Analyzing Classroom Discourse: A Comparative Study of Teacher Trainees' Teacher Talk in Indonesia and Japan Using SETT (Self Evaluation of Teacher Talk)

Veronica Dwi Puspasari

1. Introduction

Improving learners' communicative competence is an essential goal for Junior High School (JHS) English in both Japan and Indonesia. Based on the Course of Study of the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sport, Science and Technology (henceforth MEXT), the overall objective of the English subject for JHS students is to develop students' basic communication abilities such as listening, speaking, reading and writing, deepening their understanding of language and culture and fostering a positive attitude toward communicating in foreign languages. Whereas in Indonesia, the Ministry of Education states that the goal of English education in JHS level is to develop oral and written communicative competence to achieve functional literacy.

These goals have not been easy for either Indonesia and Japan to attain. This paper analyzes how pre-service teachers attempt to teach communicatively using Walsh's Self Evaluation Teacher Talk (SETT) framework. It will first compare English education in both Indonesia and Japan. After that, it will introduce the participants of the study and procedures used for observing and analyzing their classes. Lastly, it will describe the nature of the teachers' classroom discourse and the types of learning goals it facilitated.

2. Societal Aspects and English Education in Indonesia and Japan

In this section, I will give a brief background of relevant societal aspects of Indonesia and Japan and then discuss their history of English education, current English curriculum, and issues in implementing the curriculum.

2.1.Indonesia: Land, People and Language

Indonesia is an archipelagic country with more than 17,000 islands. Apart from its vast size, Indonesia also consists of different ethnic groups and local languages. The Indonesian language is the official language, but there are

hundreds of local languages spoken throughout the country. The Indonesian language is the mother tongue of fewer than 20% Indonesians. Most children who were born outside the capital city of Jakarta speak their local languages before they go to school and start learning Indonesian in elementary school. This unique condition becomes interesting when Indonesian students start learning a foreign language in JHS. It is not uncommon for English to be taught in both Indonesian and the local language.

Since 1994, the Indonesian government has mandated 9 years of compulsory education, 6 years in elementary level and 3 years in junior high school. By 2008, it was expected that the enrolment in compulsory education would reach 95%. Nevertheless, UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2014) reported that enrolment in primary school was 88.87% and dropped to 76.01% in secondary school.

2.2.English Education in Indonesia

As an official subject in JHS, the objectives of English are determined by the government in the national curriculum. Since its independence in 1945, Indonesia has changed its English curriculum seven times. Lie (2007) wrote that three methodological approaches, Grammar translation, Audiolingual, and Communicative, have served as the foundation of the national curricula since 1945. This is still true currently, in 2019.

Table 1. Major Approaches for the Indonesian National Curriculum

Starting Year	Name of Curriculum	Approach
1945	Unknown	Grammar translation
1968	Oral Approach	Audiolingual
1975	Oral Approach	Audiolingual
1984	Communicative Approach	Communicative
1994	Meaning-based curriculum	Communicative
2004	Competency-based curriculum	Communicative
2013	2013 curriculum	Communicative

The current curriculum (henceforth K-13) is expected to answer both the needs and challenges to improve education in Indonesia as it involves a "scientific approach" to foster students' critical thinking (Madkur & Nur, 2014). The Scientific approach as the way of teaching is adapted from the five

principles of discovery, namely observing, questioning, experimenting, associating and networking or communicating. These were established by Dyer, Gregersen and Christensen (Wahyudin & Sukyadi, 2015). While it is common to utilize the approach for science education, critiques have emerged from EFL practitioners because teaching English through the scientific method is an unfamiliar concept (Wahyudin & Sukyadi, 2015).

Even though K-13 sparks some controversy, Madkur and Nur (2014) have attributed it to some positive developments in the English curriculum, that is, the use of various sources of texts that teachers can bring into the classroom. Hence, students are empowered by the availability of texts. In addition, K-13 is designed so that students are able to use English through activities instead of as mere receivers of knowledge.

2.3.Issues and Constraints on English Education in Indonesia

Even though the Ministry of Education has changed the English curriculum many times to make it more communicative, the challenge remains. Upon graduation from high school, students in Indonesia still exhibit low proficiency (Imperiani, 2012; Lie, 2007; Marcellino, 2008). This is attributed to many factors including: large class sizes, the low English proficiency of teachers and inadequate teacher education for teaching the new curriculum (Dardjowidjojo, 2000; Nur, 2004).

Egar et.al (2015) reported that many teachers still use traditional approaches, such as reading aloud or dictating the content of the book and tell the students to repeat after them. Furthermore, the majority of these teachers deliver the lesson in the mother tongue of the children, either Indonesian or an indigenous language, primarily due to their self-perceived low level of communicative competence in the target language (Chodidjah, 2008).

However, some researchers pointed out that the teachers' style in adopting the traditional approaches is also caused by the mismatch of the curriculum objectives and how examinations are conducted. Since the 1950s, Indonesia has been employing a nationwide standardized English school examination, which students must pass as one of the requirements to graduate from either JHS or HS. The National Examination for grade 9 JHS students, which only

tests their reading skills, is not consistent with the national English subject objectives (Putra, 2014).

Teachers have long been burdened to make sure that the students pass the national examinations with flying colors. It is more likely that a school will get a high enrollment in the following academic year if the students gain high scores on the national examination. Thus, English teachers tend to disregard the curricular contents and skills that will not be tested on the exam, and teach test-taking strategies (Mukminin et al., 2013; Sukyadi & Mardiani, 2011; Yulia, 2014).

