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The study of communicative style is important for understanding difficulties that arise in cross-cultural communication, but has been little researched in Indonesia, an area with a long history of cross-cultural interaction. This thesis looks at one aspect of communicative style, the maintenance of relevance, in groups of Indonesians and Americans involved in discussing an issue of professional concern through the medium of English. Relevance is analyzed in terms of the topic frameworks which the participants use for establishing the relevance of contributions made in the discussions. It is found that the American participants actively create relevance in the discussions, while the Indonesians participants assume the relevance of contributions to the discussions. Implications for the field of discourse analysis and for cross-cultural communication are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The Southeast Asian archipelago that is now Indonesia has felt a series of cross-cultural and cross-linguistic contacts over its 2000 year history as a center of international activity. During the second half of the twentieth century English has been the dominant medium for the international interchange that has continued to play an increasingly important role in Indonesia's development. As a frequently used link across ethnic, cultural and national boundaries, English is often adapted to suit the needs of local norms of interaction. This can be seen in the different communicative styles found among members of differing cultures, even when they are using the same language. An understanding of differing communicative styles in English will help to foster a greater understanding of cross-cultural communication. This study will look at one aspect of communicative style, the maintenance of relevance during interaction, which can be seen to vary between Indonesian and American interlocutors, even when all parties are speaking the same language, English.
1.1. Cross-cultural interaction in Indonesia

This first section, a brief outline of the cultural and linguistic diversity of Indonesia, points out the role of cross-cultural interaction in the history of Indonesia and briefly describes the current position of English in Indonesia as a language for international communication.

Indonesia spreads across most of the islands of the Malay Archipelago from mainland Southeast Asia to Australia. Of the more than 13,000 islands which make up Indonesia, approximately 900 are inhabited. Some 300 different ethnic groups are found in Indonesia, each with its own cultural and linguistic traditions. However, Lowenberg (1984) has shown that, due to historical trends, the diverse inhabitants of these islands do in fact share a common heritage which brings them together into a "relatively unified sociolinguistic area" (40). This area has long been a crossroads of international trade which brought with it over 2000 years of far reaching cultural and linguistic influences. The result is that today the Malay language, in the form of Indonesian, continues to be the primary means of intranational communication between different ethnic groups. In the second half of this century, English has become the primary medium of international communication for Indonesians.
The vast majority of indigenous languages found in Indonesia are members of the Austronesian language family. Languages of Indonesia with the largest speaker populations are Javanese and Sundanese, both spoken on the island of Java, and the closely related Balinese and Madurese spoken on smaller neighboring islands. The island of Sumatra, where data for this study were collected, is second only to Java in terms of population size and political and economic prominence. Major languages of this island are Batak, Minangkabau and various dialects of Malay, as well as smaller regional languages. Throughout the entire archipelago some 250 different languages are spoken (Koentjaraningrat 1975).

In the midst of this linguistic and cultural diversity, one form or another of the Malay language has long served as the medium for the establishment of religious, economic and political ties within the region, and has often been used in dealings with foreigners coming from outside the archipelago. For thousands of years, the Strait of Malaka, between the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra, has been used by sailors and traders navigating between China and India. Malay, spoken in various dialects in the Straits area, was adopted as the lingua franca of these travelers (Alisjahbana 1976). Yet the foreigners who traveled through this area, and sometimes staved to dominate politically, also brought
with them their own languages, Sanskrit, Arabic, Dutch, which have had a lasting effect on the indigenous languages of the area (Lowenberg 1984). With the rising tide of nationalist sentiment against 300 years of Dutch colonialism, the Youth Pledge of 1928 established Malay as the Indonesian language, to be used in developing the unity of the Indonesian people (Alisjahbana 1976).

Today the "Indonesian language situation is dynamic [and] the language habits and behavior of the people are fairly rapidly changing" (Nababan 1979:285). Most Indonesians speak at least two languages, the regional language they acquired as a mother tongue and, to at least some degree, the national language, Indonesian. Because of the diversity of ethnic groups in Indonesia and the growing importance of international contacts, many Indonesians, especially in the urban areas, are familiar with more than one regional language, and most are exposed to some foreign language, possibly Dutch or Arabic, or, in ever growing numbers, to English.

Because of its importance in education and commerce, as well as its importance in the affairs of Indonesia's Southeast Asian neighbors and the rest of the world, English has been declared the "first foreign language" of Indonesia (Sadtono 1976:32) and is often considered a prestige language, symbolic of educational and economic advancement.
(Tanner 1967, Halim 1971). English is now a required subject in the six years of junior and senior high school, where it is taught roughly four hours per week. However, very few high school graduates have any practical proficiency in the language. In colleges, one or two semesters of English are often required, usually with emphasis on reading for a specific major subject. But most of the English texts commonly used at the universities still remain well beyond the reach of the students' English levels.

Nonetheless, many students do excel in English, usually by either majoring in English or attending private courses. Many of them go on to become English teachers. But more often proficiency in English aids people in improving their positions by allowing opportunities for study abroad and dealings with international contacts in Indonesia, whether in tourism, education, industry, government or other sectors vital to Indonesian development.

Most studies that have considered the language change and language variation that results from the use of English in Indonesia, have looked at the effects of English on Indonesian. The majority of such work focuses on lexical borrowing from English into Indonesian. These include discussions of English in the Indonesian media (Susanty 1974), the adoption of English vocabulary by the Indonesian
technocratic elite (Salim 1977) and the more thorough analysis of lexical borrowing into Indonesian in Lowenberg (1984). More subtle changes also seem to be occurring as Indonesians with English language experiences are beginning to incorporate conventions of English syntax into their Indonesian (Becker and Wirasno 1979). Fewer studies have looked at the effects of Indonesian on the English of Indonesians. One such study is a preliminary description of phonological regularities in Indonesian English by Nababan (1983).

1.2. Cross-cultural communication and discourse analysis

While studies of phonology and lexicon such as those mentioned above are of great interest for understanding the processes of language variation and language change, interactional phenomena occurring at the discourse level are of much greater importance to understanding difficulties in cross-cultural communication. This section first examines the role of discourse analysis in understanding cross-cultural interaction and then looks at the type of discourse analysis that has generally been conducted for Indonesian. Finally, the paucity of interactional studies of Indonesian or the English of Indonesians is pointed out.

Divergence in expectations about the organization of discourse and styles of communication can be great between
native and non-native speakers of English due to the different cultural assumptions they bring to the language. One result is the possibility of communicative interference (Hymes in Wolfson 1983), applying communicative norms from the first language to the second. Such variation in sociolinguistic norms can cause seemingly inexplicable misunderstandings. Violations of sociolinguistic rules seem to be much less tolerated than violations of phonological or grammatical rules (Chun et al. 1982). A communication made during cross-cultural interaction may be intelligible, with no substantial difficulties in the understanding of phonological, lexical, or syntactic properties of the utterance, yet the different cultural backgrounds of the interlocutors may cloud pragmatic intent, rendering the communication uninterpretable (Thomas 1983). Such misinterpretations of communicative intent are usually not recognized as such by participants in the speech event and are therefore highly problematic, being often attributed to bad intentions on the part of the other interlocutor. In interethnic communication this can lead to misinformed negative stereotyping that is reconfirmed with each interaction (Ross 1978, Gumperz 1982, Tannen 1984).

The burden of alleviating such misunderstanding, however, does not lie solely with a non-native speaker who must somehow adopt a more native-like communicative style.
Rather, it has been suggested that retention of first-language cultural conventions while using, for example, English should not be considered "interference" so much as an inevitable, and some might argue even positive, aspect of interethnic communication. The rapid increase in interethnic, cross-cultural communication and the frequent use of English as the medium of such communication is widely accepted as a fact of modern life (Kachru 1976, 1982; Smith 1981a, 1981b). When English is used for international communication among speakers from a large variety of speech communities, as it is in Indonesia, it is not practical for all participants to share mutual, one-to-one knowledge of their interlocutors' communicative systems. Rather, we must develop strategies for interpreting and dealing with communication that, while presented in a familiar formal code, may have divergent pragmatic intent or discourses organization (Scollon and Scollon 1983).

An important first step in improving interethnic communication in the context of English in its role as an international language is to further examine the discourse and rules of speaking which obtain in non-native varieties of English in order to identify areas that may give rise to cross-cultural misunderstanding. A great deal of work has begun to look at different discoursal and sociolinguistic systems at use in interethnic situations. Crymes 2nd Potter
(1981) and Candlin (1981) compare non-native and native speakers' interaction in terms of questioning strategies and speech act patterning respectively. Other studies have looked at properties of discourse in the English of minorities in countries with an English speaking majority. These include a look at topicality in the English of South Asians living in England (Gumperz 1978) and the forms chosen for the performance of certain speech acts by European immigrants to Australia (Clyne 1979, 1981). In North America, Phillips (1976, 1983) and Scollon and Scollon (1981, 1983) have examined the indigenous discourse patterning in the English of different Native American groups and the effects of these on interaction in a society dominated by Anglo-American culture. Japanese and American systems of proximics and choices of appropriate topics of conversation are compared by Barnlund (1975). Sukwiwat (1981) and Richards and Sukwiwat (1983) address the issues of discourse and sociolinguistic norms in the English of Thais, who, like Indonesians use English primarily for international communication.

Little work has been done on interaction or communicative styles in Indonesian. Discourse analyses of Indonesian or other dialects of Malay have usually focused more on the conditioning of syntax by discoursal concerns such as referentiality, grounding, and textual cohesion.
(e.g. Rafferty 1981, 1982). With the paucity of work on communicative styles that focus on Indonesian itself, it is not surprising that little work has looked at communicative styles in the English used by Indonesians. One study which does do so is Suprapto (1981), which examines the use of laughter to mark discomfort and reassurance in the interactions of American patients with an Indonesian doctor practicing in the U.S. This study demonstrates that while laughter is used as a sign of discomfort by the Indonesian, it is interpreted as a sign of reassurance by the patients. This case of differences in communicative styles actually ends happily in successful interaction.

Not all interactions between Americans and Indonesians can be characterized as always so successful as those in Suprapto's study. In the convergence of Indonesian and American communicative styles in the medium of English, problems of maintaining relevance, and associated problems in politeness strategies, appear to be at the heart of some of the difficulties that arises in Indonesian-American interactions. Review of the literature on relevance and politeness that informs the analysis used in this study follows.
1.3. Relevance and topic framework

Crucial to the current study are the ideas of topics and of relevance. Relevance in interaction can be understood in terms of a topic framework to which specific topics addressed by interlocutors can be tied. The following brief discussion of cooperative principles and some work that has been done to understand relevance in terms of topics will conclude with a fuller explanation of topic framework.

Relevance has usually been discussed in the literature in terms of Grice's cooperative principles. Grice (1975) has laid out a set of four maxims which guide interlocutors as they speak. These are the Maxims of:

1. Quantity: Be sufficiently informative.
2. Quality: Be truthful.
3. Relation: Be relevant.
4. Manner: Be brief and orderly.

While these maxims may well hold in the conversational norms of all cultures, the degree to which they hold and their actual operationalization in a given language may indeed be culture specific (Richards and Schmidt 1983).

Keenan (1976) suggests that the first maxim, "Be informative" is not adhered to as closely in Malagasy as, say, among English speakers. Keenan also found that while this uninformativeness can be partially attributed to
indigenous beliefs about the identification of persons and events, it is also conditioned by the significance of the information involved and the relationships between interlocutors. These results are consistent with later work that has been done with Grice's Maxims. Brown and Levinson (1978), in their work on politeness strategies (to be discussed more thoroughly in Section 1.5.), have shown that Grice's Maxims seem to be regularly broken in most natural languages, in accordance with the weightiness of the communicative act being performed and the relationships of power and distance that hold between interlocutors.

Grice's Maxims are both quite useful for the study of interaction and also quite vague (Fraser 1983). While the Maxim of Relation is often presented as the rule to Be Relevant, this does not address the question of where in linguistic phenomena relevance lies and how it is communicated. It has been suggested that relevances can most clearly be seen in the way interlocutors deal with the topics they are addressing. Keenan (1976) interprets the Maxim of Relation as the idea that "interlocutors are expected to make their utterances relevant to the topic or direction of the conversation at hand" (68). Similarly, Brown and Yule (1965) translate the principle, "Be relevant", into "Make your contribution relevant in terms of the existing topic framework" (83).
Tracy (1983, 1984) uses the notion of topic, specifically the idea of staying on topic, to explain how speakers make their utterances relevant. She identifies two approaches which have been taken in the literature toward staying on topic. The first she calls as the local approach whereby a relevant remark is one that is tied to the last utterances of the previous interlocutor's message (e.g., Halliday and Hasan 1976). The second she calls the global approach whereby a relevant remark is tied to the main idea of another speaker's message (e.g., Kintsch and van Dijk 1978). In one study, Tracy (1983) tests the viability of these two approaches by eliciting judgments on the appropriateness of the second half of constructed statement-response pairs. In another study her data consist of elicited responses to the constructed statements of hypothetical conversational partners (Tracy 1984). From this work she proposes that speakers more often follow the global approach than the local approach in making judgments of relevance. But these studies, based on constructed materials, tell us little about the actual work done by interlocutors as they maintain relevance in real time interaction. Brown and Yule (1983) have suggested that speakers can both speak topically, addressing the previous speakers utterance, or speak on a topic, addressing broader concerns that inform an entire speech event. The two
approaches to relevance outlined by Tracy (1983, 1984) attempt to explain how relevance is maintained by speaking topically, but do not touch on the possibility that relevance can be maintained by speaking on a topic. Thus her studies fail to address the possibility that the entire context of an interaction, beyond sets of two turns, can influence interlocutor's maintenance of relevance.

Brown and Yule (1983) propose the notion of topic framework as a way of understanding how topics are judged for relevance. Topic framework is defined as those aspects of the discourse context that are directly reflected in the text and which form "the contextual framework within which the topic [at a given point in the discourse] is constituted" (Brown and Yule 1983:75). While the topic framework involves elements of the text, it does not include all actors, events, or ideas occurring in the text. This notion of topic framework is consistent with van Oosten's (1984) hierarchical structure of topics in discourse. In a hierarchical system, topics may constitute subcategories of higher level topics in the discourse. These higher level topics act as an "umbrella" (van Oosten 1984:374) that unite lower level topics. The topic framework then includes those aspects of the discourse, identifiable in the text, which are used by participants to form the broader context, at a higher hierarchical level, in which other, lower level
aspects of a discussion can be understood to be relevant. As a means of maintaining relevance, the topic framework will often be assumed by interlocutors. The importance of a presupposed common ground between interlocutors in the establishment of relevance is pointed out by Werth (1981). However, different participants in a speech event will bring with them differing sets of assumptions and thus will not always perceive relevance in the same way (Wilson and Sperber 1981). Understanding the topic frameworks in which interlocutors in a speech event are operating will be useful for understanding differences in the maintenance of relevance by interlocutors with differing cultural backgrounds in the context of natural interaction.

1.4. **Face and politeness**

Brown and Levinson (1978) present a model of politeness, built on the concept of face. This model has been applied to work on cross-cultural interaction and will be used in the current study to help more fully understand the maintenance of relevance.

Face (Goffman 1967) refers to the presentation through interaction of a self image which is legitimized by its acceptance by others. In Brown and Levinson's (1978) model, maintenance of face is the primary motivating factor for the employment of politeness strategies. They view face as
having two components, positive face, the desire for solidarity or rapport with others, and negative face, the desire not to be imposed upon or otherwise hindered in one's action by others. Any communicative act has the potential of threatening face, either by imposing upon one's freedoms or by distancing interactants and lessening the feeling of group membership. The extent to which a given act will pose a threat to face is weighed as a combination of social factors (power and distance) and the extent to which an action is considered an imposition in relation to other actions. In addition, potential threat to face posed by a given action may be minimized by the urgency with which that action must be performed.

Tracy (1983) has pointed out that raising topics and maintaining relevance carries potential threat to negative face, by imposing constraints on what may be discussed at a given point in an interaction. Problems of positive face also arise when differing opinions about the relevance of a topic threaten to distance interlocutors and lessen rapport within the group.

