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ABSTRACT

Research on the nature and quantity of input in the language classroom and its effects on output have created much debate in recent years, especially around the use of the first language (L1) and consequent teacher code-switching. Much recent research points to the benefits of L1 use under certain conditions, but these are still not well defined (Cook, 2001; Lo, 2015; Waer, 2012). Many studies have identified that teachers code-switch for both pedagogical and social purposes (Caukill, 2015; Wardaugh, 2010) but the question whether teachers fully understand the processes of decision-making in code switching has not been satisfactorily answered. In the Indonesian context, the lack of specificity in matters of policy and guidelines for practice has led teachers to interpret the English curriculum for primary school (Depdiknas, 2006) in diverse individual ways; This study then investigates teacher code-switching in the primary language classroom from the point of view of teachers’ understandings and beliefs about effective language teaching and learning, within the constraints of their curriculum practices, and within a context where Bahasa Indonesia (BI) is the standard language of education but not the mother tongue.

This study was carried out in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom in two primary schools in Padang, West Sumatra, where the teacher and the students share Bahasa Minang and Bahasa Indonesia. Bahasa Minang is the mother tongue in the region, and Bahasa Indonesia is the official language of educational institutions, government, law, economics, culture and politics as
well as the lingua franca for hundreds of ethnic language-speakers throughout Indonesia.

The study used conversation analysis as a tool to quantify the input and number of student-teacher turns in ten observed and recorded lessons, and stimulated recall interviews with three teachers which focused on instances of code-switching. Case study was then used as an approach to investigate each teacher’s code-switching practices holistically. The quantitative analysis showed very diverse patterns of L1 use among the three teachers, and revealed that Bahasa Minang/Bahasa Indonesia and English were used in complex ways for different functions. Bahasa Minang was used minimally for maintaining social distance or closeness, and Bahasa Indonesia was used in differing amounts by the three teachers, with some common features such as a means of pedagogical and affective functions including motivation and encouragement, and also for pedagogical reasons such as translation of new vocabulary, explaining grammar, and instructions. Students used mostly Bahasa Indonesia when communicating with the teacher and used Bahasa Minang when they talked to their friends. One important finding was that the teachers were sometimes unaware of the motivation, functions, and outcomes of their code-switching. This complex picture of language use in the classroom, in that both learners and teachers are utilising complex linguistic repertoires, needs to be better understood in order to improve the Indonesian language teaching curriculum.
The significance of this research lies in the argument that although code-switching clearly helped teachers and students in the teaching and learning process, it was often done on an ad hoc basis. The results of this study suggest that stimulated recall techniques may help teachers to develop pedagogical self-reflexivity. Findings also suggest that teacher education programs should be modified to help pre-service teachers make principled decisions about the judicious use of the mother tongue while maximizing target language use.
CHAPTER 1
BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

In second-language learning contexts where teachers and learners share a mother tongue or national language, code-switching frequently occurs and is a phenomenon which has been noted for its pedagogical and social applications (Canagarajah, 2011; Cook, 2001; Hidayati, 2012; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). The research reported here focuses on teachers’ code-switching in EFL classrooms in Padang, Indonesia using quantitative and qualitative analysis, looking at the amount, the functions and the reasons for teachers’ code-switching. This chapter presents the context of the study, a context in which teachers and students face a complex situation in learning a foreign language. An account of the problems which frame this research follows. The purposes of the study are then discussed and the research questions are presented. Finally, an overview of the thesis is presented at the end of this chapter.

1.2 The context of the study

English has had more prestige in Indonesia than any other foreign language in recent years. It has been used to fulfill objectives in obtaining knowledge, and for participating in international communication and trade. In addition, advances in science and technology are increasing the demand for teaching English in schools and universities in Indonesia. However, the literature on English language teaching (ELT) in Indonesia suggests that the development and implementation of the English curriculum in Indonesia has generally not
been successful (Lie, 2007; Mantiri, 2004; Mappiasse & Sihes, 2014; Mukminatien, 2004; Priyono, 2004). In fact, school curricula have been revised several times since 1945 in response to social forces, philosophical positions, psychological principles, accumulations of new knowledge, and educational leadership (Basalama, 2010; Oliva, 1992; Yulia, 2014).

The first English curriculum in Indonesia was based on a grammar translation approach, and was introduced in 1945. The 1968 curriculum replaced the 1945 curriculum, and another replaced this one in 1975. These last two curricula were influenced by a structural approach, with a focus on teaching sentence structure in particular. This approach emphasises the mastery of linguistic knowledge of the target language. Therefore the teacher’s primary role was to teach the linguistic rules of the target language. In other words, classroom activities were marked by the teacher’s explanation of the grammatical rules, and it seemed that students were not expected to be involved in much authentic use of the target language.

The 1975 curriculum was revised and replaced by the 1984 curriculum. In contrast, the 1984 curriculum was based on the communicative approach and on developing competence in reading comprehension. The next curriculum, the 1994 curriculum, shared features with the 1984 curriculum as regards the communicative approach, however, the 1994 curriculum proposed that the teaching of English should include not only the teaching of language usage
(knowledge of the language) but more importantly incorporate more language use (Lie, 2007).

A policy was formulated in 1990 to allow elementary schools to teach English to their fourth, fifth and six grades. It was based on the assumption that starting the teaching of EFL before the critical period will facilitate better proficiency. Even though it is not yet strongly supported by empirical evidence, the policy was informed by the notion that the earlier EFL learning began, the better the learner’s opportunity to achieve high proficiency in the TL. Also, policy followed the belief that the more time the learner spends learning a language, the higher the proficiency he/she will achieve. In this regard, Bialystok & Hakuta (1999) argue that younger learners are better than adults in learning a language because of their younger brains, which have more plasticity and are thus more receptive to language stimuli and can organize language principles more automatically.

English as a subject in Indonesian primary schools is categorized as a local content subject, which means that the subject should be relevant to local needs and regional conditions (Lestari, 2003; Zein, 2008). Such subjects are locally specified as important for students of certain areas, as determined by their local context. For example the choice whether to teach English or not is made available; it depends on the available resources, or on teacher supply in each region.
The 1994 English curriculum document aimed to promote global competitiveness (Depdikbud, 1993) and highlighted the importance of communicative competence as the main goal of English foreign-language learning in Indonesian elementary schools. However, the National Education Ministry of the Republic of Indonesia did not provide an English syllabus for elementary schooling, because of the language’s status as a local content subject (Hawanti, 2011; Lestari, 2003; Zein, 2008). The general objective of teaching English was given as ‘to provide a good basis for communicative competence’ (Diknas, 1990), but there was no legislation regarding policy on teaching qualifications for English language teachers; as a result no qualified specialist English teachers taught in elementary schools. Those who teach English as a subject in elementary schools in Padang are generalist classroom teachers. Classroom teachers are teachers who manage the class, and teach all the subjects (excluding religion and sometimes sport). Some of them are trained teachers, however if they had training in English language pedagogy at all it was in a secondary context. These teachers struggled to manage the different situations in EFL elementary classrooms.

Teachers graduating from English departments of teacher training colleges in Indonesia are generally not provided with appropriate training to meet the needs of the primary school English classes because the teacher education curriculum does not include teaching English for young learners. Consequently, teachers who teach English in primary schools are often in doubt about the ‘what’ and ‘how’ to teach. Often, in practice they adopt
methods commonly used for teaching secondary school students such as teaching grammar rules transmissively or asking the students to read and memorize dialogue.

In Padang State University, where the researcher works, student teachers are currently provided with an elective package addressing the needs of English for young learners, 4 subjects in a 12-credit semester. The subjects are Child Language Development, Methods of Teaching English to Young Learners, English Material for Young Learners, and Instructional Media for Young Learners (see appendix 1). These subjects specifically address some of the needs offer of English learning for young learners, but only four subjects offered within one semester is rather limited. These courses are offered within a 2-credit semester which means that the subject is given for 2 hours a week. The lectures tend to be theoretical due to the short time, and the size (a large class with 40 students). More subjects on “what and how” to teach in primary schools are needed.

Furthermore, there are no national guidelines on English language teaching and learning at the elementary school level. Accordingly, the syllabi are designed by regional or provincial curriculum boards. As a result, the teaching of English at elementary school level varies significantly from one region to another. This is quite unusual in an educational system with a centralized curriculum as is the case in Indonesia.
In 2004, the Ministry of Education published a new curriculum, known as Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi– KBK, [the Competence-Based Curriculum] emphasizing the performance-based outcomes for each educational unit, from elementary to high school, in the form of national standards. This new curriculum, which is largely based on functional and interactional perspectives, was recommended as a key pathway to success for language learning. Similar to the 1994 curriculum, the 2004 curriculum for elementary school only provides general guidelines for English language teaching orientation (Diknas, 2004). The stated goals are: 1) to enhance students’ basic abilities in English communication, 2) to motivate students’ interest in English language learning, and 3) to broaden students’ perspectives towards the importance of learning English, with the aim of improving their competitiveness in global society (Depdiknas, 1994; Depdiknas, 2004).

In 2006, the 2004 curriculum was modified in such a way as to highlight the significance of using TL (English) in the language classroom (Depdiknas, 2006). It was an attempt to apply a communicative approach by emphasisising spoken English instruction. This was modified in 2006 when the government published another curriculum, Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan – KTSP, [the School Based Curriculum] which was also a competence-based curriculum. KTSP placed more emphasis on autonomy in the design, development, and implementation of the curriculum based on the school’s needs and conditions (Depdiknas, 2006). The 2006 curriculum set competence standards due to each school having different needs and conditions. It also
aimed to give teachers more chances to improve themselves by developing their own teaching materials, instead of relying on only those specified in the curriculum.

Furthermore, KTSP has set a goal of communicative competence. The development of target language competency requires the parallel acquisition of linguistic and communicative skills. KTSP thus fulfils some key criteria of communicative models, such as those referred to in the literature e.g. in Depdiknas (2006). Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell (1995) emphasize the ability to communicate in English through the use of the Communicative Language Competency model; Halliday (1978) underlines the importance of adopting social discourse strategies; and Kern (2000) sees as vital the development of integrated literacy skills. KTSP then emphasizes the use of English as the TL by the teacher, particularly at the elementary school level; the receptive and productive spoken components, that is, listening and speaking, are given more weight (Depdiknas, 2006). The emphasis can be seen as an attempt to tackle the problems of the teacher-centered approach and to improve the learning environment with a focus on student autonomy in the language learning process.

I have so far shown that English language teaching has long been part of Indonesian education, and has gone through a number of phases. In Indonesia, traditional methods of teaching have shaped concepts about the teaching and learning of English as a foreign language (Lie, 2007). In chronological order,
the traditional/grammar translation method, the direct method, the audiolingual method, and the Communicative Approach have all been promoted in Indonesian English language teaching, in line with developments from Centre English-speaking countries (Yulia, 2014), but in Indonesia practice often differs from these pedagogical currents. As a person involved in the field, I believe that a traditional/Grammar–translation method is still dominant in most EFL classrooms in Indonesia, and especially in this study’s context, Padang, West Sumatra. Informal observations over the years revealed to me that teachers barely spoke the target language in class, and tended to teach grammar explicitly to students. The students’ role was to listen to the teacher, as for any ‘content’ subject, and as a result the class was teacher-centered. I became more and more aware that this limited use of target language did not provide students with sufficient language input to stimulate authentic output, and was therefore ineffective in promoting communication goals.

Despite KTSP (2006) being recommended as a key pathway to success for language learning, the implementation of the KTSP (2006), in terms of the communicative approach in teaching EFL, seems to fall short of expectations (Basalama 2010; Mattarima & Hamdan, 2011; Yulia, 2014). To illustrate, Lubis (1996), in her Jakarta study, found that primary school teachers encountered difficulties in using communicative methods in their English classrooms. According to her, the teachers could not engage students in active involvement during classroom interaction. In addition, several other studies in EFL in Indonesia revealed that EFL in Indonesian elementary schools has not
been successful (in Hawanti, 2011; Septy, 2000) as a result of numerous problems such as issues with teachers’ qualifications, large classes, available resources and facilities (Hawanty, 2011; Yuwono, 2005; Zein, 2016).

In spite of the comprehensive implementation of English teaching in elementary schools in Indonesia, the lack of specificity in matters of policy and guidelines for practice has led to a situation where the results of this implementation have fallen well below the targets set (Alwasilah, 2000; Hawanty, 2011). Communicative competence in English is not widespread among Indonesian EFL students (Marcelino, 2008; Mattarima & Hamdan, 2011; Yulia, 2014). Thus, the effectiveness of English language teaching and learning at the elementary school level is questionable (Kurniasih, 2011; Suyanto, 2003). This is particularly the case in elementary schools in Padang, West Sumatra, where this study was located.

In July 2013, the new “2013 Curriculum” was launched. There was much debate and disagreement about the implementation of this curriculum, as English was removed as a subject from primary schools. No public elementary school teaches English any longer. The changes in the 2013 curriculum were intended to help students focus on learning Bahasa Indonesia in elementary schools and to maintain and foster a sense of nationalism (SekolahDasar.Net, 21/10/2012, Kedaulatan Rakyat, 22 May, 2013). The policy makers argue that people should not over-emphasise the importance of English learning in case this leads to the detriment of students’ second language (in the Indonesian
context). Bahasa Indonesia is a second language in Indonesia. The mother
tongue is a local language, of which there are about 600 in Indonesia
(Alisyahbana, 1990). Bahasa Indonesia unites the speakers of these local
languages, and is the language of national literacy and schooling as well as the
common lingua franca.

Previously, many cities and provinces in Indonesia had mandated English
learning in primary schools in the first grade while others started it in the fourth
grades (Depdiknas, 2006). But now with the implementation of the 2013
Curriculum, students start to learn English at grade 7. English teachers and
parents argued that children should begin learning English before entering
Junior High School because they believe young learners learn language more
easily than older learners.

Katsuyama, Nishigaki, & Wang (2008: 374) reported that

The experience of English leaning and communication
in English at an early age would be helpful to keep
students’ motivation for English learning high even
after entering junior high school. However, students
who have less English learning experience at an early
age would lose their motivation for learning English
when they start learning English at junior high school.

Furthermore, Katsuyama et al. (2008: 374) stated that “the more English
learning experience students have, the more they find English useful”. In the
context of the present study where most learners have little opportunity to hear
and to use the TL, it is important that TL is used whenever possible.
As regards my research, the data was collected before the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum, before English was removed from the curriculum. However, the data and findings still have relevance to the secondary English curriculum, because they reveal classroom practices and teacher perceptions of language use, in a context where few guidelines are given for practical language teaching.

Little has been known about the practice of teaching English in elementary schools in Padang, and available information is based largely on anecdotal evidence. One question of importance regarding the aim of achieving communicative competence is the language that is used most in classroom interaction. I was aware of anecdotal evidence that many teachers seemed to prefer to use Bahasa Indonesia (BI henceforth) in the English classroom. In Padang, most classes are teacher-fronted (see Musumeci, 1996), where the teacher leads the class and provides the main source of language input for students. Prior to 2013 students received an average of 70 minutes of English instruction per week. The teachers were non-native speakers of the TL (English), and there was virtually no communicative need for English outside the classroom. In fact, students did not hear much spoken English either inside or outside the classroom (Diknas, 2010). For the aforementioned reasons, exposure to English in Padang was limited, in both social and educational settings. Accordingly, the issue of the language employed in teaching EFL classes in West Sumatra, and more generally across Indonesia, deserved serious attention.
In the 2006 English curriculum, national policy encouraged teachers to use TL, in this case English, as much as possible in the classroom (Depdiknas, 2006). This was because the main purpose of English education was to help students develop their ability to communicate in everyday English (the performative level) and to provide a good basis for students to develop the language in secondary school (Depdiknas, 2006). The curriculum guidelines specified that the instruction should be in the four skills, listening, speaking, reading and writing (Depdiknas, 2006), and the focus should be on improving students’ listening and speaking abilities for daily communication. Due to this reason, there were two objectives of learning English in primary school: to help students to have the following capabilities: (1) develop the competence to communicate in oral form to accompany action (language accompanying action) in the context of the school; and (2) have an awareness of the nature and importance of the English language in order to enhance the nation's competitiveness in a global society (Depdiknas, 2004: 403). However, no clear guidelines were prescribed as to how much L1 or TL should be used by teachers in the classroom.

For the goal of achieving communicative competence, it has been claimed that sufficient quantity and quality in the target language (TL) is fundamental (Morata & Coule, 2012; Wong, 2011). It has also been suggested that interaction in the TL results in the development of negotiation skills and the ability to communicate in the TL (Crawford, 2004; Crichton, 2009; Ellis,
2005b; VanPatten, 2004). In order to achieve the goal of communicative competence, teachers’ understanding of what is required, in particular the importance of optimal use of TL, is crucial (Depdiknas, 2006).

Furthermore, the language learning context becomes more complicated when the teacher shares the same language/s, i.e. mother tongue, with the students, as is the case in the present study. Within such contexts, an important consideration is whether or not the students have sufficient opportunity to actually hear and use the target language as the teachers are not always aware when and why they use one language or another in instruction (Inbar-Louire, 2010; Polio & Duff, 1994). As mentioned previously, in the context of the present study students only had 70 minutes of English instruction per week, and this constituted the only exposure the students have to TL as an input. In addition, even though the curriculum document encourages teachers to use the target language, none of the English Curriculum at any level in Indonesia prescribes clear guidelines on how much target language should be used in the classroom. This is because the national curriculum only sets general objectives. Then this national curriculum is developed and interpreted at the level of each province, thus, the local curriculum in East Java will not be same as the local curriculum in West Java, either in purpose or material (Suyanto, 2003).

A further complication in Indonesia is the gap between the curriculum and teacher education in universities. University education in Indonesia is part of the Directorate General of Higher Education whereas schooling from primary
level to senior high school level is the responsibility of the Ministry of Education. In other words there is a gap between curriculum and teacher education, including language teacher education.

As mentioned, the linguistic landscape in Indonesia is a further issue of complexity for language education. In Padang, people use Bahasa Minang as their first language or mother tongue (BM henceforth). It is used actively in their daily communication with their relatives at home. Bahasa Minang is an oral language only. It is an Austronesian language spoken by Minang people in West Sumatra, the western part of Riau, South Aceh Regency, the northern part of Bengkulu and Jambi, also in several cities throughout Indonesia by migrant Minang people.

Bahasa Indonesia is the second language for most Indonesians and it is used in both formal and informal situations such as in schools and government offices. It is the national, official language of Indonesia, and the lingua franca among speakers of different local languages (more than 600 local languages throughout Indonesian archipelago). While Bahasa Indonesia is the medium of instruction in the school, Bahasa Minang is used when students communicate with their friends outside the classroom and at home. In this study, henceforth, Bahasa Minang is referred to as BM, Bahasa Indonesia as BI, and English as TL.
English as a foreign language is only spoken in the English classroom. As in other EFL contexts, TL is not only the medium of instruction but also the object of the instruction in the EFL classroom (Nation, 2003: 2). In other words, target language in the classroom is not only the subject matter, but also the tool by which the target language is taught. Students in Padang have fewer opportunities to hear and practice the target language because English is used only in the language classroom and in some content subjects delivered in English such as a Maths or Science.

1.3 The problem

My decision to concentrate on teacher code-switching arose from earlier observations of teacher professional learning. The experience that I have had as a teacher educator for many years revealed to me that it was not always easy for the teachers to be aware of what language they actually used during interactions in the classroom, even if the language choices in the classroom were well-thought beforehand and written into each teacher’s lesson plan. One activity in an observed teacher professional development session was an activity where one teacher participant performed a teaching activity, followed by a discussion. In one such discussion, the teachers mentioned that they did not realise on a deeper level the reasons for their code-switching in the classroom. They expressed the belief that Bahasa Indonesia was useful and helped them in teaching. Teacher’s beliefs are thought to have a profound influence on their classroom practices (Sanchez, 2014; Sánchez, 2014; Túma, Pišová, Nafjar, & Janíkova, 2014). To put it simply, these teachers were not
aware of the value of the target language they provided as input, or how much Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Minang they might use and still teach language effectively. Therefore, an understanding of the relationship between teacher’s beliefs and actual practice is an important factor in the teacher’s professional growth (Zheng, 2013). This is an issue I have taken up in this study.

Further inspiration for my study came from a provincial [Diknas Propinsi] program, a project aimed at answering a range of questions regarding educational issues conducted in August-September, 2010. This program, which included the assessment of language use in elementary EFL classrooms, was carried out in the 19 regions or administrative areas in West Sumatra (Diknas, 2010). Observation sessions were carried out in one elementary school in each of five selected regions in West Sumatra – two in Padang, two in Pariaman, and one in Padang Panjang. These primary classes were, in each case, observed for the full duration (70 minutes) of the class session. In each of these observation sessions, the foreign language teacher was the major source of target language input. Students might get other language input from other sources such as from audio/video recordings material in English and books written in English.

One of these observation sessions conducted in a grade 4 class was video-recorded for 35 minutes. It was generally observable that the teacher dominated and controlled the patterns of discourse in the language classroom; moreover, what happened in this observed EFL classroom was that the teacher did not
provide students with as much TL input as she might have because the teacher used more Bahasa Indonesia than English as a target language.

This video recording showed that the teacher spoke more than the students (79.29% teacher and 20.70% students), and used a little more Bahasa Indonesia (BI, 52.22%) than English (TL, 47.77%) (my observation in Padang/10 August 2010). The teacher appeared to overuse the Bahasa Indonesia and dominated the interaction, which is very different to the ideal conditions of an effective EFL classroom.

An effective EFL classroom does not necessarily involve the sole use of the target language (Inbar-Lourie, 2010), but also the use of L1 if it can be justified (Cook, 2001); many scholars support the use, to a degree, of L1 in EFL classrooms (e.g. Cook, 2001; Inbar-Lourie, 2010; Polio & Duff, 1994). However, if the phenomenon of BI overuse is the norm, then it can be surmised that the day-to-day language of instruction in English language classrooms in Indonesia may well be Bahasa Indonesia. If this is the case, students in English classes in Padang, and perhaps more widely in Indonesia, are not being given the opportunity to practice listening and speaking English in the classroom, as required by the national curriculum. It will follow, then, that both the teacher’s large amount of Bahasa Indonesia use will not be conducive to language learning, in terms of providing the students with adequate exposure to TL, and to providing adequate practice to help achieve communicative competence.
The use of mother tongue (L1) represents potentially both a strength and a weakness in EFL classrooms: strength because of what it affords from the richness of the existing mother tongue knowledge; weakness because if over used, the mother tongue may limit potential TL uptake. I intend in this thesis to move away from the exclusive/non-exclusive debate on the use of target language in order to arrive at the analysis that takes into account a more complex notion of code-switching in the classroom. This is in response to the findings by many researchers (Cook, 2001; Inbar-Lourie, 2010; Polio & Duff, 1994) that teachers are not aware of when and why they alternate languages. However, many teachers believe that the use of mother tongue (L1) in their teaching is useful (Arnetts, 2001; Juarez & Oxbrow, 2008; Macaro, 1997, 2009). Crucial to the context of my research, is the absence of guidelines for teachers on the appropriate balance of language use, resulting in code-switching on an ad hoc basis.

1.4 The purpose of this thesis

One key purpose of the present study is to examine how teachers perceive their own practices, particularly as regards the provision of TL input and the use of code-switching in the EFL classrooms. This study uses observation of instructed EFL classrooms and stimulated recall interviews with the teacher participants. This research will provide insights into classroom interaction in English classes in the chosen context. It will add to the body of available research in the area of teacher code-switching in multiple contexts. The specific aims are to:
• Investigate the pedagogical and other motivations for code-switching, on the part of the teacher, in selected schools in the Padang area;
• Determine the relationship between code-switching and the teaching of English language skills in the Indonesian language teaching context.

The intention is to provide a picture of EFL classroom interaction at two selected elementary schools in Padang, West Sumatra, Indonesia, regarding the use of language in the classroom. The focus will be on what teachers do in practice and their perceptions of their code-switching. The main purpose of the study is not to attempt to generalize from its conclusions to a larger population, but to gain a thorough and in-depth understanding of student-teacher interaction in terms of when and why they code-switch.

Therefore, the main research question for the study is:
What are the characteristics of teachers’ language input in EFL primary classrooms in Padang, Indonesia?

With the sub-questions:
• What are the pedagogical and affective factors that influence teacher code-switching in the Padang, Indonesian context?
• What are the perceptions of teachers in this context as to the relationship between code-switching and the effective teaching of English?
1.5 **Significance of the study**

This study is important in four aspects. First, it may serve as the first empirical study to investigate teachers’ language input and their code-switching practices in EFL classrooms at elementary schools in Padang, Indonesia. Second, this research offers a better understanding of teachers’ code-switching, which may lead to significant improvements in foreign language learning in the Indonesian context. It could provide insights into processes that facilitate effective classroom discourse and may enhance English language teaching and learning. Third, it can also be utilised as a reference for all EFL teachers to better understand when and why they code-switch in the EFL classroom. The findings may provide further evidence for the debated issue of the use of L1 and TL in EFL classrooms. Finally, it may provide significant evidence for the continuing debate about the presence of English as a subject in primary schools in Indonesia.

1.6 **Thesis overview**

This first chapter of this study is an introduction to the structure and the content of this thesis. It described the context of this study and identified the research problem. It also presented the research questions. The significance of the study was then discussed.

In the next chapter, I examine the literature on teachers’ language input and students’ output, the context of this study, Indonesia, as well as the development of English language teaching and the curriculum in Indonesia.
This chapter also provides an account of debates on the use of mother tongue (L1) and target language (TL) in the EFL classrooms. It presents the theoretical framework of this study and reviews the related literature on code-switching. This chapter also gives a brief discussion on the nature and roles of Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Minang in the context of this study.

In Chapter Three, I describe and justify the methodology. I briefly discuss the relevance of quantitative and qualitative approaches for this study. The research design provides information about the research method, research tools, participants of the study, data collection as well as techniques of data analysis. Data was collected from my onsite notes, video recording of English classes and the stimulated recall interviews with the teachers.

This study involved two phases, namely phase 1, conversation analysis, then phase 2, stimulated recall. In phase one, data gathered from the teachers’ lesson transcripts were first organized for assessing the amount of each language used to establish the patterns of use. Then, the turns were counted to identify instances of code-switching. I looked at the turns more closely to examine the functions of code-switching in the classes observed. In phase two, stimulated recall was used to show the teachers’ perceptions and any mismatches with the observation data.

Conversation analysis as a tool was chosen to quantify the amount of teacher input and number and nature of turns in the classroom. Finally, the stimulated
recall interview approach is also described and discussed as a viable tool for revealing teacher perceptions of their code-switching.

Chapter Four presents the results and analysis of the amounts of language input and output. Then, based on the observation, pedagogical and affective (social/psychological) reasons for classroom language-choice will be presented.

In Chapter Five, I present the results and analysis of the stimulated recall interviews. The stimulated recall interviews reveal useful information on the reasons the teachers gave for their code-switching. The effects of such an approach on self-reflexivity in teacher practice are also discussed.

Chapter Six presents a discussion of the results and analyses. Key to the discussion are the complex functions of code switching and the motivations for them, as identified in the conversation analysis and stimulated recall interviews, and the findings will be discussed in the light of the relevant literature. Teacher reflexivity is identified as a significant result of the stimulated recall approach.

Chapter Seven concludes the thesis with a summary of the chapters, presents the implications and limitations of this research as well as recommendations for future research on code-switching in EFL classrooms, and the implications for language teacher education and professional development programs.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In order to establish the issues focused on in this study, this chapter reviews the research on input and output in second/foreign language acquisition, particularly as regards the use of first language (L1) as a pedagogical tool, and its related concept of teacher code-switching in EFL classrooms. The debates about the balance and nature of uses of target language (TL) and L1 will be discussed, the EFL context in Indonesia will be described in the light of the debates, and the chapter will conclude with an overview of approaches to code-switching research, which have informed this study.

The importance of target language as input in classroom discourse and interaction in shaping learning outcomes has been seen as crucial to learning English as a foreign language (Ellis, 1985, 1994; Pinter, 2006; Turnbull & Dailey-O’Cain, 2009). Guided input is necessary in order for uptake to occur, particularly in EFL contexts such as Indonesia or other Asian countries where the classroom is typically the only place that such input is provided.

Research has also shown that output plays an important role in SLA (Lightbown & Spada, 2006; Long, 1983; Rondon-Pari, 2014; Swain & Lapkin, 1995; VanPatten, 2004). Given that output in the EFL classroom is typically prompted by teacher input, it follows that the type of language use by the
teacher and the type of interaction in the language classroom may influence the outcomes of the language learning process (Ellis, 1997).

For many years there has been controversy about whether teachers should use or exclude the students’ L1 during English language instruction (Auerbach 1993; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). Many language teaching approaches continue to assume that TL instruction should be mainly through the TL and that if there is a switch to the L1, it should be minimised as much as possible (Turnbull, 2001). Some believe that teachers should avoid using the L1 altogether and that those who use it may be regarded as inadequate pedagogues (Chambers, 1992; Cook, 2001; Pablo, Lengeling, Zenil, Crawford, & Goodwin, 2011). These opponents of L1 use believe that the use of L1 is a sign of insufficiently trained teachers or instructors and that L2 teaching should take place without interference from the L1. This is discussed further in Section 2.2.2.

In many contexts where EFL is taught in schools in non-English speaking countries, the official policy is that L1 use in the classrooms should be minimised. However, evidence shows that in many classrooms, the L1 is still widely used. The question then remains: Why is it that L1 is still being used to the detriment of opportunities for TL input? Research on the nature and quantity of input in the language classroom and the language use in the EFL classroom has created much debate, especially around the use of the first language (L1) and teacher code-switching. These will be reviewed in section 2.3.
The results from studies by Wong-Fillmore (1980), and Allen, Fröhlich & Spada (1984) suggest that both teachers and students code-switch to a larger extent in informal situations whereas the target language dominated in formal ones (as quoted in Lin, 2013). Later studies show that code-switching is used to create close relationships between students and their teachers (Jingxia, 2010; Lin, 2013). These functions of code-switching will be further described in section 2.3.2. Section 2.3.3 will highlight how much L1 can be used in EFL classroom.

This chapter also reviews research on English language teaching and learning in EFL contexts in Indonesia in order to situate the present research. No studies of classroom discourse have been conducted in my particular research context. In the wider Indonesian context, there has been extensive research dealing with all aspects of English teaching and learning processes (e.g. Hidayati, 2012; Mukhlisin, 2015; Suyanto, 2003, 2008; Zacharias, 2003, 2011); these findings can be used, in the Padang context, to refer to the development of language teaching in terms of the curriculum documents and their applications. The relevant literature will be further investigated in section 2.4.

It is important to add here that in the Padang context where this research has taken place, learning English can be considered as an even more complex phenomenon as it is often the third language being acquired. The students’ first language is Bahasa Minang, an oral vernacular; they come from an oral culture,
but they then are learning Bahasa Indonesia, which is a written language. They also have to learn another written language (English) while they have not fully acquired oracy and literacy in Bahasa Indonesia. As a consequence, both teacher and students participate in a complex linguistic landscape. Section 2.5 and 2.6 briefly describes Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Minang.

I will now begin by elaborating the role of input and output in the ESL/EFL classroom.

2.2 The role of input-output in ESL/EFL classrooms

This subsection illustrates research on the role of target language in the context of the ESL/EFL classroom. Research on second language/foreign language acquisition has demonstrated that teacher talk as linguistic input influences the learners’ language competence (Caukill, 2015; Cullen, 1998; Gass, 2013; Inbar-Lourie, 2010; Krashen, 1982, 2003; Long, 1980; Mackey & Abbuhl, 2005; Kiasi & Hemmati, 2014; Tuan & Nhu, 2010; Wesche, 1994; Wong-Fillmore, 1985). Researchers have attempted to investigate classroom discourse in relation to comprehensible input by examining speech addressed to foreign language (L2) learners (e.g. Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Tsui, 1985), in order to find out features which might be important for second/foreign language acquisition. Such studies aimed to discover the nature of the contribution of teacher talk as language input in the classroom setting.

Krashen, in his Input Hypothesis (1985), mentions that learners acquire the target language if the input is made comprehensible by appropriate
modification. Richards & Rogers (2001: 124-130) define comprehensible input as language directed to the learner that contains some new elements in it, but this is nevertheless understood by the learner because of linguistic, paralinguistic, or situational cues, or world knowledge back up.

In addition, Krashen (1981: 57) claims that comprehensible input is “the only causative variable” for language acquisition. Comprehensible input means that the input is presented at a level that is comprehensible, by whatever means are at the teacher's disposal as extra-sensory cues/stimuli, e.g. pictures, realia, physicalisation, sounds etc. He posits the workings of a subconscious process of acquiring language, which is similar to child language acquisition, which does not involve conscious learning. In line with Krashen (1981, 1982), Wong-Fillmore (1982) supports the notion that students learn to speak by listening, just as a child learns their mother tongue by listening to talk in his/her environment. A child acquires his/her mother tongue (L1) through exposure to and interaction with the language input provided by his/her surroundings. However, Krashen is also critised for assuming a degree of separation between acquisition and learning that has not been proven to exist. The idea that children do not consciously learn a language has recently been thrown into doubt by Patricia Kuhl and colleagues (Khul, 2010, 2014; Khul, Ramírez, Bosseler, Lin, & Imada, 2014) through longitudinal neuroscience experiments with bilingual and monolingual children. These studies show children are very much "conscious" in their language learning processes.
In the classroom, the teacher’s main role is to provide their learners with enough comprehensible input by listening to sufficient amounts of the target language, especially through Teacher Talk (Horst, 2010; Nation, 2003). Teacher Talk provides planned or semi-structured language input for the students (Ellis, 2008; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Musumeci, 1996). Many scholars concur with this apparently logical notion that teachers should provide the students with as much target language input as possible if second language/foreign acquisition (SLA) is to occur (see Ahmadi & Panahadeh, 2016; Bahrani, 2013; Ellis, 1994; Duff & Polio, 1990; Franklin, 1990; Krashen, 1982; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Tang, 2011; Turnbull, 2001; Wang, 2010; Wong-Fillmore, 1982; Yaqubi & Pouromid, 2013).

‘Input’ refers to language addressed to learners (either written or spoken) through any means of delivery (Krashen, 1982). Lightbown & Spada (2006: 201), in line with Krashen, define input as “the language that the learner is exposed to (either written or spoken) in the environment. Similarly to Krashen (1982) and Lightbown & Spada (2006), Sarab & Karimi (2008: 183) define input as “All types of data from the target language that the learner is exposed to and from which they learn”.

When comprehensible input is provided, learners will acquire new words by focusing on the message, not on the form itself (Krashen, 1985, 2003). Furthermore, he urges that comprehensible input fosters the leaners’ production of the language (p. 263). Therefore, learners should focus on listening before
speaking, or perhaps reading before writing, because the development of the receptive skills needs time to promote the conditions in which production may occur.

Krashen’s Input Hypothesis is known as the i + 1 Hypothesis, which means that, if the learner’s current level is ‘i’, then the learner would acquire the language only with language input of i + 1. The ‘i’ stands for interlanguage, the current level of acquisition of the learners. The ‘+1’ rule means that the level of the input should be slightly ahead of the learner’s interlanguage. Learners will begin to produce the language naturally when they have enough exposure to comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982, 1985, 2003; Zhang, 2009). However, Krashen’s notion of i + 1 has been critiqued, for the reason that his Input Hypothesis is not testable. Some also accuse him of plagiarizing Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development.

In trying to communicate with the learner in terms of comprehensible input, teachers often simplify and modify their speech (the TL) to promote their communication (Hasan, 2008; Wong-Fillmore, 1985). Gass & Selinker (1994: 199) elaborate teacher talk as including “slow speech rate, louder speech, long pauses, simple vocabulary, (e.g., few idioms, high frequency words), repetitions and elaborations, and paucity of slang”. Long (1985) as an example, examined the relationship between listening, on the one hand, and syntactic simplification and slow speech rate as used in ‘foreign talk’ on the other. He constructed two different academic style lectures–a ‘native-speaker style’ and a
‘foreign talk’ style. The foreign talk was modified from the native speaker version by reducing the complexity of its syntax and speech rate. His findings show that the subjects who were exposed to ‘foreign talk’ could answer more comprehension questions about the lecture than the students who heard the native speaker version. Long’s findings are in line with what Krashen (1985) suggests: that modified input will enhance the student’s acquisition.

Richards & Rodgers (2001: 182) support Hasan (2008) and mention that the term “comprehensible input refers to teacher’s utterances which learners understand on the basis of context which they are used to as well as the language they have learned”. They further point out that it is the modification of teacher’s speech that can make the input comprehensible. They concluded that modification can occur in different forms, such as repetition, paraphrases of words or sentences, and reduction of sentence length and complexity. Their conclusions are in accordance with Boulima (1999), who states that in non-native discourse language acquisition can be fostered by modified input when proficient speakers of the target language adjust their language to the level of the learner’s (1999).

In accordance with Richards & Rodgers’s and Boulima’s conclusions, Crichton (2009) in his study observed the responses given by students to their teacher’s use of the target language. Crichton concluded that teachers consciously adjust their use of the target language to the level of their students’ understanding to avoid overwhelming them and creating anxiety.
Like Krashen (1982), Wong-Fillmore (1985) has given attention to comprehensible input, but she puts more emphasis on the influence of teacher-student interaction in TL, as it offers more opportunities for learners to acquire the language. In line with Wong-Fillmore, Ellis (1994) contends that although language input is essential for acquisition, input alone is insufficient (Ortega, 2009; Rassaei, 2012), and the extent to which students actively use the target language is also important (Swain, 1985); another necessity for successful acquisition to occur is interaction. Ellis (1994) also claims that interactions are important because the learners can improve their language through interaction as they listen to others, their teacher or their friend, and then they can use all that they have learned for communication. This kind of activity is seen as helpful to promoting their language development. Interaction is significant because it is the means through which the learners can decode accessible target language structures and derive meaning from classroom activities (Chaudron, 1988; Gass, 2013; Lei, 2009; Wang & Castro, 2010).