Another constraint in implementing the communicative approach in the classroom is teachers' domination. Lewis (1997) found out that teachers' domination in classroom discourse was prevalent. Suryati (2015) provides an example of one-sided teacher talk in EFL classes in lower secondary schools in Malang, East Java. She reported that the classroom interaction consisted of 93% teacher-student interaction and only 7% of student-student interaction.

2.4.Japan: Land, People and Language

Japan is the largest island country in East Asia that stretches some 3,000 km from north to south. It is often viewed as a homogeneous country where all people are from the same racial background and all speak the same language (Hagerman, 2009). Almost all Japanese speak Japanese language as their mother tongue.

The Japanese government mandates 9 years of compulsory education, 6 years in elementary level and 3 years in junior high school. Japanese people perceive education as an important tool to secure prospective job. Based on UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2014), the enrollment rate of elementary education reached 98.29% and slightly increased in secondary education with 98.7%.

2.5.English Education in Japan

Shimizu (2010) explains that Japan's introduction to learning English dates back to February 1809, the year after the arrival of the British Royal Navy ship at the harbor in Nagasaki. The period from the first stage of the Showa era in 1926 to WW II showed the peak of the anti-English language

movement, resulting in the abolition of English education at schools (Adamson, 2006). Since the end of WW II, English has been taught at all secondary schools in Japan

In Japan, children begin to experience English weekly from the 5th grade in elementary school as 'foreign language activities.' Foreign language activities are considered a subject and their overall objective is to "foster a positive attitude toward communication, and familiarize pupils with the sounds and basic expressions of foreign languages." (MEXT, 2011). In these activities, students are supposed to experience the joy of communication through actively listening to and speaking in the foreign language. It is hoped that students will learn the importance of verbal communication.

It is not until JHS that Japanese students officially start studying English as a subject (Hashimoto, 2009) According to MEXT (2011, Section 9 page 1), the overall objective of English education in JHS is "to develop students' basic communication abilities" and deepen "their understanding of language and culture and fostering a positive attitude toward communication through foreign languages." It is further explained that "English should be selected in principle" for language instruction in the classroom.

Currently, Japan is in a period of English education reform. In 2020, the same year as the Tokyo Olympics, English will start as an official subject from grade 5 of elementary school and foreign language activities will begin from grade 3.

2.6.Issues and Constraints on English Education in Japan

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is strongly encouraged in the Course of Study of both JHS and HS (Otani, 2013). MEXT does not provide a specific definition of CLT in the Course of Study. As a result, misinterpretation of CLT by Japanese English teachers is common (Kanatani, 2012). The majority of Japanese English language teachers interpret the CLT encouraged in the New Course of Study as using English as a medium of language instruction with no L1 employment (Campbell, Kikuchi, & Palmer, 2006).

Another issue with English education in Japan is the confusion that emerges in realizing the communicative approach in the classroom. Nishino

(2008) attributed this constraint to the lack of practical guidelines in the course of study. The Course of Study specifies only what teachers are to teach, not how they are to teach (Gorsuch, 2000).

To improve the standard of English education and to promote a more communicative atmosphere, the Japanese government carried out a reform movement by starting the JET (Japan Exchange and Teaching) program in 1987 (Prehantro and Ishizuka, 2014). It aims "to promote internationalization in Japan's local communities by helping to improve foreign language education and developing international exchange at the community level" (JET, 2019, para. 1). MEXT hires thousands of non-Japanese to serve as ALTs (Assistant Language Teachers) at public schools to. They do team teaching with the Japanese English teachers in order to help students learn English (Brumby and Wada, 1990 as cited in Tajino & Walker, 1998).

Many people have attributed the JET program as the government's commitment to improve the quality of English education. Sakui (2004) noted that the classes with an ALT included much more English and the use of communicative activities. ALTs have also intensified student use of English while the Japanese Teachers of English (JTEs) classes consisted of more teacher-fronted grammar lessons. However, it is erroneous to perceive that the JTEs do not try to employ communicative approach in the classrooms. The reason why many JTEs do teacher-fronted grammar lesson is to progress through the curriculum to prepare students for the mid-term and final-term tests (Sakui, 2004).

2.7.Classroom Discourse to Promote English Language Learning

The above issues and constraints indicate there is a need for teachers in both contexts to provide a situation to promote communicative competence in the target language. It is through language that we can access new knowledge and develop our skills. In this section, I will explain what classroom interaction is and how teachers can use it to improve students' communicative ability.

Meltzoff as cited in Lloyd, Kolodziej and Brashears (2016) characterizes the role of the teacher as one who skillfully weaves teaching and learning, creates an interconnectedness among lesson concepts, and guides students in

developing rich relationships within the classroom. The teacher's role, then, becomes very significant in building the classroom discourse through her talking strategies.

Gonzalez (2008) defines classroom discourse as an essential component of learning that includes teacher–student interactions as well as student–student interactions. Since classroom discourse is created through interaction, it is important for teachers to develop Walsh's notion of CIC (classroom interactional competence): "the ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning" (Walsh 2011, p.158).

In 2006 Walsh developed a framework called SETT in collaboration with L2 teachers, and its aim is to foster teacher development through reflecting on classroom interaction. He argues that teachers evaluating their classroom talk will help improve teaching and learning in their classrooms. The SETT framework consists of four micro contexts (called modes). The four modes are *Managerial, Materials, Skills and System* and *Classroom Context.* Each mode has its distinctive pedagogical goals and its interactional features.