Politeness strategies are means by which threat to face can be lessened or redressed. A more threatening act will require greater redressive work to insure that face is maintained and normal social interactions can continue. A less threatening act will require less redressive work.
Brown and Levinson (1978) identify categories of politeness strategies according to the extent to which they lessen the risk of face threat. Great threat to face may require that a speaker refrain entirely from an act, or go off record by hinting or otherwise presenting the act in an ambiguous or indirect form. Less face threatening acts may be done on record or unambiguously. Actions which pose minimal threat may be done on record without any redressive action. More face threatening acts may also be done on record but will usually include redressive action, either to positive face by demonstrating the solidarity or empathy of interactants, or to negative face by stressing the desire not to impose. Brown and Levinson (1978) demonstrate that these categories of politeness strategies and the concerns for face which motivate them operate in three unrelated languages and it is suggested that their application is universal to human interaction. Cultural variation comes into play with regards to evaluations of the extent of face threat in accordance with culturally defined social roles and the extent to which specific actions are considered imposing within a given culture.

The concepts of positive and negative face and related social phenomena are used by Tannen (1984) to identify two contrasting conversational styles, related to differing cultural backgrounds, which appeared in the interaction of a
group of friends. These two styles are based respectively on the desire to create solidarity in interaction (positive face) and the desire to avoid imposition in interaction (negative face). She also shows that differing expectations for the roles of positive and negative face can cause tension and misunderstandings in interaction. Scollon and Scollon (1983) suggest such difficulties can be minimized in certain cross-cultural interactions by the use of more deferential, negatively polite, strategies. Interaction that is less redressive to the threat to face carries with it the ambiguity as to whether it is the greater power of one participant over another or lesser distance between them is the motivation of such strategies. The current study will offer evidence that for the maintenance of relevance, participants in cross-cultural interaction likewise need to address the concerns of negative face by attempting to understand their fellow interlocutors' sources of relevance, rather than by imposing their own.
2.1. **Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate that the cooperative principle, be relevant, is adhered to by both Americans and Indonesians in cross-cultural communication, but that the actual realization of this principle in interaction differs for these two groups. The results of this study will have implications both for the use of cooperative principles in the study of interaction and for the development of improved inter-cultural communication.

2.2. **Data collection**

The data for this study are taken from three separate discussion sessions conducted in Sumatra, Indonesia, involving a total of twelve participants. Each session included four people, two Americans and two Indonesians. All participants taught English at the tertiary level in Sumatra.

The goal in collecting these data was to obtain as unbiased and as naturalistic a view as possible of the communicative styles of Americans and Indonesians interacting through the medium of English. In order to
control as much as possible for the background of participants and their commitment to the discussions, without sacrificing the naturalness of the language, participants were chosen who shared professional backgrounds and they were asked to discuss a specific issue of mutual professional concern.

One problem arises when attempting an investigation of Indonesian style of communication in English. Many people in Indonesia have some familiarity with English, but a less proficient speaker's divergence from native-speaker norms could possibly be attributed to a lower level of competence in the language, rather than to an Indonesian style of communication in English. On the other hand, highly proficient Indonesian speakers of English, with many years of professional experience abroad, may also not be indicative of an "Indonesian style", having possibly adopted a more native-speaker-like style. In order to control as much as possible for both language proficiency and "Indonesian-ness" of style, English teachers from tertiary institutions were asked to participate in the three discussion sessions. Thus, regardless of what might be said about any one individual's English ability or style, these Indonesian participants would represent the kind of English that was being presented, during college training, to the
majority of Indonesians who develop the proficiency necessary to use English in cross-cultural interaction.

In order to control as much as possible for variation in native-speaker styles of communication in the discussions, all native speaker participants were American. Any more detailed control of ethnic or other group affiliation that might affect communicative style was not possible given the relatively small population of American English teachers in Sumatra. All the American participants were also working as tertiary level English teachers in Indonesia.

Following Crymes and Potter (1981), the three discussion groups were styled after "working committees" (124), each given the same discussion task presented on an instruction sheet (duplicated in Appendix A). These instructions listed two points of view concerning non-native speakers' relationship to English. Participants were asked to discuss these ideas, to seek agreement in support of one of the two views and to discuss the ramifications of their decision on their English teaching programs in Indonesia. They were then asked to outline suggestions for changes which would improve their programs. The participants' focus was thus directed to the content of their discussion. They were not told of my ulterior interest in communicative style until discussion sessions were completed. The groups were
asked to take about fifteen to twenty minutes for this task, but the participants were caught up in their assignment to the point that the groups each took form one to one and a half hours before they felt they were finished. No attempt was made to cut them off.

Each of the discussion sessions was audio taped and video taped. Due to differences in Asian and American video formats the video recordings will not be used as data in this study. In order to maintain as much as possible the professional nature of the discussions, each session was conducted in a university classroom or meeting room. While recording equipment was visible in the rooms, I was not present at the sessions. Each tape was transcribed according to standard English orthography (transcriptions conventions are listed in Appendix B). These transcripts together with the audio recordings became the data of this study.

2.3. The participants

A brief look at each of the discussion groups, including individual participants' background and intragroup dynamics, follows. Included after each participant's (pseudonymous) name is their nationality, sex and age. All the Americans speak English as a first language. They vary greatly in their Indonesian proficiency. All the Indonesian
participants speak a regional dialect of Malay as a first language, with the exception of Nani, a native Acehnese speaker. All were also proficient in Indonesian which they would use professionally. Indonesian or English language experience, travel, work or study in other countries, and current TESL work are also noted.

DISCUSSION

2 mos. formal Indonesian training, 2 yrs. in Indonesia, where she has worked as a TESL volunteer at university level.

No formal Indonesian, 1-1/2 yrs. in Indonesia, where he has worked as a TESL volunteer at university level. Previously spent 1 yr. in Brazil and 3 yrs. in England and France.

Endang: In., F, 32.
East-Indonesian Malay dialect. Moved to Sumatra at age 15. Many years contact with Americans as child, 5 yrs. formal English training. Teaching ESL in high school, private, and university English courses.

Nani: In., F, 37.
Acehnese. Approximately 5 yrs. formal English training. Teaching ESL in high school and university.

Paula, Tom and Endang have known each other, at least casually, for about one year. They have now been teaching in the same university English program for three months. Nani has taught at this same program for only two 'weeks.
She was once Endang's teacher, now her colleague. This discussion is the first time Nani and the two Americans have been in contact.

DISCUSSION II

Alice: Am., F, 33
3 mos. Indonesian training, 1 yr. living in Indonesia, where she has worked as a TESL volunteer at university level. Previously spent 2 yrs. in Italy.

Victor: Am., M, 23
4 mos. Indonesian training, 4 months living in Indonesia, where he has worked as a TESL volunteer.

Chalid: In., M, 45

Syarif: In., M, 47
Minangkabau Malay. Approximately 10 yrs. English training. Currently teaches high school and university English courses. Previously spent 5 mos. in Malaysia and Singapore; 1 yr. in Australia.

Syarif is Alice's supervisor. While Alice says the discussion is her first contact with Chalid, he says he has known her for one year (possibly due to the highly visible nature of an American teacher at an Indonesian university). Chalid and Syarif have worked together for 14 years. Victor works at a different university from the other three participants and first met them at the time of the discussion.
DISCUSSION III

John: Am., M, 34.
2 mo. Indonesian training, 2 yrs. in Indonesia as director of university level TESL program. Previously spent 6 yrs. in Korea.

2 mo. Indonesian training, 1 yr. in Indonesia, where she has worked as a TESL volunteer.

Zaid: In., M, 34.
Palembang Malay. Studied English approximately 5 yrs. Currently teaching university level English. Previously studied and worked in Java 4 yrs.

Yusuf: In., M, 55.
Palembang Malay. 6 yrs. English training. Has taught high school and university English courses 24 yrs. Previously spent 1 yr. in New Zealand, has worked in various parts of Sumatra.

John is the director of an English program for university faculty members. Yusuf is both his supervisor at the university level, as well as one of the teachers working under him in the English program. Alice and Zaid are also teachers in the same program.

2.4. Analysis

Before these discussion sessions were conducted, it was not known what aspects of communicative styles would present special problems for the participants and so provide an interesting basis for analysis. Review of the recordings and transcripts indicated that establishing relevance was often an issue. I had experienced this problem myself while
working in Indonesia and so there was also a certain personal motivation in the final decision to focus on this area.

The data were reviewed and pivotal points in the discussions, when relevance appeared to be at stake, were identified. These included topic changes, acts of directing the flow of talk, and challenges made or perceived by participants concerning the relevance of contributions. The concept of topic framework was used to identify patterns in the relevance work being done by the participants. It was found that the Americans tended to focus on the pair of ideas presented in the instructions in order to maintain relevance. The Indonesians focused on the larger English language teaching (ELT) situation in Indonesia in order to maintain relevance. Thus it will be claimed that the Americans' topic framework was built on these two ideas, while the Indonesians' topic framework was built on the ELT situation in Indonesia.

Although the participants used contrasting topic frameworks, all participants dealt both with the two ideas in the instructions as the theoretical context of the discussions and with ELT in Indonesia as the situational context of the discussions. This led to the next step in analysis, examining the interactions between the Americans and Indonesians when they were dealing with these two
contexts which had such differing positions in their respective topic frameworks. Finally, the different orientations that these two topic frameworks provided were particularly notable when the participants dealt with the task mentioned in the instructions of suggesting possible changes for ELT. The effect of topic framework on this task was therefore examined more closely. Issues of face and politeness arose from time to time as the participants worked at maintaining relevance and so politeness strategies were examined to shed more light on the maintenance of relevance by the Americans and Indonesians.

One possible difficulty with this study arises from the choice of relevance as the focus for analysis of the three discussions. I have mentioned that I was not present during the discussion sessions, but this was true only in a physical sense. My presence was constantly felt, at least indirectly, through the instruction sheet I had provided for the participants, which presented a topic for discussion and so a potential means of establishing relevance. While I did not realize it at the time, the instructions I wrote were, naturally enough, presented in a very American fashion. Possibly as a result, the American participants approached the task in much the same spirit as I had presented it while the Indonesians (at least to American eyes) often did not. I do not feel that this need be considered too serious
a difficulty for the study. To the extent that the Americans were consistent in how they approached the task and to the extent that the Indonesians were consistent in how they approached the task, these data will prove useful in understanding the Americans' and Indonesians' styles of maintaining relevance, and throughout this cross-cultural communication in general.
In this chapter the results of the analysis described in Chapter Two are presented and illustrated with examples from the discussion sessions under study. These results are divided into four sections. First, the opening sequences of the three transcripts will be examined to give an introduction to the phenomena that will be discussed subsequently. These opening sequences will also help to establish the tone of the discussion groups, giving the reader a fuller context in which to understand later more isolated extracts. Second, the American and Indonesian topic frameworks and examples of their operation in the discussion sessions will be presented. The third section will examine how all participants deal both with the two ideas in the instructions, the theoretical context of the discussions, and with ELT in Indonesia, the situational context of the discussions. The Americans' and Indonesians' approaches to the task of suggesting changes will be presented in the final section.
3.1. **Opening the discussions**

The beginning of a speech event will often contain clues about what follows. Topics that are raised in the initial stages of a discussion or conversation can serve to establish the overall frame in which subsequent choices of topics are made relevant (Richards and Schmidt 1983). Schegloff and Sacks (1973) point out the importance of "first topics" (300). First topics generally follow opening preambles such as "What's up?" "Nothing much," or, in the case of the first discussion, "Everything's already rolling, huh?" "I think so," which serve to get the interaction started. The important function of a first topic is to set the "reason" for the conversation and a first topic may have "special importance on the part of the initiator" (Schegloff and Sacks 1973:301). The idea of first topic should not be understood only as the first topic of a given discourse. Topics are negotiated between participants in the discourse process (Brown and Yule 1983), and so the first topic raised by each individual participant will be important in understanding what he or she brings to this negotiation process. While Schegloff and Sacks discuss the role of a first topic, they do not specifically define a means of identifying one. Reasonable candidates for the role of first topic would be the first substantial topics that are raised and elaborated. In the case of a more
taciturn participant who may not initiate a topic until much later in a discussion, comments addressed to other participants' contributions should give an indication at least of the perspective being taken toward the topics in the evolving discussion.

Goffman (1967) points out the further significance of work done in the beginning sequences of a conversation or discussion. Very early in an encounter, participants establish the "line" that they will be taking for the remainder of the interaction. A participant's line is "a pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts by which he expresses his view of the situation and through this his evaluation of the participants, especially himself" (Goffman 1967:5). The line that is presented at the beginning of a speech event is generally maintained through the course of the interaction and participants "tend to build their later responses on it, and in a sense become stuck with it" (Goffman 1967:12). By mutually maintaining the lines initiated at the outset of an encounter, the participants can attempt to insure that no one will be threatened by unexpected or incomprehensible contributions,

The following examination of the opening sequences of the three discussion under study points out the first topics raised by the discussants and identifies some of the interactional roles taken by various participants. Examples
will be cited in the text, and in addition the first three pages of transcripts from each of the discussion sessions is included in Appendix A to help give a more complete picture of the opening work being done by the discussants. An analyst, examining recordings and transcripts has the advantage of constructing an understanding of the initial sequences in terms of the subsequent discourse. While it is not claimed that a prediction of coming events is necessarily possible in real time, the extent to which initial topics and presentational lines persist throughout these three discussions, seen in retrospect, is still quite striking.

Discussion One (hence D-I, and likewise D-II, D-III) opens with preliminary comments about the the state of the machinery in the room and then, after a five second pause, Paula begins the discussion proper:

1. **P:** So I guess first we're supos-, we should look at these two statements at the top, [E: uh-huh] one and two, [E: hm] and decide what, what is the attitude.

   (3.5 second pause)

   Maybe here at PDPK first since we're all teaching here?

   I 1.7-8

She immediately acts in the role of moderator or chairperson of the discussion by suggesting what the first topic should
be, defining its limits, and passing her turn to the rest of the group. Notice also that the first topic raised by Paula is the choice between the two ideas presented at the beginning of the instructions. A continuing orientation to these ideas is essential to all the American participants in this study. However, unlike some of the other American participants, Paula is immediately able to place discussion of these ideas in the context of a real teaching situation, in this case the PDPK program where all four participants of D-I are working. Taking the role of discussion chair and maintaining the perspective of the two ideas while encouraging talk about the teaching situation in Indonesia are general characteristics of Paula's line throughout D-I.

Endang and Nani, in response to Paula's direction, voice their choice of the second idea. Paula supports their choice with her own observations and asks that the group as a whole accept this second idea as the attitude of the program where they all teach. After a very long pause Endang, rather than responding directly to Paula's call for confirmation, now presents her first topic and the line that she brings to the discussion:

2. P: So, we would say that PDPK would have the second attitude, huh?

(31 second pause)
E: But, but I think, well, well, we are teaching in PDPK, um, but the students, they are from SMA.

In SMA the, the aim of the English teaching is to have passive mastery, not active mastery.

The ELT situation in the Indonesian high schools (SMA) is a recurring theme in Endang's contributions and the other members of D-I are often caught up in its discussion as well. But in a broader sense what Endang does is to draw the other participants' attention to the realities of the ELT situation in Indonesia as the primary context that must be taken into consideration before the more ethereal ideas presented on the instruction sheet can be discussed. More specifically, in this example Endang is implicitly rewording the dichotomy addressed by the ideas into terms that make sense for her in the teaching situations she is familiar with. Such concrete, Indonesian contexts serve as the foundation for most of the contributions of the Indonesian participants in all discussion groups.

Tom is a little more reticent at the beginning of the D-I. He offers two short comments on what others have said (Examples 3. and 4.) before beginning a more extended contribution (Example 5.):

3. E: So I think it have, it has a co-, a relationship between their inability to speak now [P: uh-huh] with th-, their Eng-, uh, English learning at SMA [P: uh-huh]
T: Ya, the approach there is very much that "English belongs to its native speakers."

4. P: They, [E: ya] they work on looking at sentences and figuring out the meaning, but never to try and speak it themselves. [E: ya]

T: They study the language but they don't use it themselves [E: ya, yes] to express their own ideas.

N: There the practice isn't communication or in the other parts.

5. T: In some of the other programs where I teach, I often find that the students want to mimic me rather than to express their own ideas. [P: ya]

And I try very hard to engage them in some kind of exercise where the focus is really on what they are thinking.

And not trying to be like me.

N: To express what you want to talk about [T: uh-huh; P: uh-huh; T: ya]

In Example 3., Tom, like Paula, is interested in understanding what is said in terms of the the two ideas in the instructions. Example 4. is a prelude to 5., Tom's first topic and a point that he brings up many times in the discussion, the need to engage students in the meaningful use of English. But his contribution in 3. also informs Tom's later comments when he refers back to the two ideas of the instructions to interpret both his own and other's
contributions, and thus can be seen to set up the line that he is taking.

