University of Southern Queensland

Teachers' Language Ideologies and Classroom Practices in English Bilingual Education:
An Ethnographic Case Study of a Senior High School in Central Java, Indonesia

A dissertation submitted by

Sri Wuli Fitriati
S.Pd. (B.A. English language education)
M.Pd. (M.Ed. English language education)

for the award of

Doctor of Philosophy

2015

ABSTRACT

This dissertation reports on a study that investigated subject teachers' language ideologies of English, conducted *during* the implementation of the government's policy on the use of English alongside Indonesian in teaching Mathematics and Science and habitual language use of English in selected government-owned schools. This was an ethnographic case study of a state Senior High School in a city in the province of Central Java, Indonesia.

This study identified and examined subject teachers' language ideologies about English to gain insight into their language practices in classrooms in enacting the government's promotion of the use of English in school. Central to the study was exploration of links between subject teachers' English language ideologies, classroom practices, and the contexts that shape both of these. Drawing on Kroskrity (2010), I used the concept language ideologies as the conceptual framework of this study. Language ideologies, or beliefs about language, play a powerful role in the English bilingual education practice in the school context.

The participants were teachers of Mathematics, Biology, Chemistry, Geography, and Information and Communication Technology, and some school executives to enhance the extent and depth of convictions about English language use. This study was carried out using multiple methods of data collection: whole-school observations, pre-lesson interviews, classroom observations, post-lesson interviews with video-stimulated recall, observation notes, and site document review. The interpretation and analysis of the data involved cross-checking different sources of evidence. Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis was employed in the analysis of the data.

The analysis of the data revealed that subject teachers held multiple and competing language ideologies about English language use which were manifested in classroom practices. However, teachers' stated language ideologies were not always in alignment with their language practices. The school context impacted on teachers' actions and decision-making on the use of English in the classrooms and in the school. The multiplicity and contested language ideologies circulating in the school promoted and inhibited teachers' use of English.

The study offers deeper insights into the complexity of the implementation of English bilingual education in the selected government-owned school. With regard to the empirical implications of the current study, I propose some suggestions which should be taken into account when establishing English bilingual education, particularly if it is top-down policy.

CERTIFICATION OF DISSERTATION

I, Sri Wuli Fitriati, hereby certify that the ideas, experimental work, results, analyses, and conclusions reported in this dissertation are entirely my own effort, except where otherwise acknowledged. I also certify that the work is original and has not been previously submitted for any other award, except where otherwise acknowledged.

28th February 2015

_____   _____
Signature of Candidate   Date

ENDORSEMENT

February 28, 2015

_____   _____
Signature of Supervisor   Date

March 1, 2015

_____   _____
Signature of Supervisor   Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER 4: TEACHERS' LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES ABOUT ENGLISH

CHAPTER 5: SUBJECT TEACHERS' INTERACTIONAL AND PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES IN CLASSROOMS

LIST OF TABLES

PUBLICATION

The following book chapter has been based on sections of this dissertation and its data.

Fitriati, S. W. (in press). Considering teachers' language ideologies as implicated in a failed innovation. In P. Redmond, J. Lock, P. A. Danaher (Eds), *Educational innovations and contemporary technologies.* Hampshire, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The year 2006 represented a significant milestone in the development of education in Indonesia, with the introduction of an innovation to bring selected Indonesian schools up to an international standard. The Ministry of National Education (MONE) established a program known as *Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional* (translated as Pioneer International Standard Schools). These schools were not newly established schools but schools that had been selected and provided with grants to implement teaching and learning processes that complied with the international standards of developed countries (see further details in Chapter 2). As part of this innovation, these schools were directed to develop English language skills through English bilingual education in Mathematics and Science subjects (Permendiknas, 2009) and to promote habitual English use inside school (Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Menengah, MONE, 2011).

The promotion of English in Pioneer International Standard Schools entailed using the English language in selected government-owned schools, with Science and Mathematics subjects taught in English alongside Indonesian, and other subjects delivered in Indonesian. This policy appears to be in line with two aims of bilingual education provided by C. A. Ferguson, Houghton, and Wells (1977): to enable people to communicate with the outside world and to provide language skills which are marketable, aiding employment and status.

The use of English, alongside Indonesian, in teaching particular content area subjects was a new idea from the government. The aim was to provide English language exposure for students to develop their English proficiency, to prepare Indonesia for the migration of international human resources, to improve competitive skills for the international jobs market and to improve access to the local jobs market provided by foreign-owned companies in Indonesia (Depdiknas, 2009). The government regarded the command of the English language as an essential competency that Indonesian students had to acquire to be proficient in global communication.

However, in January 2013, the educational policy changed, following the Decree of *Mahkamah Konstitusi*/the Indonesian Constitutional Court (The Jakarta Post, 2013). This decree stipulated that Pioneer International Standard Schools had to return to their original status as regular schools and it required the withdrawal of English bilingual education from state schools. At this point, the struggle for bilingual education innovation to improve the English competence of Indonesian school graduates seemed to have failed.

In one sense, the innovation failed because it was terminated by a government decree. However, the current study conducted in one of the Pioneer International Standard Schools suggested that there were other reasons why the innovation might not have been successful. The study considered the problematic implementation of English bilingual education *during* the enactment of the policy. This research study examined teachers' language ideologies, which were identified by Colin Baker (2011) and Garcia (2009) as crucial factors in promoting or inhibiting the success of bilingual education.

Many research studies examined language ideologies within bilingual education in European countries and in the United States. For example, Thomas (2012) investigated language ideologies in English immersion in Austria, Kosovo, and Slovakia. Dworin (2011), Palmer (2011) and Payne (2010) examined language ideologies in bilingual education programs in the United States which consisted of large numbers of immigrant communities. However, there has been almost no research that examines Indonesian teachers' language ideologies surrounding the government's promotion of the use of English in Pioneer International Standard Schools. Indeed, I have been unable to find a single study that has done so. Language ideologies have been neglected in Indonesia's attempt to implement English bilingual education.

The current study examined language ideologies that teachers held and the extent to which their language ideologies influenced their use of English in school, particularly in their classroom practices. The context of the study is in Central Java. As I am a Javanese native speaker, graduate and teach at a state university in the region, I had experience working with teachers in Central Java and learnt about some of the challenges they faced in their attempts to use English in the classroom.

This study provides insight into how language ideologies of teachers, the participants who were at the grassroots level enacting policy, were critical to the success or failure of the use of English in the actual school context. In addition, this study contributes to clarifying stakeholders' awareness of the role of language ideologies in the future development of English bilingual education practices in the Indonesian schools. This study raises significant issues regarding language ideologies as this concept has received little attention and has been overlooked in sociolinguistic studies, foreign language education policy, and educational language policy in Indonesia.

MY PERSONAL STORY: MY STARTING POINT

I consider it is relevant to describe my personal story that explains my reason for conducting this research and how I came to the concept of language ideologies as being a powerful influence on teachers' behaviour.

As a starting point, I find it useful to describe my background. I am an Indonesian from Javanese ethnic group and a lecturer in English language education at a state university in Central Java. From 2009 to 2011, I was invited by the regional office of Education and Culture Department of Central Java Province (*Dinas Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Jawa Tengah*) to be a provider of English training for Pioneer International Standard School teachers in Central Java. The training focused on the introduction of English as an instructional language.

In 2009 in one English training session in a Pioneer International Standard School, I heard a teacher who taught English as a subject make a challenging statement in front of his colleagues. He stated that, as a Pioneer International Standard School, his was different from regular schools. Teachers, students, the school principal, and administration staff were supposed to use English for everyday communication. However, his statement stimulated contention among five English subject teachers who were present. One of them commented that it would be difficult for teachers to use English outside the classroom. She said that using English in school was not a common behaviour for all school community members. Triggered by this event, I began to realise that teachers, even from the same school, had different views on the use of English in the school.

I was curious to know of English in the school, so in 2010 a colleague and I conducted a small study on the use of English in teaching Mathematics and Science subjects (Fitriati & Utami, 2010). This project was funded by the Research Institute at *Universitas Negeri Semarang* (Semarang State University) where I was teaching. The descriptive qualitative study employed classroom observations and interviews with subject teachers. The aims were to discover the extent to which subject teachers used English in teaching and the kinds of English classroom expressions used by the teachers. Even though it was a small study, the findings directed me to consider that sociocultural factors around the school might have influenced the teachers' use of English.

In the following year, 2011, with another research grant from the same institution, I conducted a study on teachers' perceptions of English language in another Pioneer International Standard School in Central Java (Fitriati, 2010). I defined perception as a belief or opinion held by teachers about English language regarding its use as the medium of instruction in Science and Mathematics subjects. I chose a different school with the purpose of comparing teachers' English language use to that of the previous school. The findings of the study in 2010 confirmed that the sociocultural context of the school influenced teachers' views about using the English language.

Later in 2011, a statement from a school principal of a Pioneer International Standard School in Central Java caused me to react. In an opening speech before an English workshop, the school principal said:

> *Ini ada bu Wuli di sini yang akan memberikan pelatihan bahasa Inggris kepada bapak dan ibu. Bu Wuli juga akan menjelaskan mengapa bapak dan ibu harus berbahasa Inggris di kelas*. (My translation: Here is Ms Wuli with us now to give you English training. Ms Wuli will explain why you teachers should use English in classroom). (Principal's opening remarks in an English language training in a Pioneer International Standard School in Central Java, June 2011)

I reflected on the principal's statement after the training, believing previously that teachers must have the same shared view on the government's policy on the use of English in the school. His words alerted me to my own bias in favour of the use of English in this type of school. At the time I tended to be on the government's side in encouraging teachers to use English; I lacked awareness that teachers had their own voices and yet were silent but ready to express those beliefs about the English language. Over the course of my involvement in the English training conducted by the local government, I witnessed contentions among teachers on the use of English. I had a growing concern that perceptions teachers had about English language and their perceptions of their own abilities to communicate in English might have played a fundamental role in their classroom practices which indeed may reflect their linguistic ideologies.

During the early period of my doctoral study, following on from the findings of my preliminary studies, literature review, and intense consultation with my research supervisors in the process of preparing the current research project, I recognised that ideology was the powerful conceptual reality for those involved as a stakeholder in the use of English in school. Garcia (2009) and Colin Baker (2011) claimed also that language ideologies play a crucial role in bilingual education practices, by either promoting or inhibiting implementation of bilingual education. Language ideologies include perceptions, opinions, understandings, beliefs,

expectations, evaluations, and judgments of language (Kroskrity, 2010; McGroarty, 2010; Song, 2007, 2009). My hunch was that a set of beliefs about English held by subject teachers might influence their language choice and language use. Further, as McGroarty (2010) asserts, the influence is not always directly observable but can be inferred from the nature of individual and group actions, expectations and decisions as they occur in different social contexts.

Given this background, through the concept of language ideologies as the approach to investigation, the current study examines what teachers thought, perceived, believed, and felt in enacting the government's promotion of using English in the school context. I aimed to discern the kinds of language ideologies teachers held. It was my suspicion that teachers' language ideologies had a bearing on their language use both in their classrooms and in the school community. Ethnographic research methods were employed to better understand teachers' language ideologies about English and their manifestations in classroom practices. The methodology included conducting participant observations, in-depth interviews, and site document review since ethnographic methods, such as discourse analysis of face-to-face interactions, provide an essential lens for understanding language ideologies in situ (Razfar & Rumenapp, 2012).

AIMS OF THE STUDY
Following consideration of the background of the study and reasons for the study, and review of the literature, I developed three key focal areas for investigation. My study aims to identify and examine:

(1) subject teachers' language ideologies about English in regard to the government's promotion of the use of English alongside Indonesian in Mathematics and Science subjects and as a habitual use in a state senior high school in Central Java, Indonesia;

(2) manifestations of subject teachers' English language ideologies in their actual classroom practices; and

(3) school executives' language ideologies about English and the impact of their language ideologies on subject teachers' classroom practices.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS
Following identification of the problem, the literature review and delineation of the focal areas for investigation, this study endeavoured to address the following questions:

(1) What were subject teachers' language ideologies about English that informed what they said about their use of English in a state senior high school in Central Java?

(2) How were subject teachers' English language ideologies manifested in their classroom practices?

(3) What were school executives' language ideologies about English and what was the impact of their language ideologies on subject teachers' classroom practices?

OVERVIEW OF THIS DISSERTATION
This dissertation is organised into seven chapters. This chapter provides the introduction to the study. Then, I present my personal story as a starting point for the study, followed by aims of the study, research questions, and overview of the dissertation.

In Chapter 2, I review the relevant literature and theoretical framework informing this study. The theoretical framework centres on the key concepts of language ideologies including methods in discovering and analysing language ideologies by reviewing major studies conducted at other various research sites, particularly where English is a foreign language. The chapter also reviews prevailing language ideologies of English as the global language, the status of English language in Indonesia, and codeswitching and safetalk strategies as central themes relevant to teachers' classroom practices.

In Chapter 3, I discuss the research methodology. I begin by revisiting the research questions and purposes of the study, then I frame the current study by describing the research site, access to the site, participants of the study, and my role as the researcher. I explain data collection methods that include whole-school observations, classroom observations, pre-lesson interviews, post-lesson interviews with video stimulated recall, site document reviews, and informal conversations. I also discuss how I analyse these multiple sources of data and address the issue of trustworthiness.

Chapters 4, 5, and 6 present the data analyses and discussion of the findings. Chapter 4 focuses on subject teachers' language ideologies about English. Chapter 5 looks into manifestations of the teachers' language ideologies in their observed classroom practices. In Chapter 6, I discuss the circulating English language ideologies as constructed by school executives and examine the influence of their English language ideologies on teachers' classroom practices. All three analysis chapters were framed by language ideologies as the theoretical orientation of the study.

I summarise the main findings in Chapter 7. It shows the interrelationships of subject teachers' English language ideologies, manifestations of their language ideologies in actualities of classroom practices, and competing English language ideologies among the school executives. I also explore implications of the study and discuss its limitations. The final section of Chapter 7 provides recommendations for future research directions.

SUMMARY

This chapter provides the introduction to the study. I presented my personal story as the starting point, followed by aims of the study and the research questions. I then provided a brief overview of the dissertation. In the next chapter, Chapter 2, I will review related literature and discuss language ideologies as the theoretical orientation which underpinned "as both conceptual resource and methodological inspiration" (Kroskrity, 2010, p. 206) in the study.

CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
AND LITERATURE REVIEW

In Chapter 1 I described the underlying assumptions of the significance of conducting the current research by looking into the important role of teachers' language ideologies in enacting the government's promotion of the use of English in an Indonesian selected school. This chapter, Chapter 2, comprises two main parts: theoretical framework and literature review. The theoretical framework section discusses language ideologies as the theoretical lens of the study. The literature review section will discuss, among other things, some prevalent English language ideologies in a globalised world, status of English in Indonesia, and prevalent language practices in bilingual and multilingual classrooms.

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AS A THEORETICAL LENS FOR THE STUDY
Introduction
Language ideologies is a concept which has been developed in the field of linguistic anthropology by Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity (1998). Their work has facilitated analyses of language use in cultural contexts such as education and educational linguistics. Language ideologies as an area of inquiry across disciplines has been well established by Schieffelin, Woolard and Kroskrity (1998), Wortham (2008), Kroskrity (2004, 2010), and K.A. Woolard (2010).

This section reviews theoretical issues associated with language ideologies. As an approach to investigation, language ideologies provide a valuable framework and method for better understanding subject teachers' beliefs and feelings about the English language, which was promoted as the language to be used in Indonesian Pioneer International Standard Schools. To begin this section, I discuss pertinent definitions of language ideologies. Following the definitions, I present conceptual foundations as theories of language ideologies, and methods for analysing language ideologies by overviewing empirical research on language ideologies that have been conducted at various sites. The final section summarises key aspects from the review.

Definitions of language ideologies
The concept of language ideologies rooted in the general concept of ideology – that is the foundation of the social representations shared by a social group (Woolard, 1998). The term ideology in language studies refers to a shared body of commonsense notions about the nature of language, the nature and purpose of communication, and appropriate communicative behaviour; these commonsense notions and assumptions are seen as expressions of a collective order (Woolard, 1992). The ways in which I understood and analyzed various language ideologies studies have shaped my understanding that language ideologies are often naturalized, beliefs, ideas or values concerning language. Language ideologies emerged as a separate field of study within linguistic anthropology in the last decade of the 20th century and are concerned with the nexus of language and culture (Lonsmann, 2011). In the analysis of the study, I draw on theories and methods from language ideologies framework.

The role of language ideologies in promoting or inhibiting the success of bilingual education (e.g., Jeon, 2007; Palmer, 2011; Pastor, 2008), heritage language education (e.g., King, 2000), and foreign language education (e.g., Razfar & Rumenapp, 2012; Song, 2007, 2009) has been well established. The study of language ideologies is a field of study within linguistic anthropology that was originally developed "as a means of interpreting cultural conceptions of language, and analysing collective linguistic behaviour" (Blackledge, 2000, p. 26). This view considered that there was a tendency to link language and people such as equating national and regional groups and their linguistic behaviour.

Definitions of language ideologies vary widely following the broader concept of ideologies. Woolard (2010) points out four central features which recur in discussions of ideologies:

> Ideologies are most typically taken as conceptual or ideational, having to do with consciousness, beliefs, notions, or ideas. Ideologies are conceptualised as derived from, rooted in, reflective of, or responsive to the experience or interests of a particular social position, although they may be presented as universally true. Ideologies are closely related to distortion, illusion, falsity, mystification, or rationalization. Ideology is an intimate connection to social power and its legitimation. (pp. 237 – 238)

Rooted in these general concepts of ideologies, researchers focus on different aspects in their definitions with different emphases and interpretations (Lonsmann, 2011).

I use Silverstein's (1979) definition as a starting point. He defined language ideologies as "any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (p. 193). Here Silverstein stressed "the explicit expression of language ideologies as articulated rationalisations" (Lonsmann, 2011, p. 222) and later defined language ideologies in "the abstract (and often implicit) belief systems related to language and linguistic behaviour that affect speakers' choices and interpretations of communicative interactions" (Silversten, 1998, p. 138). Silverstein's later view (1998) seemed to be different from his previous definition (1979) as he pointed out that language ideologies are often unconscious thoughts and feelings which include opinions, expectations, evaluations, and judgments about languages. Therefore, language ideologies must be inferred from individual and group actions occuring in social and cultural contexts (Silverstein, 1998). K.A. Woolard (1998) defined language ideologies socially as "people's representations, whether explicit or implicit, about language and language use that construed the intersection of language and human beings in a social world" (p. 3).

In line with Silverstein's (1998) definition, McGroarty (2010) viewed language ideologies as "the understanding, beliefs and expectations that influence all choices made by language users even when implicit" (p. 3). Whether explicit or implicit, language ideologies incorporate evaluations and judgments, often unconsciously, about appropriate language forms and functions and opinions by individuals and groups who use the language (McGroarty, 2010). According to Song (2007), the beliefs include, for example, "ideas about the status of specific languages, the appropriateness or inappropriateness of some expressions in particular contexts, and how language should be taught to children" (p. 26). As is evident from this discussion, language ideologies have been defined as explicit beliefs and as implicit assumptions about language.

Conceptual foundations of language ideologies

The concept of language ideologies is regarded as "a cluster of concepts, consisting of a number of convergent dimensions" (Kroskrity, 2010, p. 195). In the following section I will discuss five foundational tenets of language ideologies theory which Kroskrity (2004, 2010) has amplified.

The first foundational tenet of language ideologies is that "language ideologies represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group" (Kroskrity, 2010, p. 195). This first tenet means that people's language ideologies are "context-bound that is necessarily constructed from the sociocultural experience of the speaker" (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 496) including "their political and economic interests" (Dyers & Abongdia, 2010, p. 122). Language ideologies are viewed as constructed in the interest of specific groups, rather than individuals. Lonsmann (2011) elaborates this first tenet:

> That they are shared does not mean that all members of the speech community share all language ideologies, but that some individuals share one language ideology which reflects the interests of this group, and that members of another group, which may include some of the same individuals, share another language ideology. (p. 224)

As language ideologies are grounded in people's sociocultural experiences and interests, language ideologies are multiple and shared.

In the second foundational tenet of language ideologies, Kroskrity (2010) highlighted multiplicity of language ideologies that people hold. He asserted that:

> language ideologies are profitably conceived as multiple because of the plurality of meaningful social divisions (class, gender, clan, elites, generations, and so on) within sociocultural groups that have the potential to produce divergent perspectives expressed as indices of group membership. (Kroskrity, 2010, p. 197)

The second tenet emphasises that language ideologies, as beliefs, or feelings, about languages as used in the users' social worlds are multiple. People (based on their social experiences) may have very different perceptions, beliefs and attitudes about language. In other words, one person can have multiple views about language. Dyers and Abongdia (2010) contended that "different language ideologies can become contentious within the same group and lead to tensions between what are often state-endorsed dominant ideologies and their opponents" (p. 122). This suggests that language ideologies are context-bound, are grounded in social experience, and differ from one person to the next. Language ideologies are viewed as multiple rather than homogeneous. In regard to multiplicity, Gal (1998) argued that different ideologies exist within a speech community as people "construct differing views arising from their different social positions" (p. 320). For that reason, language ideologies are inherently plural.

The third foundational tenet of language ideologies is that "members may display varying degrees of awareness of local language ideologies" (Kroskrity, 2010, p. 197). The core of the third tenet is "how *conscious* members of a society are about their attitudes towards languages" (Dyers & Abongdia, 2010, p. 122). Dyers and Abongdia further explained:

> Those who are most conscious of their ideologies are the ones likely to be most vocal about the value of different languages. But ordinary people's ideologies are more likely to be reflected in their actual

language usage - the languages they prefer to use as opposed to the languages they avoid using. (p. 122)

It cannot be assumed that all members of any community or any group share similar consciousness of their own or others' language-related beliefs. Varied degrees of awareness arise because of differences in people's life experience. Hence, language ideologies are also common-sense assumptions (McGroarty, 2010).

The fourth foundational tenet of language ideologies is that "members' language ideologies mediate between social structures and forms of talk" (Kroskrity, 2010, p. 200). Kroskrity's fourth tenet has been explained by McGroarty (2010) in that:

speakers' involvement in and perceptions of the life activities that occur within all the social units in which they participate, be they families, neighbourhoods, villages, work groups, schools and classrooms, clubs, or religious and occupational institutions, shape their construction of linguistic ideologies. (p.8)

Dyers and Abongdia (2010) elaborated this fourth tenet in that "people are quite *selective* about the features of language and the role of particular languages in society when expressing their language ideologies" (p. 122). To illustrate this, they gave certain examples of language ideologies, "That language/language variety is far too coarse/common/disrespectful to be used here" or "My language cannot be used at university level" (p. 122). The two examples provided by Dyers and Abongdia suggest that people's forms of talk differentiate their social status and cause people to become aware of feelings of subordination in their poorer use of English.

The fifth foundational tenet of language ideologies is that "language ideologies are major determinants of social and cultural identities" (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 498). Kroskrity suggested that language ideologies can create and represent various social and cultural identities, including nationality and ethnicity. Language ideologies are always socially situated and connected to questions of identity and power (Blackledge, 2000). Thus, language ideologies have a role in identity construction.

The conceptual foundations of language ideologies established by Kroskrity (2004, 2010) were influential in, for example, Lonsmann's research (2011) on language choice and language ideologies in an international company in Denmark. She principally followed Kroskrity and articulated clearly her working definitions of language ideologies as follows:

- language ideologies can be found both in explicitly stated beliefs and in underlying implicit assumptions
- language ideologies are situated in specific socio-cultural contexts
- language ideologies are grounded in social experience subject to the interests of their bearer's social position
- multiple, potentially conflicting, language ideologies co-exist in a speech community
- language ideologies are shared by groups of individuals rather than by all members of the speech community
- language ideologies are both determined by power relations and contribute to creating them
- language ideologies are performative in their ability to influence social and linguistic practices; as they e.g. constitute social groups,

formulate and disable discourses and valorise social identities and practice. (pp. 228-229)

The working definitions of language ideologies by Lonsmann (2011) seem to help make the concept clearer as theoretical notion in identification and exploration of language ideologies. A language ideologies approach is relevant to identify, explore and interpret language ideologies in a school and in classrooms where English is a foreign language. To identify and examine language ideologies, researchers can utilise a range of methods for analysing language ideologies and I will discuss these in the following section.

Methods for investigating language ideologies

In considering where language ideologies are evident, Woolard (1998) proposes "three sitings" (p. 9) in:

(1) linguistic practice itself;

(2) explicit talk about language, that is, metalinguistic or metapragmatic discourse; and

(3) the regimentation of language use through more implicit metapragmatics.

Lonsmann (2011) uses the term *levels* to refer to Woolard's three sitings. I am not in support of using the term *levels* in analysing language ideologies as they may connote that first level is more or less important than the second and third levels. I argue that the term 'three sitings' used by Woolard (1998) means three ways and, therefore, language ideologies can be identified through examining: (1) people's linguistic practice, i.e., the use of language, (2) people's talk about language, and (3) people's implicit assumptions about language.

The three ways for identifying language ideologies have been evident in many areas of language ideologies-related research. For example, Jeon (2007) focussed on the second and third ways of identifying language ideologies by investigating language ideologies surrounding the Korean language through analysing both explicit and implicit metalinguistic discourses that she and her students constructed about learning the Korean language, and implicit language use regarding the issue. In her study, Jeon tried to understand the kinds of language ideologies that she and her students constructed about the Korean language. Her students were mainly Korean-American university students who learned Korean as their heritage language in the United States. Through interviews, tape-recorded conversations between some of her students and their parents, journal exchanges and email correspondence, her analysis revealed ideologies of the Korean language in various speech events. One example of Jeon's data collection methods was asking her students to write an essay about the reasons why they wanted to learn Korean. This method seems to fit Woolard's second siting, metalinguistic discourse. She also used the third way (implicit metapragmatics) when she looked for the language ideologies of her students' parents as expressed in their conversations with their children.

A study which used solely the third way, implicit metapragmatics, was conducted by Lee (2010). Lee investigated ideologies of English in the South Korea by looking at news articles and editorials of two different newspapers that dealt with the new government's policy proposal for English medium classes in public schools, and explored "how the policy is presented in print media through which preexisting language ideologies are reproduced and manipulated" (p. 254). Using critical discourse analysis from Fairclough (2001), Lee's analysis illustrated how the print media texts took up ideologies of the English language in different ways, but ended

up with the conclusion that the two newspapers supported similar ideological positions, that was English language proficiency played an important role in South Korea.

An investigation which employed all the three ways of identifying language ideologies was conducted by Godley, Carpenter, and Werner (2007). In the context of their study in the United States, some school districts had 'Daily Language Practice' or was also often called 'Daily Oral Language.' This 10 minute activity as a class opener aimed to engage students in daily practice of the rules of prescriptive grammar through correction of errors in single sentences that students saw on the blackboard. This study was conducted in Grade 10 English classes that consisted of mainly African-American students in an urban school. The focus of the observations was to look at the students' choice of language varieties, specifically the contrasts between African-American vernacular versus standard English. Using an ethnography of communication from Duff (2002) and Saville-Troike (1989), they discovered language ideologies in linguistic practice itself by analysing the transcripts of audio and video of classroom activities to identify recurring themes including teacher and students' talk and comments when doing the English editing activities. One of the findings was that regarding content, the activities were predominated with beliefs about a single, correct, authoritative standard form for written English, and a belief that there was one proper dialect, while others were slang.

Researchers of language ideologies can focus on one or more of the three different ways for analysing language ideologies following their particular research problems and decisions on what constitute their data (McGroarty, 2010). Furthermore, Kroskrity (2010) suggested two strands of analyses of language ideologies: neutral ideological analysis and critical ideological analysis. He explained:

> The distinction between **neutral ideological analysis** (focusing on 'culturally shared' beliefs and practices) and **critical ideological analysis** that emphasises the political use of language as a particular group's instrument of symbolic domination may seem more gradient than dichotomous. (p. 196)

Kroskrity's crucial insight has been echoed by McGroarty (2010) suggesting that the distinction between neutral ideological analysis and critical ideological analysis is more a continuum than a clear dichotomy. McGroarty explained the differentiation of neutral and critical uses of the term language ideologies:

> Neutral uses include investigations of all systems of cultural representation described in an objective manner, while critical uses of the term extend only to certain linguistic phenomena that emphasise the social-cognitive function of ideologies and concomitant possibilities for bias and distortion based on speakers' social and political interests. The consequent distortion, they [Woolard and Schieffelin, 1994] note, may help to legitimize mechanism of social domination, and is often foregrounded in research on language politics and on language, literacy and social class. (p.6)

Common examples of neutral approaches to language ideologies which emphasise language ideologies as representative of an entire community or culture are often documented in ethnographic research. Critical approaches to language ideologies explore the capacity for language and linguistic ideologies to be used as strategies for

maintaining social power and domination, and these are often found in discussions of language politics and the intersection between language and social class (Kroskrity, 2004, 2010).

As Kroskrity (2010) and McGroarty (2010) explained, the different approaches to language ideologies between neutral and critical are not completely opposite things. Whether critical or neutral, researchers on language ideologies carry out systematic, intensive, and detailed observations of phenomena under study (Song, 2007). Following Song (2007), I take the stance that this current study is located somewhere between neutral and critical approaches as it investigates subject teachers' linguistic practices (micro-level) with attention to the school's wider sociopolitical and sociocultural factors and language ideologies (macro-level).

Teachers' language ideologies

Language ideologies influence all choices made by language users. Eunah (2012) argued that in educational settings, teachers' language ideologies mediate classroom discourse practices, even though the influence of language ideologies on people's language choices and use is not always directly observable (McGroarty, 2010). Teachers' language choices can show their commonsense assumptions about what a language is, how it functions, and what social and political identities they have (Eunah, 2012) and "the use of a language is assumed to imply about political loyalty and identity" (Gal, 1998, p. 317).

Teachers' language choice and behaviour in classrooms are reflections of their language ideologies. Jeon (2007) stated, "Language ideologies as a social production are constructed within and through everyday language practice, and in turn people's language practice reflects their language ideologies" (p. 118). Olivio's (2003) research findings were in line with Jeon's assertion. Employing an ethnographic study, Olivio explored a conflicting array of language ideologies that circulated through English-as-a-second-language classroom practices in a Canadian senior public school. He found that language ideologies emerged not only in teachers' stated beliefs, but more saliently in their actual daily practices both in their teaching and in discussing their students' performances. He conducted participant observations by accompanying select groups of English-as-a-second-language students in their daily school routines (e.g., going to the library, assemblies, or on field trips, lunch time). Structured interviews with the English-as-a-second-language teacher and his assistants as well as interviews with their students and classroom observation were conducted where he looked at spontaneous interactions in the classroom. Olivio examined the result of tensions between conflicting ideologies, and concluded that the ideologies held by the students as well as the teacher and his assistants had potential effects on the students' ability to learn English as a second language.

Although teachers' language practices are reflections of their language ideologies, research studies show that their language ideologies are not invariably aligned with their classroom language practices. McGroarty (2010) stated that "actual language behaviour may not always be consistent with explicitly proclaimed language ideologies, for many reasons" (p. 3). Various manifestations of language ideologies in classroom practices emerge as they can include elements that are internally contradictory (McGroarty, 2010), multiple and potentially conflicting (Kroskrity, 2004, 2010; Lonsmann, 2011).

This suggests that manifestations of teachers' language ideologies in their classroom practices should be examined not only through in-depth interviews but

also participant observations to investigate contexts and realities where teachers' language ideologies present. Through using language ideologies as an overaching framework, the current investigation examines what teachers think, perceive, believe, and feel in enacting the government's promotion of using English in the actual school context. Against this backdrop, the research examines teachers' dominant language ideologies that seemed to circulate in the school. That is to say, language ideologies that have developed in the school might impact on teachers' classroom practices.

Summary
This first main section of this chapter provided a theoretical framework for the study. I have reviewed the definitions and the conceptual foundations of language ideologies to provide understanding in analysis and interpretation of findings of the current research. Following the key concepts of language ideologies, I discussed three ways of investigating language ideologies by presenting some empirical research on language ideologies in various sites and areas of inquiry. In the next section, I will review the related literature, including some prevalent ideologies of the English language that are most widespread and deeply-held regarding globalization.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Introduction
This is the second main section of Chapter 2. I present the review on related literature. The review includes some prevalent English language ideologies in the global context, current status and the role of English in Indonesia, the context of the study, research studies in relation to the use of English in Pioneer International Standard Schools, definitions of bilingual education, and prevalent language practice in bilingual and multilingual classroom contexts.

Some prevalent English language ideologies in a global context
The focus of this subsection is to review some major ideologies of the English language in a global context. This review derives from previous empirical studies on English language ideologies and provides a basis for a synthesis of the claims that I will make in the data analysis chapters.

A provocative argument about English is that the spread of English is a form of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992). Phillipson viewed that the global teaching of English, which have been promoted by the United States and the United Kingdom, was an act of linguistic imperialism. The transfer of English language to other people, other countries, and other cultures is an act of linguistic imperialism because this has been seen as dominant and has been undermining multilingualism in the world. The spread of English language education globally marginalized the rights of the widespread of other languages and multilingual education in the world. Two decades on from when Phillipson's book was published, his arguments have been challenged. There have been various ways in which present-day English use has been characterized.

The most prevailing view about English today is that there is a high demand for English worldwide to many factors such as economy, trade, tourism, education, and regional cooperation and development. It is significant and necessary to learn English as people from different countries with different languages, when they

interact each other, rely on the use of English for international communication.English is preferrable as it is much more widespread than other foreign languages in many countries. The use of English for international communication is heavily related to the special role that English plays in every country. The special roles of English, according to Crystal (2003) include: (1) English is the native or first language of majority of the people in a country and used almost in all functions, such as in the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia; (2) English is a second language as it serves as the official language used in governments, law courts, media and educational system, such as in the Philippines and South Africa; and (3) English is a primary language, the priority, in a country's foreign language teaching such as in China, Thailand, and Indonesia.

Crystal (2003) viewed the pervasiveness of English today can not be separated from globalization and English language use is manifested in various domains of life. For example, government workers involved in international engagement are increasingly expected to develop proficiency in English (Nunan, 2003). Collaboration among countries, such as at government official level, whose official languages are different from one another require a shared language, and it is English which is more often selected as it tends to be used, more than other languages. The conceptualization that English is an international language is focused on the practical fact that English is used to communicate ideas and cultures to others in international scope (McKay, 2010).

The international scope of English was also evident as the language has been designated the official language for world organisation's activities. Zentz (2012) observed that the United Nations with its many official languages maintains English as its most common working language. Also, regional political organizations like ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) and SEAMEO (Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organisation) have adopted English as their official and/or working language (Kirkpatrick, 2011). Kirkpatrick asserted that the privileging of English includes the desire to participate in and benefit from internationalization and the knowledge economy. English is considered a very important linguistic tool that helps individuals and countries to develop and compete globally. As globalization spreads, investment in English language proficiency increases.

The global status of the English language has also been observed through the use of English as the language of business, technology, science, the Internet, popular entertainment, and even sports (Nunan, 2003). English is regarded as an important mechanism for direct acquisition of knowledge in the field of science and technology (M. Tan & Lan, 2010). Extensive science knowledge is written in English that needs to be accessed by English-as-foreign-language countries. It is also acknowledged by Kirkpatrick (2009) based on his study on the use of English as a medium of instruction in education throughout East and Southeast Asia that English is used for the dissemination of knowledge and is by far the most important language of scientific and scholarly conferences. Similarly, Saito (2013) found that the participants of his study, Japanese youths, positively depicted English as the language which opens access to new concepts, information, and knowledge which are not available within Japanese society.

Coleman (2009, 2010, 2011) observed that English connected with internationalization, including the use of English as the medium of instruction in subjects like Maths and Science. Besides, English is used to teach in a number of programs offered at the tertiary level across Asia (Kirkpatrick, 2011). English gives

nations a means to generate publicity of their presence in the international arena (Saito, 2013). Saito added that English plays a significant role in "the dynamism of interaction and mutual understanding through dialogue mediated by English" (p. 156). Recently, there have been much attention to analysis of interaction between second language speakers of English which was termed English as a lingua franca talk (McKay, 2010). English as a lingua franca interactions are those in which English is used as "a contact language between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication" (Firth, 1996, p. 240). This universality of English as an international language was showed in, for example, Lonsmann's study (2011) in an international company in Denmark. Her findings showed that English is the language for communication with people from abroad, no matter where they come from. Her findings revealed that English is the natural choice in the workplace when it comes to international communication or communication with non-Danish speakers. English "is the only language seriously considered for international communication" (Lonsmann, 2011, p. 257).

English language proficiency provides benefits for individual personal development. The benefits or advantages attached to English are in the forms of social capital, cultural capital, and professional capital (Lee, 2010; Young, 2011). In terms of cultural capital which includes linguistic capital, it is evident that English is becoming increasingly significant as a university entry requirement. English is required as part of the entrance examination for state universities, such as in Thailand, and becomes a medium of instruction in some international programs offered by a number of universities (Noytim, 2006). Another example of evidence of linguistic capital was stated by Crystal (2003), who suggested that people who write up their research in languages other than English might have their work ignored by the international community. English is a common language for transferring local and/or regional knowledge and information from non-English speaking countries to be disseminated globally. In a global sense, English is a world language and its primary function is to enable speakers to share their ideas and culture with others.

In addition, English provides cultural capital in terms of understanding and enjoying entertainment, such as music, movies, television, news, and the Internet (Young, 2011). For example, it is used to gain access to knowledge and information through computer-mediated communication including email, chat and the resources of the World Wide Web (Noytim, 2006), and for research, news, entertainment, and social networking sites such as Facebook (Young, 2011). Recreation, tourist activities, and entertainment through media such as newspapers, magazines, movies, some TV programs, and radio programs can widely be accessed in English (Noytim, 2006).

In terms of social and economic capital, English enhances opportunities in one's job and career. Nunan (2003) in his study on the role of English in Asia-Pasific region, including China, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Taiwan, and Vietnam, found that English enhances promotional prospects in the workplace and employment. Likewise, the findings of Saito's study (2013) in a Japanese context showed that "English is purported to be something that may open up a wider range of options and opportunities in one's career and life after graduation" (p. 146). Saito's findings echoed Balla and Pennington (1996) that Hong Kong students associated English with education and career. In professional capital terms, Young's (2011)

study revealed that English becomes a valuable skill for interacting with friends and professional colleagues throughout the world.

Research studies which particularly used a language ideologies approach to the investigation of the English language revealed multiple ideologies about English. For example, Lee's (2010) study was stimulated by English language policy debate reported in newspaper articles and editorials in South Korea. She investigated the status and social meaning of English in South Korea in order to understand the process by which the linguistic and cultural hegemony of English had become pervasive at all levels of Korean society. She investigated a specific context in which the new South Korean president at the time proposed a call for English immersion in public schools. Lee argued that, although the plan was eventually withdrawn due to intense public opposition, the debate provided a rich site for studying the ideological process of reproducing the hegemonic status of English in Korea.

Lee (2010) discussed ideologies of English in Korea taken from a language policy debate that took place in early 2008. She also looked at news articles and editorials of two different Korean newspapers that dealt with the new government's policy proposal for English-medium classes in public schools where overt metalinguistic statements about English language in Korean society were constituted, exchanged, and contested. She highlighted that her focus was "*describing* ideological constructions evident in the policy debate, not *evaluating* the particular policy or *suggesting* future language policy reforms" (p. 247). The findings of her study revealed "different themes of ideologies that emerge from the political and intellectual texts of the debate" (p. 248) in which English policy in Korea was entangled with various ideological positions. For example, the positive themes included, "English leads to national competitiveness," (p. 249) "conversational English is a top priority," (p. 250) and "English brings equality" (p. 252). Lee argued that based on her findings, Korea seemed to emphasise the symbolic capital of English. Once English is fully attained, that will boost the nation's economy. English is perceived as a commodity which means that English has an economic value. She further concluded that the ideologies embedded the perception that English is closely tied to the survival of a nation within the context of globalization.

Language ideological research carried out in family sites also indicates dominant English language ideologies. For example, Song (2009) studied English language ideologies of two groups of Korean families, Korean immigrants and early study abroad sojourners, in the United States of America. Song's interviews with the Korean families in her study revealed that they circulated particularly two language ideologies of global English: "English as marketable commodity" and "English for cosmopolitan membership" (p. 23). The first ideology that "English as marketable commodity" included the mothers' views that investing in English education is the most valuable investment for their children. Song (2009) inferred that for her respondents, English learning constitutes an economic capital or economic investment. Song argued that the belief was associated with two perspectives. First, the parents perceived the symbolic value of English (Bourdieu, 1991) is higher than that of other languages in terms of its cost. Second, the parents did not consider public English education in Korea to be efficient. Therefore, these two perspectives motivated the parents to undertake transnational migration especially to the United States for their children to learn English. The ideology that "English for cosmopolitan membership" was grounded in the mothers' view that English

education is important to provide their children with new experiences that broaden their perspectives and provide them with an opportunity for global citizenship.

English language informal educational institutions were the research sites of Pan's study (2011) in China. She examined how Chinese learners of English perceived the language and how they engaged in teaching and learning the language outside formal educational institutions, namely, Olympic community English classes and English corners, during 2006-2008 when Beijing was preparing for and hosting the 2008 Olympic Games. In group discussions and interviews with working professionals and retired senior citizens, she found why the respondents devoted their spare time to learning English voluntarily and what English meant to them. Her research findings showed that her respondents associated English learning with multiple benefits to life and career; they expressed a strong confidence that English would not be a threat to the Chinese language and culture and they claimed that English was useful to the development of China both now and in the long term.

The English language ideologies in the empirical research studies reviewed in this section are tied to the context of a globalizing world. These are by no means the only widespread ideologies of the English language; however, they are the ones most likely to have some bearing on data. The prevailing ideologies about English language use in a global context have impacted on the status and role of English in Indonesia, as I will now outline in the following section.

Current status and role of English in Indonesia

This section aims at providing understanding about the status and the important roles of the English language in Indonesia today. This overview will provide useful information as the basis of analysing the data of the current research.

English is the prime foreign language in Indonesia. It has been the first foreign language to be taught in Indonesian schools as a compulsory subject in junior and senior high schools, in Year 7 through Year 12 since 1945 (Dardjowidjojo, 2000; Lie, 2007) and as a local content subject in some primary schools in cities and urban areas. English for Specific Purposes is taught for several semesters at university based on the majors of students. According to Dardjowidjojo (2000), English has been chosen to be the first foreign language in Indonesia because it has "international stature" (p. 23), a special status due to the large number of English speakers worldwide.