Likewise, Boulima (1999) believes that negotiated interaction in the language classroom is important because it can enhance students’ language acquisition. Not only comprehensible input but also conversational interactions are key elements to promoting successful language acquisition. In order to acquire a language, learners should engage in conversation and interactions in the TL (Boulima, 1999). As regards this notion, most language classroom activities require teachers and learners to engage in negotiated interaction to reach
successful second/foreign-language production and maximum acquisition (Musumeci, 1996). The more opportunities the students have to negotiate meaning, the more they may advance second-language processing towards automaticity.

To sum up, although Krashen’s hypothesis has been debated and criticized because of its overemphasis on the role of input, and its disregard of the importance of learner’s active participation in second language interaction, it highlights an important language-teaching principle for successful language learning to occur. Maximizing comprehensible input as well as interaction is the ultimate goal in a language-learning situation, as this is an important aid to acquisition (Ellis, 1994). Learners should be provided with message-oriented input they can understand (Krashen, 1982). Comprehensible input will lead to comprehensible output (Swain & Lapkin, 1995), which indicates that learners are capable, not only of understanding, but also of producing language. Consequently, as it is believed that teachers control who speaks and when (Johnson, 2002; Talley & Hui-Ling, 2014), teachers should carefully consider the language they use in the classroom, because this language functions as input and can serve to elicit output, which the following will suggest enhances production.

While ‘input’ is obviously required in language acquisition, research has also shown that ‘output’ plays an important role in SLA. A number of researchers confirm that language input has been regarded as very important in language
acquisition and learning (e.g. Bahrani, Sim, Nekoueizadeh, 2014; Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; Ellis, 1994; Krashen, 1982; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Long, 1983; Meng & Wang, 2011). However, it has also been noted that language output can promote language acquisition and learning (Ellis, 1994; Krashen, 1982; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Long, 1980; Swain, 1995; Wang & Castro, 2010). Ellis (1985) presents ‘output’ as any instances of learner language, within a linguistic system that an L2 learner is creating while acquiring an L2. In simple words Ellis (2008: 257) and Long (1996) refer to output as “language produced by the learner”. In the present research, following Ellis (2008) and Long (1996), the term ‘output’ is interpreted as any utterance that the students produce in the TL.

Pica (1983) contends that output may trigger the learners to pay attention to the target linguistic form in order to express their intended meaning which then leads to comprehensible output. Comprehensible output is the ability to produce language (Long, 1985; Swain, 1985). Swain (1985) is well-known for her Comprehensible Output Hypothesis which stresses the importance of giving the learner opportunities to produce comprehensible output during the interaction, a theory that is in contradiction to Krashen who believes that the learners’ language acquisition leads to speaking ability rather than being a consequence of it (Krashen, 1985). In other words, the learner can develop high levels of language and literacy competence without any language production (Krashen, 1994).
Swain (1985) conducted research on French immersion students in Canadian K-12 schools where the students received an extensive amount of comprehensible input in all school subjects. Findings were that second-language listening skills were more developed than speaking skills during and at the conclusion of such programs. Long (1996) suggested that this might be due to the students being passively exposed to comprehensible input; they were not required to produce as much language in the context of the interaction. Swain & Lapkin (1995) claim that when producing the language, learners will have the opportunities to test out what they know about the target language. The learner needs to be pushed to produce the language, thus they are in a better position to notice the ‘gaps’ in their language knowledge. Hence, learners can practice the target language and modify it, monitoring their output for accuracy and other features. Furthermore, if the students practice more in the target language, they will be more motivated to engage in further communication when they have the opportunity to use the language they have learnt.

From a different perspective, Hall (1995) supports Swain & Lapkin (1995). He found that the teacher in a Spanish FL speaking class used a “recitation script”, which provided the students with only a limited context for language use, and thus the result was that the students were not given the opportunity to initiate meaningful interaction and become competent participants in the target language. It appeared that the students in Hall’s study did not have many opportunities to use the TL and thus promote, what Swain (1985) calls,
‘noticing’. The learners improve their language proficiency by pushing them to speak using the target language in meaningful ways.

To summarise, Swain (1995) claims that output has three functions: it serves the second language learning process through hypothesis testing (a hypothesis-testing function); it serves a metalinguistic function for language learning (a metalinguistic function); and it can promote noticing; learners may notice the gap in their language output between what they want to say and what they can say (a noticing-the-gap function).

Izumi, Bigelow, Fujiwara & Fearnow (1999) conducted a study of immersion students on what Swain (1995) called the ‘noticing-the-gap function’. They investigated two classes of ESL students. Both groups, the experimental group and the control group, were exposed to the same input (short reading passages) for comprehension. The experimental group produced written output while the comparison group only comprehended the passage. They found that the experimental group achieved a high level of L2 achievement and demonstrated better results in terms of correct grammar because they actually engaged in language production. When learners produce language they encounter a gap in their linguistic knowledge of the target language. The learners become aware of the gap and are able to modify their output, consequently they learn something new about the target language (Swain, 1995; Izumi et al., 1999).
Accordingly, there is a necessity for communication-oriented foreign and second language classrooms that encourage and push students to produce TL (Allen, Fröchlich & Spada, 1983; De la Fuente, 2002). The importance of output is also underlined by Pica (1996), who argues that awareness of one’s gaps in communication and the metalinguistic function are important factors and reasons to push students into producing TL.

De la Fuente (2002) claimed that for adolescent learners pushed output and negotiated meaning resulted in better productive skills than merely listening to target language input. However, De la Fuente, in agreement with other researchers into the phenomenon, concluded that both comprehensible input and comprehensible output are necessary in language learning (Long, 1996; Swain & Lapkin, 1995); and they are best realized in interaction (Khatib & Bagherkazemi, 2011). The connection between input and output in ESL/EFL learning has been summed up by Long (1996: 451-452) as follows:

…negotiation for meaning, and especially negotiation work that triggers interactional adjustments by the NS or more competent interlocutors, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways.

The following subsection elaborates the notion of the target language use as input in the EFL classroom.

2.2.1 The use of TL as input in EFL classrooms

This subsection is concerned primarily with code-switching and teacher talk. The notion that “teachers talk too much” has perhaps acted as a barrier to
evaluating teacher talk as language input. However what may be important is not only so much the quantity of teacher talk, but also how teachers talk, what language they use, and whether they talk in the right kind of way to aid language development. In fact, Turnbull & Arnett concluded after their review of studies in several countries, “there is near consensus that teachers should aim to make maximum use of the TL” (2002: 211). Likewise, LeLoup, Ponterio & Wardford (2013) suggest the maximal use of TL in EFL classrooms. Some research evidence does exist in supporting the claim that high usage of the TL in the classroom correlates significantly with student achievement (Carroll, 1975; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Polio & Duff, 1994; Rondon-Pari, 2014).

Neil (1997) studied ten teachers of German as a foreign language in Northern Ireland, investigating the use, from the teachers’ perspective, of the target foreign language in secondary schools. He concluded that the use of the TL would help the learner to develop their target language. In line with Neil (1997), Turnbull & Arnett (2002) discuss a theoretical rationale for the use of the TL in the classroom discourse. They found that teacher talk in the target language helped the students’ achievements. Their findings appear similar to that of Singleton & Ryan (2004), who discussed some studies carried out in America which focused on the effects of a program of foreign languages in elementary school, and found that the length of exposure to the target language differentiated the students’ level of proficiency in an L2. The longer they were exposed to the TL, the better their language proficiency became. Their findings
reveal that the role of the TL, as the main language input leading to student TL language output, is critical.

Mayfield (2005) in her action research in primary language classrooms found that students started producing spontaneous utterances in the target language earlier than in other classes where she used mostly the mother tongue.

In supporting the TL use in the EFL classroom, Chaudron (1985: 21) mentions that

...in the typical foreign language classroom, the common belief is that the fullest competence in the TL is achieved by means of the teacher providing a rich TL environment, in which not only instruction and drills are executed in the TL, but also disciplinary and management operations.

A study investigating the relationship between the size of the vocabulary and EFL listening, reading, and writing skills among grade 9 students in Denmark proved that the proportion of students’ vocabulary knowledge significantly correlated with their writing ability (Stæhr, 2008). This finding reveals that the size of the students’ receptive vocabulary is important for written production. It also confirms that productive lexical knowledge begins with receptive lexical knowledge (Nation, 2003) which can be interpreted as language input.

The teachers who were observed in Crichton’s research (2009) used the TL in most of their talking in order to provide their students with sufficient input. Particularly, Crichton found that the use of the TL by the teacher helped
students’ pronunciation and intonation when speaking, as they were constantly exposed to the ways the TL is pronounced.

This awareness of pronunciation may have the effect of increasing pupils’ confidence in speaking the TL. The teacher’s repetition of the language items may also make retrieval of expressions they need easier for the pupils (Crichton, 2009: 24).

In the EFL context, there are often large classes, such as in a context of this study, with limited contact hours, and this may affect student motivation and create challenges for learning; Teachers should use TL rather than L1 for motivational reasons (MacDonald, 1993; cited in Turnbull, 2001: 252). In this way, students see the target language as immediately useful, as opposed to only talking about the benefit of practicing using the target language. It leads to greater motivation on the part of the students (Turnbull & Arnett, 2002).

Maximal use of L2 is encouraged based on the reason that the TL classroom is mostly the only context they have for TL exposure (Littlewood & Yu, 2011). Moreover, it is claimed that if the teachers have recourse to students’ L1, the amount of comprehensible TL input decreases.

Linking those findings to the purposes of the communicative language classroom, authors such as Canale (1983), Brown (2001), Nunan (2004), and Littlewood (2007), confirm that there should be a focus on language as it is used in real contexts – language for ‘real life’ classroom communication in the form of modified and simplified language input (Krashen, 1985; Meng & Wang, 2011). For the aforementioned reasons, there is no doubt that the
language used by the teacher in EFL classroom interaction, particularly the TL, influences the learners’ language development. Hence, the student should be given opportunities to listen and then to use the TL. Consequently, teachers should keep in mind that the whole teaching time they have in the classroom is a significant opportunity for students to be exposed to the target language. Moreover, the students are more likely to use the TL if the teacher does so (Satchwell, 1997).

Furthermore, maximum TL exposure can improve students’ pronunciation when they listen to the teacher and practice the language themselves. What really matters is to show them that English is a language for genuine communication (Sifakis & Sougari, 2005) and functions as this in the classroom as well.

To sum up, it is particularly evident in the EFL context that teachers should offer TL as input as much as possible in the classroom since the teacher may often be the only source of EFL input. However, there is no empirical evidence that the exclusive use of the TL actually produces better language learners (Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Cook, 2001, 2008; Richards, 1985). Growing research suggest that there is a role for L1/L2 in EFL classroom (see Anton, 1999; Brook & Donato, 1994; Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Lo, 2015; De La Fuente, 2008; Swain & Lapkin, 1995; Rui & Chew, 2013; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002), but the amount and its specific use should be taken into consideration (see Macaro, 1997, 2005; Cook, 2001; Wardford, 2009).
2.2.2 The debate regarding target language and mother tongue use in EFL classroom

In more recent times, and considering the continuing expansion of EFL contexts, there has been debate and argument centered on whether language teachers should use the target language (TL) exclusively (e.g. Auerbach, 1993; Ceo-DiFrancesco, 2013; Chambers, 1992; Cummin, 2007; Krashen, 1982, 1985), or allow judicious use of learners’ L1 as the medium of instruction in the foreign language classroom (e.g. Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Cook, 2001; Duff & Polio, 1990; Rao, 2010; Rui & Chew, 2013; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003).

The Grammar-translation method has long been known in the history of language teaching. It utilised students’ L1 in the classroom, where language learners studied the foreign language through grammar and translation from the target language to the L1 or vice versa. This method was then rejected because it did not teach students to communicate in the target language. It was believed that English was best taught monolingually and that if the learners’ L1 was used the standards of English would drop (Auerbach, 1993). Moreover, it was believed that English native speakers were the ideal teachers.

Popular teaching methods developed which avoided the use of L1 in the classroom, including the Direct Method and Task–Based Learning Method, all of which are built on the assumption that the more the target language that is
used in the classroom, the better the instruction. The teachers who believed in this “English only” tenet often think of the use of the L1 in the classroom as a bad teaching (Ceo-DiFrancesco, 2013), because they strongly believed that the use of the students’ L1 will impede students’ progress in learning the target language (Auerbach, 1993) and the exclusion of the students’ L1 will ensure maximum exposure to TL input and enhance language acquisition (Cook, 2008). Krashen’s comprehensible input theory (1982) is in the same vein with these teachers’ beliefs.

2.2.3 Arguments opposing the “English only” tenet

In contrast, a change in the attitude towards the use of L1 in FL classroom has been noticed over the past years and there has been a renewed interest in investigating whether L1 in the classroom supports students in learning a language (see Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Arnfast & Jorgensen, 2003; Caukill, 2015; Evans & Morison, 2016; Inbar-Lourie, 2010; Lin, 1990; Mitchell, 1988; Shuchi & Islam, 2016; Waer, 2014).

Cook (2008) argued that the inclusion of the L1 in the L2 classroom “has been theoretically justified, verified by research and pedagogically accepted, while its exclusion is based on unexamined assumptions (cited in Brooks-Lewis, 2009: 217). “The rationale used to justify English only in the classroom is neither conclusive nor pedagogically sound” (Auerbach, 1993: 15).
However, Cook (2001) advises that teachers need to ensure that there is critical reflection around the sensible use of L1 in the EFL classroom. Cook addressed three main arguments for L1 avoidance in the L2/EFL language classroom.

a. The L1 acquisition argument (L1 and L2 are not acquired in exactly the same ways, they are different in developmental sequence). Monolingual L1 children do not have another language when they learn their L1, so they have to rely on their L1 only, whereas L2 learners already have an L1 which they can rely on.

b. The language compartmentalization argument (research has established that multiple languages are processed as one system, not separately).

c. The maximum provision of the L2 argument. The learner needs to experience the language in order to learn it. In addition it is of great importance to prevent negative transfer from L1 knowledge to L2 learning through maximum exposure to L2 and least exposure to L1 (Krashen, 1982).

Unlike the first language or the mother tongue environment that provides abundant and frequent linguistic sources, the resources in an EFL setting are usually limited. Teachers may be the only providers of language input. Moreover, in a school where students’ first language is spoken, students rarely have a chance to speak in the target language and so comprehensible input is also reduced. Consequently, without abundant language input, students can hardly learn a foreign language as effectively as they acquire their first language (Ortega, 2009).

Having described the debates around the use of L1 in the L2 classrooms, the following subsection further describes the pedagogical uses of L1 and L2 in the context of the field of code-switching in the classroom.
2.3 Code-switching

Research shows that switching between different languages is a common language behaviour that occurs in any normal interaction between speakers who share knowledge of the same languages (Bozorgian & Fallahpour, 2015; Lo, 2015; Raschka, Sercombe & Chi-Ling, 2009). This language behaviour is known as code-switching, an area of study which developed more recently into translanguaging, a different perspective in which the language users linguistic repertoire is examined holistically. Code-switching is conceptualized as a simple shift between codes or languages (Garcia & Wei, 2014). In the context of this study, code-switching will be used as the term to preserve the binaries, as L1 is seen as mediating the FL and therefore functioning as educational tool (Cook, 2001; Lo, 2015; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2015; Yıldız & Yeşilyurt, 2017).

Code-switching requires competence in all languages involved and therefore it is simplistic to consider it as simple mixture of two languages (Wei, 2005). In a similar vein, Moghadam, Samas, & Shahraki (2012: 2219) define code-switching as “shifting from one language to another in a conversation. It is a normal every day practice among people in the world for various reasons and usually an unconscious activity”. This study follows Moghadam et al.’s. (2012) definition of code switching and concludes that code-switching, like alternation between two languages in the same discourse, is a common phenomenon in the
present day bilingual classroom (see section 2.3.1 Code-switching in the EFL classroom).

### 2.3.1 Teachers' code-switching in the EFL classroom

The aim of this subsection is to take a more in-depth look into code-switching in language classrooms. The phenomenon of code-switching often concerns the use of L1 when the teacher and the students share the same mother tongue and the target language is the medium of instruction. Arnfast & Jorgensen (2003) define code-switching as the systematic use of L1 and L2 within conversation or utterances and it is treated as a competence which permits bilingual speakers to negotiate more fluently. Edmonson (2004: 156) points out that shifting between the target language and the mother tongue is only quite rarely called code-switching in the research on classroom interaction as code-switching is more frequently defined as the language use of bilinguals/multilinguals. There is evidence that in naturalistic contexts where participants in the discourse have unequal proficiency in one of their two languages, some code-switching occurs for the purpose of linguistic development as well as communication (David, 2004). This idea of code-switching has not been welcomed in the traditional L2/EFL classroom. Winford (2003: 108-109) suggests that this may be due to the reason that code-switching in language classrooms is commonly thought to be the result of incompetence.

Recent research in multilingualism has examined the positive effects of code-switching by the teacher in classroom discourse (e.g. Atkinson, 1987; Barani &
In the same vein, Lo (2015) has shown how changes in perception of the role played by the L1 in learning foreign languages have begun to impact upon classroom practice. Shuchi & Islam (2016: 62) suggest that

“A judicious and moderate use of L1 does not hinder learning; rather, it assists, aids and facilitates the teaching and learning process thus providing the teacher with an effective pedagogical tool for maximizing the learning outcomes”.

Macaro (2001: 72) concludes that “code-switching by the teacher has no negative impact on the quantity of students’ L2 production and that ‘Expert code-switching’ may actually increase and improve it”. Moreover, researchers also confirm that avoidance of the first language is unlikely to occur, especially when the teacher and learners share the same first language (Bozorgian & Fallahpour, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2014; Raschka et al., 2009; Rassaei, 2012).

Another positive effect may occur to do with structural accuracy. The grammar of the target language and the L1 often differ structurally and therefore comparing and contrasting them explicitly makes them meaningful, memorable and noticeable (Horst, 2010; Hung, 2012; Liu, Ahn, Baek, & Han, 2004). In such cases, translation focusing on the problem of misleading similarities between two languages (Atkinson, 1987) is much more effective than, as Harbord (1992) suggests, concept checking questions, eliciting language using visuals, or mime, as these may create potential ambiguity. Thus, only clarification in the L1 (mother tongue) can assure students that they understand
the exact meaning of a lexical item or structural feature (Butzkamm, 2003; Tian & Macaro, 2012).

These views may imply that in practical terms teachers cannot avoid using the L1. However, to put into practice these scholars’ ideas of the maximum and optimal use of L1 in a classroom is difficult (Zacharias, 2011) since teachers sometimes do not realize when they have used L1 (Polio & Duff, 1994; Copland & Neokleous, 2011).

Cook (1999, 2001) and Dickson (1992) argue that avoiding recourse to the native language may limit learners’ use of their ability to use their L1 for making connections and developing concepts in the foreign language, thus depriving them of an invaluable cognitive tool (Swain & Lapkin, 2000).

Cook (2001) emphasises that exclusive use of the TL in the classroom is not always desirable, as it does not lead to maximum language learning effectiveness. However, Cook (2001) also argues that TL should mostly be used in the classroom as a tool of communication. He agrees with the systematic use of L1 in the second language classroom for specific pedagogical purposes. Teacher or students can use their L1 for certain purposes, such as informing the students about the goals of the lesson, asking for feedback from the students, drawing comparisons between linguistic items and cultural items in the TL and giving instructions, if using the target language would be too difficult.
Careful use of the L1 can assist students in learning a language. It can be a facilitating, and not just an interference, factor (Yamamoto-Wilson, 1997). Communicative language teaching experts suggest that the usage of L1 should be minimised (Cook, 2001). However, to what extent it should be minimised is still an open question. How the L1 is used determines whether it is detrimental or helpful (Stephen, 2006). The following section discusses the functions of code-switching in the FL classroom context.

2.3.2 The functions of teachers’ code-switching in EFL classrooms

The pedagogical, sociological and psychological functions of code-switching are important factors in achieving the goal of the EFL classroom. Small but growing support for the use of L1 in the East and South East Asian region has been found, such as in China (Lin, 1990); Taiwan (Raschka et al., 2009); Japan (Myojin, 2007); Korea (Liu, Ahn, Baek & Han, 2004); and Indonesia (Zacharias, 2004 in Forman, 2012; Hidayati, 2012; Muhlisin, 2015; Usadiati, 2009). Lin (1990) analysed teachers’ language choices in English language classes. Her findings show that the teachers who were observed switched from TL (English) to L1 (Cantonese):

1) to signal a shift from teaching to disciplining,
2) to establish a friendly relationship with the students,
3) to signal modifications of the participation framework.

Teachers also switched to L1:

4) to prompt students to respond,
5) to check their understanding,
6) to clarify difficult grammar points, and
7) to explain vocabulary, language rules and complex instructions.

In this light, Cook (2001: 418) suggested systematic uses of the L1 in the classroom:

1) To provide a short cut for giving instruction and explanation where necessary.
2) To develop interlinking of L1 and L2 knowledge in the students’ minds.
3) To carry out learning tasks through collaborative dialogue with fellow students.
4) To develop L2 activities such as code-switching for later-life use.

In my study, I follow Cook’s (2001) systematic use of the L1 in the classroom and categorize them into pedagogical and affective functions. The pedagogical function refers to Cook’s point one of systematic use of L1 in the classroom. The affective function refers to points 2 and 3, and also reflect the social and psychological aspects; code-switching for later life-use will not be considered in this study.

2.3.2.1 Pedagogical functions

A considerable amount of literature has strongly suggested that the use of L1 in the EFL classrooms can be productive or even maybe necessary in terms of pedagogical functions. Atkinson (1987) further proposes that L1 is used to check comprehension, to elicit certain L2 translations and to give complex instructions in communicative activities. Polio & Duff conducted a study in 1990 aimed at exploring how much foreign language (TL) was used in FL classrooms. In 1994, Polio & Duff went back to their 1990 data. They focused on the primary issues looking at the teacher’s use of the L1 rather than the TL.
Their analysis reveals that instructors often deal with communication breakdowns by switching to L1, rather than negotiating in the TL.

Polio & Duffs’ findings manifest the crucial role of TL as input in the EFL classroom. They believe that the high percentage of L1 used by the teachers was due to teachers being focused on grammar and concerned about their own progress in their teaching (Polio & Duff, 1994). In explaining the grammar, those teachers whom they observed used L1 instead of TL. The strategy used by the teachers in the studies done by Mitchell (1988), Lin (1990), and Duff & Polio (1990), therefore, does not accord with the views of Krashen (1982) and Cook (2001) in terms of exposure to the TL.

Another researcher, Pennington (1995: 99), taking a similar view on the issue of language choice, defines categories of motives for L1 use in bilingual classrooms as ‘compensatory’ and ‘strategic’. The compensatory category refers to the teacher’s need to adjust to the students’ levels in terms of low competence, low motivation and poor discipline. Teachers who taught the lower level classes switched to L1 more than the teachers who were teaching more able students. Pennington concluded that the teacher adjusted the amount of their TL use to the learner’s level of English proficiency. For strategic motives, the L1 is used to establish solidarity: to interact, to explain or discuss, to lower the level of challenge, and to gain students’ long-term attention and response.
In a later study by Orland-Barak & Yinon (2005), the perceptions of two groups of EFL teachers were compared – Hebrew speakers versus speakers of Arabic – as to the use of the learners’ L1 in the EFL classroom. Both groups of teachers held a similar opinion as to when and why the L1 should be used. Both groups mentioned that the L1 was mostly used for clarification, communication and managerial purposes.

In a more recent study, Inbar-Lourie (2010), studied six teachers from four different schools. Her research aimed to explore the amount and the functions of teachers’ L1 use in the language classroom. Inbar-Lourie (2010: 259-360) found that the teachers used L1 for three common functions:

1) explaining grammar and comprehension, and explaining new words and concepts;
2) classroom management (instructions, discipline); and
3) for affective purposes and providing feedback, such as motivating and comforting students.

Lin’s finding is in accordance with that of Inbar-Lourie (2010) in terms of using L1 in explaining the grammar.

Brooks & Donato (1994: 269) reported that L1 use among students was to explain the task to each other, negotiate roles they are going to take, or check their comprehension or their production of language against that of their classmates.

To sum up, most of the scholars discussed above agree on one point for the use of L1, namely, explaining grammar. Explaining grammar using the target
language is difficult, especially when the teacher has limited fluency in the target language (Mitchell, 1988).

2.3.2.2 Affective functions

Anton & DiCamilla (1998) investigated an adult learner of Spanish using his first language (English). They seem to argue that the use of L1 in the language classroom functions as an effective tool, which provides the learners with the scaffolding language to assist them to analyse and work with the grammar of the target language. They provide reasons why it is difficult for teachers to use only L2 in explaining structure, arguing that using L1 really helps the teacher in explaining the grammar rules. Anton & DiCamilla’s findings regarding the use of L1 in explaining grammar in L2 classroom are therefore in accordance with those of Inbar-Lourie (2010) and Lin (1990). Taking the benefit of what the students have already known conceptually, strategically, and linguistically allows “a cumulative development” and “intellectual continuity” in language development (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009).

A less-investigated area suggests that the students’ L1 is important for both students and their teachers in order to establish their relationship (Jingxia, 2010; Lin, 2013; Pablo et al., 2011). Dickson (1996) proposed that the use of students L1 in the classroom can be useful because it links rapport with students to motivation and effective learning. Moreover, the use of the students’ L1 will lower students’ affective filters and create a more comfortable learning environment in the classroom (Pablo et al., 2011).
2.3.3 How much L1 is useful?

If the finding of beneficial use of L1 in the EFL classroom is taken to its logical conclusion, however, it introduces the dangerous possibility of overuse of L1 and the neglect of the oral use of TL— a situation that would no doubt be as unacceptable to the students as to the teacher (Cook, 2001; Cummins, 1996; Tuan & Nhu, 2010; Vib sulphol, 2012); this is especially so in the context of EFL teaching where the language input comes mainly from the teacher, e.g. the context of the present study, the elementary school level in Indonesia, particularly in the area of Padang, West Sumatra, Indonesia.

Given this, we need to further discuss to what extent the use of L1 in the classroom is advisable. As mentioned previously, in the context of the present study, students only have seventy minutes of English lessons per week, which constitutes the only exposure the students have to TL as input.

Although the literature states L1 is useful to some extent, various researchers have also warned of the detrimental effects of its over-use in EFL, and do not support its random use (Atkinson, 1987). Turnbull (2000) and Storch & Wigglesworth (2003) advocate a ‘moderate and judicious’ use of the L1 in the lower levels of learner proficiency. Notions of moderate and judicious use of L1 in the classroom may theoretically sound applicable, but are not so easy to apply in classroom practice, especially in the EFL classroom, where, in many cases, the teacher can speak the students’ native language (Turnbull & Arnett,
Within such contexts, the important consideration is whether or not the students have sufficient opportunity to actually hear and use the language in the process of learning due to the reasons that teachers are not always aware of when and why they code switch (Polio & Duff, 1994). Sert (2005) also concurred that the teacher’s use of code-switching is not always a conscious choice, and that teachers are therefore not always aware of the functions and resultant outcomes.

Cook (2001) points out that teacher need to ensure that there is critical reflection around the sensible use of L1 in the EFL classroom. In trying to make sense of the contradictory data of abundant versus limited L1 use, Macaro (2001: 545) calls for a framework “that identifies when reference to L1 can be a valuable tool and when it is simply used as an easy option”.

In terms of how much L1 can be used in the EFL classroom in relation to language input, Atkinson (1987) supports productive use of L1 for 5% of the classroom session at lower levels. Turnbull (2001) and Calman & Daniel (1998) also specify that the appropriate usage of L1 in EFL classroom context is less than 25%. It can obviously be concluded that having less than 5% of the L1 means optimizing TL use. It appears that limited L1 use facilitates more time saving class activity. Turnbull (2000) believes that EFL teachers who use the L1 more than 75% of their time using actual classroom discourse risk depriving the learners of useful language input. Therefore, he called for maximum target language use by the teachers. Macaro (2011) suggests that
teachers’ should use 80% of lesson time in TL. Sato (2009, 2015) emphasized that teachers should increase the use of TL in a Japanese EFL classroom in his study.

Macaro (2001: 535) concluded that L1 use in the classroom can be perceived in the following ways:

1. The virtual position. The classroom is like the target country. Therefore we should aim at total exclusion of the L1. There is no pedagogical value in L1 use. The L1 can be excluded from the FL classroom as long as the teacher is skilled enough.

2. The maximal position. There is no pedagogical value in L1 use. However, perfect teaching and learning conditions do not exist and therefore teachers have to resort to the L1.

3. The optimal position. There is some pedagogical value in L1 use. Some aspects of learning may actually be enhanced by the use of the L1. There should therefore be a consistent exploration of pedagogical principles regarding whether and in what ways L1 is justified.

Cook (2001), Schweers (1999) and Tang (2002) indicated that 5% to 30% might be the acceptable use of L1 for students. However, this percentage was based on the questionnaire given to college students in Puerto Rico and China investigating students’ attitudes toward the use of L1.

Since the students and the teacher in this research may bring both Bahasa Minang (their mother tongue) and Bahasa Indonesia (their second language) to the classroom, it is thus more likely for them to code-switch because three languages are involved in the classroom interaction, as described below. Therefore, consideration of exactly how much the teachers and the students use
the L1 and the TL becomes crucial as well as complex in this research context. Thus, the following sections discuss English language teaching and the teaching of Bahasa Indonesia in the context of the study.

2.4 English language teaching in Indonesia

Communicative competence is one of the main goals in teaching English in Indonesia because of the growth in the use of English in many areas of professional and personal life in Indonesia. In addition, Indonesia is surrounded by diverse cultures and languages in Asia and Australia. For this reason, English is used as a means of communication across cultural and linguistic boundaries, such as in commercial trade, studying, foreign affairs, etc.

Research carried out by Suyanto (2003) in two provinces in Indonesia, West Sumatra and East Java, showed that more than 80% of the elementary teachers who teach English as a subject are not qualified as elementary school teachers. In addition, Chodijah (2008) did a study on the elementary English teachers in Daerah Istimewa Jakarta and found that only 20% of the teachers at the elementary school level were competent to teach English. Musthafa (2010) and Wati (2011) also confirm that most elementary school teachers of English are not prepared for teaching at elementary level but instead they are prepared for teaching English at the secondary school level.

Indonesian governments have been very protective of local languages (Nur, 2004) in relation to Bahasa Indonesia (Sadtono, 1979) and fear that an
emphasis on English will cause those local languages to disappear (Nur, 2004). This might be one reason why English as a subject was dropped from primary schools in July 2013 (2013 Curriculum).

However, it should be noted that Baker (2011) reported in his findings on English language learning programs for immigrants in California that it takes three to five years to develop oral proficiency (listening and speaking in English). These findings reinforce the argument that students in the EFL context, such as the context of this study, Indonesia, would require a longer time for the acquisition of basic communicative skills because of the lack of exposure to target language input. The implication of Baker’s findings is that the Indonesian government policy to start English at secondary school (grade 7) will lead to such a lack of exposure and inhibit competence developing.

It is to be noted that the data for the present study was collected at the beginning of 2013 or before the 2013 Curriculum was launched. My study explores teachers’ understandings of how, when and why they code-switch in EFL classrooms. A clearer understanding of code-switching in EFL teaching may lead to important innovations to the language teaching curriculum in the Indonesian context.
2.5 The teaching of Bahasa Indonesia

History tells us that before the Youth Pledge in 1928, the Indonesian archipelago officially had no common language. Each of the more than 600 ethnic groups spoke its own language.

Every October 28th, Indonesian people celebrated a day called “Hari Sumpah Pemuda (The Youth Pledge Day). This day commemorates the day the Indonesian youth declared “Sumpah Pemuda” or Youth Pledge.

“Kami putra dan putri Indonesia bertumpah darah satu, tanah air Indonesia. (We, the sons and daughters of Indonesia, acknowledge one motherland, Indonesia)

Kami putra dan putri Indonesia, mengaku berbangsa satu, bangsa Indonesia. (We, the sons and daughters of Indonesia, acknowledge one nation, the nation of Indonesia)

Kami putra dan putri Indonesia, menjunjung tinggi bahasa persatuan, bahasa Indonesia.” (We, the sons and daughters of Indonesia, uphold the language of unity, Bahasa Indonesia)

Indonesia has a diverse background, as regards religion, ethnicity, cultures and languages. “Sumpah Pemuda” has united all the various diversities since the Indonesian youth declared it in October 28, 1928. It was the time when the youth declared their willingness to do every single thing in the name of Indonesia and for the social welfare of the Indonesian people. The goal was to establish an independent Indonesia as one motherland, one nation and with one language.
Bahasa Indonesia (BI) has become a powerful unifying language throughout the country. In 1945, Bahasa Indonesia officially has served as a lingua franca. This language was then chosen as the national language of Indonesia and given the name Bahasa Indonesia. Originally Bahasa Indonesia came from Malay, a language spoken around Western parts of Sumatra island (Anwar, 1980). The choice of this among many other regional languages was a political decision based on the rationale of national unification (Koentjaraningrat, 1976; Anwar, 1980).

Bahasa Indonesia is a subject that must be taught at every level of education in Indonesia, from elementary school level to senior high school level, as well as at university. The goal of learning Bahasa Indonesia is for the students to "have the ability to speak Bahasa Indonesia well and correctly and appreciate the Indonesian language and literature in accordance with the situation and objectives and the level of the experience elementary school students"(Akhadiah, Arsjad, Ridwan, Zufahnur, & Mukti, 1991: 1).

Bahasa Indonesia is taught in grades 1, 2, and 3 during as many as 6 hours of lessons, and in grades 4, 5, and 6 as much as 5 hours of lessons per week (Depdiknas, 2006). A large number of hours in teaching Bahasa Indonesia is intended to help students to have the ability to speak Bahasa Indonesia well and to develop the ability to think and reason critically in it. The teaching and learning of Bahasa Indonesia in schools is associated with the overarching function of language as a means of communication.
In order for the teaching and learning of Bahasa Indonesia to be managed properly, an understanding of the theory of language acquisition needs to be understood by those who teach it. Therefore, the teaching of Bahasa Indonesia is focused on the usage of Bahasa Indonesia rather than on the theory or knowledge of the language. Learning a language is learning to communicate, so the learning activities focus on fostering the ability to use the language.

Mahsun (2013) reports that Bahasa Indonesia is taught using a text-based learning approach. With this approach, Bahasa Indonesia is not only the means of communication but also a means of developing critical thinking. Text is the expression of human minds that is shaped by the context of the situation in the use of the language (Mahsun, 2013).

Furthermore, when reviewing the literature on the terms used, there is complexity because many people commonly refer to Bahasa Indonesia as the Indonesian language or Indonesian, or even Bahasa, which is wrong because the word ‘bahasa’ simply means language. As an example, people from West Sumatra who are known as Minangkabau people speak Bahasa Minang and people from Java Island speak Bahasa Jawa. I will clarify here that the languages involved in this research are referred to as Bahasa Indonesia, Bahasa Minang and English.
2.6 Bahasa Minang

West Sumatra is a part of the island of Sumatra. It is 42,297.30 square kilometers in area. Its population is approximately 4,846,909 (sumbar.bps.go.id, Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia) of which 95% are members of the Minangkabau ethnic group. The remaining 5% consist of people of mixed origins or the minorities who have made West Sumatra their homes, such as the Indians, Arabs, Chinese and a number of Javanese (Koentjaraningrat, 1976).

West Sumatra, known as Minangkabau, is one of the industrialized provinces in Indonesia. The people have long been Muslims, and Minangkabau traditions (adat) co-exist with Islam. For Muslims, there is no distinction between religion and lifestyle; religion is a lifestyle. Customs and tradition in Minangkabau are called “Adat Minangkabau”. It is a philosophy of life and a way of thinking. “Adat” is ultimately subject to correction by Islam. Moreover, it is an important part of “Adat” to give strong support to Islam (Anwar, 1980).

For the Minangkabau people, language is a social institution. Minangkabau people have a local language, Bahasa Minang, which is almost identical to Bahasa Indonesia (Anwar, 1980). Generally equivalents for words in Bahasa Minang can be found in Bahasa Indonesia by changing certain sounds. For example, the word “taba” in Bahasa Minang and its Bahasa Indonesia equivalent “tebal” or “jua” in Bahasa Minang and its equivalent is “jual” in Bahasa Indonesia (Yunus, 1990).
Bilingualism is an important characteristic of the Minangkabau speech community. Like many bilinguals, Minangkabau people identify themselves as native speakers of Bahasa Minang. The term native speaker usually refers to someone who learned a language in a natural setting from childhood as a first language (Ferguson, 1994), although it should be noted that there is considerable debate about this definition, particularly in terms of levels of proficiency.

Skutnabb-Kangas (1994) proposes four criteria for identifying an individual’s natural language; they are origin, identification (external and internal), competence, and function. Minangkabau people are regarded as competent speakers in Bahasa Minang. Its main use is in informal situations. Anwar (1980: 23) explains that “The Minangkabau community highly values its members’ skills in using correct and symbolic speech (or ‘indirect’ ways of communication suitable for maintaining social relationships), but at the same time put great emphasis on moderation and restraint. It is a community which relies very much on oral skill and like many other communities which are rich in oral literature, the position of “orator” in the community is very high”.

Bahasa Minang has no written form. It is an oral language only used in informal contexts, such as talking to friends, to family, at the market, etc. The Minangkabau use Bahasa Indonesia on formal occasions such as the conduct of formal ceremonies or meetings, or in communications that require writing.
They write in Bahasa Indonesia to their parents and relatives as well as to their friends (Anwar, 1980).

According to Anwar (1980) the Minangkabau speech community is diglossic, that is to say that it is marked by varieties which generally fall into a dichotomy of High and Low. Bahasa Indonesia is in high position and Bahasa Minang is in the lower. This means a person who enjoys a higher social status or has power or wealth may choose Bahasa Indonesia as a means of communication in the family, though normally he/she would prefer to use Bahasa Minang.

Having described the particular linguistic landscape of Indonesia I return to the issue of code-switching in the following section, but in the specifically Indonesian context.