Nani generally takes a rather unassuming place in D-I. Her main role in the discussion seems to be asking for clarification and occasionally expanding on the ideas presented by others. This can largely be understood as a function of both her relatively low English ability and her position as a substitute teacher, one who has not participated in the outside social network to which the other three discussants belong. Her only reference to the ideas in the instructions are in the first minutes of the discussion, as a reply to Paula and Endang's direct questioning, and this only reference by Nani to the ideas is preceded by a request for clarification about the local context in which the ideas should be viewed:

   N: The aim? At PDPK?

   I 1.10-11

We can also see her orientation toward explaining the situations faced by English teachers in Indonesia in the short responses she makes in Examples 4. and 5. above.

The very opening of D-II is interesting because it hints at possible stereotypical roles with which (at least certain) Americans and Indonesians may perceive each other,
as well as establishing in the first two utterances of the
discussion the lines that Chalid and Alice are taking:

7. C: Can you start, please?
   A: The old Indonesian way.
   Um, well let me just clarify what I think these two
   things means, "English belongs to its native
   speakers, English belongs to those who use it."

   II 1.1-3

Chalid defers to an American to make the first move. While
we cannot say what "way" Alice has in mind (somewhere
between polite deference and the shirking of
responsibility?), she clearly has stereotyped ideas of
Indonesian interaction. After her initial comment, Alice
then takes on to the role that is offered her. She
continues to take the role of chair sporadically for the
duration of the discussion, regularly bringing the talk back
to the issues of clarifying or choosing between the two
ideas.

The first thing that Chalid does, after Alice's attempt
at clarifying the ideas, is to place the discussion within
the context of Indonesia and the actual purposes for ELT
there:

8. C: Well, it seems this refers to the teaching English
   in Indonesia. [A: ya]
You think so?

Uh, uh, I would like to, to introduce, very specially in Indonesia, the aims of teaching English. [A: uh-huh]

In Indonesia teaching is aimed at, uh, understanding, reading books [A: oh], the second, uh the first one.

And the second one, if there is a possibility for them to go abroad, especially to the United States of America or other, uh, English foreign countries, [A: uh-huh] also Australia.

II 1.13-17

Here Chalid refers to the two ideas, and a few utterances later he makes a choice between the two. Yet, the context of ELT in Indonesia is the starting point for his discussion of these ideas, and Chalid returns to this specific Indonesian context again and again as the discussion develops. Indeed D-II is especially interesting because its major theme is something of a battle of wills as Alice (assisted by Victor) asserts the importance of coming to grips with the ideas presented in the instructions while Chalid (assisted by Syarif) asserts the importance of understanding the ELT situation in Indonesia.

Victor's first topic involves certain opinions about how English should be taught. These opinions are expressed in the framework of the ideas given in the instructions:

5. V: I think that this is possessive.
It means that the, you strive for imitation [C: ya]

The first one says that the students should try and imitate, [/?: ya-ya]

Whereas the second one may be saying that the students, or speakers of English may create or add onto the language rather than simply imitate. [/?: ya]

II 2.16

Like Alice, Victor continues to bring up the two ideas as a major topic of discussion and justification for other topics.

Syarif plays a role in synthesizing others' contributions and presenting alternate perspectives on ongoing topics, but in general his line more strongly influenced by realities then by the dictates of the instructions. Nonetheless, his first contribution presents his choice between the two ideas:

10. S: Well I think, ya, as far as I can observe, you know, yes, in Indonesia this attitude is more appropriate, the first one, "English belongs to it's native speakers."

How, you know, you speak English.

I speak English.

But we always say that you are native speakers of English.

II 2.17-3.1

But this choice, like Chalid's, is introduced by placing it in the context of Indonesia and is explained by looking at
how Indonesians in general view the status of English speakers. This constant reminder of the realities of the situation outside the discussion is characteristic of both Syarif's and Chalid's contributions and is a pattern found in the lines taken by all the Indonesian participants in this study.

As in D-I and D-II, D-III finds an American taking the role of chair and exhibits the general tendency in the Americans to use the two ideas in the instructions as their point of departure, while the Indonesians are more likely to take the local ELT situation, often justified by the middle section of the instructions, as their starting point. While Kathy initiates D-III and Zaid is obliged to respond to this initiation, John is the first to explicitly set the stage for the discussion:

11. K: Well, Zaid, what do you think?
Z: [Wh-, what's the relation, the relation that he is trying to find out?]

The relation between English teaching and the program here,
Or the, why English is taught here?
J: Well, it's two ideas
"English belongs to its native speakers."
"English belongs to all those who use it."
Now, what does that, what do those ideas have to do with English teaching, for us, here?
Does that make sense?

John lays out the problem in terms of the two ideas presented in the instructions, then, as did Paula, he ties these ideas back into the situation in which all four participants are currently involved.

Zaid is relatively quiet throughout D-III. His contributions generally include responses to direct questions and the occasional development of topics presented by others. As mentioned above, he is forced to make an initial contribution because of his obligation to respond to Kathy's question, Example 11. However his response focuses on the context in which the question is to be seen. John explains the problem first in terms of the ideas, then in terms of the current situation. In his next contribution Zaid again requests clarification of what he is expected to contribute and reminds the other participants of the Indonesian context:

12. J: Ok, what do you think Zaid?

Z: Well, it's not, it's not really for me to say number one. [Y: ya (laughing)]

Uh, does it mean that, uh, we are Indonesians of course, English is something else?

So we, we should have a, an attitude, uh, uh, English, whether you do it here or England or /former colony/,
Because English just belongs to the native speakers.

J: Well, I don't think that's the idea.

III 3.1-6

Kathy's first substantial contributions, like John's, are focused on the differentiation of the two ideas.

13. K: Hm, maybe not so much that they posses the true English but that they [J: uh-huh] truly posses it [J: ok; Y: ya-ya; J: ya.]

There's a difference. [J: ya]

III 1.18-19

14. K: But, maybe what it means is more like, um,

other speakers of English who are non-native speakers of English can use the language, but...

Their opinions about it or their, uh, the way they change the language or that kind of thing would, they can't do that, basically.

I think number one says, you know, um, the, English is the possession of the native speakers.

III 3.11-14

While Zaid was interested in clarifying the context in which the ideas were to be discussed and does so with a question, Kathy states her position and is concerned with presenting her own interpretation of the ideas without reference to a specific context.

Like Zaid, Yusuf, especially at the outset, makes a number of clarification requests. Unlike Zaid, Yusuf's
questions are often self initiated, rather than responses to other's questions.

15. Y: What does "belongs" refer, refer to?

J: Possesses.

Y: Ya, "possesses" means, uh, that the, the ya, the first, uh, statement means that only English native speakers learn English?

III 1.11-13

Yusuf also very early on restates the two ideas and makes a choice between the two.

16. Y: So, in my opinion is that in, uh, all the English people, the English native speakers use and learn English.

That's number one.

And number two is that everybody can learn English and can use it.

III 1.20-2.2

17. (5 second pause)

Y: So, are we to discuss?

J: That's right.

(5 second pause)

Y: I'll take number two, "English belongs to all those who use it."

III 2.17-20

In Example 17, we see an example of how Yusuf suggests what is to be done next in the discussion by requesting
confirmation of its direction. This indirect, deferential, method of controlling the discussion is common among the Indonesians. Yusuf's first extended turn of more than two or three utterances does not occur until page five of the transcript:

   (3.5 second pause)
   So, that's right, so I take number two, so "English belongs to all those who use it, [J: ya, well] and, uh..."

J: What does that mean, for, for your teaching?

Y: Uh, it means, that uh, the, the main objective is to communicate, [J: uh-huh] to understand people and to make ourselves understood.

So, without bothering about, uh, you know, about purity and perfectionism and something like that.

So and uh, without being fussy about British English, King's English, or any kind of English.

**III 5.11-16**

Yusuf goes on to give examples of pronunciation differences in varieties of English. While many of his earlier contributions are also responses to direct questions, it is interesting that this, his longest contribution so far, is prompted by a request for information related to the specific ELT situation with which he is involved.
3.2. **Topic Frameworks**

Topic framework was introduced in Chapter One as the upper level of a topic hierarchy in a discourse context, in which other, lower level aspects of the context can be understood to relate. The framework is what gives a discussion its form, much as the skeleton prevents one's body from collapsing in an amoeboïd heap of flesh. The aspects of the discourse context which inform the topic framework can thus be identified by the work they perform. Looking at pivotal points in the discourse, for example, changes in topic, acts of directing the flow of talk, and challenges made by one participant to another, will reveal what aspects of the context are invoked to provide the framework, often presented in the form of justification, for other, lower level, aspects of the discourse. While all participants in a speech event would ideally be operating with the same topic framework, each participant will tend to have at least partially different versions of the framework in mind and part of the work of interaction is the establishment of common points of reference between individual participants' frameworks so that the discussion will not be reduced to chaos. A topic framework then might be most properly viewed as a property of individual participants, but the framework is meaningful only in the context of interaction between participants and is
successful to the degree that it overlaps with others' topic frameworks. Because of the high degree of overlap seen in the topic frameworks of the Americans in this study, the high degree of overlap in those of the Indonesians in this study, and the wide difference between these two groups, it will often be convenient to refer to more generalized American and Indonesian topic frameworks. However, this should not be understood to imply that all Americans or all Indonesians would make use of the same topic frameworks.

In the opening sequences of the three discussions under study there is a tendency among the Americans to use the two ideas presented in the instructions as a point of departure for their contributions and for making sense of other aspects of the discourse. The Indonesian participants are more likely to use the broader context of ELT in Indonesia as the basis for their remarks. When the Indonesians do cite the instructions, they usually focus on the section which suggests possible areas for discussion which form a more direct channel for presenting conditions in Indonesia. It should not be inferred from this that the Americans never discuss actual ELT situations or that the Indonesians never discuss more theoretical issues. Both Indonesians and Americans address these and other concerns. But when the hierarchical nature of topics is examined, the ideas in the
instructions, bound as they are by the discussion itself, form the primary topic context for the Americans while the Indonesians take the broader concerns of the ELT world outside the discussion as their primary topic context. A few examples of how these differing topic frameworks are invoked in the three discussion sessions are presented below.

3.2.1. **American Topic framework**

The Americans make use of the two ideas in the instructions, the basis of their topic framework, at pivotal points during the course of the discussions, such as introducing new topics. Victor introduces the topic of teaching techniques, or methods, by tying it to the ideas:

19. A: *Um, [well*
    
V: *[Well*
    
A: *Ya, please.*

V: *As, if you take the first approach, what methods do you use [A: yes] and if you take the second [A: yes] approach, what methods do you use.*

II 14.24-15.2

In D-III, Zaid has been discussing different native varieties of English, when, after a pause, Kathy introduces the connection between language and culture by first making
a choice of one of the ideas and then explaining her choice.

20. Z: "Some say, uh, /pur/, /por/

J: Ya, that's true, hm.

(3 second pause)

[Ya.

K: [Hm.

Well, I would say number two, English belongs to anybody who uses it. [J: hm]

Um, but the ideas are pretty, I mean, I think it's not such a simple idea, because the extent to which a person can utilize English to fully communicate is going to be a little bit dependent on culture.

III 6.14-19

As well as introducing a new topic, the two ideas in the instructions are mentioned by some Americans while in the middle of their turns, to justify their contribution by tying it back to the topic framework. Paula does this while discussing changes that have taken place in their program:

21. P: I think that's where the real strength of this program lies is that a lot of that is happening, and a lot of ideas are being exchanged.

And we're talking about ways that we can make language real for the girls. [T: uh-huh]

And the fact, this gets back to English belongs to its native speakers,
so it seems that when Michael leaves on Tuesday, this program will still continue, we're not, it doesn't depend on him.

I 20.13-21.3

The ideas presented in the instructions are also used by the Americans to reinterpret what another participant has been saying, thus making someone else's contribution relevant by placing it explicitly within the topic framework. Tom does this in Example 3., Section 3.1., when he uses the first idea to explain the style of teaching at SMA which Endang has just been describing. Victor and Alice make their reinterpretations even more explicit with phrases like "so you are saying" and "you think," followed by an interpretation based on the ideas:

22. C: So they should be able to speak as the native speakers do.

V: So, you are saying if we take the attitude of number one and apply it in our classroom...

II 12.16-17

Later in D-II, Syarif has been describing difficulties inherent in certain teaching practices. Alice reintroduces the topic of choosing one of the ideas by restating a contribution made by Chalid much earlier in the discourse. She effectively cuts off the topic that Syarif had been developing:
23. S: Don't you have [A: oh] such experience? [A: some experience]

So we don't know where, so we have to choose our own, uh, techniques, uh...

A: Well, getting back to this. [C: hm]

If we were to, uh, you don't want to choose between one and two because you think one is appropriate to, uh, preparing teachers and two is appropriate for uh, just...

II 22.18-23.2

Not only has Alice shifted the topic back to one more to her liking, but by ignoring the content of Syarif's contribution and by the use of "getting back to this", she has stressed the primacy, in her mind, of the ideas presented in the instructions as the organizing principle of her topic framework.

The Americans can also make use of the two ideas presented in the instructions in order to readjust a line they have inadvertently taken, in order to prevent challenges to their own face. In D-I, Tom brings up the idea of using translation in English classes.

24. (10.5 second pause)

T: It's interesting, I don't think we've ever suggested translation as a good method.

I 37.5

While Endang first says that it "can be a good method," Paula presents compelling evidence for the detrimental
effect translating can have on second language acquisition
As the topic of translation is winding to a close, Paula asks if it should be included in the list of thoughts that the group is compiling. In response, Endang asks for Tom's opinion:

25. P: So I think translation can [E: uh-huh] be useful, But I think we have to be careful with it. That it's not used as a crutch to always be used.
E: Sometimes, maybe we can use it [P: ya] to, [T: hm] to find out, hm?
P: So, do we want to say something about translation, or do you think it's important enough?
E: Well, Tom?
T: Hm,. I, I don't know how it fits [P: ya] in here
Maybe, again, the way, the method that you teach translation will depend on your attitude or your goals for that class, so it might fit in to be very appropriate, [P: ya] ya.

While it was Tom who first brought up the issue of translation, he now down plays the topic. In doing so, he is able to provide himself with a certain amount of positive face by taking the line toward translation espoused by Paula and thus disassociating himself from the fact that it was he who first raised the topic. Notice that in order to do this he first cites relevance ("how it fits in here"), and then
points out that the relevance of translation would depend on
the attitude that one takes toward ELT.

3.2.2. Indonesian Topic Framework

The Indonesians in this study tend to approach pivotal
points in the discourse, such as those in the examples
above, with a framework based on the real world ELT
situation outside the ongoing discussion. English at the
SMA, rather than to the two ideas in the instruction sheet,
is the explicit context used by Endang in Example 2.,
Section 3.1., to introduce her first topic. Toward the end
of D-I, as pre-closing moves are being tentatively made,
Endang reintroduces this context as a means of explaining
all the difficulties in ELT that the group has been
discussing:

26. (16 second pause)

E: Well, I think all that has connection with their
English learning at SMA.

Chalid also introduces the Indonesian ELT context as his
first topic, Example 8., Section 3.1., and it remains the
basis of his topic framework throughout D-II. He repeatedly
reminds the other participants of the need to consider ELT
in Indonesia when they discuss more theoretical issues. In
one such case Chalid, like Endang, brings up the SMA situation:

27. A: [They should be able to=]
   S: [/?/ is good as far as
   A: =somehow apply it somehow, so that's number two a bit more.
   C: Uh, uh, have you been familiar uh, with, uh, the English program at the junior or senior high school in Indonesia?

II 42.18-21

The group in D-III has been discussing the problem of Indonesian students' shyness in speaking English. John asserts that the program where the discussants teach needs to "propagandize" the students into understanding the value of overcoming shyness, and then he reiterates the problem that the students are facing with the student-fronted approach used in their program. After a pause, Syarif changes the topic by introducing it with its situational context:

28. J: And we're introducing something completely, some of them may have been very successful at it too, [Y: ya]

   And now we're introducing something different.

   (3.5 second pause)

   Y: Hm, at high schools we have another problem, uh, the classes are big.
One class has sixty students.

It's, uh, very hard you see to have, uh, to have, uh, to give freedom, you see, too much.

As in the other topic introductions by Indonesians, excerpted above, Syarif uses a localized context, "at high schools," to introduce his new topic.

In Example 23. we saw how a discussion that had been dealing with the ELT situation in Indonesia prompts an American to request that the group "get back" to what she considers the primary topic that the group is to discuss. A similar situation occurs, this time instigated by an Indonesian, after a rather lengthy discussion by the Americans about how to differentiate the two ideas:

29. V: The first, ok, I'm going /to/ suggest a change, and it, [A: uh-huh] I don't know if it can be applied to one or two, but the change that I would have in speaking classes is that they meet three or four times a week [A: ah]

Now I don't know if that can be distinguished

A: I don't...