The first mode is called *Managerial* and the pedagogical purpose is to organize the learning environment. Because the main goal is to manage the learning environment, the interactional feature is marked with extended teacher turns for explanation or instruction.

Materials mode aims to focus learners' attention to the material. The language use progresses around the materials being used in the classroom. In this stage, the teacher mainly controls the flow of the classroom communication and decides who can contribute in the class discussion. The interactional features include the IRF (Initiation – Response – Feedback) pattern and the extensive use of display questions and corrective feedback.

The third mode is called *Skills and System* mode. The pedagogical goal is to provide learners with language practice related to language system or language skills. The language practice focuses on accuracy rather than fluency. Direct repair and scaffolding are the important interactional features in this mode.

Classroom Context is the last mode in SETT framework. The pedagogic goal is to enable students to express themselves and promote oral fluency. The obvious interactional features are the absence of extended teacher talk and

minimal repair from teacher. Unlike *Skills and Systems* mode that focuses on language accuracy, this mode emphasizes language fluency.

The table below shows the four modes of discourse and their interactional features:

Table 2. Four modes of discourse in the SETT framework

Mode	Pedagogical Goals	Interactional Features
Managerial	to organize learning environment, convey information and introduce or conclude an activity	• Extended teacher turns • The use of confirmation checks • The absence of learners' contribution
Materials	to center the discussion on the materials being used	• The use of display questions • Form-focused feedback • Corrective feedback • IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) pattern
Skills and System	to enable students to practice certain language focus and to produce correct forms	• Direct repair • Scaffolding • Teacher echo • Form-focused feedback
Classroom context	to promote oral fluency	• Content feedback • Referential questions • Minimal repair • Short teacher turns

The above framework can be used as a tool to analyze the types of pedagogical goals actualized by teacher talk. Through using this framework, teachers can understand what kind of pedagogical goals their classroom talk is fulfilling and consider its strengths and weaknesses.

3. Method

The purpose of this study was to compare the teacher talk employed by Indonesian and Japanese pre-service teachers to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the distribution of managerial, materials, skills and systems and classroom context mode in the observed lessons?

2. What do the modes for each class indicate about their respective pedagogical goals?

3.1.Research Settings and Participants

Schools

This research was undertaken in two JHSs in Indonesia and in Japan. The observed JHS in Indonesia is SL located in city S. It is an affiliated school of local university there. The school has 3 homerooms per grade, 12 teachers and 194 students. On average, there are 20 – 25 students in each class. Apart from English, the school also offers Chinese and Japanese languages. English is taught by Indonesian English teachers 5 periods a week per class. One-period equals 45 minutes. The distribution of the lesson is 4 hours of general English (integrated skills) and 1 hour specially designed for speaking and listening. For each meeting, students study English for 2x45 minutes for integrated skill and 1x45minutes for speaking and listening. There is no English native speaker teacher at this school

The participating JHS in Japan, FS, is also an affiliated school of the university located in city M. As an affiliated school, it serves a purpose of to cooperate on research on education and also becomes the school site to welcome pre-service students doing their teaching practice. The school has 4 homerooms per grade with class sizes ranging from 35 – 40 students. The total number of students is 459 with 29 teachers. English is the only foreign language offered and is taught four times a week. Each lesson is given 50 minutes. There are 3 English teachers and in addition, each class has a chance to be taught by a native speaking ALT once a week.

There were four participants in this study, two student-teachers from each country. At the Indonesian school, one was a female and one was a male student, named Mia and Bima respectively (pseudonyms). Both of them were in their fourth years. Prior to undergoing the teaching practice, they had to complete some required subjects, such as Teaching English for Adult Learners (TEAL), Teaching English for Young Learners (TEYL), Teaching English for Special Purposes (TESP) and micro teaching. Mia started studying English formally from grade 7 of JHS and she hoped to teach English to adults upon

graduation. Bima, on the other hand, admitted that he started studying English intensively when he entered university. Before entering university as an English education major, he attended a vocational high school, where English was not studied thoroughly. Nevertheless, he was determined to be a JHS English teacher after graduation.

At the Japanese school, one was a male student in his fourth year and the other student was a female in her third year, named Kotaro and Sakura respectively (pseudonyms). Prior to taking the teaching practice, they had to pass required subjects, such as educational counseling and English Teaching Methods (ETM). Kotaro started studying English from JHS and he spent one semester in the US as an exchange student before doing his teaching practice. In the future, he wants to be a high school English teacher. Similar to Kotaro, Sakura also started studying English formally from the first year of JHS. She wants to be an English teacher at JHS after graduation.

These student-teachers agreed to participate in the study and their lessons were recorded one time. I chose to observe the classes conducted near the end of their teaching practice so that they were familiar with the teaching and learning atmosphere. All four observed lessons were transcribed. Then, the data from the lesson transcripts were segmented into the SETT modes using the video analysis software, *Transana* (Woods, 2018). The analysis is aimed to identify the distribution of *managerial, materials, skills and systems* and *classroom context mode*.

Classroom

Bima's lesson and Mia's lesson were recorded on November 7, 2018 and November 18, 2018 respectively. Bima taught grade 8 with 20 students. The topic was about describing things on the road. The goals of the class were to identify the structure of the text and its linguistic elements and to use the structure of "there is or there are" to make a descriptive text about things in the road. The class was conducted over 2 consecutive periods of 40 minutes each.