2.7 Code-switching studies in Indonesia

In the context of this study, the students at elementary school level in Indonesia learn English ± 70 minutes per week (Depdiknas, 2006). The teacher is often the major source of TL input in an EFL classroom, as in other foreign language teaching contexts (see Ellis, 1994; Wong-Fillmore, 1985). It is therefore taken for granted that teacher use of the TL is essential. However, teachers frequently use BI to discuss the topic (Diknas, 2010) and to some extent, to explain the grammatical rules of English (Zacharias, 2011). In this type of classroom, teachers and their respective classes communicate in their national language, Bahasa Indonesia, as a second language. Moreover, both the teacher
and the students share the same first language, Minangkabau language, as the regional language. These leads to the possibility of teacher and student code-switching in classroom discourse even when English is put aside.

A limited number of studies has examined code-switching in EFL classrooms in Indonesia. Most recently, Arung (2015) investigated university students’ and teachers’ attitudes toward the use of Bahasa Indonesia in teaching English as a foreign language. The results indicated that the attitude of the students and the teachers towards using Bahasa Indonesia were generally positive. Arung (2015) used questionnaires and observations to study the use of L1 in EFL classrooms.

Hidayati (2012) explored the role of Bahasa Indonesia in teaching receptive skills and grammar in 6 classes of different majors and six lectures at university level in Bandung. Her study reveals that judicious use of Bahasa Indonesia supports the English language learning process. She also found that some teachers still overused Bahasa Indonesia in the EFL classroom. These findings in terms of the use of the L1 are similar to Cook’s (2001), and Caukill’s (2015) that the L1 is often used to teach grammar.

The study of language choice by Zacharias (2003) at tertiary level in Indonesia demonstrates the use of Bahasa Indonesia in explaining grammar. The aim of her study was to investigate teachers’ beliefs regarding the use of L1, and how teachers’ beliefs influenced their classroom practices. Zacharias claims that
Bahasa Indonesia is commonly used in the process of teaching TL. Teachers used BI to explain grammatical points and the meaning of new words, to give instructions, to check learner’s understanding, and to give feedback. Moreover, according to Zacharias, not much research on language use in EFL classrooms has been done in Indonesia. It appears that no research has yet been conducted in the context of EFL classrooms at the elementary school level in Indonesia, in terms of language use by the teacher.

In line with Zacharias’ findings, Mujiono, Poedjosoedarmo, Subroto & Wiratno (2013) investigated teachers of English in Indonesian universities and found that they alternated languages when they teach grammar. Mujiono et al. (2013) also claim that few studies have been done on code-switching in EFL classes in Indonesia. They further mention in their findings that Bahasa Indonesia was used to explain grammar at university level.

Regarding language use, Semiun (2009) conducted research on senior high school EFL teachers in West Timor, in the province of East Nusa Tenggara, and found that the teachers used Bahasa Indonesia for most of the time during English language classroom instruction. Those teachers interviewed mentioned that they used Bahasa Indonesia due to their lack of proficiency in English. In addition, teachers seem to have been inadequately prepared to implement the curriculum (Djiwandono, 2009).
Yulia (2014) evaluated the English program at 12 junior high schools in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Most teachers in her 12 case studies reported that they spoke English (45%), a ‘mixture’ of English and Indonesia (50%), and Bahasa Indonesia (5`). However, Yulia reported that her observation data displayed that the participant teachers in her study mostly spoke a mixture of Bahasa Indonesia and English as well as in Bahasa Indonesia. A few of them even spoke in Javanese (L1), a local language in Java Island, in Indonesia.

Those teachers in Yulia’s study believed that they were more comfortable communicating in Bahasa Indonesia than English. Furthermore, they contended that the students asked them to speak in Bahasa Indonesia or Javanese because they did not understand their teacher if the teacher spoke in English. In contrast, when the students were asked which language they wanted the teacher to speak, 69.7% of the students agreed that their teacher should speak in English in class.

In Indonesia, some research supports teachers’ use of L2 in the EFL classroom for the reason that MT scaffolds students understanding and accuracy of English grammatical use (see Arung, 2015; Usadiati, 2009). For example, Usadiati (2009) reported that students in her research had more success in writing sentences in the Present Perfect Tense (45% of the students) when she used MT interchangeably with English in the explanations (25% and 75% respectively) and (80% of the students) when she used 50% English and 50% MT. She quoted Ellis and Kelly’s (1997) findings that “L1 should not be minimised (Usadiati, 2009: 180)”; Matioli (2004) and Kavaliauskienė (2009)
claim that “it was not the questions of ‘how much’ L1 and L2 should be used, but ‘for what purpose” (in Usadiati, 2009: 180).

The fact that Usadiati (2009) was teaching grammar in her research explained why her use of the TL (75%) was hard for her students; and her use of TL (50%) and L1 (50%) helped her students to achieve the objective of the lesson. 50 % of the L1 used was too much, whereas Cook (2001) and Turnbull (2001: 536) recommended not using more than 5% of L1 used. In contrast Shapson, Kaufman, & Dyrward (1978) cited 25% as acceptable levels of L1 use. However, teaching grammar explicitly, especially at primary school level, is not recommended.

It is true that “a fixed percentage of the L1 use cannot be defined universally” (Edstorm, 2006). The use of L1 in the classroom should be viewed from the related perspectives of how much L1 should be used (Macaro, 2001; Turnbull & Arnett 2002) and for what purposes (Turnbull & Dailey, 2009). As mentioned previously, research has found that most teachers were not aware of their use of MT/SL in their interaction with students (Polio & Duff, 1994).

2.8 Approaches to code-switching studies

Studies on code-switching in language classrooms have mostly focused on either calculating the amount of TL and L1 spoken by teachers, or classifying the various functional uses of L1 in teacher talk. Studies which have involved the use of L1 in EFL classrooms have been mostly carried out in university
settings (De la Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Duff & Polio, 1990; Forman, 2010, 2012; Levine, 2011; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; McMillan & Rivers, 2011; Polio & Duff, 1994). In the context of the present study, there remain few research studies on EFL teachers’ use of L1 in their classroom (Arung, 2015; Wati, 2011; Usadiati, 2009; Zacharias, 2003), particularly, there still seems to be a lack of research studies situated at the elementary level.

The studies reviewed above, however, have numerous limitations due to their data collection method and analytic frameworks. First, as discussed by Polio & Duff, the ratios of TL and L1 use by the teacher which are based on teacher interviews or self-reports may be inaccurate, as the judgment of ratio can be subjective, varying among individuals, and the teachers themselves cannot exactly calculate how much SL or TL they use in class (1994). Furthermore, according to Polio & Duff (1994), the data shows that the perceptions of the teachers can vary in terms of not only the use of more TL in the FL classroom than is actually taking place, but also the use of the L1 in situations where it is not actually occurring. These inconsistencies further support the need for research into language use in the classroom, involving a greater understanding of the motivations behind L1/L2 and TL use, the types of language use, and a measure of language use, obtained from classroom observation and measurement, in the foreign language classroom.

Next, following the function-oriented approach, most of the studies fail to portray a complete picture of the EFL classroom. Most studies merely
enumerate the sociolinguistic functions performed by the teacher. Even though they find new categories of functions, their classification approach merely allows them to continuously add the new-found categories or to leave certain speech behaviour unanswered when it does not fit any functional category. Moreover, previous research seems confined to investigating only a segment of classroom interaction, not whole lesson units, therefore how much the L1/L2 or TL was used, for what purpose, and in what stage (pre-teaching, whilst teaching, or post teaching), was not comprehensively reported. Given the fact that foreign language classrooms in different educational settings might have their own unique characteristics, this study attempts to shed light on not only why and when teachers code-switch, but on their perceptions and beliefs of why they do so.

Furthermore, taken together, the available literature on code-switching has mostly applied interview/questionnaire and observations as the approach (see appendix 2). Those studies are hampered by some methodological problems. The purpose of interviews and questionnaires has been to investigate participants’ ideas about code-switching, but this was usually done without them listening or watching to the recorded materials of their classroom performance or focusing on any particular example of their code-switching. This might have undermined the reliability of the participants’ statements as they were based on what they had in mind at the time of the interview and, therefore, what they said might not fully describe their detailed belief systems about code-switching. In other words, what they stated in the interview might
not have entirely reflected their mental cognitive processes during their teaching. Consequently, the present study aims to fill this gap by utilizing a more reliable procedure investigating teachers’ code-switching.

In my study by contrast, I focus on code-switching in investigating the contextual use of second language (Bahasa Indonesia) and Bahasa Minang (as mother tongue) in the EFL elementary school classrooms. Furthermore, in the current study stimulated recall interview with teachers was used and classroom transcripts were examined according to sequential analysis of conversation analysis, and these methodological aspects will be fully described in the next chapter.

2.9 Summary

In this chapter I have reviewed literature on input and output in second language learning, with a specific focus on comprehensible input as the ultimate goal on learning English as a foreign language in the context of this study. The implication is that teachers need to use the target language as much as possible, but in targeted ways. Comprehensible input will lead to comprehensible output, which indicates that students are capable of understanding and then producing the language. Overall, the major studies reviewed acknowledge the central contribution of target language use in teacher talk to learner’s communicative competence. Learners should learn to communicate, listen to others to get the language input, talk with others in
terms of practicing the output, and involve themselves in the interaction to negotiate meaning in a shared context (Kang, 2008; Tuan & Nhu, 2010).

This chapter also discussed interaction in the EFL classroom and code-switching, including approaches to code-switching research and the functions of code-switching by language teachers, and described viewpoints from research on how much L1 can be used in the EFL classroom. Research into ‘good language use’ decisions, suggest that teachers actually need to code-switch to an extent in EFL classrooms. The research implies that there is a wide variation in TL and L1 use according to the level and location of schools, the teachers’ as well as the students’ English proficiency, and official recommendation of the TL use. Regarding the theoretical considerations mentioned so far, some scholars have found the L1 useful in the EFL classroom in areas such as explaining the grammar, explaining the task, scaffolding, checking comprehension, giving feedback, maintaining discipline, and testing (e.g. Hidayati, 2012; Lin, 1990; Mitchell, 1988; Zacharias, 2003).

The complexity the students and the teacher face is related to the idea that within the context of this study, teachers and students shared the same languages, Bahasa Indonesia and Bahasa Minang. In the EFL classrooms these two languages were also presented to highlight the code-switching employed by the teachers.
In conclusion, this study will address a specific gap in the literature on classroom interaction and language uptake by shedding new light on the issue of code-switching in EFL classrooms, its occurrences and nonoccurrences, and on clarifying the functions of code-switching. Conversation analysis as a tool and stimulated recall interview as an approach will be used, and the justification for this will be presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research design and sets out the rationale for the methodological choices that were applied to address the research questions:
What are the characteristics of teachers’ language input in EFL primary classrooms in Padang, Indonesia?

With the sub-questions:

- What are the pedagogical and affective factors that influence teacher code-switching in the Padang, Indonesian context?
- What are the perceptions of teachers in this context as to the relationship between code-switching and the effective teaching of English?

I will present the research design, then I will present a rationale for the research instrument. I will also provide a description of the setting where data were collected. Short biographical notes for each participating teacher follow. How data were collected will also be presented. Finally, the techniques and framework for data analysis are described, which include the development of the coding scheme for the analysis of the use of the BM, BI, and TL by the teachers and their students as well as the functions, which are discussed at the end.
I first used a frequency count of language used by the teachers, to establish raw data of the patterns of language use. The amount of language use of course, does not reveal much about the purposes of using a particular language or alternating between languages. I therefore undertook a qualitative analysis of code-switching in the classroom, based on transcripts of teacher talk in the observed lessons, and interviews with the teachers themselves. For the first phase I used Conversation Analysis (CA) as an instrument for coding the data, and for the second phase, I used the technique of stimulated recall with the teachers.

Certain methodological aspects of conversation analysis and its limitations in investigating the reasons for teachers’ code-switching were also discussed in this chapter. It was then demonstrated how the use of stimulated recall interviews could compensate for the limitation of the conversation analysis alone. A description of stimulated recall interview as a method of research in this study is presented.

3.2 Research design

A qualitative case study approach was applied to this research. Qualitative research is concerned with the phenomena in everyday life, in this case the reality of students’ and teachers’ lives. The exploration of meaning in context is the key to understanding a phenomenon (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013: 7).
Qualitative case study also provides an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved. Within case study research, a comprehensive understanding of the case is interpreted and analysed by taking into account the influence of each aspect in context and synthesising these aspects in a whole order to give an in-depth and comprehensive description of the case (Stake 2005). According to Yin (2003), a case study is used to answer “when”, “how”, and “why” questions in research. Thus, case study is appropriate to answer “when”, “how” and “why” teachers code-switched in this research context.

3.2.1 Research context

The participants of this study, both teachers and students, worked in two elementary schools in Kota Padang, West Sumatra, Indonesia – Sekolah Dasar Percobaan Negeri Kota Padang and Sekolah Dasar Pembangunan UNP Padang. These schools had included English-language instruction in the curriculum for at least the last 10 years. The former was a pilot school for elementary schools in Kota Padang (Diknas No: 302/C2/DL/2009- refers to a project number); the pilot school acted as a testing ground for subject, curriculum and methodology development, and as a model for elementary schools in the surrounding Kota Padang area. It was located in the centre of Padang City. Sekolah Dasar Pembangunan UNP Padang was linked to the Padang State University and the program offered there was developed with the university; thus, the English-language program at the school was developed by the English faculty members.
These two schools were set up as bilingual programmes or Rintisan Sekolah Berstandar Internasional (Pilot International Standard Schools as per Act of The Republic of Indonesia, 2009). This program was officially terminated in January 2013 because it appeared exclusively targeted for students with high economic status, and was thus criticised for discriminating against poor students (Margana, 2013). Rintisan Sekolah Berstandar Internasional was a school where students learn Maths and Science delivered in English. Some of the vocabulary they learned in English class might have already been learned in Math or Science class, for example, in English class they learned the vocabulary of ‘weather and seasons’. These vocabularies had already been learned in their Science class. In other words, these students were not only getting language input in the English class but also from Science and Math class.

The number of students in each class participating in this research ranged from 20 to 25. The classes selected for classroom recordings were the ones in which teachers A, B, and C, as I will refer to them, taught English. All the participating students were between 10 to 12 years of age. They had all learned English as a foreign language for a 70 minute period per week from first grade in elementary school. School terms run for a total of 34 weeks a year; thus, they potentially had 132 sessions of English-language instruction, or 9240 hours. In this sense, with the implementation of the 2013 curriculum, students who graduate from primary school miss a chance to be exposed to English in a classroom for 55,440 hours since they are not learning English in primary
school anymore. The students start learning English as a subject in year seven or secondary school (Depdiknas, 2013). In the 2013 curriculum, English as a subject in primary school in Indonesia was taken away from the curriculum. But up till now there are still discussions and debates on re-taking English teaching in primary schools in Indonesia (Tuhusetya, 2014).

Each English lesson in Indonesia, as in many contexts, consists of three stages: pre-teaching, ‘whilst-teaching’ (exploration, elaboration, and confirmation), and post-teaching, as required by the English curriculum for elementary school (Depdiknas, 2006). These stages need to be clearly stated in the teacher’s lesson plan for each lesson unit (see appendix 3 for an example of a teacher’s lesson plan). In pre-teaching activities, the teacher introduces the topic and gives the students clear instructions and modellings of the language to teach in that lesson. In the next stage, the ‘whilst-teaching’ stage, students are supposed to practice based on their needs, the aim being to encourage independent learning. In the post-teaching activity, the lesson concludes with the summary of the lesson that day. Hence, the present research explored the opening, body, and concluding stages of classroom discourse in terms of the language used.

One important difference between the present study and other studies on code-switching in Indonesia is that in this study the recording of the three stages of each lesson are differentiated. For example, this research investigated in which stage of the teaching the teacher mostly used English or Bahasa Indonesia and for what purpose.
3.2.2 Selection and description of teacher participants

Prior to the researcher contacting the schools selected for this research, a letter from the Department of Education of Padang City was sent to meet the local requirements for the conduct of this research. I communicated my intention first through email to the principals of the two schools in order to ensure that they knew what I was going to do with their staff and students.

The participant selection was undertaken by sending an invitation letter to the two schools mentioned above, specifying certain criteria. The initial criteria for the selection of teachers were as follows:

- They were classroom teachers responsible for teaching not only English, but also all other subjects in their class, except Sports and Religion.
- They were all graduates from English departments in Indonesian universities.
- The teaching course that they completed prepared them either for elementary teaching, or for secondary teaching.

The response from the schools was that there were three teachers who taught English subject in the two schools who fit the criteria. The three teachers who agreed to participate in this research were therefore: two teachers from grade 5 of Sekolah Dasar Percobaan Padang, and one teacher who taught grade 5 and 6 of Sekolah Dasar Pembangunan Padang.
All teachers participating in this study were female.

- Teacher A was 27 years old. She had a bachelor’s degree in English and had been teaching English for 4 years.

- Teacher B was 24 years old. She also had a bachelor’s degree in English and had been teaching English for 2 years. These two teachers (Teacher A and Teacher B) taught at Sekolah Dasar Percobaan, Padang.

- Teacher C, 39 years old, taught English at Sekolah Pembangunan UNP Padang. She had a bachelor’s degree and had been teaching English for 12 years. Teacher C had also taught at secondary schools.

The three teachers spoke Bahasa Minang, Bahasa Indonesia and English. However, they never had been to an English speaking country. In terms of proficiency levels, Teacher C’s English seemed to be the lowest among the teachers, as was evident when observing her lessons. She apologized repeatedly for her low level of proficiency in English during interview.

### 3.3 Data collection

The data were collected in a 7-week period from early January till end of February 2013, during the second semester. The school year in Indonesia begins in July. It should be noted that the data were collected before the implementation of the 2013 Curriculum in July of that year. The researcher visited each school on a weekly basis. Each classroom session was 70 minutes per week. Some classroom visits, however, were cancelled due to public holidays and schools events such as pre-final exam and religious events. The total numbers of visits varied between three teachers. It was difficult to
reschedule a visit for the same week because English was only taught once a week. As a result, the researcher observed and video recorded 10 lessons.

3.3.1 Video-recording of classroom sessions

Data concerning teacher-student interaction during the class was collected by means of video-recording. The observations were video recorded. According to Pomerantz & Fehr (1997), naturally occurring data should be video-taped for the following reasons:

a) Certain features are not recoverable in any other way;
b) Playing and replaying facilitate transcribing and developing an analysis;
c) Recording makes it possible to check particular analysis against the materials;
d) Recording makes it possible to return to an interaction with new analytic interest.

The data recorded in the first week was not to be analyzed because, during this time, the teachers and students were given time to get used to being recorded in order to reduce observer paradox effect. Therefore, there were 10 classroom observations which were analysed.

The recordings took place in the natural setting of the classroom, where the researcher was visible to both students and the teacher, and they all knew the reason for the researcher’s presence in the classroom. As I was an observer, I had less direct personal contact with participants in the classroom. I usually sat at the back of the classroom, trying to be as unobtrusive as possible. The
participants (teachers and students) were encouraged to follow the normal teaching and learning process conducted prior to the study.

The video cameras were placed as unobtrusively as possible and they were not moved while recording, as it has been claimed that a fixed position of the cameras helps to minimize the influence of the observer’s perspective with respect to what is and is not worth focusing on from moment to moment (Erickson, 2006). One camera focused on the teacher, but was set at a wide enough angle to video-record the entire class. Another camera was placed on the teacher’s table in front of the class, facing the students for the purpose of recording student participants.

Although all the three teachers had two classes to teach, only one of their classes was chosen to be video-recorded. This class was chosen purposively, based on higher interaction levels. I recorded the whole lesson. The microphone was positioned to principally capture student-teacher interactions in the whole class level. The teacher always stayed in the same position, in front of the classroom. She moved around the classroom when the students were working in pairs or in groups. Typically, Indonesian classrooms are very “live” acoustically because they have no carpets and a lot of glass and concrete, which helps the teacher to project their voice when only they are speaking, but makes student interaction difficult. The class is big with lots of chairs which make it hard for the students to move around to communicate.
An important consideration in the design of this study was to measure teachers and students as they were addressing and interacting with each other as a class rather than when the students were working together in pairs or small groups. The data, therefore, did not include recordings of interaction among students, in pair or group activities.

There were approximately ten hours twenty minutes of data recording of classroom interaction. When the teacher addressed individual students as they worked in pairs or small groups, those interactions were not transcribed because many students could not be heard due to the increased noise from working in small groups or pairs. However, I was able to take notes on two groups of students who sat close to me during the observation.

3.3.2 Note-taking

It was anticipated that technical problems might arise with the video camera on some occasions and some phenomena might not be well captured by it. For those reasons mentioned above, the researcher took notes or photos during the class, describing classroom events, commenting on their language used as they were observed.

Field notes helped the researcher to observe things the video camera did not capture; for example, the date and time of the lesson, when the teacher wrote an instruction, activity or explanation on the white board in a location where the video camera could not record her action; thus, note-taking acts as an
important back-up to the video recording. I also took notes on two pair work interactions which were close to where I sat as an observer. Cohen et al. (2007: 396) suggest “observation acts as ‘a reality check’, as what people do may differ from what they say they do”. Observation enables the researcher to rely on a real situation rather than a second-hand account.

Therefore, anything written on the white board was also written down (photographed), alongside who wrote it. These extra pieces of information turned out to be very useful during the transcribing and analysing of the video recordings, helping me recall the incidents and contextualise them more easily.

### 3.3.3 Stimulated recall interview

The stimulated recall interviews in the present research took place after the completion of the entire set of classroom recordings in order to gain the teachers’ own perspectives on their classroom practice. The participants were given the option to be interviewed in English or Bahasa Indonesia. They all chose Bahasa Indonesia to facilitate more in-depth expression. Both the researcher and the teacher were free at any time to stop the recording to provide comments. The researcher selected two lessons for each teacher on the basis of having the greatest amount of teacher-student verbal interaction to watch in the stimulated recall interview. Thus, each of the selected lessons represented a rich sample of teacher talk and students’ talk.
These video recordings were also selected for the relevant parts that I wanted to explore further, particularly as regards the teachers’ code-switching. A private room was used for the viewing of the video. All interviews were audio-recorded. The teachers were assisted in recalling what they did and said in the lessons by watching the video-recording. Standardized stimulated recall procedures (Meade & McMeniman, 1992) were followed: first, the teacher was given instructions in Bahasa Indonesia about what she was expected to do. Then, a brief description of the lesson was given to refresh their memory. Then, the pre-selected video was played and paused for the teacher to comment on her use of language, the activity in progress, and to elaborate on her beliefs and code-switching involving the observed behaviours. Importantly, the researcher was not the one who was in control of stopping the recording, but the teachers were free to do this, and were encouraged to do so when they saw themselves making a decision, conducting an activity, or considering (Smagorinsky & Coppock, 1995).

General open-ended questions were asked (see appendix 5). The purpose was to help the teacher provide recall comments without leading them. These recall sessions were audio taped with their permission and the data were transcribed for analysis, and then translated into English. Then, they were analysed according to theoretical bases of code-switching to answer the research question: “What are the perceptions of teachers in this context as to the relationship between code-switching and the effective teaching of English?”
The video recordings of classes, observation field notes and stimulated recall interviews as multiple data sources were used as a strategy of triangulation to minimize subjectivity and bias in the data analysis (Yin, 2003) to ensure validity.

### 3.3.4 Transcribing the recordings

After collecting the recordings, the researcher and researcher assistants transcribed them, working from the video recordings and audio recordings. The lesson recordings were transcribed by the researcher and an assistant with expertise in the relevant languages: Bahasa Minang, Bahasa Indonesia and English, following the transcription format adapted from Atkinson & Heritage (1984). Stimulated recall interview audio recordings were also transcribed.

Notes were produced by the researcher and her assistants. Rules described by Hubbard (1998: 248) were used to facilitate consistent transcription of the video-recorded classroom interaction.

- a. Every lesson is transcribed as a single unit.
- b. All utterances were written out in full. When two words are contracted and uttered as one as in “we’re” and “I’ll” these are counted as two words.
- c. However, contractions of the verb and the negative such as “don’t” are counted as one word.

I made decisions regarding “the awareness of the importance of minute details of communication” (Wei, 2002: 174) such as wait time, pause and intonation that will be included in a transcript because these gave me more information about teachers’ code-switching practices, particularly on wait time, pause and
intonation. Students’ facial expressions would no doubt have provided further context for teacher talk, but the position of the video camera prevented me from seeing and including such gestures in my transcripts.

The researcher used normal Bahasa Indonesia and English spelling rules; mispronunciation was noted only when it was an important feature of classroom talk, for example, when it produced misunderstanding. Although teachers’ language input and code-switching were the focus of the study, all discernible classroom talk was transcribed because student talk was an important part of the context of teachers’ speech. The researcher identified teachers in the transcripts as Teacher A, Teacher B and Teacher C; students were represented as S for single students or Ss for multiple simultaneous speakers.

Some portions of the recordings remained unclear or unusable despite repeated listening and watching of the videotapes. For example, most teachers that I observed incorporated group work into their classes. Because I had only two centrally located recorders, it was difficult to know which student was speaking in the group work because so much talk happened simultaneously. I therefore instigated a second coding check after a period of one week, to ensure consistency.
3.3.5 Ethical issues

To ensure voluntary participation, the data were obtained with informed written consent from the teachers, the principal of each school, the students and their parents prior to the first recording session. The participants were also informed that they could withdraw from participation at any time and for any reason without penalty (see appendix 4).

Prior to giving their consent, the potential participants were invited to clarify any questions they may have with the researcher. A letter of invitation was sent to the principals of both schools requesting a meeting between the researcher and the grade 5 and 6 teachers in the schools. At this meeting, copies of the Plain Language Statement (see appendix 4) were distributed to the teachers and they were asked to become involved in this study.

The teachers and the students were also informed in advance of the research focus. However, the detailed research questions were not explained to the participant until close to the end of this study, in order to secure natural classroom discourse. There was a concern that the teacher’s awareness of the topic would raise their consciousness of language selection in classroom interaction and alter its pattern, which would contaminate natural data. So, the research topic was shared with the teacher participants when they were interviewed in stimulated recall interview.
In this research the parents of the students signed the consent form because the student participants were primary school students. The consent form was only for recording and the teachers were the main focus. I was not using data from the students. The Plain Language Statement was sent by the principal to students’ parents on the researcher’s behalf. This outlined the aims of the research, the rights of the participants and the scope of participation. I invited parents to give their consent for their child to participate. The Plain Language Statement for teachers and students’ parents were written both in Bahasa Indonesia and English.

The confidentiality of the information offered in the stimulated recall interview with the teachers was crucial to this research. For this reason, the interviews were conducted privately between each teacher and the researcher in a convenient location away from the classroom. Each teacher fully understood, prior to the commencement of the interview that their responses given in the interview would not enable them to be identified.

There was no one-to-one direct contact with individual teachers or student participants prior to the university ethics committee approval. The researcher provided a clear description of the research, the potential benefits and risks involved, and the confidentiality and privacy of the information provided by the participants. As the decision to participate was completely voluntary, the researcher did not foresee any impairment to the existing or future relationship between participants and the researcher.
It was considered important that the participants had access to the data they had provided so that they could review their contributions and confirm that the data were an accurate representation. For the accuracy of the translation, I checked with them for any key points that might possibly lend themselves to mistranslation.

3.4 The rationale for conversation analysis and stimulated recall

The rationale for using conversation analysis and stimulated recall in this research is that these techniques allow the researcher to explore and describe the teachers’ language use and the teachers’ code-switching in the EFL primary classrooms, thus enabling a more nuanced understanding of the functions and the reasons of teachers’ code-switching as well as the teachers’ perspective on code-switching.

In terms of code-switching research, Auer (1988) was the first to introduce CA to language alternation research. Auer (1984) proposed that language alternation must be investigated from an interactional perspective. Auer (1984) believes that each instance of code-switching is closely tied to the specific context in which it happens. He mentions that:

While the preceding verbal activities provide the contextual frame for a current utterance, the following utterance by a next participant reflects his or her interpretation of that preceding utterance (Auer, 1995: 116).
Further, he notes that the purpose of any study on language alternation is “to analyse member’s procedures to arrive at local interpretation of language alternation” (Auer, 1984: 3).

All the data used in this study comes from the transcription of video lesson recordings, field notes and stimulated recall interview audio recordings. The aim of relying on the evidence provided in the transcriptions is to “develop an emic perspective on how the participants display to each other their understanding of the context” (Seedhouse, 2004: 43). It should be noted that the emic perspective of conversation analysis using transcription makes it possible to capture the “complex, fluid and dynamic” (Seedhouse, 2004: 60) nature of language classroom interaction. My analysis follows the analytic strategies outlined in ten Have (2007: 102-109) and Seedhouse’s (2004) practice of analysing various interactional practices, that is when the data appear relevant to my analysis rather than analysing individual conversation analysis phenomena.

Stimulated recall was chosen to show the teacher perception and any mismatches with the data from observation (e.g. Bensen & Çavuşoğlu, 2013). As far as I am aware stimulated recall interviews have not been used much in studies in EFL contexts (e.g. Bensen & Çavuşoğlu, 2013) and particularly in Indonesian EFL contexts (e.g. Cahyani, de Courcy & Barnett, 2016). Another reason why I chose stimulated recall was that foreign language researchers or second language researchers need to listen to teachers’ voices or what teachers
are saying for professional development reasons, and to understand the contexts in which they teach (Lightbown, 2000).

Since this study involves multiple cases, the data analysis followed a two-stage process as recommended by Merriam (1998: 194) “within case analysis” and “cross-case analysis”. Each single case of the teacher was analysed separately before they were viewed in cross-case context analysis. The explanations which were later developed from these two-stages became general conclusions that corresponded to all teacher’s cases (Yin, 2003). The analysis involves conversation analysis and stimulated recall as explained below.

3.4.1 Conversation analysis

Applied linguists have recognized the contribution of Conversation Analysis (CA); it has become widely accepted as a research methodology in investigations into L2 use and acquisition (e.g. Firth, 2009; He, 2004; Hellermann, 2006, 2009; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Kasper, 2009; Kurhila, 2006; Lerner, 1995; Markee, 2000, 2008; Mori, 2003; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009; Olsher, 2003; Pekarek Doehler & Ziegler, 2007; Sert & Seedhouse, 2011; Üstünel, 2014; Wagner & Gardner, 2004). In terms of language choice and code-switching, conversation analysis researchers have conducted many hours of observation and video recording as well as audio recording classroom interaction involving teachers and students (e.g. Baraja-Rohan, 2011; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Cazden, 1988; Cook, 2001; Duff & Polio, 1990; Üstünel, 2014; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; Hellermann, 2009; Kim & Elder, 2008; Nguyen,

Conversation analysis is a bottom-up process, or an “emic perspective” position (ten Have, 2007; Seedhouse, 2004). In other words, the object of the CA research should be the participants’ perspective, with the researcher ‘stepping inside their shoes’. It aims to “discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk, with a central focus on how sequences of actions are generated” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998: 94). The study focuses on participants’ contextualised perspectives and interpretations of behaviour, events, situations rather than etic (outsider-imposed) categories, models, and viewpoints (van Lier, 1988).

Markee (2000) notes the inability of mainstream second language acquisition research to prove causation of acquisition by comprehensible input, and argues that CA could contribute. Through the analysis of transcriptions, insight can be gained into the manner in which teacher talk as input is used as comprehensible input to ‘push’ output. Thus, CA can be used to capture the nature of classroom discourse by looking at the intrinsic patterns which give the researcher important insights into many aspects that are critical to classroom interaction, such as turn-taking, adjacency pairs, and conversation repair, among others.

Conversation analysis involves the study of features such as allocation of turns, repair strategies, and the use of speech acts such as questions and replies in a
conversation. According to Milroy & Gordon (2006) a conversation analysis consists of an analytical framework using the ways in which speakers express and interpret meaning on turn-by-turn basis. In the same vein, in line with Auer (1984), Gafaranga (2007) explains that conversation analysis’s central aim is to discover and describe the organization of interlocutor’s act which specifically addresses the sequential organization of talk (Segloff, 2007).

Turn taking is the underlying framework of conversation (Sidnell, 2010). It observes “when and how people take turns in conversations” (Burns, Joyce & Gollin, 1996: 18). Turn taking in the classroom setting is different from the turn taking in conversation. In the classroom setting turn taking is usually controlled by the teacher, leading to asymmetry between teacher and learners. However, research has also reported that some learners self-select without teacher nomination (Krug & Otsu, 2011).

A conversation analysis approach has been criticised for its transcription details (Wei, 2002) because a detailed focus on transcription conventions can be regarded as unnecessary as all transcripts are subjective and, therefore, favour the application of some theories over others (Wei, 2002). The decisions taken during the transcription can have an impact on the analysis of the data at a later stage. During the transcription of recorded interactions, researchers make decisions regarding the amount of detail (e.g. nonverbal cues, prosody, silence, wait time, intonation) that will be included in a transcript (Wei, 2002). Consequently, transcripts might not constitute exact representations of
interactions. This introduces a layer of subjectivity into CA approaches which claim to base their interpretations of language alternation practices solely on context-bound cues. However, with more than one independent transcriber the validity of the transcriptions would not be an issue. Moreover, the data can be made accessible through the transcription, but the recording remains available in its original form and can be accessed anytime. I have not done transcription in deep detail as it is a tool in this research used to reveal one particular level of patterning, that of code-switching and its functions, rather than deep analysis of pragmatic or discourse aspects.

Another criticism directed at Conversation Analysis is that “CA is a behavioural discipline while SLA study is a cognitive discipline” (Markee, 2000: 30). This notion has been refuted as sequencing, turn taking and repair may be seen as socially distributed cognition (Schegloff, 1992).

3.4.2 Stimulated recall

Many researchers have preferred to investigate teachers’ code-switching behaviour using questionnaire and interview only. Golato (2002) reports that the data from teachers’ perception and interview may or may not be accurate, as there is often a considerable gap between what people think they do and what they actually do (Tian & Hennebry, 2016). For example, teachers in Oguro’s study frequently report about their more frequent use of TL in their classroom interaction, but in practice teachers vary in the extent to which they
achieve this aim (Oguro, 2011). The incongruence between what the teacher
thinks and they do in practice is part of human nature (Oguro, 2011).

The use of the interview only data cannot adequately create the teaching
context and can be unreliable in eliciting teachers’ reasons for code-switching.
Meade & McMeniman (1992) explain that there is little evidence that
interactional analysis of interviews between researcher and participant is an
effective tool in revealing the interactive decision-making of teachers in action.

Stimulated recall is an introspective research instrument used to gather
information about participants’ actions (Gass & Mackey, 2000); such a data
collection method is usually carried out by presenting the participants with an
audio or visual recording of themselves doing a task, which then serves as a
prompt to help them recall their thoughts during that task (Calderhead, 1981;
Gass & Mackey, 2000). The aim of the stimulated recall interview is that the
participants report their thoughts and actions during the lessons and give
reasons for them. The participant and the researcher watch the video recording
together and the participant explores simultaneously what was done and why. It
allows the participants to decide what they want to focus on; and the researcher
can watch episodes and can make suggestions.

Stimulated recall interview has been used extensively to study teachers’ beliefs
and thinking (Calderhead, 1996; Erkmen, 2012) and it has also been found to
enhance reflection (e.g. Muir & Besawick, 2007; Rosaen, Lunderberg, Cooper,
Fritzen & Terpstra, 2008). In addition, video stimulated recall can minimise superficial self-representation when teachers are confronted by their actions in the classroom (Meade & Mcmeniman, 1992). However, according to Kennedy’s research (1999) what teachers mostly learn from viewing the video recordings of their teaching seems to be only noticing negative experiences. Rosaen et al. (2008: 349) investigated this matter and found that “explicit noticing is critical to change because if persons do not notice, they cannot choose to act differently”. It indicates that the use of stimulated recall interview with the video as a prompt might lead to improved teaching practices.

Nunan (1992) noted that stimulated recall interview has at least two advantages: to produce insights into the teaching and learning process as it promotes helping teachers understand and analyse their own practice in the classroom that would be hard to obtain by other means; and to make the class participants’ voices heard. In other words, research on teachers’ beliefs and thinking are important in teacher education. It promotes teachers’ understanding and ability to analyse their own practices in the classroom.

In the present study the stimulated recall interview was used for two reasons: to investigate the teachers’ specific reasons for using particular instances (utterances) of Bahasa Minang, Bahasa Indonesia or English at particular points in the course of their teaching; and to prompt the teachers to reflect on their teaching practice. It was a semi-structured interview, with a set of questions guiding the interview (see appendix 5 for full details). The researcher
asked teachers how often they believed they used English during the class, why they changed to Bahasa Minang/Bahasa Indonesia or English in certain instances, and what their general teaching philosophy was in relation to the language of choice in the classroom. It was hoped that exchanges in the stimulated recall interview between me and the teacher participant had an effect on the understanding of the teachers and possibly supported the better understanding of code-switching in their EFL classrooms.

Furthermore, stimulated recall interview provides a powerful insight into the way teachers code-switch in the classroom. So far, in the context of this study, Padang, Indonesia, very little is known about what and how a teacher can learn from participating in research, particularly on why and how teachers code-switch.

The stimulated recall interview is based on teachers remembering, while watching video footage of their teaching as a prompt. Video footage is useful for highlighting teachers’ perspective concerning teaching, particularly for this study, as video footage can enhance the reliability of teachers’ reporting on code-switching. The aim of the interview is that teachers report their thoughts and actions during the lesson and give reasons for their code-switching after they watched the video recording on their teaching.

It is important to combine conversation analysis and stimulated recall interview, as conversation analysis provided some evidence of functions of teachers’
code-switching and stimulated recall clarifies the teachers’ perspectives for those functions.

### 3.5 Data analysis

Overall, the analysis was done in two stages to achieve the purpose of the present study. The classroom interaction transcripts and stimulated recall interview transcripts were coded to find out the functions and reasons behind their code-switching using AS-Unit as describe below. With the conversation analysis, I transcribed and coded the examples of code-switching. With the stimulated recall, I transcribed it and coded according to the reasons given by the teachers for the functions of their code-switching.