S: But coming back to the aims of teaching, now it's a problem,

The aims of teaching English in Indonesia, which is decided by the government, you know formulated by the government, is for reading, [A: hm] train the students to be able to read books in English. [A: uh-huh]
In Example 25., Tom uses the American topic framework to counter a challenge to his face. Yusuf similarly saves face by drawing on his (Indonesian) topic framework to counter a challenge to the validity of a point he has made. John has been describing ways in which lessons that emphasize American or British culture can be recontextualized to be more accessible to Indonesian students. Yusuf makes the point that this is not practical because of classroom time limitations. John counters that this is not an obstacle in the program where they are teaching:

30. J: They'll describe, you'll read about a famous man and then you write about a famous Indonesian, [Y: uh- huh]

   Something along that lines.

Y: But, uh, for beginners, it, you know, it would take too long, you see,

   So, after talking about American situations and then, you know, talk about it, [J: well] //?.

   For beginners, [it's too, too much

   J: [In our teaching situation we don't have a problem of too long.

S: Too what?

J: Too long.
Y: Too long.

J: We, we have enough time.

Y: Uh, ya, but, uh, we should, you know, uh, distinguish between adult classes and children's classes like, uh, junior high school. [J: ya]

III 12.2-12

In 25. Tom uses the topic framework to readjust the line he has taken. In 30. Yusuf used his topic framework to maintain his line. Yusuf's last contribution in the above example is a defense of his earlier comment about time limitations, based on a distinction between two aspects of the Indonesian ELT situation. Whereas the program where the discussants are teaching is for adults, children's classes may have greater time limitations (see content of Example 64.). Thus Yusuf points out that he and John may have been thinking of different teaching contexts, maintaining his line by referring to the specific aspect of his topic framework, children's classes as part of the Indonesian teaching context, that motivated his contribution.

Points at which the Americans call on the two ideas from the instructions to assert relevance, such as topic introductions, reinterpreting other participants' contributions, and defending one's line, are generally marked by the Indonesians with references to the context of ELT in Indonesia. The relevance of Indonesian's remarks is derived from an ongoing real world situation which exists
independent of the current discussions. The Americans derive relevance from the constructs of *the instructions* they have been given, constructs which are legitimized largely by their existence within the temporary context of the discussion itself.

3.3. **Convergence of American and Indonesian relevance**

Relevance has been tied to the notion of topics, and the inclusion of specific topics in a broader topic framework. Relevance is also not only an aspect of isolated utterances, but is found in, and is fundamental to, the interaction between participants in a speech event. This section looks at examples of the interaction between the Indonesian and American participants, the utilization of their respective topic frameworks for maintaining relevance, and their reactions to an alternate topic framework used by other members of the discussion.

It was shown previously that the American participants' primary topic framework is informed by the two ideas taken from the instruction sheet. Section 3.3.1. examines how both the American and the Indonesian participants deal with the theoretical context of the two ideas in the instructions.

The Indonesian participants' primary topic framework is informed by the broader ELT situation in Indonesia. Section
3.3.2. examines how both the Indonesian and American participants deal with the context that is provided for the discussion by this Indonesian situation.

3.3.1. The theoretical context of the discussions

The two ideas presented in the instructions provide the major theoretical context for the discussion groups. While the Indonesian as well as American participants make use of this context in the discussions, the Americans do so much more frequently. The six American participants in this study invoke these two ideas, either by quoting them directly from the instructions or by referring to them with such phrases as "the first attitude," "idea two," or "these two things," a total of 113 times. The six Indonesians, in contrast, do so only 44 times. In D-I the Americans mention these ideas 20 times versus four times by the Indonesians. In D-II the two ideas from the instructions are a frequent topic of discussion, with the Americans mentioning them 67 times and the Indonesians 32. In D-III the Americans mention these two ideas 20 times versus eight times by the Indonesians. While the Indonesians participants in D-II mention these ideas more often than the participants, Indonesian or American, in the other two discussion groups, within D-II it is still the Americans who are most concerned
with discussing the theoretical context, the Indonesians often being obliged to **respond.**

More important, however, than the frequency with which the Americans mention this theoretical context is the work to which they put it, in contrast to the work done with these two theoretical ideas by the Indonesians. In Section 3.2.1. it was shown that the two ideas are fundamental to the Americans' topic framework and thus to their understanding of the organization of talk and maintenance of relevance. In this section it will be shown that for the Indonesians these ideas are secondary to the broader context of ELT in Indonesia and when the Indonesians do express these theoretical ideas, they do so in terms derived from the context outside the discussion. At other times the Indonesians minimize the work to which the ideas are put by the Americans. The American reaction to the Indonesian line for dealing with the theoretical issues is negative to the extent that this line is divergent from the American topic framework.

When Indonesian contributions to the discussions are motivated by theoretical concerns inferred from the two ideas presented in the instructions, these concerns are often represented by a dichotomy derived from concepts current in ELT in Indonesia. Such a dichotomy acts as a substitute for the two ideas, representing them with more
well-recognized phenomena, while maintaining an analogous two-part form. For example, Yusuf presents writing as a context for the first idea and speaking as a context for the second idea. The Americans never initiate these distinctions, drawn from outside the confines of the discussions, although they sometimes pick up on them. Alternate dichotomies raised by the Indonesians include distinctions between passive (teacher fronted) and active (student fronted) learning styles (D-I), English as a foreign and as a second language (D-I, D-II), reading and speaking (D-II), and formal and informal English (D-III).

These alternate ways of viewing the two ideas are sometimes acceptable to the Americans, especially when the connection to the two ideas is made explicitly, as seen in the following example:

31. Y: Well, perhaps we can split up the ideas. This is spoken English and written English.
   J: That's exactly what I was kind of thinking because, [Y: uh-huh]

II 8.14-16

However, in D-II, the Indonesian participants rarely tie such dichotomous concepts explicitly to the two ideas of the instructions. In the following example, Alice grasps the potential connection between the EFL/ESL dichotomy and the
ideas, but does not see the usefulness of this dichotomy to the topic framework in which she is operating:

32. C: In, English in Indonesian is not [A: yes] a second language.
   S: [second language.
   C: English is a foreign language
   But we, if this issue, you know, is discussed, in the, in the Philippines, probably, or Singapore, you know, the second...
   S: Ya [S: uh] English is a second [C: ya] language there.
   A: So they would regard English belongs [C: uh] to all those who use it [C: uh-huh; S: ya; V: oh, I see]
      I don't see it.

II 3.13-19

A very successful attempt at creating an overlap between the American and Indonesian topic frameworks in D-I is based on the participants' recognition and acceptance of the approximate equivalence between a substitute dichotomy presented by an Indonesian and the ideas that the Americans prefer to take directly from the instructions. The group has been discussing ELT in the high schools and then Paula shifts the focus of talk to the university's Teacher Training Faculty (FK). Example 33. begins with Paula using one of the ideas (attitudes) as the pivot for this change:
33. P: So that's the attitude at SMA when they teach English. What do you think the attitude, though, is at FK, the way English is taught there?

E: FK, for the English department, [A: hm]

I think they should have=

N: They should practice teach.

E: =active mastery [P: ya] for the English department.

But for the other one, as long as they can read their text book that is written in English, that's the aim of the English teaching at the, uh, the other department, [P: uh-huh] in FK.

P: Uh-huh, but in the English department at FK, do you think they have this number two approach=

E: [Number two.]

P: [=or number one?]

E: Number two approach, [I think]

P: [So you feel like you were giving a, given an active [E: yes] education.

Endang has interpreted the notion of two attitudes or approaches to ELT as a distinction between active and passive education. When Endang answers Paula's question in these terms, Paula reinterprets the answer in terms of the ideas presented in the instructions. After Endang has accepted this reinterpretation, Paula then translates the answer back into the active/passive distinction. In this way an Indonesian and an American present their respective
topic frameworks, explicitly restate what they are saying in terms of the other framework, then return to their own context for discussing their thoughts. The equivalence that the discussants in D-I find between active and passive learning and the two ideas in the instructions informs many contributions in this discussion group and shows that they have been successful at overlapping their potentially incongruous topic frameworks in a way that facilitates cross-cultural interaction.

While sometimes expressing the two ideas in terms compatible with their topic framework, the Indonesians also tend to minimize the significance of contributions that Americans have based on these ideas. One way this is done is by making a rapid unmarked topic shift when the Americans are discussing the two ideas:

34. V: I think it, number two, I agree.
A: Me, too.
S: Ya, uh-huh.

V: I believe that [A: ya] students should create their sentences.

They should create their language.

S: In Indonesia, there is a, a kind of controversy, you know. [A: ya]

When we start, uh, teaching English to the, to children.

II 1C.3-9
Victor begins by mentioning one of the ideas and when he mentions students' creating their own language he is still referring to the two ideas, as explicitly stated in Example 9. Syarif does not give any explicit connection between his topic of the age at which instruction should begin and the two ideas that were being discussed earlier. After Syarif and Chalid then describe the sequence of language classes in primary and secondary school, Alice returns to the topic of the ideas. In response to Alice's reintroduction of the ideas, Chalid outlines one of the aims of ELT in Indonesia, and again an explicit connection to the two ideas in the instructions is made by an American:

35. A: Well, I guess they're still trying to unify the country with Bahasa Indonesia, [S: uh-huh] so, [S: I think so; C: ya]

Uh, so you say that for you, you think it's best, number two, "English belongs to all those who use it?" [C: yes]

I also, I agree with that. [S: yes]

I think, I'd like to just, uh, feel that the students, even though their pronunciation is not perfect, and they still make some mistakes, you know, I just encourage them to sp-, speak English.

C: But formerly, you know, especially in the English Department, that we are training them, uh, the students to be teachers, [A: uh-huh]

and we try to make their English as the native speakers have English, who can, can speak, you know. [A: but]
Because they are going to be English teachers.

A: Right, but I don't, because I say I agree with two, "English belongs to all those who use it."

**II 11.6-12**

In this example we see that whereas Chalid outlines what is done in class based first on the goals for ELT in Indonesia, Alice begins to outline what she thinks should be done based first on an idea derived from the instructions, indeed an idea she had likely never considered in these terms before becoming a participant in this study.

When Chalid and Syarif do explicitly mention the potential relationship between English teaching and the two ideas, they state that indeed there may be no relation between them:

36. V: And we, there's two different approaches and how would our methods differ in class? I,

A: I see, natives...

V: I think reading could belong [to either of these.]

S: [We're talking about methods.]

A: Ya, I think [that's true.

C: [Well, I but I don't think the methods will be different.

The method, [A: oh] you know, these just the way to present the materials.

**II 19.2-8**
37. A: Would these teachers who had these different attitudes do different things?

V: I think so.

A: What do you think the first would do? What do you think...

S: You know, seems very little, uh, what's that, relation between [V: (laughing)] these, either these [A: ah] with the technique used in class.

II 24.7-10

While the Indonesians in the three groups do often respond to the topic of the two ideas, they, unlike the Americans, rarely introduce this topic. However, Chalid, in D-II, does raise the issue of deciding between the ideas once, about a third of the way into the discussion, after it has been raised repeatedly by the Americans at earlier times. He initiates the topic of the two ideas in the form of a question, posed as a request for confirmation. The two Americans' reactions to this style of raising a topic, a topic which they feel to be of primary relevance to the discussion, are instructive:

38. C: So, uh, have you decided already the question, number one and number two? Not yet?

V: (laughing)
A: You're here.
We're deciding it with you.

Victor's laughing and Alice's two utterances, spoken with raised and exaggerated intonation, reveal the incredulity with which they receive such a question. Alice's comments also indicate that, for her, the current status in the discussion of the two ideas, which are fundamental to her topic framework, is something that all members of the group should be privy to and should not need confirmation. However, Chalid's question, like Yusuf's (17.), actually introduces the topic deferentially, by asking for confirmation. When the Americans raise the issue of the two topics, it is usually done baldly on record (11., 19.).

Immediately following the excerpt in Example 38. Alice's voice returns to its normal intonation as she answers Chalid's question, explaining her interpretation of what the group has been doing:

39. A: Um, actually, rather than deciding it, what we were, I think we were doing, without saying it out loud, was trying to differentiate between the two in terms of the classes, meaning,

If a teacher believed or thought this was true, number one, "English belongs to its native speakers," how would that teacher approach [V: right] the class.
What would he or she do?  

But if he or she believed "English belongs to all those who use it," what would they do instead?  

Would these teachers who had these different attitudes do different things?

II 24.3-7

Notice that Alice describes the discussion in terms of looking first at each idea, and then from the idea, extrapolating appropriate teaching methods. This contrasts with the the Indonesian style of looking first at the Indonesian situation and from this, extrapolating the significance (if any) of the two ideas.

This is consistent with the claim made in this section that the American participants use the theoretical context of the discussion, in the form of the two ideas, to interpret information about ELT situations as well as to raise topics and direct the flow of talk. Directing the flow of talk in regards to the ideas is usually done baldly on record by the Americans. Such directions by the Indonesians (which are rare) will usually be presented in more deferential terms. More regularly, when dealing with the implications of the two ideas, the Indonesians represent these in more concrete terms relevant to the Indonesian ELT situation. Often the equivalence between these representations and the two ideas is not explicitly made.
3.3.2. The situational context of the discussions

The real world situation which informs the discussions for all the participants in these three groups is ELT in Indonesia. This will be referred to as the situational context. As seen in many of the previous examples, the Indonesian participants take this context as the primary topic framework of the discussions. While the Americans use ELT as a context to which the two ideas in the instructions may be applied, the Indonesians take the Indonesian ELT situation as the fundamental context in which to understand all other aspects of the discussion. The Indonesians interpret this context in its broadest terms, allowing for the discussion of a large range of topics related to ELT in Indonesia, while the Americans tend to limit this context to situations that can be tied to the two ideas. The Indonesian ELT situation and aspects of ELT, such as learning styles and language models, are mentioned in the instruction sheet given to the discussion groups. The aspects of ELT appearing in the instructions are often cited by the Indonesians as justification for the various topics they address. The Americans on the other hand rarely cite this portion of the instructions and often react negatively when the Indonesians do so in order to maintain the relevance of their contributions.
In D-I, the situational context, primary to the Indonesians' maintenance of relevance, rarely conflicts with the theoretical context of the discussion. Indeed the Americans in D-I are generally interested in the explanations of the ELT situation given by the Indonesians and use this information in the work they do with the two ideas (see Example 33.). While conflicts arise in D-III over some of the aspects of language teaching that are raised by the Indonesian participants (to be discussed below), the role of this Indonesian context in general does not create difficulties. The situation is quite different in D-II, in which either the Indonesian context is ignored by the Americans or the scope that this context should have in the discussion is questioned.

In D-II the Americans often ignore the context of the actual Indonesian situation as a means of understanding the two ideas and prefer instead a more intuitive reading of these ideas. This was seen in relation to Chalid's first topic in Example 8., 3.1. and is repeated again in Example 40.

40. A: "Appropriate to your English teaching situation."
V: Oh, I see.
C: Now [that's why...
A: [Wh-, what do you think this means, ya, I'm sorry.
C: That's why I said to you just now that it has something to do, something to do with the aims of teaching English in Indonesia. [A: ya]

So let's discuss this ideas and decide which seems more approp'riate to the English teaching [A: English teaching] situation here in Indonesia.

A: Because if I were to read that sentence, for me, I would say "English belongs to all those who use it."

I mean, I'm very happy as, I'd like to see my students speak it.

II 8.3-10

The discussants in D-II are trying to understand how the phrase, "appropriate to your English teaching situation," should be interpreted. Chalid understands this to mean that the Indonesian ELT situation, which has certain goals prescribed by the government, must be the primary basis for looking at the ideas. Alice, on the other hand, chooses the second idea according to the personal interpretation she gains if she "were to read that sentence," an understanding that is without reference to the Indonesian situation. When Alice is later reminded that the instructions mention the Indonesian context, the Americans and Indonesians have different opinions of the scope that this context should be given:

41. A: Yes, so, all right, you wanted to discuss this for SMA.

C: Ya, since it refers to "in Indonesia," you know, [A: yes] in Indonesia in common, you know, "to your English teaching situation here in Indonesia."
Now, so I think we cannot be away from the, the most important thing to consider in teaching English in Indonesia, [A: uh-huh]

Reading will be the target, reading ability.

S: Uh-huh, "more appropriate to your teaching English situation here in Indonesia."