English is used for international communication. As Lauder (2008) observed, a good command of English for Indonesian people is a way to get to know native speakers of English, their language, culture and literature as a means of expanding one's intellectual horizon. In relation to faster national development, Hamied (2012), an Indonesian distinguished educator of Indonesian teachers teaching English, pointed out that to improve Indonesia's current political and economic standing and to introduce its own marketable strengths and capacities to the global community, English is very important and necessary as it "is an indispensable tool in global competition and cooperation" (Hamied, 2012, p. 63). He stressed that many Indonesians need adequate proficiency in English to establish and maintain intensive bilateral and multilateral communication and interactions with other countries.

English is used for the acquisition of knowledge of science and technology. There have been growing views that English is a tool to bring in specific information as information is commonly disseminated in English (Lauder, 2008). University students in Indonesia commonly are assigned to read some references in English to complete their courses as it is perceived as the prime foreign language which is

necessary to access up-to-date information, knowledge and technology. Lamb and Coleman (2008) observed that English is an entrance requirement of "prestigious" Indonesian universities.

Currently, not only "prestigious" universities as Lamb and Coleman (2008) observed, but nearly all state and private Indonesian universities set an English test for their student candidates. In addition, before finishing higher education studies, from bachelor, Master, and doctorate degrees, students are required to take an English proficiency test, usually in the form of Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). Generally, undergraduate results of TOEFL test are used as an initial diagnosis of their English competence since the language skills are required in some workplaces.

English is in high demand in the Indonesian labour market. For example, Young (2011) found that most participants of his study in the Indonesian context had more practical reasons related to working and academic opportunities for learning English. Young gave evidence that:

> English is also used at the local level in Serang and parts of Banten, particularly the city of Cilegon, which has many international corporations. Indonesians communicate with foreigners from nearby Asian countries and around the world in English, and use English as a common language in order to learn these foreign languages and for foreigners to learn Indonesian. Another practical local motivation for learning English is commercially, for reading and understanding English print on products. (p. 113)

Generally speaking, multinational companies located in Indonesia look for Indonesian personnel who have adequate levels of English proficiency. This can be seen in companies' English language job advertisements in many national newspapers. English language qualifications are also demanded by less prestigious posts advertised in local newspapers (Lamb & Coleman, 2008). Furthermore, Indonesian white-collar workers, not limited to those who work in multinational companies but also work in national companies, and government institutions need to have English skills especially used with relation to international affairs.

English is used in the tourism industry, recreation, and entertainment. Many Indonesian young people access and enjoy movies, television programs, and music in English. English is utilized extensively on the Internet by Indonesians for research, news, entertainments, and on social networking sites such as Facebook (Young, 2011). It is also quite common today to find signs in malls and other wealthy shopping complexes in Indonesia are full of English signage (Zents, 2012).

Despite the important roles of English in Indonesia, English is not commonly used among Indonesian people. As found in Pasassung's study (2003) in many parts of Indonesia, English is not used in any form of communication. Similar findings were found by Young (2011) that English language use is more common in highly and medium-urbanized cities and English is much less used in rural areas, and virtually non-existent in remote areas.

Following Pasassung (2003) and Young (2011), Zents (2012) reported from her study that the English language is not a language of daily use nor of content instruction for International Standard Schools as well as schools that serve primarily foreign expatriate populations (who do not all come from English speaking countries). Anita Lie (2007), a well-known English language educator in Indonesia, asserted that outside the academic and professional worlds, English in Indonesia has

never been widely used as the lingua franca by the majority of the population, and it is not a language for active communication. She explained that "There are no urgent real needs for the majority of Indonesians" (p. 8). However, Simatupang (1999) stated that:

> In Indonesia, although English has no wide use in society, is not used as a medium of communication in official domains like government, the law courts, and the education system, and is not accorded any special status in the country's language legislation, it is still seen as a priority, as the most important of the foreign languages to be taught. (p. 64)

English is regarded as a necessity, as asserted by Hamid Muhammad (2012), the Education and Culture Ministry's director general for secondary education:

> 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 has become a must. (*The Jakarta Post*, October 29, 2012)

In Indonesia, English carries great power and status as the language of the world's most successful economies and cultures. It is desirable and profitable skill. Indonesian is the national language, useful, to be proud of. The regional languages are used in daily life, so they are the most familiar and intimate but have the lowest status. In terms of language policy in Indonesia, the English language has gained its current status as the prime foreign language, but Indonesian national interest gives higher priority to the development of the Indonesian language as a national unifying language. With regard to globalisation and internationalisation in education, through acquiring a good command of English, Indonesian students are prepared academically and socially for international contexts.

In the following section, I present the context of the study in relation to the government's initiative on the use of English in some selected Indonesian public schools.

Context for this study

The year 2006 represented a significant milestone in the development of education in Indonesia. The Ministry of National Education (MONE) established a program known as *Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional/SBI* (translated as International Standard School). The International Standard School program was implemented under the Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education Management that included Primary School (Years 1-6), Junior High School (Years 7-9), Senior High School (Years 10-12) and Vocational Senior High Schools (Years 10-12 in vocational education). Implementation of the International Standard School program was driven by a demand for strong competitive skills in technology, management and human resources development in this era of globalisation (Hartoyo, 2009). Suyanto (2010), the director of Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education Management, MONE, stated that Indonesia needed to establish quality schools as 'centres of excellence' to be internationally recognised for their educational quality both in terms of process and product.

The International Standard Schools were established to meet broad goals. They were designed to prepare Indonesia for the migration of international human resources, to improve competitive skills in the international jobs market and to improve access to the local jobs market provided by foreign-owned companies in Indonesia (Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education Management, MONE, 2010). Therefore, the main goal of the International Standard Schools

program was preparing students for global competitiveness (Kustulasari, 2009), for competitive advantage (Astika & Wahyana, 2010) and as a response to global pressure (Sakhiyya, 2011).

In light of the era of internationalisation, International Standard Schools came to the forefront of attention in education. The legal basis for the International Standard Schools was Act 20/2003 of the Republic of Indonesia. Article 50, clause 3 stated that the national government decreed that local governments were required to organise at least one school at each level of education to be developed into the International Standard Schools framework. According to MONE (2010), an International Standard School was defined as a school which goes beyond compliance with national standards of education and enriches its standards based on the example of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) member countries. The legislation also stipulated that in every rural local government district (*kabupaten*) and city district (*kota*), there must be at least one International Standard School at primary, junior high, senior high and vocational senior high levels of education.

International Standard Schools were not newly established schools but schools that had been selected previously and provided with grants to implement teaching and learning processes that complied with the international standards in developed countries. MONE Decree 78/2009 required schools to develop two discipline areas of English skills and Information Communication Technology (ICT). International Standard Schools had to comply with the two teaching and learning standards of Information Communication Technology in all subjects and the use of English as the medium of instruction alongside the national and official language Indonesian in Science and Mathematics. All other subjects, apart from foreign languages, were to be taught using Indonesian as the medium of instruction. Consequently, teachers in International Standard Schools conducted some lessons in Indonesian and others in English.

As several scholars have pointed out, the Indonesian government perceived English to be a very important tool that accelerates development to bring in information, knowledge and technology (Hartoyo, 2009; Indradno, 2011; Lauder, 2008; Mariati, 2007; Setyarini & Sofwan, 2011; Sundusiyah, 2011). Command of English was regarded as an essential competency for the objectives of International Standard Schools that Indonesian students were expected to acquire for global communication. However, a major obstacle to achieving this goal was that teachers were not bilingual. The use of English, therefore, received mixed reactions among Indonesian teachers in International Standard Schools, educational and language experts, subject teachers, students and parents. Pedagogical and cultural concerns were consistently expressed at educational seminars, during debates on policy and in the mass media, about using English for teaching content subjects. Clearly, the government decision on International Standard Schools was a matter of strong concern to many stakeholders and for this reason**,** a problem worthy of investigation.

Controversies over the use of English in Mathematics and Science subjects in Pioneer International Standard Schools

First established in 2006, there were 1,305 Pioneer International Standard Schools in Indonesia, comprising 239 primary schools, 356 junior high schools, 359 senior high schools, and 351 vocational senior high schools (*The Jakarta Post*, 2011, September 23). In these schools, English was to be used as the language of instruction alongside

Indonesian (MONE, 2009). Although the term was problematic, in Indonesia this program was known as a bilingual one because the teaching of content subjects was conducted through an additional language.

The reality was that the implementation of the use of English in schools has led to some controversy among Indonesians. The main points of contention were the quality and methods. The policy on the use of English alongside Indonesian can be traced to theories of second language acquisition. Of particular influence has been the notion of comprehensible input (Krashen, 2011) and the development of content-based approaches to language acquisition through content-based instruction (Brinton, 2003; Snow, 2001) by means of integrating comprehensible language input into subject content. According to second language acquisition theory, a language is acquired when learners receive comprehensible input, through listening and reading, not when they memorize vocabulary or complete grammar exercises. With this content-based instruction approach, students are taught to learn both the content subject such as Physics or Economics through the medium of a foreign language and learn the foreign language by studying content-based subjects.

The use of English alongside Indonesian has attracted negative criticism. Underpinning theories were not widely understood by the general public or the teachers themselves. The main criticism was the low teaching quality and lack of availability of bilingual teachers in the schools (Indradno, 2011; Sundusiyah, 2011). Even though the government's promotion of the use of English aimed at advancing students' English competence and pushed teachers to use English, Pioneer International Standard Schools lacked resources and coherent support to assist subject teachers in their knowledge of and use of English in their subject content. Retmono (2011), a distinguished Indonesian professor in the teaching of English, argued that students will not learn effectively when teachers who are not competent users of English have to deliver the content subjects in the language. Retmono (2011) and Dharma (2010) both claim that teachers should deliver their subjects in familiar and understandable language as it is easier to understand content concepts in Indonesian than in English.

A second negative argument about using English was the reduction in use of Indonesian in schools. Retmono (2011) considered that the main priority in schools should be building students' local knowledge in order to improve the spirit of Indonesian nationalism among students. This supported statements in a *Kompas* editorial that the use of English in schools threatens the love and the pride in Indonesian among Indonesian youth (Napitupulu, *Kompas*, 2012, April 24). Therefore, the use of local languages and the national language should be encouraged since they represent the identity, wealth and pride of the nation (Elfitri & Latief, 2012). Those who disagreed with the use of English to teach other subjects in Pioneer International Standard Schools mostly took the view that English had the potential to threaten the Indonesian national character, because by using English the development of the national language was impaired (Anna, 2012; Elfitri & Latief, 2012; Latief, 2011).

The use of English in schools was controversial also because the policy document was not clear regarding expectations of teachers in their use of English to teach content subjects. According to Law 78/2009:

> SBI [Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional] dapat menggunakan bahasa pengantar bahasa Inggris dan/atau bahasa asing lainnya yang digunakan dalam forum internasional bagi mata pelajaran tertentu. (My translation: International

Standard Schools can use English as the medium of instruction and/or another foreign language(s) which is/are used in international forums for certain subjects). (p. 6)

The modal auxiliary '*dapat*' or 'can' created different interpretations and perceptions among the actors involved in Pioneer International Standard Schools, between education officials, schools, parents and other stakeholders (Kustulasari, 2009). For example, some subject teachers used English merely to open and close lessons, while the content was delivered in Indonesian, whereas others used English enthusiastically for Mathematics and Science instruction (Indradno, 2011). During the enactment of Pioneer International Standard Schools, controversies on the use of English still continued as a main topic of discussion in Indonesia.

Research on the use of English in Pioneer International Standard Schools

Since the establishment of Pioneer or Pilot Project of International Standard Schools in the academic year of 2006/2007, much research has been conducted on the type of school concentrating on a number of foci of investigation, such as school management, teachers' professional development, and the use of English. Regarding the use of English, research studies also focussed on describing and evaluating teachers' abilities in English and developing their language skills through research and development. The review of previous research has formed the basis for the current research and, to the best of my knowledge, an investigation of teachers' language ideologies of English and the influence of their language ideologies on classroom practices in the Indonesian context has been overlooked. The structure of the review of empirical and theoretical research that follows is based on the core issues (or, their foci) of the studies.

Research on the government education policies on Pioneer International Standard Schools

Kustulasari in her masters thesis (2009) conducted a thorough analysis of seven policy documents in relation to Pioneer International Standard Schools, including the Act of the Republic of Indonesia, Number 20, Year 2003 on the National Education System. She focussed her investigation on whether the International Standard School project was likely to achieve the intended goal of improving the quality of public education in Indonesia. Her findings showed that the policy documents lacked clarity in explaining some critical terms. For example, the documents lacked "explanations on to what extent the adoption or adaptation of an international standard is allowed or on what kind of adoption or adaptation is actually expected" (p. 81). Even though Kustulasari's study did not particularly aim at examining part of the documents which stipulated the use of English in schools, Kustulasari's thesis appeared to become a base for later research on Pioneer International Standard Schools. Kustulasari's study was empirical in which she analysed policy documents on Pioneer International Standard Schools.

Hendarman (2009), a researcher in educational studies at the Research and Development Institute of the Ministry of National Education and a lecturer in a teachers' college, conducted a literature review study with a narrower focus, analysis of law and regulations related to the use of English as the medium of instruction in Pioneer International Standard Schools. Hendarman argued that, from a legal point of view, the use of English in the teaching and learning process was a misinterpretation

of the regulation and in certain degrees against the regulation. By reviewing empirical studies, he concluded that teachers in Pioneer International Standard Schools were mostly incompetent or not proficient in English language. He asserted that the use of English as a second or foreign language in the learning situation in a number of countries led to a decrease in the learning achievement of students.

Based on his criticism, Hendarman (2009) recommended that the policy of using English as the medium of instruction in Pioneer International Standard Schools should be revisited, and he even suggested that its practice should be abolished. His main argument was that the use of English as the medium of instruction would face many obstacles, specifically teachers' lack of English competency, difficulties faced by teachers which likely caused them to feel stressed, and not achieving the target of teaching and learning as stated in the curriculum. Hendarman provided some significant information deriving from literature and some empirical research conducted by other people, including a study on the use of English in Science and Mathematics in Malaysian schools. He could have possibly initiated an empirical study in Indonesia to prove his assumption that the use of English in teaching Science and Mathematics would negatively influence students' achievement in the content subjects.

Bax (2010) also found that so far neither the Indonesian government nor any Indonesian researchers had conducted research on academic achievement in Mathematics and Science between students in Pioneer International Standard School and in regular schools. Therefore he suggested that empirical research on this issue needed to be conducted.

Research on the profile of Pioneer International Standard Schools
Evaluation research on Pioneer International Standard Schools was conducted, for example, by Mariati (2007). It was evaluative, as the study examined the general implementation of Pioneer International Standard Schools. The data were taken from 48 schools from preparatory to senior high school levels across 20 provinces in Indonesia. The findings showed there were various interpretations on the definition of Pioneer International Standard Schools. Most generally, English was stated to be used in teaching, and school facilities were stated to be provided to prepare graduates for global competitiveness. Mariati's study was important to provide a general profile or description of Pioneer International Standard Schools in Indonesia. However, there was a need to follow up the findings, particularly to explore participants' common statement that they used English in schools.

Similar to Mariati (2009), Noor (2011), a researcher at the Center of Research on Policies and Innovations, Research and Development Institute of the Ministry of National Education, conducted research titled *Studi Evaluasi Penyelenggaraan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional (SBI) di Sekolah Dasar (SD), Sekolah Menengah Pertama (SMP), Sekolah Menengah Atas (SMA)/Sekolah Menengah kejuruan (SMK) (*my translation: An evaluative study of the implementation of International Standard Schools in Primary, Junior High, Senior High/Vocational High education levels). The objectives of the study were to obtain information on four areas of inquiry: recruitment of prospective students, academic achievement, management of finance, and management of administration and accountability. The study was conducted in 16 provinces. It was not surprising that one of Noor's findings was that teachers' English abilities were categorised as novice as they got TOEFL scores between 10 and 250 and yet the project proceeded with such as base.

Sumintono and Mislan (2011) examined an International Standard School's capacity building. They used a framework developed by King and Newman (2001) to analyse several dimensions of capacity building in a secondary school that was located in a small city in West Java. They found that policy structure was not adequately designed and developed to gear the school towards a significant direction in terms of improving its capacity building. In terms of using English, teachers had difficulties reaching "international requirements" such as communicating in English for teaching. They also found that the program to improve language fluency did not work properly. They concluded that the school did not utilise capacity to increase the professional learning community for teachers, but relied on a usual program managed by the district education office.

Research on teachers' and students' perceptions of bilingual science lessons

Astuti (2012) described teachers' and students' perceptions of bilingual instruction (Indonesian and English) in science lessons. She conducted a survey through a questionnaire to demonstrate existing problems of bilingual teaching in four Pioneer International Standard Junior High Schools in Central Java. Results showed that from 26 teacher respondents, 17 teachers had positive perceptions about bilingual science teaching and nine teachers had negative views. Astuti categorised teachers' positive perceptions as:

> bilingual teaching helps students master English; it helps students understand the English terms for science tools/equipments; it supports students to speak in English; it supports those who will study abroad; bilingual science teaching is fun; it helps students master the English language because it helps them know un-common English words related to science and it enhances the students' English mastery; and it is quite helpful for students although they get difficulties in understanding science concepts in English. (p. 2)

Teachers' negative perceptions of bilingual science teaching were categorised by Astuti as:

> science is difficult because science concepts are difficult and both teachers and students have trouble with English; a bilingual science lesson does not help students understand the learning materials; and it is less effective and not good enough for students' understanding toward the learning content because science would be easier understood in the native language. (p. 2)

Astuti (2012) concluded that:

(1) All the four Pioneering International Standardized Junior High Schools had already conducted bilingual science education with clear supports in the form of the availability of teachers who can communicate in English and sufficient teaching and learning materials and facilities.

(2) Both teachers and students in the four International Standardized Junior High Schools had good perception on the bilingual science education; however, they still had big problem in having the bilingual science teaching and learning.

(3) The clearest big problem among the teachers was their weak English proficiency so that they had difficulty in understanding the teaching content, in explaining the materials by using English, and in making evaluations or tests written in English.

(4) One of the causes of the problem mentioned above was the limited chance for teachers to get professional development activities such as training,

workshop, and seminar on how to improve the bilingual science teaching. (adapted from p. 82, numbering added)

As is evident, Astuti's statements in her conclusions seemed to contradict each other. For example, in number (1) she concluded that teachers who could communicate in English were available in the schools of her study, but in number (3) she stated that teachers were weak in English proficiency, so it became a big problem in teaching bilingually. Her findings showed that bilingual competent teachers were present in the school, but at the same time Astuti also concluded that the teachers in her study had low English proficiency. These two statements were contradictive. It is more likely that Astuti's finding was that teachers were low in English as indicated in her suggestions as follows:

> It takes time for achieving the ideal bilingual science education service; therefore, the schools should keep improving all factors that make the bilingual science education run smoothly and effectively especially in giving much more opportunity for teachers to get various kinds of professional development programs to improve their capability in teaching bilingual science. Teachers and students should maintain their positive attitude toward the English language so that their motivation in mastering the language as well as in using the language during the teaching and learning processes can be maximized. (pp. 82-83)

Astuti's findings on teachers' perceptions on bilingual science teaching could be a good starting point to make a further study on teachers' ideologies about the English language. She seemed to define perceptions as opinions held by individual teachers. Teachers' perceptions influenced their individual attitudes towards English bilingual teaching. What underpinned teachers' perceptions and their language attitudes needs to be further explored.

Research and development of teachers' English language skills

Some research on the implementation of Pioneer International Standard Schools focussed on improving teachers' English skills to teach their subjects, Science and Mathematics, in English. For example, Suma (2011) followed Borg and Gall's (1983) model of educational research and development to improve English skills of Physics teachers in a Pioneer International Standard School in Bali Province. He developed a technique for Physics bilingual teaching by using a preview-review bilingual learning model supported by information communication technology. In his interview with the principal and Physics teachers in the school, he found that not only did the teachers have a limited proficiency of English but also they lacked references on how to teach their subjects in English. For example, the teachers did not have adequate information and knowledge of bilingual teaching models which could be applied in their classrooms. Suma's study focussed on the improvement of teachers' teaching skills in English with little consideration of teachers' affective aspect, including their "voice" on using English. It might be important to consider teachers' perceptions and feelings in the application of the bilingual teaching model that he developed.

While Suma (2011) developed a technique called preview-review bilingual learning model in Physics, Indradno (2011) for his dissertation research developed a model for improving teachers' competence in three areas: content subjects, English, and information communication technology (ICT). Indradno conducted his research in six Junior High Schools in Central Java. He claimed that the appropriate model to improve teachers' content knowledge, English and ICT was in-house training where

all the three areas were simultaneously trained at their own schools. Research conducted by Suma (2011) and Indradno (2011) were a trend at the time during the implementation of Pioneer International Standard Schools since teachers seemed to be in urgent need of English training to improve their language skills to teach subjects in English.

Astika and Wahyana (2010) Indonesian lecturers of English language in a private university in Central Java, conducted a study in three Pioneer International Standard Schools in Central Java. One noteworthy finding from their interviews with teachers was that:

> Tidak semua guru mau melaksanakan tanggung jawab dengan sungguh-sungguh dan sikap ini mempunyai dampak negatif terhadap guru yang melaksanakan tanggung jawab dengan sungguh-sungguh. Akhirnya muncul kecenderungan sementara guru untuk ikut-ikutan, sekedar melaksanakan tanggung jawab karena tidak ada bedanya guru yang betul-betul bertanggung jawab dengan guru yang sekedar melaksanakan tugas. Pembelajaran kelas bilingual dianggap sebagai beban. (Astika & Wahyana, 2010, p. 20)
>
> (My translation: not all teachers in the study show a willingness to take their responsibilities [to teach using English]. This attitude has impacted negatively on other teachers who have willingly done their jobs. Consequently some teachers tended to just follow their colleagues [who teach bilingually, but unwillingly] because they might think people can not differentiate between teachers who really do their jobs with high responsibilites and those who simply do their jobs because they have to. Eventually bilingual teaching is felt as a burden).

The finding seemed to uncover teachers' existing attitudes about teaching using English, but needed further research to gain understanding of the reasons underlying these attitudes.

Research on teachers' competence in developing teaching tools

Bharati (2010), an Indonesian lecturer at the English language education program at a state university in Central Java, investigated teachers' abilities in preparing teaching documents including syllabus, lesson plans, and media needed for teaching subjects in English alongside Indonesian (bilingual). Bharati's observations in some Science and Mathematics classes in four schools in Central Java showed that mispronunciation, misspelling, grammatical mistakes, wrong diction, and some other linguistic feature problems often happened in the classroom activities. Her findings highlighted some problems in the way teachers developed teaching documents. Bharati's study seemed to be descriptive, aiming at describing teachers' performance in writing teaching documents and their use of English in classrooms. However, the teachers' experiences needed to be explored to gain understandings of challenges they faced on preparing teaching documents in English.

Teachers' low competence in developing English-medium teaching tools was noted by Hadisantosa (2010). Most Indonesian teachers were not prepared for teaching their subjects using English as a medium of instruction. She wrote:

> Teachers are not confident in teaching maths and science using English. Students are often smarter than the teachers when it comes to English. Teachers have problems with scientific terminology as well as in classroom instruction. They might be good teachers when teaching their subjects in

Indonesian, but teaching these same subjects in English is a different matter. (p. 35)

Research on classroom interactions in Mathematics and Science bilingual teaching

Studies of classroom interactions in Science and Mathematics classroom teaching also mushroomed during the implementation of Pioneer International Standard Schools. For example, Suharyadi (2010) conducted a study of classroom interaction in Mathematics and Science bilingual classes in one public Senior High School in Malang, East Java. His study aimed at describing patterns of classroom interactions and communication strategies employed by teachers in classrooms. Classroom interaction patterns were categorised broadly into teacher and whole class interaction, teacher and individual student interaction, teacher and group interaction, and individual student and teacher interaction. He also categorised teachers' communication strategies in using English in terms of the use of translation, codeswitching and code mixing, repetition, and paraphrasing or approximation. The teachers' reasons for using certain classroom interaction and communication strategies in the use of English could have been further investigated.

With a clearer data analysis tool than Suharyadi (2010), Nurmasitah (2010) in her Master's degree study investigated a classroom interaction in a Geography class in Year 10 in one Pioneer International Standard School in the capital city of Central Java. Nurmasitah used Flanders Interaction Analysis (1970) to identify classroom interactions and Walberg's theory (1986) of teaching effectiveness elements. Results of her analysis showed that "the most dominant characteristic in the classroom interaction was the content cross" (p. xviii) that most of the teaching and learning time was devoted to questions and lecturing by the teacher. She claimed that students in the class she observed were active enough in the classroom interaction. Like Suharyadi (2010), she categorised the classroom interaction into three-way communication: interaction between teacher to students, students to teacher, and students to students. Findings did not show patterns of classroom language use including the extent to which the teacher and the students used English.

Margana (2013) a lecturer at a state university in Yogyakarta, attempted to provide a theoretical justification of a bilingual education program in Pioneer International Standard Schools. He was supportive of bilingual education programs in the schools as he believed bilingual teaching offered some advantages which could be classified in terms of meta-cognitive awareness and cognitive development. He also suggested that empirical studies on the implementation of bilingual teaching be conducted to "gain the effectiveness and efficiency of the bilingual programs which accommodate all different social status which is prone to creating social jealousy among the Indonesian society members" (p. 782). His statement implied that using English alongside Indonesian in science and mathematics subjects might have both a positive impact on students in terms of acquiring English language skills and stimulating cognitive development, and a negative impact in terms of creating social envy between students who were taught in English bilingual classes and those who were taught in Indonesian.

The majority of previous research related to the use of English in Pioneer International Standard Schools has focussed on describing the general English proficiency of subject teachers, problems and difficulties in teaching using English, teachers' classroom performance in English, teachers' English language training, and

the development of English language skills for subject teachers. There emerged one aspect that seemed to have been neglected in the research but played an important role in the implementation of the policy, that is language ideologies. Although teachers might have taken English training (as evidenced in the empirical research reviewed within this section), I argue that they actually held their own beliefs about the English language and about the use of English in schools which in turn would influence their language practice.

Bilingual education: Definitions

In light of the Indonesian government's promotion of the use of English in the selected government-owned schools, it is important to arrive at a working definition of bilingual education and I therefore consulted the literature on bilingual education.

The use of English as the medium of instruction alongside Indonesian in Pioneer International Standard Schools might be classified as a form of bilingual education. Among the many definitions of bilingual education, Colin Baker (1993), one of the most influential scholars in the field of bilingual education, sometimes used the term bilingual education "to refer to the education of students who are already speakers of two languages, and at other times to the education of those who are studying additional languages" (p. 9). Compared to Baker's (1993) definition, Garcia (2009) referred to bilingual education programs as those that use a second or a foreign language "as a medium of instruction; that is, bilingual education programs teach content through an additional language other than the children's home language" (p. 6). Bilingual education is different from language education programs that teach a second or a foreign language. Second or foreign language education programs teach the language as a subject, whereas bilingual education programs use the language as a medium of instruction.

There are variants of bilingual education programs. Some categories within bilingual education include transitional bilingual education program (e.g., Palmer, 2011), two way immersion program (e.g., Jeon, 2007), dual language program (e.g., (Volk & Angelova, 2007); foreign immersion program (e.g., Swain & Johnson, 1997; Hong, 2010); and content and language integrated learning (CLIL) (e.g., Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Graaff, Koopman & Westhoff, 2007). Full discussion of the similarities and distinction amongst these bilingual education programs is beyond the scope of the current study, but Baker (2011) provides a very comprehensive explanation for each type of bilingual education program. More importantly, the different forms of bilingual education programs can have different aims which include:

> (1) to assimilate individuals or groups into the mainstream of society; to socialize people for full participation in the community, (2) to unify a multilingual society; to bring unity to a multi-ethnic, multi tribal, or multi-national linguistically diverse state, **(3)** to enable people to communicate with the outside world, (4) to provide language skills which are marketable, aiding employment and status, (5) to preserve ethnic and religious identity, (6) to reconcile and mediate between different linguistic and political communities, (7) to spread the use of a colonial language, socializing an entire population to a colonial existence, (8) to strengthen elite groups and preserve their privilege position in society, (9) to give equal status in law to languages of

unequal status in daily life, and (10) to deepen an understanding of language and culture. (Ferguson, Houghton & Wells, 1977, p. 12)

As indicated in Chapter 1, the purposes of the government's encouragement of the use of English in the Indonesian selected schools were to enable school leavers (school graduates) to communicate with the outside world, to provide English language skills which are marketable, aiding employment and improved economic status, and also to deepen an understanding of the language and culture.

A review of research studies on the use of English in Pioneer International Standard Schools shows that the researchers used various terms for this practice. Some of them considered the use of the language in the schools as bilingual teaching or bilingual education (see for example, Astuti 2012; Hadisantosa, 2010; Margana, 2013). Hadisantosa (2010) explicitly stated the use of English in Mathematics and Science subjects in a bilingual program has the objective to building a globally competent workforce. Some other researchers suggested the use of English in schools as being in immersion programs (see e.g., Andayani, 2010; Anggani, 2010; Nurmasitah, 2010; Setyorini & Sofwan, 2011). Sultan, Borland, and Eckersley (2012) preferred to use the term English medium of instruction or in his longer term "a form of content-based foreign language learning through English medium of instruction" (p. 4). Bax (2010) being more careful called this education "the bilingual dimension of teaching content subjects through English" (p. 30).

The actual use of English as the medium of instruction in Pioneer International Standard Schools is extremely varied (Coleman, 2010). There are some Pioneer International Standard Schools which claim a 50:50 bilingual program, while others claim to be implementing a partial English bilingual program even though only 10% of one lesson was in English and the remaining 90% was a mixture of Indonesian and Javanese the home language (Andayani et al., 2010). The research findings showed by Coleman (2010) and Andayani et al. (2010) indicated that the ideology underpinned the government's encouragement of the use of English as the language of instruction seemed to be not fully understood by teachers as the main actors of the policy.

It is important to highlight that there was a policy change in regard to the use of English in Pioneer International Standard Schools. Referring to *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia* (the regulation of Ministry of National Education of Republic of Indonesia) number 78 year 2009, the kind of English bilingual education program expected by the government to be implemented in the schools was a form of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) (Baker, 2011; Dalton-Puffer, 2007; 2011; Garcia, 2009; Graaff, Koopman & Westhoff, 2007; Snow, 2001). The review of the latest government policy documents, including its official letter issued by *Direktur Jenderal Pendidikan Menengah* (Directorate General of Secondary Education, Ministry of National Education, 18 April 2011), indicated that the government's expectation of the use of English in teaching Science and Mathematics shifted onto the encouragement to make habitual English language learning and practice at school, not necessarily meaning the use of English to teach Science and Mathematics.

Despite the policy change, my review of the policy documents and findings of previous literature research conducted by some Indonesian scholars (e.g., Setyorini & Sofwan, 2011) showed that the use of English in teaching Science and Mathematics as first enforced by the government was categorized as content and language integrated learning (Content and Language Integrated Learning; henceforth,

CLIL). In the United States, it is sometimes called content-based second language instruction, while in Europe, it is referred to as Content and Language Integrated Learning CLIL (Baker, 2011). It is not about teaching English language for its own sake as in second or foreign language lessons, but teaching content subjects by using English as the language of instruction.

The content subjects are those which are currently studying by students in their school classes, such as history, science and mathematics (Snow, 2001). The main goal of CLIL is to prepare students for the integration of language teaching with discipline subject content instruction. CLIL develops access to subject-specific target language terminology and improve overall target language competence, including develop oral communication skills (Daiton-Puffer, 2007; 2011).

The theoretical foundation for CLIL is drawn from second language acquisition theories and research. According to Krashen (1985; 1994), second language acquisition occurs when the learner receives comprehensible input, not when the learner is memorizing vocabulary or completing grammar exercises. The comprehensible input is in the form of comprehensible subject content teaching integrated with language teaching. For the purpose of exposing students with comprehensible input in subject content and language, teachers in CLIL classrooms must be competent both in the subject content and in the target language. The target language proficiency of CLIL teachers is paramount. They have to be able to develop CLIL teaching materials by taking into consideration the content-specific concepts to be learnt as well as the relevant linguistic resources (Daiton-Puffer, 2007).

Consequently, CLIL teachers should be occupied with language pedagogy in CLIL teacher education to gain necessary knowledge of conditions for successful teaching and learning in CLIL classes.Two of the basic principles of CLIL are that in the CLIL classrooms the target language is used to learn as well as to communicate, and it is the subject matter which determines the language needed to learn (Dalton-Puffer, 2007; 2011). Teachers in CLIL context should be competent in the target language and take account of second language learning pedagogy to be applied in classes (Baker, 2011; Garcia, 2009; Graaff, Koopman & Westhoff, 2007; Snow, 2001). But, most CLIL teachers are non-native speakers of the target language, and do not have a professional background in language pedagogy (Graaff, Koopman, & Westhoff, 2007).

Graaff, Koopman, and Westhoff (2007) are very clear in suggesting that teachers who teach in CLIL classes understand the significance and necessity of second language learning theory and language pedagogy. Based on the findings of their study carried out in three Dutch schools for secondary education offering CLIL, Graaff, Koopman and Westhoff (2007) recommend five tenets of language pedagogy directed at CLIL teaching, as follows:

1. *Teachers facilitate exposure to input at a (just) challenging level* by selecting attractive authentic materials, adapting texts up to the level of the learners and scaffolding on the content and language level by active use of body language and visual aids.

2. *Teachers facilitate meaning-focused processing* by stimulating the learners to request new vocabulary items, check their meaning, use explicit and implicit types of corrective feedback on incorrect meaning identification, and practice through relevant speaking and writing assignments.

3. *Teachers facilitate form-focused processing* by giving examples, using recasts and confirmation checks, making clarification requests and giving feedback (sometimes including peer feedback).
4. Teachers facilitate output production by encouraging learners' reactions, working in different interactive formats and practising creative forms of oral (presentations, round tables, debates) and written (letters, surveys, articles, manuals) output production, suggesting communicatively feasible tasks, which give the learners enough time for task completion, encouraging learners to speak only in English, providing feedback on students' incorrect language use and stimulating peer feedback.
5. *Teachers facilitate the use of compensation strategies* by stimulating students to overcome problems in language comprehension and language production, reflecting on the use of compensation strategies, and scaffolding on-the-spot strategy use. (Graff, Koopman, and Westhoff , 2007, p. 18)

It is crucial for Indonesian teachers of Science and Mathematics subjects, who were required to teach their subjects in English, to understand that they taught both discipline subject and English language. Through CLIL, students of the International Standard Schools were aimed at gaining good competence on the English language. Second language acquisition is a gradual developmental language learning. Therefore, teachers' knowledge and beliefs of second language learning and pedagogy should be comprehensively understood if content and language learning (CLIL) classes are to be successful.

Prevalent language practice in bilingual classroom contexts

Silverstein (1998) and Woolard (1998) reminded us that language ideologies affect people's social language use. Language ideologies influence all choices made by language users. The study of classroom discourse may reveal manifestations or reflections of teachers' language ideologies although the influence of language ideologies on people's language choices and use are not always directly observable (McGroarty, 2010).

Codeswitching and safe talk are the most noticeable language behaviours in many bilingual and multilingual classrooms (Baker, 2011; Chimbutane, 2011; Garcia, 2009; Martin, 2005). I will review previous research on the topic of codeswitching and safetalk. Deriving from the discussion, I will apply some of the insights to the current study.

Codeswitching in bilingual and/or multilingual classrooms

Scholars sometimes distinguish between 'codeswitching' and 'code-mixing'. Baker (2011) gave some examples of switches between languages in conversation. He mentioned that the term 'codemixing' has sometimes been used to describe changes at the word level (e.g., when one word or a few words in a sentence change). A mixed language sentence such as "Leo un magazine" (I read a magazine) might be called codemixing. In contrast, "Come to the table. Bwyd yn barod" (food is ready) (Baker, 2011, p. 107) might be called codeswitching. The first phrase is an English; the second in Welsh. In Garcia's (2009) words, codeswitching refers to language switches at sentence boundaries (inter-sentential switching) and codemixing refers to switching or mixing languages within a sentence (intra-sentential switching) (pp. 50-51). However, the focus of the current study is not to differentiate between these two

types of switching, and therefore I will use the term 'codeswitching' throughout this dissertation to refer to "the alternate use of two or more languages" (Martin, 1999, p. 129) or the "process of going back and forth from one language to the other" (Garcia, 2009, p. 49).

Codeswitching is language behaviour that seemed to be not only accepted but also often encouraged by teachers in order for students participate actively in classroom interactional practices and to facilitate students comprehension (Baker, 2011; Garcia, 2009). In Brunei Darussalam, Martin (1999) conducted a research study about codeswitching which occured during the teaching and learning of Science in two upper primary classrooms which included the use of Malay, the local language alongside English, the official language of the classroom. Since 1985, one year after Brunei's independence, a bilingual system of education has been implemented in which a high degree of proficiency in the Malay language and English should be achieved. Martin's study indicated that switching from English to Malay in the classrooms seemed to be encouraged by the teachers to make pupils actively participate in the classroom interactions and to help them understand the lessons more. A further study was carried out by Martin (2005) in Brunei primary classrooms. He observed that teachers and students in the classrooms could not manage content lessons in English alone. He argued that they needed to use Malay to allow a greater freedom of expression and provide more meaningful opportunities for real communication.

Studies on codeswitching in bilingual classroom teaching show a causal relationship between teachers' language competencies and codeswitching. Codeswitching can be a sign of inadequacy or lack of language knowledge and language abilities and communicative repertoire (Martin, 1999). Baker (2011) asserted that codeswitching may show "a communication deficit or a lack of mastery of both or either languages" (p.106) and people tend to codeswitch as they are more fluent in one language than the other language (Meisel, 2004). Martin's (1999, 2005) studies also show that codeswitching is a valuable linguistic tool and there is usually purpose and reason in changing languages.

Baker (2011) points out thirteen over-lapping purposes and aims of codeswitching in bilingual situations as follows:

1. Codeswitches may be used to emphasise a particular point in a conversation. If one word needs stressing or is central in a sentence, a switch may be made.
2. If a person does not know a word or a phrase in a language, that person may substitute a word in another language.
3. Words or phrases in two languages may not correspond exactly and the person may switch to one language to express a concept that has no equivalent in the culture of the other language.
4. Codeswitching may be used to reinforce a request.
5. Repetition of a phrase or passage in another language may also be used to clarify a point.
6. Codeswitching may be used to express identity, shorten social distance, and communicate friendship or family bonding.
7. In relating a conversation held previously, the person may report the conversation in the language or language used. For example, two people may be speaking Spanish together. When one reports a previous conversation with an English monolingual, that conversation is reported authentically – for example, in English – as it occured.

8. Codeswitching is sometimes used as a way of interjecting into a conversation.
9. Codeswitching may be used to ease tension and inject humour into a conversation.
10. Codeswitching often relates to change of attitude or relationship.
11. Codeswitching can also be used to exclude people from a conversation.
12. In some bilingual situations, codeswitching occurs regularly when certain topics are introduced.
13. In some contexts, children are simply copying peers and adults. They are identifying with higher status of friends and adults who codeswitch and more powerful people in their lives. (pp. 108-110)

Lonsmann (2011) added that codeswitching might be used for three reasons: codeswitching due to limited proficiency, codeswitching used for clarification, and codeswitching due to a lack of vocabulary.

Farrugia (2003) investigated the use of English as a medium of instruction in Maltese Mathematics classrooms. In the local situation in Malta, Mathematics was taught either through code-switching between Maltese and English or through English only, which is generally the children's second language. Farrugia discovered that code-switching from English to Maltese language may serve an important role in the teaching and learning of Mathematical ideas. Teachers in her study favoured codeswitching instead of English only as they were concerned about pupil participation and the teachers' own confidence in using English. Some teachers in her study also justified that it was not practical to expect teachers to stick to English, especially at points where they felt that their pupils did not understand the Mathematical concepts/English technical words. Farrugia argued that it was important to keep the subject itself clearly in focus and considered that English-Maltese codeswitching is a "useful pedagogical tool in that it provides an *additional resource* for aiding understanding" (p. 4). Ferguson (2003) suggested that codeswitching:

> is not only very prevalent across a wide range of educational settings but also seems to arise naturally, perhaps inevitably, as a pragmatic response to the difficulties of teaching content in a language medium over which pupils have imperfect control. Moreover, because teaching is an adrenalin-fuelled activity, making numerous competing demands one's attentional resources, much switching takes place below the level of consciousness. Teachers are often simply not aware of when they switch languages or inded if they switch at all. (p. 46)

Baker (2011) indicated that codeswitching in classrooms is also about which language is relatively valued or privileged. The status of languages, whether the languages have prevalence in the environment outside school, may influence codeswitching behaviour. Hence, "codeswitching in the classroom has to be understood within a particular political context, the history of two languages within a region, values, expectations and intentions" (Baker, 2011, p. 287).

Codeswitching might be seen as a resource to learning or an impediment (Kamwangamalu, 2010). Despite seemingly acceptable classroom codeswitching practices as having pedagogic and societal functions, such as increased communication of meaning and emphasis, codeswitching is also criticized. There is a body of evidence that suggests that with beginning and low level proficiency learners, codeswitching is detrimental. Such findings were mostly evident in second language classrooms or language classrooms. It is commonly believed, that in second

or foreign language lessons using first language will impede the development of the second language acquisition (Ellis, 2008). Up to the present, contentious views about classroom codeswitching practices circulate.

Safetalk strategies in bilingual and/or multilingual classrooms
I now turn to a brief overview of safetalk, another recurrent feature in bi/multilingual settings. Like codeswitching, safetalk is a very common interactional strategy of classroom language practice. Some researchers in the field of bilingual and multilingual education categorised codeswitching into safetalk practices or safetalk strategy (e.g., Chimbutane, 2009, 2011; Martin, 2005).

The notion safetalk was termed by Chick (1996) who investigated the characteristics of interactions in schools for black people in South Africa under the former apartheid system. Chick's background of study was that he observed classroom practices were "highly centralised, with teachers adopting authoritarian roles and doing most of the talking, with few pupil initiations, and with most of the pupil responses taking the form of group chorusing" (p. 21). Later, Hornberger collaborated with Chick (2001) to examine safetalk practices in Peruvian and South African classrooms. They defined safetalk practices as language practices in which teachers and students preserve their dignity by hiding the fact that little or no learning is taking place (Hornberger & Chick, 2001).

Safetalk is a particular type of classroom interaction. In research which employed a discourse-analytic study to look at classroom language practices in two classrooms, primary and secondary, in two rural schools, Martin (2005) found that safetalk practices were present. His study was against the backdrop that beginning in the year 2003 Malaysia decided to implement a policy to switch the medium of instruction in Mathematics and Science from Malay to English. His findings revealed that what usually went on in bilingual classrooms were slot-filling, labelling and chorusing. Martin (2005) suggested that "Such practices can create an illusion that learning (of both content and English) is taking place" (p. 83). Following Chick (1996) and Hornberger and Chick (2001), Martin (2005) used the term 'safe' but he claimed that he gave his own emphasis that safetalk practices allow classroom participants to be seen to accomplish lessons. According to him, safetalk is "a pragmatic discourse strategy (linguistic strategy) that is 'safe' in that, potentially, it facilitates comprehension" (Martin, 2005, p. 80).