The data revealed the practices of the target language used by the teacher as input, and the functions as well as the teachers’ awareness of code-switching. All analysis followed a thematic approach in order to uncover overarching themes that emerged from the individual participant teacher data as well as those emerging from comparisons of the three participant teachers’ performances.

#### 3.5.1 Conversation analysis of lesson transcripts

The conversation analysis starts with the coding of the lesson transcripts. Instances of code-switching were identified from the lesson transcripts. Hence, the occurrence of BM, BI and TL as a target language used in each class were
calculated and compared. For this purpose, the teacher talk as well as the student talk, were extracted from the lesson transcriptions.

The counting of instances of use of each language was based on a simple word-count method in which all intelligible words of BM, BI and TL used by the teacher and the students were counted. This included articles and prepositions. Only whole words were taken into account. Names of people and replies that could not be distinguished as belonging to either language, such as minimal responses, “mmm-m”, and “hm-m” were excluded.

Accurate transcription requires numerous and repeated listening to the recordings, so I listened to the tapes 6 times and occasionally modified or amended them. The analysis focused on conversational units within the turn. The present research analysis segmented utterances depending on the definition of an AS-Unit (Foster et al., 2000): a sub-clausal or clausal unit with or without one or more subordinate clauses, intonation contour, and pause.

Example of coding a turn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>What about the water in the bottle?//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>*air yang ada di dalam [botol]?//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{the water in the bottle?}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>[Botol]//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{bottle}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the whole turn there are three utterances, marked by the “//” sign. The first utterance is all in TL; the second is the repetition of the previous TL utterances in Bahasa Indonesia.
The transcripts were analysed by firstly reading through them carefully and repeatedly, taking notes, and highlighting important points or recurring themes.

The functions of code-switching were put into categories: pedagogical and affective functions of code-switching as discussed in Chapter 2.

The length of the turn was measured by the number of words uttered in English (TL) within AS-Unit analysis in relation to the teacher language input. To illustrate the language choice of the teachers and the students within a turn – Bahasa Minang, Bahasa Indonesia, or English, or a combination of the two – the teacher’s and the students’ utterances were coded using AS-Units containing, in the following way:

- Only Bahasa Indonesia
- Only English,
- Mix, at least one morpheme from Bahasa Indonesia (BI),
- Mix at least one morpheme from English (TL), or
- An utterance attributable, undetected voice, silence, etc.

Rules described by Hubbard (1998: 248) were used to facilitate consistent transcription of the video-recorded classroom interaction.

- Every lesson is transcribed as a single unit.
- All utterances were written out in full.
- When two words are contracted and uttered as one as in “we’re” and “I’ll” are counted as two words.
Given this fact, the researcher identified the functional categories by reading and rereading the transcriptions and identifying the instances of code-switching and their purposes. Psathas (1995: 46) explains that

Thus the phenomena that are discovered are the results of a process of repeated listening/viewings and transcribing. Numerous instances of similar phenomena, or singular instances of structurally complex and transparently significant phenomena, may be collected.

Modifications were made to the initial coding scheme to reflect the purposes of BM, BI and TL utterances presented in the data.

### 3.5.2 Stimulated recall analysis

In the second stage of this study, the stimulated recall interview transcripts were analysed to look at affective reasons for psychological and pedagogical functions of code-switching in the classroom. In the analysis of teachers’ stimulated recall sessions, the researcher extracted and then analysed all the statements teachers made about their beliefs and reasons for their uses of code-switching. The transcripts were analysed by firstly reading through them carefully and repeatedly, taking notes, and highlighting important points or recurring themes. The unit of analysis was a thematic point related to an aspect of code-switching that the teachers mentioned during the interview sessions.

In detail, the procedure was as follows: First, the researcher identified all the reasons given for the teachers’ code-switching. The unit analysis was a thematic point related to an aspect of code-switching that the teachers
mentioned during the stimulated recall. To this end, the teachers’ comments and explanations were summarized and classified into themes as the data emerged. These ideas were constantly compared with the other available data. The comparison was meant to look at the teachers’ perspective on code-switching and verify their code-switching.

3.6 Summary

This chapter has presented the research design and methodology, and discussed the rationale for these. The instruments used in the present study were conversation analysis and stimulated recall interview. Information about the context, the participants, and method of collecting the data were presented. Then it was demonstrated how conversation analysis and stimulated recall interview methodologies could complement each other in this study.

The context of this study was EFL classrooms in two primary schools in Padang, Indonesia. The participants were teachers who taught English at these two schools. The data were collected through classroom observation, video recordings of lessons and stimulated recall interviews with the teachers. I transcribed these data with the help of my assistants who were also speakers of Bahasa Minang, Bahasa Indonesia and English. Then, the Bahasa Minang and Bahasa Indonesia utterances in the transcripts were translated into English.

Conversation analysis was used as a tool to explore the code-switching that occurred; and in particular its pedagogical and affective functions. Teachers in
the present study used Bahasa Indonesia extensively, and often switched between languages in single turn, or used only the Bahasa Indonesia in some of the turns. This meant that it was not possible to code every instance of code-switching function into one category, as some of them overlapped. Moreover, it is not easy to explore the pedagogical reasons why teachers use code-switching by using observation methods only; thus stimulated recall interview was applied in this study.

In the stimulated recall interviews, I would play back the video recorded lessons of those teachers. Before starting, I briefed the teachers that the focus of the interview was to uncover the teacher’s thoughts while they had been paying attention to their code-switching. They were asked the reasons why they code-switched in relation to pedagogical and affective functions of their code-switching. Thus, stimulated recall interviews were used to unpack the teachers’ reasons and perspective of their code-switching in the classroom.

The first stage of the analysis involved a review of lesson transcripts. This allowed for a broad view of the data and a deeper understanding of the classroom interaction in terms of functions of code-switching. The transcription provided a list of instances of code-switching which were then grouped into functions of code-switching by means of pedagogical and affective functions of code-switching. The second stage was the analysis of the stimulated recall interviews to look at teachers’ perspectives on their code-switching in the classrooms and verify for what reasons they were doing it.
In the following two chapters, the results of the data analyses are presented, relating the findings to the research questions. Chapter 4 will discuss the functions of code-switching as observed in the lessons, and Chapter 5 will discuss the teachers’ perceptions of their code-switching.
CHAPTER 4
CODE-SWITCHING IN THE EFL CLASSROOMS

4.1 Introduction

This study used conversation analysis as a tool and stimulated recall interviews to analyse EFL classrooms. This chapter reports on the main findings from the classroom observation data; it analyses the teachers’ language input to the learners, particularly as regards instances of code-switching in the contexts in which they occurred. It sheds light on the ways Bahasa Indonesia as the second language (BI), and the target language, English as a foreign language (TL) were used in the EFL classroom in primary schools in Padang, Indonesia, with some data on how Bahasa Minang, the mother tongue of most of the students, was used. This chapter aims to address the research question: “What are the characteristics of teachers’ language input in EFL primary classrooms in Padang, Indonesia?” To answer this research question, each of the teacher lesson transcripts will be analysed in terms of amount of teacher language use, numbers of turns, and code-switching practices.

Further analysis is presented over this and the next chapter to address the research sub-questions:

a. What are the pedagogical and affective factors that influence teacher code-switching in EFL primary classrooms in Padang, Indonesia?

b. What are the perceptions of teachers in this context as to the relationship between code-switching and the effective teaching of English?
The first sub-question will be addressed in this chapter; and the second sub-question will be addressed in Chapter 5. The intention is not to treat the data as two separate entities, but rather to focus on their complementary nature; in this way I hope to realise more in-depth insights into the data.

Conversation analysis provided a tool to examine the operation of different functions of code-switching in the contexts in which they occurred. This analysis made it possible to obtain an overall picture of the EFL classroom contexts with code-switching as a focus. It enabled the researcher to understand the code-switching functions in more depth and in a more systematic way, but it did not capture the teachers’ perceptions of their practices. For this purpose stimulated recall interview data was used to address research sub-question 2.

Substantial differences were found between the three teachers observed in this study regarding the amount of Bahasa Minang (BM or mother tongue), Bahasa Indonesia (BI/L2), and English (TL) spoken by each teacher. Teacher A and Teacher B elicited more student output in English words (76.7% and 75.3% words, respectively); on the other hand Teacher C talked more than Teacher A, but she elicited the least student TL output (61.2%). Therefore, a comparison of the language practices of the three teachers seems important. This study was not trying to make value claims for the relative pedagogical effectiveness of the three teachers, it only sought to explore the implications of their code-switching in the research context.
The three teacher participants in this study had differing foci in the observed lessons. Teacher A focused principally on listening skills, with a certain emphasis on introducing new vocabulary. In her observed lessons, Teacher B frequently focused on providing her students with practice of target language structures via speaking activities. She explained grammatical items, and then provided controlled speaking tasks to practice them in context. Similar to Teacher B, Teacher C focused her lessons on grammar. She used Bahasa Indonesia much more than the other teachers in her interaction with the students. Most of the activities in her lesson were writing activities. I will begin with a description of the language use of the teachers as below.

4.2 The amount of teachers’ language use and numbers of turns

In Indonesian EFL classes teacher talk often involves at least two languages in the classroom, BI and TL. However, a few uses of a local language, Bahasa Minang (Minang language), did appear in teachers’ and students’ utterances (4 words and 32 words respectively). The word count, from the transcriptions of recordings of classroom interaction, show the number of words of BM, BI, and TL for teachers’ language use and students’ language use (Figure 4.1).
This table presents the amount of teacher talk and student talk over ten sessions, represented as the total number of words spoken by teachers and their respective classes in BM, BI and the TL. Although this does not show differentiation in teacher practices, it illustrates the overall proportions of teacher to student talk which may be representative of Indonesian primary EFL classrooms.

The table below shows the amount of teacher and student talk over ten lessons, represented as the total number of words spoken by each teacher and their students in Bahasa Minang, Bahasa Indonesia or English, thus revealing the raw data on the nature of language input and student output.
Figure 4-2 The amount of teachers’ language input and students’ language output counted in words

Overall, the video recordings of the classes indicated that the three teachers used 29.6% of BI and 70.3% was devoted to the use of TL of TL during ten lessons and 2 words of Bahasa Minang. On average, more TL was used by the students than BI (2891 words of English, 1054 words of Bahasa Indonesia, and 32 words of Bahasa Minang) used by the students.

Averages are misleading however, when it is evident that the three teachers used each language in varying amounts. In terms of the target language, Teacher A provided her students with more language input (94.50%) than Teacher B (89.9%) and Teacher C (33.8%). It is interesting in terms of language output produced by the students, Teacher B’s students produced less TL (75.3%) than Teacher A (76.7%), perhaps because she talked much more, so therefore her students did not have so many chances to speak; and Teacher A’s students produced the most TL among the three teachers. Teacher C’s students produced 61.2% of TL. These varied amount of words and various languages used by the teachers may be explained by the frequent amounts of
code-switching that occurred in the observed classes, however quantitative analysis is not intended in this research.

It is to be noted in particular that Teacher A varied her language input by using visual stimuli and tape recordings. The proportion from her talk was 43.1%, and from cassette recordings 40.1%. The above data alone, however, does not of course explain the reasons for or the factors influencing these teachers’ language use, and analysis of this in terms of their observed code-switching practices will be reported in section 4.3.2.

Having shown overall teachers’ input and students’ output, the next section will also report on the teachers’ language use during each stage of one lesson for each teacher. Teacher language use: lesson stages

![Figure 4-3 Teacher A’s lesson stages](image-url)
The terms pre-activity, whilst activity, and post activity are commonly used to refer to language lesson stages from primary to high school in Indonesia (see
Depdiknas, 2004; 2006). The first bar chart above shows that during the pre-activity stage Teacher A used mostly English; English was used the most during the whilst-activity; and during the post-activity stage, English was also used the most. Teacher A used no Bahasa Minang during the pre-activity and post-activity, but some limited Bahasa Minang was used during whilst-activity. Teacher A used varying amounts of Bahasa Indonesia in all stages. She used mostly TL during the whilst activity because this stage usually involves the implementation and practice of new language, and this is typically reinforced by an emphasis on TL use.

As shown in the bar chart for Teacher B, in pre-activity, a combination of English and Bahasa Indonesia was used at the pre-activity stage, but with a higher ratio of TL than for Teacher A. Although, she used less BI in this stage but, it turned out that Teacher B used more Bahasa Indonesia than Teacher A in the whilst-activity. Nevertheless, the whilst-activity in Teacher B’s lessons was mostly carried out in TL (5662 words). No Bahasa Minang was used in pre-activity, whilst-activity, and post-activity by Teacher B.

The data shows that Teacher C used more Bahasa Indonesia than English and Bahasa Minang (zero in this case) at every stage of the lesson. In contrast to the other teachers, more BI was used than TL (66 words as opposed to 26 words of TL) in the pre-activity.
Teacher C used significantly more Bahasa Indonesia during the whilst activity than the other two teachers – up to nearly ten times as much. Bahasa Minang was not used by this teacher, or Teacher B, in any of the activities. As is evident, Bahasa Minang was used in negligible amounts, but its use by Teacher A is still worthy of some comment, and is referred to in section 4.3.2.

4.2.1 Numbers and mean length of turns

After the raw word count was undertaken, teacher performances were analysed in terms of the number and length of turns. In order to find the mean length of each teacher turn, the total number of words was taken and divided by the total number of turns.

4.2.1.1 Teacher A

The students in Teacher A’s class on average spoke longer than Teacher A in one turn. As expected, the teacher’s turns were outnumbered by the students’ turns. The comparison of the length of teacher talk and student talk shows indicative trends that the teacher’s utterances in BM, BI and TL over 4 classroom sessions were shorter than her students’. The average length of Teacher A’s talk is 4.33 words while the average length of student talk was 4.35 words. This means that Teacher A’s utterances were shorter in number of words (4.33 words) than her students’ (4.56 words). These data are data on teachers’ turn and students’ turn in Bahasa Minang, Bahasa Indonesia, and English.
It is also important to have a closer look at each instance of BM, BI, or TL used in both the teacher’s and her students’ utterances, particularly in the TL utterances. Teacher A talked more than her students in TL. Results reveal that out of 333 Teacher A’s utterances, she uttered 321 AS-Units of TL, while students uttered 161 AS-Units of TL out of 190 utterances. This shows that teacher’s language input outweighs students’ language output in this class despite the teacher’s efforts to elicit more student output. She used picture and prompt questions to elicit students’ language output. However, it was evident that students were highly dependent on the teacher for models of language, particularly the participants in this study who were beginners in English as a foreign language. This finding is in line with Sinclair & Coulthard (1975) who say that one of the multiple roles a teacher plays in communication activities is that the teacher acts as the main resource for language input to students.

4.2.1.2 Teacher B

Differences were found between Teacher B’s number of utterances and those of her students, counted in Analysis of Speech (AS-Units). The total number of Teacher B’s turns were 359 turns (49.70%) while her students took 362 turns (50.20%). These suggest that Teacher B’s speech directed to the students tended to contain less turns compared to her students’ as measured by the number of AS-Units (49.70 % and 45.80% respectively). In other words, students had a slightly higher number of turns than Teacher B. A closer look at Teacher B’s and her students’ turn reveal that sometimes one of Teacher B’s utterances was responded to by more than one student.
However, the analysis of the length of Teacher B’s talk and students’ talk in AS-Units shows indicative trends that Teacher B’s utterances in BM, BI and TL were longer than their students. The mean length of utterance was determined by taking the total number of words and dividing it by the total number of turns. Thus, the mean length of Teacher B’s turn and her students’ was 4.56 and 2.16, respectively. The students’ length of utterance was shorter than this teacher’s, whereas Teacher A’s students’ utterances were longer than Teacher B’s students’ utterances (4.56 words and 2.16 words respectively). It was observed that Teacher B often gave long and complex explanations on grammar points, which did not give enough opportunities for her students to speak.

4.2.1.3 Teacher C

Similar to Teacher A and Teacher B above, the analysis of Teacher C turns, in 3 observed classes shows indicative trends that she had more turns than her students (417 and 419 turn respectively). What is important to be noted here is the length of Teacher C’s turns. In one turn she uttered far more utterances than her students as in the following extract.

Extract 1 (C, 16-01, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ya, “who”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>sekarang kita berbicara tentang skill menulis {now we} talked about writing skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>jadi nanti disamping anak mam bisa {so, later beside}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this extract 1, Teacher C is reviewing the previous week’s topic. The topic of the lesson was ‘asking and giving information’. It appeared that she talked much, and the students responded often in one or two short utterances.

The following section presents the teachers’ language use in the classroom. It describes the context of the teachers’ language input and the functions of the teachers’ code-switching.
4.3 Language use in the classroom

In Indonesia, the four skills of language: learning, listening, speaking, reading, and writing, are expected to be developed by the students at primary school level. However, the major focus is listening and speaking (Depdiknas, 2006). Even though the general objective of the lesson was to develop listening and speaking skills, grammar was the main focus of the classes for Teacher B and C. It was taught within the context of oral activities by Teacher B and writing activities by Teacher C. Meanwhile, Teacher A focused her lessons on pronunciation and listening skills. The following table is the list of the lessons and the focus of the lessons for each teacher.

The lessons: Topic and focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Topic of the lesson</th>
<th>Focus of the lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>Topic: Government Skills: Listening and speaking</td>
<td>Pronunciation and listening skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>Topic: Present perfect tense Skills: Reading and writing</td>
<td>Pronunciation and listening skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
<td>Topic: Season and weather Skills: Listening and speaking</td>
<td>Pronunciation and listening skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 4</td>
<td>Topic: Present perfect tense Skills: Reading and writing</td>
<td>Pronunciation and listening skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>Topic: Countable vs uncountable Skills: Listening &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>Grammar explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>Topic: Seasons &amp; weather Skills: Listening &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>Grammar explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
<td>Topic: Seasons &amp; weather Skills: Reading and writing</td>
<td>Grammar explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>Topic: asking and giving information Skills: Listening &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>Grammar explanation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lesson 2 | Topic: asking and giving information  
           | Skills: Listening & Speaking | Grammar explanation |
|----------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Lesson 3 | Topic: accept and refuse the invitation  
           | Skills: Reading & Writing | Grammar explanation |

Table 4.1 The topic and the focus of the lessons

4.3.1 Language input analysis

This section describes in more depth the language input the teachers in the present study provided for the students, in relation to the actual language-related activities provided. This will delineate more clearly the contexts in which code-switching occurred.

4.3.1.1 Teacher A

Listening to either the teacher or the tape occurred frequently in Teacher A’s classes. Listening activity typically started with the students listening to an audio-recorded text, repeating after the teacher, then answering the teacher’s comprehension questions in English. Next, the students completed a worksheet answering more comprehension questions, and translating major sentences. In these sessions providing correct answers was important to the students because every correct answer earned them credits which were regarded as their participation grade as well as their performance in other activities.

Teacher A used the same text for several different tasks. As Mendelsohn (1994) emphasises, students should be given opportunities to progressively structure their listening by listening to a text several times and working through
increasingly challenging listening tasks. Teacher A asked each one of the students from groups to take turns to read the tape transcript. Then, having the same text, she asked the students to repeat after her. Even though Teacher A asked students to repeat certain aspects of the language or did mechanical drills, since the participants were young learners, it appeared that mechanical drills seemed to help students to engage in learning.

In another lesson, firstly Teacher A used the text in a listening activity. She read the text and asked the students to repeat after her. It appeared that she was aiming to help students with pronunciation. Then, the same text which was used for the listening activity was used again in the next activity. In this activity, she asked students in groups to translate the text. Those students’ translations were then discussed by the whole class. Then Teacher A conducted another class discussion to talk about some comprehension questions. Again the same text was used.

Teacher A’s input included much of the repetition that constitutes much of the teacher discourse. Repetition is said to contribute to success in language learning (Wong-Fillmore, 1985) because it makes input comprehensible by giving the students opportunities to hear the same content or another chance to hear the sentence (Long, 1981; Pica, Young, & Doughty, 1987; Wong-Fillmore, 1985). Similarly, Horst (2010) and Brown, Waring, & Donkaebua (2008) reported that repetition in the spoken input of the language classroom is crucial.
The other thing to be noted from Teacher A is that she creates a rich and conducive learning environment by providing more input to the students. For the reason that modelling requires children to repeat or imitate teachers’ statements, this strategy could be suitable for primary school students.

According to Krashen (1985: 9)

> The purpose of language teaching in a sense is to optimise samples of language for the learner to profit from—the best ‘input’ to the process of language learning. Everything the teacher does provides the learner with opportunities for encountering the language.

Moreover, students seemed to enjoy listening to Teacher A’s presentation. It was good that students had more opportunities to listen and participate in classroom interaction. Giving input constantly to students probably is the best way to teach a language.

In the EFL classroom, as in many types of teacher-fronted classes, turn taking is usually allocated and controlled by the teacher. Similarly, as in other classrooms in Indonesia, when it comes to allocating the turn, the teacher holds the floor and students are entitled to participate only when the teacher addresses them. However, in Teacher A’s class sometimes students self-selection occurred. Van Lier (1988) reveals that even though the classroom discourse is strictly controlled by the teacher, students do sometimes initiate the exchange in the classroom discourse. This indicates students’ strong desire for participation and higher expectation toward the opportunity to practice English. Teacher A provided her students with a significant number of
opportunities for practice through group or individual work, thus reducing ‘teacher-fronted’ activity and increasing opportunities for students’ output. She also used visual aids, further reducing her teacher talk (extract 9).

4.3.1.2 Teacher B

Teacher B seemed to intend to model language for her students. Therefore, it might be assumed that she should demonstrate her proficiency in using the target language most of the time. However, it appeared that her use of the TL was often less than accurate and could provide a poor model. Examples include “Are (sic) you forget”, or “That’s why pasta is (sic) goes to uncountable noun”.

Next, it is important for the teacher to consider the wait-time, which is the length of time the teacher waits after asking the students questions. Pause length means that if there is a lack of answer in the TL, the teacher switches to L2 after a pause of more than a second. However, it appeared that in some cases, Teacher B asked a question and answered it by herself not giving the students a long enough time to think about the questions. Instead of giving time to the students to answer her questions, she answered the question by herself. In this case, Teacher B could perhaps keep the interaction between herself and the students continual and smooth, but at the same time it could possibly deprive the students of opportunities to comprehend the main point of her question or to find out blocks to their understanding. She only gave 2.56 seconds for the students to answer her questions. Meng & Wang (2011) suggest
that “Increasing wait time to three to five seconds can increase the amount of students’ participation as well as the quality of the participation”.

What is interesting to observe in Teacher B’s classroom practice was her strong desire to achieve her curriculum aims which seemingly blinds her to the need to practice real communication. For example, in one activity, she put the students in pairs, distributed topics for a conversation written on a piece of a paper, one topic for each group (data from note taking). The aim of one of Teacher B’s classes was to make the students say correct sentences. Next, she asked the students to prepare a dialogue to practice the use of ‘many’ and ‘much’ in a group, a written dialogue. Students practiced the prepared dialogue in a group, then the teacher asked each group to perform the conversation in front of the class. It seemed that she focused her teaching on improving students’ speaking ability but it appeared that this activity was not at all communicative. It lacked spontaneity. This finding is in the same vein as Hall (1995) as discussed in Chapter 2. Hall (1995) noted the use of “recitation scripts” in a Spanish speaking class, and Teacher B appears to be using these.

4.3.1.3 Teacher C

Teacher C’s classroom was also predominantly teacher directed. Similar to Teacher A and Teacher B, she started the class with a standard greeting, ‘as-salamu alaykum’, actually from Arabic, then greeted them in English. The phrase in full (Assallamuallikum warahmatullah hi wa barakatuh in Bahasa
Indonesia) is used as a ritualised greeting in Indonesia as an expression of Muslim faith.

She also initiated the topic, dominated the floor and the turns. Her students, on the other hand, most of the time only responded to the teacher, rather than self-initiated. Communication, in the sense of conversation in the TL, only occurred during the first few minutes of class. Then, the classroom discourse centered on grammar, using Bahasa Indonesia. She often employed switch repetitions, exact repetitions of the same content in one of the other languages, in her explicit teaching of grammar. This switch repetition will be discussed further in section 4.3.2.2.3.

Teacher C often did not seem to be very aware that she was not providing her students with opportunities for target language learning input. The amount of teacher talk in her lesson, specifically in Bahasa Indonesia, was high, compared to the other teachers. It was noticed that there were instances in Teacher C’s classroom which allowed students to produce TL. However, it appeared that students only repeated utterance by utterance after Teacher C. She read a sentence or a phrase which was followed or repeated by students; sometimes she asked one student to repeat after her.

To sum up this section, the nature of input evidently plays a critical role in language learning. In terms of providing input for their students, teachers in
this study were not presenting the target language exclusively but in their interaction with the students in the classroom involving code-switching.

Having contextualised the type of language input provided by the three teachers and as the classroom interaction took place in TL, BI and a minimal amount of BM, or in some utterances a mix of two languages, in the next section I will examine the teacher’s language practices in terms of how they code-switched as well as the functions of the code-switching.

4.3.2 Code-switching practices in the observed EFL classrooms

In this section, selected extracts of lesson transcripts are presented and analysed to reflect the various stages: the beginning lesson (pre-activity), whilst activity and finally, eventual closure of the activity (post-activity). It is divided in this particular way to highlight how the teacher’s code-switching might vary according to the lesson phase. All utterances that contained all or some Bahasa Indonesia were first identified, and categorized into two main categories: pedagogical and affective functions. Following Canagarajah (1995: 179), pedagogical function means that “code-switching can help in the effective communication of the lesson content and language skill which have been specified in the curriculum”. Affective functions refers to the functions of code-switching “that serve for expressions of emotions” (Sert, 2005: 3) “in order to build solidarity and good rapport with the students” (Bensen & Çavuşoğlu, 2013: 72). The following table shows the pedagogical and affective functions of code switching as performed by the three teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Teacher C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>introducing/explaining vocabulary</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving instruction</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explaining grammar rules</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept checking</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehension check</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giving motivation</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reinforcement</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feedback</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘scolding’ or reprimanding</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintain the flow of the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 Pedagogical and Affective functions of Code-switching

The analysis reveals that Teacher A did the least code-switching among the three teacher participants. Similar to the other teachers in the present study, she did the most code-switching in the whilst activity. It is notable that in Teacher A’s case, she was able to maintain the TL for her students by using other strategies to help the students understand her TL. The analysis also revealed that Teacher C switched code more than Teacher B and Teacher A. Having the lowest proficiency in English could be the principal reason for this.

During the pre-activity no new material was being taught. ‘Whilst activity’, as the main part of the lesson, involved learning new material or practicing what
had previously been learned, or a mixture of these two. During this activity, in Teacher A’s, B’s, and C’s classes, it was most likely that students used their course book, or other material such as tapes to provide the TL input. As mentioned above, the three teachers in the present study code-switched the most during this whilst activity.

The post-activity was usually brief because this was the conclusion of the lesson, when the teacher assigned homework or made additional announcements; then the class was dismissed. In this study, in the four lessons analysed, Teacher A and Teacher B did not make any attempt to ‘conclude’ the lesson by summarizing or recapitulating; instead they straight away assigned homework or made additional announcements and then their classes were dismissed.

In contrast, Teacher C concluded the lessons. She synthesized essential information from the lesson that day in order to gain an overall understanding of what the students had learned. In fact, it is not always the teacher who concludes the lesson at the post activity, it could be students as well. But in Teacher C’s classes, she was always the one who concluded the lesson.

In terms of the language used, as mentioned earlier, in post-activity almost all Teacher B’s utterances were in TL, for example when she asked her students to submit their work. She also asked students in English to pray Zhuhur, the midday prayer. In other words, no code-switching occurred in Teacher B’s
utterances in the post-activity. Different to Teacher B’s language use, Teacher A and Teacher C used Bahasa Indonesia and English in the post activity; Teacher C used more Bahasa Indonesia than Teacher A.

4.3.2.1 Teacher A’s code-switching: Functions

This section presents the analysis of relevant turns from the lessons taught by Teacher A in relation to observed code-switching. Teacher A’s classes typically included the presentation and practice of vocabulary as well as the teaching of new grammatical structures. Among the four skills, the main focus of the observed lessons was the development of pronunciation and listening skills. The lessons observed were two lessons of ‘listening and speaking’ and also two lessons of ‘reading and writing’. The topics of the listening and speaking lesson were ‘government’ and ‘season and weather’; the topics for the reading and writing lesson were ‘present perfect tense’ and ‘government’.

It was found that Teacher A employed code-switching for both pedagogical and affective functions. Pedagogical functions include introducing/explaining vocabulary, giving instruction, grammar rules, and concept checking; affective functions include encouragement, reinforcement feedback and, at times, ‘scolding’ or reprimanding.
4.3.2.1.1 Pedagogical functions: Teacher A

Introducing/explaining vocabulary

By far the largest category of functions used by Teacher A was introducing/explaining vocabulary as in the extract below.

Extract 2 (A, 02-05, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Do you know government? (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>apa artinya? {What does it mean?}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(teacher points to one of the students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pemerintah {government}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the beginning of one whilst activity, Teacher A was introducing the topic of that day’s lesson, ‘government’. She wrote the word government on the white board and asked students “Do you know government?” She waited for 0.5 second and then asked the question in Bahasa Indonesia. This appeared to be an example of code-switching employed by Teacher A as a teaching strategy.

Giving instructions

Next, giving instructions was the second largest category in which code switching by Teacher A occurred, as in the next extract.

Extract 3 (A, 02-05, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Ani, ke depan, next question {to the white board}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This extract (Extract 3) shows that Teacher A asked the students to come to the white board to write the answer of the reading comprehension question.
In the next extract (Extract 4) I show an example of Teacher A using Bahasa Indonesia to ensure understanding of key words in an instruction. She asked students to turn their chairs so that they were facing each other. Some of the students seemed not to know what to do. So, she used Bahasa Indonesia to complement her TL utterance, “You can turn the chair”, with “berhadapan” [face-to-face]. The students then complied promptly.

Extract 4 (A, 05-02, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Okay, now I will put you in group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>in group, this one group one, group two, group three,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>group four, group six, group seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>group one, two, three, four, six, seven,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>you can turn the chair, berhadapan {face-to-face}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Group lima miss? {group five}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above example of code-switching appeared to accommodate the needs of the lower-proficiency students.

A phenomenon which is interesting to note about Teacher A’s code switching as well as the other two teacher participants of the present study was that the teacher said exactly the same thing in the TL as in Bahasa Indonesia; here I will call this phenomenon switch repetition, and it also has a function or functions attached on it. Teacher A often translated her target language utterances literally (“Do you have difficult words?”) into Bahasa Indonesia (“Ada kata-kata sukar?”) as an example in Extract 5.
**Extract 5 (A, 05-02, 13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Have you answered the question?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Yes, mam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| T       | 130  | Do you have difficult words? 
  *ada kata-kata sukar?* 
  {Do you have difficult words?} |
| S       | 131  | Yes, miss |
| T       | 132  | Write the difficult words on the whiteboard, group six. |

The function which is attached to this example of switch repetition is checking for understanding (Extract 5). Another example of switch repetition can be found in the following extract.

**Extract 6 (A, 05-02, 13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ok, attention to page 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|         | 37   | *perhatikan halaman ke-2* tentang 
  {pay attention to page 2 of} |
|         | 38   | listening test |

The difference with the above switch repetition lies in the function of the switch repetition (Extract 6). The functions of the code-switching in extract 6 above is giving instruction. The students were going to have a test on listening; Teacher A asked her students to pay attention to page 2 of the listening test. It appeared that she may believe that they needed the reinforcement of using BI to understand the instructions and therefore perform better.

**Lesson Review**

Reviewing past lesson material was another practice in which Teacher A applied code-switching in her teaching (extract 7). In the following extract,
Teacher A started to review the last lesson, for example, (“T: Last week we have studied (sic) about government”). A student answered her in Bahasa Indonesia, “Ya” which means “Yes”. This student’s answer tells us she understood the teacher’s TL, even though Teacher A’s actual usage was incorrect. The simple past tense should have been used (“Last week we studied about government”) instead of present perfect tense. It might have been because only one student answered that she switched code, using Bahasa Indonesia in asking students to mention what they remembered about ‘government’. The reasons she gave for code-switching in her classroom discourse will be highlighted in Chapter 5.

Extract 7 (A, 05-02, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Last week we have studied about government, you still remember?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ya {Yes}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ok, <em>coba sebutkan apa saja yang kita pelajari tentang</em> {mentioned what we have learned about} government. (the teacher point to one student in first row)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explaining grammatical rules**

Teacher A taught grammar to her students but in a small part of her teaching from observed lessons. Similar to the other two teachers in this study, the way she taught grammar tells us that she was not prepared for teaching English to primary school students, but approached it as she might for secondary school students. She wrote the pattern of the present perfect tense on the white board.
In other words, she taught grammar explicitly. Grammar is generally believed to be best taught to primary students communicatively, by exposing them to new language through activities in listening, speaking, reading or writing (Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Mellow, 2000) or through games (Nedomová, 2007), not teaching them explicitly as in extract 8 below.

Extract 8 (A, 01-22, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pakai ( ) Pakai s {use} {use ‘s’} (the teacher add the –s to the student’s work written on the whiteboard)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.1.2 Affective functions: Teacher A

Feedback

Giving feedback can be seen as both a pedagogical or an affective function, depending on whether it is seen as encouragement or whether it fulfills some part of a task. In the case below, Teacher A confirmed that a student was giving the correct answer. Teacher A’s utterance “ya” (yes) was spontaneous, and probably unconscious, as we will explore in the following chapter.

Extract 9 (A, 29-01, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ya president {yes}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>he is our president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>what about this? (point to the picture next to the picture of the president of Republic of Indonesia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘Scolding’

Teacher A occasionally code-switched when she felt the need to scold her students. The next extract is an example in which Teacher A responded in Bahasa Minang. Teacher A used Bahasa Minang (BM) in order to let her students know that she was a little surprised (“Ndak tau?↑”) that her students did not know the English word for gubernur [governor], especially as the form is nearly the same. This word had been taught in the main part of the lesson, but apparently not all the students remembered it. She mentioned in the interview that she had used Bahasa Minang to attract the students’ attention, letting them know that she was a little angry. Using Bahasa Minang with rising intonation means that she was not happy, and that she wanted the students to know that.

Extract 10 (A, 29-01, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>What is English for gubernur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Ndak tau?↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{You don’t know?↑}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this section I have highlighted the pedagogical and affective functions of Teacher A’s code-switching, including deliberate (or ‘switch’) translation for comprehension purposes. Teacher A led many classroom activities which focus on pronunciation and listening. She asked the students to repeat after her and she also asked individual students to pronounce the vocabulary learned that day. She also asked students to answer listening comprehension questions. From observation, it could be concluded that Teacher A tended to give more listening activities to students in both ‘listening and speaking lesson’ and ‘reading and
writing lesson’ as well. She did more listening and speaking activities in the reading and writing lesson than reading and writing activities. Moreover, she provided individual assistance, pair work and group work. She tended to address students in a more friendly way than the other two teachers, most of the time in the target language (English), which may have lightened the ‘scolding’, particularly as she used the mother tongue, Bahasa Minang, which may have narrowed the social distance. She was more flexible and gave students more opportunities to engage in activity. She let the students used Bahasa Indonesia or Bahasa Minang in responding to her utterances.

She used Bahasa Indonesia and also a few Bahasa Minang words in her teaching; in other words she employed code-switching in her teaching mostly for introducing and explaining vocabulary using Bahasa Indonesia and a few Bahasa Minang words for affective function (see extract 10 above). Teacher A also encouraged the use of dictionaries for the students to check the meaning of the difficult words they encountered, thus building students’ self-learning habits which is also a form of code switching in a sense, although a thorough discussion of this is beyond the scope of this study. In the following section I will analyse Teacher B’s code switching practices.

4.3.2.2 Teacher B’s code-switching: Functions

In this section, Teacher B’s classroom activity is described to highlight her code-switching practice. As for Teacher A, I will consider Teacher B’s lesson according to its three stages: Pre-Activity, Whilst-Activity, and Post-Activity.
The topics for her lesson were ‘Countable and Uncountable nouns’ and ‘Seasons and weather’. The skills to be achieved were ‘Listening and Speaking’ for the topics ‘Countable and Uncountable nouns’ and ‘Seasons and weather’; and reading and writing for the topic ‘Seasons and weather’.

The analysis revealed that Teacher B switched from English to Bahasa Indonesia as well as from BI to TL. She used Bahasa Indonesia in explaining grammar in whilst activity. She tended to use long explanations for grammar (see extract 11 and 12 below as examples) which suggested that she was trained for teaching at secondary level schools instead of primary; grammatical explanations themselves can of course be seen as a rather traditional approach.

4.3.2.2.1 Pedagogical functions: Teacher B

The examples I have selected here of Teacher B’s code-switching include pedagogical functions such as explaining grammatical rules, concept checking, and comprehension check.

Explaining grammatical rules

The long explanations using grammatical metalanguage seem to exemplify the pedagogical decisions of a secondary-trained teacher who is not used to primary language learning. Teacher B introduced the topic, ‘many’ and ‘much’ by eliciting the literal meaning of “many” and “much” from the students. However, much and many do not have any real meaning unless in context – it is the use that is the issue – countability or uncountability. Teacher B explained
the structural features in Bahasa Indonesia in an over-complex way. Bahasa Indonesia does not distinguish count-non-count nouns in the same way as English does. For example, Saya punya banyak uang di dompet saya [I have much money in my wallet]; Saya punya banyak buku di rumah [I have many books at home]. So, ‘much’ and ‘many’ have the same meaning in Bahasa Indonesia that is ‘banyak’.

Extract 11 (B, 14-02, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Banyak, is it the same meaning? {many}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>… Ya much and many has the same meaning {Yes}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>but they different here,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>ha these … words are different, (teacher points at the words “many” and “much” written on the whiteboard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>for example ( ),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>you can give to noun,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>what is noun?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>noun? ( ) (teacher raises her eyebrow with surprise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>are you forget? (the teacher walks to the whiteboard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>noun?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>in Bahasa, what you call it?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seemed that Teacher B code-switched to facilitate the understanding of the term, yet knowing that ‘banyak’ means both much and many does not actually facilitate accurate usage. Then, the teacher confirmed that they had the same meaning by saying “ya” meaning yes (line 45).