C: That's right.

A: Oh, so appropriate for me.

How about appropriate for us then?

Chalid's focus is directed to the phrase "in Indonesia" which he interprets in a very general sense, thus justifying his repeated topic of the ELT goal prescribed by the government for SMA as reading ability. Alice on the other hand focuses on the phrase "your teaching" and first 'interprets this to mean her teaching personally, and then extends this to include all the members of the group, still at a personal level. Alice's emphasis is on the experiences of the members present at the discussion rather than, as Chalid sees it, on the broader Indonesian context.

The differing emphasis on personal and situational interpretations of the ideas sheds light on an earlier conflict between Alice and Chalid:

42. C: In Indonesia teaching is aimed at, uh, understanding, reading books [A: oh], the second, uh, the first one.
And the second one, if there is a possibility for them to go abroad, especially to the United States of America or other, uh, English foreign countries [A: uh-huh] also Australia.

So both be able to understand the speakers of English there. [A: yes]

Now, so that, when we, we are forced now to, to choose, let's say to, to decide how English is taught as a second or a foreign language. English belongs to it's native speakers, or English belongs to all those who use it.

Now I think, "English belongs to it's native speakers" will be, will be much preferred.

A: But, what does it mean?

I mean, for example you choose "English belongs to it's native speakers."

How does that differ for you from English belongs to all those who use it?"

C: (laughs) Probably I misunderstand, ya?

Now, what I mean is, uh, probably I misunderstand, uh, [A: no, I, uh] to comprehend this way.

How English is taught as a second, uh, two different attitude [A: yes] which can have an effect on how English is taught as a second or foreign language.

The first, the first attitude is that "English belongs to it's native speakers."

Does it mean that in studying English in Indonesia, we should study English according to the language used by the native speakers?

Does it mean that?

II 1.16-2.10

Chalid has made his interpretations based on the roles English plays in Indonesia. Notice that the concluding
utterance in his first turn in (Example 42.) is passive, implying the preference is not his, but the one held in Indonesia. Alice immediately requests a personal interpretations, "How does that differ for you?" Chalid's answer is again based on the Indonesian context as seen in the second to the last utterance. His reaction to the problem is also interesting. He defends his own face by suggesting that he has misunderstood. He restates his position using requests for confirmation. This same pattern is repeated about half way through the discussion. After Alice has explained at length that she wants to discuss the issues in terms of the individual classes they each teach, Chalid responds:

43. A: And you will present them with certain sentences that maybe they should study, or vocabulary or...

What would you do?

(8 second pause)

C: Ok, probably I still misunderstand the idea of this question, ya.

Does it mean here, that there are two different attitudes?

II 36.8-11

Again he explains his position and Alice responds with hers.

While the American topic framework is based on part of the instruction sheet that was used to set up these
discussion groups, the Indonesian topic framework has the broader base of the Indonesian ELT context outside the discussion. It should not be thought, however, that the Indonesians do not use portions of the instructions to regulate the flow of talk. Because they take the Indonesian situation as the primary context of the discussion, they can neatly exploit the areas for discussion suggested in the instructions (see Appendix A) to introduce topics that are tied to both the instructions and the realities of ELT.

While the Indonesian participants in D-I never mention the aspects of ELT suggested in the instructions, the Indonesians in D-II and D-III do do so a total of 30 times. The Americans cite these portions of the instructions only five times. For the Indonesians, citing aspects of ELT suggested for discussion in the instructions is a very productive method of controlling the overall flow of the discussion, in much the same way that the Americans use the ideas or, as will be shown later, the task of making suggestions, to control the flow of talk. In addition, the way that the Indonesians often control the discussion is reminiscent of the way that the suggested areas happen to be presented in the instruction, in the form of a list. The Indonesians often raise a topic, discuss it briefly, then move on to a new topic, as though they are running down the list and checking of the individual items.
44. Y: So in, ya, using formal English now, we have got to be, you know, to be strict. [J: uh-huh]

But, uh, informal English can be flexible, [J: ya], you see, so.

And, uh, you know, here "the model of English to be taught in your classes," I think, uh, it depends upon the levels of the classes. [J: uh-huh]

So, at the beginning levels then we should use formal English, maybe, (laughing) well, in-, informal.

J: Informal English.

Y: Informal English

J: Ya, I was a li-, little surprised [when you said formal].

Y: [ya, spoken English.

J: I was just anticipating informal.

Y: Ya, informal, that's right. [J: uh-huh]

And, uh, "the appropriate subject matter for English lessons" also depends upon, you know, the levels of the classes.

So, I, I think in, at the, for beginning classes we can use, ya, daily topics [J: uh-huh]

III 10.9-16

As soon as Yusuf clarifies the main point he is making about "the model of English", he introduces the topic of "appropriate subject matter" and comments on it. In a similar example Chalid introduces a new topic by explicitly pointing out that one topic listed in the instructions has
received enough discussion and that the next suggested area should now be examined:

45. C: Now, let's leave it first, model of English
   Let's come to the appropriate subject matter first.
   A: Ok.
   S: Hm, subject matter.

II 18.1-5

Notice that in this way Chalid is also able to reintroduce his first topic of the discourse, Example 8., 3.1.

In the following example Yusuf introduces a topic suggested in the instructions and then continues to run through a series of related topics which he generates himself, rather than taking directly from the instructions:

46. (9.5 second pause)
   Y: So?
   J: Where does that leave us?
   Y: Well, the general idea should be, we should use the model of English to be taught, which is the kind of English the students need. (laughing)
   J: I guess that's...
   Y: That's too broad.
   (8 second pause)
What about slang?
Is there anything about slang?
Slang is that, uh...

J: Hm.

Y: (laughing)

(14 second pause)

Y: And another thing is that we should use, uh, current English, not old English, not Shakespeare's English. (laughing)

J: I think that makes sense.

Y: Uh-huh, and, uh, now, should we use the, the type of English that is the same as the majors of the students?

Like we use agricultural English for agriculture students and, uh, law English for law students. (laughing)

In this excerpt Yusuf first discusses the model of English used in class, and then briefly raises the issues of slang, old English, and English for specific purposes (each possibly, although not explicitly, derived from the notion of model of English). By applying this style of going down a list of topics using topics not presented directly in the instructions, Yusuf demonstrates that such a style of dealing with topics may be motivated by a broader Indonesian style of discourse rather than being simply a result of the form in which the instructions are presented.
By using the list of areas for discussion suggested in the instructions and by generating similar lists of new topics for discussion, the Indonesians can operate with a system in which different aspects of the ELT context can be discussed by virtue of their existence within this context, but without making explicit ties to the theoretical context of the two ideas. American reactions to this Indonesian method of quickly checking off topics are often negative, and indeed these negative reactions are often produced by the lack of explicit connection made between these topics and the two ideas.

After Victor reminds the participants of D-II that they are trying to look at the two ideas and decided how these ideas would stimulate different teaching methods (Example 36.), Chalid and Syarif begin to outline some of the methods that have been used in the past in Indonesia, including grammar translation, oral approach, cognitive code, direct method, and silent way. This discussion takes the form described above as running through a list of different sub-topics. While the Indonesians explain the basic principles of each method, they do not explicitly state any connection these night have with the ideas in the instructions. When Chalid then directs the talk toward the next suggested area for discussion listed in the instructions, Victor protests:
Silent way, now

S: Silent way.

A: /I/ didn't understand.

C: But this is a way...

S: But, I, I just don't care about names of methods now.

A: That's nice.

S: That, uh, for me, uh, techniques of presenting the materials [A: hm] is more important.

C: Mow "styles of teaching or learning."

V: I, I think that we still, you know, I think, I'm not even sure if we've all agreed which approach we want to take. [C: (laughing); A: yes]

And that's what he wants us to do.

Which approach do we think is [S: That's...] more appropriate?

Victor's protest is founded on his desire to differentiate the two ideas in the instructions, to which the discussion of methods actually used in Indonesia has not been explicitly connected. Notice that Chalid's reaction to Victor's contribution is a laugh, while Alice's is agreement. Indeed, in this example Victor does not refer specifically to the instructions for justification of his stand, but rather reminds the participants of the obligation he feels they have to the instigator of the entire affair to decided between the ideas, "that's what he [Michael] wants us to do."
In two similar examples from D-II, John explicitly challenges the relevance of comments that Yusuf has made concerning the suggested areas for discussion. In Example 48, Yusuf concludes a discussion about parts of English grammar that are notoriously difficult for Indonesians. After a pause he changes the topic to one suggested in the instructions:

48. Y: Tenses, tenses, too, ya. [J: ya]
   Verb tenses.
   And prepositions.
   (5.5 second pause)
   So, uh, "styles of teaching and learning." (laugh)
   We accept these student centered, but anyhow we see, uh, (laughing)
   J: I don't know how that necessarily comes from these two ideas. [Y: uh, uh]
   Well, I guess it could.
   Y: Ya, yes, yes, see, uh, "appropriate subject matter for - for English lessons, styles of teaching and learning."

III 17.13-18.2

It is ambiguous whether John's initial challenge of relevance is aimed at the flow of the discussion at that point (i.e., the relevance of Yusuf's contribution) or at the place of that particular topic in the instructions (i.e., the relevance of my contribution to the discussion
through the instructions). Nonetheless, John's challenge is based on his desire to tie what is said to the two ideas in the initial portion of the instructions and Yusuf does interpret it as a challenge to the relevance of his own contribution. However, rather than justifying himself by citing the ideas (as John requests) he cites a portion of the suggested areas for discussion.

Example 49. illustrates a similar challenge by John to the relevance of one of Yusuf's contributions. After John makes a pre-closing move by asking for any other thoughts, Yusuf brings up another of the suggested areas for discussion. This time John's initial relevance challenge is not expressed specifically in terms of the two ideas in the instructions, but more generally in terms of the flow of talk:

49. (6 second pause)

J: Anybody else?

Z: I don't have anything else to say.

J: To say.

Y: (laughing)

(6.5 second pause)

"Appropriate subject matter for English lessons," uh, I think, uh, variety should be stressed, you see.

So, uh, [J: uh-huh] uh-huh, so we should use, uh, varied materials.
Like, uh, ya, uh, about campus, about social life, about culture [J: uh-huh] about, uh, the English geography.

J: What does that have to do with the flow of ideas?

Y: Uh, does it use it, the second idea?

J: No, ya, how did that connect with the second idea as opposed to the first one?

Y: Ya, that means, you see, it's, uh, that everybody is the en-, you know, can be encouraged, you see, to communicate, [J: uh-huh]

Uh, because if you just talk about medicines these, uh [J: oh] people who not, you know, who do not know much about medicines, they are [J: uh-huh] reluctant to talk.

(12 second pause)

J: Ok, anything else?

Notice that in response to this challenge Yusuf now justifies his contribution in terms of the one of the two ideas, phrasing his justification deferentially in the form of a request for confirmation. Rather than confirming as requested, John turns the question back on Yusuf, asking for an explicit connection to be made between what Yusuf has said and the two ideas in the instructions. While such a connection can be inferred from Yusuf's reply, it is not explicitly stated. After a pause, John reinitiates preclosing activity and, after nine more turns, when all agree that they are "finished really," the discussion ends.
In this section examples have been presented to support the claim that for the Indonesian participants, the situational context of the discussions covers a broad range of issues tied to ELT in Indonesia. In D-II the Americans tend to take a more personal view of the situational context of the discussions. Specific aspects of the ELT situation in Indonesia are raised by the Indonesians in D-II and D-III with reference to the areas for talk suggested in the instructions, often in a style reminiscent of running down a list. These, and other topics similarly introduced, are generally acceptable to the Americans only to the extent that they are tied to the two ideas in the instructions. As previously illustrated for all three discussion groups, it is again seen that, rather than these two ideas from the instructions, it is the broader Indonesian context that forms the primary topic framework in which the Indonesian participants are operating.

3.4. Changes, obstacles, and concluding

The Indonesian participants in the discussion groups sometimes make suggestions for what should be done in the English classroom (see Examples 33. and 44.); however, these are presented as assumed facts rather than as new approaches juxtaposed against already existing conditions or in other ways explicitly marked as changes that should be undertaken.
In contrast, the Americans make suggestions which are presented as changes they feel need to be made in the ELT situation. The six Americans in this study mention the notion of suggesting changes a total of 22 times. In contrast, the Indonesians mention change only three times, once in each discussion group. More importantly, the Americans also often direct the flow of talk by citing the portion of the instructions which directs the group to make suggestions for possible changes in their English programs, something the Indonesians do not do.

In the following example, Paula directs the group toward suggesting changes, and presents her understanding of the section of the instructions that request the group to do so:

50. (11.5 second pause)

P: So I guess here in his conclusion he's wanting us to write down "some suggestions for possible changes or improvements in this English program, based on our attitudes about native and non-native speakers' relationships with English," so

(5.5 second pause)

I guess what he wants us, our feelings on ways to improve. [T: uh-huh, ya]

I 20.2-3

Paula interprets the instruction to make suggestions as a call from me (as organizer of the discussion) for the participants to rely on their own feelings. When she
introduces the need to suggest changes, she does not explicitly mention the need to consider the actual context of ELT in Indonesia. Tom even more explicitly points out the American view that their suggestions can be personal and hypothetical, rather than of a practical nature:

51. (12.5 second pause)

T: Well, I guess in our discussion today we can talk idealistically.
Like, what suggestions would we have ourselves.
They may not even be that practical, but what might be some solutions.

In addition to being hypothetical, the suggestions made by Americans are often explicitly based on the two ideas that form the American topic framework. In the following example Paula establishes one of the two ideas as the basis for a suggestion she subsequently makes:

52. (4.5 second pause)

P: So maybe what you said in the first place, Tom, is that if we know that the aim of our program here is that English belongsto all those, that, who use it,

So could one of our suggestions be that if, if, the, at the SMA level they also took this attitude towards English,
Then when we receive our students here at PDPK, they already have in their mind that English is not just some foreign thing that is very far away from them, that they can, [E: ya] they can grasp it, too.

Notice also that Paula's suggestion deals with a situation in Indonesian ELT that was raised by Endang in her first topic (Example 3., Section 3.1.). Here Paula is able to respond to information that has been presented in an Indonesian topic framework by tying it into the concerns that form her American topic framework. This type of cooperation is similar to that seen in Paula and Endang's reinterpretation of their respective topic frameworks in Example 33.

Example 53. illustrates again that the Americans generally feel that it is important to make suggestions and to base these suggestions on the two ideas, and that it is acceptable to make hypothetical suggestions. After directing the participants in D-II to make suggestions, Victor makes one himself. He admits that he does not know the actual ELT situation where he is working (he has only been teaching there three months); nevertheless, he is willing to make suggestions which are based more on a personal interpretation than on knowledge of the actual ELT situation that his suggestion would affect. Thus Victor
also takes a rather hypothetical and potentially non-practical orientation toward making suggestions, although he does not state this as explicitly as Tom does. But if not practical, Victor's suggestion is clearly derived from the two ideas that form his primary topic framework:

53. V: How do we go a, uh, have we, how do we go about concluding this?

Do we want to take his method of concluding it and give suggestions, or...

S: [It's] hard to reach an agreement.

V: [Does any of us have any suggestions [A: no] for our English departments?

S: "Briefly outline some suggestions..."

A: Ya, I'm, do you have any?

V: My problem is I don't know my teachers, the dosens in my [A: ya] English department, and their methods too well. [A: uh-huh]

But I would say that if they are going too much to one side or the other, then they should be careful.

And they should try and stay somewhere in the middle [A: ya] of those two [C: now] approaches.

S: You know, today, seems, there is a tendency in Indonesia, at least in Padang, uh, could be in, in Indonesia,

this tendency to move from structural approach to, uh, communication, [A: yes; V: uh-huh; A: yes] communicative, uh, competence.

A: Ya, I think, oh, well, I don't know if this would be true.
But the, number two would definitely be the communicative [S: ya; C: ya] approach, right?

What do you think of that approach, the communicative approach?

II 61.5-18

Notice also that Syarif deflects the thrust of Victor's suggestion by changing the topic from possible suggestions to communicative competence. He grounds this change on the new topic's relevance as an example of a phenomenon in the current Indonesian ELT situation. Alice, however, feels it is necessary to ground the new topic in the American topic framework by connecting it to one of the two ideas. After thus establishing the new topic's relevance, Alice asks Syarif to continue what he has to say.

The American desire that suggestions made during these discussions be tied to the American topic framework is illustrated even more explicitly in Examples 54. and 55. when John, as he did in 48. and 49., challenges the relevance of a contribution made by an Indonesian.