Mia taught grade 7 with 20 students. The topic was about describing people. The goals of the lesson were to figure out the structure of a descriptive text and its linguistic elements and to write a simple descriptive text about a

person. The class was conducted over 2 consecutive periods of 35 minutes each.

Kotaro's class and Sakura's class were recorded on September 14, 2018 and September 19 respectively. Kotaro was observed teaching a speech-giving lesson for grade 9 and Sakura was observed teaching the structure "May I" for giving request for grade 8. They taught for 50 minutes and both classes consisted of 40 students. The figure below shows the summary of the observed lessons.

Table 3. Summary of the Observed Lessons

Teachers	Country	Number of Students	Teaching Duration	Topic	Grade
Mia	Indonesia	20	2x35 minutes	Reading: Describing people	7
Bima	Indonesia	20	2x40 minutes	Reading: Describing things on the road	8
Kotaro	Japan	40	50 minutes	Speaking: Giving speech	9
Sakura	Japan	40	50 minutes	Speaking: "May I" for giving requests	8

4. Findings

This section describes the result of classroom observation for each teacher in Indonesia and Japan. It summarizes the distribution of *managerial, materials, skills and system* and *classroom context modes* in each class and explains what the modes for each class indicate about the pedagogical goals.

4.1. Distributions of Discourse Modes in Each Class

The table below shows that the *materials* mode was predominant form of teacher talk for the Indonesian textbook and no example of classroom context could be found. On the other hand, for the Japanese teachers, the main form of teacher talk was the *managerial* mode with a small percentage of the *classroom context*.

Table 4. Mode Distribution for each Teacher

Teachers	Managerial	Materials	Skills and System	Classroom Context
Mia	4:36 (8%)	46:06 (87%)	2:37 (4%)	00:00 (0%)
Bima	15:13 (35%)	22:47 (52%)	5:32 (13%)	00:00 (0%)
Kotaro	31:09 (75%)	6:09 (15%)	2:06 (5%)	2:17 (5%)
Sakura	18:20 (49%)	12:05 (32%)	5:10 (14%)	1:52 (4%)

4.2.Modes to Indicate Pedagogic Goal in Each Class

This section will introduce the kind of talk for each mode in each class to compare the similarities and differences of each lesson and the pedagogical goals that were being accomplished through the teacher talk. The transcription conventions are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Convention for Transcription

Symbol	Meaning
M	Mia
B	Bima
K	Kotaro
Sa	Sakura
Ss	Students
S1	Student (identified)
S	Student (unidentified)
italics	Japanese/Indonesian utterances
[ ]	translation of Japanese/Indonesian utterances
bold	gestures made with or without utterances
(_)	transcriber's comments
. . .	unfinished sentence
(( ))	unintelligible speech

Mia's Class

The *managerial* mode in Mia's extract below was taken at the beginning of her lesson. The teacher's goal was to organize the physical learning environment. She sets the rules as can be seen in lines 1 – 3 and 5 – 10. After the rules are set, at the end of the managerial mode, there is a transition to *materials* mode, marked by the presence of discourse marker *so* (line 13).

Exctract 1 (Managerial)

1　　　M: *Tapi sebelum itu Miss mau ingatkan dulu* [Before we proceed, I will

2   remind you]. In my class I have some rules. *Apa itu rules?* [What

3   are rules?]

4   Ss: *Peraturan* [Rules].

5   M: *Jadi peraturan untuk ditaati* [Rules are made to obey]. Okay, the

6   rule is. The rules are simple. The first one, when someone speaks in

7   front of the class, don't be noisy. Don't be noisy. *Jangan ribut* [Don't

8   be noisy]. Be quiet because it will disturb your friends. *Kalau*

9   *ngomong sendiri kasihan temannya nggak tau.* [If you are noisy,

10   your friends will be disturbed]. The second one, try to use English

11   Ss: Simple, but difficult

12   M: *Yang rame terus nanti Miss catat* [I'll write down the names who

13   are noisy]. So, we will learn about describing people.

In the extract below, we can see how her classroom mode shifts from *managerial* mode (line 1 – 3) to *materials* mode. The discourse marker "okay" and "so" in line 4 marks the shift. *Materials* mode start from line 4 – 12. When discussing the vocabularies, the interaction is tightly controlled and follows the IR (Initiation – Response) exchange structure. We can notice the initiation in line 5, 8 and 11. The *materials* mode in Mia's class is dominant. In total, she spends 46:06 minutes in the *materials* mode.

Extract 2 (Managerial → Materials)

1   M: First, please help me. **M distributes the handout.** Okay. Have you all

2   got your paper?

3   Ss: Yes

4   M: Okay, so, let's. You can see your handout or see on the slide. So, the

5   first one, we can talk about appearance. *Appearance tadi apa?*

6   [What is appearance in Indonesian?]

7   Ss: *Penampilan* [Appearance]

8   M: *Kalau physical appearance?* [What about physical appearance in

9   Indonesian?]

10   Ss: *Penampilan fisik* [Physical appearance].

11   M: The first one, we can talk about age. Age *apa?* [What is age?]

12   Ss: *Umur* [Age]

In the *skills and system* mode, Mia tries to get learners to produce a description about English language (line 3). In line 5, a student tries to form a sentence by saying a subject "I". A slight pause in line 5 provides a chance for Mia to scaffold learner's contribution (line 6). In line 7, student is able to make one complete sentence but she attempts to make a longer one. Again, Mia gives questions to help the student to finish her sentence in line 8. Finally, the student is able to make one full sentence to describe English language as we can see in line 9 and 10. Scaffolding plays an important role to assist learners to express themselves.