While Martin (2005) asserted that safetalk was used at least for two functions - to be seen to accomplish a lesson and to facilitate comprehension - Chimbutane (2009, 2011) emphasised that "the use of safetalk strategies was prompted by the language barrier and by the teachers' limited preparation to using appropriate second-language teaching strategies to minimise this barrier" (p. 87). That is to say, teachers used safetalk strategies because of their limited proficiency in the medium of instruction. Chimbutane (2009, 2011) conducted an ethnographic study in two primary bilingual schools in Mozambique. A language-in-education policy in Mozambique shifted from a Portuguese-only-system of education (which is a second/foreign language for most Mozambican citizens) to a situation in which local African languages were promoted in formal education through the gradual introduction of a bilingual program.

In subject classes in which Portuguese was the medium of instruction, Chimbutane (2011) observed that most of the pupils used chorusing, that is they chorused responses and chanted. He concluded that the teachers and their pupils were aware of the lack of communication between them. Therefore, in order to preserve

34

their dignity and give the sense of accomplishment, they colluded in using safetalk strategies such as group chorusing and clued elicitation. To sum up what safetalk is, Chimbutane (2011) explained:

> Safetalk is a term used to refer to teachers' and pupils' use of interactional strategies that allow them to preserve their dignity by avoiding opportunities for displays of academic or lingustic incompetence. The key pattern of safetalk is that of teacher prompt and pupils' choral responses, that is, teachers routinely provide cues to which pupils respond in chorus. The prompts or cues used by teachers to trigger such pupils' chorusing responses include yes/no questions and oral gap filling exercises. In these exercises, teachers provide incomplete words or sentences in which they raise the tone on accented syllable leaving an oral gap for pupils to fill in, for example, with a syllable, word, of phrase. (p. 28)

Teachers and students may use safetalk to respond to their constraints including language barriers. The use of safetalk and codeswitching are two pervasive discursive strategies used to ensure classroom interaction flow in bilingual and multilingual contexts.

Drawing together the literature

The era of globalization has affected the development of education in Indonesia. In order to prepare Indonesian school leavers to be able to collaborate and compete internationally, the attainment of English competency was viewed by the Indonesian government as a desirable goal. Government legislation mandated the establishment of International Standard Schools with a characteristic of using English as the medium of instruction in the core content subjects of Science and Mathematics. The government expectation for International Standard Schools to implement English as the medium of instruction have an impact on teachers' classroom practices. The teachers' use of English was shaped by their language ideologies that were developing in the school. Drawing on the concept of language ideologies (Kroskrity, 2010) as the conceptual framework, the current study identifies and examines English language ideologies of Indonesian teachers of Science and Mathematics in a senior high school.

The literature review shows that the policy on the use of English in Science and Mathematics subjects and habitual English language use at school was considered as bilingual education, more specifically of the type content and language integrated learning, or CLIL. In CLIL classes, teachers are expected to effectively contribute to the target language development and proficiency of their students, that is the English language. In light of the theoretical foundation of CLIL that is based on second language acquisiton theory (Krashen, 1985; 1994; Ellis, 2008), this study combines language ideologies as the conceptual framework and the application of second language learning theory and pedagogy in the analysis of the data.

In describing, understanding and explaining subject teachers' ideologies of English language use and their classroom practices and the context that shape both of these, this study employed an ethnographic case study to obtain rich data to gain deeper insights of language ideologies *in situ*. The consideration for an ethnographic case study in this research will be explained in Chapter 3 Research Methodology.

Summary

This chapter comprised two main parts. The first part was the theoretical framework of the study in which I discussed definitions of language ideologies, conceptual foundations, and methods of analysing language ideologies. In the second part I reviewed related literature about, among other things, some prevalent English language ideologies in the global context, research on the use of English in Pioneer International Standard Schools, and prevalent language practices in bilingual and multilingual classroom contexts. In the next chapter I will describe and discuss the methodology of the research.

CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I present and justify the decisions that led to my choice of research methods. I begin this chapter by revisiting the research questions and the purposes of the study. Following this, I describe ethnographic case study as the research design. I describe my role as researcher, selecting participants, the research site and my access to it. Next, I discuss multiple data sources and data collection methods including whole-school observations, classroom observations, in-depth interviews, observation notes, and document reviews. I then explain the data analysis process. In the last sections of this chapter, I address trustworthiness and present a summary of the chapter.

REVISITING RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

Research questions

As stated in Chapter 1, the three guiding questions for this study were:

(1) What were subject teachers' language ideologies about English that informed what they said about their use of English in a state Senior High School in Central Java?

(2) How were subject teachers' English language ideologies manifested in their classroom practices?

(3) What were school executives' language ideologies about English and what the impact of their language ideologies on subject teachers' classroom practices?

Purposes of the study

In accord with the research questions, the purposes of this study were to identify and examine:

(1) subject teachers' language ideologies about English in regard to the government's promotion of the use of English alongside Indonesian in Mathematics and Science subjects and as habitual language use of English in a state Senior High School in Central Java;

(2) manifestations of subject teachers' English language ideologies in their actual classroom practices; and

(3) school executives' language ideologies about English and the impact of their language ideologies on subject teachers' classroom practices.

In other words, the research sought to identify, describe and interpret subject teachers' English language ideologies and those of a school's executives to gain insight into language practices in classrooms in enacting the government's promotion of the use of English in school. Central to the study was exploration of links between subject teachers' English language ideologies, their classroom practices, and the contexts that shape both of these.

FRAMING THE CURRENT STUDY:
AN ETHNOGRAPHIC CASE STUDY

The research questions directed me towards the need to build close and trusting relationships with participants so that I could fully understand the realities of the participants' understandings, beliefs and feelings about the English language and their language practices at school and in classrooms. In light of this, I took a social constructivist approach in the belief that reality is socially constructed with multiple perspectives (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011) and social constructivism leads the researcher to look for complexity of views (Creswell, 2013). Social constructivism as the paradigm pointed me towards a qualitative approach to data collection (Neuman, 2011). This qualitative approach was best captured by the application of ethnographic methods. According to Creswell (2013), in ethnographic research,

> the researcher relies on the participants' views as an insider *emic* perspective and reports them in verbatim quotes, and then synthesizes the data filtering it through the researchers' *etic* scientific perspective to develop an overall *cultural interpretation*. This cultural interpretation is a description of the group and themes related to the theoretical concepts being explored in the study. (p. 92)

It was necessary for me as the researcher to establish and develop a close rapport with the participants of the study to obtain quality data.

I chose to do my data collection in the form of a single case study in one school. Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) suggested that ethnographic research usually has the feature of focusing on a single setting or group of people to facilitate in-depth study. Lonsmann (2011) confirmed that "case studies have the advantage of allowing the researcher to study the language practice of the case in depth" (p. 47). With the purpose of prioritising detailed insights, I included teacher participants who taught different subjects and some school executives to enhance the extent and depth of convictions about English language use.

My choice of conducting this ethnographic case study led me to the technique of participant observation. I immersed myself in the research site, a state Senior High School in an urban city in Central Java in Indonesia for two months from August to October 2012. As the sole researcher, I was the primary data collector. I made regular observations of linguistic behaviour of the subject teachers as the participants in my study and engaged in interpersonal relationships and conversations every day at school. The focus of my attention was the participants' language practices during normal activities in classrooms and in school. I tried to understand perceptions, views and voices of the participants of the study by employing "naturalistic methods" (Best & Kahn, 2006, p. 261) to capture rich and thick description that addressed the research questions. Naturalistic methods influenced the whole process of data collection, which included participant observation, whole-school observations, classroom observations, interviews, observation notes, audio and video-recordings, and document reviews.

The ethnographic research methods that I utilised enabled me to discover, identify, describe, and interpret language ideologies of my research participants and also enabled me to observe and to describe their practices using English language in natural settings, in classes and throughout their interactions in school. Because Rampton (2007) argued, case studies should always be positioned within some wider setting and context, I positioned my case within the social, historical, political, and

cultural contexts of the school and outside the school, most importantly the status and role of English in Indonesia.

THE STUDY
A State Senior High School: The research site

The study was conducted in 2012 when the school had the status as a Pioneer International Standard School. I purposively selected Senior High School *Negeri* (pseudonym) as the research site. The school, established in 1950, is located in the capital city of Central Java Province, Indonesia. The school was chosen as the research site for the following reasons: There are 16 state senior high schools in the city, including three state schools accredited as Pioneer International Standard Schools (*Dinas Pendidikan Kota*, 2012). Senior High School *Negeri* was designated a Pioneer International Standard School from the academic year of 2009/2010. Before being given this status by the Government, this school had been implementing an English immersion program since 2004. In the period 2004 to 2008, three English immersion classes had been running in Years 10, 11 and 12, and the rest of the classes were regular where the language of instruction was Indonesian.

English was the medium of instruction in seven subjects: Mathematics, Biology, Physics, Chemistry, History, Economics and Accounting, and Geography. The teachers in the immersion program were Indonesian teachers appointed by the principal. They undertook English professional development training conducted in collaboration with a local university. During the years 2004 to 2008 the English immersion program was implemented gradually in the classrooms until the immersion teachers were expected to teach in English through most of the class time. Deputy principal for curriculum affairs provided this information during an informal interview (3 September 2012). With this historical background of the school, I assumed Senior High School *Negeri* might have been considered the leader of English bilingual education program in the city. However, my preliminary informal conversations with a teacher of the school indicated that having the first English immersion programs in the city did not necessarily mean that the school was a model of the ways that the program could be implemented.

The other reason for my choice of this school was accessibility. During the preparation of the current research project in 2011 I had already obtained informal permission from the school administrators to conduct research there, and had been able to make frequent contact through emails, short message service (sms), and telephone calls with the deputy principal for curriculum affairs as the "gatekeeper" (Creswell, 2013, p. 94) who managed access to other participants and the school.

In 2009, the school gained the status as a Pioneer International Standard School (source: *Keputusan Direktur Jenderal Manajemen Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, Departemen Pendidikan Nasional*/Decree of Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education Management, Ministy of National Education, No. 1823/C.C4/LL/2009). As a Pioneer International Standard School, particular subject teachers were required to use English as the medium of instruction alongside Indonesian and to apply Information Communication Technology in their teaching and learning processes. The subjects were Mathematics and Science and included Biology, Chemistry and Physics (Regulation of the Ministry of National Education No. 78/2009).

The student population of the school was 1243 consisting of 553 male students and 790 female students. There were 42 classes; 14 classes for each grade

(Year 10, Year 11 and Year 12) with an average of 32 students in each class. The total number of the teachers was 86 consisting of 37 male teachers and 49 female teachers and 12 administrative staff (source: School Administration Package/*Paket Administrasi Sekolah*, 2012). The vast majority of the school community members was Javanese.

At the time of the research, there was an acting principal. He was a principal for another Pioneer International Standard School in the city and he was also a coordinator of Pioneer International Standard Schools in Central Java. There were four deputy principals; each was in charge of one area of the school affairs: curriculum, students, facilities, and public relations. In addition, there was a Management Representative of the Pioneer International Standard School or commonly it was called the Pioneer International Standard School program coordinator (henceforth, program coordinator). Unlike this type of school, regular schools did not have a program coordinator, who had been assigned by the principal to be responsible for any programs implemented, including the use of English in Mathematics and Science subjects and in school.

During my data collection, I noticed there was a billboard posted at the front yard of the school stating the vision and mission of the school. The vision and mission read as follows:

> *Visi:*
>
> *Menjadi sekolah bertaraf internasional yang unggul dalam prestasi dan budi pekerti, berwawasan imtaq, iptek, nasionalisme, budaya daerah, dan lingkungan.*
>
> *Misi:*
>
> - *Meningkatkan ketaqwaan kepada Tuhan Yang Maha Esa dan berbudi pekerti yang luhur.*
> - *Mengembangkan kemampuan berkomunikasi dalam bahasa Inggris dan bahasa asing serta menguasai ilmu pengetahuan dan teknologi secara profesional.*
> - *Meningkatkan potensi diri untuk meraih prestasi dalam bidang akademis dan nonakademis secara nasional dan internasional melalui pembelajaran berbasis siswa.*
> - *Menjunjung tinggi nilai budaya daerah dan nasionalisme.*
> - *Meningkatkan sarana dan prasarana pendidikan yang berstandar internasional serta lingkungan sekolah yang bersih, sehat, dan asri.*
> - *Meningkatkan kemandirian dan berperan aktif secara internasional dalam perkembangan dunia dari perspektif ekonomi, sosiokultural, dan lingkungan hidup.*
> - *Meningkatkan peran serta masyarakat dalam pendidikan dan kepedulian terhadap masyarakat kurang mampu secara sosial ekonomi yang berprestasi.* (Observation notes, 3 September 2012)
>
> (My translation: The vision says: Pursuing an international standard school which is excellent in achievements and manners, religious, open minded in science, knowledge, information communication technology, nationalism, local culture, and environment. The school missions are to improve religious state of mind and good manners, develop communication skills in English and/or other foreign languages and develop science and technology, improve the school self-potential to pursue academic and non-academic achievements in national and

international levels through student-based learning, appreciate values of local culture and nationalism, improve school facilities based on international standard, improve clean and healthy school environment, improve self-reliance and actively participate in the globalized world from the perspectives of economics, socio culture and environment, and improve communities' participation in education and caring to children coming from low-income families).

The school's mission indicated its intention to develop the school community members' communication skills in English and/or other foreign languages although it was not stated clearly what other foreign language(s) would be used in the school.

Access to the site

In this section, I will recount the procedure of gaining access to the research site. The first step in gaining access to the site was seeking the permission of gatekeepers (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). In most schools, the principal is the most important gatekeeper in determining admission into the school for research (Gay & Airasian, 2003). At the selected research site, however, the gatekeepers were the acting principal, the deputy principal for curriculum affairs, and the program coordinator.

After obtaining the permission from the acting principal who strongly influenced the decision to allow me to conduct my study in that school, I was required by the school to obtain formal written permission from *Dinas Pendidikan Kota*/ Department of Education of the city. This is in line with Gay and Airasian (2003) who observed that there may be a central body that decides on the acceptability of proposed research study requests, although the school principal will still likely have substantial input in the decision to permit use of his or her school. Even though the acting principal allowed me to conduct the study there, it was the procedure to have written permission from the Department of Education. Before applying for the approval from the Department of Education, I had to obtain a written recommendation from the Dean of the Faculty at the state university where I was employed as a lecturer. In addition, research ethics approval from the university where I was doing my postgraduate study was another requirement that I had to receive before conducting the research. This process of obtaining entrance to the field site was quite lengthy.

Gaining permission to the school also required negotiation between myself and the school gatekeepers (Gay & Airasian, 2003). For example, I negotiated with the deputy principal for curriculum affairs about the issue of timing, that is, the period of my field work. I was advised not to conduct my fieldwork at times when teachers would possibly concentrate on reviewing their lessons and trying out tests as part of their students' preparation for the school and national examination. Therefore, before my fieldwork, we negotiated the appropriate months of data collection. The first face-to-face meeting with the four deputy principals and the program coordinator on the first day of my fieldwork was mainly intended to explain my research plan to complement information in the participant information sheet that I had already sent to them by emails. I found it was very important to provide them with information on my research activites in the school.

My professional identity as a lecturer at a state university in the city and my identity as a doctoral student helped me to have access to the space of the school. I became aware that my identities, as a lecturer and a doctoral student, seemed to be seen by the gatekeepers as a linguistic and knowledge resource that the school could take advantage of. The following communications (translated from Indonesian into

English) show the responses of the deputy principal for curriculum affairs and the program coordinator to my request for access to participants:

> We welcome you to do research in our school. We are willing to do what you have already planned in your research plan as far as we can. We also hope that we can read findings of your research which can be very useful information resource for us in implementing programs of Pioneer International Standard. (Deputy principal for curriculum affairs, informal conversation, 1 September 2012)

After the deputy principal's statement, the program coordinator said:

> If you want to interact with teachers intensively, you can choose a desk in the teachers' room. So, you can come to school every day to do observations and interviews as you wish. Please come on Monday morning before the flag ceremony at 6:45 AM, so we can introduce you to all teachers. Is that fine with you?

Then, he continued:

> Do you want us to choose teachers to become your participants, or will you approach them by yourself and asked them to be your participants? Perhaps it is better for you to talk and ask teachers directly rather than we decide which teachers. We can ask some teachers now to come here [the deputy principal's and the program coordinator's office] if you like. (Program coordinator, informal interview, 1 September 2012)

It seemed that my presence in school was taken as an opportunity for the school management leaders to obtain more understanding about what had been happening in school concerning the government's promotion of the use of English.

The participants

My access to research participants was through the deputy principal for curriculum affairs and the program coordinator. The participants in this study were the teachers of Mathematics, Biology, Chemistry, Information Communication Technology, and Geography. Of the five subject teachers, there were three female and two male.

First, Ms Lis (pseudonym) was a Geography teacher. She was qualified with a bachelor degree in Geography education from a local university. She had been teaching in the school for 26 years. In 2004 when the school initiated the English immersion program, she was assigned by the principal to teach in immersion classes. In 2005 she undertook English language training conducted by the school in collaboration with a local university. The English training which were done once a week for one semester aimed at using English for instructional purposes. Some English major lecturers from the university facilitated the teachers in improving their English language skills and gave guidance in preparing syllabus and lesson plans in English. In 2009 Ms Lis took training in English for daily conversation conducted by the school in cooperation with a private English language training course in the city.

Second, Ms Tuti (pseudonym) was a Mathematics teacher. She had been teaching in the school for nine years. She was also chosen by the principal to teach in English immersion classes in 2005. Her bachelor's degree in Mathematics education was obtained from a local university. She undertook four English short professional development courses conducted by the school; two aimed at English for daily conversation, one was TOEFL, and the other was English classroom language. The language training took eight to 12 meetings. Each meeting lasted two hours and was conducted once a week.

Third, Mr Cho (pseudonym) was a Biology teacher. He had 30-years teaching experience in the school. Like Ms Lis and Ms Tuti, he was also assigned by the principal to teach in immersion classes in 2004. He had a bachelor's degree in Biology education from a local university. Similar to Ms Tuti, Mr Cho undertook English short professional development four times conducted by the school: two aimed at English for daily conversation, one was TOEFL, and the other was English classroom language.

Fourth, Mr Brur (pseudonym) was an Information and Communication Technology teacher. He had just been teaching in the school for two years (that is, since 2010). His bachelor's degree was in Information Technique from a local university. Mr Brur had never taken English professional development.

Fifth, Ms Dian (pseudonym) was a Chemistry teacher. She had been assigned to teach in the school for four years. She had a bachelor's degree in Chemistry education from a local university. Both Mr Brur and Ms Dian had not taught in immersion classes. But, like Ms Tuti and Mr Cho, Ms Dian has undertaken four English short professional developments held in the school: two aimed at English for daily conversation, one was TOEFL, and the other was English classroom language.

None of the teachers in my study had experienced special training in English bilingual education program during their study at university, but they took English as a compulsory course for one semester. In addition, they were government employees and had a Javanese ethnic group background. As government teachers, they passed a set of tests conducted by the government, written aptitude and citizenship tests, and met all the requirements including holding a bachelor degree in the content subjects. But, there was no specific English proficiency requirement.

The other key participants were the acting principal, the deputy principal for academic affairs, and the program coordinator. In addition, I had some informal conversations with an English teacher who was also a mentor in the English Conversation Club for students in school, and a senior government officer at the Department of Education Central Java Province. All ten participants produced very rich data for the current research.

ROLES OF THE RESEARCHER

In qualitative research, it was of paramount importance to establish and develop a good rapport with participants of the study. My relationships with the research participants were shaped through our interpersonal dynamics which resulted from my multiple roles during my fieldwork. In the following, I described my roles in terms of reciprocity and reflexivity (Creswell, 2013) during fieldwork.

Reciprocity

Reciprocity is about benefits for me and my research participants from the study. Creswell (2013) reminds qualitative researchers that reciprocity is important, "giving back to participants for their time and efforts in our projects" (p. 55). When I designed my research project, recalling the point Gay and Airasian (2003) made that "it is not unusual for the principal or teachers to want something in return for their participation" (p. 87), I had been thinking about what my potential participants would gain from my study as to what I would give back to them and to the school. Gradually, I felt that the benefits for my participants in the research became apparent.

In my research I found myself in a similar situation to Lonsmann (2011) that my role as researcher in school also entailed the roles of expert, consultant, and confidante (Lonsmann, 2011). For example, I occupied all those roles when Ms Tuti

who was going to take part in an English language competition held by the Department of Education Central Java Province, asked assistance from me in checking her PowerPoint presentation and mentoring in a practice run. Another example was that at the teachers' office, I was frequently asked by some teachers about some English specific terms in their subjects. I was also asked by an English teacher to give a presentation for students in an English Conversation Club meeting, one of the extracurricular activities offered to students. In addition, school executives, particularly the program coordinator and the deputy principal for curriculum affairs, asked me to observe and give feedback on a five-day TOEFL (Test of English as Foreign Language) training for 20 subject teachers, held in the school.

In these respects, I felt I was seen by the school community as a facilitator, someone who could assist to achieve teachers' objectives. Another example of my role as a facilitator was on the two-day visit of an Australian teacher from a school in Queensland, when the program coordinator asked me to join him to welcome the guest teacher. The program coordinator and I accompanied the guest who gave short talks in some classes and looked around the school. It was a reciprocal visit after a Physics teacher and some students had spent time in the school in Queensland several months before, and they had experienced home stay for two weeks there.

> This morning the program coordinator met me when I was interviewing a teacher in a computer laboratory. He explained briefly about a visit of an Australian teacher and asked me to join him to welcome the guest because most of teachers would be teaching at the time. Implicitly I was expected to speak a lot with the guest and describe the school. I felt that my English skills were considered by the program coordinator to help him to communicate with the Australian guest. (Observation notes, 18 September 2012)

My roles seemed to be not only as a language expert, consultant, or facilitator, but also close confidante for some teachers. They enjoyed talking to me to "get things off their chest," talking about their problems and difficulties using English in their teaching. For example, several participants said that they would not have talked to other teachers or even to school executives about the matters they just shared, only with me. I was seen as "a relief agency or counsellor" (Wood, 1992, p. 40) by some teachers. One comment from Ms Dian supported that view. She said, "During your presence here, I feel I have a friend to share my feelings about English" (Informal interview, 3 October 2012). Some participants and other teachers said that during my time at the school, they felt they had 'a buddy,' a friend with whom they could share their thoughts and feelings, especially about English language practice.

I was also conscious that my participants expected to gain something from my study such as the program coordinator expecting to read in depth research results.

> I would like to know your research findings and have a copy of the report. I am sure your findings could become our reference to do English language-related programs in our school. Your research will help us know our own strengths, weaknesses, obstacles and threats in using English in our school because so far, since we got the status as Pioneer International Standard School, there was no study like what you have been doing now, immersing yourself with teachers, coming to school every day, and talking with us. Previous research conducted in our school was usually just distributing

questionnaire and doing one or two classroom observations. (Program coordinator, informal interview, 29 September 2012)

In all these various respects, I felt quite deeply involved in the life of the school and I believe that I was quite functional for that purpose.

Reflexivity

I was aware of monitoring my own role in the gathering of data and necessarily being aware of the impact of my activities and my behaviour on the research participants in particular, and on the school community in general. I entered the research site with no prior relationship with the participants, but we shared the same nationality, ethnicity, language and profession as educators. I needed to be reflexive about how my personal experiences, beliefs and values may have shaped my interpretation of the events. My self-awareness of my positioning in all phases of the research process is called reflexivity by Creswell (2013) and Townley (2008). As Creswell (2013) explained:

> Researchers "position themselves" in a qualitative research study. This means that researchers convey (i.e., in a method section, in an introduction, or in other places in a study) their background (e.g. work experiences, cultural experiences, history), how it informs their interpretation of the information in a study, and what they have to gain from the study. (p. 47)

Townley (2008) suggests that qualitative researchers "have to be reflexive and consider whether or not their own biases and expectations of the surroundings under study are influencing their results and findings" (p. 3).

Reflexivity, according to Given (2008) and Tricoglus (2001), can also mean the way in which the researcher as the observer has an impact on what is observed. For example, after teaching, Ms Tuti and I walked together into the teachers' office. While we were walking through the school corridor, I asked about her feeling when I sat in her class. She responded to my question by saying, *"I should do the best, optimising my English abilities when teaching today since you were there in my class. You were observing my English, weren't you?"* (Ms Tuti, informal conversation, September 20, 2012). Her response made me more aware of the effect of my presence in classrooms.

DATA SOURCES AND DATA COLLECTION METHODS

This study was carried out using five methods of data collection: whole-school observations, classroom observations, observation notes, in-depth interviews, and site document reviews. In the following, I further describe the methods employed in data collection and analysis.

Whole-school observations

The purpose of whole-school observations was to observe whether there were emerging situations or events related to the use of English for every day communication, such as in the teachers' office, the administration staff room, science or interest clubs in the school. Observations were also made of whether any school announcements, posters, or mottoes were displayed in English. For two months, on weekdays (Monday to Saturday), from seven in the morning until two in the afternoon (during school hours) I went to the school and spent the days in various locations, including the teachers' office, principal's office, deputy principals' office, administration staff's office, canteen, school hall, sports yard, and parking area.

I had informal chats with other teachers, a security guard, a cleaning service worker, and some students. After school hours, I often joined students' extracurricular activities, such as English Conversation Club on Wednesdays from 2:00 pm – 3:00 pm. Also, I attended teacher professional development meetings, such as a TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) training conducted in the school and a teacher professional development for Biology teachers across the city (*Musyawarah Guru Mata pelajaran/MGMP*) to which they invited two Biology lecturers from a local university to enrich teachers' content knowledge with the newest development of Biology subject matter. In addition, I often accompanied some teacher participants to the school canteen for lunch during the breaks and I encouraged them to tell their stories. My main focus of interest on the school observations was discovering English language use among the school community members.

Classroom observations

The classroom observations were conducted on five occasions, as shown in Table 1. For all classroom observations, all times and days of observations were proposed by the teachers themselves. Although I observed one subject teacher in one lesson, the data from the classroom observations were enriched with the data from post-lesson interviews with video-stimulated recall, classroom observation sheets, observation notes, review of the teaching documents, informal conversations, and also supported with my prolonged engagement and observations in the school.

It would have been valuable for me as a researcher if I had been able to conduct more classroom observations to further explore teachers' language practices in classrooms. This constraint was also due to the teacher participants' time availability. For example, some teachers gave me the same schedule for classroom observations. This overlapping schedule made me have to choose which I would first observe. This resulted in re-arranging a new schedule to observe other teachers' classrooms while I was constrained by the time frame of the fieldwork set by the school authority. The classroom observation was more than adequately complemented by informal observations in the school community of these teachers.

Table 1. Schedule of classroom observations

No	Date	Time	Lesson	Year	Topic of the lesson
1	4 September 2012	7:45 am – 8.30 am	Geography	12	Industrial and agricultural locations
2	13 September 2012	8:30 am – 9:15 am	Information and Communication Technology	10	Functions and system of telecommunication network (wireline, wireless, modem and satellite)
3	13 September 2012	10:15 am – 11:00 am.	Biology	11	Human movement

					skeleton
4	13 September 2012	11:00 am – 11.45 am	Mathematics	11	Cyclical permutation
5	17 September 2012	10:00 am – 11:00 am.	Chemistry	10	Periodic table and periodic properties

During classroom observations, I sat on a chair at the back of the classrooms. The lessons were videorecorded. To enable me to have ample opportunity to write on my classroom observation sheet (Appendix F: Classroom observation sheet) and to take notes while I was observing, I asked assistance from a former student from my university to video record the lessons. Since I had explained my research plan with the teachers through the Participant Information Sheet and oral explanation at the first meeting with them, they understood that their lessons would be videorecorded not by me but by another person while I would be sitting down quietly and observing classroom activities. I made sure that my assistant who would videorecord in classes would keep all recordings confidential. In short, all teachers were willingly videorecorded. Each teacher requested one copy of their own lesson DVD for their own collection.

There might have been a certain degree of uneasiness about my presence in the classrooms and my videorecording. In the beginning of my fieldwork, the teachers understood that their teaching was not being assessed for any purpose other than the study. Besides, I conducted the classroom observations after I was engaged in interpersonal interactions with the teachers for quite some time in the school. In the post-teaching interviews, the teachers and I discussed about possible impact of my presence and the video equipment in the classes. My impact was minimal because, as they stated, they did not feel as being supervised (Post-lesson interviews, numerous occasions).

The classroom observation sheet contained three sections. The first section was general information (date of observation, time allotment, year, subject, topic of the lesson, objectives of the lesson). Section two focused on all of the teachers' language use which was divided into five phases (pre-lesson, orientation phase, enhancing phase, synsethising phase, and post lesson) and the use of teaching media. Section three was about non-verbal behaviours of the teachers when using Indonesian, English and/or Javanese as the language(s) of instruction (their facial expression, body language, and voice audibility).

Before classroom observations, I had been given lesson plans by the teachers. The lesson plans oriented me to what the teachers were going to teach on the day and what teaching and learning activities the teachers were going to do with their students in the classrooms. An example of a lesson plan can be seen in Appendix H.

Observation notes

Observation notes were the descriptions of what I observed in relation to the use of English by teachers both in classrooms and inside the school as well as by other members of the school community. I wrote classroom observation notes during my classroom observations to complement the classroom observation sheets. During my fieldwork at the school, I also made observation notes that I wrote in in my notebook (a small writing book) which I could carry easily. Usually I took notes in the teachers' office or at my home after school. The notes contained what I saw, heard,

experienced and thought about during observations (Gay & Airasian, 2003). The notes on whole-school observations included observations in the teachers' office, the administration staff office, the English Conversation Club meetings, the school canteen, the subject teachers' meetings, the teachers' professional development, and also when the school had English native-speaker guests from New Zealand and Australia.

In-depth interviews: Pre-teaching interviews and post-teaching interviews (video stimulated recall)

For each subject teacher in my study, I conducted interviews twice, pre-teaching interview (before classroom observation) and post-teaching interview (after classroom observation). The interviews were audio recorded and were conducted one-to-one in order to ensure privacy and to explore each participant's responses in depth, as Best and Kahn (2006) pointed out that the purpose of interviewing is to find out "what is in or on someone else's mind and to access the perspective of the person being interviewed" (p. 265).

The pre-teaching interviews were developed through an interview guide in order to initiate responses. Then, follow-up questions depended on individual responses to the interview questions. There were eight topics that I asked of the teachers: their experiences in teaching the subject, their learning experiences in the subject when they were students, the history of the school as Pioneer International Standard School, their perceptions on their Pioneer International Standard School, the school's general view about the use of English in the school, the teachers' perceptions of the English language, the teachers' opinions about English bilingual education, and their opinions, including their feelings on learning and using English in the school. Each of these topics was elaborated into some questions. I encouraged my participants to elaborate and move the interview in the direction of their choice. Additionally, informal interviews and conversations with the teachers in different situations gave important and useful information on their voices about learning and using English.

After classroom observations, I conducted the second interviews with the teachers (the post-lesson interviews). The post-lesson interviews were conducted one or two days after the classroom observations following the availability of the teachers and the readiness of the videorecording in the form of Digital Video Disc (DVD). The teacher and I watched the video of the lesson during the second interview (video-stimulated recall). I sought the teachers' views of their own lessons, the activities they undertook and the rationale for in-class decisions. The guiding question in this post-lesson interview was "*Could you please describe what you were doing in the classroom?*" The purpose was for the teachers to reflect on their own teaching practices and explain the rationale for their teaching behaviours, their language use, and their classroom interactions.

Furthermore, interviews were conducted with the school principal, the deputy principal for curriculum affairs, the program coordinator, an English teacher, and a government official of the Department of Education Central Java Province. The interviews focused on their views on the government's encouragement of the use of English in the school, whether there were communities of practice in the use of English, and their own opinions about the English language. I also took notes on conversations with other school community members such as other teachers at the school, some administration staff, some students during their break time in the school

corridor and the school hall, a cleaning service worker, some sellers in the school canteen, and a security guard. The conversations gave me complementary and useful information related to the use of English at school.

Site document review
During my fieldwork, I looked at teaching tools and resources used by the teachers. The teaching tools and resources referred to lesson plans, handbooks, worksheets and teaching media used during the lessons. All teaching resources in Pioneer International Standard Schools were supposed to be written in Indonesian and English (Program coordinator interview, 29 September 2012). My examination of the documents aimed to find out to what extent the teaching resources were written in English, to what extent they were used by the teachers in the lessons, and to what extent teaching practices aligned with the lesson plans.

DATA ANALYSIS
In keeping with the multiple methods of data collection, the interpretation and analysis of the data involved cross-checking different sources of evidence. I undertook three processes in analysing the data to find answers to the three guiding research questions. The first process was identifying and describing subject teachers' language ideologies of English by mainly analysing pre-teaching interview data by using a thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In the second process, I looked at subject teachers' teaching practices with particular interest in their language practices. The data derived from classroom observation data which included video recordings of the lessons, the classroom observation sheet for each lesson, classroom observation notes, lesson transcripts, post-teaching interview data (video-stimulated recall), and teaching tools and resources. I used thematic analysis to discover commonalities across the lessons observed.

In the third process I identified and described school executives' English language ideologies by using thematic analysis. The aim was to find out linkages between teachers' English language ideologies and school executives' to uncover alignment or tensions amongst their language ideologies and also the effects of language ideologies that circulated in the school. The processes of analysing the data were recurrent, that is, analyses, descriptions and interpretations were carried out continously throughout the period of study. In the following I will describe the data analysis methods in detail.

Method of analysing subject teachers' and school executives' English language ideologies
As discussed in the theoretical framework of the study in Chapter 2, language ideologies can be identified in three ways through investigating: linguistic practices, explicit talk about language (metalinguistic or metapragmatics), and implicit assumptions about language (Woolard, 1998). In the current study, I employed all three ways in investigating the participants' English language ideologies. To identify the participants' language ideologies and related language beliefs, I inferred and interpreted from their explicit talk about the English language and their assumptions which were implicitly stated. Later, when I investigated manifestations of their language ideologies in their observable classroom practices, I focussed on the teachers' language practices.

Following Abdi (2009), Palmer (2011), and Pan (2011) who used thematic analysis as the data analytical method in their language ideologies studies, I also analysed the interview data, both pre-teaching and post-teaching interview data, using thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is "a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 79). Braun and Clarke explained that "a theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research questions" and it can also "represent some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set" (p. 82). Braun and Clarke (2006) suggest six phases of doing thematic analysis: familiarising oneself with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing a report. I did the step-by-step actions in thematic analysis as follows:

First, to familiarise myself with the data I listened to the audio recordings as soon as I could after observations. I listened to them several times while doing informal coding of the data.

Second, I did all transcribing by myself. Transcribing by myself actually enhanced familiarity with my participants' utterances, so I was able to do "an interpretive act" (Bailey, 2008, p. 130) of what was said by the participants. As Bailey (2008) stated:

> Transcription involves close observation of data through repeated careful listening (and/or watching), and this is an important first step in data analysis. This familiarity with data and attention to what is actually there rather than what is expected can facilitate realisations or ideas which emerge during analysis. (p. 129)

Third, I read through all interview transcripts at least three times as Braun and Clarke (2006) suggest that "it is ideal to read through the entire data set at least once before you begin your coding, as ideas and identification of possible patterns will be shaped as you read through" (p. 87). Repeated reading of all the transcripts enabled me to start informal coding.

Fourth, when I read and re-read all the transcripts several times, I marked any instances of what the participants said about the English language and what they said they felt and thought about the language as it appeared in their talk. I marked them up with different coloured pens or using highlighters to indicate both potentially tacit or implicit notions in addition to explicit language ideologies, that is, explicit verbal expressions about the English language. For example:

Table 2. Data extract, with codes applied (adapted from Braun and Clarke, 2006)

Data extract	Coded for
Belajar bahasa Inggris ngelu rasane. Aku ora iso opo-opo. Ngelu. Sedih. Akan mengajar sedih. Tidak gembira tapi sedih karena harus berbahasa Inggris. Langsung praktek dengan bahasa Inggris kan tidak bisa. Bingung, sedih, stress. (Mr Cho, interview, 7 September 2012) (My translation: I feel headache when learning English. I do not know English. Headache. Sad. Whenever I	*Belajar bahasa Inggris dan menggunakan bahasa Inggris membuat guru stress dan terbebani.* (My translation: Learning English and at the same time teaching in English make teachers feel it a burden and stressed).

was going to teach, I felt sad. I was not happy in teaching, but sad because I had to use English. Suddenly I had to teach in English, of course I couldn't. Confused. Sad. Stress).		

Fifth, after all data were initially coded and collated, and I had a long list of the different codes that I had identified across the data set, I re-focussed "the analysis at the broader level of themes, rather than codes, involves sorting the different codes into potential themes and collating all the relevant coded data extracts within the identified themes" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 89). For example:

Table 3. Data extract, with codes and potential themes applied
(adapted from Braun and Clarke, 2006)

Data extract	**Coded for**	**Potential themes**
Belajar bahasa Inggris ngelu rasane. Aku ora iso opo-opo. Ngelu. Sedih. Akan mengajar sedih. Tidak gembira tapi sedih karena harus berbahasa Inggris. Langsung praktek dengan bahasa Inggris kan tidak bisa. Bingung, sedih, stress. (Mr Cho, interview, 7 September 2012) (My translation: I feel headache when learning English. I do not know English. Headache. Sad. Whenever I was going to teach, I felt sad. I was not happy in teaching, but sad because I had to use English. Suddenly I had to teach in English, of course I couldn't. Confused. Sad. Stress).	*Belajar bahasa Inggris dan menggunakan bahasa Inggris membuat guru stress dan terbebani.* (My translation: Learning English and at the same time teaching in English make teachers feel it a burden and stressed).	*Menggunakan bahasa Inggris dalam mengajar itu beban.* (My translation: Using English to teach is a burden).
Saya malah lebih senang dengan salam Assalamu'alaikum daripada harus mengatakan good morning setelah itu tidak bisa menjelaskan secara bahasa Inggris atau bahkan merasa takut. Siswa sendiri tidak bisa atau tidak tahu apa yang disampaikan dalam bahasa Inggris tersebut. Saya sendiri bahasa Inggrisnya kurang, dalam segi pelogatan kurang	1. *Guru takut menggunakan bahasa Inggris.* 2. *Anggapan guru bahwa siswa tidak paham bila guru berbahasa Inggris.* 3. *Guru tidak percaya diri menggunakan bahasa Inggris.* (My translation: 1. The	

maksimal, siswa salah persepsi, salah penerimaan, malah menjadi masalah.(Mr Brur, interview, 4 September 2012) (My translation: I would rather greet my students by saying "Assalamu'alaikum" than "Good morning." What is it for, then, if I can not explain my lessons in English and even feel afraid. The students themselves may not understand what is being explained in English. I myself lack English skills particularly in pronunciation. Mispronunciation can make students misunderstand what I am saying. And this will become a problem.	teacher is afraid of using English; 2. The teacher assumed that students would not understand him if he spoke in English; 3. The teacher does not have self-confidence to speak English).	

In short, I paraphrased the participants' English language ideologies and their related beliefs about language into themes. Thus, a theme captures meanings and content of the participants' English language ideologies.

Method of analysing teachers' classroom practices focussing on their language practices

To find answers for the research question number two: "How are manifestations of subject teachers' English language ideologies evident in their classroom practices, most particularly their language practices?" I employed a thematic analysis. I analysed subject teachers' observable classroom practices with particular interest in the teachers' language practices. Post-lesson interviews with video-stimulated recall were transcribed by myself. Similar to the pre-lesson interview data analysis, I conducted thematic analysis for the post-lesson interview data to search for themes. The Digital Video Disc (DVD) of the lessons, classroom observation sheets and classroom observation notes in addition to teaching tools and resources including lesson plans, handbooks, worksheet, and teaching media or PowerPoint presentations functioned to provide complementary data.

In presenting the data analysis and findings, I selected episodes from those lessons. Episodes are "interactional sequences bounded by change of activity or topic" (Hornberger & Chick, 2001, p. 32). My knowledge and reading of the literature has provided me with "a set of sensitising concepts" (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003, p. 19) so that I could enhance my analysis and use these concepts to begin working on the data.

All four datasets (interviews, observations, observation notes, and site documents) functioned to provide "descriptive complementarity" (Palmer, 2011, p.109) which allowed me to address the research questions more thoroughly. Chimbutane (2011) supported this by saying:

From an ethnographic perspective, and in keeping with the multiple method approach adopted for data collection, the interpretation and analysis of the data involved triangulation of different sources of evidence. All sources of evidence are reviewed and analysed together and, as a consequence, the findings were based on convergence of information from those different sources. (p. 11)

ISSUES OF TRANSCRIPTION AND TRANSLATION
I, the researcher as the transcriber

Transcribing as the first step in analysing the data involved an interpretive process. I found it necessary and useful to transcribe all interview data and lessons by myself, since the participants and I shared the same language background, Indonesian and Javanese, and we came from the same sociocultural background, Indonesian nationality from Javanese ethnic group. I felt certain that I had adequate preparation for transcribing the entire interview and lessons. The recordings were relatively easy to understand because of their good recording quality. Moreover, participants' utterances were interpretable through my knowledge of their local context (Bailey, 2008).

In accord with the purposes of the study to investigating language ideologies, my transcriptions did not capture features of talk such as timing, pauses, speed, coughs, and laughs, since the transcriptions focussed on what were said rather than how things were said. Content and meaning of participants' utterances became the focus of the investigation, not the way in which something was said.

I, the researcher as the translator

At the beginning of each interview with the participants, I asked them what language(s) they would use, and all of them always preferred Indonesian and/or Indonesian mixed with Javanese. Their preference indicated their language ideologies in that they might feel much more comfortable and easy to express their feelings and anything that they intended to say in the languages with which they were both familiar and competent.

In one of supervisory meetings with both of my research supervisors, the issue of the act of translation was raised by them. I was asked whether or not I would consider involving a second translator in addition to myself. The function of translation in this study was to report the data to readers who do not speak the Indonesian and Javanese languages. In the following I justify my decision to be the sole translator of the data.

To the best of my knowledge, English-medium research reports, including international journal articles, thesis, and dissertations conducted and written by Indonesian researchers who studied in foreign countries such as in Australia and Thailand, did not address nor identify the issue of translation of their interview transcripts from the Indonesian language into the English language (see e.g., Basamala, 2010; Haryanto, 2012; Hawanti, 2012; Jafar, 2010; Pasassung, 2003; Zacharias, 2003). Although it was clear from their methodology chapters that they conducted interviews with Indonesian participants in the Indonesian language, it appeared that they did not consider the act of translation as a matter of significance. However, in contrast, Temple and Young (2004) pointed out that "centring translation and how it is dealt with raises issues of representation that should be of concern to all researchers" (p. 161).