In 54., Kathy first calls for suggested changes and Yusuf requests confirmation of the context in which suggestions are to be made. Having established the appropriate context, Yusuf fakes his suggestion:

54. K: We haven't made very many suggestions for possible changes or improvements in our English program. [Y: (laughing) ya]
J: Well,

Y: So, I, we are talking about our English programs here?

J: Ya.

Y: Oh, I see

In, in my opinion then, one of the changes that we should make is, is you see, to coordinate the material.

III 22.3-8

But rather than tying his suggestion to the ideas in the instructions, Yusuf expresses it in terms of problems that have been experienced in the program where the four discussants are working. After Yusuf ends his contribution with a story exemplifying the situation he has suggested changing, John challenges the relevance of the contribution, first by questioning the validity of Yusuf's students' statements and secondly by asserting that Yusuf's point does not relate to the two ideas:

55. Y: Ya, I found out you see in my reading, uh, teaching see, sometimes, you know, the students could not give correct answers to the questions because of the fact, you see, that they did, they didn't see the structural relationship of the ideas. [J: uh-huh]

Then I asked, you see, have you studied this kind of structure?

Oh, not yet, (laughing) yes.

J: Well I, I doubt that.
I doubt, [Y: (laughing)] they probably had it presented to them at least five to ten times, [Y: ya] but they haven't mastered or they didn't recognize it.

Now, I, that's, that's, but I know what, I know what you mean.

It is a problem, though, hm, coordinating. [Y: hm] It really is.

But I'm not sure how that relates to the point.

Y: (laughing) ya, ya

J: Maybe it does.

K: What do you think Zaid?

Z: (laughing)

J: I think I've been trying to make changes that are on the lines of the second idea.

Trying to introduce, well I think part of it, well, for myself, for example, I don't see any reason why an Indonesian teacher's pronunciation is any, [Y: hm] you know if, particularly if the pronunciation is good, I don't see any problem with that.

 Rather than defending the relevance of his contribution, Yusuf accepts John's challenge. Next John suggests that some changes have been made in the program and he maintains the relevance of his contribution by tying it to one of the two ideas.

 At another point when John asks for suggested changes that might be made in their courses, Zaid seems to be focused more strongly on the courses themselves than on
change, and indeed is interested in discussing Indonesian language courses rather than English courses.

56. J: Well, we haven't really stated anything specific that we would do in our courses that would be different.

(6.5 second pause)

Z: I don't know.

J: Have we said anything specific?

Z: About the courses?

J: How we would change our courses, [because ...]

Z: [How about Indonesian course?]

J: That really doesn't relate to the discussion. [Y: (laugh)] It just... [Y: ya]

Ya, I agree with, uh, indeed we've talked about that in our last two meetings.

Mow, I, does that [Y: /?/] come from, how does that relate to the two ide-, or one of the ideas?

Y: Oh ya, So, uh, but, uh, what does model here mean anyway? "Model of English to be taught."

III 30.18-31.9

John states that Indonesian language training is not a topic relevant to the discussion. Notice that John is aware that what Zaid has suggested is derived from discussions that they have had earlier, but for John this is not sufficient to make the new topic relevant to the discussion currently in progress. John instead asks Zaid to establish the relevance of his proposed topic in terms of the ideas in the
instructions. It is interesting that Yusuf, rather than allowing this conflict in relevance to be resolved, immediately changes the topic to one of the suggested areas for discussion from the instructions.

When the Americans are talking about possible changes that they would like to see in their programs, the Indonesians often respond in a way that Americans could interpret as deflecting the thrust of their suggestions. This was seen in Example 53. One way this is done is by asserting that changes are not necessary in the particular area of ELT being looked at. After Paula asks for possible changes in materials, Endang says that the materials currently being used in their program are sufficient:

57. P: So here where Michael has written, "Discuss how the attitude you, uh, have agreed on affects your English program in such areas as the model of English to be taught in your classes, appropriate subject matter for English lessons and style of teaching and learning."

So the style of teaching you, we're saying is active, it needs to be active.

But what about the appropriate subject matter for the English lessons?

How do you feel about the materials that we've been using for this course?

Do you think it's appropriate for the students?

E: I think so because one, the AEL is for the pattern, how do you do pattern,
and, and the reinforcement is the structure.

Of course they should, should know the grammar first, should know the grammar, the structure [P: uh-huh] then they can use it appropriately.

P: Uh-huh, the only thing I, I could think of, I like all the text books that are being used.

I, the only thing I wish is that there was a text book something like Notion by Notion, or, um, uh, Side by Side, that was written using the culture of Indonesia [T: hm] in the items.

I 15.6-15

While Paula states that she is in general agreement with Endang's assertion, she still is able to find at least one possible suggestion for changing the material, thus satisfying the requirements set forth for the discussants in the instructions. In Example 58., Alice calls on the group to conclude. Notice that the conclusion statement given by Syarif does not directly reflect any aspects of the American's topic framework, although it does refer to a topic mentioned briefly, earlier in the discussion. This conclusion neither refers to the two ideas in the instructions, nor follows the Americans' process of concluding by giving suggestions.. Victor, however, feels that concluding the discussion is tied up with making suggestions and so asks what changes Syarif's conclusion would call for:

58. A: Well, should we just, um, [S: uh] conclude? [C: Ya (laughing)]
So we can go home

S: That's my conclusion, you know.
Accuracy and fluency must go together.

A: You said it.

Ok, so, I guess we could just...

V: Guess so...

Does that, does that call for changes or improvements in your English program or do you think that th-, your English program already does that?

S: Ya. Already does.

V: It already does it?

S: Uh-huh.

A: /?/

V: Ok, so, you don't need any changes, maybe.

He asks for...

II 54.21-55.14

But in response to Victor's call for improvements, Syarif asserts, much as Endang did, that the current program already fulfills the needs of the goal set forth in his conclusion. Victor then begins to point out (as he did in Example 47.) that the group has an obligation to make suggestions for change. The conclusion proposed by Syarif is derived from what he feels is already appropriate about the present state of English classes in Indonesia, and so it does not create a situation conducive to suggesting changes.
In the previous examples, Indonesians confronted the American desire to discuss change by presenting aspects of the ELT situation which deflected the issue of suggesting changes. Often the presentation of such realities in ELT go even further and become the presentation of obstacles which would make the suggested change impossible. In the following example, Syarif now demonstrates that he clearly understands that the application of the second of the two ideas implies the need for changes. However, he immediately presents evidence that such change is not possible, regardless of the fact that one may believe in this second idea:

59. S: I'll, I'll, I'll agree=  
   A: We've agreed.  
   S: =with you, you know, with Victor, that second, second idea is more appropriate, [A: uh-huh] but...  
   'There's a "but," a big "but" here.  
   I'm afraid we can't, uh, we can't /do/, due to some, say, handicaps, uh, obstacles, you know.  
   If you, uh, design [A: uh-huh] your instructions, [A: yes] you know, based on this second ideas, you have to have very good teachers.  
   I mean, uh, teachers who are very, really qualified, who speaks English, you know.  
   But in, uh, most high schools in Indonesia [uh-huh] they teach English, but they don't speak English, most of them do not speak English.
In a similar example, Yusuf has established that talk about "styles of teaching and learning" is relevant to the discussion (see Example 48.) when John then points out that a behaviorist view of ELT is one way not to approach the issue. Susuf accepts this as support for the topic he has raised previously, "student centered learning," and then proceeds to explain why this is not possible:

60. J: Well, uh, you know, [Y: hm] learning is not like, uh, uh, you know, completely stimulus and response where you have behavioral patterns [Y: ya] that are etched in your mind. [Y: uh-huh]

Y: Well, we talk about, uh, student active learning, but, uh, there, it doesn't work in Indonesia, because, uh, most Indonesians, you see, are too shy to, (laughing) to talk.

III 18.3-4

Not only specific changes, but also the broader notion of change in general is often considered difficult by the Indonesians because of circumstances outside the control of those who may wish to see it occur. Tom has just finished explaining that the group may want to take an idealistic point of view in order to suggest changes even if the changes are not possible (see Example 51.). Even before a specific change is suggested, Nani points out that change is difficult:

61. T: They may not even be that practical, 'but what might be some solutions.
Do you think that language classes need to be changed at the SMA level?

Or, it's OK, the training they get?

N: According to us, [T: ya] maybe Bu Endang, that's what she will teach.

But according to, to the department, I don't know, maybe yes, maybe not. [T: hm]

I 30.5-9

Nani states that even though she or Endang may wish to change their classes, the department where they teach still has the final say in the matter. Earlier in D-I, Tom points out that this reluctance to change because of circumstances outside the teacher's control is something that he has experienced with other Indonesians, aside from those in the discussion group, specifically with his students who are studying to be English teachers:

62. T: I have that with my FK students, like they still want, uh,

Let's say I teach a very active class,

But they still want me to help them with their more passive classes that they must teach at SMA.

And they want me to give them books on drills that I think would be good,

More relevant drills, let's say, or drills that Americans actually say,

Things like that,

And often that confuses me, because I think that they'll be able to take some of the, uh, work that I'm giving them to their class.
But they always tell me, no they can't

That that's university level and that there's a curriculum that they must follow

And, [E: ya] and they can't do anything but drills at school.

P: Is that really true, Endang?
E: Yes.

P: That's what is expected of the English teachers?
E: Yes.

So, well, it's very hard,

Because we have to teach according to the, to what curriculum says.

A: According to curriculum and according to book.
E: According to the, yes, to the text book.

I 6.15-7.11

There is an interruption here in D-I when someone inadvertently enters and leaves the room. Then Nani continues to describe the obstacle that prevents Indonesian teachers from changing the way they teach:

63. N: But according syllabus, we must use this book
    Uh, PK, is this right?
E: Yes, from PK.
A: From PK.
    So we cannot change that book.

I 8.1-5
Here the obstacle is the curriculum, syllabus, and materials prescribed by the Department of Education and Culture (PDIK). In addition, time limitations are also cited as a reason that teachers can not make changes even if they so desire, as does Endang:

64. E: I'll, I would like if they were have some reading exercise and writing exercise.

   But the time, it's impossible for us to make such a exercises in reading,

   I 8.18-19

In 62. Tom has presented a certain attitude toward change seen in his students as a situation with which he is unsatisfied and confused, and one which he still hopes to improve. The two Indonesian discussants, however, rather than exhibiting similar confusion or suggesting possible solutions, simply state that the problem is indeed the case, thus themselves exemplifying the very problem raised by Tom for discussion.

   Example 30., Section 3.2.2, illustrated how Yusuf saved face when a line he had taken was challenged. Repeated below, this example shows that Yusuf's line was in fact the presentation of an obstacle. John challenges Yusuf's line by presenting evidence that the problem does not in fact exist:
65. Y: But, uh, for beginners, it, you know, it would take too long, you see,

So, after talking about American situations and then, you know, talk about it, [J: well] /?/. 

For beginners, [it's too, too much 

J: [In our teaching situation we don't have a problem of too long.

III 12.2-7

The Americans also attempt to override the obstacles described by the Indonesians, by citing the ideas in the instructions and reminding the other participants in the group that these ideas should be used as a motivation for change.

66. P: That's the only way I can think that we can improve our lessons is, is if we took lessons such as those and reworked them so that it has more meaning for these students.

E: But, you see, as we've been, uh, told that learning a language is learning a culture, too.

So I think when you learn English you have to know the culture [T: Ok] also.

Well it's both, [T: but,] both together. [T: hm, P: uh-huh]

T: Then again we're talking about English belonging to native speakers.

I 16.1-5

Tom cites the first idea from the instructions as the reason that culture and language might be viewed as tied together and thus creating an obstacle to Indonesian students'
English study. Tom then suggests that the students do in fact need to be able to use English in their own environment, finally justifying his opinion in terms of the second idea:

67. T: So, I think that if we want to say that English belongs to those who use it, we have to think of approaches, un, to localizing the language so that we can use it right here and now.

I 16.11

In another example from D-I, Endang has just finished a long description of the negative attitude that many students have toward studying English when both Tom and Paula cite the second idea as a way of overcoming the problem:

68. P: So what can we do to improve students' attitudes, toward English?

T: [Well, there you have that English belongs to those who use it. [P: hm] Um...

E: Well, I guess for the certain... [T: huh]

P: So, it makes sense that ones, the ones who believe number one, English belongs to its native speakers, of course they have no interest, [E: ya] because they are, they are not from an English speaking country, [E: ya] and so what, what, why is it, um, important for them, or...

E: It's important because the government.

Well, the government make the curriculum.

I 27.7-13
Notice that as Paula is developing her claim that the students' poor attitude is based on their adoption of the first idea, Endang reintroduces another problem, the seemingly unchangeable nature of the government prescribed curriculum.

Finally, at one point when Endang asserts what might be interpreted as another fatalistically expressed obstacle, Paula, who is writing down suggestions that the group has made, is able to perceive the potentially suggestive force of what Endang is saying and express it in a more American way as another suggested change.

69. (28.5 second pause)

P: "That for any real change to take place at the university level, the English program in SMA needs to be changed also, to," should I say, to active?

E: Yes.

P: ...to active, to active mastery.

(30 second pause)

T: You're not feeling well, Ibu?

N: I got head ache.

T: Huh. Hm.

(20 second pause)

E: Yes, how can we hope an active mastery in the university if they have [/?: basic] passive mastery in the SMA,

Because learning language, we have to start from when we are young, not when we are [P: ya] old already.

E: So, [T: uh-huh] I, I, think not also, not only from SMA, but from, starting from SMP, [T: hm] the very beginning.

P: Even.

E: Even from [SMP.

P: [From SMA, so we'll just add that. [E: ya]

A: SMP, because level [T: uh-huh]

P: And then I added that then when the students reach the university level they'll be prepared for serious English study. [E: ya]

This example is interesting because, if Endang's statement about active and passive mastery of English is taken at face value, it appears to be another warning that university students will not achieve high English proficiency because of the nature of English training in high school. But in the context of the discussion Paula is able to see the implication of Endang's comment and incorporate it into the suggestions she is writing down. If poor ELT in SMA causes poor students at the university, then an improvement in the SMA will be necessary to produce an improvement at the university. Thus, while the obstacles to change that are often cited by the Indonesians might be viewed as the fatalistic acceptance of reality, another interpretation could be that the Indonesians are in fact focusing attention on the heart of the problem, found in the general ELT
context. And if the Americans' are still intent on suggesting changes, they should look to this broader context to see how change might be brought about.

Many of the previous examples illustrate that the Americans often equate the task of making suggestions for change with the task of concluding the discussion. The fourth task presented in the instruction sheet does request the participants to come up with suggestions for changing the ELT programs in which they work and the sentence in which this task is presented is introduced with the word "finally," marking it as the last task of the instructions. However, neither this nor any other task was explicitly labeled in the instructions as a concluding task. Nonetheless, Americans in all three groups introduced the notion of "concluding" the discussion:

70. P: So I guess here in his conclusion he's wanting us to write down "some suggestions..."

    I 20.2
    (see Example 50.)

71. V: How do we go a--, uh, have we, how do we go about concluding this?
    Do we want to take his method of concluding it and give suggestions, or...

    II 61.5-6
    (see Example 53.)
72. K: What other conclusions are we coming to?

III 30.12

The Indonesians in D-I never refer to the need to conclude. In D-III, Yusuf raises the issue of outlining some of the main points the group has discussed:

73. (7.5 second pause)

Y: So we are supposed to outline (laugh) some of the points, that's it?

III 24.13

However, he does not explicitly label this as a way of concluding the discussion. Yusuf's contribution is also an example of an Indonesian directing the flow of talk with a request for confirmation regarding the work the group is to perform. Yusuf does this with a request for confirmation.

In D-II, Syarif does raise the issue of ending the discussion. Just prior to the following example, the Indonesians had briefly excused themselves for sunset prayers. On returning they raise the issue of ending the discussion by asking whether or not this is in fact what the group is doing. It is an American who translates the idea of ending into the issue of concluding:

74. S: Are we coming to the end now?

A: Yes, we're concluding. (laughing)

S: Ok, you formulate, a conclusion.
A: And you'll just rubber stamp?

S: Ah, yes (C and S laughing) rubber stamp, that's right.

A: Well, well, I'd like to suggest, really, for, I think for some teachers who might stress number one too much, that they um, somehow, if they just drill too much with the correct, um, the correct sentences and the correct, um, even maybe with listening, if they only, if they only listen to what's on TV, I think maybe that's too difficult for them. [S: uh-huh]

This exchange is light hearted, but is also reminiscent of the initial two contributions to D-II (Example 7., Section 3.1.). Again, stereotyped roles are presented, humorously, for each group: the Americans are to formulate the conclusion, which the Indonesians are willing to accept even before hearing it. Thus the participants in D-II ironically and explicitly comment on a situation that has been observed in all the discussion groups, that the Americans have a much stronger commitment to the notion of concluding than do the Indonesians.

