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mainly L1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mainly L2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. L1&amp;L2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Student-student Interaction

1) Type of tasks in student-student interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of task</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FLP1: Pair or group work where students ask each other questions on a predetermined topic such as daily routines - in other words, question and answer practice using targeted vocabulary and structures, including survey type activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FLP2: Pair or group work where students describe an item, person or a picture to each other using targeted vocabulary and/or structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FLP3: Pair or group work where students engage in role play either based on a model dialogue or involving a situation which requires them to use familiar and well-rehearsed language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CT1: Pair work where students engage in one or two-way information gap tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CT2: Pair or group work where students work collaboratively to construct text e.g., list questions to ask exchange students who will visit the class in the future; develop an argument for their side for a debate; create a role play; prepare part of a procedural text such as a recipe; list the ingredients of an imaginary dish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (as found in fieldwork):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. .......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Distribution of LREs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Tasks</th>
<th>Correctly resolved</th>
<th>Unresolved/ abandoned</th>
<th>Incorrectly resolved</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

3) Distribution of Linguistic Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Correctly resolved</th>
<th>Unresolved/ Abandoned</th>
<th>Incorrectly resolved</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-V Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) Student language choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language choice</th>
<th>Total exchanges</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mainly L1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mainly L2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. L1&amp;L2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>