Translation adds an additional layer of interpretation to the transcribing process (Bailey, 2008). Therefore, I chose to be "the researcher as translator" (Temple & Young, 2004, p. 168) because I am fluent in the languages of the participants in the study, Indonesian and Javanese, and I have acquired a reasonable level of competency in the English language. Temple and Young (2004) suggest:

> The researcher/translator role [the researcher as translator] offers the researcher significant opportunities for close attention to cross cultural meanings and interpretations and potentially brings the researcher up close to the problems of meaning equivalence within the research process. (p. 168)

From the outset of the study, with the premise that the act of translation is an act of interpretation, I wanted myself to be the translator. If I had used a translator, I would have had to find someone who was competent in three languages, Indonesian, Javanese, and English, and had understanding of Javanese culture as well as Javanese idiomatic expressions such as: *nopo koq ndadak repot-repot, nggolek rai, kemlinthi* (to name a few from the interview data). Also, I would have had to ensure that the prospective translator had the same perpective as I had since I was the researcher and the participant observer who engaged and immersed in the research process. The translator would have had to be aware of his/her own biases, position, or assumptions that might impact on his/her translation (Nikander, 2008; Temple & Young, 2004; Van Nes, Abma, Jonsson & Deeg, 2010). Surely, to find this kind of an ideal translator would be a very long search.

TRUSTWORTHINESS

Trustworthiness is "validity of the data collection and analysis methods" in qualitative research (Mills, 2007, p. 308). The interpretation and analysis of the data of the current study involved triangulation of multiple sources of data and used multiple data-gathering techniques. I gathered the interrelated data from different sources: pre-teaching and post-teaching interviews, informal conversations, whole-school observations, classroom observations, observation notes, and teaching documents review.

Over two months of my fieldwork I established close rapport with the participants to get rich data. I employed member checks (Creswell, 2013). I showed my participants my preliminary analyses consisting of description of themes. By this way, I tried to seek my participants' alternative interpretations to my analysis. These prolonged engagement, persistent observations, a range of data collection methods, and everyday interaction produced rich data and added to the trustworthiness of the current study.

SUMMARY

In this chapter I have explained the major methodological issues framing the study. Rationale for the selection of the research site and a full description of the school were presented. There was explanation of the roles of the researcher in this study. This chapter also explained the data sources, methods of collecting the data, and how the data were analysed. Trustworthiness of the study was also addressed. In the next chapter, Chapter 4, I move on to present the first data analysis chapter – that is, the description, analysis, and interpretation on the subject teachers' English language ideologies with regard to the use of English in school.

CHAPTER 4
TEACHERS' LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES
ABOUT ENGLISH

INTRODUCTION
In Chapter 3 I have discussed the research methodology including descriptions of the research participants, methods of collecting the data, and methods of analysing the data. I noted in Chapter 3 that all the interviews and collaborative talks were conducted in Indonesian, so all the extracts or quotations used as evidence in the analyses were originally in Indonesian, translated by me into English. In Chapter 4, I aim to analyse prevailing English language ideologies evident in the interview discourse with the subject teachers in the senior high school. The analysis in this chapter was reinforced with observational data which contributed in answering the first research question.

This chapter attempts to answer the research question, "What were subject teachers' language ideologies about English that informed what the teachers said about their use of English in school?" The analysis focussed on finding out what English meant to the teachers in the study, what they said they thought about the use of English in school, what they believed about English, including their feelings and perceptions of English, regarding the government's promotion of the use of English in science and mathematics subjects and its promotion of habitual English language use at school. I will present English language ideologies revealed in the data. Then, I discuss the findings which indicates the teachers' multiple, interconnected, and competing ideologies about the English language. At the end I give a summary of the chapter.

SUBJECT TEACHERS' LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES ABOUT ENGLISH
Having analysed the data, I phrased the teachers' language ideologies as:
(1) Using English is a heavy burden.
(2) We have our own language.
(3) English is the international language.
(4) English benefits students in the future.
(5) Using English will not decrease our nationalism.
The presentation of the language ideologies in this chapter is not based on which ideology is more dominant than the others as the teachers held these multiple ideologies as they moved into different contexts.

Language ideology 1
Using English is a heavy burden
The use of English in Science and Mathematics subjects in the Senior High School was expressed as hard work by all teachers in the study. The teachers had been struggling to be able to teach in English, admitting that their capacity was inadequate to keep up with the bilingual challenge, as English was not a widely used language at the school as their workplace. In the interviews and informal conversations, all teachers discussed at least three inter-related factors that underlay the ideology that *Using English is a heavy burden*, including the issues of difficulties and problems the

teachers faced when teaching through English, time-consuming when teaching subjects in English, and teachers' lack of self-confidence in using English. The major concerns underlying the ideology that *Using English is a heavy burden* will be discussed.

Difficulties and problems teachers faced when teaching through English

Teaching Mathematics and Science bilingually (in Indonesian and English) was felt to be a heavy burden for most teachers. This perception related to the difficulties they faced in preparing the teaching tools which had to be written in English. Tools such as lesson plans, PowerPoint slides, worksheets, quizzes and small tests for assessment as well as other media and materials for teaching and learning, were required in English as well as Indonesian.

Teaching preparation

Part of the burden was not only in the preparation of teaching tools but also in the preparation for delivering a lesson in English. Some teachers admitted they had to practise pronunciation, check accuracy of the grammatical structure of their sentences, and find translations for subject specific terminology. They said it was difficult to deliver lessons in English. For example, Mr Cho recalled that he had to study hard every night, reviewing the subject content in English before teaching the following day (Interview, 7 September 2012). This routine often made him stressed and under pressure. Teaching was no longer fun when using English, as he described:

> English is difficult, make me have very hard time and stressed. I have to study English all the time, practising my English at home before teaching. I can't study English all the time. I have to do other things not only English. (Mr Cho, interview, 7 September 2012)

Their limited English skills and unfamiliarity with the language made the teachers choose to teach in their primary languages, Indonesian or Indonesian mixed with Javanese. Not being able to use English fluently caused personal tension and a feeling of being uncomfortable and uncheerful in the classroom. Mr Cho said, "I always feel anxious and nervous, maybe because I'm afraid of making mistakes" (Interview, 7 September 2012). Memorising such a lot of subject content in English stressed the teachers. They were also afraid of making mistakes when delivering the lesson in English.

Teachers' self-expectation of using "good English"

Some teachers tended to make an assumption that students expected their teachers would deliver good, proper, or correct English in classrooms. The teachers said that they should have what they called 'good English' and this made an added burden. Ms Tuti said:

> I got nervous and hesitant when speaking English in my class, but I tried to make my students as my buddies. So, if I made mistakes in English they gave me comments like correcting my pronunciation. (Ms Tuti, interview, 5 September 2012)

Another example of teachers' opinion that they should provide a good model of English was stated by Mr Brur:

> The English language when pronounced by Javanese people like me sounds different from native speakers of English. Different pronunciation will make students not understand teachers' English. As a result, they will not understand the contents the teachers are trying to explain. This makes a burden and doubles our difficulties. (Interview, 4 September 2012)

To Mr Brur, speaking English without a Javanese accent was preferred, as he considered it important. One of the objectives of the use of English in classrooms and at school was to boost students' English competence by giving them exposure to the use of English. Therefore, the teachers perceived that they were expected to produce acceptable English pronunciation and accurate grammar in order for students to have role models of English.

Mr Brur's concern about the importance of accurate pronunciation of teachers speaking English reflected the finding of the study conducted by Astika and Wahyana (2010) that, even though the teachers in their study used English more than Indonesian in their lessons, more than half of their use of English was incorrect in terms of pronunciation, choice of words, sentence structure, and language functions. From the viewpoint of the quality of teaching and learning, inappropriate language use and incomprehensible language are likely to result in ineffective communication in classrooms. When the language of instruction was difficult to understand, there could be a negative impact on students' comprehension of the language which then very likely caused students to lack understanding of the content knoweldge.

Hard to explain concepts in English

The teachers' comments on their difficulties in explaining specific scientific terms of their subjects in English related to the responsibility embedded in them as teachers to lead students towards understanding subject content. Explaining a new concept, providing fruitful examples, elaborating on initial explanation, questioning, and giving back are all part of a teacher's scaffolding talk. Scaffolding instruction for students is needed to offer high support in lessons (Baker, 2011; Hammond & Gibbon, 2005), but performing the scaffolding instruction, especially through explanatory skills in English was difficult for foreign language users of English, such as these teachers.

Using English in teaching is time-consuming

The belief that *English is a heavy burden* was also derived from experiences described by some teachers that teaching in English was time-consuming.

Translating from Indonesian into English

They said that teaching in English took double the time as teaching in Indonesian as stated by Ms Wulan and Ms Tuti. "If I teach in English, it means double working because I must translate into Indonesian to make sure my students understand my explanation. It's faster to explain using Indonesian," said Ms Wulan (Interview, 21 September 2012). Her comment was similar with Ms Tuti who said:

> My students need longer time to understand my explanation if I used English, compared to when I used Indonesian. They did not comprehend a lesson easily when delivered in English. Sometimes they asked me, mam, what is it in Indonesian, so I had to explain it again in Indonesian. It takes longer time and takes my energy. (Ms Tuti, interview, 5 September 2012)

Re-explaning the content knowledge from English into Indonesian took much of the time allotment of the lesson in which the teachers were expected to cover a certain topic to discuss in one lesson. They did repeat in Indonesian because they were worried if they went on explaining in English, their students would not understand the lesson at all and this could create a boring class situation which might demotivate students in the lessons.

Repeating some explanations

In addition, syllabus and lesson plans demanded the teachers to keep up with basic competence or lesson objectives to be achieved on that day. When teachers repeated

the same content in two languages, English and Indonesian, it was explained by the teachers as spending extra time to talk about the same content. Ms Tuti coined a term *loading-nya lama* (my translation: long loading) to refer to students taking a longer time to understand the lesson when taught in English. She elaborated:

> My students seem to like me using Indonesian because for them it's not thinking double in two languages. If I use English, they need a longer time to understand my lesson. I have found difficulties in saying some English words in the class. Then they [my students] said, "That's fine, Mam, just speak in Indonesian. We like more if you teach in Indonesian. (Ms Tuti, interview, 5 September 2012)

The teachers admitted that they were often not able to catch up with what was written in their lesson plans when they used English in the classrooms because they frequently had to repeat the lessons in Indonesian to make sure that their students understood them.

Exam pressure

It seemed that part of the heavy burden the teachers felt related to curriculum requirements, exam pressure and time constraints which made most teachers prefer using Indonesian more than English. It was more complicated and confusing for the teachers that the national examination administered by the Ministry of Education and Culture was written in Indonesian. All teachers stated that it was risky to teach in English for Year 12 students because of the high-stakes exams. Mr Cho said:

> The national examination is conducted in Indonesian. It is much better if our energy and time are to review lessons for enrichment or remedial teaching rather than using it for teaching through English. (Mr Cho, interview, 1 October 2012)

Mr Brur had another different perception about the use of English in teaching. He viewed that English should not be used to teach a subject but students could be given homework or assignment with some references written in English. He explained:

> Do students understand if subject content is delivered in English like Physics and Biology subjects? Do students understand lessons in English? Being taught in Indonesian, it's not guaranteed students understand the lessons and, moreover, if they are taught in English. That makes a heavy burden, doubles problem: understanding the English language used by the teachers and understanding the content. I would be happier and optimistic that my school which has the status of Pioneer International Standard is progressing, not in teaching subjects in English, but giving students assignments and quizzes in English because English pronounced by Javanese people like us is different. Students will misunderstand our English. (Mr Brur, interview, 20 September 2012)

In Mr Brur's opinion, giving students homework or assignments with references written in English could help students get used to the language while at the same time exploring up-to-date knowledge on Information and Communication Technology, for example, browsing the Internet which mostly used English. He said students would not only learn but also develop their own English skills.

Teachers' lack of self confidence

Most teachers stated both explicitly and implicitly that they felt embarrased, anxious, and also envious. These feelings seemed to stem from their lack of self confidence in using English.

Feeling embarrased

Several teachers preferred not to use English in their lessons because at times they felt embarrassed to use English. They said that their students were better at English than they were. This was contrary to what they said at other times in the interviews that they needed to re-explain some subject content from English into Indonesian since they thought some students were incapable of understanding lessons in English. Despite their belief that not all students were good at English, some teachers admitted that very often they did not have enough self-confidence to speak English in front of students. "Sometimes we do not explain well in Indonesian and, moreover, if we teach in English our foreign language," said Mr Brur (Interview, 4 September 2012). Similarly, Ms Tuti said:

> I guess my students understand that I do not use English very well. Sometimes they gave me comments on my English. For example, they corrected my pronunciation or my grammar. They said, it's wrong mam, you should say this not that. I said to them that if I make mistakes, please correct me. I said to them, I am sure you are good at English and even better than me. (Ms Tuti, interview, 18 September 2012)

The feeling that the teachers shared with me was that teaching in English gave them a burden related to their view that students spoke English better than the teachers. Socioculturally the status of being teachers entails being viewed as persons who should have higher knowledge than students so they can transfer knowledge and educate their students to be more able persons. Therefore, when the teachers perceived that they themselves lacked English skills, they lacked self-confidence in using English.

Anxious and envious

The teachers' view that English was difficult added to their anxiety, reduced confidence, and made the burden heavier. The teachers had to overcome their English language barrier while they also had to grapple with teaching their subjects in English. In other words, the teachers felt under confident about being language models. Although they wanted to provide their students with good models of English, since they were not at ease when teaching using English, the bilingual teaching was felt to be an unattainable practice. Mr Cho and Mr Brur regarded it was too late to learn English at their age. Mr Cho, for example, claimed that the younger people learn a foreign language, the better the results are. He said:

> Students are smarter. They take English private courses after school. And they are still young. They easily learn a foreign language, whereas I have many things to take care of. So, it's difficult for me to learn English. (Mr Cho, interview, 7 September 2012)

To Mr Cho, learning English at all times meant making "a personal sacrifice" (Jeon, 2008, p. 60) as he complained:

> If I always focus on learning English at all times, my other tasks and responsibility as a teacher, a father, and in my community will be in a mess. English comes to me very late. I am above 50 [years old] now, so when can I study English? I do not have time [to study English]. (Mr Cho, interview, 7 September 2012)

Mr Cho's statement clearly showed that he complained about not being able to do his daily activities properly if his concentration was tied to learning and practising English. It seemed that for him learning English was a kind of wasting time, and he blamed the promotion of bilingual program as very late for him. Implicitly he was

also envious of English language teachers at school as he felt it was not fair for him who was expected to teach bilingually:

> Ask the teachers who teach English subject to teach Biology. I am sure they cannot do it. So, what I mean is just teaching as usual. Do not make teachers afraid by asking us to teach in English. Yes, many colleagues are afraid of teaching in English. Many of them got stressed complaining their difficulties and inabilities speaking in English. Students, too. Actually both teachers and students complain. (Mr Cho, interview, 1 October 2012)

The government policy requesting teachers of Science and Mathematics subjects to teach by using English as the language of instruction was felt by some teachers unfair expectation. Teaching Biology was Mr Cho's clearly specific duty. It was realistic to feel envious to teachers of English as they were not expected to do a job beyond their capability as using English as the language of instruction.

Lack of teachers' professional development and training in bilingual education

All teacher participant in the study were non-language subject teachers. They were Mathematics and Science teachers. Four teachers had English training experiences and the other teacher did not have any experience of professional development and training in English language. No teachers were trained as bilingual teachers. They did not have training which prepared them for being competent bilingual teachers nor did they have exposure to teaching approaches in English that used scaffolding strategies to communicate meaningful input to their students. Most teachers reported that they had to have a practice run on their own before teaching. Even though these teachers studied English as a compulsory school subject during high school (Years 7 – 12) and a subject course for one semester when they were at teacher-training college or at university, they were not prepared and trained to be English bilingual teachers.

After the school gained the Pioneer International Standard status, the teachers undertook occasional training sessions in terms of in-house English training after school hours. For example, in the year 2005 Ms Lis, Ms Tuti, and Mr Cho were instructed by the school principal to take English training which was conducted once a week for one semester in the school. This training, facilitated by English and discipline lecturers from a local university, had three objectives, that is the teachers were able to use English for daily conversations, use English for instructional purposes, and prepare syllabus and lesson plans in English. By the end of the training, the teachers did microteaching, that is, practice teaching sessions where the teachers presented short lessons to a small group of colleagues and received feedback on their performance. However, the teachers said that they had limited training in English as the language of instruction. All English training sessions did not equip the teachers with knowledge of language pedagogies and second language learning theories (Teachers' interviews, numerous occasions).

From what I was told in the interviews with all teachers, any professional development in English training sessions seemed to have had minimal results. Mr Cho illustrated that as long as he remembered, there were four English training sessions conducted in the school in collaboration with a local university and English language private institutions. The aims of the training were on general English or English for daily communication. For example, they learned and practised simple greetings in English, such as saying goodbye, giving an invitation, accepting or declining invitation, apologizing, and making compliments. Mr Cho commented that although he attended four training sessions, he still could not use English very well in

teaching (Interview, 28 September 2012). His statement indicated that the English training he undertook did not equip him with English skills necessary for teaching his subject area.

All teachers had multiple reasons which constituted *Using English is a heavy burden*. Considerable comments, complaints, and opinions from the teachers about difficulties and problems they encountered in teaching bilingually seemed to be rooted in their personal experiences in learning and using English. Teachers' English language knowledge, their interest in English, and English training conflicts of purposes contributed to the construction of this ideology.

Language ideology 2
We have our own language

The ideology that *English is a heavy burden* derived mainly from the teachers' experiences in learning and using the language to teach their subjects. The second ideology that I discuss in this section emerged as a result of what the teachers perceived as the status of English in day-to-day life at school and in the local community outside school. The status of English as a foreign language in Indonesia was discussed by all teachers as they talked about their feelings and thoughts, as well as experiences when using English in the school context. The most common statement uttered by the teachers was *Kita punya bahasa sendiri* (my translation: We have our own language). This belief was present with regard to teachers' background, including the community and society that they and the school are part of, teachers' perceived identity, and opportunities for English language use inside and outside school.

Teachers' background

The analysis of my interview data and informal conversations with the teachers confirmed the findings of my observations at school, showing that English use was not prevalent among the school community members. For example, as evident in the interview with Mr Brur:

> I think each language has its own place. When teachers go home seeing their families, involved in their societies and communities, they absolutely use the languages spoken by their families and communities. (Interview, 20 September 2012)

Mr Brur clearly meant that English was not a widely used language for his community and society, so he thought it would be strange to use English while others did not use the language. Mr Cho expressed a similar opinion with Mr Brur about English. He stated:

> *Kenapa sih ndadak repot-repot? Wong dengan bahasa kita sendiri saja kita bisa/*Why should we put ourselves out while we can use our own language.

He continued:

> Our environment is not supportive because our official and national language is Indonesian and because we are Javanese living in Javanese communities. We speak Javanese too. (Mr Cho, interview, 1 October 2012)

I quote Mr Cho's Javanese mixed with Indonesian statement (*Kenapa sih ndadak repot-repot? Wong dengan bahasa kita sendiri saja kita bisa)* to highlight his view that speaking English was a kind of putting himself in trouble because the language was not his own, but Indonesian. Mr Cho's contention that the environments inside and outside school were not supportive of using English was accurate. All members of the school community spoke Indonesian and Javanese. On a very few occasions

they spoke a few words or sentences in English if they were asked in English by several teachers who taught English as a subject (Observation notes, 20 October 2012).

Mr Cho claimed that the Indonesian and Javanese languages had a wider range of vocabulary which could express specific intended meanings, which were not possible in his English vocabulary. As illustrated by Mr Cho, sometimes he felt that there were no English equivalents available to him with his lack of English proficiency for certain Javanese or Indonesian words. He gave an example that in one lesson he wanted to express the Indonesian word *pasrah* in English. He asked his students. Some students called out that *pasrah* equals *ready* in English. But in his opinion, the word *ready* for *pasrah* did not express the same nuance of meaning as he intended. In this case it seemed that as Indonesian and Javanese were the teacher's own languages that were very commonly used, they were much easier and chosen to express his intention. This was because he did not really have any depth of English. Mr Cho's English language proficiency reduced his ability to understand the nuances in the English language evenly.

Teachers' identity

Further discussions revealed that the teachers adhered to the *We have our own language* ideology rooted in their linguistic identity and national identity. Mr Cho commented that using English in teaching could cause trouble because it was not the language of the nation and using English did not show his Indonesian identity (Interview, 1 October 2012). His statement indicated that he linked language to identity. Identity, according to Baker (2011), concerns "the shared characteristics of members of a group, community or region" and "language is an index, symbol and marker of identity" (p. 45). Mr Cho believed that being an Indonesian meant using the Indonesian language as the symbol of Indonesian national identity.

Opportunity for English use inside and outside school

In light of the national identity, some teachers stated their feeling that colleagues might regard teachers who spoke English as strange as it seemed inappropriate to use English among people of Indonesian nationality. Ms Lis shared her story about initiating speaking English with her teacher colleagues:

> If I initiated to speak English, I might be laughed at. They [my colleagues] would think I was like pretending as if I were an English native speaker and acting as if I were a Westerner [Javanese: *halah sok keinggris-inggrisan*]. If they don't like, they will talk behind our back. Actually I can ignore them. It doesn't matter they call me acting like Westerners [*keinggris-inggrisan*]. But I don't feel comfortable with such a comment. I should know my position. I am glad if I am addressed in English or asked to chat in English [by my colleagues] as long as it is not my own initiative because I am not an English subject teacher. (Ms Lis, interview, 1 October 2012)

Halah, sok keinggris-inggrisan (my translation: it's like imitating Westerners) uttered by Ms Lis appeared to be a negative label for any teacher in the school who spoke English. Implicitly she assumed that her colleagues would think that way. Some teachers in the study seemed to be afraid if their colleagues talked negatively about them when they spoke English.

The negative comment towards teachers who spoke English might have arisen from the belief that English was not the common language of the school, the society, the community, and the nation so the teachers who practised English might be considered "different" people. These reactions to the teachers using English

affected the language behaviours of these teachers. Since they were not comfortable with such remarks, they became reluctant to practise English. Ms Lis related this with people's mindset as she described:

> There are some colleagues who like or dislike teachers who speak English. That's common because there are some teachers who have their own mindset and it is difficult to change. They are old-minded [Indonesian colloquial word: *jadul-jaman dulu*], conventional. They do not think the usefulness of English. *Ngopo to wong awake dhewe wis ngene, ya ngene wae*. For these conventional teachers they believe this is just the way they are. However, teachers who want a change, who are open-minded, and think ahead for students' future know the benefits of English skills. (Ms Lis, interview, 4 October 2012)

Ms Lis' description of some colleagues who liked and disliked teachers speaking English showed that to some extent there was some influence of the ideology that *We have our own language* on their attitudes. The individual teachers' comments towards teachers speaking English might derive from their experiences with English. For example, some teachers might have thought that they had been forced by the school authority to use English in teaching or to enforce habitual use of English at school. This rocked their "comfort zone" as they perceived their status as senior and experienced teachers was already established (Ms Manis, an English subject teacher, informal conversation, 4 October 2012). My analysis showed that when a colleague, particularly a new, young teacher, spoke in English with other teachers, and they seemed to be enjoying their simple conversations despite grammatical mistakes, this might cause strong negative emotions on teachers who could not speak English or had low English language skills. To cover their lack of English abilities, these teachers might give such negative remarks such as *Halah sok keinggris-inggrisan* (my translation: Imitating Englishmen or Westerners by speaking English) to teachers who practised English at school. This showed the teachers' defensiveness to cover for feeling inadequate.

The ideology that *We have our own language* seemed to derive from an implicit question about the necessity of using English in school. Mr Cho stated clearly about this:

> Where are we taking our students to? To what direction? Why do we have to use English? If they continue their study in universities in Indonesia, we do not need to insist teaching in English. If students plan to continue to study abroad, English is a must. But, if they study at universities in Indonesia, our time to study English can be used to study additional subject content. (Interview, 1 October 2012)

Mr Cho's statement indicated his doubt about the necessity of English for students. It seemed that Mr Cho thought that using English lacked direct usefulness for students unless they intended to continue their higher education in English speaking countries or universities where English is the instructional language.

The teachers highlighted that they did not own the English language. Several teachers stated that Indonesian should be the only language of instruction at the school as the school was a formal education institution owned by the government. Indonesian as the official and national language was strongly regarded as the marker of national identity and the practical and functional communication tool in their everyday lives, alongside Javanese, as the marker of their ethnicity. The teachers' linguistic background, the opportunity for English language use in and out of school,

national identity, and the status of English language shaped *We have our own language* ideology. This ideology underpinned the teachers' use of Indonesian or Javanese rather than English. As a result, it was simply not possible to suppose that the kind of parity of the languages (i.e. Indonesian, Javanese and English) exists in the context of the study. This was impacted from the government's official ideologies which were still contested. The government policies showed that conflicting ideologies about English existed. So, it was not clear whether or not it enforced the teachers to use English as the medium of instruction

Language ideology 3
English is the international language

All teachers in the study explicitly mentioned that English was chosen by the government as the language of instruction alongside Indonesian over other foreign languages because of its well-recognised status as an international language. It is the language widely spoken in many countries. The teachers talked about the spread of the use of English for international communication in the fields of education, Information and Communication Technology, science, popular entertainment, tourism, international job markets, and social networking services or online services. The teachers focussed differently when talking about the values attached to the English language, and they seemed to associate English with globalisation and progress. In the following, I discuss the analysis of the *English is the international language* ideology by presenting the data based on the teachers' perceptions of multiple values embedded in English as an international language.

English to establish and maintain international partnerships

English was perceived as the most common tool of communication between people from different countries who speak different languages. Ms Wulan gave an example of an event when an Australian teacher came to the school as part of a partnership program. She said that English was the language of communication with the guest from abroad so English skills were important for teachers (Ms Wulan, interview, 1 October 2012). Since the school status was Pioneer International Standard, a partnership program with a school from one member country of the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) was encouraged by the government. The main purpose of the partnership was to establish a mutual relationship by learning best practices in teaching and learning to improve the quality of education in the light of international standards.

English for development and dissemination of science and information communication technology

All teachers regarded English as the international language for the development and dissemination of information and communication technology and science. English abilities were seen as supporting skills to keep up with the latest information, technology, and science. Mr Brur, for example, stated that knowledge of information and communication technology cannot be separated from knowledge of English because nearly all information communication technology instruction manuals and computer programs are all in English (Interview, 20 September 2012). In his opinion, up to the present there are no computer programs presented in Indonesian language (Mr Brur, interview, 20 September 2012). Although he admitted that he was not good at English and he did not use English in teaching his subject, he asserted that English was the international language that there is an obligation to learn and use English (his Indonesian language: *sesuatu yang wajib*). He said he tried to always

motivate students to learn English since English skill is a special skill, an added value for students who obtained it (Interview, 20 September 2012). It seemed *English is the international language* was associated with information communication technology.

Similar to Mr Brur, Ms Tuti and Ms Wulan in different interviews strongly agreed that students who obtained English abilities had added value (in their Indonesian language: *nilai plus* or *nilai tambah*). Ms Wulan seemed to say for certain that because the school gained the special status, English should be used to teach Mathematics and Science to give an added value for the school (Interview, 1 October 2012). Her statement indicated that the special status of the school was associated with using English in teaching Science and Mathematics.

English is a priority in international job markets

Most teachers in the study stated that they assumed English is the language used in international job markets. Mr Cho, for example, commented that those working with foreigners needed English (Interview, 1 October 2012). He gave an example of his two sons' experiences working with employers from India who were speaking English. The companies were located in Indonesia. His first son seemed to enjoy working in the company while the second son did not enjoy it and complained about not being able to understand what his employer said to him (Mr Cho, interview, 1 October 2012). Referring to his sons' experiences, Mr Cho asserted that some multinational companies in Indonesia which hired foreign employees used English as the language of communication in workplaces.

English for cross cultural understanding and English for tourism and entertainment

There was a view stated by teachers that it was useful to have English competence to help understand other cultures. Mr Cho said:

> English is one of the international languages. We will know foreigners' way of life by knowing their culture. So, to know their culture, we need to know English. We need to know their culture to add our knowledge about them. (Interview, 21 September 2012)

Mr Cho also gave some justification that he considered English is the international language as he saw many cases in which English was used by foreign visitors in tourist places. Although the tourists or visitors come from English-speaking and non-English speaking countries, the language used among tourists and a local guide was usually English. Mr Cho gave an illustration:

> When I saw a group of Japanese tourists in the Borobudur temple [a very well-known tourist place in Central Java, Indonesia] I heard these Japanese speaking English. Although they did not speak it very fluently, they used English to communicate with people in Borobudur. Perhaps they thought that people knew English more than other foreign languages. So actually we need English because it is a unifying international language. (Mr Cho, interview, 7 September 2012)

What Mr Cho illustrated showed an example of the role of English as a lingua franca, that is, the language was used to serve communication between people of different mother tongues.

Some teachers also stated that many popular entertainment programs on television were presented in English, including movies, musics, and sports. Mr Cho described that, for example, Chinese films often used English for the purpose of getting films or movies enjoyed by international movie viewers. (Interview, 7

September 2012). According to Ms Wulan, English was also used for television commercial breaks, advertisements, and music entertainment. She said that she was sure that English was a universal language in many aspects of life (Interview, 21 September 2012). In other words, English was regarded as the international language in entertainment targetted specifically at an international audience.

English associates with global challenge

English is the international language was further related to the language of today's globalized world. For example, Ms Lis associated English with globalization by stating that the school's vision was to prepare its graduates for global challenge (in her Indonesian language: *tantangan global*) (Interview, 3 September 2012). She elaborated her argument:

> In the era of globalisation the demand for change never stops. If we want to make much progress, we have to change. To change to be better, we need knowledge. From better knowledge, there will be a change in our way of thinking. Time keeps moving. Teachers should change to make good progress. The progress can be in their ways or methods in teaching, teaching materials, better attitudes for giving a good model for their students. Because of the global challenge, our school which has Pioneer International Standard status should be bilingual. If students want to continue their study abroad, they will be familiar with some technical words in specific subject content. So, learning English is important. We should not be afraid of learning a foreign language. (Ms Lis, interview, 3 September 2012)

It seemed obvious from Ms Lis' statement that learning English was expected to help students achieve progress in the era of globalization. She mentioned that the school's view of the future was preparing the school graduates for global challenge. One of the global challenges, according to Ms Lis, was command of English. To her, English would broaden teachers' and students' perspectives, and English would provide the school graduates with wider opportunities for global competition. Ms Lis seemed to hold a firm opinion that students' English competence formed part of competitive skills. Her further ideological assumption was that English is the international language so it has become increasingly a necessity for students in the globalisation era. In Ms Wulan's opinion, English was a means to "go international" (Interview, 1 October 2012). The internationalization of the school was assumed as using English, as it was the international language.

Overall, the ideology that *English is the international language* was held firmly by all teachers. Each of the teachers had a different emphasis when talking about the role that English played as the international language. Their main reasons were around the use of English in the field of education, information communication technology and science development, entertainment, tourism, employment, and globalisation. In short, English is the international language which is seen as giving advantage to people who master it in this increasingly globalized world. This *English is an international language* ideology very closely links with the ideology that I will discuss in the following section.

Language ideology 4
English benefits students in the future

All teachers contended that if students had a good command of the English language, they had a better chance in the future, particularly in employment and education. This view of English closely linked with the ideology that *English is the*

international language. All teachers talked about the possible benefits they hoped their students would gain from having English skills.

Acquiring English skills will bring benefits for students' higher education

The use of English alongside Indonesian in teaching Science and Mathematics was considered by some teachers to give benefits to students for their future higher education. Ms Tuti, Ms Wulan, and Ms Lis contended that given bilingual teaching in Science and Mathematics during high school, students would at least be familiar with scientific terminology in content subjects. This would help them better understand the concepts at university specifically when majoring in Science and Mathematics. Ms Tuti told her story when she met her former students who were studying at university:

> I met several alumni of this school. They came here [to the school]. They told me that they felt lucky to be taught Science and Mathematics in English during their high school. Now they have been familiar with most English scientific terms of Science and Mathematics that they are studying at university. (Interview, 5 September 2012)

Ms Wulan had a similar story about some alumni mentioning the benefit of English for their studies:

> I was told by some alumni of the school when they came here. They felt more confident at university and in applying for a job in the future, because they said they had what they called resource [Ms Wulan's Indonesian word: *bekal*] in the English language skills from high school. (Interview, 1 October 2012)

Like Ms Tuti and Ms Wulan, Ms Lis had a similar story about meeting some alumni of the school. The teachers claimed that some alumni of the school felt lucky about being taught bilingually at school. The students were reported as being already familiar with some scientific terminology in English, being confident in their study such as self-translating some references in English. At this point, Ms Tuti, Ms Wulan, and Ms Lis implicitly supported teaching Science and Mathematics subjects bilingually looking at the perceived benefits some students had when they went to university.

Mr Cho had a different opinion from his colleagues. He said that he thought teaching Mathematics and Science bilingually would give a distinct advantage for students only if they continued to study abroad. He said:

> At university our students will certainly use literature in English. Moreover, if our students want to continue their studies in foreign countries, English proficiency is a must...[*Kalau dia itu arahnya mau belajar ke luar negeri ya memang wajib hukumnya* – Mr Cho's Indonesian utterances]. (Mr Cho, interview, 7 September 2012)

On the one hand Mr Cho seemed to support bilingual teaching, but on the other hand he thought students would get the real benefit of bilingual teaching if they studied abroad.

Another view held was that bilingual teaching would bring benefits for students by improving their test scores in the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). Ms Lis considered that English bilingual teaching would somehow positively influence students' abilities when taking TOEFL at university (interview, 3 September 2012). In most Indonesian universities, one of the requirements that students must fulfil to get a bachelor's degree is that they should pass the passing grade of TOEFL set by universities. From Ms Lis' point of view, students would get

a maximum score of TOEFL if they were exposed to English since high school. The minimum score of the TOEFL varied depending on each university policy. For example, in the university where I am employed, undergraduate candidates must obtain the minimum score of 500 for the institutional TOEFL-like test. Although there has not been such a study investigating the impacts of bilingual teaching in Indonesian high schools on students' achievement in TOEFL, Ms Lis still believed bilingual teaching would impact on students' English test scores in their bachelor's degree study.

English skill as an economic advantage

Students with English competency were considered to gain benefit not only in higher education, but also for employment. Most teachers stated that students who had a good command of English would be more likely to get a job (Interviews, various occasions) and would find it easier to work with foreigners. Referring to his sons' experiences, that the first son enjoyed his work as he could communicate in English with his foreign employer while the other son could not understand his employer's instructions in English, Mr Cho suggested:

> Students should know English. It will be difficult for them if they don't know English in this era. If our students in the future work with foreigners, they must learn English. So, it's better to learn English now as part of their preparation for their future life. (Mr Cho, interview, 21 September 2012)

Mr Cho's statement indicated that he believed English skills would bring benefits to students in the future especially when they work with foreigners. Learning English is a necessity for students when they apply for a job as many multinationally-owned companies located in Indonesia require new employees with English skills.

The perception that job prospects can be boosted by English skills is closely related with their ideology that English is the international language used in international workplaces. English abilities would not only be a benefit in international contexts, but also in national and regional contexts. As Ms Lis said, "English abilities will increase one's competitive skills in looking for employment. Some companies require job applicants writing their application letters in English" (Interview, 3 September 2012). Thousands of graduates from Indonesian universities create a lot of competition for jobs every year, and English skills are part of the requirements that they should meet. That English ties to opportunities in career and employment was asserted by Wood (2008) that in the present day English is perceived as a highly influential factor in employment and promotion in periphery nations. Non-English speaking countries such as Indonesia, Vietnam, and Cambodia where the status of English is a foreign language are some examples of Periphery nations (Kachru, 1992). Through learning English at a formal educational institution like a school, competence in English becomes a capital or a resource for one's competitiveness in workplaces and also in pursuing higher education. To sum up, the belief that *English benefits students in future life* linked with the widespread recognition of the importance of English as the preferred international language.

Language ideology 5
Using English will not decrease our nationalism

The language ideology *Using English will not decrease our nationalism* came out when the teachers in different interviews discussed the increasing public debate in some Indonesian mass media that using English in Indonesian selected schools would be a threat to Indonesian nationalism. This contested opinion circulated in the

mass media at the time of my field work so I attempted to investigate the teachers' opinions on this issue. The data seems to suggest that all teachers did not think that English was a threat to Indonesian language and nationalism. The following discussion provides some examples of the teachers' responses.

Using English would not diminish the use of the Indonesian language

Using English would not diminish the use of Indonesian among students. Ms Tuti made this point as she said:

> I think students who have English abilities are students who have special skills. This [using English] will not decrease the use of the Indonesian language. They will always have the Indonesian language as a school subject. Mastering English becomes added-value for students. They will know Mathematics terminology in English. Is there any study investigating the correlation between students' grades in the Indonesian language subject and the use of English at school? It is not necessarily like that. Do not make English as the scapegoat. It is not true if English is often used, Indonesian language skills will become bad... (*Tidak benar kalau bahasa Inggrisnya sering dipakai, bahasa Indonesia nya jadi jeblok* – Ms Tuti's Indonesian utterances*) (Ms Tuti, interview, 5 September 2012)

In her statement above, Ms Tuti clearly refuted that the use of English would make the use of Indonesian language decline. She even noted - positive opinion about English - that having English competency is a special skill for students.

Some teachers overtly stated that English was important for students' future lives while maintaining Indonesian and the local language, Javanese. Mr Cho suggested, "With English students are prepared for employment and further studies without forgetting Indonesian and Javanese" (Interview, 28 September 2012). Indonesian and Javanese were considered the must-use languages while learning English was considered necessary. Mr Cho seemed to favour his students becoming bilingual or multilingual in Indonesian, Javanese, and English. The view that English was necessary and Indonesian was always used was also affirmed by Ms Lis as she said:

> That's too much afraidness. A fear that has no basis [Indonesian: *Ketakutan yang tidak berdasar*]. I do not think using English is a threat to our own language. It will not, it will not decrease our nationalism. Our society knows that learning English becomes a demand. Learning English becomes a necessity[Indonesian: *belajar bahasa Inggris menjadi sebuah kebutuhan*]. (Ms Lis, interview, 3 September 2012)

In these interviews, nationalism, a feeling that people have of being loyal to and proud of their country, was not measured by most teachers as whether or not people were using a foreign language, in this case English. Some teachers, for example Ms Lis, seemed to believe that people who had thought that using English would decrease nationalism were of a conservative mindset that was resisting or rejecting learning English (Ms Lis, interview, 3 September 2012) . Similarly, Mr Cho had the opinion that learning and using English would not decrease nationalism but could be a means to learn other cultures as he said:

> Using English does not mean one's nationalism is decreasing. We need to learn English because it will give an advantage for us to know the cultures of English speaking people, so our knowledge about other cultures will improve. (Mr Cho, interview, 28 September 2012)

According to Baker (2011), "nationalism concerns a consciousness of belonging to a perceived separate people, located in a defined territory, bound by a belief in having a common culture and history, with common institutions and the desire to achieve or maintain political autonomy" (p. 80). Indonesia, a country with diverse ethnic groups, local languages, and cultures, but sharing the common culture and history has its own national unifying language, the Indonesian language, that has been held as the symbol of national identity and nationalism (Teachers' interviews, numerous occasions).

Drawing on the teachers' responses, the fear of language shift, that the English language would replace Indonesian, was not held to be true by the teachers in the study. Language shift happens if "there is a reduction in the number of speakers of a language, a decreasing saturation of language speakers in the population, a loss in language proficiency, or a decreasing use of that language in different domains" (Baker, 2011, p. 72). All teachers seemed to hold an opinion that the use of Indonesian was not decreasing. My observations showed that Indonesian and Javanese remained the common languages spoken by the school community members at school. Only on a very few occasions several teachers and students spoke in English, such as in the students' English Conversation Club and in the teachers' offices where occasionally two English subject teachers had a small talk. These pieces of evidence suggested that the teachers in the study have conviction that the use of Indonesian and Javanese in the school would always be dominant.

Using English would not cause students' nationalism to decline

The findings showed that all teachers seemed to share the opinion that using English would not cause students' nationalism to decline in the sense of their pride in the country. Being an Indonesian nationalist was seen as having the attitudes and actions that were performed for the benefit of the country. Most teachers in the study had a point of view that having a good command of English and using the language was not a form of disloyal behaviour to the nation. According to some teachers, mastering English could even impact positively on Indonesian people's nationalism, particularly when they were able to talk about Indonesia in English for English-speaking people. The teachers' opinion was in line with Bayuni (2013) who suggested:

> Now that Indonesia is becoming an important global player, the world wants to know a lot more about the country, about its people, its cultures and traditions, its political and economic systems and the aspirations of the people. The Indonesian story or stories need to be told preferably by Indonesians. (*The Jakarta Post*, 26 February 2013)

Consequently, the ability to tell stories about Indonesia for an international audience requires English skills, the most common language used in international affairs.

From the evidence available, it appeared that the teachers viewed that *using English will not decrease nationalism*. Nationalism in this sense also includes loyalty to use Indonesian. This finding was in line with a study conducted by Bax (2010). In his interviews with Indonesian educational stakeholders, Bax's findings suggested that "no evidence could be deduced that in fact English was having a serious impact on Indonesian language or likely to impact directly on local languages" (Bax, 2010, p. 50). Therefore, Coleman's (2009) claim about the possible impact of the English bilingual program on local languages, where he referred to the possibility of language death, did not seem likely in the context of Bax's study (2010) and was not supported in the current study. In fact, Indonesian and Javanese remain the dominant

languages in all aspects of life including public and official life, at home, in the neighbourhood, and indeed in the school.

MULTIPLE AND OFTEN COMPETING TEACHERS' ENGLISH LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES

The findings of the study revealed that the subject teachers held multiple ideologies regarding the promotion of the use of English alongside Indonesian in teaching Mathematics and Science and a habitual use at school. I categorized into five themes the teachers' English language ideologies: 1) English is a heavy burden, 2) We have our own language, 3) English is the international language, 4) English benefits students in the future, and 5) English will not decrease our nationalism. These language ideologies were interrelated as teachers talked about different contexts underlying the ideologies. With regard to these findings, the next section will discuss factors which seemed to influence multiplicity and contentions in the teachers' language ideologies.

English language competence and English learning experience

The ideology that *English is a heavy burden* emerged as most teachers vividly described their difficulties and problems when teaching Science and Mathematics in English. Most teachers admitted that the preparation of teaching tools and also in classrooms made them feel that teaching was a burden as they were expected to be bilingual, using both English and Indonesian. There was some degree of assistance from one or two English subject teachers (of five English teachers in the school), but it was done occasionally and only if the subject teachers asked some help to correct the grammar or translation from Indonesian to English or from English to Indonesian.