Looking back again at the opening sequences of the three discussions (Section 3.1.), a similar situation is apparent with regards to the notion of introducing. In D-I and D-II, Americans make the first move to establish the topic framework and goals of the discussion and in D-II an Indonesian explicitly passes this job to an American. Taken together these examples suggest that the Americans have
stronger interest in explicitly creating the form that the discussions will take. This should not be taken to imply that the Indonesians perceive the discussion as formless, but that they are more reluctant to explicitly create such a form.
CHAPTER FOUR
DISCUSSION

4.1. Politeness and relevance

Chapter Three examined the respective topic frameworks of the Indonesian and American participants in three discussion groups. How these topic frameworks informed the Americans' and Indonesians' contributions in dealing with the theoretical and situational contexts of the discussion and the task of suggesting changes in ELT was also discussed. Comments were also made on how the participants direct the organization of the discussion sessions in terms of initiating tasks the groups were to undertake and topics the groups were to discuss. The results are summarized below.

The Americans in this study:

1. Have a topic framework based on the two ideas in the instructions.

2. View the theoretical context of the discussion as primarily important.

3. Maintain the relevance of contributions by addressing the situational context of the discussion in terms of the theoretical context.
4. Make frequent suggestions for changing ELT.

5. Direct the discussion with regards to tasks the group is to perform.

The Indonesians in this study:

1. Have a topic framework based on the general ELT situation in Indonesia.

2. Maintain the relevance of contributions by addressing the theoretical context of the discussion in terms of the situational context.

3. View the situational context of the discussion as primarily relevant.

4. Present aspects of ELT that might hinder change.

5. Direct the discussion with regards to topics derived from ELT in Indonesia.

Comments were also made in Chapter Three concerning politeness strategies used by participants in terms of Brown and Levinson's (1978) model. Much of the work done by the participants was explicit, either without redressive action (bald on record) or with conventionalized hedges ("maybe, " "it seems," use of modals). Other contributions were made using negative politeness strategies which redress the hearer's desire not to be imposed upon. The strategies used by participants in this study will be reviewed to point out patterns of American and Indonesian politeness strategies in regards to relevance. These patterns will be show to be consistent with approaches to their respective maintenance of relevance and the direction of talk.
Bearing in mind the different topic frameworks involved, it can be seen that all participants in these discussions use on-record forms, without redressive action or with conventionalized hedging, to place their contributions within the context of their topic framework. For the Americans this means explicitly stating that what they are saying involves some aspect of the two ideas from the instructions:

35. Eight, but I don't because I say I agree with two, "English belongs to all those who use it."

55. I think I've been trying to make changes that are on the lines of the second idea.

For the Indonesians this involves clearly expressing the situational context of their contributions, often left-dislocating adverbials of place:

27. Uh, uh, have you been familiar, uh, with, uh, the English program at the junior or senior high school in Indonesia?

34. In Indonesia, there's is a, a kind of controversy, you know.

While both the Indonesians and Americans explicitly mark the situational or theoretical context of their respective topic frameworks in many of their contributions, it seems there is still a fundamental difference between the two. For the Indonesians, this process involves explicitly locating their
topic in Indonesia, that is, emphasizing a quality already inherent in the topic. For the Americans, this involves applying to their topic a theoretical construct taken from outside that topic. Whereas the Americans must make a connection between two disparate components of the discourse to maintain relevance, the Indonesians can maintain relevance without recourse to issues outside the topic they are addressing. The Indonesians' topic framework and the topics discussed within it are virtually coterminous, while there is a larger gap between the Americans' topic framework and the topics that are discussed within it.

It has been shown that the Americans in this study frequently reinterpret or occasionally challenge the relevance of other speaker's contributions. Sometimes the act of reinterpreting is done off record, although the reference to the topic framework is made explicit, as when Tom adds an additional comment about Endang's topic without explicitly marking it as an reinterpretation:

3. **Ya,** the approach there is very much that "English belongs to its native speakers."

More often the Americans go on record that they are rewording:

22. So you are saying if we take the attitude of number one and apply it in our classroom...
The Indonesians in this study generally do not try to fit other speakers' contributions into their own topic framework to the extent that the Americans do. When the Indonesians do do this, consistent with their topic framework the strategy is to emphasize the situational context of the current topic, only implying (off record) that the other discussant may want to reconsider the place his or her contribution has in the broad situation and so in the Indonesians' topic framework:

40. That's why I said to you just now that it has something to do with the aims of teaching English in Indonesia.

Explicit challenges to relevance are only made by the Americans, never by the Indonesians. These might be tied to the American topic framework:

48. I don't know how that necessarily comes from these two ideas.

or to a more general notion of relevance which simply demands that contributions fit into the discussion, without specifying how:

49. What does that have to do with the flow of ideas?
More interesting are the Indonesian reactions to such challenges to relevance. Twice Chalid responds to perceived challenges to his contributions deferentially by stating that he may have misunderstood (Examples 42. and 43.). He then accompanies a restatement of his position with a request for confirmation that his position is indeed valid. Chalid's initial response redresses the hearer's negative face by explaining why relevance may not have been maintained and thus may have caused an imposition on the hearer. The hearer's face is further redressed by Chalid's taking the responsibility for the irrelevant comment upon himself. His own positive face is redressed by offering an explanation for why his comment may have been irrelevant and thus may have distanced him from the group. Next Chalid restates his same position, indicating that he does not actually view his contribution as irrelevant, yet at the same time minimizing the imposition of his restatement by requesting confirmation of its validity. That Chalid shifts from on-record presentation of his view to an essentially negatively polite presentation implies the threat that he felt by the challenge. Yusuf acts with similar deference in response to challenges to the relevance of his contributions, conceding to the challenge (Example 55.) or questioning the possibility of a connection to one of the
two ideas (Example 49.). Only once does he defend the relevance of a challenged remark on-record, and here he does so by citing an aspect of the Indonesian topic framework (Example 48.).

A similar pattern of American and Indonesian politeness strategies is seen in how the discussants direct the flow of talk. The Americans tend to go on record when pointing out a task that the discussants should accomplish. These strategies were seen in the opening sequences of all the sessions when Americans pointed out the initial task that the group was to undertake. Further American on-record directing of the discussions is seen in the Americans' frequent calls for the participants to make suggestions for change and to conclude the discussions. When the Indonesians direct the flow of talk with regards to these same task oriented issues they do so with requests for confirmation that the discussion is indeed going in that direction:

17. Are we to discuss?
38. Have you decided yet, number one or number two?
74. Are we coming to an end, now?

This strategy for directing the flow of talk redresses the hearer's negative face by giving the hearer, at least on the surface, an option. The frequency with which this strategy
is used by some Indonesian participants in this study suggests that it may be a conventionalized form of politeness in Indonesian interaction. That it is not always recognized as such by Americans was shown in Example 38. On-record direction of the flow of topic by Indonesians occurs most frequently with the presentation of new topics to the group, topics relevant to the Indonesian topic framework and often drawn from the instruction sheet.

The Americans generally mark the maintenance of relevance in their own contributions and in the contributions of other discussants and direct the flow of talk toward tasks to be accomplished with on-record strategies that give little redressive action to face. In Brown and Levinson's model such strategies are generally used in situations viewed as minimally face threatening. The Indonesians on the other hand either use off-record strategies for correcting problems with relevance, or do not perform the act of correcting these relevance problems at all. In addition, they use deferential strategies to redress threats to face that could occur as the result of such attempts to explicitly control other participants' contributions to the discussion. These strategies are associated with more seriously face threatening acts.

The reinterpretation of another's words, challenges to the relevance of what another has said, and the expectation
that others will follow the direction in which talk is
guided, carry the potential for heavy loss of face. This
includes both loss of positive face by putting the hearer in
a position at odds with the rest of the group and loss of
negative face by imposing limits on the hearer's options.
However, a potentially face threatening act will often be
performed with minimal redressive action when the need to
perform the act is great. Thus the Indonesians appear to
view the control of talk, either directing its flow or
controlling the relevance of other's contributions, as
highly face threatening. The Americans on the other hand
appear to feel that the importance of exercising such
control is sufficient to warrant the use of less redressive
strategies. A synthesis of the results in the previous
chapter will show that these different approaches to the
face threatening quality of maintaining relevance and the
direction of talk are consistent with the participants'
differing topic frameworks and the relationship of these
frameworks to the work done in the discussion sessions.

The American participants in this study can be seen to
create relevance in their discussion groups. This creation
of relevance employs their topic framework which is based on
the two ideas in the instructions. Thus drawn from the
instructions, this American topic framework is transitory,
the result of the specific context in which the Americans
find themselves, for a period of an hour or so, as a result of having agreed to participate in this study. The extent to which the American participants may have considered approaching ELT in ways similar to either of these two ideas previous to joining the discussion groups, or remembered them afterwards, are coincidental to the organization of the discussion itself. It is the presence of these two ideas on the instruction sheet which legitimizes the Americans' topic framework.

The situational context of ELT in Indonesia is also important to the Americans. However, its importance is shaped by the way that actual aspects of this situation contribute to the understanding and application of the two ideas of the Americans' theoretically inclined topic framework. One of the tasks done by the Americans is to suggest possible changes in ELT. This task is laid out in the instructions and a place for it is further created in the discussions when the Americans tie the making of such suggestions to the notion of concluding the discussion. Making suggestions for change is consistent with how the Americans approach the theoretical and situational aspects of the discussions. By taking the two theoretical constructs of the instructions as the basis for the discussions, the Americans create a finely woven screen with which to filter aspects of the broader situational context.
that could be considered relevant to the discussion. In addition, when these constructs are applied to aspects of the ELT situation, their role as the primary topic framework insures that for the Americans, it will be the ELT situation, not the theoretical constructs, which can be compromised. This makes possible the suggestion of changes in the ELT situation, changes that may not be practical, but which are consistent with the topic framework in which the Americans are operating.

The primary, yet transitory, constructs of the American topic framework, the secondary role of the more concrete ELT context, and the hypothetical nature of the Americans' suggestions, make for a rather tenuous combination unless the Americans are able to create links between these disparate aspects of the discussions, thus firmly binding them together. The Americans frequently make explicit marking of the links they feel obtain, or should obtain, between their topic framework, aspects of the situation that are discussed, and the suggestions that are made for change, thus creating the relevance which holds the discussion together for them. The need to create relevance in the discussion is consistent with, and possibly a motivating factor in, the Americans' use of on-record control of relevance and directing the tasks to be undertaken in the discussion. The threat of possible collapse of the form the
Americans are creating for the discussion is great enough to override concerns for potential threat to face that may occur as a result of such control.

The Indonesians in this study are generally able to assume relevance within the discussion groups. The ability to assume relevance is tied to their topic framework which is based on the wider ELT context in Indonesia, outside the confines of the discussion sessions. From this perspective, the discussion groups are coincidental to the more fundamental realities of this ELT situation which have existed before the start of each discussion group and is naturally expected to remain essentially the same after the short time the groups meet. Thus the Indonesian topic framework is legitimized not by its tie to specific aspects of the discussion context, but to the more general situational context outside the discussion.

While the Indonesians do not ignore the theoretical constructs which exist within the discussions, these constructs are important only to the extent that they can be seen to fit into the Indonesian ELT situation, either by being susceptible to analogies drawn from this outside context or consistent with important aspects of this context. Thus the theoretical issues presented in the instruction sheet are but one facet of the broader situational context of the discussions. The Indonesians'
reluctance to suggest change and their presentation of obstacles to potential changes are also consistent with their topic framework. Only in the presence of an approach (like the Americans'), which attempts to put theoretical concerns above situational realities, and thus generates a rationale for change, would the presentation of situational realities as preeminent over theoretical concerns be viewed as the presentation of obstacles. In the context of a topic framework which accepts as primarily relevant the presentation of various aspects of the broader ELT situation, the Indonesians' reactions to the Americans' suggested changes can be seen as simply more examples of the application of their topic framework.

The broad and realistic base of the Indonesian topic framework, and the inclusion under this framework of a variety of aspects of the ELT situation, among them the more theoretical ideas from the instructions and practical aspects of the ELT situation that might be contrary to the application of these ideas, makes for a rather congruous combination, supported by a previously known context outside the confines of the discussion. The Indonesians in this study rarely initiate explicit marking of relevance because the topics they raise can usually be implicitly tied to the larger context, and thus relevance can be assumed. As long as participants speak to the general topic framework of ELT
in Indonesia, there is little danger of the discussion falling into that kind of disorder that the Americans guard against. The Indonesians' ability to assume relevance during the discussion sessions is consistent with, and possibly motivated by their concern for maintaining face in the interactions. The threat of possible collapse of the discussion is minimal and not sufficient to outweigh the need to maintain face against the threat imposed by explicit control of the discussion.

4.2. Implications for discourse analysis

The study of cross-cultural interaction is valuable to the development of the field of discourse analysis. When people of different cultures interact, bringing with them their differing assumptions about what to say and how to say it, difficulties in interaction regularly arise. These difficulties provide a means for identifying areas important to the study of discourse that may have gone unnoticed in the relatively smooth interaction of intracultural communication (Tannen 1984). A fundamental interactional difference between the American and Indonesian participants in this study, aside from their topic frameworks, is that the Americans generally need to create relevance, while the Indonesians generally can assume relevance. This phenomenon
has interesting implications for understanding Grice's Maxims of conversational cooperation.

These Maxims are generally interpreted in terms of speaker rules rather than hearer rules. Thus the Maxim of Relation is presented as the rule that one should "Be Relevant." Interestingly, this rule is exactly the one the Americans follow as they attempt to create relevance. The Indonesians may, to Americans, often appear to break this rule, yet they are clearly adhering to some interpretation of the Maxim of Relation. An alternative interpretation of this maxim needs to be found if the Indonesians are not to be viewed as blatantly uncooperative in their interactions.

Cooperation, by definition, is at least a two person enterprise and cooperative principles need to be understood in terms of interaction, thus placing part of the responsibility for cooperation on the hearer as well as the speaker. Thus, at least among the Indonesian participants in this study, the Maxim of Relation could be interpreted from the hearer's standpoint as "Assume Relevance." It is because of the expectation that relevance can be assumed that we find the deferential behavior of Indonesians when the relevance of their contributions is somehow challenged. The importance of the hearer's role in the establishment of relevance in this study suggests that more work needs to be done in the analysis of interaction to shed light on other
cooperative principles that are often viewed from only the speaker's point of view. In addition; further work in the cross-cultural application of cooperative principles and other interactional phenomena is essential to insure that our general understanding of discourse is not too heavily colored by our own styles of interactions.

4.3. **Implications for cross-cultural communication**

Up to this point, claims about the nature of Indonesian and American topic frameworks, maintenance of relevance and the maintenance of face have been safely limited to claims about the nature of the communicative styles of six Indonesian and six American colleagues who had met and interacted in groups of four at three separate universities on Sumatra. It is more dangerous to draw conclusions about Indonesian and American communicative styles in general from these specific encounters. However, when I have discussed the results of this study with friends and colleagues (both Indonesian and American) who have had experience in Indonesian-American interaction, the feelings of familiarity that they expressed (Tannen's "aha factor," 1984:38) encourage me to believe that the results of this study are at least partially generalizable. Another important, and indeed crucial, method for corroborating findings from a study such as that undertaken here, and thus for supporting
the generalizability of its findings, is to discuss the results of the analysis with the participants themselves (Tannen 1984). Unfortunately, this was not possible at the time the data for this study were collected: however, the suggestions about difference in Indonesian and American maintenance of relevance presented here should prove useful in designing further studies that will be able to take participant's post hoc reactions to the interaction into account. It should also be borne in mind that the styles of maintaining relevance presented in this study, regardless of their generalizability to other people, may be effected by change of speech event (say, a casual conversation rather than an arranged discussion group), power and distance (a tourist at the immigration office rather than university colleagues), and any of the other factors which can effect interaction. Further research is needed to gauge the effects of such factors on the maintenance of relevance.