In line 50 Teacher B directed students’ attention to understand what a ‘noun’ is in relation to the use of ‘many’ and ‘much’ by asking the question (“what is
noun?”). However, no student answered her question. Realising it she took the turn herself, this time rephrasing the question (“noun?” line 51). However, still no student took the turn. The teacher’s remark “are you forget” (line 52) showed that the teacher may assume that the students did not pay attention hence could not answer her question. Teacher B then initiated a switch asking the meaning of ‘noun’ in Bahasa Indonesia (line 54) and wrote the word “noun” on the white board.

The students did supply the answer, but the answer from the student was wrong (line 55 in extract 12 below). Knowing that the students could not answer it correctly, Teacher B switched to Bahasa Indonesia, line 57. Her questions seemed to make the students confused as she asked whether the bottle does something. As a result, no student answered her question. When the students still could not answer with a right answer, she was a little annoyed and uttered (‘come on ↑, come on’↑, line 58) with rising intonation (↑) and then nominated a smart student (Chacha) to answer it (line 60).

Extract 12 (B, 14-02, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (s)</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>verb ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(the students answer in low voice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Verb?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(the teacher writes the word “verb” on the whiteboard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Apakah bekerja botolnya?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{Does the bottle do something?}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Oh…come on↑, come on↑,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>ok, who knows?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Chacha?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Chacha is the student’s name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>this is an example of noun,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This extract (extract 12) is another example when the teacher switched to Bahasa Indonesia after she gave complicated grammar explanation that was beyond the comprehension of the students.

**Comprehension checks**

Another function of code-switching employed by Teacher B was comprehension checking.

Extract 13 (B, 14-02, 13)
Concept checking

In some cases, Teacher B was sometimes impatient to receive answers to the question she asked. At the beginning of her turn (extract 14 below line 54) she also asked a question related to ‘should’. In this case, her Bahasa Indonesia used did not help the students in understanding her question. She switched to TL (“is the sentence correct?”); but still no students answered. Finally, she asked “What is the form of using should?” (i.e, ‘what verb form should be used with “should”?). Her question seemed confusing. She was asking about what form of active verb followed ‘should’. This question then was followed by its translation in Bahasa Indonesia and the answer to the question.

However, she only gave 2.56 seconds for the students to answer her questions. Instead of giving time to the students to answer her questions, she answered the questions herself. Although this can be seen as a pedagogical function, in that Teacher B was trying to get through the course content, it can also be seen as a psychological function of code-switching, in that she may have felt anxiety at the pace material was being covered. She herself later explained that she did not have enough time because of the pressure to get through curriculum content. This will be discussed further in chapter 5.

Extract 14 (B, 07-02, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>We should wearing socks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ciri-ciri dari, we should wearing socks/? {what is the characteristics of}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>is the sentence correct?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Iffa, Frizzy, what do you think about the sentence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>come on, who still remember?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher, after a number of attempts at explaining what a noun or verb is, finally code-switched from English to Bahasa Indonesia when she detected “blank looks” from the class (extract 15 below). It seemed that Teacher B did not effectively transmit the concept of count/uncount nouns. Her target language use did not help her students to understand her question (“water is a noun, adjective or verb?” line 68). It was reflected by the student’s wrong answer (“Verb”). She switched to Bahasa Indonesia (“Air, benda: atau kata sifat?”) to ask the question she asked in line 68 (“Water, water is a noun, adjective or verb?”). The other student answered it correctly (“noun”, line 71), but it seemed that Teacher B did not hear it. Her later question, ‘I ask about this, water, is this noun or verb?’ (extract 15 below, line 76) in English implied that she was still expecting the student’s answer to the question. To conclude here, her code-switching actually did help the students; they could answer her question and give another example of a noun (line 74). However, it is clear here that this is an example of the teacher losing sight of the actual grammar point because she fixated on the parts of speech instead.

Extract 15 (B, 14-02, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Water, water is a noun, adjective or verb?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| T          | 70   | Air, benda: atau kata sifat?  
{Water, noun or adjective?} |
| S          | 71   | Noun      |
4.3.2.2 Affective functions: Teacher B

In terms of affective functions of code-switching, Teacher B employed feedback and ‘scolding’.

Feedback

In most cases, Teacher B gave feedback in Bahasa Indonesia (extract 16). As an example, in one of the classroom activities, Teacher B asked the students to find examples of countable and uncountable nouns. The student proposed in Bahasa Indonesia “Perban” [bandage]. Teacher B responded by saying “Iya, bisa tu sayang” [yes, it belongs to uncountable noun my dear child]. Her feedback was categorized as affective functions as she uttered “Iya, bisa tu sayang” which created a good rapport between them.

Extract 16 (B, 14-02, 13)
‘Scolding’

Teacher B was found to use Bahasa Indonesia to ‘scold’ her students. She had just finished explaining the task for the class to do when suddenly one student asked her what to do. She was somewhat annoyed with the question and so she asked the student “Kemana aja?” [Where have you been?]. This utterance was not a question because she wanted to know where the student was, but as an expression of annoyance. She had been asking the students to do the exercise two times, but one student still asked what to do.

Extract 17 (B, 07-02, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>I tell you two times, Sari,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>kemana aja?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{Where have you been?}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>ok, according to this picture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>find the characteristic,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>you know the characteristics? ciri-ciri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{characteristic}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.2.3 Switch repetition: Teacher B

Many studies have shown that the use of translation from target language into L1 discourages the students from trying to decode the utterances in the TL (Chen, Warden, & Chang, 2005; VanPatten, Dvorak, & Lee, 1987). It is therefore important that the translation from TL to BI is not often used in the classroom. However, sometimes it appeared that the teacher participant was not confident enough in using the target language (Cameron, 2001) and she translated directly her TL utterances into her students’ mother tongue.
Regarding the use of translation from BI to TL, it was observed that it was not used very often.

Switch repetition from English to Bahasa Indonesia often occurred and a few from Bahasa Indonesia to English in Teacher B’s teaching. Most of the examples of switch repetition occurred while the teacher was speaking in English first. However, in the extract below (Extract 18) Teacher B started with a sentence in Bahasa Indonesia “Cepat nak” then she repeated it in English “hurry up”. Teacher B switched to English from Bahasa Indonesia to discipline the students. At that time the class was noisy, students were talking to each other, and some students were not sitting in their chairs. She asked the students in English to sit down and to hurry in Bahasa Indonesia (line 245). This utterance was translated into English (“hurry up”). In line 241, Teacher B used Bahasa Indonesia in asking a question.

Extract 18 (B, 07-02, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>what is milkshake?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>241</td>
<td>ok, siapa yang punya? sunny? {who's got}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>242</td>
<td>ok, come on Sari (.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>243</td>
<td>come on Sari, come on Sari,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>244</td>
<td>sit down please</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>cepat nak, cepat nak, hurry up. {hurry up, hurry child}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>yang pakai soda miss {the one with soda}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>pakai soda {with soda}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>ok, who have different weather?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td>siapa yang punya yang beda weathernya? {anyone who had a different weather?}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In extract 18, I also show how Teacher B translated her target language in line 248 into Bahasa Indonesia in line 249. It is interesting, in this utterance Teacher B kept to target language for the words ‘sunny’ (line 241) and ‘weather’ (line 249). Without knowing the context, these code-switchings or these utterances (line 241 and 249) look very odd. So, in this extract 18, she was discussing ‘summer’. It appears that she wanted to continue discussing other seasons as she asked “who have different weather?” (line 248, 249).

In other words, she did not use Bahasa Indonesia for certain words as in the extract below (extract 19). The students were doing the exercise on ‘much and many’. Teacher B asked them to underline ‘much or many’ for the noun found in the sentence. She did not use Bahasa Indonesia for the word ‘noun’ in lines 13 and 14 as well as the word ‘cake’ in line 14. She kept to English as the target language for these words. It seemed that she code-switched from TL to BI to increase the pace of the lesson and get through the material.

Extract 19 (B, 07-02, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ok, look at number one, my mother cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>much many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| T       | 13   | cake that we couldn’t finish it, noun nya apa?  
|         |      | {What is} |
| T       | 14   | cake, noun nya, cake kan?  
|         |      | {its} {right?} |
| S       | 15   | do you use much or many? |
| T       | 16   | Much |
| T       | 17   | Ha: iya, ok  
|         |      | {yes} |
4.3.2.2.4 Questioning: Teacher B

Classroom interaction in Teacher B’s class was mostly realised in an IRF (initiate-respond-teacher’s feedback) structure such as in extract 19 above. In the case of the EFL classroom, the teacher might initiate interaction by asking questions which can prompt students to participate (Faruji, 2011), and this creates more interaction through activities involving different kinds of negotiations of meaning (Long, 1985; Sujariati, Rahman & Mahmud, 2016). Yet, Teacher B asked questions which make her teaching complicated as in the extract 18 above. In the extract 18 above, line 240, Teacher B was asking a question (“what is a milkshake?” line 240); it appeared that she did not give students a chance to answer her question; the students might know what a milkshake is but to explain it may be difficult. She asked another question but now in Bahasa Indonesia “siapa yang punya?” (line 241). It seemed that she tried to give a clue to her previous question (“what is a milkshake?” line 240) and asked another question but in English (“sunny?” line 241). Finally, in line 246, one of the students answered in Bahasa Indonesia which then was confirmed by Teacher B by repeating the student’s utterance.

In conclusion, Teacher B perceived English more as a school subject, enhancing her students’ knowledge about the target language and preparing her students for school exams. Overall, she used class time mostly to explain the grammar points rather than practicing speaking English, and the code-switching happened mostly in explaining grammar points.
4.3.2.3 Teacher C’s code-switching: Functions

In line with Teacher A and Teacher B, Teacher C’s lessons were also divided into three stages: pre-activity, whilst activity and post-activity, and transcripts of these sections were analysed. The results reveal that Teacher C employed code-switching the most among the three teachers. The functions of her code-switching included pedagogical ones such as giving instruction, explaining grammar, introducing/explaining vocabulary, and concept checking; and affective functions: giving motivation and feedback to maintain the flow of the lesson. Teacher C also employed switch repetition with functions such as grammar explanation, concept checking, comprehension checks, or giving instructions.

4.3.2.3.1 Pedagogical functions: Teacher C

Giving Instructions

Teacher C gave instructions in Bahasa Indonesia much more often than Teacher A and Teacher B. The next example of code-switching shows exchanges between Teacher C and the students, and illustrates her typical way of giving instruction. For beginners, doing the exercise might be difficult, so the teacher may have thought she was making the task easier by using BI for instruction. It seemed that Teacher C code-switched deliberately as in line 1, for this reason. She may have used TL in line 4 because this is a frequent instruction in EFL classroom, and so the students were expected to be familiar with this instruction- or possibly her relatively low proficiency in English made her use Bahasa Indonesia. Her utterances in line 6 gave more examples of this
reason. However, it is interesting to note that for a simple utterance such as in line 2, she used Bahasa Indonesia as well as in line 5.

Extract 20 (C, 30-01, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Belum, bikin saja dulu nomornya, {Not yet, just write the number first}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>kemudian listen to me, {then}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>I will read the dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>and you will try to complete the dialogue,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>lihat while listen to me, {look at me}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>kamu melengkapi jawabannya dengan bahasa kamu, {answer it with your own words}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explaining grammar rules**

Teacher C did not seem to be very aware of the principles of communicative language teaching as most of the activities in her class offered few opportunities for real communication in the TL. She provided students mostly with writing practice. For example, in one lesson she focused on grammar, with the topic ‘accepting and refusing an invitation’. In extract 21, I show how Teacher C code-switched from TL to BI. Teacher C code-switched frequently during the whole turn while explaining grammar and new vocabulary.

Extract 21 (C, 16-01, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>ya, menanyakan tentang apa {yes, to ask about what}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ya, something ( ) what is used {yes}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>untuk menanyakan tentang apa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
She stressed the grammatical word she was focusing on (‘what’), but she highlighted the spoken word in English and checked its concept in Bahasa Indonesia. This teacher seemed to make the process rather complicated, as ‘what’ is not a difficult word, and is easily translated.

Extract 22 (C, 16-01, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>tidak karena dia sudah di ambil oleh {no, because it has taken by}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>does,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>So</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>what does mother cook in the kitchen every morning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>so the answer is ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>apa anak? {What is it students?}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore Teacher C often used questions in explaining the grammar as in extract 23 below, line 06, 11, 13, 19. She was explaining ‘how to accept the invitation’. Most of her questions were in Bahasa Indonesia.
The main reason Teacher C used BI appeared to be to facilitate the understanding of her students. However, in the stimulated recall interviews we explored her perception of her English proficiency, which may have been a contributing factor.

**Introducing or explaining vocabulary**

Intrinsic to learning a foreign language is the learning of new vocabulary and expressions. When new vocabulary was introduced, Teacher C asked the students about the meaning of the words in questions which were mostly in Bahasa Indonesia, for example: “apa artinya?” or “apa bahasa Inggrisnya?” as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Kita menerima undangan, {We accept the invitation}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>kemudian bagaimana responnya. {then how do we respond?}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07</td>
<td>it can be response positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>and negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
<td>response positive,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>we accept the invitation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>apa artinya itu student? {What does it mean student?}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>kita menerima undangannya, {We accept the invitation}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>apa respon yang kita gunakan? {How do we respond}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>kita menerima undangannya. {We accept the invitation}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>sure, certainly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>sure,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>certainly,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>apalagi? {What else}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the following extract (Extract 24). And again, in this case, she jumped in with Bahasa Indonesia stressing the meaning of the word “when”. One of the students asked the meaning of the word ‘when’. Teacher C translated it to Bahasa Indonesia and said “When itu waktu” which literally means ‘when is time’. Surprisingly, she continued her utterances and asked what is ‘when’ in English, perhaps because she thought it would be good pedagogy to immediately check the concept again.

Extract 24 (C, 16-01, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>When itu apa mam? {What is it}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>When itu waktu, apa bahasa Inggrisnya? {That’s time, how do you say it in English}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>kalau when itu pasti waktu {if} {it must be time}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concept checking**

Concept checking in the classroom can be used to avoid asking the question “Do you understand?” As discussed in section 4.3.2.3.4 below, this question can be answered with “yes” without indicating students’ true understanding. It is especially important in inductive language teaching where students arrive at an understanding of rules through looking at examples of use, in this case the use of the target language; and the teacher may need to check whether the students have a clear understanding of the concept presented. The following extract shows Teacher C checking the students’ understanding. She used Bahasa Indonesia as in line 126, 127.
4.3.2.3.2 Affective functions: Teacher C

Teacher C’s code-switching also accompanied affective functions which serve as expressions of emotion. In this respect, code-switching, which was actually a switch repetition, was used to build solidarity with the students as in the following extract (Extract 26). What was interesting to observe in this utterance was the combination of the Bahasa Minang word ‘Ndak’ and Bahasa Indonesia ‘pa-pa’. This Bahasa Minang word, literally means ‘no’; and ‘pa-pa’ comes from word ‘apa-apa’ which literally means ‘everything’. However, in this context, the utterance ‘ndak pa-pa’ means never mind.

Extract 26 (C, 30-01, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>Ndak pa-pa, never mind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.3.3 Switch repetition: Teacher C

Furthermore, Teacher C employed switch repetition the most among the three teacher participants of this study. Similar to Teacher A and Teacher B some function was attached to those instances of switch repetition. For example, as in the following extract (Extract 27) Teacher C asked the students to do
exercises from number one until number ten, thus the functions of switch repetition here “Nomor satu sampai nomor sepuluh” are for giving instruction. The question may be asked why she code-switch, when number is not particularly difficult and is usually some of the first vocabulary to be learned.

Extract 27 (C, 16-01, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Number one until number ten,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>write the number first, one until ten,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Nomor satu sampai nomor sepuluh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{one until ten}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.3.4 Maintaining the flow of the lesson: Teacher C

Often Teacher C asked a question; but it appeared that she did not expect an answer from students. The questions such as “understand?” in the extract below were answered by a student with “Yes”. This answer might not be true since she questioned the whole class; and only one student answered. There was a possibility that this student was not being honest, she answered “yes” probably to make the teacher happy, or because of shyness.

Extract 28 (C, 13-02, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Understand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>yakin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{Sure?}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{yes}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>yang digaris ya jawabannya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{The underlined one is the answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Nah sekarang kita mengerjakan latihannya lagi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{Now, we are going to do the exercise}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Bagikan buku ke kawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{Share books to your friend}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Yang digaris nanti jawabannya ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{The underlined one is the answer, yes}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To sum up, some of Teacher C’s code-switching examples were not pedagogical because they did not help the students. She used Bahasa Indonesia the most among the teachers. From the observation data, her proficiency seemed to be the issue, and so this will be explored in Chapter 5.

4.4 Summary of teachers’ code-switching and classroom language use

In this chapter I have analysed examples of code-switching practices of the three teachers. I first analysed the amounts of use of each language and how much student output there was in terms of words. Then I looked at the number of turns in each language, as the basis for more closely analysing the reasons for the use of each language within these turns. For this purpose, conversation analysis was chosen as a tool because it can offer a useful way of analysing the pedagogical and affective purposes of language use in these classrooms.

The results of the conversation analysis show that code-switching occurred in the classrooms and teachers used code-switching as a tool to enhance interaction. The use of Bahasa Indonesia on occasion provided students more opportunities to engage in TL. Teachers used Bahasa Indonesia to build vocabulary meaning through the use of translation, to teach grammar and to motivate the students.

Teacher A typically began her listening-focused lessons with an audio-recorded text or read part of a text to model pronunciation. Her instructions to the
students were more consistently in the target language. Teacher A employed more pedagogical functions than affective functions. She also gave more pedagogical reasons than affective reasons in the stimulated recall interview.

Contrary to Teacher A’s patterns of language use, Teacher B employed more switch repetitions. Teacher B translated from TL to Bahasa Indonesia and less frequently from Bahasa Indonesia to TL. Similar to Teacher A, her code-switching demonstrated both pedagogical and affective functions; and used more pedagogical functions than affective functions. As Teacher A, Teacher B and C applied more pedagogical than affective functions in her code-switching. Teacher C used Bahasa Indonesia the most among the three teachers.

Conversation analysis revealed some of the functions of code-switching; however, teacher perspectives on their decision-making are also important, as is the degree of awareness they had of the phenomena. Therefore, stimulated recall interviews were undertaken with the teachers to throw light on these perspectives. These interviews also prompted the teachers to reflect on their teaching practices, and the analysis of these perspectives and reflections will be reported in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5
STIMULATED RECALL INTERVIEW: UNPACKING THE REASONS BEHIND TEACHERS’ CODE-SWITCHING PRACTICES

5.1 Introduction

In chapter four, data relating to the amount and functions of teacher code-switching were discussed through the medium of conversation analysis. In my study, three languages were available in the participants’ repertoire, though only two of them (Bahasa Indonesia and English) were activated, with minimal exceptions. The reason that Bahasa Minang was less evident may be that Bahasa Indonesia is the official language of the school and the unifying language of the country, and English of course is the target language. Code-switching therefore occurred almost exclusively between Bahasa Indonesia and English, and I analysed the functions which accompanied the phenomenon.

This chapter describes the teachers’ own perceptions of why they applied code-switching. These are explored through stimulated recall interviews which provide ways to unpack the teachers’ own beliefs and understandings about code-switching, and answering the second sub-section of the research question:

- What are the perceptions of teachers in this context as to the relationship between code-switching and the effective teaching of English?

The main aim of the stimulated recall interview technique is to help the teacher recall his/her thought processes and reflect on what was happening during his/her teaching (Gass & Mackey, 2000). During the stimulated recall
interviews each teacher viewed a video recording of two of their lessons, and they were encouraged to make comments and/or pause the video at any time. The researcher also paused the video at certain points to clarify the teacher’s intentions. Overall, it appeared that the three teachers described their code-switching in terms of both pedagogical and affective reasons, paralleling to an extent the observation data. To save time was the main reason Teacher A gave for code-switching. Teacher B and Teacher C used Bahasa Indonesia often for giving classroom or task instructions and explaining grammar rules.

Although the teachers’ professional learning was not explicitly investigated, one of the more significant findings of this study is the effect of the stimulated recall interview technique on the development of the teachers’ self-reflection. At the beginning of the interview the teachers were not very aware of at what points they code-switched or in which stage of the lesson, but at the end of the interview, after being presented with actual data, they were prompted to reflect on their practice, and they acknowledged how surprised they were at the revelations of these phenomena. They appeared to gain better understandings of the relationship between their code-switching and the more effective teaching of English language skills in the Indonesian context, and for their future teaching. In a sense it can be seen as co-construction of knowledge between the teacher participants and the researcher.

Thus, the teachers’ ideas of the ‘need’ to use Bahasa Indonesia had been modified. This is an interesting dimension that developed during the stimulated
recall interviews. They were used primarily as a research instrument, but actually took on the role of an intervention, in that teachers gained pedagogical awareness. This provides evidence that stimulated recall might be a useful tool for language teacher education itself.

Excerpts of data from the transcripts of the interviews are presented below, to build an in-depth understanding of the teachers’ language use and the reasons for their code-switching. Before I address the functions specifically, I will deal with a key finding that emerged, the issue of the teachers’ awareness of their own code-switching.

5.2 Awareness of switch repetition

One finding that emerged from this study is what I have referred to as switch repetition, which I have used to denote what happens when the teachers made an utterance in one language then immediately translated it into another. The three teachers employed this switch repetition in different ways, for example with differing initial language choices, and they claimed differing reasons for its use.

Teacher A

For Teacher A, switch repetition occurred mostly from TL to Bahasa Indonesia. Almost all her switch repetition dealt with the vocabulary teaching, such as asking students the meaning of certain vocabulary. Her utterance in TL was easy to understand but she still code-switched. When asked why she repeated
her TL utterance in Bahasa Indonesia in the video, she said it occurred spontaneously. Another example is presented below, and relates to giving task instructions. She explained this as “untuk menghemat waktu” [to save time], but it is apparent that she did not allow enough time to test students’ understanding before switching. Whether Teacher A’s switch repetitions were conscious or unconscious was not fully clear.

Extract 29 (A, 22-01, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ok, attention to page 2,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>perhatikan halaman keduanya tentang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{pay attention to page 2 to}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>listening test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that the switch repetition from initial Bahasa Indonesia to English was not found in Teacher A’s utterances.

**Teacher B**

In contrast to Teacher A, Teacher B switched code (switch repetition) both from English to Bahasa Indonesia and vice versa.

Extract 30 (B, 14-02, 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>melindungi kita dari panas matahari,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{to protect us from the sunlight}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
<td>Ok, to protect us from the sunlight,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>what is sunlight?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When she was asked why she used Bahasa Indonesia first here, she mentioned that she wanted to know whether the students know the English word for
matahari [sunlight]. She expected the students could answer her vocabulary question as the expected answer had already been given in Bahasa Indonesia.

**Teacher C**

Teacher C claimed significant learning after watching the video in the stimulated recall interview. Several times in the interview she commented and mentioned how surprised she was when looked at how she code-switched in her teaching. After watching the video on her teaching, Teacher C commented that she realized that she repeated many target language utterances immediately in Bahasa Indonesia. She then admitted that she should not do that because it was unnecessary.

_Sometimes we spoil the students, right mam? I repeat even the simple one. I repeat it in Bahasa Indonesia. It might be insignificant, but sometimes I do it spontaneously without realizing it._ (C, 03-03, 13)

Her comment above also shows her low self-confidence. She used the word ‘we’ (sometimes we spoil ….). She was asking my agreement to support her on the idea of spoiling the students.

The above extracts illustrate the apparent development of critical reflection and indicate that watching the video footage was a significant stimulus towards enabling those teachers to view their teaching objectively. This was also assisted by their growing awareness of the underlying motivation behind such ‘spontaneous’ occurrences.
5.3 Lack of awareness of language choices

Teacher A

At the end of the interview Teacher A acknowledged that it was useful that she could watch her performance in class and focus on her use of language. She was on occasion unaware of her use of Bahasa Indonesia in her teaching, referring to its use as ‘spontaneous’. She also showed how surprised she was at the end of the interview when she realized how and when she code-switched.

She mentioned sometimes she translated from English to Bahasa Indonesia, even though she realized it was not necessary.

Sometimes I tend to translate, well (laughing), it should not be necessary. (A, 02-03, 13)

This illustrates the lack of awareness.

As the students are quiet I realize that they didn’t understand what I’m saying, so spontaneously I spoke in Bahasa Indonesia. And it seems to me that it works well. (A, 02-03, 13)

Although this teacher referred to the switch as ‘spontaneous’, it is evident that there was a stimulus – the judgment that their silence signified lack of understanding. Teacher A’s response was spontaneous in the sense of being unconscious and automatic, and perhaps reflects her confidence in her teaching experience and awareness of good language learning practices.
**Teacher B**

After watching the video of her teaching, Teacher B mentioned that her lesson would be better if she used English more. She admitted that, however, sometimes she was not aware that she used Bahasa Indonesia. According to her, she used Bahasa Indonesia spontaneously or sometimes she was influenced by the students’ utterances, but then she realized that it would be more productive to use English.

*(Laugh) Sometimes, it is just happened. Students’ influenced me, and then I remembered I should use English.* (B, 28-02, 13)

After watching the video on her teaching, she mentioned in the interview that she was surprised at how much she code-switched and how she communicated in the classroom. She used the word “ya, kira-kira begitu” [Yes, roughly] to begin the reflection which means well, what can I say.

*Yes, roughly. By watching this video, it is feedback for myself, much to be repaired, for example, there should be more use of English, so that it becomes more attractive to students. Not focusing on Bahasa Indonesia, but they should focus on English too.* (B, 28-02, 13)

She realized that much should be done in terms of her use of the language in the classroom. Teacher B believed that using TL motivates the students as opposed to Teacher C who believed that using Bahasa Indonesia would motivate her students because her students were just primary school students and beginners in English.
Teacher C

Similar to Teacher A and B, Teacher C states that she was not aware that she code-switched to the extent she observed when watching her teaching.

After watching this video, I realised that I repeat a lot mam. But then I think I can repeat several time because they are primary school students. (C, 03-03, 13)

Teacher C also reported that she repeated several times which, according to her, was not necessary. She repeated her TL utterances in Bahasa Indonesia – using frequent switch repetitions. She realized this after watching herself teaching on video. Her statement above suggests her sense of vulnerability due to her students’ level of development and that she was learning something from watching the video.

She further mentioned in the interview that she even translated simple words or sentences. What she meant by simple here are the high frequency words or a simple sentence often heard in classroom discourse. She acknowledged that it might be better if she used English.

In my opinion, because this is basic, so I used Bahasa Indonesia, but after watching this video, even the simple one I say it in Bahasa Indonesia, I should use English. (C, 03-03-13)

The opportunity for self-reflection acted as a change agent for this teacher, as she proposed that in the future she would use Bahasa Indonesia for more complex explanations or instructions, but would try to consistently use English for simple ones, as she states below:
There was mam, for simple things it might be better in English, but in saying complicated thing it might be better in Bahasa Indonesia. (C, 03-03-13)

She also commented on her English proficiency after watching the video, which was the lowest among the three teachers. She acknowledged this herself, and cited a certain lack of confidence, which suggests why she code-switched the most among the teachers. She is a graduate from a low-ranking private university, which may not mean that her teacher education course was in any real sense deficient, but in the Indonesian context, as in many contexts, institutional prestige is highly influential. In addition, her environment, which is the same for all three teachers, does not support her in using English outside the classroom. If it happened that someone used English outside the classroom, people around would judge him/her as overacting, showing off (Yulia, 2014). Overall, the teachers’ reaction to watching themselves teach language showed that they found the experience to be a powerful agent for change. It revealed aspects of code-switching that they had not previously considered.

5.4 Teacher responses to students’ Bahasa Indonesia utterances

An important aspect of interaction in the language classroom is the nature of learner output and the teacher’s effect on this, and this is considered in this section. As previously established, Teacher A was the most consistent in using TL with her students during lesson interactions. She tried her best to always communicate with her students in English even though some students used Bahasa Indonesia when responding to her at on various occasions. She felt that
as her students were just beginners in English, their English competence was not high, and they found it difficult to express more sophisticated concepts in English. Teacher A let them continue in Bahasa Indonesia as long as they could express themselves. When I asked why she let the students respond in Bahasa Indonesia and did not ask them to speak in English when responding to her TL utterance, she mentioned that

_My students are primary school students who are really beginners in English. Their English is limited. They probably can understand but it is difficult for them to express their ideas in English. Therefore, I let them use Bahasa Indonesia when responding, while I keep speaking in English. By doing so they will still be able to express their ideas without fear of making mistakes._ (A, 02-03, 13)

In contrast, when Teacher B watched herself providing additional information about English words, she saw that she did not attempt to use English but continued to use Bahasa Indonesia, as she believed, in order to make sure of her students’ understanding of the content or grammar. She gave reasons for what she was doing as follows:

_I gradually try to use more English in the classroom, but if I need to use Bahasa Indonesia then I will use Bahasa Indonesia._ (B, 05-03, 13)

Like Teacher B, Teacher C also gave long wordy explanations, especially relating to grammar, mostly in Bahasa Indonesia. However, she was generally more aware than Teacher B that she did this. After viewing, she acknowledged the limitations of her target language use with the students. She realised that she
should teach listening and speaking skills but instead she focused on explaining grammar through writing activities.

5.5 Teachers’ perceptions of their underlying reasons for code-switching

The table below presents the key motivations for code-switching as stated by the three teachers during the stimulated recall interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Teacher C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogical reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To save time</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To introduce new vocabulary</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To present grammatical rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Device to maintain lesson flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To accommodate the limited English proficiency of their students</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To motivate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For a reason of emphasis</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the lack of awareness</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Teacher’s functions and reasons for code-switching

The sections below elaborate the table above or the reasons given by the teachers for their code-switching.
5.5.1 Pedagogical reasons

This section describes the teachers’ pedagogical reasons for their code-switching, however there may be overlap with the affective reasons, as in Teacher B’s example below.

5.5.1.1 To ‘save time’

The three teachers mentioned that they had very limited EFL classroom time, just 70 minutes a week for English. According to them, incorporating Bahasa Indonesia in English lessons was essential because it was more efficient and time saving. However, the three teachers gave different reasons for why they needed to code-switch to save time.

Teacher A

Teacher A stopped the video when she was teaching the words around ‘government’. She gave comments about why, in this certain part, she used Bahasa Indonesia. She mentioned that

\[
\text{Sometimes it took time to explain something in English and I had to use Bahasa Indonesia in order to save time. (A 24-02, 13)}
\]

When teaching and explaining new words, Teacher A avoided giving long and tedious word explanations in English. She believed that as class time was limited it could not be spent on providing excessive descriptions for a single word so she translated.
**Teacher B**

Overall, Teacher B gave longer explanations in the TL. However, she frequently resorted to speaking Bahasa Indonesia. Often she translated her TL utterances directly into BI immediately afterwards. She seemed to recognise the need for the TL use in her interaction; but when she was asked why she switched code in explaining the words ‘many’ and ‘much’ she reported that she needed to use Bahasa Indonesia to save time, thus giving an apparently pedagogical reason. In Teacher B’s stimulated recall interview transcripts it is evident that Teacher B used Bahasa Indonesia to explain complicated grammatical concepts, and she herself expressed the belief that they would be more comprehensible if BI was used to save time.

As she mentioned in the stimulated recall interview, the time factor exerted certain pressures as she worried she would not be able to deliver all the curriculum topics in the required timeframe. So it appeared that the reasons for switching were also affective on her part, to reduce her own anxiety. Teacher B argued that it was hard for her to follow the curriculum strictly, but knew that this was required in Indonesian classrooms.

### 5.5.1.2 Explaining grammar rules

**Teacher B**

The primary reason for Teacher B to code-switch, she said, was to enable students’ comprehension and to help them complete tasks successfully. When
Teacher B watched a section of the video in which she used some Bahasa Indonesia to explain grammar she said that

*I use Bahasa Indonesia to explain English grammar because it was difficult for the students to understand grammar if explained in English. (B, 24-02, 13)*

In addition, Teacher B claimed that her students had not achieved enough competence to comprehend a grammar explanation in English as they are grade 5 students at primary school.

Teacher B explained further that she wanted the students to understand the lesson on grammar because there would be an English test coming, and such tests usually have a grammatical focus.

*First of all, I need to think about the topics I teach, if the students seemed not to understand the lesson, If I use English exclusively, So, why I used Bahasa Indonesia, while actually they learned English.........If I used English all the time, I’m worried that the learning objective would not be achieved by the students, and I’m worried next week there will be a test, they cannot answer the test, therefore I used both English and Bahasa Indonesia. (B 25-02, 13)*

According to Teacher B, some of her students occasionally complained about the fact that she used too much English in an English lesson. She reported that these were usually the weaker students.

*Yes, I do use lots of Bahasa Indonesia, yes that’s right, students need to practice to use English, but because of the method, it’s not possible for me to teach grammar using English exclusively. I want the students to understand how to
use ‘should’ and ‘have to’, so I need to use Bahasa Indonesia to explain them to the students. (B, 24-02, 13)

Teacher B used BI to explain some points which are easy to explain, such ‘many climates and seasons’, however she appeared to make the explanations quite complicated. She asked about the ‘characteristics’ of the weather which might make the students confused; she said “make the characteristics (sic) of the weather”.

In another part of the lesson when she explained ‘much and many’ she also talked about parts of speech (see extract 12 in chapter 4). The use of metalanguage appeared to confuse some of the students.

In summary, Teacher B tended to teach grammar using Bahasa Indonesia because, according to her, even though the skill to be taught in primary school was listening and speaking, the teaching aim was also to help students gain good grades at the end of the school year and in the national examination.

**Teacher C**

Teacher C reported that it was already a difficult thing for her students to understand her speaking in English. Moreover, learning English grammar from explanations in English is difficult.

Moreover, if I taught grammar Bu. English alone is difficult-it adds more to teach the grammar in English. (C, 03-03, 13)
Teacher B gave grammar explanations in the target language (English), and in contrast Teacher C used Bahasa Indonesia for the same function. She depended more on Bahasa Indonesia in fear that her TL use might lead to students’ lack of comprehension which would result in them not being able to perform the task successfully.

5.5.1.3 To introduce/explain new vocabulary

Teacher A

In general, Teacher A mentioned that she usually switched to Bahasa Indonesia to teach new vocabulary. Rather than explain it in TL, which took time, she translated the vocabulary directly into Bahasa Indonesia. When she saw herself translating the word in the video during the stimulated recall interview she said that Bahasa Indonesia could be used instead to provide a quick translation of an English word. She commented that:

_I will explain the difficult word or new word using Bahasa Indonesia, but first I will explain it using simple English which can be understood by the students easily. But if they still don’t understand I will use Bahasa Indonesia._ (A, 24-02, 13)

The following picture taken as part of my field notes during observation shows the translation written on the whiteboard. In this way she formalized the translation process, but also did not ‘push’ the students to use memorization.
At other times, Teacher A checked the concepts by asking the students the meaning of the new words. Most of the time, she used Bahasa Indonesia in asking these questions “Apa artinya” [What does it mean?] (see chapter 4, extract 2).

Teacher B

Teacher B mentioned that sometimes she was not aware that even for simple vocabulary she used Bahasa Indonesia, but then after watching the video of her teaching she realised that that she needed to use more English.

For example, in teaching simple words recently, I should have used English, for example, when I asked one of the students to come forward before, I used Indonesian, hurry e.e .. but when I realised it I quickly switch to English hopefully no students pay attention to me. There may be students who think that I should use English, so I should have used English at that time. (B 25-02, 13)
She stopped the video and commented that she sometimes used Bahasa Indonesia for simple instructions for example when she asked the student to come to the whiteboard and said “come on hurry up” in Bahasa Indonesia, but then she realized that she should have used English, which in turn made her switch to English. She was afraid that the students would realise that she did not use English. It appeared that she wanted to be a model for the target language use for her students.

5.5.2 Affective reasons

The teacher participants also expressed an awareness of affective reasons behind their code-switching, reasons that at times overlapped with the pedagogical. They all felt that use of Bahasa Indonesia would help students feel solidarity and overcome the stressful situation that may arise when prompted to use English in the classroom. The teachers’ way of building rapport illustrates this. As an example, Teacher B addressed students using Bahasa Indonesia “sayang” [honey]; and Teacher C used “anak-anak mam” [my children]. (It is not common to call someone “sayang” [honey] in an Indonesian classroom context).

5.5.2.1 To accommodate the limited English proficiency of their students

Teacher A

As described in Chapter Four, Teacher A taught the majority of her lesson in the TL, including for instructions and classroom management. She clearly saw that her role as a primary school teacher of English was to provide exposure to
the TL for her students. Therefore, she should demonstrate her proficiency as well as encouraging students to speak English. Overall, when asked why she sometimes alternated languages in class, she stated that she used Bahasa Indonesia spontaneously. She explained that this would allow the students to participate more in the activity. She admitted that sometimes she was not aware that she used Bahasa Indonesia.

Only occasionally did she switch to Bahasa Indonesia, when there was lack of comprehension or when she judged the students would not understand her English.

*Because we learn English, yes, we should use English as much as possible. So, if they don’t understand me, then I use Bahasa Indonesia. (A, 05-03, 13)*

However, she clearly recognised the need for the TL use in her interaction. According to Krashen, (1982), learning opportunities can be created by providing the students with comprehensible and relevant input which meet students’ immediate interests; Teacher A attempted to follow this principle, the natural input hypothesis, which emphasizes the importance of comprehensible input for second/foreign language learners (Krashen 1982). However she was quick to code-switch rather than paraphrase when the students seemed not to understand her, so perhaps her understanding of appropriate comprehensible input was limited.
Like Teacher A, Teacher B also mentioned in the interview section that students’ lack of comprehension was the most serious problem in terms of teachers’ use of the TL in class.