Extract 3 (Skills and System)

1   M: *Kan kemarin sudah belajar tentang descriptive to?* [Yesterday you
2   learned about descriptive text. Is that correct?] How to describe
3   things at home. What about English? How would you describe
4   English?
5   S: I . . .
6   M: English is. . .
7   S: English is language or. . .
8   M: Is it fun? English?
9   S: English is an important language.
10   S: Miss, miss, English is important.

As evident from the classroom discourse, the main purpose of Mia's class was to identify the structure of a descriptive text and its linguistic elements through reading such a text and then writing one about a person. In order to achieve the goal, she spent a lot of time discussing the new vocabulary. Therefore, the predominant mode was *materials* with the pedagogic goal being to discuss the vocabulary and reading text.

Bima's Class

The *managerial* mode in Extract 4 was recorded at the beginning of his lesson. Similar to Mia, he sets the rules to organise learning (line 1 – 4). However, throughout the lesson, he still needed to maintain the discipline.

Because the observed lesson is not his first meeting, he does not need to explain the rules as long as Mia does. At the end of the managerial mode, there is a transition to *materials* mode, marked by the presence of discourse marker *and then* (line 5).

Extract 4 (Managerial → Material)

1   B: Okay, before we start our class, we still have the same rules as the
2   rules before. So, the first rule is don't say inappropriate words. And then
3   the second rule is raising your hand before speak. Before you speak. Or
4   answer the question.
5   B: And then, I will ask you about the previous meeting. What did you
6   learn?
7   S: Card. Greeting card

Extract 5 is an example of *materials* mode from Bima's class. Here, teacher and learners are discussing a reading text which describes Orchard Road. Bima directs students' contribution. The interaction is determined by the materials being used and managed entirely by the teacher. Bima asked questions as shown in lines 1, 4, 5, 9, 10, 13 and 16. All of the questions are display questions. Students respond in lines 3, 6, 7, 12 and 15.

Extract 5 (Materials)

1   B: So, the text is about Orchard Road. *Apa itu? Jalan* . . . [What is that?
2   Road . . .]
3   S: *Jalan Orchard* [Orchard Road]
4   B: *Jalan Orchard* [Orchard Road]. So, what is the identification? What
5   paragraph?
6   S: All
7   S: *Line satu.* Line one
8   B: Line 1? Okay, line 1. And then, the identification is the first
9   paragraph. You . . . in this text, it explains about the road and what
10   is the things that in that road? *Benda-benda apa saja yang ada di*
11   *jalanan tersebut?* [What things are there in that road?]
12   S: *Tiang listrik* [Lamppost].

13   B: Okay. And then, what about the description? *Ada di paragraf*
14   *berapa?* [In which paragraph?]
15   S: One and two and . . .
16   B: Two and three. So, what things that you found in this paragraph?
17   *Benda-bendanya apa saja?* [What are the things?]

In Extract 6, students are doing the guessing game activity. A student is invited to the front and given a picture. He has to describe the picture and the other students will guess the word. The teacher's pedagogic goal is to get the learners to produce a sentence to describe the picture. In line 1, we can see the student tries to produce a string of sentence but he pauses. In line 2, Bima waits until he makes a longer sentence but it is lacking a verb (line 3). Bima tries to assist him to self-correct using the utterance "that" (line 4). However, the student fails to self-correct and still makes error (line 5). In line 6, Bima gives a direct repair by adding the missing verb.

Extract 6 (Skills and System)
1   S1: This is a transport . . .
2   B: Okay . . .
3   S1: This is a transportation that . . . two wheels.
4   B: That . . .
5   S1: That two . . . wheels
6   B: It is a transportation that has two wheels
7   S: Two *apa?*
8   B: Two wheels.

The objective of Bima's class was to identify the structure of the text and its linguistic elements and to use the structure "there is/ there are" to make a descriptive text about things in the road. The predominant mode was *materials* mode and the main pedagogical goal was comprehending the reading passage. I assumed that he tried to promote communication through the guessing game activity. However, throughout the activity, he interacted by providing direct repair (See Extract 6, line 6). Thus, it falls

under the *skills and systems* category. He could have used the *classroom context* mode to match the pedagogical goals of the guessing game activity.

Kotaro's Class

Extract 7 shows the *managerial* mode in Kotaro's class. He explains about the things that the students need to focus to make their speech better. The interaction is marked dominantly by the extended teacher turn (lines 1 – 4 and lines 6 – 11). Students respond by nodding (line 5) and short affirmative answer (line 12).

Extract 7 (Managerial)

1 K: So, as you already know, today is the last class before the final
2   performance. Okay. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. So, I want to check. I want
3   you to check the final performance again. So, you are going to
4   introduce a country that you want to go. Is that right?
5 Ss: Nodding
6 K: Yes, yes, I know you can do. I know you know that. But, I want to
7   focus this. I want to say this, about this. **Pointing to the screen.**
8   Okay. Listeners, you . . . err . . . you will not be a Japanese. You will
9   be international. Okay. Here. **Pointing to the screen.** Okay. You will
10   be international, not Japanese. So, act, play, you're like American,
11   European, Filipino. Something like that. Okay. Yeah. Yeah.
12 Ss: Yeah.