Learning English and at the same time using the language to teach content subjects was seen as a challenge for most teachers as they still struggled to be able to use English for simple conversation. Learning to speak English for the purposes of daily conversation is different from learning to teach in English (Cummins, 2008). It is widely recognised that second or foreign language acquisition competencies cannot be achieved instantly or quickly (Celce-Murcia, 2007; Cummins, 2008; Ellis, 2008; Richards, 2005). Language competence and the kind of language associated with the teaching of Mathematics and Science require high cognitive levels of comprehension as Cummins (2008) has demonstrated in the concept of Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency as part of Second Language Acquisition theory. Cummins (2008) suggests that the language competence consists of two separate skills types, that is, Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency. Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills include everyday conversational language, basically communication skills.

On the other hand, Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency, for example using language to teach Mathematics, differs from everyday language usage. To be able to use English needed as the instructional language in content, Cummins (2008) claims that it takes at least five years typically to catch up to native speakers in academic aspects of the second language. In fact, subject teachers in the school started to take professional development in English training just after the school gained the status as Pioneer International Standard in 2009 to 2011.

Moreover, English training in the school was conducted without continuity and with conflicting purposes. In other words, the English training sessions were conducted over short periods and were not continued. The English training did not

promote sustainable development of the teachers' English competence, nor did the training provide teaching methodology in bilingual education. As a result, teachers gained only a very basic level of English for daily conversation, not how to teach deep content knowledge in English.

In addition, teachers' motivation to learn and use English was influenced by their opinion that learning English above the age of 40 was too late as stated by Mr Cho in several instances in the interviews. This might have meant that learning and using English around that age lacked usefulness and added to their burden. This reflects the findings of the study by Astika and Wahyana (2010), that learning English when someone is above 40 years old will have various disturbances and obstacles, including the person's language aptitude, motivation, and time.

Language-in-education policy

Findings of my study also showed that teachers' language ideologies were heavily influenced by the government's language policies - that is, the goverment policy about using English in the school. This top-down policy was like a sudden and shocking instruction. The teachers, including the school executives, had varied interpretations on how they would implemet English use in the school. The data suggested that teachers considered that both the government and the school policy on the use of English were not enforceable. All teachers appeared to observe that at the higher level of the school, that is the school executives level, they themeselves had their own contentions on the use of English. Consequently, most teachers argued that it was not obligatory for them to use English in school.

While Mathematics and Science teachers were expected to use English alongside Indonesian, the national examination for Year 12 students was in the Indonesian language. The inconsistency between the government's expectation on the teachers to teach in English and the government's policy on conducting the national examination in Indonesian confused the teachers. Similar to my study, Lan and Tan (2008) reported in their Malaysian study that:

> Instead of teaching Mathematics and Science in English, many teachers end up teaching these subjects in English and Malay (the official language of Malaysia). This pedagogical response has much to do with the pressure that teachers feel about covering the syllabus within specific timelines so that students will be ready for school exams and mandated public exams. (p. 148)

Similar concerns were evident in a later study by Tan (2011) in Malaysia that "because teachers work within an exam-driven education system, they are very concerned with subject matter mastery and students' achievement" (p. 332).

Linguistic background

Indonesia is a linguistically diverse country with hundreds of local languages and hundreds of ethnic groups (Hadisantosa, 2010; Hamied, 2012) . The government has designated Indonesian language as the unifying national and official language. The ideology that *We have our own language* was a "commonsense notion and representation" about the Indonesian language (Gal, 1998, p. 445).

All teachers valued the English language as the international language that will benefit students in the future and yet some teachers showed their strong opinions that they chose Indonesian and Javanese rather than English, with a very definite reason that Indonesian and Javanese are their own common languages in which they have fluency and content knowledge. All teachers were clear in pointing out that the

dominant language ideology present in the school was one that privileges Indonesian. English remains a foreign language inside and outside the school.

National and ethnic identity

Further, a sense of cultural and ethnic identity seemed to affect teachers' language ideologies and impact on their language use. *We have our own language* ideology derived from the belief that the Indonesian language is the index of national identity and Javanese is the index of ethnic identity. From the perspective of Bourdieu's legitimate language (1991), a person who is not an English native speaker and speaks English to persons who do not speak the language in an environment or social conditions in which there is an opportunity to speak their own language is called an illegitimate speaker addressing an illegitimate interlocutor.

In the school context, speaking in English was sometimes perceived as not belonging to the teachers' own community. Indonesian and Javanese were regarded as bearing "symbolic status" (Baker, 2011, p. 55) as these languages were important symbols of national and ethnic identity. Indonesian and Javanese are not only simple identity markers, but the languages are also capable of constructing particular loyalties and solidarity (Garcia, 2009). Using Indonesian or Javanese could be perceived as showing solidarity with other members of the school community. This perception might be "behind the belief that speaking a foreign language can be distancing" (Lonsmann, 2011, p. 243). Speaking English sometimes was regarded as a sign of high status and a sign of arrogance by less proficient English-speaking teachers.

Societal reasons

The ideologies about English which supported the use of the language in school were generally underpinned by "societal reasons" (Baker, 2011, p. 117) which include the importance of English for careers, access to further and higher education, and access to information and communication technology. All teachers stated that *English is the international language*. In their view, English had a significant role as the primary international language in the global world due to its use for international relations, education, science and technology development, tourism, and entertainment. English was also unbeatable as a language for communication in international workplaces, and was regarded as "a crucial tool for technological advancement" (Nunan, 2003, p. 597).

The value that teachers gave to English made it as an important language to learn to be able to keep up with globalisation. Common opinions that emerged from the data were that proficiency in the English language could result in making good progress in an individual's professional repertoire. Consequently, to become a member of the global world, people need a reasonable level of competence in English. According to Block (2008), globalisation is "the ongoing process of the increasing and intensifying interconnectedness of communications, events, activities and relationships taking place at the local, national or international level" (p. 31). In his paper on "Indonesia's international standard school: What are they for?" Coleman (2009) stated that "the desire to teach other subjects through English may be in some way associated with the concept of globalisation or internationalisation" (p. 20). His statement was true in the current study. It was assumed by some teachers in the current study that the internationalisation of the school could be achieved by cooperation or establishment of mutual relationships with a school abroad. In this context, the use of English was indeed necessary.

Bourdieu (1991) stated the value attached to English as symbolic capital. The symbolic capital that teachers gave to English was that acquiring competencies in the language would increase one's ability, for example, to pursue quality education, to perform better in international workplaces, and to open up knowledge in science and information and communication technology. Moreover, in Indonesia information and communication technology has advanced tremendously. Through the Internet Indonesians are getting much exposure to and contact with English, particularly because of the domination of English language used in the Internet (Hamied, 2012).

Economic advantage or capital

English is seen not only as a tool to ensure effective communication between people of various linguistic backgrounds, but also is considered as a capital, that the use of the language will benefit the people more. English is perceived as giving advantages for students' future life. Being able to speak English may mean opening up more opportunities for a wider variety of employment and careers. By acquiring English competence, there are some potential careers related to the language. The careers include:

> becoming translators and interpreters, working in tourism, buying and selling goods and services, exchanging information with local, regional, national and international organizations, migrating across national frontiers to find work, gaining promotion in neigbouring countries, and becoming part of an international team or company, as well as working from home of from the local village and using multilingual telecommunications to spread a product. (Baker, 2011, p. 121)

The benefits of the English language for individuals and societies were recognised by all teachers in the study. Ironically, these teachers actually had very limited English.

The use of English did not relate to Indonesian nationalism

All teachers stated that *Using English will not decrease nationalism*. According to Baker (2011), nationalism "concerns a consciousness of belonging to a perceived separate people, located in a defined territory, bound by a belief in having a common culture and history, with common institutions and the desire to achieve or maintain political economy" and "language helps create that consciousness" (p. 80). The teachers highlighted that English would not be a threat for Indonesian nationalism nor would it decrease the use of Indonesian. Findings showed that all teachers in the study held a strong opinion that the Indonesian language would always be the national language and the official language of Indonesia and would never be replaced with English even in English-medium classes. The Indonesian language has been an important symbol of the Indonesian national identity (Teachers' interviews, numerous occasions).

In conclusion, teachers' language ideologies were not uniform. The teachers displayed "varying degrees of awareness" (Kroskrity, 2010, p. 198) of their language ideologies. They both consciously and unconsciously held language ideologies including their evaluations and judgements about the English language. Their ideological stances about the English language were context-bound which were rooted in teachers' "individual experiences" (Garret & Baquedano-López, 2002, p. 76). The closest broader context included the extent to which school executives' language ideologies permeated in school. Therefore, school executives' language ideologies needed to be examined in relation to the findings. I will explore this investigation more fully in Chapter 6.

SUMMARY

This chapter explored the divergent English language ideologies which existed among the five subject teachers in the school. Analysis of data from mainly teachers' pre-teaching interviews, complemented with informal conversations and whole-school observations, revealed the multiplicity of their language ideologies. In Chapter 5, teachers' English language ideologies will be examined further in their classroom practices.

CHAPTER 5
SUBJECT TEACHERS' INTERACTIONAL
AND PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES IN CLASSROOMS

INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 4 I presented and discussed subject teachers' English language ideologies in regard to the government's initiative to use English alongside Indonesian in teaching Science and Mathematics and the promotion of habitual English language use in school. In Chapter 5 the aim is to examine manifestations or reflections of the subject teachers' ideologies of the English language in their observable classroom practices by focussing on their language practices, where a range of languages (Indonesian, Javanese and English) were used in classroom interactions.

The sources of data for this chapter were classroom observations, including classroom observation notes and classroom video recordings, and post-lesson interviews with video-stimulated recall. This chapter comprises two main sections. First, I present the key features of the teachers' language practices in their classroom interaction with students across five lessons that I observed: Geography, Mathematics, Biology, Chemistry, and Information and Communication Technology. Then, I discuss the manifestations of the teachers' language ideologies as reflected in their classroom practices. I end by providing a summary of the chapter.

The transcription conventions used in this chapter are as follows:

S	Student (unidentified student)
Ss	Students (several or all students are speaking in chorus)
Plain font	Indonesian language
Bold font	English language
[ ]	Commentary on what is happening in the classroom
{	Overlapping speech
underlining	Indicates raised intonation from the teacher where the teacher expects students to orally "fill in the blank"

INTERACTIONAL AND PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES
IN CLASSROOMS

After conducting a thematic analysis of data, including classroom observation notes and interview transcriptions, the findings revealed six commonalities in the teachers' language practices in the classrooms. They are teachers' use of codeswitching and allowing students to codeswitch, teachers' lack of awareness of their English language errors, safetalk practices, using PowerPoint in English as a useful tool to teach bilingually, and cooperative learning.

Teachers' use of codeswitching

In the classes I observed, the degree to which English was used varied, and the use of codeswitching was common among most teachers. According to Baker (2011), codeswitching, codemixing and direct translation are common phenomena in many bilingual and multilingual classrooms. Codeswitching refers to "language switches at sentence boundaries (inter-sentential switching)"; while, codemixing refers to "switching or mixing languages within a sentence (intra-sentential switching)" and direct translation refers to translating directly from one language to the other (Baker,

2011). These three terms convey a similar meaning that is the alternate use of two or more languages in utterances. In this dissertation, I use the embracing term 'codeswitching' to refer to the alternating use of Indonesian and English throughout the classroom discussion to refer to codeswitching as well as codemixing, and direct translation. My reason for using codeswitching as the embracing term is because the focus of the analysis was not to differentiate between these three types of switching, but to understand and explain the functions and the teachers' reasons for this behaviour in the classrooms.

Analysis of teachers' use of codeswitching revealed that codeswitching had at least six functions in classroom interactions. They are encouraging students to be more responsive to the teachers' questions and to focus more on the content; re-explaining some concepts of the lessons; reinforcing a request and repeating a command; encouraging students' participation in the flow of a lesson; saving face for teachers; and injecting humour. In the following sections, I describe and explain each function of teachers' codeswitching.

Codeswitching to encourage students to be more responsive to teachers' questions and focus on content

Codeswitching seemed to be used to encourage students to be more responsive. Extract One was taken from the opening stage of Ms Lis' lesson in which she attempted to prompt her students to define the concept of industry by answering her questions.

Extract 1 (lines 1 to 27)

1	Ms Lis	Ok, **now we will discuss or continue our topic industry location**
2		atau lokasi industri. Kita tahu bahwa saat orang mendengar kata
3		industri **when we hear industry**… yang ada di benak kita apa?
4	S	Pabrik.
5	S	**Factory.**
6	Ms Lis	Pabrik dengan segala perangkat mesin, kemudian cerobong, **and so**
7		**on. In principle the meaning of industry is wide**. Pengertian secara
8		luas mencakup semua usaha di bidang ekonomi yang sifatnya
9		produktif. **Just economic? Just economic?**
10	Ss	**No.** [chorusing]
11	Ms Lis	**Another economic** selain ekonomi pengertian industri **can relate**
12		dapat berhubungan dengan… **agriculture?**
13	Ss	Ya.[chorusing]
14	Ms Lis	Ya… jadi pengertian industry itu bisa abstrak**. The meaning of**
15		**industry abstract and concrete.** Industri yang abstrak **for example,** yang tidak wujud **for example?**
16	S	**Education.** Pendidikan.
17	Ms Lis	Konkret **for example?** Yang wujud apa?
18	Ss	**Economic.** [chorusing]
19	Ms Lis	**Economic or relate products** yang menghasilkan dalam bentuk
20		material atau materi. Dalam sifat yang abstrak, industri berupa
21		pendidikan. Kira-kira hasilnya bisa berupa material nggak?
22	Ss	Nggak! [chorusing]
23	Ms Lis	Hasilnya dari pendidikan bisa nggak?
24	Ss	Bisa! [chorusing]
25	Ms Lis	Dari industri yang abstrak **for education** kira-kira hasilnya bisa

```
26          berupa material nggak?
27    Ss     Bisa! [chorusing]
```

As illustrated in Extract 1, Ms Lis used Indonesian and English alternately to facilitate her students' comprehension and make the communication flow. In the post lesson interview, her view was explicit about the use of Indonesian in this episode. She stated that she used Indonesian in order for the students to be more responsive and to focus on the content that the class was discussing. According to her, the students would not be able to understand the content well if she spoke in English all the time. This was what she said:

> Perhaps not all students will understand my explanation if I speak in English all the time. So, I have to do like that, translating. I used to mixing, Indonesian mixed with English. They want me not to use much English in my lesson. (Ms Lis, interview, 6 September 2012)

Her statement suggested that using English was not preferred by either the teacher or the students. She said that for the students, using English was felt to be difficult to understand so it discouraged students from interacting in class.

Codeswitching to reinforce a request and repeat a command

Codeswitching was also used to reinforce a request for an answer from students, such as clarifying teachers' questions or repeating a command, as in the following example taken from Ms Tuti's lesson.
Extract 2 (lines 1 to 5)

```
1    Ms Tuti  Ok, next… I have student worksheet. So, please you make a
2             group. Every group consists of two students. So you can discuss
3             with your partner. Dengan teman sebangkumu to discuss these
4             questions. You need five minutes to discuss these questions.
5             Because only three, only three numbers.
```

In extract 2 line 3, Ms Tuti switched English into Indonesian when she emphasised the command on how her students had to do the worksheet. This could be because she wanted to make sure that her students clearly understood her instruction or she intended to confirm herself that her command was clear.

Codeswitching to encourage students' participation in the flow of a lesson

Codeswitching appeared to be a strategy used by most teachers to help students participate in the flow of a lesson. Extract 3 provides an example of direct translation. It was taken from a Biology lesson where the objective of the lesson was to introduce students to the scientific vocabulary of the names of parts of the human skeleton in Latin and English languages.
Extract 3 (lines 1 to 10)

```
1    Mr Cho   Sekarang kita belajar tentang human movement system sistem
2             gerak pada manusia. Number one skeleton. You know skeleton?
3    S        Rangka. [unidentified student answered in low voice]
4    Mr Cho   Skeleton?
5    Ss:      Rangka! [in chorus]
6    Mr Cho   Muscle?
7    Ss       Otot! [in chorus]
8    Mr Cho   Joint?
```

9	Ss	Sendi! [in chorus]
10	Mr Cho	**Good!**

Extract 3 line 2 suggests that the teacher's question 'You know skeleton?' was not really asking the students to provide the definition or the elaboration of what skeleton was. In asking such a question, the teacher actually expected his students to answer an Indonesian equivalence for the English word 'skeleton'. This was evident from the extract and observation notes that Mr Cho seemed to accept his students' answers by continuing his questions (lines 4, 6 and 8) and giving a compliment (line 10). If Mr Cho had not given the next questions (lines 6 & 8), it could have meant that he was not satisfied with his students' answers and would have asked them to give different answers or elaborate their answers. Mr Cho intended to check his students' English vocabulary of the subject (Post-lesson interview, 17 September, 2012).

The use of these two languages seemed to have resulted in the students' active participation in the classroom interaction. Such a classroom practice is what Martin (1999) called "bilingual label quests" (p. 134). It is a teacher's questioning strategy in which he/she was looking for students to provide equivalents in a different language. This term "label quest" was coined by Heath (1986) as the genre of classroom language use where teacher attempts to elicit a vocabulary item from students. This recurring feature in the observed classrooms also occurred in classrooms in other contexts, for example, primary schools in Brunei and Malaysia (Martin, 1999, 2010).

Codeswitching to clarify a point

As confirmed by most teachers in the post-lesson interviews, repeating a phrase or a sentence from English into Indonesian was used to clarify a point. For example, Ms Tuti stated that she believed code switching would reinforce and help students understand the content better. For her, using Indonesian was much easier to explain some English terms for Mathematics. (Ms Tuti, interview, 6 September 2012). Extract 4 below illustrates Ms Tuti's use of the two languages in order to facilitate her students' comprehension in Mathematics lesson with the topic of 'cyclical permutation.'
Extract 4 (lines 1 to 6)

1	Ms Tuti	**Next. How about number two? If we have seven diamonds, and**
2		**we have to place them to make bracelet, how many possible**
3		**number of the bracelet can be made?** Jadi kita punya tujuh
4		diamond, dan kita ingin menempatkannya dalam gelang.
5		Berapa banyak kemungkinan gelang yang akan bisa kita buat?
6		**Is that true? Number two?**

In Extract 4 lines 3 to 5, Ms Tuti did translate her utterances in English into Indonesian. This showed that she felt the need to make clearer her English utterance to deliver her intended meaning in Indonesian, as Ms Tuti stated that her students would not understand the content materials if only English was used (Ms Tuti, interview, 18 September 2012). Like Ms Tuti, Ms Lis also said she needed to re-explain a concept from English into Indonesian as she believed repetition added completeness of her students' understanding (Ms Lis, interview, 6 September 2012). This evidence was in line with Swain (2010) who suggested that in classroom teaching, the teacher should not use a second or foreign language fully since learning

through a second or foreign language that students cannot cope with can result in a failure in learning. However, students would never speak and understand English if the teachers did not use it regularly, fluently and purposefully. This exposes the conflicted ideology which is not implemented in practice.

Codeswitching to "save teachers' face"

The observations of the lessons also suggested that the teachers might switch from English into Indonesian to 'save face' when teachers realised they lacked linguistic competence to use English. For example, Ms Lis simply stated that she lacked English vocabulary mastery so when she did not know the English words, she switched or mixed in Indonesian (Ms Lis, interview, 6 September 2012). Mr Cho also admitted that he felt he did not have adequate ability to explain his lesson in English. He only used to introduce students to Biology terminology and to greet students and check the roll (Mr Cho, interview, 28 September 2012). Similar to Ms Lis and Mr Cho, Ms Wulan stated that she did not dare to say some numbers in English because she was not sure how to pronounce them (Ms Wulan, interview, 17 September 2012). This evidence shows that teachers used code switching to avoid using English, as the teachers at some times lacked English language competence. Codeswitching appeared to be a common communication strategy used by the teachers in class.

Codeswitching appeared to be used to save face, and not speaking English at all could also be inferred as teachers' communication strategy to save face, too. Further classroom observations in Mr Brur's class showed that he did not use English at all. Interestingly, however, he asked his students to speak in English when presenting their group discussion work. In the pre-lesson interview, Mr Brur said that he thought he was not good in either pronunciation or in grammar in English. He lacked the self-confidence required to teach in English. The classroom observation confirmed that during the teaching-learning process he did not utter even a single English word. In support of his statement about encouraging students to use English, I observed a group of four students presenting their group discussion in English and their PowerPoint presentations were also in English. They even answered their friends' questions in English. Despite some grammatical mistakes and inappropriate word choices in their speaking, this group's effort to speak in English was commendable, given the difficult nature of the topic 'wireless and wireline'. Their orientation to use English could have been because the teacher encouraged them or they were motivated by the added score benefits granted to those who used English (written or spoken) in doing their work. The teacher himself admitted that he did not "have the nerve" to teach in English (Mr Brur, interview, 20 September 2012). He said that he thought English was his weakness so he was both hesitant and frightened to speak English in front of his students. Despite recognising a weakness in his English language proficiency, he never undertook teachers' professional development session in English training (Mr Brur, interview, 20 September 2012).

Codeswitching to inject humour

Another purpose of codeswitching that I observed was that inserting a few English words could create an enjoyable class, particularly when both teacher and students knew the appropriate English words, but the teacher intentionally chose to use another word to encode a similar meaning. For example, on very rare occasions, Mr Cho used English to inject humour into his lesson. Extract 5 illustrates this.
Extract 5 (lines 1 to 5)

1	Mr Cho	Oke. Saya ambilkan dari surat Al Mukminun ayat yang ke 14. Ini
2		tentang orangtua kalian. Jadi setelah LG….
3	Ss	[students were laughing; they seem to have known what "LG" is]
4	Mr Cho	LG itu **looking garden**… bertemunya **versection** [unclear voice]
5		**between spermatozoon and egg**.

Extract 5 line 4 was an example of how the teacher inserted the English language in his explanation in order to make his students laugh, thus engendering humour and fun. The observation in this lesson suggested that inserting English words could arouse the students' interest in the lesson. I noticed that most students laughed and seemed to enjoy the moment, despite the incorrect choice of words (e.g., looking garden) that the teacher produced to express the intended meaning.

The description presented in this section suggests that there were at least six functions of codeswitching in the classroom interactions: encouraging students to be more responsive to the teachers' questions and to focus more on the content; re-explaining some concepts of the lessons; reinforcing a request and repeating a command; encouraging students' participation in the flow of lessons; saving face for teachers; and injecting humour. The use of codeswitching in the classrooms appeared to be acceptable by the teachers, even if it was felt necessary for the teachers in attempting to implement bilingual education in the high school classrooms. The data analysis showed that most teachers in the study used codeswitching as they found it difficult to deliver their lessons fully in English. It also seemed that the teachers put emphasis on the students' understanding of the subject content in Indonesian medium and the flow of classroom interactions over the use of English (Post-lesson interviews, numerous occasions).

Evidence from the classroom observation transcripts, observation notes, and post-lesson interviews showed that codeswitching was considered desirable by the teachers as it was felt as fulfilling some functions in the classroom interaction. However, Ellis (2008) stressed that codeswitching may limit the production of communicative English by the teachers. As a result, students did not have much input into English language use. Teachers' codeswitching was mainly an avoidance strategy which was used when they had an inability to use English in particular instances.

Teachers allowed students to codeswitch

I have just discussed teachers' use of codeswitching, an apparent language practice of teachers in the classrooms. The data further showed that the teachers did not only let themselves codeswitch but also allowed students to codeswitch. In the following I provide some evidence taken from teachers' and students' classroom interactions which showed their negotiation in codeswitching. The observed interactional practices in the classrooms suggest that all teachers allowed students to use Indonesian or English, or a mix and a switch between the two languages to deal with their classroom work, their talk within a peer group, their answers to teachers' questions, and participation in whole-class discussions.

Codeswitching to ease classroom interaction

It seemed that the teachers preferred their students to feel comfortable in whatever language they chose to use in the classrooms. Extract 8 (line 4) and Extract 9 (lines 6) show a student answering in Indonesian to Ms Lis' question which was in English in an episode of a Geography lesson.

Extract 8 (lines 1 to 8)

1	Ms Lis	**What is the kinds of material?** Jenis materialnya apa? Jenis
2		bendanya apa? Ya? Jenis bendanya apa? **What is the kinds of**
3		**materials** dari hasil pendidikan?
4	S	Mobil SMK.
5	Ms Lis	Motor SMK. Hasil pendidikan kan itu? Dari yang abstrak ke
6		konkret menjadi yang nyata, wujud, ril. Yang selalu yang
7		berhubungan dengan yang konkret. Itulah industri yang
8		sesungguhnya.

Extract 9 (lines 1 to 10)

1	Ms Lis	**Next, the activity from the natural resource, direct or indirect.**
2		Langsung ataupun tidak langsung. **Give for example**.
3		Sinta. [calling a student's name]. **Give for example the activity to**
4		**take natural resources.** Karakteristik yang bersifat langsung apa?
5		Hasil alam secara langsung, **for example? For example?**
6	S	Sebagai contoh mengambil hasil alam kelapa sawit, perkebunan.
7	Ms Lis	Ok, mengambil buah kelapa sawit. **What is the aspect?** Aspek apa
8		itu? **Plantation**. Perkebunan kan? **Another example? Another**
9		**plantation?** Selain perkebunan apa lagi?
10	Ss	**Agriculture.** [chorusing]

The interactional exchange shown in Extracts 8 and 9 suggest that the teacher, Ms Lis, permitted the use of either Indonesian or English. The observation in this lesson also noted that Ms Lis was more concerned with the content of the student's response than the language the student used. Ms Lis did not prescribe the language to be used by her students, as she said that making the students exuberant in the class discussion was more important than requiring them speak in English since English would make them hesitate to answer (Ms Lis, interview, 6 September 2012). She justified a mix of languages:

> When I did not translate my questions in English into Indonesian, no students answered my questions. Also, when I tried to ask them to speak in English, they suddenly stopped speaking. When I said, "Please, explain in English", students stopped and kept quiet. They said, "Indonesian, Mam. I want to answer but in Indonesian." What should I do then? I cannot force them. Their answer was like that; they cannot answer in English. (Ms Lis, interview, 6 September 2012)

Ms Lis' explanation showed that her students asked permission to answer in Indonesian because they knew the teacher would revert to Indonesian. It clearly showed that students were given an opportunity to choose the language they wanted to use in the classroom as their active participation in the class discussion was the primary concern of the teacher. However, if the teacher's English competence was adequate, she should have taught the students the English language they needed, or translated what they said into English and asked them to repeat it.

Codeswitching to reinforce content area subject terminology
Even though students could mix and switch the two languages, in the Biology lesson, the teacher seemed to demand the students to memorise scientific terminology of parts of the human skeleton in English alongside the Latin form. Mr Cho argued that

this drilling activity was one of the teaching techniques he usually applied in his lesson to familiarise his students with the terms in English as well as in Latin. He said this would benefit the students if they took Biology as a major in their higher education (Mr Cho, interview, 21 September 2012). My observations noted that although the students were asked to memorise specific scientific terms in English and in Latin, during the rest of the whole-class discussion they could use Indonesian. The teacher did not ask the students to speak in English because he thought it would be difficult for them (Mr Cho, interview, 21 September 2012).

Codeswitching to get additional marks from teachers

Unlike Mr Cho, Ms Tuti, and Ms Lis who seemed not to be concerned very much with which language their students used, Mr Brur and Ms Wulan had slightly different views. In his class, Mr Brur encouraged his students to do their group work in English. For example, he asked them to present the results of their group discussion as well as their PowerPoint presentations in English. Mr Brur explained to me that in the previous meeting the week before, he divided his students into several groups consisting of four to five students. Each group was assigned to read the textbook and make a report summary of their reading on a certain sub-topic taken from the lesson topic 'wireless and wireline'. On the day I observed the lesson, there was one group presenting their summary. Mr Brur said he challenged the students to make the PowerPoint presentation and to deliver it in English as he would give mark-added benefits for those who used English (Mr Brur, interview, 20 September 2012). These mark-added benefits would also be given to other students (non-presenting group) if they gave comments, questions, or responses in English during the class discussion (Mr Brur, interview, 20 September 2012).

Mr Brur's encouragement of his students to speak in English and the reward of added marks indicated that he intended to provide as many opportunities as possible for his students to use English in the classrooms. It seemed that he also tried to accommodate and promote students who liked to use English. However, his actions of letting students respond in English might be a strategy because he would not use English himself and this might have been a way of showing that English was used. In a later observation in his lesson, students were making gestures and had puzzled looks. In response, the teacher let his students speak in Indonesian or a mixture of the two languages. Extract 10 (lines 8 to 10 and 16 to 18) illustrate the negotiation between two students and the teacher on the language the student preferred to use to give a question to the presenting group.

Extract 10 (lines 1 to 18)

1	Mr Brur	Oke, siapa mau nanya? Silakan dicatat. Mungkin bisa di**zoom**?
2		Di**zoom** lagi, biar kelihatan.Di situ ada pertanyaan, penanya, nomer
3		absen. Siapa? Bisa dipahami apa yang sudah disampaikan tadi?
4	Ss:	Bisa! [chorusing]
5	T:	Bisa ya? Silakan dirumuskan pertanyaan. Diusahakan pertanyaan
6		itu memang ada kaitannya dengan materi yang ada hari ini.
7		Ya, silakan. **Please.** Ya, sebelah sana.
8	S:	**English**? [asking the teacher whether he had to speak in English]
9	T:	Ya, boleh. Enggak Inggris boleh, boleh. Ndak pa pa. [the student
10		could use either English or Indonesian]
11	S:	**What is the weaknesses of dial up modem?**
12	T:	Ok, berikutnya pertanyaan yang kedua?
13		Kita ambil tiga pertanyaan dulu. Pertanyaan yang kedua?

14		Mungkin bisa dijawab langsung sambil menunggu yang lain?
15		Ada yang ditanyakan? Ada yang pake bahasa Indonesia?
16	S:	Pake bahasa Indonesia boleh, Pak?
17	T:	Boleh. [The teacher confirmed again that students could use
18		Indonesian]

The episode transcribed above (Extract 10) showed that the teacher eventually allowed his students to choose the language they felt comfortable with. In line 8, a student asked whether he had to use English and Mr Brur answered he could use either English or Indonesian (lines 9 to 10). Then, the student gave a question in English (line 11). The next turn, another student asked a confirmation whether he might use Indonesian (line 16) and Mr Brur allowed him to use Indonesian. Extract 10 gave an example of students' choice of language use. This referred to lines 9-10 that the teacher said either language was acceptable. Mr Brur's decision to loosen his requirement that students speak in English might have resulted from his own experience in finding English difficult. Moreover, the aim of the lesson was for students to understand the concepts of wireline and wireless by being actively involved in whole-class discussions (Mr Brur, interview, 20 September 2012). Mr Brur's decision on allowing students to choose which language they would use in the classroom indicated that he considered using English in his lesson was difficult; therefore, he seemed not to force his students to use English. His decision suggested that mastery of the lesson was more important than the use of English.

Language choice negotiated by teacher and students

A similar episode occurred in Ms Wulan's class where the students negotiated the language used for a group presentation with the teacher. In the beginning, Ms Wulan asked the students to speak in English. Later, she allowed them to speak in Indonesian to present the results of their group discussion. Both Mr Brur and Ms Wulan applied a collaborative learning technique, that of group work. The difference was that in Mr Brur's class the groups had already pre-prepared their PowerPoint presentation at home (as an assignment), while in Ms Wulan's, the students discussed the topic in class, then presented using a flip chart.

Extract 11 showed a small conversation between Ms Wulan and a student who was going to come forward to present her group work. This conversation was not heard clearly by the rest of the class, but it was recorded clearly enough for me to know what was happening, as the digital audio device was in the teacher's pocket.

Extract 11 (lines 1 to 14)

1	S1	**Only one people?** [a student asked in low voice to the teacher in
2		English, depite her incorrect grammar, about how many
3		members of her group should come forward to present their
4		summary]
5	Ms Wulan	**All of you**. Kamu baca dulu.Terus terangkan pakai bahasa
6		Inggris.
7	S1	Pakai bahasa Inggris? [the student was surprised and looked
8		little bit worried]
9	Ms Wulan	Iyya, baca saja.
10	S1	Baca aja, terus diterangkan pake bahasa Inggris?
11	Ms Wulan	Iya, baca saja, terus terangkan pake bahasa Inggris.
12	S1	Piye yo? [very low voice in Javanese, she seemed to be hesitant]
13	S2	**You can do it**. [another student in her group gave
14		encouragement]

From extract 11 (lines 5 to 12), it was apparent that Ms Wulan actually asked her student to speak in English. However, it seemed that she also knew that her student became worried after being asked to present in English. Therefore, to save the time, she decided that using Indonesian was acceptable, rather than seeing her students stutter and stumble over their English which pedagogically could hinder the learning process.

The students' comprehension of the lesson content was a higher priority for the teachers than demanding them to use English. This also related to the need to catch up with the syllabus and lesson plans, and the pressures of high-stakes examinations. Consequently, the Indonesian language in the teaching and learning process was dominant, as Indonesian was mainly chosen both by the teachers and the students in classroom talk. In other words, these were normal subject lessons in Indonesian with an annoying imposition of English foisted on the teachers from outside.

Teachers' unawareness of their English language errors

Four of the five teachers observed in the classrooms used English alongside Indonesian. Even though these teachers used English to varying degrees of competency, their efforts to teach subjects bilingually deserved praise, considering that they were not English specialists. However, there were some noticeable inaccuracies in their English use in terms of grammar, word choice, and pronunciation. This might have resulted from their lack of awareness, not knowing that they had made mistakes, as they lacked knowledge and experience in the use of English.

Inaccurate grammatical competence

One teacher's inaccurate grammatical competence can be seen in Extract 6 lines 2 and 11, taken from Ms Tuti's lesson.

Extract 6 (lines 1 to 12)

1	Ms Tuti	**Ok, yesterday we learned about permutation with n element and**
2		**some identical element. And now, today we lesson about…**
3		**cyclical permutation. Ok, speaking now. How about cyclical**
4		**permutation?** Ada yang sudah baca di rumah?
5		**Cyclical permutation… it consists of two words, cyclical and**
6		**permutation. Cyclical means?**
7	Ss	Siklus. [chorusing]
8	Ms Tuti	Siklis melingkar. **And then permutation?**
9	Ss	Permutasi. [chorusing]
10	Ms Tuti	**Each number element. Ok. Now about cyclical permutation** Bu
11		Tuti **need two volunteers to practical about cyclical permutation.**
12		**Who wants to be volunteers?**

Extract 6 provided a piece of evidence that when conducting the lesson, Ms Tuti was not aware of producing grammatically incorrect utterances. However, in the post-lesson interview with the video-stimulated recall, she said that perhaps she made some grammatical mistakes in her use of English, but without specifying which mistakes. She then gave a justification that she was also still learning to use English (Ms Tuti, interview, 18 September 2012). Ms Tuti seemed to recognise that she might make mistakes in using English, but she did not know what the errors were.

Another example of grammatical mistakes was taken from the opening stage of Ms Wulan's lesson when she greeted the students, as illustrated in Extract 7.
Extract 7 (lines 1 to 2)

| 1 | Ms Wulan | **This is… today is Monday. I hope you still get fresh for get my** |
| 2 | | **lesson today. Are you agree?** |

Like Ms Tuti, Ms Wulan commented that it was fine for teachers to make mistakes in English because they were still learning it, and students would understand that their teachers were not yet well practised either (Ms Wulan, interview, 21 September 2012).

Such a statement seemed to excuse the matter. However, there is a more fundamental issue. In the context of second language acquisition, errors or mistakes in using a foreign language without any corrective feedback is likely to result in fossilisation (Ellis, 2008; Fidler, 2006; Gass & Selinker, 2008) by the teacher. Consequently, students might consider the language their teachers used was accurate and then they likely would follow their teachers in the way they used the language.

Such fossilisation, or persistent typical errors, might then impact negatively on students' English acquisition and lead to confusion. Teachers' language use is their students' language input, and this input has a determining function in the acquisition of language (Ellis, 2008). So, if too often teachers gave inaccurate model of English language use in classrooms, it would make the students exposed to what might be unacceptable English use. In addition to the teachers' errors in grammar and choice of words, mispronunciation frequently occured in the classrooms. Pronouncing English words inappropriately and unacceptably makes word and expressive meanings unclear and incomprehensible at times. My study suggests that most teachers were not aware of the potential impact of their errors on student learning. These teachers lacked knowledge of language pedagogy and the impact of inaccurate grammatical competence on students' learning.

Based on the evidence from the classrooms observed, the subject teachers had an important role as language models for students in pursuing bilingual education in the school. This is in line with Astika and Wahyana (2010) who suggest that students should be exposed to correct English for English as a foreign language in Indonesia is mostly learned by students in schools (p. 19). In the teaching and learning process, mistakes in language use could cause a serious impact on delivering important concepts of the lessons and on the students' language acquisition as well.

Safetalk practices in classrooms
The analysis revealed that besides codeswitching, aware or unaware teachers together with students appeared to hide their poor command of English which might have given a sense of accomplishing a lesson. The apparent dominant language practices were students' chorused responses to teachers' questions and cues, teachers' elongating and raising intonation of the last word of phrase of their questions, and response slot. These language practices were called "safe practices" or "safe talk" strategies (Chick, 1996; Chimbutane, 2009; Hornberger and Chick, 2001; Martin, 2005).

Chorused responses
Chorusing or answering teachers' questions together occurred often during the lessons, as can be seen in Extract 12 which comes from the Mathematics lesson. In

this episode, after the orientation stage of the lesson, Ms Tuti attempted to elicit her students' responses to define the concept of cyclical permutation.
Extract 12 (lines 1 to 30)

1	Ms Tuti	**OK,** yuk**, let we define about cyclical permutation.**
2		**If we have two volunteers, we get one arrangement. And if we**
3		**have three volunteers, we have two arrangements. And if we**
4		**have four volunteers, we get six arrangements. One if you written**
5		**in one factorial permutation... one equal?**
6	Ss	**One factorial**. [chorusing]
7	Ms Tuti	**And two?**
8	Ss	**Two factorial.** [chorusing]
9	Ms Tuti	**Two factorial. How about six?**
10	Ss	**Three factorial**. [chorusing]
11	Ms Tuti	**Three factorial. So can you make conclusion about three**
12		**examples?**
13	S	**Yes**.
14	Ms Tuti	Permutasi siklis. **Cyclical permutation?**
15	Ss	**C equals minus one and minus one factorial**. [chorusing]
16	Ms Tuti	**Ok. Any questions about cyclical permutation?**
17	Ss	**{No, I think not.**
18		**{Not yet.**[overlapping response]
19	Ms Tuti	**So, about determine cyclical permutation** untuk menentukan
20		permutasi siklis, langkah pertama adalah pastikan dulu satu orang
21		pada posisi yang tidak boleh berubah. **And then you can determine**
22		**the remaining or the other position.** Setelah itu kalian bisa
23		menentukan sisanya. Jadi kalau kita punya **the number of**
24		**permutation cycles the number of cyclical permutation of**
25		**n element, can be noted by p equal n minus one factorial.**
26		**Any questions?**
27	Ss	**No! Not yet** [chorusing]
28	Ms Tuti	**No? Everybody understand?**
29	Ss:	**Yes!** [chorusing]
30	Ms Tuti	**OK. Good!**

It can be seen in Extract 12 that the students provided choral two-word answers, shown in lines 6 to 10. Despite asking her students to voluntarily raise hands to respond to her cues (lines 1 to 5), Ms Tuti let her students answer in chorus (lines 6, 8, 10, 15). Ms Tuti continued to ask whether there were any students who wanted to ask a question (line 16). This was answered by some students in muffled response (line 17). Ms Tuti, then, made a conclusion (lines 18 to 24) and again asked whether her students had questions (line 25). The students responded that they did not have questions (lines 26). This extract suggests that the teacher assumed that all her students must have understood the concept of cyclical permutation by the use of choral responses.

Ms Tuti's teaching practice shows classroom interactions lacked individual spot checks as a means of checking students' understanding of the lesson content. The episode transcribed in Extract 13 was taken from Mr Cho's class where the teacher was eliciting names of parts of the skull in Latin from his students.
Extract 13 (lines 1 to 28)

1	Mr Cho	Apa itu? [pointing on the screen]
2	Ss	[students were mumbling; their voices were indistinct; some were
3		laughing]
4	S	**Parietal**. [a student voluntarily answered and he answered correctly]
5	Mr Cho	**Parietal**. **Paritalis**. [confirming the student's answer]
6	Mr Cho	**Number five?**
7	S	**Temporal**. [another student voluntarily provided a correct answer]
8	Mr Cho	**Temporal**. [confirming the answer]
9	Mr Cho	**Number three?** [pointing on the screen, then pointing a student to
10		answer]
11	The pointed S	**Temporal** [some students laughed because of his wrong answer]
12	Mr Cho	**Occipital**. [teacher provided a correct answer]
13	Mr Cho	**Number seven?**
14	Ss	**Mandibula**. [chorusing]
15	Mr Cho	**Number six?**
16	Ss	{**Spenoid**. [chorusing]
17		{**Zigomaticum**. [chorusing]
18	Mr Cho	**Zigomaticum**. [confirming the answer]
19	Mr Cho	**Number four?**
20	Ss	**Spenoid**. [chorusing]
21	Mr Cho	**Number ten?**
22	Ss	**Ethmoid**. [only several students answered together]
23	Mr Cho	**Ethmoid**. [confirming the answer]
24	Ss	Opo mau? Opo mau? [some students asked one another in
25		Javanese as it was not clear for them what the correct answer was]
26	Mr Cho	**Number eleven? Eleven?**
27	Ss	[mumbling, indistinct answer/inaudible response]
28	Mr Cho	**Ethmoid**. **Ethmoid**.

My classroom observation noted that not all students stated the correct names of parts of the skull that the teacher pointed to on the slide. From lines 14 to 22 it seemed that the teacher was satisfied with the class chorus, but when the teacher selected a student to answer, this student provided a wrong answer. I happened to hear a student sitting close to me ask a friend in Javanese language (line 24) which is translated in English "what is that?" This suggested that this student did not understand and asked his friend to repeat it. Lines 26 to 28 showed that most students mumbled, saying words quietly and unclearly to the teacher's question until the teacher himself answered his own question.