**Teacher C**

Teacher B’s and Teacher C’s lessons seemed to be mainly conducted by using grammar translation methods, in which the teacher explained the grammar as well as asked questions and the students answered or repeated certain aspects of the language.

To accommodate the perceived limited English proficiency of her students, Teacher C used Bahasa Indonesia as in her explanation below. When she saw herself teaching in the video recording explaining the topic ‘to refuse or accept an invitation’ she said that she gave grammar explanation in English first but then automatically translated it to Bahasa Indonesia because she was not sure whether the students understood her. She explained:

> Yes, perhaps indirectly we did not realize that we were translating. I don’t feel comfortable, maybe they do not understand yet, so I repeat it in Bahasa Indonesia with the hope that they understand. (C, 03-03, 13)

She seemed to express her belief that by doing so she helped the students in their language learning process.
Affective functions, as illustrated above, suggest the teachers’ desire to create a respectful classroom community where students can produce language without fear of being mocked (Moeller & Roberts, 2013).

5.5.2.2 To motivate students

Teacher C

As expressed above, Teacher C believed that most of her students with limited English proficiency would not be able to understand the lesson if she used English exclusively. She was concerned that if the teacher used TL exclusively it might make her less able students lose interest in learning English. She also claimed that her class was a large mixed ability class. All three teachers in fact taught large mixed ability classes.

*It happened because students in my class have different capability that is why sometimes I use Bahasa Indonesia and sometimes English. (C, 03-03, 13)*

She further explained that students in her class all had different levels of English competence. Therefore, using Bahasa Indonesia was useful for her to accommodate all the students’ needs.

Teacher C indicated that she wanted the students to understand her and participate in class and she believed that motivation is one of important factors affecting students’ achievement in learning a language. She therefore consciously used Bahasa Indonesia in giving encouragement to the students.

She emphasized that if she used English not all her students would understand
her, only the more capable students would, and she wanted all the students to actively participate in class.

5.5.2.3 Device to maintain lesson flow

There were certain utterances from Teacher C which only function so as to maintain lesson flow, for example “sudah mengerti anak-anak?” [Do you understand students?]. It is interesting to note that this function was absent in Teacher A’s lessons, while Teacher B tended to use more TL to keep things moving.

Teacher C

Teacher C claimed that one of the reasons she used Bahasa Indonesia was to check students’ understanding by asking a question in Bahasa Indonesia, “sudah mengerti?” [Do you understand?]. However, the observation data suggested it was merely in order to maintain lesson flow. It has little value as a question to check understanding; if there was an answer from the students, it was usually “sudah mam” which means [“yes mam”] which in itself does not guarantee that they have understood. This question was given to the whole class, but often only two or three students answered.

Another use of Bahasa Indonesia which was often uttered by Teacher C was “kita lanjut” [we continue]. When asked the reason she claimed that using this utterance would save time. Such utterances then appear to be ‘phatic’, in that the meaning is less important than their function in maintaining flow.
You can see mam, ‘Do you understand?’, ‘sudah mengerti?’, ‘kita lanjut’, ‘we continue?’ they are sometimes to save time mam. (C, 03-03, 13)

Teacher C used such phatic devices the most among the three teachers. In her case it seemed to be related to her lack of self-confidence regarding her English proficiency. In her case the use of phatic communication can be seen to be more affective than pedagogical.

5.5.2.4 For emphasis

Teacher A

When Teacher A was asked why she responded to students in Bahasa Minang in the part of the lesson we watched, she claimed that she used L1 at particular times especially to emphasise that word. She viewed the part of the lesson where the students could not answer her question about vocabulary they have learned previously (see chapter 4 Extract 10). When she was asked why she used Bahasa Minang rather than Bahasa Indonesia or English in her utterance “ndak tau” [you don’t know?], she explained that she felt it would have more impact if she used Bahasa Minang. She felt the students would feel the deeper meaning of the words than if the word were uttered in Bahasa Indonesia or English. It is true that Bahasa Indonesia is a language of instruction in the Indonesian context, however, Bahasa Minang is still widely used in class at the primary school level in Padang, Indonesia. This might explain Teacher A’s reason for her use of Bahasa Minang in this case. As mentioned, the use of Bahasa Minang was very limited.
Then she continued her utterance in Bahasa Indonesia after her saying “Ndak tau” [you don’t know?]; she tried to maintain rapport with the students by saying “Itukan sudah kita pelajari. masak tidak tahu ananda” [we have learned it, how come you do not know my dear child]. The word ‘ananda’ which mean my dear child, softens her previous utterance.

**Teacher B**

Teacher B used BI for reasons of emphasis when one of her students did not pay attention when she was giving instruction about a task. She said “Kemana aja kamu Sari”. I stopped this part of the recording and asked why she used Bahasa Indonesia. Her reason was similar to Teacher A, that it would be more impactful to say it in Bahasa Indonesia than the target language. Her utterance was aimed at one particular student in this case.

**5.6 Teacher self-reflection on the relationship between code-switching and the teaching of English language skills in the Indonesian language context**

Every teacher gave comments on their use of L1 in their teaching after watching their respective video recordings of their teaching. The following comments are examples of teachers’ reflections that indicated that watching the video was a significant stimulus in enabling the teachers to view their own teaching objectively. Their reaction after watching the video recordings showed that, like Rosean et al. (2008), they found it was a powerful medium in revealing aspects of their teaching which they had previously not considered.
The comparison of data from the lesson transcripts and the stimulated recall interview transcripts suggest that the teachers were aware of some of the factors that may have influenced their language choices in general, but as the teachers themselves commented, they were not aware of other factors until they watched the video of their teaching. The actual experience of watching their own lessons appeared to provide a professional learning experience around code-switching in the classroom. These findings may have implications for language teacher education (to be discussed in chapter 6).

As mentioned previously, at the end of the stimulated recall interview the teacher participants in this study gained more awareness of when and how much they engaged in code-switching. The implication is that they appeared to gain knowledge of how to fine-tune their use of code-switching in the classroom. Typical occasions when they switched to Bahasa Indonesia consciously were to explain some points of grammar or to explain a new or difficult word. Watching the occasions during which code-switching appeared to occur unconsciously appeared to give significant pause for thought.

5.7 Beliefs about language choices in the classroom

The teachers in this study were in agreement about the need to expose students significantly to the TL, however when they were asked to give their opinion on the ideal proportions of English and Bahasa Indonesia to be used in classroom discourse, only Teacher B proposed specific percentages: 70% English and
30% Bahasa Indonesia. Her belief in a sense matches her practice, in that 89.9% of her observed utterances were in English. However this does not take into account her switch repetitions, which may reduce the effectiveness of TL exposure.

**Teacher A**

When Teacher A was asked about the ideal proportions of English and Bahasa Indonesia used in class, she did not mention specific percentages, but she acknowledged that more English should be used. She used the most English in the classroom of the three (94.50%).

**Teacher B**

Teacher B explained her beliefs about the ideal proportions (70%TL: 30%L1) by expressing to the researcher in the interview that it was difficult to teach grammar in TL to young learners. These remarks appear to be compatible with what her observation data revealed. She reported that she switched to Bahasa Indonesia in order to explain important points related to grammar or vocabulary. Grammar was a difficult part of teaching a language; therefore she chose to explain it in Bahasa Indonesia instead of English (see p. 166 in this chapter).

Teacher B admitted that she needed to consider further about the way she taught in regard to language choice. She mentioned that this class is a RSBI class (Rintisan Sekolah Berstandar Internasional, [Pilot International Standard
Schools as per Act of The Republic of Indonesia 2003]) in where the students learn Maths and Science delivered in English. She expected the students should understand the vocabulary taught in English class because some of the topics, for example, climates and characteristics, had been discussed in RSBI class. Thus, she believed that students would already be familiar with these terms.

**Teacher C**

Teacher C believed that teachers should be educated on the use of mother tongue in the classroom. She felt that there was a lack of knowledge among teachers in Indonesia regarding this. She gave examples that even the lecturers in the university from where she finished her undergraduate degree did not speak English all the time, they mostly used Bahasa Indonesia in teaching; she mentioned that she particularly appreciated one native speaker who taught her and never used Bahasa Indonesia even though he knew the language.

*There are also lecturers who do not use English when teaching Bu. I was very happy to have a foreigner in my class when I was in college. He did not want to teach students who do not speak English, though this foreigner can speak Bahasa Indonesia. (C, 03-03, 13)*

5.8 Summary of the reasons given by the teachers’ for their code-switching

In this chapter I have explored, through the instrument of stimulated recall interviews, the teachers’ own beliefs about their language use in the classroom. I have documented the conscious and unconscious reasons for their code-switching. The three teachers noted that the use of Bahasa Indonesia
compensated for the constraints of time and allowed activities that required some explanations to be done smoothly with little confusion. Every teacher agreed that one of the reasons for their code-switching was to save time, a main motive behind teachers’ code-switching in the classroom in the two schools. It is worth noting that certain code-switching, like switch repetition, might save time but is an ineffective teaching tool because it does not allow students’ time to process the target language.

This chapter presented data from the teachers’ own perceptions of their code-switching practices. These include the pedagogical: to save time, to introduce new vocabulary, to present grammatical rules and to maintain lesson flow; and affective reasons: to accommodate the limited English proficiency of the students, for emphasis, and to motivate students. Teachers’ reflections indicated that their code switching was frequently used to support students to gain understanding of unfamiliar concepts. They also reported that they used Bahasa Indonesia in their teaching to cover the curriculum content within the school time constraints. At the same time they still held the pedagogical belief that they should limit their Bahasa Indonesia use to ensure sufficient target language input.

The teachers also integrated the two languages in order to achieve better communication and engagement in learning. It is worth noting that sometimes the reason for their code-switching appeared to contain elements of both the pedagogical and the affective, and that sometimes what was claimed to be a
pedagogical reason appeared to be more affective – ‘the save time’ function especially. Students’ English proficiency level was also another reason why the participant teachers in this study code-switched in their classroom– a reason that can also be seen as both pedagogical and affective, in that it incorporates both motivation and scaffolding of understanding.

Teachers in this study believed that switching from English to Bahasa Indonesia was necessary to help students in understanding the target language use, such as giving instruction and explaining grammar rules. Given that their beliefs were not always consistent with their practices, the results of this study suggest that there is a need for better understanding of code-switching phenomena among teachers and for teacher education, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Watching the video was a significant stimulus in enabling the teacher participants in this study to view their teaching objectively. In this chapter I have shown that the combination of observations and stimulated recall interviews seemed to have been particularly valuable in raising the teachers’ awareness of their code-switching practices. This insight is important and may help the participants in their future teaching. As indicated in previous studies (see Muir & Beswick, 2007; Rosaen et al., 2008), a significant finding of the present study was that video stimulated recall interview enhanced teachers’ self-reflection.
Having described the results of the classroom observation data and the stimulated recall interview data, in the following chapter I will discuss these results and their implications for second language teaching and teacher education.
CHAPTER 6
TEACHER SELF-REFLECTION AND
THE FUNCTIONS OF CODE-SWITCHING IN THE CLASSROOM

6.1 Introduction

Chapters 4 and 5 presented analyses of data from classroom observations and teacher interviews relating to language choices and functions of code-switching. This chapter discusses the findings of the study with regard to these principal foci, teachers’ language input (section 6.3) and teacher code-switching (section 6.5) in a specific context, that of Indonesian EFL primary classrooms.

As the findings have shown, the three teachers employed code-switching in a variety of ways, consciously and unconsciously, in their interaction with students. Functions of code-switching were observed to be pedagogical in that they may serve to extend language development, or affective in that they express psychological and/or emotional states in the teacher, or serve to build rapport in the class and thus enhance motivation.

The literature reviewed in this area in Chapter 2 suggested that teacher code-switching and the use of L1 may be an effective teaching strategy when dealing with low-proficiency learners of English (Ahmad, 2009; Tariq, Bilal, Abbas & Mahmood, 2013). However, if it is used on an ad hoc basis with limited awareness of its benefits it can be overused and actually be detrimental to language acquisition. Students may be underexposed to useful comprehensible
input, or may fail to realise the importance of communicating in the target language even if they are capable (Mart, 2013).

The process of stimulated recall had an effect on teachers’ awareness of how they used code-switching during their teaching, which may be a major benefit to their professional development. Unpacking the pedagogical and affective functions of code-switching through this exploration of both classroom observation and teacher perceptions of the phenomena may, I believe, have significant implications for language teacher education in Indonesia and perhaps in other Asian contexts. To begin this discussion, therefore, I will first revisit the particular context of this study and factors affecting younger language learners.

6.2 Indonesian context and young learners

What has been particularly significant in EFL teaching in Indonesia in the last few years are the changes in the stated objectives of EFL teaching. From the inception of the 1994 English curriculum up until the introduction of the 2013, more attention was given to the development of speaking and listening skills at the elementary level, and listening, speaking, reading and writing at the secondary school levels (Depdiknas, 2006). Students started to learn English in primary schools at Grade 4, but some started at Grade 1, which meant that these students were exposed to target language (TL) earlier in their formal education. However, the implementation of the 2013 curriculum resulted in the dropping of the English subject from primary schools curriculum (2013
curriculum) in Indonesia. Therefore from this time students in Indonesia only began learning English in Grade 7. Hence, students now have less exposure to target language than previously, although the reintroduction of primary EFL continues to be debated, especially as many private schools offer English at primary level, which may be seen to advantage them.

6.2.1 Young learners of English

As we know, in primary school English teaching more emphasis is placed on creating interest in learning English. For all subjects, the element of play is more significant in primary school. Teachers will organize various kinds of activities to attract students’ attention and improve their desire to learn. Nedomová (2007: 17) argues “young learners are not able to pay attention for more than 10-20 minutes and after that they start to be bored and tired.” Particularly when grammar teaching is too dependent on rules and memorization, the students start to lose their interest and motivation. Thus, teaching grammar through games may be an effective strategy (Nedomová, 2007).

Students at primary school in Indonesia can be categorized as young learners of English; in this study, Teacher A tended to accommodate such learners; she avoided giving long and tedious explanations of grammar or vocabulary. She believed that it is possible to understand TL sentences without explaining them. She preferred to use other teaching aids such as visual aids in explaining, e.g. pictures (see chapter 4, Extract 9) rather than long explanations. As Bahrani &
Sim (2011) and Mangubhai (2005) says, the use of visual aids in the classroom is a good way to convey meaning to students especially during the early stages of EFL learning.

Teacher A read out the sentences in TL and the students were asked to repeat the sentences together or individually. Then if any new words or difficult words were found Teacher A provided their interpretation in Bahasa Indonesia. It reduces the time spent on grasping the meaning of the TL sentences, considering the limited time allocated. In agreement with Van Lier (1988), teachers’ use of the students’ L1 in the classroom helps to create a more salient input that then promotes intake. The exclusive use rule of the TL in the classroom may lead to the overuse of L1 (Butzkamm, 2003) because teachers who are less proficient in the target language are unable to maintain the communication if they had to use the target language exclusively.

Musthafa (2010: 123) explains that

First of all, it should be made clear here that effective teachers of English are those who can fluently use English for functional communicative purpose, including for instructional purposes. With their good command of English and skills in using the language for communication, the teachers can serve as a role model to the learners they teach.

The use of Bahasa Indonesia by the students throughout the classroom interaction was acceptable to Teacher A. As discussed previously, students could ask and answer questions in Bahasa Indonesia if they feel unable to do so in the target language (English). If the students were not allowed to use Bahasa
Indonesia in this situation, this teacher perceived that they would not be likely to answer or to participate actively in the classroom discourse. Especially, in the beginning of the students’ English language learning process, it can be hard for them to express themselves in English as they have not yet achieved an appropriate level of proficiency. Also in this context, they are still developing literacy in the national language, which is not their mother tongue. Teacher A believed that she had a heterogeneous class; there were varying degrees of competency due to its large size. She needed to find a balance so as to accommodate the slower learners and to challenge and stimulate the faster ones within the time allocated. Thus, this finding is consistent with previous studies (e.g. Cheng, 2013; De La Campa & Nassaji, 2009; Liu, 2010; Macaro, 2001; Song, 2009; Tang, 2002) in which students’ language proficiency was found to be an important factor in teachers’ code-switching.

As referred to above, Nedomová (2007) proposes that one effective way to teach young learners is through game, song and other activities which involve action. However, in this study, Teacher B and Teacher C were observed to teach grammar mostly explicitly. Teacher B, as one example, said that it was difficult for her to teach grammar in TL to young learners (in Chapter 5, p. 168), so she chose to switch to Bahasa Indonesia to explain structural points or new vocabulary. Teacher B also mentioned that several times during the semester and at the end of every semester and school year students were asked to sit for graded exams; and the questions in those exams are related to the knowledge of the target language or grammar item.
6.2.2 The exam-centred syllabus

This next section relating to the particular context of the study discusses the effects of the exam-centred syllabus on secondary teachers who teach in primary, and how syllabus issues may take priority over professional development in language teaching. As discussed in the previous chapter, the current EFL teaching and learning in Indonesia is exam-centred, and the command of English grammar is still the focus of the exams. English language practice is not given much attention. This is an important factor in the context of this study.

At the end of every semester and the end of the school year each student from primary school to year 12 secondary school is given an accumulation of marks for each subject they have learned. There is a possibility that a student will fail the year, in which case they may have to repeat the grade. That is why to pass every exam is important for the student at any grade.

All exams for all subjects are in the form of written tests, including English. Particularly for the English subject, the exam contains questions about the grammar of the TL in a multiple choice form. Since the exam asks for grammatical rules (Musthafa, 2010), this would have influenced the teacher to teach the language explicitly and to abandon communicative language teaching (Musthafa, 2010) in order to achieve the results. If the assessment was concerned with how well the students can communicate, which, in the context
of this study was not happening, this would put pressure on the teacher to teach communicatively.

Thus, it appears that this grammar/exam focus in the current EFL syllabus design influenced the way Teacher B taught in particular, yet it seems that she found teaching grammar especially demanding, and she always used an explicit approach rather than an inductive one. This pressure to get her students to pass the year, expressed in her interview, resulted in examples of code-switching on her part that had both affective functions (e.g. psychological compulsion for her) and pedagogical ones. When subjects are taught where the medium of the instruction is not the mother tongue, there exists the possibility of teachers ignoring the language needs of the students because they are under pressure to cover the syllabus (Miller & Deborah, 2000), and this was seen to an extent in many of the observed lessons.

6.3 Revisiting comprehensible input and the TL/L1 debate
Having many opportunities to hear the TL in communicative situations is very important for students. It not only raises their awareness of the communicative functions of the language they are learning, but it also allows them opportunities to process input and produce output (Swain, 1985). However, it is not only the amount of teachers’ target language use or even L1 use that matters so much as the nature of meaningful communication promoting interaction. The communicative interaction based on meaning is a basic principle in EFL as taught in English-speaking countries but this study appears
to confirm that it is lacking in Indonesian primary EFL. Specifically, I have identified that English as the target language tends to be treated as a subject area rather than a means of communication in this context; the production of TL as a goal seems not to be the main focus. This may partly be ascribed to the lack of specific primary school language training for teachers, and has implications for teacher education in the Indonesian context. Chodijah (2000), Musthafa (2010), and Wati (2011) (as discussed in Chapter 2) support and claim that teachers who teach in primary schools are teachers who are prepared for teaching at secondary schools not at primary school.

Krashen (1983) claims that language acquisition is primarily a subconscious process and takes place in the same way that children develop the ability to speak in their mother tongue. Language learning is a more conscious process of learning a language through the process of learning words and grammatical rules (Krashen, 1983). From his Natural Order hypothesis, it follows that explicit teaching of grammar would have a null effect on learners. Involving students in communication rich TL is the key to effective language learning (e.g. Ahmadi & Panahandeh, 2016; Bahrani & Sim, 2013; Ellis, 1994; Inbar-Lourie, 2010; Krashen, 1983; Long, 1983). Long (1996) discussed that high quantities of comprehensible input are likely to increase the speed of language acquisition and lack of comprehensible input will result in slower acquisition.

Hence, if the students are to acquire the language they need to be exposed to the language as much as possible and teachers need to provide students with
opportunities for negotiating meaning in the EFL classroom. The effects of frequent exposure on performance are greatest early in the learning process and repetition is a key factor (DeKeyser, 2007). Thus, the teacher’s skilful use of the target language and any use of code-switching in the EFL classroom is crucial.

The key question here is how L1 in this and other contexts can be integrated effectively into teaching, so that its role is a scaffolding one that does not reduce relevant exposure to TL. Four guidelines proposed by Cook (2001) should be taken into consideration. They are efficiency, learning, naturalness, and external relevance. Efficiency means that the L1 may help present the meaning of abstract concepts and complicated vocabulary items in a less time consuming but more effective manner. The second factor is learning. Learning relative clauses, for example, may be better with the L1 explanation. Naturalness refers to creating an environment of rapport by showing concern for the students in L1 than in the TL, and is therefore affective. Finally, external relevance refers to knowing how to deliver a lesson in both L1 and TL, which might help students with uses of the TL they may need beyond the classroom.

6.4 Language choice

In this study, the word-count gave us raw data on the language input provided by the teachers. Teacher A seemed to be the most aware of communicative pedagogies and principles. She used less language than the other teachers but
she used English the most (94.5%) and her students produced the highest amount of TL (76.7%). One way she did this was by ignoring the use of BM and BI by the students and remaining generally consistent in using TL. It appears that this happened under the following conditions. First, it occurred when students did not understand and thus wanted to request clarification or confirm their understanding. Second, it occurred when the teacher aimed to focus on the students’ listening skills rather than speaking skills. Last, it occurred when the teacher did not feel that she needed to switch to BM/BI because she was confident the students understood her questions in TL. This confidence was communicated as encouragement, therefore the students may not have felt they were being pressured to use the TL and fostered a positive attitude towards the target language. This allowed them to share their thoughts with the teacher with confidence.

In contrast, Teachers B and C talked significantly more than Teacher A in the classroom. Teacher B talked the most in any language but her students did not produced the TL as much as Teacher A’s students. She gave longer explanations in the TL, however, she frequently switched to speaking Bahasa Indonesia. Often she translated her TL utterances immediately into Bahasa Indonesia, thus negating opportunities for comprehensible input or any negotiation of meaning in the TL. Studies have shown (Ellis, 1994; Long, 1983; Swain & Lapkin, 1995) that through interaction in the TL students are more likely to ‘notice’ differences between their interlanguage and the language they are learning. This awareness may then cause the students to
modify their language output. Two-way exchanges of information provide more comprehensible input and thus promote language acquisition, and this is often achieved through open-ended questioning as I will discuss in the next section.

In light of the nature of the language input the students received, it is not surprising that the language output of the students in Teacher C’s class was low in terms of the number of words spoken in TL (61.2%). The raw observation data appeared to show that she seemed to provide her students with significant TL input, but through the use of conversation analysis as a tool it was shown that the students were mostly repeating the TL given by their teacher. This type of language output could not be classified as meaningful communication because there was no guarantee that the students understood what they were saying. Teacher C relied too much on the use of Bahasa Indonesia and in a sense made her students dependent on it. As a result, limited target language was produced by the students.

In this context, the goal of maximising use of the TL in the classroom may be more attainable, rather than aiming for exclusive use of the TL. A related goal for non-native speaking English teachers is therefore to minimise L1, which requires awareness and focused attention on its use. Cook (2001) and Van Lier (1996) highlight the need for this attention when they point out that minimal use of L1 requires teachers to develop a heightened awareness of their language choices and the functions they accompany. Minimising the L1 in the
classroom has benefits for both teaching and learning. The learning benefits have been previously made clear in terms of exposure and input, and the benefits for teaching may be that it requires teachers to recognize the most useful functions of L1 use when the goal is maximum exposure to TL. However, this leaves a question of how to define “maximizing”. Three theoretical positions regarding L1 can perhaps be considered in answering the question of “maximizing” (Macaro, 2001: 535) as discussed in chapter 2.

In order to promote acquisition “as much language as possible serving as many functions as possible should be presented in the L2” (Duff & Polio, 1990: 154) because the amount of language input will affect the students’ language learning outcome (Ellis, 2005b; Mangubhai, 2005; Tang, 2011; VanPatten 2003). This is due to the fact that the language input has a consistent positive effect in improving proficiency (Ellis, 2005b; Krashen, 1982, 1985; Piske & Young-Scholten, 2009; Tang, 2011; Tuan & Nhu, 2010; VanPatten, 2003). The more frequently L2 learners experience a given pattern in the input, especially across a range of lexical items, the more accurately they will perceive and produce the language output within the given patterns (Robinson & Ellis, 2008).

It has been established that Teacher A tended to provide a rich and conducive learning environment by providing more input to the students. She asked the students to write on the whiteboard or she wrote the word herself on the whiteboard with the aim of reinforcing the students’ memory for the
vocabulary. When the teacher provided TL in several different ways, it gave students more than one chance to figure out what had been said and to obtain some clues in order to say something in the target language. However, it is not necessarily best practice to translate. What Teacher A did is more like the equivalent of written ‘switch repetition,’ which may not stimulate the students to memorise the vocabulary.

Translation or the use of mother tongue was formerly dismissed as a pedagogical resource in language teaching, primarily because of Centre-based methodologies that reflect a monolingual norm. In reality, however, teachers who share the same language with the students frequently use it naturally as a teaching technique (Cook, 2007) because the mother tongue and its semantic structures are the steadiest “cognitive hook to hang the new item on” (Fraser, 1999: 238). Translation can be a useful skill as suggested by Cook (2007), who explicitly refers to as Translation in Language Teaching (TILT). He considers TILT as a natural and effective means of language teaching.

6.4.1 Language choice classroom questioning

Questions are basic tools in classroom interaction. They can be used to elicit information, to check understanding and to control behaviour (Nunan & Lamb, 1996). In the language classroom they are also a means of stimulating language production. Typical questioning patterns in the observed lessons showed that teachers called on students to answer the question and the students gave answers which were then acknowledged by the teacher as correct or incorrect
(IRF or initiation-response-feedback). The teachers may have perceived this strategy as obligatory – perhaps an unquestioned traditional approach to knowledge acquisition – a ‘container’ approach. Elicitation entails asking questions and is also one of ways in which teachers control classroom discourse (Walsh, Morton, & O’Keeffe, 2011).

However, it appeared that teachers tended to limit speaking opportunities for the students by asking questions that may fulfill a task goal but prevent the students from developing TL conversation skills or negotiating. What usually happens in an Indonesian EFL classroom context is the teacher does not ask the question because she does not know the answer, instead she asks questions because she wants to know whether the students know the answer (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). These type of questions are termed closed questions or “display questions” (Cazden, 2001: 46). As an example, the interaction in Teacher C’s class was limited to display questions. Students had few opportunities to negotiate meaning. Being involved in a conversation is part of the language learning process therefore negotiated conversations are essential for the students to internalize the linguistic elements of the language being studied (Hatch, 1978).

Negotiation is a process in which “a listener requests message clarification and confirmation, and a speaker follows up these requests, often through repeating, elaborating or simplifying the original message (Pica, 1994: 497)”. Ellis, Tanaka, & Yamazaki (1994) suggest that by negotiating input students achieve
higher vocabulary acquisition. In the case of the ideal EFL classroom or more effective one, most of the time the teacher initiates interaction by asking questions which can prompt students to participate. Teachers also create more interaction activities through different kinds of negotiation of meaning (Faruji, 2011).

For language teachers, interaction plays an important role; it is the teachers’ language that keeps the interaction going towards the goal of teaching and learning. Thus, from the very beginning of learning a language, classrooms should be interactive. Brown (2001: 159) explains that

Through interaction, students can increase their language store as they listen to or read authentic linguistic material, or even the output of their fellow students in discussions, students can use all they possess of the language – all they have learned or casually absorbed in real-life exchange. Even at elementary stage, they learn in this way to exploit the elasticity of language.

In Teacher C’s case for example, it is her constant switching to Bahasa Indonesia, and its use in questioning that also limits the interaction opportunities in her class.

Questioning in Bahasa Indonesia happened at various stages during most of the lessons. Bahasa Indonesia was employed because the teachers felt that this was the best way to make sure the students understood the English words. The question type most frequently used in Bahasa Indonesia in this study was display question. Its function was to elicit responses from students which were expected by the teacher. Hence, negotiated interactions were rarely seen.
In this study it was observed that Bahasa Indonesia was used for three types of common questioning in the language classroom: comprehension check, concept checking, and confirmation check. Concept checking is commonly used to check the understanding of new vocabulary or a newly-introduced grammatical rule. It is normally characterised by the use of a set of strictly-controlled questions designed to ensure the comprehension of new language, raise awareness of any complexities and to indicate to the teacher that the students have understood. In checking students’ comprehension, teachers might ask questions in TL first then switch to Bahasa Indonesia. The aim of the teacher’s turn in Bahasa Indonesia was to clarify the questions in TL and thus to provide a pedagogical focus for the students.

However, the comparison of the observed pedagogical functions of language choice in questioning and the reasons given by the teachers did not always match. In other words, teachers did not always seem aware of how to use questions in their interaction with their students. Asking the right questions in the EFL classroom will help students to participate and creates more interaction activities in the kinds of negotiations of meaning that Faruji (2011) refers to.

### 6.4.2 Switch repetitions in teacher code-switching

As established in Chapter 4, I have used the term ‘switch repetition’ to apply to the phenomenon where a language teacher makes an utterance, usually in the TL, and immediately provides a translation in the L1, often without allowing
learners time to process the TL. Flyman-Mattsson & Burenthult (1999: 67) state that such “repetition in the first language can be partial or full and is often expanded with further information. Commonly in repetitive code-switching, the target language precedes the first language”. Switch repetition has a function or functions attached to it, which may be pedagogical or affective or both, of which the teacher may be aware or not.

Teacher C employed switch repetition the most among the three teachers in this study. Teacher C asked her student to do the exercise. The question may then be asked why did she code-switch? The instruction was in simple language that the students would have heard in the classroom, and required little processing. The teacher herself said it was spontaneous, and she only realized that she code-switched after she watched herself in the video. As an example of unconscious code-switching, perhaps a crucial pedagogical factor is that it typically does not allow much ‘wait-time’ for students to process language.

Wait-time is the length of time the teacher waits after asking the question before calling on a students to answer it. She could be rephrasing the question, directing the question to other students, or giving the answer. Meng & Wang (2011) suggest that “Increasing wait time to three to five seconds can increase the amount of students’ participation as well as the quality of the participation”. However, in this present study, a typical case was recorded where the teacher only gave 2.56 seconds for the students to answer her question. She then answered the question by herself. In this case, the teacher may have been
aiming at maintaining the flow of the interaction, but at the same time it could deprive the students of opportunities for negotiated output.

It is worth noting that on some occasions, switch repetitions occurred with initial Bahasa Indonesia followed by English. These were much fewer than initial TL, and this happened because, unconsciously, Teacher B gave a Bahasa Indonesia instruction then she reported that she ‘remembered’ that she was teaching English, thus she code-switched to TL. This code-switching exposes students’ to TL, but it is not effective as the message has already been communicated and presumably understood in BI.

6.5 Code-switching theory and classroom practice

This section describes differences between the three teachers in terms of their code-switching functions. Malik (1994:10) defines code-switching as “a context-governed phenomenon”; in this context, it entails switching between the target language and the students’ L2 (Bahasa Indonesia). Jamshidi & Navehebraim (2013: 186) define code-switching as “the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence, or constituent”. Teachers use code-switching in the classroom to provide students with sufficient input in the two languages to help students of different language levels to understand explanation and to keep students on task (& Rydén, 2010). It has been pointed out that “the use of code-switching in the language classroom does not prevent students from acquiring their L2” (Cook, 2001: 404).
Code-switching serves some key functions, pedagogical and affective, which may be beneficial in language learning environments; the teacher helps students to transfer the knowledge by using the mother tongue so a teacher can take the advantage of students’ previous L1 learning experience to increase their understanding of L2 (Cole, 1998).

Overall, the three teachers employed a variety of code-switching in their teaching, beginning with the initiation of the class. Classes in Indonesia usually start with teacher greeting the students with ‘as-salamu alaykum, actually an Arabic greeting meaning ‘peace be with you’ and this is answered in Arabic by the students. In Indonesia a limited number of ritualized expressions are used for reasons of (Muslim) faith, and in West Sumatra people or Minangkabau people are Muslims (100%). Following this ritualized greeting in Arabic in the observed classes, there was another greeting exchange, but this time in English. In many language learning contexts, especially in a foreign language context, code-switching is used for maintaining communication, even within daily greetings.

6.5.1 The functions: pedagogic and affective

Code-switching is a widespread phenomenon among teachers and students in foreign language contexts. It accompanies a variety of functions, which have been grouped into two main categories, pedagogical and affective, although there may be overlap. I explore these broad groupings here in the light of the data collected.
6.5.1.1 The pedagogic functions of code-switching: introducing vocabulary

Especially at primary level, one of the goals of learning English is to learn vocabulary to be used for every day conversation in school (Depdiknas, 2006). Typical vocabulary work with the teachers in this study involves a switch to Bahasa Indonesia to give a brief translation. If a teacher relies too much on translation in introducing a new vocabulary, students will be discouraged and they will fail to realise the importance of target language. They will, rather, express their thoughts in Bahasa Indonesia. Students might benefit more from deducing meaning in context rather than from translation.

Teaching the meaning from context when introducing vocabulary may link a new TL word with both linguistic structure and related or linked TL terms, which can help the students retain the new vocabulary longer. Translating can seem to be a quick solution, but ‘pushing’ students to work out the meaning from context may lead to longer retention in the memory. Teacher A seemed not to be aware of this when she stated that she used translation ‘to save time’ in teaching new vocabulary. Teachers need to be provided with professional training on how to ‘push’ students to work out the meaning from context. Lin (2013) supports this finding and suggests that vocabulary learning can also be facilitated by code-switching as well as grammar learning (Kumar & Narendra, 2012).

Providing translation equivalents is an easy and effective way of depicting the core meaning of a word. However, any use should be designed in a careful,
explicit and systematic way to avoid the overuse of L1; Teachers should be made aware of the guidelines for the use of mother tongue. Certain words with more abstract meanings that are hard to contextualize might be effectively taught through translation.

**Explaining grammar rules**

Teaching grammar explicitly is not the main goal of teaching English to primary school level students according to the National Curriculum for primary school (KTSP, 2006), but rather to help the students to acquire not only linguistic but also communicative competence (KTSP, 2006). However, Teacher B and C did tend to teach grammar explicitly. This illustrates to a great extent, the practices of EFL teaching in Indonesia which are characterized by heavy emphasis on teaching grammar (Alwasilah, 2000; Dardjowidjojo, 2003; Gustine, 2014; Yulia, 2014). Explicit teaching of grammar may explain rules, but knowing a rule does not mean that a learner is automatically able to apply it. In line with other researchers such as Antón and Dicamilla (1999), Auerbach (1993), Cook (2001), Crawford (2004), Franklin (1990), Ferrer (2005), Levine (2003, 2011), Lin (1990), Macaro (2001), Peng & Zhang (2009), Turnbull (2001) and Wardford (2007) on the use of L1 to teach grammar, Turnbull & Arnett (2002), Franklin (1990), Jakobsson & Rydén (2010), Polio & Duff (1994) these studies also reveal that grammar teaching is one of the main reasons for using the L1 for some teachers. The majority of these researchers agree that it is easier to explain grammar using L1, and it could be considered justifiable because difficulties would arise if TL was used instead (Butzkamm,
Two main difficulties have been identified in relation to the use of TL in this study as mentioned by teachers in stimulated recall interview:

1) If grammar is taught explicitly and exclusively in TL, there is a danger that students will not understand. It can be explained by the fact that this is only the students’ second year of studying English, thus their vocabulary is not very wide yet to understand grammar delivered in English exclusively. Moreover, the students’ proficiency in English varies. This would create a gap among students. If they compare themselves with other competent students in class and find that others have done better, they would feel anxious. Anxiety is one of key factors that contribute to poor performance for students in learning a language (Krashen, 1985).

It will be clear from the data that the communicative approach in language teaching is barely applied in this context. In the communicative approach, grammar is not always taught explicitly. It is often taught inductively by presenting contexts in which the rules are made salient and therefore ‘noticed’. The issue here seems that teachers in this study do not know how to do this. Thus, this could be highlighted in language teacher education particularly in preparing teachers of English for beginners.

2) Teachers are not always themselves capable of using the appropriate TL to provide longer explanation as expressed by Teacher C during the stimulated recall interview. Even experienced native speakers find it hard to explain or teach grammar rules without experience. They are not always aware of the
grammatical metalanguage themselves, so expecting the primary students to understand it puts great demands on them. The important point to consider is the fact that secondary teachers are being put in primary schools where they seemed unaware of how to deal with young learners learning a foreign language.

Explaining grammar rules is less appropriate for primary students; it is much more effective to present grammar in a variety of contexts and train students to ‘notice’ the rule. This could be one of the implications for teacher education in Indonesia, that is, to provide student teachers with a more inductive approach which they can apply when they come to class to teach. This is one of the major areas mentioned in the literature about teaching grammar to young learners; for example Celce-Murcia & Hilles (1988), Nedomová (2007), Rinvolucri (1990) and Yolageldili & Arikan (2011) propose using games as one of the strategies because “young learners tend to have short attention spans” and “one way to capture their attention and keep it is to engage them in activities” (Shin, 2006: 3). This could be done by involving them in games or more ‘contextualising’ tasks. This technique is taught in basic TEFL courses in the United Kingdom, Australia, and the United States, where trainees not only learn some metalanguage but they also learn to teach grammar without ‘explanation’, but by presenting clear contexts in which the grammar can be noticed, and which encourage the students to formulate the rules for themselves. Some of these techniques may need a stronger presence in language teacher education in Indonesia.
However, Wardford (2009) tends to concur with Butzkamm (2003), Macaro (2001) and Turnbull (2001), who indicated a preference for the use of the L1 in grammar teaching (Ferrer, 2005; Crawford, 2004; Peng & Zhang, 2009). L1 use is important to build the knowledge of the students as well as to explain the meaning accurately. Again teachers need to be careful how much L1 they use.