Extract 8 below shows the example of *materials* mode in Kotaro's lesson. Here, he discusses about the manners of speech. The interaction is controlled by the teacher following the IRF pattern. He tries to elicit responses as we can see in lines 5, 7 and 13. Students' responses can be seen in lines 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14.

Extract 8 (Materials)

1 K: So, communication. Do you remember this? ((unintelligible)). Do you
2   remember this? In communication, we need two roles, speakers and
3   listeners. Okay. Speakers, try to tell, try to tell, like ((unintelligible)).

4		Listeners, try to understand, try to understand. Okay. So, I want to
5		ask this. What are good manners?
6	Ss:	Open your legs
7	K:	Open your legs. Speak out (encouraging students to speak more)
8	Ss:	Smile
9	K:	Smile.
10	Ss:	Gestures
11	K:	Gestures.
12	Ss:	Stand straight
13	K:	Stand straight. More?
14	S:	Gestures

In Extract 9, students are practicing making questions after listening to their friends' speech. Here, the teacher's pedagogic goal is to get the students to produce questions using various question words. The IRF sequence still occurs. Kotaro asked questions (lines 2 and 7) and students answered in lines 3, 5 and 10. There are also clarification requests as we can see in lines 4 and 6.

Extract 9 (Skills and System)

1	K:	I want to share. I want to share. Everybody, (nominating a student)
2		what kind of question did you make?
3	S1:	Umm . . . *eto* . . . what song do you like the best?
4	K:	Again?
5	S1:	What song do you like the best from Katy Perry?
6	K:	What song is the best, right? What song? She used 'what'. She used
7		'what'. Any other? Umm, Yuji-kun what kind of question did you
8		make?
9	S2:	*Eto* . . .
10	K:	(to the students) Listen.
11	S2:	Which do you like the best? ((unintelligible))
12	T:	Ooh, Yuji-kun used which and comparison. Compare three persons.
13		Okay? Try to use that. You can use next.

Extract 10 shows the *classroom context* mode in Kotaro's class. A student is invited to come in front of the class and deliver his speech. The pedagogic goal is to enable learners to express themselves. The interactional features include extended learner turns (lines 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24) and the minimal repair from the teacher. Even though there are some errors, the teacher does not attempt to repair them because the focus is on the fluency, not accuracy.

Extract 10 (Classroom Context)

1	S1: Hello everyone. I want to go to Canada for sightseeing. Why?
2	Because I have two reasons. First, do you know Canadian language?
3	(wait the other students to response)
4	Ss: No
5	S1: It is English and French. So, I will talk easy. Umm. I will talk. I will
6	talk Canadian people is little easy. But you will, you will worry
7	about feel lonely. You don't have to think that. There are many.
8	There are many countries people. They are very very kind. So, you
9	don't worry that.
10	K: Uh huh.
11	S1: Second, Toronto has some beautiful nature, that have Niagara fall.
12	K: Niagara fall (whisper).
13	S1: By the way, do you know Toronto?
14	Ss: Yes.
15	S1: It is state in Canada. Look at this graph
16	T+SS: Oooh..
17	A: White is Tokyo's rainfall, red is Niagara, eh, Toronto's rainfall.
18	Toronto's rainfall isn't more than Tokyo. So, we can stay comfortable.
19	Where do you know Niagara fall?
20	K: Yes?
21	A: It is very big scale. It is 51 meters high. I want to go to there in near
22	the future. I thought two reasons. Canadian people and Niagara
23	Fall in Toronto. I think my thought about Canada thought for you.
24	Thank you very much.
25	K+Ss: **Clap hands**

26   K: Okay. Thank you so much.

In this class, Kotaro's goal was to practice giving speeches. An analysis of his talk shows that he used the *managerial* mode to accomplish this goal. The pedagogical goal of the managerial mode was predominantly to shift from teacher-centered to student-centered learning in which students were observed doing a lot of pair work and group work.

Sakura's Class

In Extract 11, we can see Sakura's *managerial* mode. Here, she prepares the students for the next activity, that is listening. In line 1 we can see that initially she is ready to shift to *materials* mode, marked by discourse marker "okay" (line 1), but she shifts back to *managerial* mode. Teacher uses instructions as her interactional features (line 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11).

Extract 11 (Managerial)

1   Sa: Okay, so now let's listen to the CDs. Don't open the textbook. Don't.

2   Don't. Don't. Don't. Don't. Sorry, just a moment. **Preparing the CD**

3   Ss: (talking to each other)

4   Sa: Okay. Please listen, please listen. Okay?

5   S: Okay.

6   Sa: And you can write memos on your worksheet. Okay?

7   Ss: Okay.

8   Sa: Ah, you. Did you write your name on your worksheet? So, please

9   write. Write down your name on your worksheet. Okay. *Okawari*

10   *kudasai* [May I have more?] *Nandarouka?* [What is that?]

11   *Kiishinagara, kiite mite kudasai* [Please listen]. Okay, let's listen.

Extract 12 occurs after the listening activity. The pedagogic goal is to check students' understanding in relation to the material. The structure of the interaction follows IRF pattern and there is extensive use of display questions (line 1, 3, 5 and 6).

Extract 12 (Materials)

1   Sa: How was Mrs. Shukra's curry? How was?

2   Ss: Delicious.

3   Sa: Delicious. And what did Ken say? What did Ken?

4   Ss: May I have more?

5   Sa: Yes, may I have more? It's mean. It means, *nanda to omou?* [What

6   do you think?] It means . . .