These characteristics of interactions demonstrated that the teacher tolerated choral responses and lacked individual spot-checking required to enhance the accomplishment of learning the content. However, Mr Cho had his own point of view. By allowing the students to chorus their responses to his questions, Mr Cho justified to himself that he was using a strategy to encourage the students to be active and engaged in the class (Interview, 28 September 2012). By chorusing or answering the teacher's questions together in English or Latin, they would not be afraid of making mistakes, since the students and the teacher would not notice which student was answering incorrectly, and this would avoid students' embarrassment particularly for the shy students (Mr Cho, interview, 28 September 2012). This

assumption is only partially correct since observation found that there were some students who simply did not answer or respond to the teacher's questions. These students were just silent, and it seemed that they relied on other students to answer the questions.

There is no harm in a certain amount of chorused responses, but it is not good practice in terms of the learning process because it will never sponsor creative production in students. If this happens all the time during the study in the school, it is possible that some students will depend on their peers and will not achieve maximum progress in the learning process. Chick (1996), Chimbutane (2009, 2011), Hornberger and Chick (2001), and Martin (2005) label chorused responses as "safe practices" or "safe talk". Safe talk is the classroom practice in which too often the teacher accepts correct answers in chorus as a means of checking that the whole class has accomplished the required learning in the lesson. When they were questioned individually, it appeared that not all students could provide correct answers.

Response slot

Safe talk practices also included teachers' particular questioning techniques. My observations suggested that the teachers mostly used a certain type of questioning technique, that is, elongating and raising the last word of phrase of their questions. For example, on several occasions in Ms Lis' lesson, she elongated some last words (see the underlined words in extract 14 lines 6 and 9). By elongating and raising her intonation for the last words in her questions, she expected her students to complete the slots with correct words or answers. Extract 14 below (lines 6 and 9) illustrate that the teacher employed a question technique in which she created gapped contexts for which the students provided the deleted element, that is, a one-word or single-phrase answer.

Extract 14 (lines 1 to 13)

1	Ms Lis	**Next number two.** Segala seasuatu untuk memenuhi kebutuhan
2		manusia, **to daily needs**, untuk memenuhi kebutuhan hidup sehari-
3		hari. **For example**? Ilham [pointing a student]. **Please mention the**
4		**example**. Kebutuhan sehari-hari apa?
5	Ilham	Garmen.
6	Ms Lis	Garmen. Ada kata dihasilkan, berarti ada <u>proses...</u>?
7	Ss	Pembuatan. [chorusing]
8	Ms Lis	Produksi. **Product**. Itu yang dimaksud dengan industri. Ternyata
9		industri **not just product in economy but can abstract <u>or...</u>** karena
10		bisa diwujudkan dalam sifatnya yang abstract. **Between two**
11		**characteristic from industry abstract and concrete, which one is**
12		**important for the country?** Mana yang lebih penting?
13		**abstract or concrete?**

Another example (Extract 15) was taken from the closing stage of Ms Tuti's lesson where the class was encouraged to synthesise or conclude about the concept of permutation.

Extract 15 (lines 1 to 12)

1	Ms Tuti	**OK... about cyclical permutation. First to make conclusion about**
2		**our lesson today**. Siapa yang mau membuat kesimpulan mengenai
3		pelajaran kita hari ini? **About cyclical permutation. Who? Who?**

4		**Every body? Who? Okay, please you... you can make conclusion.**
5	S	**The conclusion of permutation, we can learn the conclusion is**
6		**the number of cyclical permutation is of n object is p equal and**
7		**minus one factorial.** [the student is reading from the textbook]
8	Ms Tuti	**OK, good!**
9	Ms Tuti	**The cyclical permutation, the number of cyclical permutation in**
10		**of element is...?**
11	Ss	**p equals n minus one factorial.**
12	Ms Tuti	**OK, good!**

After several prompts from the teacher to make her students say the definition of cyclical permutation (lines 2 to 4), one student voluntarily raised her hand. This student then read from her textbook the definition of cyclical permutation, instead of constructing the definition in her own words. The teacher complimented this student's willingness to participate (line 8). Then, the teacher repeated the definition by giving a cue that the whole class had to complete her utterance. The cue was when the teacher paused to cause the students to finish her incomplete utterance (Extract 15 line 10). This questioning strategy has been called "response slot" by Martin (2005, p. 80), a term similar to "gap filling" by M. Swain and Johnson (1997, p. 177). Response slot or gap filling appeared to be a common language practice used by the teachers, regardless of whether they used Indonesian, English, or mixed the two languages.

The language practices, students' chorused responses to teachers' questions and cues, teachers' elongating and raising intonation of the last word of phrase of their questions, and response slot, might be considered by the teachers as safe strategies to potentially facilitate comprehension (Martin, 2005). Chick (1996) referred to this type of strategy, that is, the "completion chorus phenomenon" as "safe-talk" which enabled teachers and students "to hide their poor command of English," and "to obscure their inadequate understanding of academic content" (p. 26). When being questioned about her safetalk practices, Ms Lis explained:

> That sort of behaviour is very typical of students and commonly found in classes. It happens in Year 12 and also in Year 10. They usually answer without raising hands first but directly answer in chorus and they mumble. I think it is because they do not have self-confidence. So, it seems that when they raise hands and their answer is not correct, they feel embarrassed. I think they are too worried. If I ask them to raise their hands, they do not answer, they are even silent. That is a weakness. When they are speaking together at the same time, it seems all students are active, and the class sometimes becomes disoriented. I must be able to control and manage the class, so I give them turns and say which student should speak first. (Ms Lis, interview, 6 September 2012)

Ms Lis's response suggested that the possible cause of chorus answering was that the students were not confident enough to speak independently. They were afraid of making incorrect answers. It seemed that when there were students who raised their hands, the class's attention was directly drawn to a particular student, and if her/his answer was not correct, she/he would feel embarrassed. Ms Lis reflected on her classroom practices in the following way:

> I have asked students to put their hands up before answering, but the class became quiet, not what I expected. Actually this has become a concern of

mine. I often ask them what makes them afraid to raise their hands or ask questions. I say that they must have guts, but they say that they are afraid if they answer incorrectly. The more I demand them to raise hands, the more the class becomes silent. When the situation was like this, I myself did not feel comfortable. Finally I let it go. (Ms Lis, interview, 6 September 2012)

Analysis of classroom observations revealed that students' chorus answers, teachers' elongating questions, gap-filling or slot response, and teachers' lack of individual spot checking were common practices in the five classrooms observed as these practices "allow the classroom participants to be seen to accomplish lessons" (Martin, 2005, p. 89). The data presented in this section confirmed that the use of English in the classrooms was regarded as a heavy task both for the teachers and the students.

English-medium PowerPoint as a useful tool to teach subjects in English and Indonesian (bilingually)

In the classes observed, the majority of teachers used PowerPoint with the texts written in English. The use of PowerPoint technology was a helpful tool for teaching. The teachers used it as a tool, particularly as a guideline in the flow of the information. The analysis revealed that there were at least three functions of the use of PowerPoint in the classrooms.

First, PowerPoint slides showed main ideas and supporting details of the topic of the lesson, which helped the teachers to explain the lesson content in logical order. The slides gave the teachers an outline to keep them focused on the topics. The slides helped them by seeing the points that were next so they could inform or explain. They made good use of the slides as clues to what sub topics they were going to talk about next. These also gave the students an idea of what to expect. With English texts on the PowerPoints, the teachers seemed to be confident to communicate the contents in English to the students. PowerPoint was also used flexibly where the teachers were still able to stand and walk around the class or move the slides according to sub topics being discussed (Observation notes, numerous occasions).

Second, PowerPoint displayed images and pictures. These visual displays helped the delivery of the content. For example, in the Biology lesson, the PowerPoints with pictures and names on human skeleton became the main instrument of teaching the introduction to the topic of the human skeleton. Through the whole discussion of the topic, the teacher referred to the slides to show which parts of the skeleton he was talking about.

According to Mr Cho, the majority of teachers in the school used PowerPoint slides in teaching. They had Indonesian and English versions of the PowerPoint slides. The use of the English version of PowerPoint slides increased teachers' attempt to give students comprehensible input in English through visual aids (Baker, 2011; Garcia, 2009). Hence, the English version was to introduce students to English scientific terms, while the Indonesian was used as the translation and to make the concepts clear. The source of content for the PowerPoints came from adopting or adapting from the Internet, or the teachers made their own. These days some textbook publishing companies provide PowerPoint presentations to accompany their textbooks (Mr Cho, interview, 28 September 2012).

Third, PowerPoint was chosen as an alternative medium of teaching as it was felt to be more convenient for the teachers. Moreover, each classroom in the school

had accesss to a Liquid-Crystal Display (LCD) projector and a screen. For example, in Mr Cho's lesson, he said that he felt that it was much more convenient for him to display the pictures or images of the human skeleton through PowerPoint slides rather than bringing an imitation of a human skeleton into the classroom. For him, PowerPoint was an important learning tool which could be used to align with the topic and objectives of the lesson (Mr Cho, interview, 28 September 2012).

Similarly, Mr Brur explained that in his lesson, PowerPoint played a central role for instructional material. He encouraged his students to use PowerPoint when presenting their group tasks. As it was an Information Communication Technology lesson, the students' design of the presentation slides, such as the colour scheme, font type and size were considered to be criteria in the scoring system (Mr Brur, interview, 20 September 2012). Therefore, the use of PowerPoint did not simply aim to demonstrate that the students were able to use technology in class, but also that they were able to understand the lesson content. PowerPoint was an alternative tool for teaching and it was considered very useful in teaching content integrated with English language. Using visual aids like pictures and English written texts in the PowerPoint slides was a technique in bilingual education programs because it gave students contextual support for the English language being used by the teachers (Baker, 2011).

Cooperative learning

In an attempt to implement the use of Indonesian and English (bilingual) in teaching, some teachers applied a kind of teaching strategy to the lessons, that is, cooperative learning. Cooperative learning is defined as:

> a set of instructional strategies by which small groups of students to facilitate peer interactions and cooperation for studying academic subjects. It is a classroom technique in which students work on learning activities in small groups and receive rewards or recognition based on their group's performance. Cooperative learning obviously would put students together in groups and give them tasks to do. (Weihong, 2012, p. 961)

It might be assumed that performing some classroom tasks in English was difficult for students so the teachers seemed to expect that more able students in English would help less able students in group work. Ms Wulan, Ms Tuti, and Mr Brur's lessons were evidence of cooperative learning strategies, as they asserted the cooperative learning technique to create teamwork, interdependence, social interaction, and partnership among the students.

Working in pairs and in groups was seen by several teachers as a way of encouraging students to use English. In the elaboration stage of Ms Wulan's lesson on the topic of the history of the periodic table of chemical elements, the class was asked to break into groups of eight students. Each group was given the task of reading and making a summary of different parts of a larger text on the history of the periodic table. The text in English was taken from their textbooks. During the group discussion, the teacher went around the class and walked towards some students' desks to provide additional explanations. She usually spoke in English, but when the students looked confused, she switched into Indonesian. Each group was given a piece of a flip chart to write down summary points of their discussions. At this stage, the teacher required her students to write the summary in English and report their summary in English to the rest of the class. The students made a great attempt to speak in English. The teacher seemed to encourage all members of each group to speak in English in front of the class.

In Ms Tuti's lesson, a cooperative learning technique was used, in the form of pairwork. Each pair was given a worksheet about cyclical permutation problem solving (Observation notes, 15 September 2012). After an appropriate amount of time for the students to work on the problem solving, they were asked to voluntarily come up to the whiteboard to display their work. In this way, as Ms Tuti said in the post-lesson interview, the use of whiteboard was preferred as it was considered more interactive to show how a mathematical problem was solved (Ms Tuti, interview, 18 September 2012). Ms Tuti stated her justification of choosing the pairwork technique:

> In my opinion, fewer students in a group allow better discussion. Two students will be effectively working together to solve problems, rather than bigger groups which is not as effective as small groups. Because two students focus on their work, compared to four students in a group in which the others may only chat and not do their shared job. Through pairwork, I also stress in character building to be able to work cooperatively. (Ms Tuti, interview, 18 September 2012)

Ms Tuti did not ask her students to speak in English during their pairwork nor did she speak in English when helping them. She mentioned the time constraints as her reason for not inviting students to speak in English during their work (Ms Tuti, interview, 18 September 2012).

> Mr Brur stated his viewpoint of cooperative learning as follows:
> I want my students to gain more understanding of the content materials through the group presentation. They have to read to comprehend the contents at home then work together in their group to discuss the materials and make the PowerPoints. So, I hope they have prepared well. Also, I encourage other groups who are not presenting on the day to ask questions. I award them additional scores if they raise questions. I feel that through this technique, they would become more active. (Mr Brur, interview, 20 September 2012)

Mr Brur's opinion seemed to suggest that group work was a technique to improve students' comprehension of the content subject. In a different interview, he also encouraged his students to use English if they could as he considered that using English gave added-value for students in terms of rising to the challenge in activity and creativity.

In the classrooms, some teachers gave opportunities for the students to do their work cooperatively in English. However, during student-student interactions discussing the task they used Indonesian and mainly Javanese language. My observations also showed that the teachers in all the classes rarely gave specific attention to detail of the students' English language practices, such as giving corrections on spelling, pronunciation, or grammar. This was because the teachers were not aware of their students' mistakes. This relates to the key feature I discussed in the section on teachers' lack of awareness (even ignorance) of their own language errors.

My observation data showed that group work and pair work did not develop students' talk that is useful for learning English. The teachers encouraged students to focus more on the completion of the subject matter tasks. Group work and pair work did not expose to the use of English, so the students did not hear more English language with greater variety. There was lack of teachers' comprehensible input, that is English language input that could be understood by students despite them not

understanding all the words and structures in the language (Krashen, 1985; 1994). According to Krashen's theory of language acquisition, giving students this kind of input helps them acquire the English language naturally, rather than learn it consciously. But, the teachers were not language teachers, so they had no idea how to structure language learning through content and language integrated learning.

The analyses of the subject teachers' classroom interactions revealed six common language practices in regard to the implementation of English bilingual education. In the following section, I relate the teachers' language ideologies as reflected and manifested in their interactional and pedagogical practices in the classroom. I argue that there was relationships between language ideologies held by the teachers and what they were doing in the classrooms in terms of their linguistic and communicative behaviour.

MANIFESTATIONS OF TEACHERS' LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES IN THEIR CLASSROOM PRACTICES

Findings from the analysis of teachers' classroom practices should expand our understanding of their language ideologies about English in regard to the government's promotion of the use of English alongside Indonesian in teaching Science and Mathematics in school. I support Dyers and Abongdia's (2010) argument that "language ideologies are reflected in actual language practices and language ideologies are on the whole not hidden but quite clearly reflected in particular behaviours" (p.3) and also Olivo's finding (2003) that "language ideologies give shape to, and are shaped by, the classroom practices of the teachers" (p. 50).

Findings on teachers' classroom practices also bring me to agree that language ideologies "frame and influence most aspects of language use, but their influence is not always directly observable" (McGroarty, 2010, p. 3). Analysis of classroom observation data showed several instances of teachers' explicit talk or statements related to the English language in their classrooms. Data from other sources, including lesson transcripts, observation notes, and post-lesson interviews with video-stimulated recall, enabled me to analyse the manifestations of teachers' language ideologies in classrooms. Teachers' language ideologies were not always in alignment with their language practices in the classrooms.

Codeswitching and safetalk as manifestations of the language ideology that using English is a heavy burden

After examining closely the teachers' practices in the classrooms, it became obvious that the teachers tried to use English in their classrooms. They found it challenging. Enormous problems were faced by the teachers when they used English in such situations because of little exposure to the language for themselves. Teachers struggled to speak the language as was evident in their codeswitching and safetalk strategies as their way of implementing the use of English in teaching their subjects. Teachers' stated belief that *English is a heavy burden* was underpinned with their classroom experiences in using English in teaching.

All teachers in the study found it difficult to explain concepts, technical terms, or specific scientific terms in English, for example in defining cyclical permutation and particularly in scaffolding the lessons to help students understand the lesson content (Classroom observation notes, numerous occasions). It was not easy for some teachers to use simple expressions, such as giving instructions. This

resulted in them using safetalk strategies, including codeswitching, bilingual label quests, and students' chorus responses. The safetalk strategies were further represented in a lack of individual spot checks, and elongated questions to accomplish the lessons. These linguistic practices were common patterns of classroom interactions. Therefore, these difficulties in using English certainly impacted on the teachers' views that English is difficult.

In addition to teaching in classrooms, preparing teaching resources or tools, such as syllabus, lesson plans, worksheets, small quizzes, and PowerPoint in English language was felt by some teachers to be difficult and added to their burden. Four teachers used PowerPoint with the texts in English as their tool to deliver the content materials in English. However, preparing PowerPoint presentations in English language was not as easy as preparing them in the Indonesian language. Some teachers often asked for assistance from one or two English teachers in the school, such as to check their translations. They did so informally, and felt uncomfortable always asking for help from these English teachers who were busy with their own teaching (Interviews, numerous occasions). Consequently, the PowerPoints and the worksheets often contained ungrammatical and unacceptable sentences. For example, in Mr Cho's PowerPoint, instead of writing 'skeleton', the text was written as 'skuleton' (Classroom observation, 13 September 2012). Another example was a problem solution question type on a Mathematics worksheet which used some incorrect word choices. Moreover, at times teachers seemed unsure of how to pronounce English sentences, and they gave the impression of being hesitant.

The teachers' belief that English is difficult was also reflected in them allowing students to codeswitch or to speak in the language they chose to. Even though in the classroom context, power relations between teachers and students were evident, some students showed that they tried to negotiate with their teachers which language they would use to participate in class discussions. The teachers always allowed students to codeswitch between Indonesian and English, as the teachers themselves seemed to assume that their students might lack English competence. Another piece of evidence reflecting the belief that English is difficult was that most teachers who used English in their classes were unaware that they made errors in using English, even when the mistakes seemed to be very simple, such as giving a simple order to the students.

Codeswitching as a manifestation of *We have our own language* ideology

We have our own language ideology appeared to be reflected through the dominant use of the Indonesian language by the teachers in the classrooms. Several teachers showed attempts which deserved praise for speaking in English with varying degrees of sentence complexity but the fact remains that they tended to choose Indonesian and Javanese languages, their own languages. It was natural for teachers to prefer the two languages to English since Indonesian and Javanese are the everyday languages used in the communicative practices of the community.

The teachers tended to choose Indonesian whenever they felt they would hesitate if they spoke in English. It seemed that using the Indonesian language allowed teachers to 'save face' instead of stumbling when speaking English. Moreover, assuming that their students might not be competent in English, the teachers tolerated and allowed the students to speak in Indonesian or Javanese in their group discussions (peer interactions), or when their students displayed work to the rest of the class. The teachers appeared to be more comfortable using their own languages, Indonesian and Javanese, and permitted the students to interact in their

every day languages which were also Indonesian or Javanese. For them, using Indonesian saved time, as they were aware of the need to move beyond a certain teaching and learning activity to catch up with the objectives stated in the lesson plans. The use of Indonesian and Javanese, the shared languages among the teachers and the students, seemed to be viewed as the medium of instruction which would facilitate students' understanding of the lessons whilst, English was a bothersome nuisance.

Teachers' efforts to use English as manifestations of their language ideologies which promote English

Teachers' language ideologies that *English is the international language, acquiring English skills benefit students in the future,* and *English will not decrease nationalism* could be categorised as language ideologies that motivated teachers to have positive attitudes towards using English. It was reflected through the teachers' efforts to use English in the lessons. The data revealed that most teachers attempted to use English despite their difficulties in delivering the lessons in English.

Another piece of evidence which showed that the teachers agreed that English would benefit students in the future was giving students exercises, worksheets and assignments in English. Most teachers stated that they used English for short-term goals as well as for long-term goals (Interviews, numerous occasions). Using English in the lessons was to prepare students for school examinations which were conducted in the two languages, Indonesian and English. The teachers' concern about the school examination seemed to have motivated them to teach bilingually, as they said they thought students would find it difficult to do their exams in English if they were not accustomed to being taught in English. Therefore, they asserted that their use of English in the classrooms would benefit students in their preparation for the examinations. It would benefit students if teachers were fluent competent use of English.

The teachers also stated that students would feel the benefit of bilingual education from their high school when they reached university. Some school alumni who visited the school and met these teachers said that their experiences at the school of being taught in English gave them an advantage during their university education. Particularly when majoring in Mathematics and Science, the conceptual knowledge in English that they had gained from the school had improved their English competence. It was necessary to have a high standard of English given that many sources of information were in English on the Internet and in textbooks. The accounts from these school alumni encouraged some teachers to use English. As a result, these teachers said that they believed that having students accustomed to listening, speaking, reading, and writing in English would benefit them in their higher education. As could be seen in the classrooms, the students were given learning activities which required the four macro skills in language.

Closely related to the *English benefits students in the future* ideology is that all teachers acknowledged English as the international language. Despite the limitations of their knowledge and competence in English, most teachers showed their attempts to use English to varying degrees. Some of them held the opinion that *tidak apa-apa mencoba meskipun salah* (in Indonesian language) which is similar to "It's okay to make mistakes" or, practice makes perfect. This meant that as they viewed that English was important for students' futures, teachers were trying to use English in their teaching practices. This evidence is similar to the Malaysian context

in which teachers recognised "the pragmatic, academic and global importance of English" (Martin, 2005, p. 75).

These efforts to use English reinforced the teachers' ideology that *Using English will not decrease nationalism* or the pride to the country. Despite difficulties, stumbling and hesitancy in using English, several teachers continued to attempt to teach bilingually. It became more evident when I noticed several teachers displaying enthusiasm in their attempts to use English. Data showed that all the teachers wanted to implement bilingual education, but their bilingual teaching practices varied. For example, although Mr Brur admitted that he was not good in English, nor confident to speak English in the class, he still encouraged his students to use English, by asking them to present their group work in English.

For the teachers in the study, using English for bilingual teaching was not considered an obstacle to Indonesian nationalism. They held a deep-seated ideology that the Indonesian language would always remain as the strong unifying language of the country, as it has long been used in most domains in the lives of Indonesian people. I have explained that view in the *We have our own language* ideology. It was apparent that teachers' classroom actions did not always appear to coincide with their stated beliefs. The findings are congruent with those of Olivio (2003) who found in his study that teachers' language ideologies manisfested through classroom practice, "often in complex and even contradictory ways" (p. 68). This "may be the case that local contextual factors have a role to play here" (Li & Walsh, 2011, p. 51). The teachers had to pay lip service to central and local hierarcy and kept trying despite low English proficiency.

In conclusion, teachers' multiple and competing language ideologies were reflected in their classroom teaching practices, and also their classroom teaching experiences influenced their language ideologies, as people's language ideologies are rooted in their social, cultural and political experiences (Kroskrity, 2000). Most importantly, data analysis of teachers' classroom practices revealed that the teachers' pedagogy and concern for learning has taken precedence over use of English. This demonstrates the teachers' complex decision-making and the complexity of their jobs.

SUMMARY

This chapter has shown observable classroom practices of five subject teachers and their attempts to implement the government's policy on the use of English in teaching Science and Mathematics. By employing a thematic analysis, the data analysis revealed six key features in teachers' language practices across the classrooms: teachers' use of codeswitching, allowing students to codeswitch, teachers' lack of awareness of their language errors, use of safetalk strategies, using English-medium PowerPoint as a useful tool to teach in English, and cooperative learning techniques to promote using English. I have discussed the complex interrelationship of teachers' language practices, language choice, and their language ideologies. In Chapter 6, I will describe and discuss school executives' English language ideologies to gain a better understanding of the school context, as that might influence the teachers.

CHAPTER 6
SCHOOL EXECUTIVES' LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES ABOUT ENGLISH

INTRODUCTION

To better understand subject teachers' language ideologies about the English language and their classroom practices, it is important to consider teachers' immediate context, that is, school executives' language ideologies. This chapter sets out to investigate the language ideologies held by school executives to find out the answer to the third research question, "What were school executives' language ideologies about English that informed what they said about the use of English in the school?" The main source of data for this chapter came from in-depth interviews with three school executives: acting principal, deputy principal for curriculum affairs, and program coordinator. The data were complemented with whole-school observations and informal conversations with the school executives.

The interviews focussed on questions related to their views about subject teachers' use of English, the status of the language in the school, current use of the language in the school, and the government's policy on the use of English in the school. In this chapter firstly I will show findings of the prevailing English language ideologies held by the school executives. Then, I will discuss the findings on sections about conflicting language ideologies between the acting principal and the program coordinator, and multiple English language ideologies among the school executives. Finally, a summary of this chapter will be presented.

SCHOOL EXECUTIVES' ENGLISH LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES

Multiplicity and conflicting language ideologies among school executives emerged in the data. The analysis showed that their English language ideologies were grounded in different social contexts and different underlying assumptions surrounding English. In the following, I will show the prevailing language ideologies of English which I classified into four themes: (1) English is the international language, (2) English skills advance an individual's professional repertoire, (3) English is not a common language used in daily life, and (4) Using English will not threaten Indonesian nationalism.

Language ideology 1
English is the international language

All school executives in the study stated clearly that it was *Karena bahasa Inggris adalah bahasa internasional* (my translation: Because English is an international language) when they were asked what they thought about the government's promotion of the use of English as the medium of instruction alongside Indonesian in Mathematics and Science subjects and the promotion of English as a language of habitual use at the school. The school executives' ideology that *English is the international language* derived from their assumption about the important roles that English played in international scope and particularly in the internationalisation of the school as the school was projected to be an International-Standard School. The school executives addressed at least four underlying assumptions which constructed

their belief that *English is the international language* which I will describe in the next sections.

English is a means of developing and enriching school curriculum with international-based standards

English was needed to learn and understand school curriculum of other countries. Mr Amad, the deputy principal for curriculum affairs, explained that according to the guidelines of *Departemen Pendidikan Nasional* (the Ministry of National Education, 2008, 2009), the government expected the school to adapt and adopt curriculum from developed countries, that is, the countries which were considered to have a quality education. This includes the member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), such as United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Australia, and New Zealand (Mr Amad, interview, 3 September 2012).

> The Ministry of National Education policy document stated that:
> *proses pembelajaran diperkaya dengan model proses pembelajaran sekolah unggul dari negara anggota OECD dan/atau negara maju lainnya yang mempunyai keunggulan tertentu dalam bidang pendidikan* (my translation: teaching and learning process should be enriched with models of teaching from schools of the OECD member countries and/or other developed countries which have a quality education). (*Departemen Pendidikan Nasional*, 2008, p. viii)

Referring to the government document, the school was to benchmark against the international standards of education of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) member countries or other developed countries, in particular their standards of teaching and learning processes. As Mr Amad stated, English was necessary in order for teachers to understand English-medium curriculum of other countries which would enable them to develop and enrich the existing school curriculum with educational standards of foreign countries.

Apart from strong public debate of benchmarking school curriculum with those of foreign countries, in Mr Amad's view, teachers as well as school executives should have a good command of English if they intended to develop the school curriculum with reference to international curriculum. For example, teachers could enrich the content of teaching and learning materials or learn alternative teaching approaches and strategies from other countries. And vice versa, English competency would facilitate teachers' writing or translating the school curriculum in English so that it could be accessed and recognised internationally (Mr Amad, interview, 3 September 2012). In this case, Mr Amad held a strong view that English as the international language played an important role as a means of curriculum benchmarking.

English is an essential means of communication to establish and maintain partnership with schools abroad

English as the international language was perceived as a means of benchmarking against international-standard-based curriculum, and also as an essential means of communication to build and maintain a partnership with one overseas school. According to Mr Bagus the program coordinator, because of the special status attached to the school, the government required it to build and maintain a partnership with one overseas school which then would be called "a sister school". In *Departemen Pendidikan Nasional* document (Department of National Education, 2008, p. X), it stated that the school should *menjalin hubungan "sister school"*

dengan sekolah bertaraf internasional di luar negeri (my translation: build a relationship and partnership with "a sister school" – an international standard school overseas).

Mr Bagus further described that the school built collaboration with an Australian school. It was a high school on the Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia. The aim of the partnership was to promote international collaboration to increase opportunities to learn each other's experiences and best practice models, strengthen knowledge sharing, encourage teacher exchanges, and learn more about the language and culture of another country (Mr Bagus, interview, 5 October 2012). Similarly, Mr Arjuna the acting principal seemed convinced that English was an important means of communication with the sister school, as he said:

> With English, our school and the school abroad can learn about each other. For example, in February 2012 one of our teachers together with four students visited a school on Gold Coast for two weeks to give our students opportunities seeing the teaching learning process in there, living with Australian families, sharing cultures, and discussing some programs which would contribute to both schools. All of these activities required abilities to communicate in English. (Mr Arjuna, interview, 24 September 2012)

Mr Arjuna's statement offered a clear opinion that English language use was essential to establish and maintain cooperation between his school and the Australian school. His statement suggested that English was the preferred international language.

Another piece of evidence that English was important for communication was seen on one occasion when an Australian teacher from the sister school visited the school for two days. I described the short event in my observation notes:

> Today I met an Australian teacher from an Australian school who visited the school for two days. In the teachers' room Mr Bagus introduced him to five teachers who were not teaching at that time. I was also introduced to him. During the introduction, it seemed some teachers were little bit nervous in greeting the Australian teacher. After the guest and the teachers shook hands, one by one the teachers stepped back quietly and got back to their chairs. Only one teacher, a teacher who teaches English subject, had a small chat with him. Then, instead of asking the teachers who were free at the moment to accompany him and the guest to look around the school and visited several classes, Mr Bagus asked me. (Observation notes, 18 September 2012)

This short event clearly showed that teachers' speaking skills in English such as making a self-introduction and a friendly greeting were regarded by the teachers as helping to establish interpersonal communication with the foreign guest. The context here indicated that English was chosen to be used as the medium of communication as it is the international language.

English is a means of accessing knowledge and information in English-medium journals, books, and the Internet

All school executives stated that *English is the international language* because it was the language mostly used in international journal articles, books, and the Internet. They shared an opinion that teachers should have adequate competence in English to make use of international journal articles as part of teaching references, especially to keep up with up-to-date content area knowledge of the subjects they taught. In Mr

Amad's opinion, teachers as well as students should have a willingness to engage in self-directed learning by reading journal articles and research reports to access up-to-date information and knowledge. Mr Amad argued:

> To some extent our students should be different from those of regular schools. At least they should be accustomed to communicating in English, oral and written. In oral communication they should be brave to speak in English. In written communication they should increase their motivation to access knowledge and information from other sources, especially books and journal articles in English because many qualified journal articles and research results are published in English. (Interview, 3 September 2012)

English is the medium of international competitions
Mr Amad stated that students of the school should be accustomed to using English since the language is the medium of Science and Mathematics subject competitions in the international sphere (Interview, 3 September 2012). The opinion from the school executives related with the government's encouragement that the school should *meraih medali tingkat internasional pada berbagai kompetisi sains, matematika, teknologi, seni, dan olah raga* (my translation: gain international achievement in varied competitions such as Science, Mathematics, technology, arts, and sports) (*Departemen Pendidikan Nasional*, 2008, p. X). According to Mr Amad:

> The government encouraged all pioneer international standard schools to participate in international competitions such as Mathematics and Science olympiads. Also, one of our school goals is to become well-known for its academic or non-academic excellence such as in arts, sports or other interests. And if possible, to be recognised internationally. (Interview, 3 September 2012)

Mr Amad's statement suggested that in participating in such international competitions in Mathematics and Science subjects, the English competency of students and teachers was paramount. Because of diverse language backgrounds of students from different countries who participated in such international events, English was commonly selected as a means of communication.

It seemed that school executives tended to associate *English is the international language* with the concept of internationalising the school as they explicitly and implicitly linked the use of English with internationalisation.

Language ideology 2
English advances an individual's professional repertoire
The ideology that *English advances an individual's professional repertoire* came from the school executives' explicit talk about some benefits that teachers and students might obtain if they had English abilities. All school executives in the study stated that a good command of English would make it relatively easy for students to access knowledge and information and would bring more job opportunities for them.

Having English abilities would extend wider job opportunities
All school executives in the study said that English abilities equate with wider job opportunities for school graduates. Mr Bagus, for example, stated that he believed that because English is the preferred international language, it is mostly required in international job markets. Students who have good English skills would get more opportunities in employment, such as working abroad or in multinational-owned companies where English is the language in workplaces (Mr Bagus, interview, 7

September 2012). One main reason the government promoted the use of English in Pioneer International Standard Schools, according to Mr Bagus, was to give students much exposure to English communication skills, so in future they would be able to compete in international job markets. Mr Bagus explained:

> Historically the establishment of Pioneer International Standard Schools firstly aimed for vocational high schools. Many vocational high school graduates from Indonesia were accepted working in foreign countries because they got adequate vocational training during their school. But, they lacked English communication skills, so they often did not understand instructions given to them at their workplaces. This influenced results of their works, and consequently some Indonesian workers did not get a same salary as their counterparts who were able to communicate in English, particularly those from Commonwealth nations such as Malaysia, Philippines, Afghanistan, and India who got higher payment because they understood instructions in English. In the second year of their work usually Indonesian workers began to understand instructions in English. So, actually the problem is about a lack of English skills. Therefore, to boost Indonesian students' skills in English the government initiated the establishment of Pioneer International Standard School for Vocational High Schools where English communication was expected to be a daily habit in school environment. The government then established for senior high schools, so in every rural region and urban there is one school at each educational level called Pioneer International Standard School. (Mr Bagus, interview, 7 September 2012)

Mr Bagus's explanation highlighted that the government's initiative of the use of English in the schools with the Pioneer International Standard status was grounded in the government's consideration to improve English communication skills of Indonesian school graduates so that they would have wider job opportunities at home or abroad.

All school executives in the study stated their thoughts that students who acquired English proficiency were students who had added-value as they had special quality in the form of English communication skills.

Proficiency in English makes it easier to access and present knowledge and information

Teachers and students who were competent in English would enjoy certain privileges, such as broadening their access to knowledge and information written or presented in English, and also broadening opportunities to present their knowledge and information for an international audience (school executives, interviews, various occasions). For example, Mr Arjuna, the acting principal, asserted:

> English should become a need for teachers. In the globalisation era, English competency is a global need. For example, English is the language mostly used in the internet. There are many teaching materials in the internet, so they [teachers] can browse them. English is a need for teachers. It becomes a demand for all teachers. We also can see that going abroad is no longer a luxurious matter, so people should equip with English to be able to communicate when they are abroad. English abilities will be common for us. (Mr Arjuna, interview, 25 September 2012)

Similar to Mr Arjuna, Mr Amad suggested students should be browsing from the Internet to find up-to-date journal articles related to their content subjects. He said:

English abilities should make students able to access learning materials in English. Many useful journal articles and research findings are written in English, so with English skills teachers and students should know the development of science and information through those English journals. (Mr Amad, interview, 3 September 2012)

Mr Amad and Mr Arjuna had the same opinion that by having English competence teachers might develop and enrich their quality of teaching through browsing the Internet and if possible downloading useful sources to improve teaching. In Mr Arjuna's words, *Bahasa Inggris membuka wawasan*/English enhances our horizon" (Interview, 25 September 2012). Both Mr Arjuna and Mr Amad related English skills with enrichment of teachers' content knowledge. They argued that mastery of content knowledge would help teachers to respond to spontaneous and increasingly demanding questions from students. Therefore, students would also benefit from having teachers who were competent in English.

Good command of English is associated with good educational progress

All the school executives in the study emphasised that proficiency in English would extend wider job opportunities for students and make it easier to access or present knowledge and information for the international purposes. They stated that a command of English was also associated with educational progress. Mr Arjuna highlighted:

I should emphasise to teachers at this school that life now has become increasing globalised. Teachers should change their mindset and realise that English skills are needs in our lives. The skills are not just job tasks nor an obligation, that is something that teachers must do because of the rule. It is not like that. But, our teachers should feel they need English. So, if they do not fulfil the needs, they will be left behind. They will not be making progress in their teaching knowledge. (Interview, 25 September 2012)

It could be inferred from Mr Arjuna's statement that teachers should be aware that the English language was necessary for them in relation to their teaching profession. Command of the English language was understood as contributing to the development of teachers' professional competency.

Language ideology 3
English is not a common language in daily life

Further findings showed that English was still considered as not a shared language used for everyday life. Three interconnected assumptions formed the strong view that English was not a common language. Those are: identity as the Indonesian nationality, value judgment about the Javanese language, and cultural perceptions about using English. I will discuss these underlying assumptions constituting the ideology that *English is not a common language in daily life* as follows.

Strong identity as Indonesian nationality and Javanese ethnicity

All school executives in the study explained that generally all members of the school community including the school executives themselves tended to prefer using Indonesian and Javanese to English, with consideration of their national and ethnic identity. Mr Arjuna asserted *Bahasa ibu itu tetap menjadi bahasa di sebuah negara kita berpijak* (My translation: Mother tongue remains the language of the country where our feet touch the soil (Interview, 25 September 2012). Mr Arjuna also explained that nationality (Indonesian), ethnicity (Javanese) and where the teachers

live (Javanese community) influenced their language choice (Interview, 25 September 2012). The Indonesian and Javanese languages are the teachers' "linguistic identity" (Baker, 2011, p. 400). The link between identity and language choice was pointed out by Mr Bagus who remarked, "There are always obstacles in using English because we are Indonesians; it is absolute that we choose Indonesian" (Interview, 5 October 2012). He added:

> English subject teachers at school will speak in English if we speak English with them, but in everyday activities they use Indonesian or Javanese because of the environment. (Mr Bagus, interview, 5 October 2012)

My observations in the school were that all members of the school community were heard and seen using Indonesian and Javanese in everyday life at school in all domains such as in the canteen, the sports yard, the teachers' offices, the administration office, the library, the school corridor, the parking area, and the musholla (a small mosque located inside the school). On very few occasions some teachers spoke a few words or short utterances in English. For example, an English subject teacher spoke in English to another English subject teacher, and an English subject teacher spoke in English with another subject teacher. However, I was aware that these few occasions of teachers speaking English might have been influenced by my presence around them (Observation notes, 20 September 2012). Mr Bagus confirmed my observation notes by saying:

> Indonesian is the official language of the nation, and the state schools are government-owned formal educational institutions. Therefore, most teachers believe that the official language of instruction should be Indonesian. And, as teachers come from Javanese ethnic background, they speak Javanese their mother tongue. (Interview, 5 October 2012)

Even though Mr Bagus admitted that he himself tended to use Indonesian for everyday communication, he suggested that teachers who teach English speak English with other English subject teachers. For him, the use of English was more appropriate to be used by English subject teachers because of their professional identity. English subject teachers, according to Mr Bagus, had more legitimacy to use English as they had responsibilty for the English language education which is a compulsory subject in Indonesian junior and senior high schools. Therefore, using English was related to the professional identity of the users. It seemed natural that Indonesian and Javanese languages were regarded as more acceptable to be used among Indonesian teachers as they owned the two languages.

Value judgment between English and Javanese

Mr Arjuna who was the school principal was the only school executive participant who gave an explicit opinion about the value of Javanese over English in terms of the feelings of using Javanese and English. Mr Arjuna said that he felt he liked more to be addressed in Javanese rather than English because in the Javanese community, Javanese has some degree of politeness and higher status than English (*nilai rasa bahasa Jawa ini memang tinggi*) (Mr Arjuna, interview, 26 September 2012). Further he elaborated his judgment about Javanese:

> *Ya, bisa jadi kan ya apa ya karena ini keyakinan nilai juga. Khusus bahasa Jawa lho ya karena dia mengenal bahasa ini penuh dengan toto kromo. Ini juga nganu jadi kan akan sangat berbeda nilai rasa, lha nilai rasa bahasa Jawa ini memang tinggi, sehingga ini kadang-kadang orang kalau berbahasa lain ya itu nilai rasa bahasa Jawa terhadap toto kromo, sopan santun, nilai budaya itu tinggi dianggap tinggi. Saya rasakan betul,*

alangkah nyamannya saya dipanggil anak saya dengan bahasa yang saya panggil jawabannya kan mungkin kalau bahasa Inggris halo Dad kan sudah oke kita nilai rasanya mungkin agak beda ya, tapi kalau bahasa Jawa ini kan betul-betul kita saja sebagai orang Jawa, saya sebagai orang Jawa sangat terasa sekali manakala anak saya menuturkan bahasa Jawa dengan penuh ini akan menghambat penggunaan bahasa lain, berpengaruh karena keyakinan. Saya yakin nilai inilah yang cocok dengan saya pikir ini wajar-wajar saja karena ini kita muncul budaya ini juga dari ya manggil orang tuanya dipanggil dengan jawaban nggih kan berbeda dengan ya dad nilai rasanya berbeda. Versi kita sebagai orang Jawa lho ya lebih spesifik lho ya.
(Interview, 25 September 2012)

(My translation: Maybe it's about value judgment, especially about the Javanese language. The language is popular of its politeness strategies. The feeling can be different when we use Javanese; politeness, attitudes in using the language seem to be high. I really feel that. It's like more comfortable if our kids speak with us in Javanese rather than in English; for example, if I call them and they say, "Hello, Dad," my feeling is just different from when they greet us in Javanese. I feel that because I am Javanese. I think such a feeling is normal. If parents call their children and they answer "Nggih" [Yes] the nuance of feeling is just not the same. This may be my version as a Javanese).

What he meant by politeness was that when people communicate in Javanese, they were expected to choose and use different words to convey the same meanings for different people; its use is varied according to whom we are speaking to. Javanese is a hierarchical language (See Poedjosoedarmo's study about Javanese speech level, 1968; Wardhaugh's study about politeness in Javanese language, 2010). Nadar (2007) explained that in Javanese culture, attitudes towards status difference are reflected in the system of naming and addressing. Javanese language has three levels, namely, *krama* (high or refined language), *madya* (middle level) and *ngoko* (low or informal level). Naming and addressing systems play an important role in interaction, and the wrong use of the system may disrupt harmonious interaction (Nadar, 2007) . The judgments about the Javanese language appeared to lead to the ideology that the language had higher symbolic value than English in Javanese communities (Bourdieu, 1991). Javanese is associated with a very strong, confident cultural identity. When it came to the local context such as in school, the ideology that *English is not a common language used in daily life* was dominant.

Cultural labelling for people speaking English
The ideology that *English is not a common language used in daily life* also stemmed from an assumption that teachers speaking English might be given a negative label. In other words, since English was rarely used in school, teachers and school executives who used the language might be labelled negatively. Mr Arjuna gave an illustration:

> Sometimes when some teachers spoke English as a kind of practice at school, some colleagues might label them *kemlinthi* [acting up so proudly]. This expression is not directly addressed to teachers who spoke English, but it was said to other teachers. And eventually teachers who spoke English would know that their colleagues have a negative opinion about them because they practised English. This may be part of our culture. We sometimes view someone who has skills beyond ours and uses the skills in

everyday practices where not all people can acquire these skills as a person who was *kemlinthi*. (Interview, 24 September 2012)

Mr Arjuna assumed that it was not a common practice among teachers at school to use English. He said that some teachers sometimes talked negatively behind someone's back who used English at school. Persons if they used English were given a label *kemlinthi* which meant someone who was acting up so proudly, showing off her/his abilities in English skills. The tendency to criticize more able people who spoke English seemed to hinder them in using English at school. Mr Arjuna considered that negative attitudes towards teachers speaking English, such as giving a negative label, became an obstacle in learning and using the language at school.