**Giving instructions**

Todd (1997: 32) defines instructions as “a series of directives, possibly mixed with explanations, questions and so on, which as a whole aim to get the students to do something”. The goal of instructions in classroom discourse is to direct students to do an activity in the near future. Atkinson argues that giving instructions constitutes a source of “genuine communication” in the TL (Atkinson, 1987: 243), which can enhance language acquisition and therefore should be given in the target language.

In any school environment the students are expected to obey instructions from the teacher (Watkins & Biggs, 1996). In Asian school contexts their attitude to learning tends to be passive, and the teacher tends to ‘front’ the lesson. Teacher A and Teacher B in this study usually used TL initially in giving instructions. If students do not understand teachers’ instructions for a task, teachers tend to explain it in students’ mother tongue (Cook, 2008; Ling & Brain, 2007), and this is what these teachers tended to do.
However, giving instructions in mother tongue (L1) is a debatable issue. The three teachers show differences in terms of the language use in giving instructions for tasks. Whereas Teachers A and B mostly used English, Teacher C mostly used Bahasa Indonesia even for simple instructions. Actually, the kinds of classroom instructions observed were fixed routines that could easily be taught formulaically in the target language, but in this study teachers tended to use Bahasa Indonesia instead such as “lihat teksnya” [“look at the text”] and “salin ini dulu”. [“firstly, copy this”].

In contrast to Teacher C, Teacher B used English more often for giving task instructions; however these instructions often became overly complex. In one example she wanted the students to find what she called the ‘characteristic’ of a season or weather and then write a paragraph using that characteristic. She gave a long and complicated instruction involving a series of directives and mixed with explanation. For this kind of instruction, it might be better in Bahasa Indonesia instead of English as it is commonly agreed in the literature that L1 should be used only for giving complex instructions to early learners (Aurbach, 1993; Cameron, 2001; Harbord, 1992; Schweers, 1999). It would be difficult for the primary school students to understand her, thus she needs to learn how to give concise instructions in the TL.

The main issue as regards second language learning is that if the teacher devotes most of her time to language explanation or grammar and vocabulary teaching in L1, the students may have less opportunity for target language
input; the students then have fewer opportunities to participate as a speaker in
the language they are learning. Traditional approaches that restrict lesson
content to grammar rules and vocabulary teaching are not likely to successfully
develop either learners’ correct pronunciation or communicative skills, and the
teacher-centred classrooms do not promote students’ interest and motivation
(Kirsch, 2008).

Thus, it is important to understand the pedagogic functions of code-switching.
The use of L1 as a pedagogical tool helps students conquer the fear of
participating in classroom activities especially among young learners and those
who are at the beginning stages of learning a language. Timor (2012: 9) also
proposes three psycholinguistic arguments on the use of mother tongue in
second language learning:

1. Teachers who use the MT cannot present a threat to FL
   acquisition because learners already have a language basis from
   their MT.
2. The belief in the 20th century was that the MT and the FL make
distinct systems in the brain. However, evidence shows that
languages are interwoven in the brain in vocabulary, syntax,
phonology, and pragmatics.
3. The process of foreign language acquisition involves cognitive,
   social, and emotional factors that are inseparable and equally
   related to the MT and the FL.

As Krashen (1985) claims, if students are going to learn another language, the
first step is reducing their affective filter so that they can approach the TL
without much apprehension. The following section will therefore discuss the affective function of code-switching.

6.5.1.2 The affective functions of code-switching

It seems clear from the observations that one positive use of code-switching was as a contributor to maintaining the students’ interest in learning the target language. Positive emotions can facilitate the language learning process. The influence of negative emotional factors include anxiety, low self-esteem, insecure classroom atmosphere, and lack of rapport between teachers and students, all of which produce barriers to language learning. According to Krashen (1982) affective factors which he termed “affective filters” can act as a mental block and prevent comprehensible input from being absorbed. The issue of perceived lack of comprehension caused teachers in this study to use Bahasa Indonesia to aid students' understanding. Teacher A for example, believed that English should consistently be the medium of instruction; however, she herself code-switched in some instances and she allowed the students to do so under certain conditions. It seemed that the intention was to provide a secure learning environment for her students as she expressed during the stimulated recall interview.

Auerbach (1993) proposes that “starting with the L1 provides a sense of security and validates the learner’s lived experiences, allowing them to express themselves. The learner is then willing to experiment and takes risks with English”. This finding also echoes Lin (1990) who demonstrates that L1 can be used to establish a friendly relationship with the students. Thus, in short,
teachers’ code-switching is important in providing an affective conducive learning environment for the students (Jamshidi & Navehebrahim, 2013; Schweers, 1999). The presence of affective support makes the students feel more relaxed when learning the language. When they feel they can follow the lesson, they may look forward to learning more target language. Specific affective functions are discussed below.

**Giving Feedback**

In providing positive feedback, teachers mostly used English terms such as ‘good, well done, excellent’; for providing negative feedback, it seemed that teachers preferred Bahasa Indonesia, possibly because the teachers wanted to explain the error the students made which they could not do in English due to the students’ proficiency level (Cameron, 2001). Cahyani et al. (2016: 8) explain that “Bahasa Indonesia does not lend itself to giving praise”.

Teachers in this study often repeated the correct learner response to reinforce and display for the whole class and encourage or praise the student. Many language learners feel anxious when they are asked to answer questions before the whole class, because of the pressure in many subject environments to be accurate. Students need to learn and live with mistakes, to take risks and accept imperfection (Amara, Deborah, & Ayse, 2015). It is a significant demand. Success in school is too often defined as high marks on tests, which tends to place a burden of anxiety and insecurity on the students.
Reducing anxiety and insecurity

Anxiety may be considered an important and common affective factor in learning English. It is related to the feeling of worry, doubt and frustration. Krashen (1982) in his Affective Filter Hypothesis argues that students with low anxiety, high motivation and self-confidence, and therefore with a low affective filter, are likely to take more risks, and achieve more in language learning.

Teachers’ code-switching in the observed classrooms functions as a means of promoting a conducive learning environment for the students (Schweer, 1999), providing a strong foundation for students’ affective satisfaction. The comprehensible input allows the students to feel less stressful and to become more comfortable with the environment without any unnecessary anxiety (Schweer, 1999). The presence of affective support makes the students feel more relaxed when learning the target language. Once they are comfortable with the environment, the students are able to focus and participate in classroom activities.

Therefore the teachers’ willingness to code-switch to be able to maintain exchanges with students who may not have the level of proficiency for more sophisticated discussion in the target language is an essential part of classroom discourse. This kind of switching can be even more powerful in the study context when the mother tongue is occasionally used, as described in the next section.
The use of Bahasa Minang for affective functions

Limited Bahasa Minang use was observed in this study by the teachers; however, that small amount is worth noting since the code-switching is affective in the sense that one teacher showed her anger by using the mother tongue (Bahasa Minang). In this way, it is also stressed that the utterance is seriously meant and expected to be obeyed. The mother tongue has sometimes more power in the foreign language classroom, but also mitigates to an extent because it is a shared ‘out of school’ language, so it may also ‘soften the blow’. This finding is in line with Lin’s study (1990) that one of the functions of code-switching is to signal a shift from teaching to disciplining.

Using Bahasa Minang in disciplining may obtain better results as when the teacher uses Bahasa Indonesia they probably sound more serious and their students will understand that their teacher was not joking around or pretending. When the mother tongue is used the students know that they cannot make an excuse by appearing not to understand the teacher, as the language is an informal, shared one. So, the use of Bahasa Minang when scolding the students may be an effective strategy.

In summary, the findings of this study regarding the pedagogical and affective functions mentioned have attempted to address Macaro’s (2009: 48) statement that “observation studies which have described the function to which first language use is put, or have measured the amount of target language used, have
failed to control for the type of learning environment that the teacher was trying to create”.

This study has identified the learning environment in terms of teachers’ code-switching by using conversation analysis to locate the pedagogical and affective functions of code-switching and then relating these observed functions to teachers’ perceptions of these through stimulated recall interviews. Various themes were demonstrated as a result of analyzing lesson transcripts. They are the pedagogical: to teach grammar, to explain new vocabulary (translation), to help students to focus, to maintain the flow of the lesson, checking comprehension, confirmation check, and concept checking. Affective functions included: to accommodate the limited English proficiency of their students, to motivate students, to build good rapport with students.

6.6 Teacher perceptions and self-reflexivity

Not all the observed data are consistent with the teachers’ perceptions as expressed in interviews. The chief functions of code-switching as expressed by the teachers were: to save time, to teach grammar, to explain new vocabulary (translation), and to maintain lesson flow (pedagogical reasons) and: to avoid misunderstanding, and to motivate students (affective reasons). The three teachers all claimed that they applied code-switching to save time, and it may certainly be true that, as Macaro (2001) and Tang (2002) state, using L1 is less time consuming than using the target language exclusively. They mentioned that they had very limited EFL classroom time and this affected the practice
time available. They thought that incorporating L1 in EFL classrooms was essential because it was more efficient and time saving.

Another interesting finding involves the use of code-switching to maintain the lesson flow. Teacher C used the utterance “paham anak mam” to check whether her students understand her explanation so this is for her a pedagogical choice. But the analysis of the lesson transcript as described in Chapter 4 showed that students answered her with “yes”, which might not an honest answer. In other words, the utterance “paham anak mam” was used for the affective reason of helping the teacher to be confident.

The interviews revealed that the teachers liked to use Bahasa Indonesia in order to construct a comfortable learning environment in which the students enjoy learning English. To do this, Teacher C stated that she used Bahasa Indonesia to put students at ease and maintain relationships with the students. Teacher B also maintained that Bahasa Indonesia helped build the student-teacher relationships in class.

Teacher C reported that she used Bahasa Indonesia to motivate her students to participate in class interaction; the use of Bahasa Indonesia might facilitate the learners’ understanding, but they had less exposure to TL especially in the context of EFL learning where the opportunities to listen and to use the TL is limited (Musumeci, 1996). The over reliance on L1 will not help the students in achieving their goal in learning a foreign language. Moreover, in the context of
this study, the teachers had no clear guidelines on how much L1 can be used in 
the class; the curriculum recommendation is simply to expose the students to 
the target language. The debate about whether or not L1/L2 can be useful in 
the classroom is irrelevant if the teachers are unable to select the appropriate 
occasions to use it. Consequently, a teacher’s ability to control her/his use of 
language is considered to be as important as her/his ability to select appropriate 
methodologies (Walsh, 2002).

6.6.1 Conscious and unconscious code-switching

As Sert (2005) reports, and as this study found, teachers’ language choices in 
the classroom are not always conscious, but may still be influenced by training 
and beliefs about language learning. Whether conscious or not, therefore, the 
functions of teacher code-switching may be beneficial, although a raised 
awareness of these functions may increase language teacher professionalism.

Teacher A mentioned in the interview that she was not aware of the times she 
alternated from TL to BI or BM. She emphasised that she was reluctant to 
avoid the use of Bahasa Minang/Bahasa Indonesia because she shares the same 
languages with the students. To some extent, she believed that she needed to 
use Bahasa Indonesia, for example when the students had no previous 
knowledge about the vocabulary she taught. Her primary reason was to 
scaffold students’ comprehension and to be able to say and use the vocabulary 
she taught. Thus, it seems clear that the use of code-switching contributed to 
maintaining the students-teacher’s connection in learning the target language.
Teacher C believed that to discipline or to motivate students in Bahasa Indonesia was easier and more effective than to do it in English. She seemed to suggest that whenever something of ‘importance’ was communicated to students she should use Bahasa Indonesia, for example in motivating them. She was explaining the form of the verb after modal auxiliary; she seemed to suggest that it is important for the students to pay attention to what she had explained which then led her to motivate her students to practice it in daily conversation. She motivated her students using Bahasa Indonesia.

However, in this case, Teacher C may be unconsciously communicating to her students a suspect notion that English itself is a restricted medium of communication that only certain language functions can be done in the TL, such as drills. This is denying the idea that teachers should provide an environment rich in language function done in the TL (Chambers, 1992; Caukill, 2015; Ellis, 1994; Inbar-Louire, 2010; Musthafa, 2010; Polio & Duff, 1994; Pablo et al., 2011; Turnbull, 2000). What really matters is to show students that English is a language for genuine communication (Sifakis & Sougari, 2006) and functions as such in the classroom as well.

Both the L1 and L2 must be valued and should be used judiciously (Cook, 2001; Macaro, 2001; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). It will be a hindrance in learning a language if the amount of L1 is too high in EFL classroom (Mart, 2013). Moreover, if teachers code-switch too frequently, it can create the
expectation that the teacher would explain and give all instruction in L1 (Pablo et al., 2011). Thus, making the ‘unconscious conscious’ may be a useful feature to incorporate into language teacher education in Indonesia. For this reason there should be clear guidelines for them to follow (Deller & Rinvolucri, 2002).

Teacher A let the students use Bahasa Indonesia or Minang in response to her utterances as long as the students’ responses meant that they understood her target language use. This was apparent even though they did not respond in the target language. However, in contrast, this result can also be interpreted in light of cognitive theories postulating that students who learn a foreign language need not only comprehensible input but they also need to demonstrate their comprehensible output. As Swain (1985: 249) discusses, “using the language, as opposed to simply comprehending, may force the learner to move from semantic processing to syntactic processing”. In sum, the lack of awareness of some instances of code-switching suggests that the use of code-switching in the classroom should be addressed in language teacher education, and its benefits made clear, as well as the disadvantages of its overuse (Cook, 2001; Littlewood & Yu, 2011).

### 6.6.2 Shifting from teacher self-reflection to teachers’ self-reflexivity

The term self-reflexivity is the term which refers to reflective practice, the ongoing cycle of self-observation and self-evaluation which teachers enact in order to understand their own actions and the reactions they observe in
themselves. The following section discusses teacher self-reflections which lead to teacher self-reflexivity.

6.6.2.1 Teacher self-reflection

Self-reflection provides information about one’s condition at the moment in a particular context (Richard & Lockhart, 1994). This self-reflection is important as it may reflect the individual’s self-conception at that current moment and connects to the facts in the real world. As a matter of fact, “what teachers do is a reflection of what they know and believe, and that teacher knowledge and ‘teacher thinking’ provide underlying framework or schema which guide teacher’s classroom actions” (Richard & Lockhart, 1994: 29). This teacher self-reflection is important as it can be used as part of her/his professional development.

The three teachers all expressed surprise at their code-switching practice when watching the recordings, and acknowledged gains in awareness through the instrument of stimulated recall. The resulting examples of self-reflection found in this study suggest that this technique might also be a powerful tool in language teacher education or in ongoing teacher professional learning. For example, Teacher B sometimes used Bahasa Indonesia for giving classroom or task instructions, but she realized that she should have used English in certain parts after watching the recording of her teaching. Her previous ideas of the ‘need’ to use Bahasa Indonesia had been modified. This is an interesting dimension to the stimulated recall interviews. The stimulated recall interview
can be used as a tool in reflective teaching. Reflective teaching is a valuable teaching approach in which teachers as participants of the research collect information about their own classes and pay close attention to their behaviour and teaching strategies (Ferdowsi & Afghari, 2015).

The case of teachers’ poor English proficiency, identified during the interview sessions as one of the reasons hindering teachers from using the target language, seems to be problematic because logically an English teacher should be someone who is proficient in the target language. However, this problem was apparent in the context of this study. This matter can eventually be well anticipated in advance if teacher education programs also contain strong elements of enhanced TL learning, with perhaps refresher language courses offered during pre-service or even in-service contexts, via opportunities to spend time in English-speaking countries.

6.6.2.2 Teacher self-reflexivity

Generally, self-reflexivity in teaching refers to teachers learning to subject their own beliefs of teaching and take more responsibility for their actions in the classroom (Korthagen, 1993). Reflexivity is viewed as a process of becoming aware of one’s context and gaining control over this awareness. According to Nagata (2004: 142)

...self-reflection is after the fact; self-reflexivity is in the moment and feeling is likely to have more immediacy so it may be easier to grasp its role. To be reflective is to sit and think about what took place after it is completed; one’s role in it, others’ reactions and one’s responses to them.
Teachers need to be reflective as it is a useful source of professional development, but to be also reflexive supports critical introspections. To be reflexive can actually nourish reflections as introspection leads to heightened awareness and improvement of self and profession (Nagata, 2004).

Teachers observed in this study mentioned that they believed they can see aspects of their teaching they were unaware of, when they were reviewing their lesson on video, which helped them in seeing their teaching strengths as well as identifying areas of language use they wished to improve later on. When teachers have an opportunity to watch and analyse video of their own rather than others’ teaching, they may experience greater motivation and engagement in the activity further enriching the reflective process. Kong, Shroff & Hung (2009) support that the use of the video cases to study classroom interaction in teacher education program and teacher professional development might lead to improved teaching practices and in turn has the potential to improve students’ achievement.

What happened in my study was that the teacher participants developed evident self-reflexivity through stimulated recall interviews. In other words, the stimulated recall interview caused teacher participants to engage in self-dialogue and self-assessment which, according to Tsui (2007) and Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, & Johnson (2005), is an ideal approach. In contrast, Park’s (2014: 173) study calls “for a shift from employing reflective practices in
teacher education program to reflexivity”, which emphasises the mutuality of both the researcher and the participant. Park (2014: 175) continues that

As the researchers, we often focused on the research participants and fail to reflect upon ourselves and the extent of our influence upon the research context. Although theories of L2 learning have emphasised the importance of interaction, most L2 researchers do not seem to consider themselves as an active agent within their research context.

In the Padang context, there are teacher working groups known as KKG [Kelompok Kerja Guru] and MGMP [Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran], teachers’ professional development programs. Syofiarni (2006) explains that KKG aims to facilitate teachers to improve quality of knowledge, insight and professional skills especially for primary school teachers which in turn can improve the quality of their teaching. MGMP aims to increase the competence of junior and senior high school teachers which leads to the improvement of the quality of education (Alwiyasin, 2016). In this group, teachers from schools located in the same area organised a monthly meeting to discuss all matters related to their teaching.

However, one of the teachers in Marwan’s (2014) study reported that this teacher gathering is not effective due to the lack of better training activities. “Observing someone’s teaching was a useful activity” (Marwan, 2014: 229), however there was no reliable classroom observation practice. In addition, the activities in KKG are not effective because teachers in the meeting speak in Bahasa Indonesia (Marwan, 2014). It would be worth doing if teachers in this monthly meeting speak in English to enhance their English speaking
proficiency. In this case, stimulated recall interviews involving self-reflexivity might help these teachers. They can video record themselves teaching in their normal classroom and bring the video recording to the KKG meeting to have a self-reflection with the help of their instructors and peers. They can also perform self-reflexivity by allowing teachers and student participants to engage in reflective practice.

6.7 Summary

In this chapter I have discussed language input and teacher code-switching in EFL classrooms through comparing classroom observation as analysed through conversation analysis and teacher perceptions through stimulated recall interviews, in order to give a more comprehensive understanding of teachers’ code-switching. I have discussed the two major findings of this study.

The first main finding is that teachers performed code-switching in the classroom for a variety of reasons, but they were rarely clear on why they were doing it, or on many occasions actually unaware that they were doing it. First I revisited the context of the study, a primary, Indonesian exam-focused context, in which teachers seem to be employing code-switching as a means of providing students with the opportunities to communicate and enhancing students understanding. I then considered the two broad categories of teachers’ code-switching, the pedagogical and the affective. I discussed how teachers appear to code-switch purposefully to save time, to teach grammar, to help the low level proficiency students, and to achieve instructional goals. The teacher
participants in this study found that by using Bahasa Indonesia they could avoid lengthy explanation in English. They resorted to using L1 in their EFL teaching to cover the curriculum content efficiently within the time constraints. In line with Crawford (2004), findings of this study show that two teachers believe that the mother tongue is more effective than the TL for teaching grammar. Grammar is presented in a deductive way to students, which is not suitable for young learners, as argued by Nedomová (2007).

Certain pedagogical functions analysed with conversation analysis were also mentioned by the teacher during the stimulated recall interview. The functions were related to saving time, to teaching grammar rules, and to introducing vocabulary. Additional reasons, such as to accommodate low proficiency students, to motivate students, to maintain the lesson flow and to give feedback were mentioned by the teacher in the stimulated recall interview.

There was occasional overlap of the pedagogical functions with the affective functions, in terms of a discrepancy between the comparison of the functions of code-switching identified from lesson transcripts and the reasons mentioned by the teacher in the stimulated recall interview. These differences need to be understood and highlighted in teachers’ professional development, especially as it was also revealed that teachers expressed lack of awareness that they were code-switching at all on some occasions.
My second important finding is that stimulated recall interview might be a very useful tool in both teacher education and ongoing professional learning. The three teachers agreed that the use of Bahasa Indonesia in classrooms was helpful for teaching and learning process, but they lacked awareness of how it can be useful and might facilitate the learning of language. The teachers in this study only realised how much and why they code-switched after the stimulated recall interview. This suggests that stimulated recall interview techniques are of value for language teacher professional development in that they foster habits of self-reflexivity. In other words stimulated recall interview might be very usefully incorporated into both teacher education and ongoing professional learning. Both these findings lead to the recommendations presented in the final chapter.

As far as language policy is concerned, the findings of the present study also have implications for a reconsideration of the main goal of learning a foreign language as expressed in the national curriculum. In the context of Indonesia, particularly in Padang elementary schools, research findings on effective language pedagogy are not included in detail in the curriculum. Therefore, it basically remains the teacher’s job to determine the finer points of how they can deal with the language in the classroom. Implications for teacher education and professional learning in Indonesia will be presented in the next, concluding chapter.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

7.1 Introduction
This concluding chapter offers a summary of the study and outlines implications for language teacher education in Indonesia. Limitations of this study are also acknowledged, and recommendations for further research are provided.

7.2 Summary of the Chapters
Through this study I have explored the nature of language input provided by three EFL teachers, as manifested in their code-switching practices, in Indonesian EFL primary classrooms in Padang, the capital city of West Sumatra, Indonesia. In Chapter One I described the context of the study and why I felt the question of language choice in the classroom was an important one in this context. This was based on my experience of observing EFL classes in several schools during a teacher professional development program held by the Department of Education in West Sumatra in 2010. I noticed that teachers in those schools used much more Bahasa Indonesia than English in EFL classrooms, even though the curriculum required them to expose students to the target language as much as possible. I wanted to find out whether this was the case in primary schools in Padang, West Sumatra, and if so what the underlying reasons were. Specifically, I wanted to explore the pedagogical and affective functions of the teachers’ language use.
In Chapter Two I reviewed literature relevant to the study. First, I documented the key literature on input and output, commencing with Krashen’s Input Hypothesis, then key research by Long (1983), Ellis (1994), Swain & Lapkin (1995), and Inbar-Lourie (2010). This literature reveals the importance of the quality of teacher language input in EFL classrooms (Bahrani & Sim, 2013; Ellis, 1994; Krashen, 1982) and its relationship to learner output. Central to the question of the nature of input in more recent years has been the role of the first language in EFL settings where English is not the mother tongue. Numerous scholars have argued that students should be exposed to target language input as much as possible if not exclusively. However, L1 usage may benefit language learning in some contexts (Cook, 2001; Turnbull, 2001), especially for learners with lower levels of language proficiency. Students in the context of this study were categorised as low proficiency since they only started learning English as a foreign language in Grade 4 primary.

In Chapter Three I outlined the methodology of the study. It was a qualitative case study design focusing on three teachers. I observed three teachers with their respective classes in two primary schools in Padang in order to answer the research question:

What are the characteristics of teachers’ language input in EFL primary classrooms in Padang, West Sumatra, Indonesia?

The sub-questions were:

- What are the pedagogical and affective factors that influence teacher code-switching in the Padang, Indonesian context?
What are the perceptions of teachers in this context as to the relationship between code-switching and the effective teaching of English?

Two phases of analysis were applied in this study. The first phase was conducted to answer the first sub-question, and used conversation analysis as a frame; and in the second phase I used stimulated recall interviews to answer the second sub-question above.

In Chapter Four, I analysed the amount of teacher talk compared to students’ talk and recorded and analysed the apparent functions of teachers’ language use, using conversation analysis. The results showed that code-switching was applied by the three teachers in this study in different ways, as influenced by their teaching styles and, to an extent, their proficiency level in English. The conversation analysis approach revealed that the three teachers’ code-switching practices were linked to both pedagogic and affective functions.

In Chapter Five, I presented evidence from the stimulated recall interviews about the beliefs the teachers hold about their code-switching and its relationship to their teaching philosophies. The pedagogical and affective reasons given for their code-switching mostly matched the observed practices, with some slight differences. The main pedagogical reasons given were to save time, to teach grammar, and to explain new vocabulary. Affective reasons given were to maintain lesson flow, to avoid misunderstanding, and to motivate students. The three teachers were in particular agreement about code-switching to save time, which suggests that they all perceived pressure relating to
completing the curriculum in an exam-oriented education system. One important finding from this study as expressed by the three teachers is that they were frequently unaware of their code-switching.

Another interesting finding in my study related to the use of the stimulated recall interview itself as a tool to stimulate self-reflection. After watching themselves teach on video, the teachers in this study all expressed how the awareness they gained of their code-switching practice would help them in their future teaching.

In Chapter Six, I discussed the findings and the analysis presented in Chapter Four and Five. The key finding in this context is that teachers code-switched in various ways, but were frequently unaware of how they applied it; whether effective or ineffective in outcomes, the uses appeared to be largely haphazard. The pressure of the perceived need to complete the syllabus and to help the students with exams may have made the teachers more inclined to use the L1 in order to save time in, for example, giving grammar explanations. The teachers’ previous experience in language learning with their previous training (i.e. secondary rather than primary) also influenced their use of the language in the classroom. All the teachers in this study had completed a 4-year graduate degree in English, but their proficiency level and language teaching philosophies differed to some extent. As Chen & Goh (2011) argue, many EFL teachers lack confidence because they are not native speakers, and tend to rely more on L1. Arifin & Husin (2011) and Liu (2010) also found teachers’
English proficiency to be important determinant of EFL teachers’ code-switching.

I also discussed the shift from teacher self-reflection to teacher self-reflexivity, which I believe is an important concept that could be fostered in teacher education programs, and also in in-service teacher professional development programs. This in turn requires a reconceptualization of the goals of teacher education programs, to include the scaffolding of language teachers to be more competent target language users, with an accompanying awareness of how they themselves advance in proficiency, including a more in-depth understanding of the role of their first language. A more rigorous understanding of how teachers achieve their own competence in an additional language may better help their students to be more successful language learners.

In conclusion, this study supports the notion that teacher code-switching in the language classroom is not necessarily an impediment or deficiency in language teaching, but may be a useful strategy to stimulate classroom interaction, if properly understood. It may be used in the EFL classroom for conveying meaning efficiently when setting tasks, for example; however, the overuse of code-switching may have a negative influence; students are simply not provided with sufficient language input to stimulate their output. The combination of conversation analysis and stimulated recall interview as research tools could provide a more complete understanding of code-switching practice in EFL classrooms in many contexts.
7.3 Implications and recommendations

Managing code-switching in the EFL classroom could be incorporated into language teacher education as a component of classroom interactional competence (Walsh, 2006), according to the principle: “Use English where possible and L1 where necessary” (Weschler, 1997: 5). As I believe I have established that it is important to know why teachers code-switch, I recommend that English teachers should be cautious not to overuse their L1, as “it may substitute for, rather than support, second language learning” (Swain & Lapkin, 2000: 268). A raised awareness of code-switching practice and the role of the L1 are therefore helpful.

To acquire a language is a long and complex process. The argument over the effectiveness of English language introduced in early-years schooling is still ongoing in Indonesia. Thousands of hours of exposure to input, together with effective practices to stimulate output, are needed to help students develop a high level of proficiency in the target language. In the context of this study, the overall amount of instruction was limited to 70 minutes per week, and English is no longer offered in the primary curriculum, except in private schools.

With the new 2013 Curriculum, students now start to learn English in Grade 7, which implies a significant reduction in the time students are exposed to the target language during schooling. Arguments have been focused on the necessity of establishing communicative and literacy skills in the national language first, despite research evidence that additional language learning in
the early years is not detrimental to first language development, but may in fact enhance it. Consequently, it is necessary for institutional language policy makers to consider the matter very carefully, and make principled decisions about when the students start learning English.

In this study, I have shown that the practice of stimulated recall interviews may help teachers to become consciously aware of their code-switching, and of other pedagogical practices. Accordingly, stimulated recall interview may be a useful tool for self-reflection, and could be incorporated as a fixture of language teacher education and in-service teacher professional learning. The in-service training I discussed in the first chapter initially appeared helpful for teachers, but in reality this program did not achieve its aims. There has been funding from the government towards the improvement of teacher learning, however, it has often appeared that teacher learning programs have been project oriented rather than quality oriented (Sudrajat, 2010). It can therefore be seen that it is difficult to bring about changes at the official level; however change at the grass roots level, through teacher communities of practice (COPs) may have an effect. Such COPs may be informed and guided by research initiatives such as the present study. For example, teachers may get together and share their awareness on how to code-switch, and at the same time they might use the opportunity to improve their English proficiency.
7.4 Limitations of the study

I acknowledge the following limitations to the study. First, only three teachers participated in this study, a small sample, yet I am confident that in-depth analysis of each of these teachers’ practices has given a rich and realistic picture of teachers’ code-switching in this particular context.

Second, the study investigated only primary or low English proficiency students. A study on advanced proficiency groups might produce different findings since they would have mastered different linguistic skills and would require less code-switching from the teacher.

Third, a methodological limitation is the length of time for data collection. Seven weeks observation can yield much information about teachers’ language use, I believe, but this still may remain only a relatively small ‘portrait’ of teachers’ language use as it occurs in the EFL classroom.

Finally, as regards the use of the camera and microphone in the classroom observations, there were some technical problems in that not everything that students said could be heard clearly, especially when they did pair work and group work; therefore it is suggested that if the study were to be replicated, more cameras and microphones should be used in order to capture detailed teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction.
7.5 Code-switching in the classroom as related to the nature of the teacher input recommendations for further research

The present study focused on teachers’ language input and their code-switching; it would be a complementary and valuable direction to investigate students’ language output. Analyses of resulting data may contribute practical strategies to improve the nature of teachers’ language input in EFL classrooms.

This study was conducted in Padang, the capital city of West Sumatra, where the use of Bahasa Indonesia is more widespread than Bahasa Minang, despite its being the mother tongue of the region. Thus, it may be very useful to carry out research on how teachers code-switch in rural areas of Padang, West Sumatra, where much more Bahasa Minang is used in the classroom than Bahasa Indonesia.

7.6 Concluding remarks

The purpose of the present study was to explore the nature of language input provided in primary EFL classrooms in Padang, Indonesia. The findings suggest that this topic is of value for further research, and that an enhanced understanding of the pedagogical and affective functions of code-switching may contribute significantly to English language pedagogy in EFL contexts in non-English speaking countries. Many of these contexts, particularly in Asia, tend to be exam-focused and rigidly curriculum-driven, so understanding of the phenomenon may have dual benefits for teachers in that these factors may be
accommodated while still providing effective language pedagogy – but with a possible reduction of anxiety on the part of teachers.

Stimulated recall interview proved to be a valuable technique also, for analysis and for the promotion of self-reflexivity. An extension of this principle is that the teacher becomes a participant in their own Action Research, a paradigm long-recognised for its potential for teacher development. In this paradigm, teachers develop professionally through the heightened awareness and understanding that accompany research on their own teaching context.

During this study, I was challenged not only as a researcher but also as a teacher who helps student teachers to prepare themselves for teaching in EFL classrooms. When I consider the issues that have arisen from exploring the use of the target language and the second language in the EFL classroom with low proficiency learners, I realise and acknowledge the many gains that I, as well as my participating teachers, may take from this study.
REFERENCES


Khatib, M., & Bagherkazemi, M. (2011). The potential of learner output for enhancing EFL learners’ short-term and long-term learning of the


Yıldız, M. & Yeşilyurt, S. (2017). Use or Avoid? The Perceptions of
Prospective English Teachers in Turkey about L1 Use in English Classes. *English Language Teaching, 10*(1), 84-96.


Zacharias, N. T. (2011). *An English teacher’s struggle to establish voice in the periphery.* K@ta, 13*(1), 64-77.


APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Kurikulum Prodi BING

DAFTAR MATA KULIAH PER SEMESTER
KURIKULUM : JURUSAN BAHASA DAN SASTRA INGGRIS
PRODI BAHASA DAN SASTRA INGGRIS TAHUN
2007

SEMESTER: I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Kode</th>
<th>Nama Mata Kuliah</th>
<th>SKS</th>
<th>Tatap Muka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ING001</td>
<td>Pembinaan Akhlak dan Budi Pekerti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UNP001</td>
<td>Pendidikan Agama</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNP002</td>
<td>Pendidikan Pancasila</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ING002</td>
<td>Intensive Course</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ING026</td>
<td>English Language Learning Strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24

SEMESTER: II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Kode</th>
<th>Nama Mata Kuliah</th>
<th>SKS</th>
<th>Tatap Muka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ING004</td>
<td>Listening 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ING007</td>
<td>Speaking 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ING010</td>
<td>Reading 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ING014</td>
<td>Writing 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ING020</td>
<td>Structure 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ING024</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ING025</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19

SEMESTER: III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Kode</th>
<th>Nama Mata Kuliah</th>
<th>SKS</th>
<th>Tatap Muka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FBS002</td>
<td>Sejarah Pemikiran Modern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ING005</td>
<td>Listening 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ING008</td>
<td>Speaking 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ING011</td>
<td>Reading 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kode</td>
<td>Nama Mata Kuliah</td>
<td>SKS</td>
<td>Tatap muka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ING015</td>
<td>Writing 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ING021</td>
<td>Structure 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ING201</td>
<td>Introduction to Linguistics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ING207</td>
<td>Introduction to Literature</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEMESTER: IV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Kode</th>
<th>Nama Mata Kuliah</th>
<th>SKS</th>
<th>Tatap muka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FBS004</td>
<td>Sejarah Kebudayaan Indonesia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ING006</td>
<td>Advanced Listening</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ING009</td>
<td>Public Speaking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ING012</td>
<td>Reading 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ING016</td>
<td>Writing 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ING022</td>
<td>Structure 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ING202</td>
<td>Phonology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ING203</td>
<td>Morphology and Syntax</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ING208</td>
<td>Poetry 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ING209</td>
<td>Prose 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEMESTER: V**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Kode</th>
<th>Nama Mata Kuliah</th>
<th>SKS</th>
<th>Tatap Muka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FBS009</td>
<td>Dasar-dasar Filsafat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ING013</td>
<td>Extensive Reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ING017</td>
<td>Paper/Thesis Writing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ING023</td>
<td>Structure 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ING204</td>
<td>Semantics and Pragmatics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ING210</td>
<td>Drama 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ING216</td>
<td>History of English Language*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ING222</td>
<td>History of British and American Literature**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UNP031</td>
<td>Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kode</td>
<td>Nama Mata Kuliah</td>
<td>SKS</td>
<td>Tatap Muka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UNP003</td>
<td>Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FBS003</td>
<td>Metodologi Ilmu Budaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ING003</td>
<td>Spoken English Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ING205</td>
<td>Sociolinguistics*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ING206</td>
<td>Psycholinguistics*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ING211</td>
<td>Pragmatics*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ING212</td>
<td>Discourse Analysis*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ING217</td>
<td>Poetry 2**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ING218</td>
<td>Prose 2**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ING219</td>
<td>Drama 2**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ING047</td>
<td>CALL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ING232</td>
<td>History of Brities American Civilization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ING116</td>
<td>Cross Cultural Understanding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ING027</td>
<td>Theory of Translation***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ING028</td>
<td>English Indonesian Translation***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ING031</td>
<td>Child Language Development***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ING032</td>
<td>Method of Teaching English to YL***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ING036</td>
<td>Basic Principles of PR***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ING037</td>
<td>Basic Principles of Communication***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>UNP032</td>
<td>Bahasa Indonesia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>UNP016</td>
<td>PSPB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catatan: 
* Pilihan Linguistics
** Pilihan Sastra
*** Pilihan Paket (4sks)
### SEMESTER: VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Kode</th>
<th>Nama Mata Kuliah</th>
<th>SKS</th>
<th>Tatap Muka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ING018</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ING019</td>
<td>English Correspondence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ING213</td>
<td>Historical Comparative Linguistics*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ING214</td>
<td>Dialectology*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ING215</td>
<td>Anthropological Linguistics*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ING220</td>
<td>Theory of Literature**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ING221</td>
<td>Literary Criticism**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ING226</td>
<td>Linguistics Research Methodology*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ING230</td>
<td>Literary Research Methodology**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ING029</td>
<td>Indonesian English Translation***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ING030</td>
<td>Interpretation***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ING033</td>
<td>English Material for YL***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ING034</td>
<td>Instructional Media for YL***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ING038</td>
<td>Business English Correspondence***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ING039</td>
<td>Interpersonal Communication***</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>UNP033</td>
<td>ISBD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>UNP034</td>
<td>IKD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**36**

Catatan : * Pilihan Linguistics  
** ** Pilihan Sastra  
*** ** Pilihan Paket (4sks)

### SEMESTER: VIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Kode</th>
<th>Nama Mata Kuliah</th>
<th>SKS</th>
<th>Tatap Muka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ING225</td>
<td>Seminar on Linguistics*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ING229</td>
<td>Seminar on Literature**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNP013</td>
<td>Skripsi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UNP019</td>
<td>Makalah*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6/8**

Catatan : * Pilihan Linguistics  
** ** Pilihan Sastra
Appendix 2: Approaches to code-switching studies (in alphabetical order)

Studies on code-switching are mostly using questionnaire and observation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Participants’ Educational level</th>
<th>Learner’s L1</th>
<th>Target language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al-Alawi (2008)</td>
<td>Teachers’ use of learner L1 &amp; beliefs about this use</td>
<td>*Observations *Interviews</td>
<td>Lower secondary schools</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Buraiki (2008)</td>
<td>*Teachers’ L1 use &amp; rationale *Teachers’ reported beliefs &amp; practices</td>
<td>*Observations *Interviews *Questionnaire</td>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arung (2015)</td>
<td>* roles of Bahasa Indonesia in teaching and learning English</td>
<td>*questionnaire *interviews</td>
<td>Senior high schools</td>
<td>Bahasa</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahyani et al. (2016)</td>
<td>How and why teachers code-switch</td>
<td>*observation *Stimulated recall interview</td>
<td>Bahasa Indonesia</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caukill (2015)</td>
<td>The influences of L1 on vocabulary and writing</td>
<td>(1)classroom observations (2) writing samples; and (3) post-observation interviews</td>
<td>government primary school</td>
<td>Bislama</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimbutane (2013)</td>
<td>Teachers’ beliefs &amp; code switching in TL/L1</td>
<td>*Observations *Interviews</td>
<td>Elementary schools (Grades 4-5)</td>
<td>Changana</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De la Campa &amp; Nassaji (2009)</td>
<td>Amount, the purposes, and the reasons for Code-switching</td>
<td>*Observations *stimulated recall interviews</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duff &amp;</td>
<td>English and</td>
<td>*Observations</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Target Language Alteration</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Language(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polio (1990)</td>
<td>*questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbs, Matsuo &amp; Payne</td>
<td>Teachers’ use of TL/L1 &amp; rationale for code switching</td>
<td>*Observations *interviews</td>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>English, Japanese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inbar-Louire (2010)</td>
<td>to explore the language patterns of teachers</td>
<td>*Observations *interviews</td>
<td>Young learners in Hebrew and Arabic medium schools</td>
<td>Hebrew, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izumitani (2016)</td>
<td>Frequency, functions and reasons behind the use of L1</td>
<td>*Questionnaire *Stimulated recall interview</td>
<td>Elementary and secondary schools</td>
<td>Japanese, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim (2015)</td>
<td>The perception and the effectiveness of codeswitching in the classroom</td>
<td>*Observations *Questionnaire</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Korean, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu &amp; Fehring (2016)</td>
<td>When and why teachers’ used students’ L1</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Chinese, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan &amp; Rivers (2011)</td>
<td>Teachers’ attitudes towards using their learners’ L1, knowledge, &amp; beliefs regarding CLT and TL use.</td>
<td>*Questionnaire</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Japanese, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan &amp; Turnbull (2009)</td>
<td>Teachers’ beliefs &amp; attitude regarding TL/L1 use, &amp; code switching practices</td>
<td>*Observations *Interviews</td>
<td>Lower secondary school (Grade 7)</td>
<td>English, French immersion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor (2012)</td>
<td>Use of mother tongue in EFL teaching</td>
<td>*Questionnaire</td>
<td>Elementary and secondary schools in Israel</td>
<td>Hebrew, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Research Method</td>
<td>School Type</td>
<td>Language(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent (2013)</td>
<td>Teachers’ reported beliefs &amp; practices regarding L1 use in relation to school policy.</td>
<td>*Interviews</td>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Cantonese, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang &amp; Kirkpatrick (2012)</td>
<td>Teachers’ attitudes towards using English as a lingua franca &amp; reported practices</td>
<td>*Interviews</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Various, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raschka, Sercombe, &amp; Chi-Ling (2009)</td>
<td>Perceived functions of code switching in EFL classroom</td>
<td>*Observations *Interviews</td>
<td>Various (Bushibans or cram schools)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohebbi &amp; Alavi (2014)</td>
<td>Teachers’ belief &amp; perception about L1 use in EFL learning context</td>
<td>*Questionnaire</td>
<td>Private schools</td>
<td>Persian, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaqubi &amp; Pouromid</td>
<td>Discrepancy between theory and practice on the teachers’ language choice</td>
<td>2 separate *questionnaire: for parents and for teachers</td>
<td>Private language institute</td>
<td>Persian, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3: Lesson Plan

### LESSON PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percobaan Elementary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/Semester</td>
<td>V/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2 x 35 minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Season &amp; Weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. Competency Standards

5. Understanding the simple instruction and information either the action or the language in the context around the learner.