7   S: *Okawari. Okawari.* [May I have more?]

8   Sa: *Souda ne. Okawari. Okawari. Ii da ne.* [Yes, that's right. May I have

9   more? May I have more? Good].

Extract 13 shows the *skills and system*. Here, the teacher provides learners the examples of the intonation. The interactional feature in this mode is teacher echo. The teacher, Sakura, provides examples in lines 1, 3, and 5.

Extract 13 (Skills and System)

1   Sa: Your curry is delicious.

2   Ss: Your curry is delicious.

3   Sa: May I have more?

4   Ss: May I have more?

5   Sa: Sure

6   Ss: Sure

In Extract 14 we can see two students acting a dialogue using the expression "May I?". The goal of the lesson is to enable students to use the expression "May I?" and to give the affirmative or negative responses (line 1 and 2). In line 3, S1 tries to extend the dialogue by asking what the dog's name is. S2 answers the question in line 4 without any hesitation. Again, S1 in line 5 is able to give appropriate response. He does not ask any further question. At last, we can see in line 6, there is a 21-second pause before finally S2 tells the teacher that it is the end of the dialogue. Throughout the dialogue, the teacher's turn is absent.

Extract 14 (Classroom Context)

1   S1: May I ask a question?

2   S2: Okay

3   S1: What is this dog's name?

4   S2: The dog's name is Pon.

5   S1: Oh...good name. I, I have dog too

6   S2: (21 seconds) ((unintelligible in Japanese))

The goal of this class was to practice the structure of "May I?" for giving requests and to respond with affirmative or negative answers. To accomplish this goal, Sakura used mostly the *managerial* mode to shift from one activity to another. Students were able to achieve the goals, but were not particularly successful in extending the authentic conversation. This class shows how a teacher frequently changes the modes of learning to accomplish the goals.

5. Discussion

English education in Indonesia and Japan have undergone numerous changes, such as curriculum reforms, to ensure that learners develop basic communication abilities. In order to meet this goal, teachers are required to facilitate learning opportunities for the students. When a teacher uses the language that is consistent with the pedagogical goals, it can be said that she facilitates learning opportunities. However, when the language use and the pedagogical aim is inconsistent, it means that she hinders the teaching-learning activity.

Research question number one was what the distribution of *managerial, materials, skills and systems* and *classroom context* is. It was found that the dominant mode for the Indonesian teacher was *materials* mode that it constituted 87% and 52% for Mia's class and Bima's class respectively. Both of their observed lessons centered on the materials being used and there were few changes from one mode to another.

Whereas for Kotaro and Sakura, the predominant mode was *managerial* mode, 75% and 49% for Kotaro's class and Sakura's class respectively. There were frequent changes from one mode of learning to another in their classes. Thus, they needed to switch these modes by using transitional markers. In Japan, the duration of English class is 50 minutes, much shorter than in

Indonesia. Therefore, the teacher has to ensure that the activities are as efficient as possible. Both Kotaro and Sakura used stopwatches to monitor the time in each activity so that they did not waste any time. Additionally, the nature of the students influences the outcomes. In Japan, students are familiar with a fast-pace teaching-learning activity, so teachers can carry out numerous activities in a relatively short lesson period.

Research question number two was what the classroom discourse modes for each class indicate about the pedagogical goals. It was found that Mia's pedagogical goals and language usage were congruent with facilitating learning opportunities. While in Bima's class, it seemed that he was trying to promote fluency in the guessing game activity (See Extract 6). However, there was an inconsistency in his pedagogic goal and interactional features. Instead of giving scaffolding, he was giving a series of direct repairs. Thus, his discourse fell under *skills and systems* mode instead of *classroom context*. In that way, learners missed a chance to express themselves. From the overall transcriptions for Kotaro's talk and Sakura's talk, their classroom discourse modes were consistent with their pedagogical goals.

6. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to compare the teacher talk employed by Indonesian and Japanese pre-service teachers. I first introduced English education in Japan and Indonesia and showed that both countries are attempting to implement a CLT approach but have the following issues: large class sizes, the low English proficiency of teachers, traditional approach to teach English and misinterpretation of CLT. One of the ways to encourage communication in the classroom is by using classroom interactions that can facilitate teaching-learning activities.

This study had some shortcomings. The primary shortcoming is that although all of the observed teachers were pre-service teachers in their third or fourth year, the lesson topics were different in nature. Both observed classes in Japan were intended for speaking skills, whereas in Indonesia both classes were for reading skills. It would have been more conclusive if the classes had been for the same skill.

In conclusion, this study was exploratory in nature. It cannot make generalizations outside of the context of the classes because every L2 classroom is unique. However, these results contain an important lesson for pre-service teachers: teachers' interactional styles need to meet their pedagogical goals for them to encourage student learning. Both Indonesia and Japan have launched large-scale communicative reforms and this study shows how teacher talk in the classroom can facilitate or hamper this.

References

Adamson, N.F. (2006). Globalization and history of English education in Japan. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 8*(3), 259-282.

Campbell, C., Kikuchi, A., & Palmer, R. (2006). Bridging the gap between CLT theory and practice in a Japanese junior high school. *Kansai University Repository,* (12), 1-20. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10112/1466

Chodidjah, I. (2008). Scrutinizing the teaching of English in elementary schools in East Asian countries. Paper presented at the ASIA TEFL International Conference 2008, Bali, 1–3 August 2008.