Mr Bagus stated that sometimes he felt that his colleagues would comment on him negatively if he kept using English. He said, "I myself admitted that I became lack of using English. Because if I insisted on using English, my colleagues would think I am 'looking for a face'." (*Kalau saya bertahan nanti saya dikira nggolek rai* – Mr Bagus' Indonesian mixed with Javanese utterances) (Interview, 5 October 2012). *Nggolek rai* is a Javanese idiomatic expression that means expecting other people to compliment. If translated literally in English *nggolek rai* meaning "looking for a face". Mr Bagus described what he felt about using English while the education policy on the use of English in school had been loosened. He did not want his colleagues to label him *nggolek rai*. He sounded like he was complaining that it was beyond his capacity to enforce teachers to keep using English; otherwise he would be considered a person who was looking for compliments from school supervisors. Such labels, *kemlinthi and nggolek rai*, could be traced back to the conviction that *English is not a common language used in daily life*.

Language ideology 4
Using English will not decrease our nationalism

When the school executives were asked about a growing public debate presented in some Indonesian mass media about fears that the use of English in Pioneer International Standard Schools would threaten students' nationalism, decrease their pride in the country, or reduce their use of and pride in the Indonesian language, all of them strongly answered that such fears would not happen. *Kita pakai bilingual karena itu tidak mengurangi nasionalisme kita* (My translation: We can use bilingual [Indonesian and English] because it will not decrease our nationalism), said Mr Bagus (Interview, 7 September 2012). He elaborated:

> *Dan itu dikaitkan dengan kondisi nasionalisme sekarang yang sedikit luntur karena dipengaruhi oleh beberapa berita-berita di mass media. Dikhawatirkan kalau mengajar dengan bahasa inggris justru nanti lebih suka ke inggrisnya malah meninggalkan ke indonesiaan dan itu tidak terbukti. Tidak terbukti. Justru itu bisa lebih menguatkan rasa nasionalisme. Itu tidak ada kaitannya dengan rasa nasionalisme. Karena kalau dengan bahasa inggris kan kita menjadi lebih tahu. Ya apalagi kalau sudah pernah ke negara pengguna bahasa inggris. Gitu kan. Ternyata di negara kita jauh lebih hebat. Lebih banyak segi positif, keunggulan yang ternyata mampu dijual disana. Ya karena kita bisa menjual ternyata banyak yang kita jual, yang banyak kita informasikan ke negara luar dan mereka pasti tertarik dengan yang kita sampaikan, gitu kan. Itu kan memupuk akan meningkatkan nasionalisme iya kan. Menjual Indonesia kan mempromosikan Indonesia itu kan berarti nasionalismenya makin kuat.*

(My translation: It is indicated that nationalism has been fading as presented in some Indonesian mass media. They [mass media] were worried if teachers teach in English, they [teachers and students] will like English much more, or even they will leave their Indonesian identity. There is no evidence of that. It has not been proven. Using English can even strengthen our nationalism. Using English or not, there is no link with nationalism or with English abilities. We will know what is happening outside our country. Moreover, when we are abroad in English speaking countries, we can explain that our country is far more excellent, more positive sides. We can promote our country. We can provide them [foreigners] with information about our country and they might be very interested in what we provide to them. That's why our nationalism increases, promoting Indonesia. Promoting Indonesia makes our nationalism stronger). (Mr Bagus, interview, 7 September 2012)

His statement showed that he held an opinion that the use of English in school would never decrease the feeling of nationalism in Indonesia. He considered that having English skills would make it easier for Indonesian people to describe, inform, and explain about the country to an international audience compared to those who lacked English skills. In this context, Mr Bagus seemed to emphasise that English was important to promote Indonesian culture and its interests. In this way, he considered it as an act of nationalism.

Like Mr Bagus, Mr Arjuna stated that he did not think the use of English in school would threaten Indonesian nationalism. Mr Arjuna explained his view:

Nasionalisme dengan menuturkan bahasa asing itu sangat berbeda. Ya menurut saya nasionalisme sebuah keyakinan yang diyakini ya sesuai nilai yang diyakini oleh seseorang. Saya di mana saja akan mengatakan Indonesia ya baik, ya baik karena itu adalah tanah kelahiran saya, sebagai hidup saya. Baik artinya saya tidak akan pernah menjelek-jelekkan bangsa dan negaraku sendiri, itu nasionalisme. Tapi kalau penuturan berbahasa, ya kan landasannya bukan nasionalisme. Landasannya bahwa pemahaman kita terhadap kehidupan berbangsa, bernegara secara global, beda, kalau nasionalisme ini sesuatu yang dipertahankan diyakini betul. Harus kita anggap baik dan itu kita pertahankan. Tapi kalau hanya sekedar menuturkan, landasan dasarnya bukan karena keyakinan itu, hanya sekedar untuk memenuhi kepentingan komunikasi global dan sebagainya. Ndak perlu kita berbahasa Inggris terus kita kepingin menjadi orang Inggris kan nggak perlu ndak perlu.

(My translation: Nationalism and using a foreign language are two different things. In my opinion, nationalism is a belief that someone holds. I wherever and whenever I am [I] will always say that Indonesia is good. It is a good country because it is my homeland, the country where I was born, the country where I live. My country is good. I will never look down or disregard my own nation and country. That is nationalism. But, when we use or speak a foreign language like English, it's not about nationalism. The basis or the philosophy is that, in this world we live with other nations and with other countries globally so we need the language. That's the difference. Nationalism is the belief in our nation that we maintain and we believe in it. But, if we speak English, that is because we fulfil our need to communicate

globally. Using English does not mean we want to be an English native speaker. No, it's not like that). (Mr Arjuna, interview, 25 September 2012)

Mr Arjuna's explanation above stressed that there was no relationship between using English and Indonesians' nationalism. Nationalism, according to him, was people's beliefs about their nation and country. It included pride ("It is a good country because it is my homeland, the country where I was born, the country where I live"), loyalty ("I, wherever and whenever I am, will always say that Indonesia is good"), and devotion ("I will never look down or disregard my own nation and country"). Mr Arjuna argued that the roots of Indonesian people would not change just because they used English. He added that English skills were very important, so teachers who were reluctant to learn English - he called them "blunt in insights/*kethul wawasane*" (Interview, 25 September 2012). He emphasised that as a Pioneer International Standard School, teachers and students were encouraged to develop a habit of using English in school but not to replace Indonesian and Javanese as everyday languages of communication (Mr Arjuna, interview, 25 September 2012).

Mr Arjuna's stance seemed to encourage habitual English use in school as he asserted that the use of English would not decrease nationalism. However, in a later interview, Mr Arjuna said that he also valued the Javanese language, his mother tongue, more highly than English and admitted that he liked to be addressed by colleagues in Javanese rather than English. This indicated that the acting principal had apparent seemingly conflicting beliefs simultaneously.

DIFFERENT LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES REGARDING CREATING HABITUAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE USE IN SCHOOL

The analysis of the data showed that the school executives held multiple language ideologies about the English language: 1) English is the international language, 2) English advances an individual's quality, 3) English is not a common language in daily life, and 4) Using English will not threaten Indonesian nationalism. Further analysis indicated that there were different views between Mr Arjuna the acting principal and Mr Bagus the program coordinator, on using English in the school.

Support and encouragement from the acting principal to create a conducive school atmosphere for using English seemed to be less than what was expected by Mr Bagus. To some degree, what the acting principal stated seemed to be contradictory with what most teachers said they felt about his role. Mr Arjuna explained:

> *Memang kadang kendalanya masih cukup dominan. Jadi ini memang tantangan.Jadi menurut saya mereka yang dibutuhkan itu bukan pelatihan-pelatihan, justru penciptaan suasana, motivasi dan sebagainya.Berbahasa Inggris salah nggak apa-apa, wong kita ini bukan orang Inggris. Jadi menghilangkan handicap tadi.Rasa malu, kenapa kita malu? Jadi penciptaan suasana.Menjadi sarannya adalah bagaimana memotivasi seseorang dengan membantu penciptaan suasana untuk berbahasa Inggris yang fun, bahasa Inggris yang lucu menyenangkan, tidak takut salah, bahkan itu kita tidak berdosa kalau kita salah dalam berbahasa.Itu bukan termasuk dosa.Lha yang seperti ini.*
>
> (My translation: There are many dominant obstacles which become our challenges. I think what they [teachers] need is not training but creating a situation and environment and motivation [to speak English]. Speaking

English incorrectly is okay because we are not English native speakers, so we have to remove that kind of feeling, of embarrassment. Why are we embarrassed [to make mistakes]? Creating situation is important. My suggestion is that how to motivate teachers by helping them create situation or environment to use English in fun, enjoyful, not afraid of making mistakes. (Mr Arjuna, interview, 25 September 2012)

On the one hand, Mr Arjuna suggested that creating a supportive environment inside the school for teachers to use English was very important. On the other hand, as stated by Mr Bagus in interviews and informal conversations, there was a lack of motivation, encouragement and support from the principal in establishing supportive stituations for using English in school.

Mr Bagus seemed to agree with the opinion of most teachers in the study that they needed a role model for using English. They wanted to see the acting principal also use English as they said it would make them motivated (interviews, numerous occasions). However, the acting principal seemed not to agree with the emerging opinion, as he explained:

Itulah pikiran-pikiran itu untuk memulai berbahasa Inggris sebenarnya tidak harus teladan. Kemampuan itu milik kita sendiri. Bukan njagagke wong liya. Ya motivasinya internal, intrinsic. Muncul pada siapa saja, nggak apa-apa. Maka tadi saya mengatakan kita tidak malu lagi salah. Tidak mengatakan kita dianggap kemlinti ya ora, wong kita... Ya kita coba dulu, awal-awal saya belajar ya kepengen, karena tidak tersalurkan malah ora iso-iso, malah nggak pernah berbahasa Inggris, akhirnya lupa lagi. Panjang waktu 16 tahun ora dinggo sama sekali. Makanya English Day itu sebuah penciptaan yang bagus. Dan tidak usah mengatakan aku mulai dari siapa karena berbahasa itu kepentingan diri sendiri, internal, koq njagagke wong liya.

(My translation: To start speaking English actually it does not need a role model. We have our own English abilities. It does not depend on somebody else. Using English comes from internal motivation, intrinsic [motivation]. Using English can be started by anybody. It's alright to make mistakes [in using English]. That's what I said before that we should not feel embarrassed to make mistakes. People will not say that we act up so proudly or arrogant if we speak English. We must try first. I myself like to learn English, but because I never practise it now I forget how to speak it. So, English Day is a very good initiative to create supportive environment. And, do not say who should start using English because using a language is our own need. It's an internal need. Do not depend on others). (Mr Arjuna, interview, 25 September 2012)

The principal's words suggested that any teacher could initiate speaking English. His opinion appeared to be misaligned with the other participants' shared opinion. For example, Mr Bagus noted that teachers should be assisted and prompted to use English (Interview, 5 October 2012). The data analysis revealed that the acting principal's leadership in terms of providing direct support and role model for using English were expected as it was seen to be influencing teachers' language use in the school. There appeared to be a degree of tension between the acting principal and the other participants' expectations on the role of the acting principal. At this point, different ideologies of the English language between the acting principal on one side and the program coordinator together with the deputy principal and the teachers on

the other side appeared to impact on the use of English in the school. The conflicting ideologies might be grounded in differing interpretations of the government policy on the use of English in the school. As a result, the implementation of using English in the school was facing an increasing challenge. School executives seemed to find themselves confronting to teachers about how the English language should have been promoted and used in classrooms and in school.

THE IMPACT OF PREVAILING ENGLISH LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES CIRCULATED IN SCHOOL ON TEACHERS' CLASSROOM LANGUAGE PRACTICES

Language ideologies about English which were constructed by the school executives were multiple and interrelated. The ideologies appeared to stem from the different social experiences and different interests of the school executives (Dyers & Abongdia, 2010; Kroskrity, 2010). School executives talked about different background assumptions about the English language and its use in the school. The different background assumptions closely connected with the sociocultural and political contexts of the school.

School executives articulated a strong view that English is the international language. The language was intentionally but slowly promoted to be used in the school as it was believed to be playing a role in internationalising the school in light of its status as Pioneer International Standard School. In this school, internationalisation in the context of education was perceived as preparing students or graduates academically and socially for a globalised society. This confirmed Coleman's finding (2009) that the use of English to teach other subjects may be in some way associated with the concept of globalisation or internationalisation.

For the school executives, especially Mr Amad who was the deputy principal for curriculum affairs, perceived activities related to the internationalisation of the school involved incorporation (adaption and adoption – in Mr Amad's terms) of the international school curriculum of the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) member countries, into the existing school curriculum. To learn international curriculum from foreign countries, English competencies were necessary. All school executives were also of the opinion that English was an essential means of communication for international relationships in education. School executives appeared to be conscious about English as necessity, as Young (2011) points out that English becomes a valuable skill for interacting with friends and professional colleagues within Indonesian society and throughout the world

Relating to the language ideology that *English is the international language*, it was accepted that acquiring the language would advance teachers and students' academic quality. School executives considered that teachers needed English to enrich their content knowledge as well as knowledge of methods and techniques in teaching through self-learning from English-medium references such as journal articles and research. In addition, in the school executives' point of view, students' quality would be better if they had English skills as their added-value in job markets. Familiarising students with subject specific terminology in English since senior high school was also assumed would give benefits for students when they continued to higher education particularly when they major in Science and Mathematics. This view seemed to be aligned with Pilkinton-Pihko (2010) who asserted that there has been a trend where a good proportion of the world's technical and scientific knowledge is available in English only. Therefore, if students have acquired English

competence, they are supposed to know and understand some English technical and scientific words.

The language ideologies that *English is the international language* and *English advances an individual's quality* seemed to underpin positive attitudes towards the language in the school. However, there seemed to be a dominant ideology about English that might impede the language use in the school. It was the language ideology that *English is not a common language used in daily life.* Indonesian and Javanese languages were the shared languages inside and outside the school and in community neigbourhood. The two languages were used in almost all domains of everyday life. However, besides the Indonesian language, English was likely used in workplaces, such as in international-scale trade and industries, multinational companies, and five-star hotels where foreign guests sometimes stay some days in the city where the school was situated.

The choice of Indonesian and Javanese languages seemed to be natural as the two languages were said by the school executives to be much more practical and useful in the school context. The language use which favoured Indonesian and Javanese seemed to be a manifestation of the dominant ideology that *English is not a common language used in daily life.* The use of Indonesian and Javanese was perceived as indexing national identity and ethnic linguistic identity as languages could be "the strongest symbols and boundary markers in having a group, regional, cultural or national identity" (Dyers & Abongdia, 2010, p. 398). The view that the Indonesian language is central the national identity were invariably present in the interviews with the school executives.

The school executives in the study also overtly stated that *the use of English would not threaten Indonesian nationalism* of school teachers and students. Two possible arguments underlie the view. First, the language ideology that *English is not a common language used in daily life* was deeply held. It was reflected in dominant use of Indonesian and Javanese by the school community members in all aspects of school daily life. Indeed, there was no apparent reason to believe that English would replace the two languages. Second, there was no empirical evidence from studies which showed that using English would decrease teachers and students' nationalism. On the contrary, school executives seemed to have an expectation that teachers and students who had English skills would be able to promote Indonesia internationally through their English skills both in speaking and writing modes.

The school executives gave great importance to the English language but they also thought of its lack of functionality for communicating in the school. This is similar to Pan's finding (2011) on her study of English language ideologies in the context of the Beijing Olympiad in China that while her participants recognised the greater prestige and utility of English, their foreign language, they also greatly valued the Chinese language. Similarly, using Indonesian and Javanese was described by the school executives as safer than using English in order to be seen "normal" by other school community members, as Baker (2011) argues:

> An individual may also switch languages, either deliberately or subconsciously, to accomodate the perceived preference of the other participant in the conversation. A language switch may be made as one language is regarded as the more prestigious or as more appropriate for the other person. To gain acceptance or status, a person may deliberately and consciously use the majority language. (p. 6)

School executives' multiple ideologies about the English language resulted in potential conflict of interest regarding the use of English. There was a degree of difference between the acting principal and the other school executives' expectations on the role of the acting principal. For example, as I discussed in the previous section in this chapter, the program coordinator expected the acting principal to develop English language practice in school, while the acting principal considered this could be established from initiatives and willingness of individual teachers. These different views about who should have initiated to create habitual language use of English seemed to have come from different ideologies operating in the school.

The different language ideologies existed in school also seemed to stem from the government policy which was not enforced. There were times when policy changing in the context of the use of English in school. This change seemed not to be fully understood by all school community members. According to the policy of *Departemen Pendidikan Nasional* (2008; 2009), English could be used as the medium of instruction alongside Indonesian in science and mathematics subjects. Then, in 2011 the policy changed as it stated that English was not necessarily used to teach the subjects but should be used as a habit in school (*Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional*, 2011). The policy shift indicated that the government might have changed its ideologies regarding the use of English in school, or that it learned from failure and adapted. Lack of clarity about the government's language ideologies was reflected in the government's unclear guidance about the use of English in school. The policy was not enforceable and, therefore, affected school executives' decisions and actions.

The school executives' ideological stances towards the English language were grounded in various social contexts they were in and the roles they were expected to play. The school executives appeared to be quite aware of their apparent different language ideologies about English. Contentious ideologies of the English language circulated around in the school very likely influenced the implementation of the policy at the school level which, in turn, impacted on teachers' classroom practices. Teachers' ideological stance on the use of English in the classrooms appeared to be challenged by their immediate context in school, particularly influenced by the varied English language ideologies held at school executives' level and in the community surrounding the school. There appearead to be language ideological struggle and the need for ideological clarification (Kroskrity, 2009) in school in regard to the use of English.

In sum, the school's English language ideological position needed to be explicitly and clearly stated and disseminated to teachers at the grassroot level who were expected to use English in school. However, the school executives appeared to be also confused in interpreting the government policy documents as a result of lack of clear guidance from the government. In this case, the government policy on the promotion of the use of English in school needed to be clarified overtly, with respect to its ideological stance about English. The government, school executives, and teachers should have been in alignment with one another in regard to the language ideologies of English.

SUMMARY

This chapter has examined school executives' English language ideologies in regard to the government's promotion of the use of English alongside Indonesian in teaching Science and Mathematics subjects and as habitual language use in school. Findings revealed existing multiple and conflicting English language ideologies

among school executives. This chapter enhances understanding of English language use in school and also teachers' language ideologies and their classroom practices which I discussed in Chapter 4 and 5. In Chapter 7, I will draw conclusions and implications of the study.

CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I recapitulate the findings from Chapters 4 to 6. I revisit the research questions and summarise the findings. In connection with the summary of the main findings, I draw implications of the study. I then identify limitations of the current study and conclude this chapter by offering some closing remarks.

SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS

This research provided an in-depth analysis of subject teachers' language ideologies of English and their classroom practices with regard to the government's initiative of the use of English alongside Indonesian in teaching Mathematics and Science and of habitual English language use in a state Senior High School in a city in Central Java Province, Indonesia. Ethnographic research methods, including whole-school observations, classroom observations, in-depth interviews, video-stimulated recall, and site document review, were employed since they provided an essential lens for understanding language ideologies in the school.

As evidenced by the data and data analysis, the subject teachers in this study held multiple and competing language ideologies about English. Their language ideologies both promoted and inhibited their use of English in the classrooms and in the school. The teachers' language ideologies and their observable language practices in the classrooms were interconnected. English language ideologies that circulated in the school were contentious and not uniform. The school executives' English language ideologies were even in tension which impacted on the teachers' classroom practices. In the following section I restate the research questions and recap briefly the findings.

Research question 1: What were subject teachers' language ideologies about English that informed what they said about their use of English in school?
The teachers in the study held multiple and often contested ideologies surrounding the English language given the government's promotion of the integration of content subjects teaching and English language teaching and as habitual language use at school. The teachers explicitly and implicitly constructed five language ideologies about English that 1) Using English is a heavy burden, 2) We have our own language, 3) English is the international language, 4) English benefits students in the future, and 5) English will not decrease our nationalism. These language ideologies emerged as the teachers talked about what they thought and felt about English in regard to its use in school. The teachers gave various reasons underlying their ideologies of the English language use which were derived from their sociocultural experiences including teachers' language background, their experiences of learning English, and their competence in English.

There were some factors influencing multiplicity and contentions of the teachers' language ideologies. Teachers' vivid difficulties and problems when trying to implement content and language integrated learning in their classes were unexpected experiences which made them hold a view that using English is a heavy burden. Learning English and at the same time using the language to teach content

subjects was seen as a challenge for most teachers as they still struggled to be able to use English for simple conversations in their interactions. Using English required extra effort by both teachers and students. There was an additional burden in teaching in English.

That *Using English is a heavy burden* was grounded in teachers' lack of English language competence and English learning experience. The subject teachers had never undertaken the English language education which aimed at providing them with knowledge of second language acquisition theory and language pedagogy. The absence of such knowledge on second language pedagogy caused the teachers not understand that they were supposed to simultaneously teach both content subjects and English. This lack of knowledge of second language pedagogy impacted on valuing English that using it only added their burden.

My study showed that teachers' language ideologies were heavily influenced by the government's policy. The data suggested that teachers considered that both the government and the school policy on the use of English were not enforceable. All teachers appeared to observe that at the higher level of the school, that is at school executives level, they themselves had their own contentions on the use of English. Consequently, most teachers argued that it was not obligatory for them to use English in school.

It is fact that the teachers already speak Indonesian and Javanese and do not speak English well. It is a "commonsense notion and representation" (Gal, 1998, p. 445) as they stated explicitly *Kita punya bahasa sendiri* (My translation: We have our own language). All teachers valued the English language as the international language and therefore benefits students in the future and yet some teachers showed their strong opinions that they chose Indonesian and Javanese rather than English, with a very definite reason that Indonesian and Javanese are their own common languages. The teachers also devalued English as a language which is not practical – very rarely used in their daily lives including at home and family domains. Teachers believed that Indonesian and Javanese are the languages which are adequate for teaching Science and Mathematics. All teachers were clear in pointing out that the dominant language ideology present in the school was one that privileges Indonesian. English remains a foreign language inside and outside the school. With this evidence, the Indonesian educational policy makers should be more explicit and assertive about their language ideological stance in favour of the development of English language education.

A sense of national, cultural and ethnic identities also affected teachers' language ideologies and impacted on their language use. In the school context, speaking in English was sometimes perceived as not belonging to the teachers' own community. Using Indonesian alongside Javanese is not simply a means of marking identity, but the languages are also capable of constructing particular loyalties and solidarity (Garcia, 2009). Using Indonesian or Javanese could be perceived as showing solidarity with other members of the school community. In this case, the policy makers seemed to lack of consideration in constructing the initiative of applying content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in Science and Mathematics teaching, as teachers viewed using English did not reflect their identities.

On the contrary, the teachers also favoured English as they took into account the role of English in the globalizing world. English was seen not only as a tool to ensure effective communication in international scope, but also an economic

advantage or capital. English is the dominant international language, so the language was perceived as giving advantages to students in their future lives. Additional potential careers are available for those who have acquired competence in English. Teachers believed that English would increase an individual's professional repertoire.

It was evident in this study that the teachers held a strong opinion that using English will not decrease nationalism and pride in Indonesia. There was a deep seated language ideology that Indonesian language is always the national language and the official language of Indonesia and would never be replaced with English. The Indonesian language has been an important symbol of the Indonesian national identity.

This study suggests that the teachers had apparent language ideological conflict. They displayed positively and negatively value of their ideologies about English use in CLIL. The use of English in CLIL in Mathematics and Science subject was positively and negatively valued by teachers in the study. They both consciously and unconsciously held their evaluations and judgements about the English language. Their negative ideological stances about the English language use in CLIL was influenced by their lack of understanding of second language learning pedagogies and low competence in the language. Simultaneously they also held positive ideologies that favour English use in classrooms and in school. This confirmed that language ideologies held by this group of teachers are always multiple and competing.

Research question 2: How were subject teachers' English language ideologies manifested in their classroom practices?

Findings on teachers' classroom practices showed that teachers' language ideologies were not always in alignment with their language practices in the classrooms. It was apparent that teachers' classroom actions did not always coincide with their stated beliefs about the English language. The teachers' multiple language ideologies influenced their language choice and in turn affect their language practices.

This study found that one feature of the teachers' language practices included codeswitching between English and Indonesian during the lessons. Examination of the lesson transcripts and post-lesson interviews with video-stimulated recall showed that codeswitching fulfilled various functions in the lessons. But, these classroom codeswitching practices limited the teachers' English outcomes. It is evident that codeswitching practices became an avoidance strategy (Chen & Hird, 2006) because teachers had inability to use English in particular instances. Inadequate English language proficiency and incapability of producing spoken English made the teachers choose Indonesian or sometimes Javanese which were more practical.

The teachers in the school appeared to work alone in their attempts to implement CLIL in their classes. There was lack of professional development in English language training. There were no continuity of English training sessions and lack of support from teachers of English subject and English specialists. Moreover, there was no specially-designed English language education for these teachers which addressed second language pedagogy, the area of concern that is important for CLIL teachers.

Despite the fact that the teachers were not capable of applying CLIL effectively, they believed that students would gain benefits in their future lives when being taught content subjects in English. Another manifestation evident in the classrooms was the teachers' use of cooperative learning strategy. Teachers'

116

preference of making small group discussion or group work was underlain by their belief that students would interact and communicate each other to discuss the work in English. Group work is a popular technique of communicative language teaching and commonly used in teaching English as a foreign language settings. The use of group work can facilitate second language acquisition, as Krashen (1985) pointed out, students could have communicative language input from their peers as well as produce language. However, the data in this study suggested that both teachers and students did not understand how group work could facilitate students' learning of English, as they always reverted to Indonesian, even Javanese when encountering difficulties to speak in English.

Many factors influenced teachers' language practices in the classrooms. In the lessons observed in this study, teachers' limited English language competence and lack of knowledge of second language acquisition and language pedagogy mainly influenced their ideologies about English use in content and language integrated learning contexts.

Research question 3: What were school executives' language ideologies about English and what were the impact of their language ideologies on teachers' classroom practices?

The school executives talked about different background assumptions about the English language and its use in school which closely connected with sociocultural and political contexts of the school. They articulated a strong belief that English is the international language. The language was intentionally but slowly promoted to be used in the school as it was considered playing a role in internationalizing the school in light of its status as Pioneer International Standard School. Internationalization in the context of education, in this school, was perceived as preparing students or graduates academically and socially for a globalized society. The dominant ideology circulating in the discourse of the school executives was that habitual English language use and bilingual classes in the school were the characteristics of Pioneer International Standard Schools. Unfortunately the principles and pedagogy of content and language integrated learning were not fully understood by the school executives. As a result, there were lack of clarity, shared vision and mission, and commitment to implement the policy.

In the school level, a positive opinion was circulating that acquiring English language would advance teachers' and students' academic quality. The school executives considered that teachers needed English to enrich their content knowledge as well as knowledge of methods and techniques in teaching through self-learning from English-medium sources of information, such as journal articles and research. The belief that attaining English skills would increase teachers and students' academic quality underpinned positive attitudes towards the use of English in the school. Even though the school executives gave great importance to the English language but they also thought of its lack of functionality for communicating in the school and the community.

The divergent and conflicting language ideologies existed in the school also related to the government policy which was not enforced. There were times when policy changed in the context of the use of English in school. This change was not fully understood by all school community members. The educational policy shift indicated that the government might have changed its ideologies regarding the use of English in school. Lack of clarity about the government's language ideologies was reflected in the government's unclear guidance about the use of English in school.

The policy was not enforceable and, therefore, affected school executives' decisions and actions.

The policy on the promotion of the use of English in some selected government-owned schools was eventually withdrawn in 2013 after seven years of its implementation due to a judicial review on the policy. My study indicated that the policy might have been destined to fail, as the top-down educational policy neglected teachers' ideologies relating to the English language. The policy makers overlooked a conceptual reality of the powerful role of language ideologies in the enactment of English bilingual education in the Indonesian school context. There appeared language ideological struggle and the need for ideological clarification (Kroskrity, 2009) in school in regard to the use of English. Contentious ideologies of the English language circulated around in school.

Through an investigation of teachers' ideologies relating to the English language, the government's encouragement to CLIL implementation and habitual language use in selected government-owned schools could have been predicted to fail because of a failure of follow through. Teachers' language ideologies, or beliefs about language, play a powerful role in English bilingual education practice and this is demonstrated by discussion of an ethnographic case study conducted *during* the implementation of the policy. The data illustrated that the crucial role of language ideologies in English bilingual education resulted in a 'failed' innovation. In regard to these findings, in the following section I explain contribution of my study to knowledge.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNOWLEDGE

Kroskrity (2010) proposed that language ideologies are grounded in sociocultural, political, economical, historical factors, and interest of the people who hold the ideologies. In the context of this study, the teachers' ideologies of English use in the school were derived from teachers' linguistic background, national, cultural, and ethnic identity, and the extent to which teachers had interest to the English language and its speakers. The findings of this study further showed that teachers' language ideologies are impacted by their English competence, language learning experience, and more importantly, their understanding of second language learning pedagogy.

Language ideologies influence language choices and language practices, and therefore, are a vital parameter that must be taken into account in bilingual education and foreign language education. Language ideologies should not be considered merely as a situational factor, but they should be made visible for teachers as well as for other educational stakeholders. Visibility of the teachers' English language ideologies should cause them to be self-aware that their language ideologies will impact on the ways they enact the policy and on their teaching. Therefore, real English language education for subject teachers would be essential.

Another major contribution of my study to knowledge is, that language ideologies influence language-in-education policies, that is, policies related to the use of language(s) in education. In the fields of bilingual education, both in foreign bilingual education and heritage bilingual education , and foreign language education - teaching and learning a foreign language as a subject, this study contributes to deepen our insights that language ideologies must not be neglected if the language-related-education programs are expected to be successful. This study also contributes to the fields of sociolinguistics and applied linguistics. That is to say, language ideologies as a conceptual framework can be used in the study of languages and in investigations of people's use of particular languages in societies and communities.

118

From a methodological perspective, whilst the utilisation of multiple sources of data, especially the use of video-stimulated recall is a widely used approach within educational research, my literature review on language ideologies studies in international educational contexts showed that the use of video-stimulated recall is rare. In many cases, language ideologies studies in schools and classroom contexts employ interviews and classroom observations. In the current study, the use of post-lesson interviews with video-stimulated recall can give some validity in the analysis process. Video-stimulated recall in post-lesson interviews provided a deeper contribution to investigation of the manifestations of stated language ideologies in classroom teaching. In the Indonesian context, implementation of language policy and language-in-education policy are commonly investigated through questionnaire survey. This study made a methodological contribution, particularly in Indonesia educational research context that, an ethnographic case study with the use of video-stimulated recall can be employed to investigate language ideologies *in situ*.

Empirically, this study indicated that during the implementation of the government' policy on the promotion of the use of English, teachers' language ideologies about the use of English in school were not aligned with the government's intentions. There was tension and apparent contradiction, between the government's policy and the teachers' ideologies surrounding English. As the data from this research have shown, the future of English bilingual education in the Indonesian educational context, where English is a foreign language, appears to be determined to a noticeable extent by the issue of language ideologies. In other words, the teachers and the school executives, including the principal, did not believe content and language integrated learning (CLIL) could work, and they did not really implement the bilingual program in practice.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

There are limitations of this study. I acknowledge that generalisability from the school studied to other school settings in the entire country is limited. It is because research in language ideologies should be grounded within a specific social or cultural group, and with regard to the nature of the current research as a case study. In other words, findings of this study may not be generalised in other school settings because investigations of language ideologies in other schools which are located in different ethnic groups in the country will need to explore a broader context of the school sites including sociocultural, historical and political contexts surrounding the schools studied.

Despite this consideration, this study in one school gave me rich data about the particular context. Findings of the current study can reflect what occurs in other settings in the Indonesian educational context and, therefore, the findings can shed light on understanding of the English bilingual education implementation, not limited in former schools called Pioneer International Standard Schools, but also other schools, including private schools which set out to establish bilingual education programs.

I also recognise that the period of my fieldwork in the school probably was another limitation of this study. This study was conducted over two months. The school authority, especially the deputy principal for curriculum affairs, in the beginning of my process of gaining permission from the school advised me to collect data between August to October. In the Indonesian school system, an academic year starts in July and ends in June on the following year. In October there was mid-semester examination and by the end of December there was the first semester

examination. I understood that the school authority prioritised the examination preparation.

I assumed there might be concern from the school authority that my presence in the school during school hours every day and "shadowing" the teacher participants in the school might directly and indirectly influence their teaching and learning processes. Consequently, during the fieldwork I had opportunities to observe only five lessons. This meant I was able to observe five different lessons taught by five subject teacher participants. However, I could not have done such detailed analysis if I had observed more lessons. Detailed analyses provide rich insights into the details of classroom practice. The data were also derived from other sources including classroom observation sheets, whole-school observations, pre- and post-lesson interviews with video stimulated recall, informal conversations, and teaching documents which enabled me to draw reasonable conclusions on their observable language practices in the classrooms with regard to their language ideologies. The classroom observation was more than adequately complemented by informal observations in the school community of these teachers.

THE WAY FORWARD

With regard to the empirical implications of the current study, I propose some suggestions which should be taken into account when establishing English bilingual education and the habitual use of English, particularly if it is top-down policy.

Firstly, the government or educational policy makers need to analyse and understand English language ideologies through teachers' perspectives and to understand how teachers have developed English language ideologies in their social contexts. While policy makers and teachers hold different ideologies, then top-down policy is unlikely to work. However, an understanding of ideologies may lead to a clearly planned implementation of new policy.

Secondly, teacher educators, particularly those who train English bilingual pre-service in Teacher Education Colleges and in-service teachers during professional development, should incorporate values of English language and second language acquisition principles and pedagogy as well into their teaching and address positive values and ideologies that favour English. Teacher educators should assist prospective English teachers to be aware of ideologies and how they work and make critical reflections on what they believe about the English language. This means that in teacher education, more real English language education for discipline teachers would be essential. Also, the significance of English language needs to be explicitly discussed and promoted.

Finally, policy makers should clearly explain in their relevant educational policies that the orientation of English bilingual education is additive, not subtractive, to Indonesians' primary languages, Indonesian and local languages. By making the benefits and advantages of English bilingual education and of being bilingual explicit to all those involved – from the policy itself to the enactment of policy, it can be expected that the promotion of learning and using English could raise commitment of all stakeholders and and have a much better chance of being successful.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study examined subject teachers' English language ideologies in regard to the government's promotion of the use of English alongside Indonesian in teaching Science and Mathematics and habitual language use of English in a state Senior High

School in Central Java, Indonesia. While the findings in this study are valuable to the field of bilingual education research, they are limited to what goes on in one school.

One direction for future research, therefore, would be to expand the scope of such a study by conducting research to other school contexts across the country. It aims at broadening insights into what language ideologies circulate in other schools, that influence teachers' classroom practices, which in turn, impact on how the government's policy may be enacted. Therefore, comparing one school and other schools with respect to language ideologies would make for interesting research. It would also be interesting to look at English language ideologies of the policy makers, that is, educational policy makers in the central goverment who made the top-down policy on the promotion of English use in Indonesian selected schools.

However, the Act of the Republic of Indonesia No. 23 Year 2003 on National Education System and its related educational policies regarding Pioneer International Standard Schools were abolished in 2013. There were no longer Indonesian schools with such a special status. From an empirical perspective, this study indicated that language ideologies must be taken into account in setting out bilingual education programs in schools, particularly if it is a top-down policy. At present there have been English bilingual education programs running in a number of Indonesian private schools, therefore, I suggest that research on language ideologies of teachers, students, parents, and other stake holders are conducted to raise awareness that ideologies about the English language can promote or impede the success of such programs.

CLOSING REMARKS

Language ideologies seemed to have been overlooked in the English bilingual education in the Indonesian educational contexts. This study has the benefit of being one of the first empirical studies examining language ideologies about English in Indonesia. Findings from this study give strong indications about the challenge and the complexity of the implementation of English bilingual education in Indonesian schools and in other school contexts, particularly in the countries where English is either a second language or a foreign language.

Appendix A Ethical clearance approval

University of Southern Queensland

CRICOS: QLD 00244B NSW 02225M

TOOWOOMBA QUEENSLAND 4350

AUSTRALIA

TELEPHONE +61 7 4631 2100

www.usq.edu.au

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND HIGHER DEGREES
Ethics Committee Support Officer
PHONE (07) 4631 2690 | FAX (07) 4631 1995
EMAIL ethics@usq.edu.au

Tuesday, 10 July 2012

Sri Wuli Fitriati
Email: SriWuli.Fitriati@usq.edu.au
u1025616@umail.usq.edu.au

CC: Ann Dashwood (Supervisor)

Dear Wuli

The Chair of the USQ Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) recently reviewed your responses to the HREC's conditions placed upon the ethical approval for the below project. Your proposal now meets the requirements of the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007)* and full ethics approval has been granted.

Project Title	Cultural themes and language ideologies in the use of English as the medium of instruction in an International Standard School in Central Java, Indonesia
Approval no.	H12REA128
Expiry date	31.05.2013
FTHREC Decision	Approved

The standard conditions of this approval are:

(a) conduct the project strictly in accordance with the proposal submitted and granted ethics approval, including any amendments made to the proposal required by the HREC

(b) advise (email: ethics@usq.edu.au) immediately of any complaints or other issues in relation to the project which may warrant review of the ethical approval of the project

(c) make submission for approval of amendments to the approved project before implementing such changes

(d) provide a 'progress report' for every year of approval

(e) provide a 'final report' when the project is complete

(f) advise in writing if the project has been discontinued.

For (c) to (e) forms are available on the USQ ethics website: http://www.usq.edu.au/research/ethicsbio/human

Please note that failure to comply with the conditions of approval and the *National Statement (2007)* may result in withdrawal of approval for the project.

You may now commence your project. I wish you all the best for the conduct of the project.

Melissa McKain
Ethics Committee Support Officer
Office of Research and Higher Degrees

Appendix B Participant information sheet

University of Southern Queensland

University of Southern Queensland

Participant Information Sheet

HREC Approval Number: H12REA128

Full Project Title: Teachers' English language ideologies and their classroom practices: An ethnographic case study in a state senior high school in Central Java, Indonesia

Principal Researcher: Sri Wuli Fitriati

I would like to invite you to take part in this research project for my PhD.

1. Procedures

Aim:

to explore how teachers' cultural background and their beliefs about English affect their language choices and behaviour in classrooms and to provide an overview of the effects of teachers' beliefs about using English as the medium of instruction (EMOI) on the teaching of content subjects and the extent to which these beliefs have an influence on the way the program is implemented.

Proposed participants:

(i) Five teachers who teach five subjects mandated to be taught in English; (ii) the school principal; (iii) the International Standard School program coordinator; (iv) an administrative staff member; (v) a professional development facilitator from the local university; (vi) an extracurricular activity instructor; and (vii) a government officer from the city education bureau.

Data collection:

Data will be collected using interviews, classroom observations, whole-school observation, field notes, audio and video recording and document review (syllabus and lesson plans). The participants will be interviewed about how the school gained its status an ISS, their beliefs about English language, their cultural beliefs and whether there are emergent or existing communities of practice regarding the use of EMOI at their school. Each individual interview will take approximately 60 to 90 minutes. Classroom observations (of 45 minutes) will observe the teacher's actual use of English or Indonesian in the classroom. In addition, selected lessons will be video-recorded. The second interview (of approximately 40 minutes) for each teacher (post-teaching) will be based on recall stimulated by watching the recorded lesson.

By referring to the video, each teacher will be asked to describe and explain what they were doing in the classroom related to their choices of English or Indonesian.

Risks:

There may be inconvenience about recording teachers' classes but this is expected to be minimal. The teaching is not being assessed or used for any purposes other than study.

Benefits:

Participants will have the opportunity to think about their beliefs, discuss their problems and identify their future needs in conducting the program. By understanding their own cultural beliefs and perceptions and role of communities of practice regarding EMOI, teachers will obtain opportunities to reflect on and evaluate their practices and identify potential areas for improvement in using EMOI.

Monitoring:

The research will be monitored by the researcher's supervisors and the ethics and research integrity officer of University of Southern Queensland.

2. **Voluntary Participation**

The participation in this study is purely voluntary and they have the right to refuse to be interviewed or observed in their classroom. Once participants agree to take part in this study, the researcher will ensure that the time (day and time) for interview and observation are based on participants' availability and convenience. If participants withdraw, they may request that audio and video recordings will be destroyed.

Should you have any queries regarding the progress or conduct of this research, you can contact the researcher:

Sri Wuli Fitriati
PhD Student, Room G342/11, Faculty of Education
University of Southern Queensland
Phone: +61 7 4631 1768
Mobile: +61 402185182
Email: SriWuli.Fitriati@usq.edu.au

If you have any ethical concerns with how the research is being conducted or any queries about your rights as a participant please feel free to contact the University of Southern Queensland Ethics Officer on the following details.

Ethics and Research Integrity Officer
Office of Research and Higher Degrees
University of Southern Queensland
West Street, Toowoomba 4350
Ph: +61 7 4631 2690
Email: *ethics@usq.edu.au*

Appendix C Consent form

University of Southern Queensland

University of Southern Queensland

Consent Form

HREC Approval Number: **H12REA128**

To: Teacher

Full Project Title: Teachers' English language ideologies and their classroom practices: An ethnographic case study in a state senior high school in Central Java, Indonesia

Principal Researcher: Sri Wuli Fitriati

- I have read the Participant Information Sheet and the nature and purpose of the research project has been explained to me. I understand and agree to take part.
- I understand the purpose of the research project and my involvement in it.
- I understand that I may withdraw from the research project at any stage and that this will not affect my status now or in the future.
- I confirm that I am over 18 years of age.
- I understand that while information gained during the study may be published, I will not be identified and my personal results will remain confidential.
- I understand that the tape will be stored in a locked cabinet in my office and only the researcher (Sri Wuli Fitriati) and supervisors who will have access to it and after five years tape will be destroyed.
- I understand that I will be audio taped / videotaped / photographed during the study.

Name of participant ....
Signed……………………………………………………….......................................
Date ....

If you have any ethical concerns with how the research is being conducted or any queries about your rights as a participant please feel free to contact the University of Southern Queensland Ethics Officer on the following details.