6. Reveal the simple instruction and information in contexts around the learner.

### B. Basic Competency

- Respond to simple instruction and information either the action or language inside and outside the classroom.
- Understanding simple sentences and simple texts.
- Mimicked speech in very simple expression.
- Conversing for asking and giving information that related with season and weather

### C. Indicators of the competence achievement:

- Respond by repeating what the teacher says loudly.
- Pronounce vocabulary or sentence correctly.
- The students write what they listen from cassette or teacher.
- Respond by repeating what the teacher says loudly.
- Pronounce dialogue correctly.
- Student’s performs the dialogue in front of class.
D. Objective of Learning:

- The students can respond by repeating what the teacher says loudly.
- The students can pronounce vocabulary or sentence correctly.
- The students can write what they listen from cassette or teacher.
- The students can pronounce dialogue correctly.
- Students can performance the dialogue in front of class.

Character of students expected:

- Trustworthiness
- respect
- diligence
- responsibility
- courage

E. Method of Learning:

1. Repetition
2. Reading aloud
3. Cooperative
4. Performance

F. PROCEDURE:

A. PRE ACTIVITIES (5 Minute)

- Greeting
- Praying
- Checking student’s attendance
- Review the last lesson

B. WHILST ACTIVITIES

1. Exploration (10 minute)

- Teacher shows some picture “season and weather” such as summer, winter, spring, autumn and so on.
- Teacher asks the student
- What is the picture?
- Teacher writes kind of season and weather on the whiteboard
2. Elaboration (15 minute)

- Teacher reads aloud *kind of season and weather* then the students repeat it together
- Teacher asks some students to read aloud *kind of season and weather*
- Teacher asks students to write about *season and weather* on their notebook

3. Confirmation (35 minute)

- Teacher gives incomplete dialogue related to *season and weather* to students.
- Teacher asks students to complete the dialogue based on the cassette or what teacher says.
- Teacher discusses the correct answer with all of students.
- Teacher divides students in group or partner.
- Teacher asks students to memorize the dialogue.
- Teacher asks students to performance the dialogue with partner or group in front of class.
- Teacher gives comment or correction about group performance.

C. POST ACTIVITIES (5 minute)

- Teacher closes the lesson and say goodbye

G. SOURCE/Media

- Internet
- Picture
- Recorder
- Text books: *Get Ready*, jilid 3, Erlangga
- Text books: *buku pintar bahasa Inggris*, wahyu media
- Cemara

Evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of the competence achievement</th>
<th>Evaluation Technique</th>
<th>Form of Instrument</th>
<th>Example of Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respond by repeating what the teacher says</td>
<td>Oral test</td>
<td>Repeating</td>
<td>Listen and repeat. <em>e.g: winter,</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The students write what they listen from cassette or teacher. Respond by repeating what the teacher says loudly. Pronounce dialogue correctly. Students performance the dialogue in front of class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>All true</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All most true</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Few true</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All wrong</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FORM OF EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**PRODUCT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active enough</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little active</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERFORMANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active enough</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little active</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active enough</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little active</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>attitude</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enough</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
✓ Evaluation Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Student s’ Name</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Amount of score</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**note:**

\[
\text{mark} = \left( \frac{\text{amount of score}}{\text{maximum amount of score}} \right) \times 10.
\]

📝 For the student who is not required KKM, so it holds remedial

Approved by

Headmaster of Padang,
January , 2013
Percobaan Elementary School English Teacher

**SALMA YENTI, M.Pd**
NIP: 19670703 199001 2001

**SILFIANI EDISON, S.Pd**
Appendix 4: Plain Language Statement

PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM
For The Head of Diknas Kota Padang
(Department of Education of Padang City)

________________________________________________________

Date: _____ /_____ /_____

Project Title: Input-Output Interplay in Indonesian EFL Classrooms: A Conversational Analytic Study

Reference Number : _________________
Student Researcher : Yetti Zainil
Principal Researcher : Dr Zosia Golebiowski
Associate Researcher : Dr Tricia Henry
Associate Researcher : Dr Hossein Shokouhi

Introduction:

My name is Yetti Zainil, and I am currently undertaking a PhD at Deakin University, Australia. I have worked in the English Language Department of Universitas Negeri Padang (State University of Padang) for twenty years. I have also been involved in the Diknas professional development program for teachers in Padang.

The importance of English language teaching and communicative competence as the major goal of English as Foreign Language learning (EFL) in Indonesian elementary schools is stated in the 1994 elementary English curriculum. Thus, teachers’ understanding of what is required to achieve such a goal is crucial. This study will investigate the classroom interaction of elementary school teachers and students in English language classrooms in Padang.
Your permission:

To conduct my research at schools in SD Percobaan Negeri Kota Padang, I would appreciate your granting me permission to attend two classes of grades 5 and 6 to record teacher-student interactions and to interview the teachers. Should you not agree to this request, or change your mind and withdraw your consent, thus discontinuing the participation of your teachers and students in this study, you will do so without any penalty or loss. If you agree to my request, please sign the consent form below. With this consent, and the consent of the principal, the teachers and the parents of the children, two digital video cameras will be used to record classroom interactions that are occurring naturally in two classes. These interactions, together with other collected data and teacher interviews, will be analysed to address the following:

- investigate the use of Bahasa Indonesia and English in the English language classroom;
- find out the pedagogical reasons behind the use of the L1 and the TL by the teachers;
- investigate the relationship between teacher’s input and the students’ output.

In order to achieve the aims of the project, the class will be observed over seven sessions, and the interaction between the teacher and the students will be videotaped. The observations will be followed by a stimulated recall interview with each teacher, where each teacher will watch two selected video observation recordings and comment on the type of interaction in the classroom.

The potential benefits of participating in this research will include opportunities for the teachers to reflect, through stimulated recall interviews, on their teaching of English as a foreign language. More specifically, each teacher will share and discuss with me the recording of the observed classroom discourse. The confidentiality of the information offered in this interview is crucial to this research; any impediment to such confidentiality may negatively affect the responses teachers are prepared to offer. For this reason, the interview will be conducted privately between each teacher and myself in a convenient location. Each teacher will fully understand, prior to the commencement of the interview, that the responses given in the interview will not allow them to be identified.

There will be no anticipated risks expected to arise from this research, as this research focuses on the usual teaching and learning process. There will be no additional costs to the school or payment to any participants taking part in this research. The participation of your staff must be voluntary in order to meet the ethical requirements of the study.
In case a parent does not agree to the participation of their child, there will be no consequences to either the student or the parent. In the process of recording, the video camera will focus on the interaction between the teacher and the students. In order to get to know the teachers and students well and to make them feel comfortable with the video camera, I propose attending the classroom prior to data collection and teachers will introduce me as an observer interested in aspects of the EFL classroom: I will endeavour to adopt the lowest possible profile to ensure that the recordings capture the normally occurring interaction.

All videos taken during this research will be used and accessed for the purposes of linguistic and pedagogical analysis. In order to protect the participants’ privacy and confidentiality, all names will be encoded so that actual names are unable to be identified. A summary of results will be made available to you, the school, the teachers and students’ families, if requested. The results of this research will be used in my PhD thesis and may also be reported in peer-reviewed journals, presented at national and/or international conferences, and used for teacher-training purposes. This may include the video data, but only if consent from all the participants appearing in the video is given.

Any data collected will not be used without the participants’ consent. All digital data collected will be stored on a password-protected computer at Deakin University, Australia, and hard copies will be stored in a locked filing cabinet. The data will be stored for 5 years after the date of the final publication, after which time it will be destroyed.

This research is partially funded through the DIKTI (Directorate General of Higher Education of Indonesia) Scholarship, and the School of Education at Deakin University.

There is no other party which may claim a financial or other interest in this research.

As I am a student at Deakin University, my research will be monitored by my supervisory team to ensure it complies with ethical guidelines. If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted, or any questions about your rights as a research participant, please quote project number _______________ and contact:

The Manager, phone: +61 3 9251 7129,
Office of Research Integrity, fax +61 3 9244 6581;
Deakin University, email: research-
ethics@deakin.edu.au
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125
Australia

I will be available to provide any further information you may about this research project. Alternatively, if you wish to withdraw your consent to participate, or if you have any problems concerning this project, you can contact the researcher:

Yetti Zainil
Building 2
Deakin University,
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125
Australia

phone: +61421928219/+627517052864
email: yzainil@deakin.edu.au
Consent Form
(For The Head of Diknas Kota Padang)

Date: _____ / _____ / _____

Project Title: Input-Output Interplay in Indonesian EFL Classrooms: A Conversational Analytic Study
Reference Number : ________________

Student Researcher : Yetti Zainil
Principal Researcher : Dr Zosia Golebiowski
Associate Researcher : Dr Tricia Henry
Associate Researcher : Dr Hossein Shokouhi

I agree to the on-site recruitment of a member of my staff and students from................................. (name of the school ) for the above research project. I have had the project explained to me in my first language (Bahasa Indonesia), and I have read the Plain Language Statement, which I will keep for my records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that I am willing for:

- the student researcher to explain the project to staff, at a staff or faculty meeting and for copies of the Plain Language Statement to be left for perusal by interested staff.

- the student researcher to explain the project to student’s parents and care-givers and for copies of the Plain Language Statement and consent forms to be sent to them.

I understand that teachers’ and students’ participation is voluntary, that they can choose not to participate in part or all of the project, and that they can withdraw at any stage of the project.

I understand that the teacher and the students will be observed and videorecorded during classroom interaction in their regular English language
classroom. Then, each teacher will be involved in individual stimulated recall interview.

I understand that any identifying features of the participants and school will be removed prior to submission of the thesis or in other research outputs, including publication.

I am aware that this research has ethics approval from Deakin University-Human Research Ethics Committee, to conduct research in schools.

Name (please print) ..............................................................................................................

Role/Position at organization ..............................................................................................

Signature ............................................................................................................................
Date: ................................................

This form will be collected from the participant’s institution or may be returned to the researcher:

Yetti Zainil
Building 2
Deakin University,
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125
Australia

phone: +61421928219/+627517052864
email: yzainil@deakin.edu.au
Revocation Consent Form
(For Head of Diknas Kota Padang)

Date: _____ / _____ / _____

Project Title: Input-Output Interplay in Indonesian EFL Classrooms: A Conversational Analytic Study
Reference Number : ______________

Student Researcher : Yetti Zainil
Principal Researcher : Dr Zosia Golebiowski
Associate Researcher : Dr Tricia Henry
Associate Researcher : Dr Hossein Shokouhi

I hereby wish to WITHDRAW the consent for the school, teachers, families and students of:

__________________________
___ (school name)

__________________________
___ (school Address)

to participate in the above research project and understand that such withdrawal WILL NOT jeopardize my relationship with Deakin University.

Name (please print) ..........................................................................................................................
Role/Position at organization

Signature
Date: 

This form will be collected from the participant’s institution or may be returned to the researcher:

Yetti Zainil
Building 2  phone: +61421928219/+627517052864
Deakin University, email yzainil@deakin.edu.au
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125,
Australia
PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM
(For Elementary School Principal)

Date: ______ / ______ / ______

Project Title: Input-Output Interplay in Indonesian EFL Classrooms: A Conversational Analytic Study
Reference Number: ______________
Student Researcher: Yetti Zainil
Principal Researcher: Dr Zosia Golebiowski
Associate Researcher: Dr Tricia Henry
Associate Researcher: Dr Hossein Shokouhi

Introduction:

My name is Yetti Zainil, and I am currently undertaking a PhD at Deakin University, Australia. I have worked in the English Language Department of Universitas Negeri Padang (State University of Padang) for twenty years. I have also been involved in the Diknas professional development program for teachers in Padang.

The importance of English language teaching and communicative competence as the main goal of English foreign-language learning in Indonesian elementary schools is stated in the 1994 elementary English curriculum. Thus, teachers’ understanding of what is required to achieve such a goal is crucial. This study will investigate the classroom interaction between teachers and students in the English language classroom in your school.

Your participation:

As the principal of this school, you are invited to voluntarily take part in this research by allowing me access to your school, to record classroom interactions of teachers and students, and to interview teachers. Should you not agree to participate in this research, or change your mind and withdraw your consent, thus discontinuing the participation of your teachers and students in this study, you will do so without any penalty or loss. If you agree to participate, please sign this consent form. With this consent, and the consent of your teachers, the students and the parents of the children, two digital video cameras will be used to record classroom interactions that are occurring naturally in your school.
These interactions, together with other collected data and teacher interviews, will be analysed to address the following research questions:

- investigate the use of Bahasa Indonesia (L1) and English (TL) in classroom interaction;
- find out the pedagogical reasons behind the use of the L1 and the TL by the teachers;
- investigate the relationship between teacher’s input and students’ language output.

In order to achieve the aims of the project, the class will be observed over seven sessions, and the interaction between the teacher and the students will be videotaped. The observations will be followed by two interview sessions (stimulated recall interview) with each teacher, where each teacher will watch two selected video observation recordings and comment on the interaction.

The potential benefits of participating in this research may include opportunities for the teachers to reflect, through the stimulated recall interview, on their teaching of English as a foreign language. More specifically, each teacher will share and discuss with me the recordings of the classroom discourse observed. The confidentiality of the information offered in this interview is crucial to this research; any impediment to such confidentiality may negatively affect the responses teachers are prepared to offer. For this reason, the interview will be conducted privately between each teacher and myself in a convenient location. Each teacher will fully understand, prior to the commencement of the interview, that the responses given in the interview will not allow them to be identified.

There will be no anticipated risks expected to arise from this research, as this research focuses on the usual teaching and learning process. There will be no additional costs to your school or payment to any participants taking part in this research. The participation of your staff and students must be voluntary in order to meet the ethical requirements of the study.

In case a parent does not agree to the participation of their child, there will be no consequences to either the student or the parent. In the process of recording, the video camera will focus on the interaction between the teacher and the students. The video file will be edited if the non-participating teacher or student is recorded unintentionally. In order to get to know the teachers and students well and to make them feel comfortable with the video camera, I propose attending the classroom prior to data collection; teachers will introduce me as an observer interested in aspects of the EFL classroom; I will endeavour to adopt the lowest possible profile to ensure that the recordings capture the normally occurring interaction.
All videos taken during this research will be used and accessed for the purposes of analysis. In order to protect the participants’ privacy and confidentiality, all names will be encoded differently from the actual names. A summary of results will, if requested, be made available to you, your teachers and the students’ families. The results of this research will be used in my PhD thesis. Results may also be reported in peer-reviewed journals, presented at national and/or international conferences, and used for teacher-training purposes. This may include the video data, but only if consent from all the participants appearing in the video is given.

Any data collected will not be used without the teachers’, parents’, and students’ consent. All digital data collected will be stored on a password-protected computer at Deakin University, Australia, and hard copies will be stored in a locked filing cabinet. The data will be stored for 5 years after the date of the final publication after which time it will be destroyed.

This research is partially funded through the DIKTI (Directorate General of Higher Education of Indonesia) Scholarship, and the School of Education at Deakin University.

There is no other party which may claim a financial or other interest in this research.

As I am a student at Deakin University, my research will be monitored by my supervisory team to ensure it complies with ethical guidelines. If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted, or any questions about your rights as a research participant, please quote project number _______________ and contact:

The Manager, 
Office of Research Integrity, 
Deakin University,  
221 Burwood Highway  
Burwood, Victoria, 3125  
Australia

phone: +61 3 9251 7129,  
fax: +61 3 9244 6581;  
email: researchethics@deakin.edu.au

I will be available to answer any questions you have about the research project, and you may ask for any further information you require. If you wish to
withdraw your consent to participate, or if you have any problems concerning this project, you can contact the researcher:

Yetti Zainil  
Building 2  
Deakin University,  
221 Burwood Highway  
Burwood, Victoria, 3125  
Australia

phone: +61421928219/+627517052864  
email: yzainil@deakin.edu.au
Consent Form
(For Elementary School Principal)

Date: _____ / _____ / _____

Project Title: Input-Output Interplay in Indonesian EFL Classrooms: A Conversational Analytic Study
Reference Number : ______________

Student Researcher : Yetti Zainil
Principal Researcher : Dr Zosia Golebiowski
Associate Researcher : Dr Tricia Henry
Associate Researcher : Dr Hossein Shokouhi

I agree to the on-site recruitment of a member of my staff and students from......................................... (name of the school ) for the above research project. I have had the project explained to me in my first language (Bahasa Indonesia), and I have read the Plain Language Statement, which I will keep for my records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that I am willing for:

- the student researcher to explain the project to staff, at a staff or faculty meeting and for copies of the Plain Language Statement to be left for perusal by interested staff.

- the student researcher to explain the project to student’s parents and care-givers and for copies of the Plain Language Statement and consent forms to be sent to them.

I understand that teachers’ and students’ participation is voluntary, that they can choose not to participate in part or all of the project, and that they can withdraw at any stage of the project.

I understand that the teacher and the students will be observed and videorecorded during classroom interaction in their regular English language
classroom. Then, each teacher will be involved in individual stimulated recall interview.

I understand that any identifying features of the participants and school will be removed prior to submission of the thesis or in other research outputs, including publication.

I am aware that this research has ethics approval from Deakin University-Human Research Ethics Committee, to conduct research in schools.

Name (please print) .................................................................................................................................

Role/Position at organization .....................................................................................................................

Signature ...................................................................................................................................................

Date: .......................................................................................................................................................

This form will be collected from the participant’s institution or may be returned to the researcher:

Yetti Zainil
Building 2
Deakin University,
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125
Australia

phone: +61421928219/+627517052864
email: yzaini@deakin.edu.au
I hereby wish to **WITHDRAW** the consent for teachers, families and students of:

________________________________________________________
(school name)

________________________________________________________
(school Address)

I understand that such withdrawal WILL NOT jeopardize my relationship with Deakin University.

Name (please print) ..............................................................

Role/Position at organization ..............................................

Signature .......................................................... Date:
..............................................................

This form will be collected from the participant’s institution or may be returned to the researcher:
Yetti Zainil
Building 2
Deakin University,
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125
Australia

phone: +61421928219/+627517052864
email: yzainil@deakin.edu.au
Date: _____ /_____ /_____

Project Title: Input-Output Interplay in Indonesian EFL Classrooms: A Conversational Analytic Study
Reference Number : ____________
Student Researcher : Yetti Zainil
Principal Researcher : Dr Zosia Golebiowski
Associate Researcher : Dr Tricia Henry
Associate Researcher : Dr Hossein Shokouhi

Introduction:
My name is Yetti Zainil, and I am currently undertaking a PhD at Deakin University, Australia. I have worked in the English Language Department of Universitas Negeri Padang (State University of Padang) for twenty years. I have also been involved in the Diknas professional development program for teachers in Padang.

The importance of communicative competence as the main goal of English foreign-language learning in Indonesian elementary schools is stated in the 1994 elementary English curriculum. Thus, teachers’ understanding of what is required to achieve such a goal is crucial. This study will investigate classroom interaction between you and your students in the English language classroom.

Your participation:
As a teacher, you are invited to voluntarily take part in this research by allowing me access to your classroom, to record your classroom interactions with students, and to interview you. If you do not agree to participate in this research, or change your mind and withdraw your consent, thus discontinuing your participation, you will do so without any penalty or loss. If you agree to participate, please sign this consent form. With this consent, the consents of the parents of the students and the students, two digital video cameras will be used to record classroom interactions that are occurring naturally in your class.
These interactions, together with other collected data and interviews, will be analysed to answer the following research questions:

- investigate the use of Bahasa Indonesia (L1) and English (TL) in classroom interaction;
- find out the pedagogical reasons behind the use of the L1 and the TL by the teachers;
- investigate the relationship between teacher’s input and students’ language output.

In order to achieve the aims of the project, the class will be observed over seven sessions, and the interaction between you and the students will be videotaped. The observations will be followed by two sessions interview (stimulated recall interview) with you, where you will be assisted in recalling what you did and said in the lessons by watching the video-recording. You will watch two selected video observation recordings and comment on the interaction.

The potential benefits of participating in this research may include opportunities for you to reflect, through the stimulated recall interview, on your teaching of English as a foreign language. More specifically, you will share and discuss with me the recordings of the classroom discourse observed. The confidentiality of the information offered in this interview is crucial to this research; any impediment to such confidentiality may negatively affect the responses you are prepared to offer. For this reason, the interview will be conducted privately between you and myself in a convenient location. You will fully understand, prior to the commencement of the interview, that the responses given in the interview will not allow you to be identified.

There will be no anticipated risks expected to arise from this research, as this research focus on your regular teaching and learning process. There will be no additional costs to you and the school or payment to any participants taking part in this research. Your participation must be voluntary in order to meet the ethical requirements of the study.

In case a parent doesn’t agree to the participation of their child, there will be no consequences to either the student or the parent. In the process of recording, the video camera will focus on the interaction between you and the students. The video file will be edited if the non-participating teacher or student is recorded unintentionally. In order to get to know you and students well and to make them feel comfortable with the video camera, I propose attending the classroom prior to data collection; you will introduce me as an observer interested in aspects of the EFL classroom; I will endeavour to adopt the lowest
possible profile to ensure that the recordings capture the normally occurring interaction.

All videos taken during this research will be used and accessed for the purposes of analysis. In order to protect the participants’ privacy and confidentiality, all names will be encoded differently from the actual names. A summary of results will be made available to you, if requested. The results of this research will be used in my PhD thesis. Results may also be reported in peer-reviewed journals, presented at national and/or international conferences, and used for teacher-training purposes. This may include the video data, but only if consent from all the participants appearing in video is given.

Any data collected from you will not be used without your consent. All digital data collected will be stored on a password-protected computer at Deakin University, Australia, and hard copies will be stored in a locked filing cabinet. The data will be stored for 5 years after the date of the final publication after which time it will be destroyed.

This research is partially funded through the DIKTI (Directorate General of Higher Education of Indonesia) Scholarship, and the School of Education at Deakin University.

There is no other party which may claim a financial or other interest in this research.

As I am a student at Deakin University, my research will be monitored by my supervisory team to ensure it complies with ethical guidelines. If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted or any questions about your rights as a research participant, please quote project number ______________ and contact:

The Manager,  
Office of Research Integrity,  
Deakin University,  
extics@deakin.edu.au  
221 Burwood Highway  
Burwood, Victoria, 3125  
Australia  

I will be available to answer any questions you have about the research project, and you may ask for any further information you require. If you wish to withdraw your consent to participate, or if you have any problems concerning this project, you can contact the researcher:
Yetti Zainil
Building 2
Deakin University,
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125
Australia

phone: +61421928219/+627517052864
email: yzainil@deakin.edu.au
Date: _____ / _____ / _____

Project Title: Input-Output Interplay in Indonesian EFL Classrooms: A Conversational Analytic Study
Reference Number : ____________

Student Researcher : Yetti Zainil
Principal Researcher : Dr Zosia Golebiowsk
Associate Researcher : Dr Tricia Henry
Associate Researcher : Dr Hossein Shokouhi

I have read the above document in my first language (Bahasa Indonesia), and I understand the attached Plain Language Statement and

I, ______________________________________________________________ (your name),

agree to take part in the above research project. I have had the project explained to me, and I have read the Plain Language Statement, which I will keep for my records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that I am willing to:

- Participate in classroom observation;
- Allow the classroom interactions to be video-recorded;
- Accommodate the researcher in ongoing observation (approximately 28 hours over 7 weeks);
- Join with the researcher in three sessions stimulated recall interview after the observation that should take no longer than 2 hours each session.
Signature .................................................................
Date: ............................................................

This form will be collected from the participant’s institution or may be returned to the researcher:

Yetti Zainil
Building 2
Deakin University,
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125
Australia

phone: +61421928219/+627517052864
email: yzainil@deakin.edu.au

Deakin University,
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125
Australia

email: yzainil@deakin.edu.au
Revocation Consent Form  
(For Teacher)

Date: _____ / _____ / _____

Project Title: Input-Output Interplay in Indonesian EFL Classrooms: A Conversational Analytic Study
Reference Number : ______________

Student Researcher : Yetti Zainil
Principal Researcher : Dr Zosia Golebiowski
Associate Researcher : Dr Tricia Henry
Associate Researcher : Dr Hossein Shokouhi

I

_________________________________________________________(participant’s name)

Teaching at _____________________________________________ (school Address)

hereby wish to WITHDRAW my consent to participate in the above research project and understand that such withdrawal WILL NOT jeopardize my relationship with Deakin University.

Signature ..............................................................
Date: .....................................................

This form will be collected from the institution of the participant or may be returned to the researcher:
Yetti Zainil
Building 2
Deakin University,
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125
Australia
phone: +61421928219/+627517052864
e-mail: yzainil@deakin.edu.au
Date: _____ /_____ /_____

Project Title: Input-Output Interplay in Indonesian EFL Classrooms: A Conversational Analytic Study
Reference Number: ______________

Student Researcher: Yetti Zainil
Principal Researcher: Dr Zosia Golebiowski
Associate Researcher: Dr Tricia Henry
Associate Researcher: Dr Hossein Shokouhi

Introduction:

My name is Yetti Zainil, and I am currently undertaking a PhD at Deakin University, Australia. I have worked in the English Language Department of Universitas Negeri Padang (State University of Padang) for twenty years. I have also been involved in the Diknas professional development program for teachers in Padang.

The importance of English language teaching in Indonesia has been well established over the years with many studies highlighting communicative competence as the main goal of English foreign-language learning. Thus, teachers’ understanding of what is required to achieve such a goal is crucial. This study will investigate interaction between the teacher and your child as a student in the English language class.

Your participation:

As a parent or a care-giver, your child is invited to voluntarily take part in this research by allowing me access to record classroom interactions between your child/children and the teacher. If you do not agree your child to participate in this research, or change your mind and withdraw your consent, thus discontinuing the participation of your child in this study, you will do so without any penalty or loss. If you agree to participate, please sign this consent form. With this consent, and the consent of the teachers and your child, two digital video cameras will be used to record classroom interactions that are occurring naturally in your child class. These interactions, together with other
collected data and teacher interviews, will be analysed to answer the following research questions:

- investigate the relative use of Bahasa Indonesia and English in the English language classroom;
- find out the pedagogical reasons behind the use of the L1 and the TL by the teachers;
- investigate the relationship between teacher’s input and the students’ language output.

In order to achieve the aims of the project, the class will be observed over seven sessions, and the interaction between your child/children and the teacher will be videotaped.

There will be no anticipated risks expected to arise from this research, as the teaching and learning process will run as usual. There will be no additional costs to you or payment to any participants taking part in this research. Your child/children participation must be voluntary in order to meet the ethical requirements of the study.

In the process of recording, the video camera will focus on the interaction between the teacher and your child/children. The video file will be edited if the non-participating teacher or student is recorded unintentionally. In order to get to know the teachers and students well and to make them feel comfortable with the video camera, I propose attending the classroom prior to data collection; teachers will introduce me as an observer interested in aspects of the EFL classroom; I will endeavour to adopt the lowest possible profile to ensure that the recordings capture the normally occurring interaction.

All videos taken during this research will be used and accessed for the purposes of analysis. In order to protect the participants’ privacy and confidentiality, all names will be encoded differently from the actual names. A summary of results will be made available to you, if required. The results of this research will be used in my PhD thesis. Results may also be reported in peer-reviewed journals, presented at national and international conferences, and/or used for teacher-training purposes. This may include the video data, but only if consent from all the participants appearing in video is given.

Any data collected from your child/children will not be used without your consent and your child’s consent. Before you agree to consent, please ensure:

- You have discussed with your child/children whether or not to participate in this study;
You have explained about the video recording of the interaction between your child and his/her teacher.

All digital data collected will be stored on a password-protected computer at Deakin University, Australia, and hard copies will be stored in a locked filing cabinet. The data will be stored for 5 years after the date of the final publication after which time it will be destroyed.

This research is partially funded through the DIKTI (Directorate General of Higher Education of Indonesia) Scholarship, and the School of Education at Deakin University.

There is no other party which may claim a financial or other interest in this research.

As I am a student at Deakin University, my research will be monitored by my supervisory team to ensure it complies with ethical guidelines. If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted or any questions about your child/children rights as a research participant, please quote project number _______________ and contact:

The Manager, phone: +61 3 9251 7129,
Office of Research Integrity, fax +61 3 9244 6581;
Deakin University, email: research-ethics@deakin.edu.au
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125
Australia

I will be available to answer any questions you have about the research project, and you may ask for any further information you require. If you wish to withdraw your consent to participate, or if you have any problems concerning this project, you can contact the researcher:

Yetti Zainil phone:
+61421928219/+627517052864
Building 2 email: yzainil@deakin.edu.au
Deakin University,
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125
Australia
Consent Form
(For Parental/Guardian)

Date: _____ / _____ / _____

Project Title: Input-Output Interplay in Indonesian EFL Classrooms: A Conversational Analytic Study
Reference Number : __________

Student Researcher : Yeti Zainil
Principal Researcher : Dr Zosia Golebiowski
Associate Researcher : Dr Tricia Henry
Associate Researcher : Dr Hossein Shokouhi

I have read the above document in my first language (Bahasa Indonesia), and I understand the attached Plain Language Statement and

I,
_______________________________(your name),

Parent or guardian of
_______________________________(child’s name)

agree to his/her participation in the above research project according to the condition in the plain Language Statement, which I will keep for my records.

I agree that.....

- My child participates in this study;
- Allow my child to be video-recorded in normal classroom activities;
I give consent for the use of selected video clips in which my child may appear for presentations at national and international conferences, and to be used for teaching training purposes provided consent is granted by all participants appearing in the video.

The researcher has agreed not to reveal my child’s identity or personal details, if information about this project is published, or presented in any public forum.

Signature ..............................................................................................................
Date:..........................................................................

This form will be collected from the participant’s institution or may be returned to the researcher:

Yeti Zainil
Building 2
Deakin University,
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125
Australia

phone: +61421928219/+627517052864
email: yzainil@deakin.edu.au
Revocation of Consent Form
(For Parental/Guardian)

Date: _____ / _____ / _____

Project Title: Input-Output Interplay in Indonesian EFL Classrooms: A Conversational Analytic Study
Reference Number : ________________

Student Researcher : Yetti Zainil
Principal Researcher : Dr Zosia Golebiowski
Associate Researcher : Dr Tricia Henry
Associate Researcher : Dr Hossein Shokouhi

I hereby wish to WITHDRAW my consent for my child,
____________________________________________(child’s name)

to participate in the above research project and understand that such withdrawal WILL NOT jeopardize my relationship with Deakin University.

Signature ............................................................... Date:
...........................................................................

This form will be collected from the institution of the participant or may be returned to the researcher:
Yetti Zainil
Building 2
Deakin University,
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood, Victoria, 3125
Australia

phone: +61421928219/+627517052864
email: yzainil@deakin.edu.au
Date: _____ /_____ /_____

Project Title: Input-Output Interplay in Indonesian EFL Classrooms: A Conversational Analytic Study
Reference Number : ______________

Student Researcher : Yetti Zainil
Principal Researcher : Dr Zosia Golebiowski
Associate Researcher : Dr Tricia Henry
Associate Researcher : Dr Hossein Shokouhi

Your parents have allowed me to talk to you about a project that I am going to conduct in your English class. However, you do not have to join this project if you don’t want to. The project is about the way that you and your English teacher talk to each other. I am going to spend a few minutes telling you about our project, and then I am going to ask you if you are interested in taking part in the project.

Who am I?

My name is Yetti Zainil and I am a student researcher at Deakin University.

Why am I meeting with you?

I want to tell you about a study that involves children like yourself regarding learning English.

Why are we doing this study?

I want to find out how you and your teacher communicate in your English language class.

What will happen to you if you are in the study?
If you decide to take part in this study, you and your teacher in your English language class will be video recorded for seven sessions. These sessions will not be special lessons; they will be your regular English lessons.

**Are there good things and bad things about the study?**

What we find in this study will be used to get real information about the way you and your teacher talk to each other. There is nothing in this study that can hurt you and it will not make you feel bad.

**Who will know that you are in the study?**

The things you say and any information we write about you will not have your name on it, so no one will know they are your answers or the things that you did.

The researchers will not let anyone else see your answers or any other information about you. Your teachers, principal, and parents will never see the answers you gave or the information we wrote about you.

**Do you have to be in the study?**

You do not have to be in the study. No one will get angry or upset with you if you don’t want to do this. Just tell us if you don’t want to be in the study. And remember, if you decide to be in the study, but later you change your mind, then you can tell us you do not want to be in the study anymore. If you are upset about anything in the study, please make sure you tell me or your parents or your teacher.

**Do you have any questions?**

You can ask questions at any time. You can ask now or you can ask later. You can talk to me or you can talk to someone else at any time during the study. Here are the telephone numbers and e-mail address to reach us:

Local Contact: **the teacher**

Yetti Zainil  
Building 2  
Deakin University,  
221 Burwood Highway  
Burwood, Victoria, 3125  

phone: +61421928219/+627517052864  
email: [yzainil@deakin.edu.au](mailto:yzainil@deakin.edu.au)
IF YOU WANT TO BE IN THE STUDY, SIGN YOUR NAME ON THE LINE BELOW:

Child’s name: __________________________________________

Signature _________________________

Date: _____________________________
Appendix 5: Guide Questions

Guide Questions for the stimulated recall interviews.

1. Do you think it is a good idea to use Bahasa Indonesia for certain functions in the language class? When do you think it is a good idea to use it?
2. Why did you use Bahasa Indonesia in this part of your teaching?
3. What were you thinking when you switched from English to Bahasa Indonesia in this part of the lesson? Were you aware that you changed language?
4. You gave this explanation of new language first in English, but you immediately translated it into Bahasa Indonesia. Can you tell me why?
5. First you gave these new words in English, wrote them on the board, then you translated them, also on the whiteboard. Did you think that was necessary? Why?
6. What do you think a good balance of English and Bahasa Indonesia would be for the teacher in a language class?
Appendix 6: CA Transcription conventions

I use transcription conventions develop by Atkinson and Heritage (1984) and list here only those symbols which occur in the extracts used in this study.

[ ] Overlapping utterances – (Beginning [ ) and (end ]

(0.4) Represents the tenth of a second between utterances

↑↓ Rising and falling intonation (after an utterance)

(XX) Intelligible speech

{tr} Translation is provided

(Analyst’s notes)

Utterances in Bahasa Indonesia