Yet given that the findings of this study may be generalized, it is still difficult to suggest specific ways for changing Indonesian-American interaction. As Tannen (1984) has pointed out, simple awareness of how specific stylistic differences operate does not necessarily make it easier to alter our own styles during communication. And for me to direct specific suggestions on how to act in certain situations to either Indonesians or Americans would
be presumptuous. In addition, Scollon and Scollon (1983) have pointed out that when faced with the complexity of the modern world situation, those who participate in cross-cultural interaction cannot expect to learn the specific communicative styles of all those with whom they may come in contact. Rather, we must strive to develop an intercultural communicative style based on the acceptance of differences. It will be more valuable then to take what has been learned about interaction between certain Americans and Indonesians and apply it to the development of our understanding of cross-cultural communication in general.

The implications of this study for cross-cultural communication parallel the implications for rethinking Grice's Maxims discussed in Section 4.2. As participants in an interaction, we should be aware of our responsibility not only as speakers, but also as hearers and so, following the Indonesian example, should train ourselves to be able to assume relevance. By this I do not mean that we should presume that the relevance of others' contributions can be judged according to our own culturally conditioned criteria. Such a presumption would only insure that expectations about relevance would often not be met, thus fostering an assumption of irrelevance and with it an assumption of non-cooperativeness. Scollon and Scollon (1983) have suggested that in cross-cultural interactions "we must minimize our
impositions on others" (186). Thus we must assume that relevance does in fact exist in the contributions made by others, even if it is not immediately transparent to us. Taking this perspective makes it easier for us to refrain from imposing our own topic frameworks and judgements of relevance on others and gives us a motivation for looking within the interaction to discover clues for how the relevance of contributions made by those with whom we interact can be understood.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSION

The understanding of differences in communicative style is essential to understanding the difficulties that inevitably arise in cross-cultural interaction. This study has examined an aspect of communicative style, maintenance of relevance, that plays a role in difficulties found in Indonesian-American cross-cultural interaction. It has been shown that for the American participants in this study, relevance was maintained with reference to two theoretical concerns that they were presented within the context of discussion groups. The Indonesian participants in these discussion groups maintained relevance with reference to the broader ELT situation outside the confines of the discussion sessions. By emphasizing the primacy of the theoretical concerns, the Americans were comfortable with suggesting changes in the ELT situation, even when such changes may have been impractical, in order to maintain the integrity of the theoretical concerns. By emphasizing the primacy of the ELT situation, the Indonesians were comfortable with presenting evidence for the impracticality of such suggestions, even when the suggestions were desirable, in
order to maintain a realistic view of conditions obtaining in the world.

It was suggested that, possibly motivated by the need to tie the narrow theoretical issues of their topic framework to the more concrete situations they also discussed, the Americans tended to create relevance. The importance of creating relevance in order to insure the integrity of the discussion allowed the frequent use of on-record contributions by Americans, often with minimal concern for threat to face, in order to maintain relevance. The Indonesian participants operated within a broader topic framework which subsumed the theoretical concerns within its scope and allowed for the discussion of a multitude of specific topics, which were already part of the topic framework by their very nature. This provided for a context in which the Indonesians could generally assume relevance, and so they would use deferential strategies in dealing with the imposition made by the explicit creation of relevance.

The results of this study suggest that Grice's Maxims need to be understood from the hearer's as well as speaker's perspective. Thus the admonition for the speaker to Be Relevant can also be understood as a suggestion for the hearer to Assume Relevance. Similar implications were discussed for cross-cultural communication. Participants in cross-cultural communication, when confronted with
contributions that do not immediately fit into their understanding of what is relevant should not automatically assume irrelevance. Rather they should assume that relevance does in fact exist in such contributions and take upon themselves the responsibility for working toward an understanding of that relevance.
APPENDIX A
INSTRUCTIONS

The following set of instructions was given to the three discussion groups in this study:

As English has spread around the world as a means of international communication, many different attitudes have developed toward it by both native and non-native speakers. Here are two different attitudes which can have an effect on how English is taught as a second or foreign language:

1. English belongs to its native speakers.
2. English belongs to all those who use it.

As a group, please discuss these ideas and decide which seems more appropriate to your English teaching situation here in Indonesia. Discuss how the attitude you've agreed on effects your English program in such areas as, for example, the model of English to be taught in your classes, appropriate subject matter for English lessons, styles of teaching and learning, or other relevant areas.

Finally, as much as possible, try to reach an agreement within your group and briefly outline some suggestions for possible changes or improvements in your English program,
based on your attitude about native and non-native speakers' relationships with English.

This does not need to be a detailed analysis. Just take about 15 to 20 minutes to outline some of the main points that your group feels are important when thinking about how English is taught in an international context.
APPENDIX B
EXAMPLE TRANSCRIPTS

The following conventions were used in transcribing the
data and appear both in the examples in the text of this
thesis and in the three excerpts of transcripts appearing in
this appendix:

Segmentation is by utterance, defined as a stream of speech falling under a single intonation curve, bounded by pauses. Each utterance is single spaced, with double spacing between utterances. False starts and repetitions which adjoin complete utterances are included in the same single spaced segment with the complete utterance.

Pauses in talk of three or more seconds is indicated as an (n second pause).

[Closed brackets] within an utterance surround back channeling from other speakers which does not interrupt the flow of the primary speaker's talk.

Open [brackets connecting two lines indicate the beginning of an overlap between two speakers.

A double hyphens "indicates one speaker's single, unbroken utterance which has been split on the printed page because of an intervening utterance from another speaker.
(Parentheses) indicate extralinguistic phenomena such as laughter or outside noise.

/Words/ within slash marks indicate uncertain transcription (with the exception of Example 20., page 48, in which slashes are used to mark phonemic transcription).

A question mark within slashes, /?/, indicates that transcription was impossible.

Three points... indicate trailing intonation signifying an unfinished utterance.

The source of excerpts from the transcribed data that appear in the text of this study are indicted by a three part tag which includes 1) a Roman numeral indicating the discussion group, 2) page of transcript, separated by a point from 3) segment(s) or partial segment(s) on that page. For example,

I 3.5-7

indicates that the example consists of the fifth through seventh segments or partial segments on the third page of the transcript from the first discussion group.

The following excerpts include the first three pages of transcripts from each of the three discussion groups. Because of formatting restrictions, pagination cannot be reproduced exactly in the format which informs the tags given to the examples appearing in the text of this study; therefore, original page numbers are given as section headings.
Transcript I

Participants:

Paula
Tom
Endang
Nani

Transcript I, page one

P: Everything's already rolling, huh?
E: I think so.
T: I suppose so.
P: I guess so.

E: Well?
P: Here we go.

(5 second pause)

So I guess first we're supos-, we should look at these two statements at the top, [E: uh-huh] one and two, [E: hm] and decide what, what is the attitude,

(3.5 second pause)

Maybe here at PDPK first since we're all teaching here. [T: hm]

E: Well.

(5.5 second pause)

10 What do you think, Bu? Ibu?
N: The aim? At PDPK?
P: Ya. Does, do you think here, does English belong to it's native speakers or does English belong to all those who use it?

What do you think is the attitude here?
N: [I think English belongs to=]
15 E: [English belongs to all, =to those who use it.]
N: Yes, all those who use it
E: How bout you, Paula?
P: I think so, too.
N: I think that's probably the idea behind this program, is that.

Transcript I, page two

We can, we can produce secretaries who are able to work in international companies and to speak English as if they are a native speaker, or on the same level as native speakers, to have meaningful conversations, to be able to write meaningful letters.

(6 second pause)
So, we would say that PDPK would have the second attitude, huh?

(31 second pause)
E: But, but I think, well, well, we are teaching in, in PDPK, um, but the students, they are from SKA.

In SMA the, the aim of the English teaching is to have passive mastery, not active mastery.

So they don't have to speak appropriately. [P: uh-huh]
They only have to master it passively, not active. [P: uh-huh]

So I think it have, it has a co-, a relationship between their inability to speak now [P: uh-huh] with th-, their Eng-, uh, English learning at SMA. [P: uh-huh]

T: Ya. The approach there is very much that "English belongs to its native speakers."
E: Yes.

10 P: So, so the approach there is only that we want to understand what those people are saying.

They, [E: Ya] they work on looking at sentences and figuring out the meaning, but never to try and speak it themselves. [E: yes]

T: They study the language but they don't use it themselves [E: ya, yes] to express their own ideas.

N: There the practice isn't communication or in the other parts.

Only in the class room.

15 Outside in the classroom use, uh, Indonesian or it, uh, native language. [P: uh-huh]

Transcript I, page three

Is that right? [P: ya]

E: Uh, yes, because they are, uh, learning English as a foreign language, not as a second language [P: ya] here in Indonesia. [N: ya]

Uh, it's different in Singapore or Malay, I would think.

P: Ya, [but ac-

5 E: [But in Indonesia, as a foreign language,

so, uh, the aim is to have a passive mastery not [T: hm] active mastery. [P: ya]

T: In some of the other programs where I teach, I often find that the students want to mimic me rather than to express their own ideas. [P: ya]

And I try very hard to engage them in some kind of exercise where the focus is really on what they are thinking.

And not trying to be like me.
10 N: To express what you want to talk about. [T: uh-huh; P: uh-huh; T: ya]

T: To try and personalize the language. [E: ya]

P: So that's the attitude at SMA when they teach English.

What do you think the attitude, though, is at FK, the way English is taught there?

E: FK, for the English department. [N: hm]

15 I think they should have

N: They should practice teach.

E: =active mastery [P: ya] for the English department.

But for the other one, as long as they can read their text book that is written in English, that's the aim of the English teaching at the, uh, the other department, [P: uh-huh] in FK.

Transcript II

Participants:

Alice
Victor
Chalid
Syarif

Transcript II, page one

C: Can you start, please?

A: The old Indonesian way.

Uh, (noise) [S: sorry] um, well let me just clarify what I think these two things mean, "English belongs to it's native speakers, English belongs to those who use it."

I guess they mean, uh, when they say English belongs to its native speakers, like all those...
When native speakers use it they use very, they're very rich in idiomatic expressions [\?\??: yes]
and very particular,
much more subjective than let's say a, s-, a normal standard English.
"English belongs to those who, all those who use it,"
I mean if they can communicate with it and they can some how use it, it's, it's, it's Ok.

What do you think?
Is, is that what you think this is?
What do you think these two things are?
C: Well, it seems this refers to the teaching English in Indonesia, [A: ya]
You think so?
Uh, uh, I would like to, to introduce, very specially in Indonesia, the aims of teaching English. [A: uh-huh]
In Indonesia teaching is aimed at, uh, understanding, reading books [A: oh], the second, uh the first one.
And the second one, if there is a possibility for them to go abroad, especially to the United States of America or other, uh, English foreign countries [A: uh-huh] also Australia.
So both be able to understand the speakers of English there. [A: yes]
Now, so that, when we, we are forced now to, to choose, let's say to, to decide how English is taught as a second or a foreign language. English belongs to it's native speakers, or English belongs to all those who use it.
Now I think, "English belongs to it's native speakers" will be, will be much preferred.

A: But, what does it mean?

I mean, for example you choose "English belongs to it's native speakers".

How does that differ for you from English belongs to all those who use it?

C: (laughs) Probably I misunderstand, ya? Now, what I mean is uh, probably I misunderstand, uh [A: no, I uh] to comprehend this way.

How English is taught as a second, uh, two different attitude [A: yes] which can have an effect on how English is taught as a second or foreign language.

The first, the first attitude is that English belongs to it's native speakers.

Does it mean that in studying English in Indonesia, we should study English according to the language used by the native speakers?

Does it mean that?

What do you think, /Victor/?

V: I think so.

I think that this is possessive.

It means that the, you strive for imitation. [C: ya-ya]

The first one says that the students should try and imitate, [/?: ya-ya]

Whereas the second one may be saying that the students, or speakers of English may create or add on to the language rather than simply imitate. [/?: ya]
Well I think, ya, as far'as I can observe, you know, yes, in Indonesia this attitude is more appropriate, the first one, English belongs to it's native speakers.

How, you know, you speak English.

I speak English.

Transcript II, page three

But, we always say that you are native speakers of English.

C: I am not a native speaker [of English.

S: [No, I am not a native speaker of English.

V: And so therefore [S: ah] you must [S: ah] always listen to us? [S: ah] Um...

A: As the final rule of what the [language is.

V: [final rule.

A: Does that affect language teaching?

V: Yes.

A: How?

C: Because [you know,=

A: [How does it affect language [teaching?

C: Indonesian people [A: no, I] still regard that English is a foreign language.

In, English in Indonesian is not [A: yes] a second language

S: [Second language.

C: English is a foreign language.

But we, if this issue, you know, is discussed, in the, in the Philippines, probably, or Singapore, you know, the second...
S: Ya, [/?/; uh] English is a second [C: ya] language there.

A: So they would regard English belongs [C: uh] to all those who use it? [C: uh-huh; S: ya; V: oh, I see]

I don't see it.

What, meaning they, they just see it as English.

They don't care that, um, in quote, native speakers speak it,

Transcript III

Participants:

Kathy
John
Zaid
Yusuf

Transcript III, page one

K: Well, Zainal, [what do you think?

Z: [Wh-, what's the relation, the relation that he is trying to find out?

The relation between English teaching and the program here,

or the, why English is taught here?

J: Well, it's two ideas.

"English belongs to its native speakers."

"English belongs to all those who use it."

Now, what does that, what do those ideas have to do with English teaching, for us, here?
Does that make sense?

10 Y: (laughing) Ya.

What does "belongs" refer, refer to?

J: Possesses.

Y: Ya, "possesses" means, uh, that the, the, ya, the first, uh, statement means that only English native speakers learn English?

J: Only they possess the true English, [you could say].

15 Y: [Oh, I see.]

J: =I think that's what it means. [Y: hm]

Does that, does, do you read that into this?

Y: uh-huh.

K: Hm. Maybe not so much that they posses the true English but that they [J: uh-huh] truly posses it. [J: ok; Y: ya-ya; J: ya.]

20 There's a difference. [J; Ya]

Y: So, in my opinion is that in, uh, all the English people, the English native speakers use and learn English.

Transcript III, page two

That's number one.

And number two is that everybody can learn English and can use it.

J: I think the ideas are in opposition

Z: [Opposition.

5 Y: [Ya, that's right.]
J: They, they're in opposition, they're not in, uh...
   The first idea is trying to say something like, um,

Y: Pure English.

J: Ya, in other words if you speak a dialect or if you,
or if you use dialect [Y: uh-huh] of English, that
   would be incorrect.

10 Y: Oh, I see

J: Um, and the second one is that perhaps...

Y: Pidgin.

J: No, no, [Y: (laughing)] no, no, no.
   Uh, well, there's English in India [Y: ya], and Kong
   Kong [Y: Hong Kong] and Singapore [Y: ya, right]
   You could even say that, you know, the, even the
difference in America and England and Australia, [Y:
   hm] New Zealand.

Y: Oh, I see, oh, ya.

(5 second pause)
   So, are we to discuss?

J: That's right.

Y: (laughing)

(5 second pause)

20 I'll take number two, "English belongs to all those
   who use it."

Transcript III. page three

J: Ok. What do you think Zainal?

Z: Well, it's not, it's not really for me to say number
   one. [Y: ya (laughing)]
   Uh, does it mean that, uh, we are Indonesians of
   course, English is something else.
So we, we should have a, an attitude, uh, uh, English, whether you do it here or England or /former colony/,

Because English just belongs to the native speakers.

J: Well, I don't think that's the idea

I'm not really, I think maybe the way it's expressed here is a little bit confusing.

Y: Ya

K: Ya

10 Y: uh-huh, ya

K: But, maybe what it means is more like, um,

Other speakers of English who are non-native speakers of English can use the language, but...

Their opinions about it or their, uh the way they change the language or that kind of thing would...

They can't do that, basically

I think number one says, you know, um, the...

15 English is the possession of the native speakers,

And that other speakers who use English only may use the English as presented by, more or less, the native speakers and, and they don't have certain, uh, freedoms with the language.

Is that something [like what he's saying?]

J: [Ya, I think, I think there's, something like speaking, uh, correct English is a sign, is a sign of education, and so... [Y: hm]

um, part of what you said was that the non-native speaker can't change the language.
The following glossary includes Indonesian acronyms and words found in the examples cited in the text of this thesis and in Appendix B. The definitions only cover the sense of the words as used by the participants in this study, and are not meant to be complete.

Bahasa Indonesia: the Indonesian language
Bu: see Ibu.
dosen: lecturer at university.
FK: the school of teacher training at an Indonesian university.
Ibu: literally, mother; used as title and address term equivalent to Mrs. or ma'am; contracted as Bu.
PDPK: special, all female, university secretarial school.
PK: Department of Education and Culture.
SMA: equivalent to American high school, grades ten through twelve.
SMP: equivalent to American junior high school, grades seven through nine.