Ethics and Research Integrity Officer
Office of Research and Higher Degrees
University of Southern Queensland
West Street, Toowoomba 4350
Ph: +61 7 4631 2690
Email: *ethics@usq.edu.au*

University of Southern Queensland

University of Southern Queensland

Format Persetujuan

HREC Approval Number: **H12REA128**

Kepada: Guru

Judul Penelitian: *Teachers' English language ideologies and their classroom practices: An ethnographic case study in a state senior high school in Central Java, Indonesia* **(Ideologi bahasa Inggris guru dan pengajaran di kelas: Penelitian etnografi studi kasus di Sekolah Menengah Atas di Jawa Tengah, Indonesia)**

Peneliti: Sri Wuli Fitriati

Saya sudah membaca Lembar Informasi Responden dan sudah memahami tujuan penelitian ini. Saya memahami informasi tersebut dan memberikan persetujuan kepada anak saya untuk berpartisipasi dalam penelitian ini.

- Saya memahami tujuan dari penelitian ini dan keterlibatan anak saya di sini.
- Saya memahami bahwa anak saya bisa mengundurkan diri dari penelitian ini kapan saja dan hal ini tidak mempengaruhi status anak saya saat ini maupun di masa yang akan datang.
- Saya menyatakan bahwa saya berumur lebih dari 18 tahun.
- Saya memahami bahwa informasi yang dikumpulkan selama penelitian bisa dipublikasikan, tanpa identitas pribadi. Informasi pribadi anak saya akan tetap dirahasiakan.
- Saya memahami bahwa rekaman video akan dipertahankan beberapa tahun dan akan disimpan dengan aman. Hanya peneliti (Sri Wuli Fitriati) dan supervisor yang memiliki akses terhadap rekaman ini. Rekaman akan dimusnahkan setelah lima tahun.
- Saya memahami bahwa selama peneliti melakukan pengamatan di kelas, anak saya akan terekam dengan video.

Nama guru ....

Tanda tangan guru ....

Tanggal ....

Jika Bapak/Ibu mempunyai pertanyaan yang berhubungan dengan etika bagaimana penelitian ini dilakukan, atau jika ada pertanyaan yang berkenaan dengan hak-hak Bapak/Ibu sebagai peserta penelitian ini, silakan menghubungi University of Southern Queensland Ethics Officer dengan alamat berikut ini.

Ethics and Research Integrity Officer
Office of Research and Higher Degrees
University of Southern Queensland
West Street, Toowoomba 4350
Ph: +61 7 4631 2690
Email: *ethics@usq.edu.au*

Appendix D Pre-lesson interview guide for subject teachers

Panduan wawancara dengan guru

(Wawancara sebelum pelajaran)

Wawancara ini bertujuan untuk mendapatkan informasi dari guru mengenai: (i) Bagaimana sekolah mendapatkan akreditasi Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional (RSBI), (ii) Persepsi sekolah mengenai bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar, (iii) persepsi/pendapat pribadi guru mengenai bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar, (iv) penggunaan dan pembelajaran bahasa Inggris di kelas, sekolah dan lingkungan sekolah dan (v) tema-tema kultural berkaitan dengan penggunaan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar.

I. Sejarah

1. Bagaimana sekolah Anda mendapatkan status akreditasi sebagai Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional (RSBI)?
2. Mohon Anda jelaskan mengenai apakah RSBI itu? Apa yang Anda ketahui tentang RSBI? Apakah tujuan RSBI?

II. Persepsi sekolah mengenai bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar

1. Bagaimana sikap/persepsi sekolah atau anggota komunitas sekolah pada umumnya mengenai penggunaan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar?
2. Bagaimana pelaksanaan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar di sekolah Anda?

III. Persepsi/Pendapat guru mengenai penggunaan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar

1. Apa pendapat/pandangan pribadi Anda mengenai penggunaan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar?
2. Bagaimana pelaksanaan penggunaan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar di kelas Anda?

IV. Pembelajaran dan Penggunaan bahasa Inggris

Di sekolah Anda, apakah ada kegiatan ekstra kurikuler untuk para siswa dan/atau kegiatan untuk para guru dan para staff administrasi sekolah untuk menggunakan bahasa Inggris?

V. Bagaimana respon kepala sekolah, para wakil kepala sekolah, koordinator RSBI, para staff administrasi terhadap pemakaian bahasa Inggris untuk komunikasi sehari-hari di sekolah?

VI.   Tema-tema kultural

1. Mohon dapat Anda deskripsikan kegiatan-kegiatan pembelajaran apa yang Anda lakukan di kelas pada saat Anda berbahasa Indonesia, Inggris atau bahasa daerah? Apakah tujuan Anda menggunakan bahasa Indonesia, Inggris atau bahasa daerah pada saat Anda mengajar di kelas?

2. Mohon dijelaskan topik-topik apa yang Anda diskusikan dengan kolega dan/atau fasilitator/tutor pada saat pertemuan Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran (MGMP)? Apakah Anda berbahasa Inggris dengan mereka dalam pertemuan itu?

3. Apakah yang Anda rasakan dan pikirkan pada saat Anda (kebetulan) mendengar kolega/teman guru berbahasa Inggris dengan kolega/staff yang lain?

VII.   Apakah ada hal-hal lain yang ingin Anda sampaikan kepada saya?

The English-language version of *Panduan wawancara dengan guru (wawancara sebelum pelajaran)*

Interview Guide for Subject Teachers

(Pre-teaching)

The researcher will conduct the first interviews with subject teachers before classroom observations. The interviews will attempt to seek information from subject teachers about: (i) how the school gained its status a Pioneer International Standard School, (ii) the school's beliefs about English as the medium of instruction (EMOI), (iii) the teacher's personal beliefs on the use of EMOI, (iv) current situation of learning and using English at classroom, at school and community, and (v) the teacher's cultural beliefs.

I. History

1. How was your school designated as *Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf International* (Pioneer International Standard School)?
2. Could you please tell me about *Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional* program? What is your understanding of it? And what is it for?

II. The school's beliefs about English as the medium of instruction

1. Could you please describe general attitudes and perceptions of your school community members towards English as the medium of instruction?
2. How is English as the medium of instruction being implemented in your school?

III. The teacher's personal beliefs on the use of English as the medium of instruction
1. What are your personal views about English as the medium of instruction?
2. What do you think of English as the medium of instruction as you implement it in your classroom?

IV. Learning and using English
Could you please describe any school clubs for students, teachers and school community members in relation to learning and using English as a foreign language?

V. How are the school administrators (the school principal, the program coordinator and non-teaching staff) responding to the English language use in the school?

VI. Teacher's cultural beliefs

1. Can you describe for me what you do in the classroom when you teach in English, Indonesian or your home language? For what purposes you use the language(s) in the classroom?
2. Can you describe for me when and for what purposes do you speak in English with your colleagues and/or your principal?
3. Can you describe for me what topics do you discuss with your colleagues and/or your facilitator in teacher professional development meetings?
4. Can you tell me what you feel and think when you hear colleagues speaking English with other colleagues or other school members?

VII. Anything else you want to tell me?

Appendix E Post-lesson interview guide for subject teachers

Panduan wawancara dengan guru

(Wawancara setelah pelajaran)

Setelah pelajaran, peneliti akan melakukan wawancara dengan guru pada waktu yang ditetapkan/diinginkan oleh guru. Tujuan dari wawancara ini adalah guru mendeskripsikan dan menjelaskan apa yang guru lakukan di kelas selama pelajaran berlangsung. Di depan guru dan peneliti, rekaman video akan diputar (selama kurang lebih 40 menit) untuk membantu guru mengingat kembali *(recall)* apa yang dilakukan di kelas terutama sikap dan tingkah laku guru pada saat berbahasa Inggris, Indonesia atau bahasa daerah.

Pertanyaan utama dalam wawancara ini adalah:

"Mohon Anda deskripsikan dan jelaskan apa yang sedang Anda lakukan di kelas pada saat ini?" (sambil merujuk pada rekaman video).

"Mohon Anda jelaskan alasan Anda melakukan hal ini? Mengapa?"

The English-language version of *Panduan wawancara dengan guru (wawancara setelah pelajaran)*

Interview Guide for Subject Teacher

(Post-teaching)

The researcher will conduct the second interviews after classroom observations at the teacher's convenient time. The aim of the post-teaching interview is to ask him/her describe and explain what he/she was doing in the classroom. This selective video stimulated recall (of approximately 40 minutes) will discover the teacher's existing behaviour related to their choices of English, Indonesian or home language.

The guiding question:

"Could you please describe and explain what you were doing at this moment in your classroom?"

"Why?"

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SHEET

I. **General information**

    a. Date of observation:

    b. Time of observation:

    c. Year level:

    d. Subject:

    e. Topic of the lesson:

II. **Language use**

Observation of teacher's language practice focuses on event of interest such as, "Is the teaching happening in English, Indonesian, Javanese, or all three languages?" and teaching methods such as, "Is the teacher lecturing, conducting small groups, and/or pair work?; "Is the teacher using teaching materials in English or Indonesian or both, e.g., textbook, PowerPoint presentation, worksheet?"; "Is the teacher using translation, codeswitching, or other ways to help students understand?"

Time	Phase (in accordance with a lesson plan)	Language used (languages used by the teacher in each phase of a lesson)			Teaching activities
		English	Indonesian	Native language/ Other language(s)	
	Pre-lesson				
	Orientation phase				
	Enhancing phase				
	Synthesising phase				
	Post-lesson				

III. Non-verbal behaviors

How are the teacher's non-verbal behaviors when using the languages? E.g., face expressions, gestures/body language, audibility.

	English	Indonesian	Javanese or other languages
Face expressions (e.g., tense, natural, worried expressions/ look)			
Gestures (e.g., self-confident, nervous)			
Audibility and intelligibility (e.g., loud voice, clarity)			

Further notes:

Panduan wawancara untuk pimpinan sekolah
(kepala sekolah, koordinator program,
dan wakil kepala sekolah bidang kurikulum)

Wawancara ini bertujuan untuk mendapatkan informasi dari kepala sekolah dan koordinator RSBI mengenai: (i) Bagaimana sekolah mendapatkan akreditasi Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional (RSBI), (ii) Persepsi sekolah mengenai bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar, (iii) persepsi/pendapat pribadi kepala sekolah dan koordinator RSBI mengenai bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar, (iv) penggunaan dan pembelajaran bahasa Inggris di kelas, sekolah dan lingkungan sekolah dan (v) tema-tema kultural berkaitan dengan penggunaan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar

I. Sejarah
1. Bagaimana sekolah Anda mendapatkan status akreditasi sebagai Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional (RSBI)?
2. Mohon Anda jelaskan mengenai apakah RSBI itu? Apa yang Anda ketahui tentang RSBI? Apakah tujuan RSBI?

II. Persepsi sekolah mengenai bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar

1. Bagaimana sikap/persepsi sekolah atau anggota komunitas sekolah pada umumnya mengenai penggunaan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar?
2. Bagaimana pelaksanaan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar di sekolah Anda?

III. Persepsi/Pendapat kepala sekolah dan koordinator RSBI mengenai penggunaan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar
1. Apa pendapat/pandangan pribadi Anda mengenai penggunaan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar?
2. Bagaimana pelaksanaan penggunaan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar di kelas-kelas di sekolah ini?

IV. Pembelajaran dan Penggunaan bahasa Inggris
1. Di sekolah Anda, apakah ada kegiatan ekstra kurikuler untuk para siswa dan/atau kegiatan untuk para guru dan para staff administrasi sekolah untuk menggunakan bahasa Inggris?
2. Bagaimana respon para guru dan para staff administrasi sekolah terhadap pemakaian bahasa Inggris untuk komunikasi sehari-hari di sekolah?

V.   Tema-tema kultural

1. Mohon Anda jelaskan kapan dan untuk tujuan apa Anda berbicara bahasa Inggris dengan guru, staff administrasi dan anggota komunitas sekolah lainnya?
2. Mohon Anda jelaskan topik-topik diskusi apa yang Anda bicarakan dengan fasilitator Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran (MGMP)? Apakah Anda berbahasa Inggris dengan mereka dalam pertemuan itu?
3. Apakah yang Anda rasakan dan pikirkan pada saat Anda (kebetulan) mendengar kolega/teman guru berbahasa Inggris dengan kolega/staff yang lain?

VI.   Apakah ada hal-hal lain yang ingin Anda sampaikan kepada saya?

The English-language version of *Panduan wawancara untuk pimpinan sekolah (kepala sekolah, koordinator program, dan wakil kepala sekolah bidang kurikulum)*

Interview Guide for School Executives

The interview will attempt to seek information from the school principal and the program coordinator about: (i) how the school gained its status a Pioneer International Standard School, (ii) the school's beliefs about English as the medium of instruction, (iii) the school principal's and the program coordinator's personal beliefs on the use of English as the medium of instruction, (iv) current situation of learning and using English at the school community, and (v) the principal and the coordinator's cultural beliefs.

I. History
1. How was your school designated as *Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf International* (Pioneer International Standard School)?
2. Could you please tell me about *Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional* program? What is your understanding of it? And what is it for?

II. The school's beliefs about English as the medium of instruction
1. Could you please describe the general attitudes and perceptions of your school community members towards English as the medium of instruction?
2. How is English as the medium of instruction being implemented in your school?

III. Personal beliefs on the use of English as the medium of instruction
1. What is your personal views about English as the medium of instruction program?
2. What do you think of English as the medium of instruction as you implement it in your classroom?

IV. Learning and using English
1. Could you please describe any school clubs for students, teachers and school community members in relation to learning and using English as a foreign language?
2. How are teachers and administrative staff members responding to the English language use in the school?

V.   The principal's/the program coordinator's cultural beliefs

1. Can you describe for me when and for what purposes do you speak in English with teachers, administrative staff members and other school community members?
2. Can you describe for me what topics you usually discuss with your colleagues in English?
3. Can you tell me what you feel and think when you hear teachers, administrative staff members speaking English with one another?

VI.   Anything else you want to tell me?

Appendix H Sample of a Mathematics teacher's lesson plan

This lesson plan was written by Ms Tuti, the Mathematics teacher, and given to the researcher before the classroom observation. This lesson plan is in original, except the names of the school, the Mathematics teacher, and the acting principal are all under pseudonyms)

LESSON PLAN
MATHEMATICS SUBJECT

FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL GRADE XI

NATURAL SCIENCE

SEMESTER I

The school's badge

Arranged by:

Ms Tuti

ID Number

Mathematics Teacher

LESSON PLAN

SCHOOL	: **Semarang Internationally standarized high school project**
SUBJECT	: **Mathematics**
GRADE / SEMESTER	: **XI Natural Science / 1**
MAIN MATERIAL	: **Probability**
TIME ALLOCATION	: **1 x 45 menit**

A. Standard Competence

1. Solving the problem related to statistic rule, counting rule, and the property of probability

B. Basic Competence

1.4 Using counting rule, permutation and combination in problem solving

C. Indicators

1. Arranging cyclical permutation

2. Using cyclical permutation

D. Learning Objectives

1. Students are able to arrange cyclical permutation

2. Students are able to use cyclical permutation

E. Main Material

Cyclical Permutation

Determining a cyclical permutation can be obtained by determining one object at the specific position first and then determine the remaining object position, so if there are n distinct object, then number of cyclical permutations of n element is $P = (n - 1)!$

F. Learning Resources

----------. 2010. *Mathematics Hand Book for Student Year XI Natural Science Senior High School 2*. Semarang : -----------

Mathematics Forum. 2009. *Bilingual Mathematics for Senior High School Year XI*. Bogor: Yudhistira.

G. Teaching Model and Methods :

1. Model   : TPS (Think Pair and Share)
2. Method   : Discussion and Game

H. Learning Activities

1. Pre Activity = 2 minutes

a. Teacher starts the lesson by greeting.

b. Teacher checks student's attendance.

c. Teacher talks about materials under discussion.

d. Teacher gives motivation to students.

2. Main Actifity = 40 minutes

a. Exploration
1) Teacher asks students to think creatively by defining something related to cyclical permutation
2) Does question and answer method to know student's idea

b. Elaboration
1) Teacher asks students to play cyclical permutation with some examples
2) Teacher asks students to define cyclical permutation
3) Teacher asks students to work in pairs.
4) Teacher gives worksheets to each pair of students
5) Students discuss in pairs to solve the problem given by the teacher.

c. Confirmation
1) Teacher gives opportunity to students to present their exercises in front of the class
2) Teacher gives reward for students who do exercises quickly and correctly
3) Teacher helps students solve the problem

3. Post Actifity = 2 minutes

a. Students summarize the materials about cyclical permutation

b. Teacher gives homework to the students.

c. Teacher closes the lesson by saying good bye.

I. Teaching Aids

1. L K S / Module Handbook

2. Student Worksheet

3. Power Point

J. Evaluation

1. Technical

   Individual and group assignments, question – answer, student activity and result of learning process, student attendance, paper test.

2. Instruments

   Student experiment and activity, essay paper test

K. Remedial
1. Remedial program   : given to students who get value < 76
2. Enrichment program : given to students who get value ≥ 76

Approved by,   Semarang, August 2012

The Principal of SMA Negeri Semarang   Mathematics Teacher

_____   _____

Signature   Signature

Mr Arjuna   Ms Tuti

ID Number   ID number

EVALUATION OF RESULT LEARNING

Learning Material   : Cyclical Permutation

Time Allocation   : 10 minutes

No.	Item Test	Solution	Score
1.	Ratih has 8 diamonds and she wants to place them to make necklaces. How many possible numbers of necklaces can be made?	P = (8 − 1)! = 7! = 7 x 6 x 5 x 4 x 3 x 2 x 1 = 5040 So, there are 5040 ways	5

2.	How many ways six children can be seated surrounding the circular table if :
	
	a. They sit freely
	b. Two children always side by side
		a. P = (6 − 1)! = 5! = 5 x 4 x 3 x 2 x 1 = 120
		   So, there are 120 ways
		b. P = (5 − 1)! 2! = (4 x 3 x 2 x 1)(2 x 1) = 48
		   So, there are 48 ways
			10

3.	A meeting which Dika and Aby is attended by 7 participants. If they arrage 7 chairs in a roundtable form, how many ways that the participants will sit when:
	
	a. They are free to choose the places
	b. Dika and Aby will sit side by side
	c. Dika and Aby must sit separatedly
		a. P = (7 − 1)! = 6! = 720
		   So, there are 720 ways
		b. P = (6 − 1)!2! = 5! x 2! = 240
		   So, there are 240 ways
		c. P = 720 − 240 = 480
		   So, there are 480 ways
			15

	Total Score		**30**

Final score = (total score x 10) : 3

STUDENTS WORKSHEET

Group   : …….

Member   : 1. ………………………………

            2. ………………………………

GROUP ACTIVITY

1. The number of cyclical permutations of n object is P = (…. - …)!

2. If we have 7 diamonds and want to place them to make bracelets, how many possible number of bracelets can be made?

3. A meeting which Hanif, Niza and Azam join is attended by 8 participants. If they arrage 8 chairs in a roundtable form, How many ways that the participants will sit when,

   a. They are free to choose the places
   b. Hanif, Niza and Azam will sit side by side
   c. Hanif, Niza and Azam must sit separatedly

ANSWER SHEET

REFERENCES

Abdi, K. (2009). *Spanish heritage language learners in Canadian high school Spanish classes: Negotiating ethnolinguistic identities and ideologies* (Master of Arts), The University of British Columbia, Vancouver. Retrieved from https://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/id/30492/ubc_2009_fall_abdi_klara.pdf

Andayani, R. D., & al, e. (2010). *The partial immersion program as a model of bilingual English class to lead to the idea of the International Standard Schools in the Province of Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta.* Paper presented at the 57th TEFLIN International Conference: Revitaziling professionalis in ELT as a response to the globlazed world, Bandung

Anna, L. K. (2012). RSBI jangan kesampingkan bahasa ibu, *Kompas*. Retrieved from http://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2012/03/29/17123681/RSBI.Jangan.Kesampingkan.Bahasa.Ibu

Astika, G., & Wahyana, A. (2010). Model pembelajaran MIPA bilingual dalam rangka mendukung keberhasilan program sekolah bertaraf internasional di Jawa Tengah. Salatiga: Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana

Astuti, W. (2012). *Teachers and students' perceptions on bilingual Science lesson: A case study in four selected Pioneering International Standardized Junior High Schools in Central Java, Indonesia.* (Master), Hiroshima University, Hiroshima.

Bailey, J. (2008). First steps in qualitative data analysis: transcribing. *Family Practice, 25*(2), 127-131. doi: 10.1093/fampra/cmn003

Baker, C. (1993). Bilingual education in Wales. In H. B. Beardsmore (Ed.), *European typologies of bilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Balla, J., & Pennington, M. C. (1996). The perception of English-medium instruction by tertiary-level vocational students in Hong Kong. *Education Journal, 24*(1), 131-154.

Basamala, N. (2010). *English teachers in Indonesian senior high schools in Gorontalo: A qualitative study of professional fomation, identity and practice.* (Doctor of Philosophy), Victoria University, Victoria.

Bax, S. (2010). *Researching English bilingual education in Thailand, Indonesia and South Korea* P. Powell-Davies (Ed.)   Retrieved from http://www.britishcouncil.org/publication_2_-_researching_english_bilingual_education.pdf

Bayuni, E. (2013). Commentary: Indonesia is a story waiting to be told *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2013/02/26/commentary-indonesia-a-story-waiting-be-told.html

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in education* (10th ed. ed.). Boston: A & B/Pearson.

Bharati, D. A. L. (2010). Teachers' professional development through an observation in immersion classes based on the documents and teaching and learning processes. *Language Circle, Journal of Language and Literature, 4*(2), 1-18.

Blackledge, A. (2000). Monolingual ideologies in multilingual states: Language, hegemony and social justice in Western liberal democracies. *Estudios de Sociolingüística, 1*(2), 25-45.

Block, D. (2008). Language Education and Globalization. In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (pp. 31-43): Springer US.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brinton, D. (2003). Content-based instruction. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Practical English language teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the Role of Communicative Competence in Language Teaching. In E. Soler & M. P. Jordà (Eds.), *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning* (pp. 41-57): Springer Netherlands.

Chen, R., & Hird, B. (2006). Codeswitching in EFL Group Work in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 19*(2), 208-219. doi: 10.1080/07908310608668763

Chick, J. K. (1996). Safe-talk: Collusion in apartheid education. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the Language Classroom* (pp. 21-39). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chimbutane, F. (2011). *Rethinking bilingual education in postcolonial contexts* Multilingual Matters.

Chimbutane, F. S. (2009). *The purpose and value of bilingual education: A critical, linguistic ethnographic study of two rural primary schools in Mozambique.* (Doctor of Philosophy), The University of Birmingham, Birmingham.

Coleman, H. (2009). *Indonesia's international standard schools': What are they for?* Paper presented at the The 8th Language and Development Conference, Dhaka. http://www.acsa.edu.au/pages/images/Simone%20Smala%20-%20Introducing%20content%20and%20language.pdf

Coleman, H. (2010). *Teaching and learning in Pakistan: The role of language in education*. Islamabad: British Council.

Coleman, H. (2011). *Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English language*. London: British Council.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design : choosing among five approaches* (3rd edition. ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2 ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. In B. Street & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2 ed., Vol. 2 Literacy). New York: Springer.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in CLIL classrooms*. Amsterdam et al.: Benjamins.

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-Language Integrated Learning: From Practice to Principles? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31*, 182-204. doi: doi:10.1017/S0267190511000092

Dardjowidjojo, S. (2000). English Teaching in Indonesia. *EA Journal, 18*(1), 22-30.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Depdiknas. (2009). *Rencana Strategies Departemen Pendidikan Nasional Tahun 2010 - 2014*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

Dharma, S. (2010). Kritik atas program sekolah bertaraf internasional (SBI) dan usulan perbaikannya. Retrieved from http://satriadharma.com/2010/11/03/kritik-atas-program-sekolah-bertaraf-internasional-sbi-dan-usulan-perbaikannya/

Dworin, J. (2011). Listening to graduates of a K-12 bilingual program: Language ideologies and literacy practices of former bilingual students. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal, 5*(November), 104-126.

Dyers, C., & Abongdia, J. F. (2010). An exploration of the relationship between language attitudes and ideologies in a study of Francophone students of English in Cameroon. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 31*(2), 119-134. doi: 10.1080/01434630903470837

Elfitri, A. R., & Latief. (2012). RSBI tak mencerminkan nasionalisme., *Kompas*. Retrieved from http://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2012/04/09/13215395/RSBI.Tak.Mencerminkan.Nasionalisme

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (Second edition. ed.).

Eunah, Y. (2012). *Transforming language ideologies through action research: A case study of bilingual science learning.* (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Illinois Chicago. Retrieved from http://indigo.uic.edu/handle/10027/9518

Farrugia, M. T. (2003). The use of English as a medium of instruction in Maltese mathematics classrooms: continuing the debate. *Journal of Maltese Education Research, 1* (2), 1-14.

Ferguson, C. A., Houghton, C., &, & Wells, M. H. (1977). Bilingual education: An international perspective. In B. S. R. Cooper (Ed.), *Frontiers of Bilingual Education*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Ferguson, G. (2003). Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts. In S. Makoni & U. H. Meinhof (Eds.), *Africa and Applied Linguistics* (Vol. 16). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fidler, A. (2006). Reconceptualizing fossilization in second language acquisition: a review. *Second Language Research, 22*(3), 398-411. doi: 10.1191/0267658306sr273ra

Fitriati, S. W. (2010). *Content-subject teachers use of English classroom language in pioneering international standard senior high school*. Paper presented at the The 57th Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia international seminar (TEFLIN) UPI Bandung.

http://repository.upi.edu/operator/upload/paps_2010_teflin_sri_wuli_fitr
iati.pdf

Fitriati, S. W., & Utami, T. U. (2010). *'Classroom language' yang digunakan oleh guru-guru RSBI (Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional) SMA Negeri 1 Demak* Research report. Universitas Negeri Semarang. Semarang.

Gal, S. (1998). Multiplicity and contention among language ideologies: A commentary. In B. Schieffelin, Woolard, K. & Kroskrity, P. (Ed.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 3-47). New York Oxford University Press.

Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.

Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language socialization: Reproduction and continuity, transformation and change. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 31*(1), 339-361. doi: doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085352

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition an introductory course* Retrieved from http://ezproxy.usq.edu.au/login?url=http://www.USQ.eblib.com.au/EBL Web/patron?target=patron&extendedid=P_325577_0&

Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2003). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and applications* (7 ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Given, L. M. (2008). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods. The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods. SAGE Publications, Inc*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Godley, A. J., Carpenter, B. D., & Werner, C. A. (2007). "I'll speak in proper slang": Language ideologies in a daily editing activity. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42*(1), 100-131. doi: 10.1598/RRQ.42.14

Graaff, R. D., Koopman, G. J., & Westhoff, G. (2007). Identifying effective L2 pedagogy in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) *Views Vienna English Working Papers, 16*(3), 12-19.

Hadisantosa, N. (2010). *Learning through English: Policies, challenges and prospects: Insights from East Asia* (R. Johnstone Ed.). Malaysia: British Council.

Hamied, F. A. (2012). English in multicultural and multilingual Indonesian education. In A. Kirkpatrick & R. Sussex (Eds.), *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education* (Vol. 1, pp. 63-78). Netherlands: Springer.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography : principles in practice* (3rd ed. ed.). London: Routledge.

Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). Putting scaffolding to work: The contribution of scaffolding in articulating ESL education. *Prospect, 20*(1), 6-30.

Hartoyo. (2009). Menggagas Madrasah Aliyah bertaraf internasional

Retrieved 15 July, 2009, from http://hartoyo.wordpress.com/category/seminar-articles/seminar-depag-jateng/

Haryanto, E. (2012). Listening to students voice: A survey of implementation of English as a medium of instruction in an international standard school in Indonesia. *Journal of Education and Practice, 3*(15), 111-119.

Hawanti, S. (2012). *Teachers' knowledge and beliefs about the teaching and learning of English in primary schools in Indonesia.* (Doctor of Philosophy), University of South Australia, Adelaide.

Heath, S. B. (1986). Sociocultural contexts of language development. In D. Holt (Ed.), *Beyond language: Social change and cultural factors in schooling minority students*. CA: Los Angeles evaluation, dissemination and assessment center, California State University.

Hendarman. (2009). Penggunaan Bahasa Inggris pada Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional (RSBI).

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2003). *Inside interviewing : new lenses, new concerns*. Thousand Oaks Calif: Sage Publications.

Hong, J. (2010). An overview of bilingual education: Summary of successful bilingual and immersion education models/programs (pp. 1-3). Honolulu: Pacific Policy Research Center.

Hornberger, N. H., & Chick, J. K. (2001). Co-constructing school safetime: Safetalk practices in Peruvian and South African classrooms. In M. Heller & M. Martin-Jones (Eds.), *Voices of Authority: Education and Linguistic Difference* (pp. 31-56). London: Ablex.

Indradno, J. (2011). *Model pengembangan kompetensi guru Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional (RSBI) di Jawa Tengah.* (Doctor of Education), Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang.

Jafar, M. B. (2010). *An ecological approach to researching biliteracy development of Indonesian bilingual children in Australian social contexts.* (Doctor of Philosophy), Victoria University, Victoria, Australia. Retrieved from http://vuir.vu.edu.au/15989/1/Muhammad_Basri_Jafar.pdf

Jeon, M. (2007). Language ideologies and bilingual education: A Korean-American perspective. *Language Awareness, 16*(2), 114-130. doi: 10.2167/la369.0

Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2 ed.). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2010). Multilingualism and codeswitching in education. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic and language education* (pp. 116-142). Bristol et al.: Multilingual Matters.

King, K. A. (2000). Language Ideologies and Heritage Language Education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 3*(3), 167-184. doi: 10.1080/13670050008667705

Kirkpatrick, A. (2009). English as the International Language of Scholarship: Implications for the Dissemination of 'Local' Knowledge (pp. 254-270).

Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). English as an Asian lingua franca and the multilingual model of ELT. *Language Teaching, 44*(02), 212-224. doi: doi:10.1017/S0261444810000145

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis.* Beverly Hills, CA: Laredo Publishing Company.

Krashen, S. (1994). Bilingual education and second language acquisition theory. In B. E. Office (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (2 ed., pp. 47-75). Los Angeles, CA: California State University, National Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Krashen, S. (2011). Academic Proficiency (Language and Content) and the Role of Strategies. *TESOL Journal, 2*(4), 381-393. doi: 10.5054/tj.2011.274624

Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 496-517). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2009). Language renewal as sites of language ideological struggle The Need for "ideological clarification". In J. Reyhner & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Indigenous Language Revitalization: Encouragement, Guidance & Lessons Learned* (pp. 71-83). Northern Arizona University: Flagstaff, AZ.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2010). Language ideologies - Evolving perspectives. In J. Jaspers, J.-O. Ostman & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Society and Language Use* (pp. 192-211). Amsterdam, NLD: John Benjamins Publsihing Company.

Kustulasari. (2009). *The international standard school project in Indonesia: a policy document analysis.* (Master), The Ohio State University. Retrieved from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/view.cgi/Kustulasari%20Ag.pdf?acc_num=osu1242851740

Lamb, M., & Coleman, H. (2008). Literacy in English and the transformation of self and society in post-Soeharto Indonesia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 11*(2), 189-205.

Latief. (2011). Pemakaian bahasa di RSBI/SBI dievaluasi. Retrieved from http://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2011/03/09/16163756/Pemakaian.Bahasa.di.RSBI/SBI.Dievaluasi

Lauder, A. (2008). The status and function of English in Indonsia: A review of key factors. *Makara, Sosial Humaniora, 12*(1), 9-20.

Lee, J. (2010). *Ideologies of English in the South Korean "English Immersion" debate.* Paper presented at the The 2008 Second Language Research Forum, Somerville, MA.

Li, L., & Walsh, S. (2011). 'Seeing is believing': looking at EFL teachers' beliefs through classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse, 2*(1), 39-57. doi: DOI: 10.1080/19463014.2011.562657

Lie, A. (2007). Education policy and EFL curriculum in Indonesia: Between the commitment to competence and the quest for higher test scores *TEFLIN Journal, 18*(1), 1-14.

Lonsmann, D. (2011). *English as a corporate language: Language choice and language ideologies in an international company in Denmark.* (PhD), Roskilde University. Retrieved from http://rudar.ruc.dk/bitstream/1800/6844/1/PhD_thesis_Dorte_L_nsmann.pdf

Mahditama, I. (2012, 29 October 2012). Interview: On the importance of English language education for students, *The Jakarta Post* Retrieved

from http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/10/29/on-importance-english-language-education-students.html

Margana. (2013). Theoretical justification of bilingual education program in Indonesia. Retrieved January 12, 2013, from http://www.fllt2013.org/private_folder/Proceeding/772.pdf

Mariati. (Juli 2007). Menyoal profil sekolah bertaraf internasional. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 67*(Tahun ke-13), 566-597.

Martin, P. (2005). 'Safe' language practices in two rural schools in Malaysia: Tensions between policy and practice. In A. M. Y. Lin & P. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice* (pp. 74-97). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Martin, P. W. (1999). Close encounters of a bilingual kind: interactional practices in the primary classroom in Brunei. *International Journal of Educational Development, 19*(2), 127-140. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(98)00057-1

McGroarty, M. E. (2010). Language and ideologies. In N. H. M. Hornberger, S.L. (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 6). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

McKay, S. L. (2010). English as an international language. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic and language education* (pp. 89-115). Bristol et al.: Multilingual Matters.

Meisel, J. M. (2004). The bilingual child. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism*. Malden MA: Blackwell.

Mills, K. A. (2007). Access to multiliteracies: a critical ethnography. *Ethnography and Education, 2*(3), 305-325. doi: 10.1080/17457820701547310

MONE. (2011). *Penyelenggaraan Rintisan SMA Bertaraf Internasional*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Menengah

Nadar, F. X. (2007). The prominent characteristics of Javanese culture and their reflections in language use. *Humaniora, 19*, 168-174.

Napitupulu, E. L. (2012). RSBI ancam kecintaan berbahasa Indonesia, *Kompas*. Retrieved from http://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2012/04/24/17171217/RSBI.Ancam.Kecintaan.Berbahasa.Indonesia

Neuman, W. L. (2011). *Social research methods : qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th edition. ed.). Boston Mass: Allyn and Bacon.

Nikander, P. (2008). Working with Transcripts and Translated Data. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 5*(3), 225-231. doi: 10.1080/14780880802314346

Noor, I. H. M. (2011). Studi evaluasi penyelenggaraan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional (SBI) di Sekolah Dasar (SD), Sekolah Menengah Pertama (SMP), Sekolah Menengah Atas (SMA)/Sekolah Menengah kejuruan (SMK). *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 17*(2), 254-268.

Noytim, U. (2006). *The impact of the Internet on English language teaching: A case study at Thai Rhajabat University.* (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Technology Sydney, Sydney.

Nunan, D. (2003). The Impact of English as a Global Language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pasific Region. *Tesol Quarterly, 37*(4), 589-613.

Nurmasitah, S. (2010). *A study of classroom interaction characteristics in a Geography class conducted in English: The case at year ten of an immersion class in SMA N 2 Semarang.* (Master), Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang.

Olivo, W. (2003). "Quit Talking and Learn English!": Conflicting Language Ideologies in an ESL Classroom. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 34*(1), 50-71. doi: 10.1525/aeq.2003.34.1.50

Palmer, D. (2011). The discourse of transition: Teachers' language ideologies within transitional bilingual education programs. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 5*(2), 103-122. doi: 10.1080/19313152.2011.594019

Pan, L. (2011). English language ideologies (ELI) in Olympic Beijing. In L. Wei (Ed.), *Applied Linguistics Review* (Vol. 2, pp. 75-97). Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.

Pasassung, N. (2003). *Teaching English in an "Acquisition-poor environment": An ethnographic example of a remote Indonesian EFL classroom* (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Sydney, Sydney.

Pastor, A. M. R. (2008). Competing language ideologies in a bilingual/bicultural after-school program in Southern California. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 7*(1), 4-24. doi: 0.1080/15348430701693XXX

Payne, J. (2010). *Language ideologies, language attitudes, and discourse: African American English in middle school.* (Doctorate of Philosophy), The University of Texas San Antonio. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/305239637

Permendiknas. (2009). *Penyelenggaraan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional Pada Jenjang Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah.* Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pilkinton-Pihko, D. (2010). English as a lingua franca lecturers' self-perceptions of their language use *Helsinki English Studies, 6*, 58-74.

Post, T. J. (2013, January 8, 2013). International-standard school unconstitutional: MK, *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2013/01/08/international-standard-school-unconstitutional-mk.html

Rampton, B. (2007). Neo-Hymesian linguistic ethnography in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 11*(5), 584-607. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00341.x

Razfar, A., & Rumenapp, J. C. (2012). Language ideologies in English learner classrooms: critical reflections and the role of explicit awareness. *Language Awareness*, 1-22. doi: 10.1080/09658416.2011.616591

Retmono. (2011). Bahasa Inggris bukan standar RSBI, *Suara Merdeka*. Retrieved from http://www.suaramerdeka.com/smcetak/index.php?fuseaction=beritacetak.detailberitacetak&id_beritacetak=140493

Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Sakhiyya, Z. (2011). Interrogating identity: the International Standard School in Indonesia. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 19*(3), 345-365.

Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. A., & Kroskrity, P. V. (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and Theory* (B. B. Schieffelin, Woolard, K.A., Kroskrity, P. V. Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Setyorini, A., & Sofwan, A. (2011). Teaching Mathematics and Sciences in English in Pilot International Standard High Schools in Indonesia. *Language Circle, Journal of Language and Literature, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Semarang., 5*(2), 179 -186.

Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In R. P. Clyne, W. F. Hanks & L. C. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels* (pp. 193-247). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Silverstein, M. (1998). The uses and utility of ideology. In B. B. Schieffelin, Woolard, K. and Kroskrity P.V. (Ed.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 123-145). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Simatupang, M. (1999). *Bahasa Inggris: Variasi Yang Mana? Suatu Tinjauan Ulang Tentang Status Bahasa Inggris di Indonesia.* Paper presented at the PELLBA 12 (Pertemuan Linguistik Lembaga Bahasa Atma Jaya: Kedua Belas), Jakarta.

Snow, M. A. (2001). Content-based and immersion models for second and foreign language teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3 ed., pp. 303-318). USA: Heinle & Heinle.

Song, J. (2007). *Language ideologies and identity: Korean children's language socialization in a bilingual setting.* (Doctor of Philosophy), The Ohio State University, Ohio. Retrieved from http://etd.ohiolink.edu/send-pdf.cgi/%EE%80%80Song%EE%80%81%20Juyoung.pdf?osu1190126864

Song, J. (2009). Language ideology and identity in transnational space: Globalization, migration, and bilingualism among Korean families in the USA. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 13*(1), 23-42. doi: 10.1080/13670050902748778

Suharyadi. (2010). *Classroom interaction in English in Mathematics and Science classes (A case study at Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional (RSBI), SMA Negeri 3 Malang.* (Master), Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang.

Sultan, S., Borland, H., & Eckersley, B. (2012). *English medium of instruction (EMI) in Indonesian public junior secondary school: Student's language use, attitudes/motivation and foreign language outcomes.* Paper presented at the ACTA International TESOL Conference, Cairns Australia.

Suma, K. (2011). Pengembangan model pembelajaran bilingual preview-review berbasis inkuiri *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran, 44*(1-3), 1-9.

Sumintono, B., & Mislan, N. (2011). *Struggling to improve: A case study of the Indonesia's International Standard School in improving its capacity building*. Paper presented at the Conference on Policy Research on Child Education in Indonesia, Tangerang, Jakarta, Indonesia. http://eprints.utm.my/18627/

Sundusiyah, A. (2011). Teachers in international-standard schools: What is missing? What can be improved? What does it take? . In Z. Sakhiyya, Arsana, I.M.A., Ramadewi, M. (Ed.), *Education counts! the contribution of Indonesian students studying overseas for education in Indonesia* (pp. 87-108). Yogyakarta: Insight Media

Suyanto. (2010, 3 June 2010). Ditjen Mandikdasmen adakan konferensi pers ihwal RSBI/SBI, *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from http://dikdas.kemdiknas.go.id/content/berita/utama/berita-599.html

Swain, M. (2010). *Sociocultural theory in second language education : an introduction through narratives*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Swain, M., & Johnson, R. K. (1997). Immersion Education: A category within bilingual education. In R. K. S. Johnson, M. (Ed.), *Immersion Education: International Perspective*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tan, M. (2011). Mathematics and science teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the teaching of language in content learning. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(3), 325-342. doi: 10.1177/1362168811401153

Tan, M., & Lan, O. S. (2010). Teaching mathematics and science in English in Malaysian classrooms: The impact of teacher beliefs on classroom practices and student learning. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10*(1), 5-16. doi: doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2010.11.001

Temple, B., & Young, A. (2004). Qualitative research and translation dilemmas. *Qualitative Research, 4*(2), 161-178.

Thomas, C. A. (2012). *Living in L1, learning in L2: language ideologies and practices of English immersion students. .* (Master), University of Oxford, United Kingdom. Retrieved from http://englishagenda.britishcouncil.org/sites/ec/files/Carrie%20Anne%20Thomas%20Abstract_20512885-v2.pdf

Townley, R. (2008). What is meant by reflexivity in the context of ethnographic research? Does reflexivity have limits? . *UG Journal, 1*.

Tricoglus, G. (2001). Living the theoretical principles of critical ethnography' in educational research. *Educational Action Research, 9*(1), 135-148. doi: 10.1080/09650790100200146

van Nes, F., Abma, T., Jonsson, H., & Deeg, D. (2010). Language differences in qualitative research: is meaning lost in translation? *European Journal of Ageing, 7*(4), 313-316. doi: 10.1007/s10433-010-0168-y

Volk, D., & Angelova, M. (2007). Language Ideology and the Mediation of Language Choice in Peer Interactions in a Dual-Language First Grade. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 6*(3), 177-199. doi: 10.1080/15348450701454205

Weihong, L. (2012). Critical Analysis of Cooperative Learning in Chinese ELT Context. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research, 3*(5), 961-966. doi: 10.4304/jltr.3.5.961-966

Wood, D. (1992). *Teaching talk: How models of teacher talk affect pupil participation*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Wood, J. C. M. (2008). *The impact of globalization on education reform: A case study of Uganda.* (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Maryland, College Park

Woolard, K. A. (1992). Language ideology: Issues and approaches. *Pragmatics, 2*(3), 235-259.

Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, Woolard, K. and Kroskrity P.V. (Ed.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 3-47). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Woolard, K. A. (2010). Language ideology: Issues and approaches. *International Pragmatics Association, 2*(3), 235-249.

Wortham, S. (2008). Linguistic Anthropology of Education. *Annual Review of Anthropolgy, 37*(1), 37-51. doi: 10.1146/annurev.anthro.36.081406.094401

Young, M. S. (2011). *A case of the global-local dialectic: Decentralization and teacher training in Banten, Indonesia* (Doctor of Philosophy), The Florida State University Florida.

Zentz, L. (2012). *Global language identities and ideologies in an Indonesian university context* (Doctor of Philosophy), The University of Arizona Arizona.