Dardjowidjojo, S. (2000). English teaching in Indonesia. *EA Journal, 18*(1), 22-30.

Egar, N., Sukmaningrum, R., & Musarokah, S. (2015). The implementation of Indonesian rural classroom and the problems encountered. *Journal of IKIP PGRI Semarang,* 17, 1–10.

Gonzalez, J. M. (2008). *Encyclopedia of bilingual education.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Gorsuch, G. (2000). EFL educational policies and education cultures: Influences on teachers' approval of communicative activities. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(4), 675-710.

Hagerman, C. (2009). English Language Policy and Practice in Japan. 大阪女学院大学紀要 6 号, 47-64. Retrieved from http://www.wilmina.ac.jp/ojc/edu/kiyo_2009/kiyo_06_PDF/2009_04.pdf

Hashimoto, K. (2009). Cultivating "Japanese Who Can Use English": Problems and Contradictions in Government Policy. *Asian Studies Review, 33*(1), 21-42. doi: 10.1080/10 357820802716166

Imperiani, E. (2012). English language teaching in Indonesia and its relation to the role of English as an international language. *Passage, 1*(1), 1-12.

JET. (2019). History. Retrieved from http://jetprogramme.org/en/history/

Kanatani, K. (2012).「英語授業は英語で」をめざして: 課題と解決策 [Targeting 'Teaching English language course in English': Issues and solutions]. *The English Teachers' Magazine, 61*(1), 10-12.

Lewis, R. (1997). Indonesian students' learning styles. *EA Journal, 14*(2), 27-32.

Lie, A. (2007). Education policy and EFL curriculum in Indonesia: Between the commitment to competence and the quest for higher test scores. *TEFLIN Journal, 18*(1), 01-15. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v18i1/1-15

Lloyd, M.H., Kolodziej, N. J., & Brashears K. M. (2016). Classroom discourse: An essential component in building a classroom community. *School Community Journal, 26*(2), 291-304.

Madkur, A., & Nur, M.R. (2014). Teachers' voices on the 2013 curriculum for English instructional activities. *Indonesian Journal of English Education, 1*(2). DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v1i2.1340

Marcellino, M. (2008). English language teaching in Indonesia: A continuous challenge in education and cultural diversity. *TEFLIN Journal, 19*(1), 57-69. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v19i1/57-69

MEXT. (2011). Improvement of Academic Abilities (Course of Study). Retrieved February 5, 2018 from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/english/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2011/03/17/1303755_011.pdf

Mukminin, A., Haryanto, E., Makmur, Failasofah, Fajaryani, N., Thabran, Y., & Hamzah, S. A. N. (2013). The achievement ideology and top-down standardized exam policy in Indonesia: voices from local English teachers. *Turkish Online Journal on Qualitative Inquiry, 4*(4), 19-38.

Nishino, T. (2008). Japanese secondary school teachers' beliefs and practices regarding communicative language teaching: An exploratory survey. *JALT Journal, 30*(1), 27-50. Retrieved from http://jalt-publications.org/jj/issues/2008-05_30.1

Nur, C. (2004). English Language Teaching in Indonesia: Changing policies and Practical Constraints. In *H. W. Kam & R. Y. L. Wong (Eds.). English language teaching in East Asia today: Changing policies and practices* (pp. 178-186). Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

Otani, M. (2013). Communicative language teaching in English at Japanese junior high schools. 創価大学大学院紀要, 35, 285-305.

Prehantro, P., & Ishizuka, H. (2014). A comparison between high school English education in Indonesia and Japan. *Journal of Hokkaido University of Education (Humanities and Social Sciences), 65*(1). 129-149. Retrieved from http://s-ir.sap.hokkyodai.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/123456789/7564/6/65-1-z inbun-10.pdf

Putra, K. A. (2014). The implication of curriculum renewal on ELT in Indonesia. *Parole, 4*(1), 63 – 75.

Sakui, K. (2004). Wearing two pairs of shoes: language teaching in Japan. *ELT Journal, 58*(2), 155-163.

Shimizu, M. (2010). Japanese English education and learning: A history of adapting foreign cultures. *Educational Perspectives, 43*(1-2), 5-11.

Sukyadi, D., & Mardiani, R. (2011). The washback effect of the English national examination (ENE) on English teachers' classroom teaching and students' learning. *K@ ta, 13*(1), 96-111.

Suryati, N. (2015). Classroom interaction strategies employed by English teachers at lower secondary schools. *TEFLIN Journal, 26*(2), 247-264. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v26i2/247-264

Tajino, A., & Walker, L. (1998). Teacher's roles in a team-taught lesson: The perspectives of Japanese teachers. *Studies in the Humanities and Sciences, 38*(2), 179-198.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2014). Participation in education. Retrieved from http://uis.unesco.org/country/ID#slideoutmenu

Wahyudin, A. Y., Sukyadi, D. (2015). A Closer Look at the Implementation of the Curriculum 2013 in Indonesia: Should the Scientific Approach Be Used in EFL Classroom? *Rangsit Journal of Educational Studies, 2*(2), 56-70.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse Language in Action*. New York, NY: Routledge

Woods, D. (2018). *Transana*. Retrieved from http://www.transana.org

Yulia, Y. (2014). *An evaluation of English language teaching programs in Indonesian junior high schools in Yogyakarta province*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.

（文部科学省教員研修留学生）