

MS #3912 – Submission received for Australian Journal of Teacher Education  
Yahoo/Sent

- **Editors of Australian Journal of Teacher Education** <editors-ajte-3912@ro.ecu.edu.au>
- 

**To:** Soni Mirizon <smirizon@yahoo.com>

**Cc:** The Authors, The Editors

9 Oct 2017 at 10:56 am

A new submission for Australian Journal of Teacher Education has been uploaded by "Soni Mirizon" <[smirizon@yahoo.com](mailto:smirizon@yahoo.com)>.

The authors are:

"Soni Mirizon" <[smirizon@yahoo.com](mailto:smirizon@yahoo.com)>

"Ben Wadham" <[ben.wadham@flinders.edu.au](mailto:ben.wadham@flinders.edu.au)>

"David Curtis" <[david.curtis@flinders.edu.au](mailto:david.curtis@flinders.edu.au)>

The title is: "Integrated Content and Language Instruction: Lecturers' Views and Classroom Instructional Practices"

The keywords are:

language, content, lecturers' views, classroom practices

The disciplines are:

Curriculum and Instruction | Language and Literacy Education | Teacher Education and Professional Development

The submission has been assigned #3912. Please refer to this number in any correspondence related to the submission.

Authors may check the status of the submission, submit revisions, and contact editors via the following link:

<http://ro.ecu.edu.au/cgi/preview.cgi?article=3912&context=ajte>

---

Editors can access the management tools for this submission at:

<http://ro.ecu.edu.au/cgi/editor.cgi?article=3912&context=ajte>

Regards,

The Editors

Australian Journal of Teacher Education

---

---

Re: MS #3912 - Australian Journal of Teacher Education  
Yahoo/Sent

- **Rozita Dass** <editor-ajte-3912-2343757@ro.ecu.edu.au>

**To:** Soni Mirizon <smirizon@yahoo.com>

**Cc:** The Authors, The Editors

2 Apr 2018 at 1:52 pm

Dear Soni Mirizon, Ben Wadham, and David Curtis

We believe that your submission "Integrated Content and Language Instruction: Lecturers' Views and Classroom Instructional Practices" shows promise although we cannot accept it in its current form. We encourage you to revise your paper in light of the reviewers' feedback. If you decide to revise and resubmit, please do so within three months to facilitate continuation of the review process.

If you resubmit, please indicate the changes you have made to the original version by including a table on the first page of the revised manuscript detailing your responses to the review's comments. In addition, using highlighting within the article will assist the reviewers to identify the changes you have made.

To see the reviews, please go to the following page:

<http://ro.ecu.edu.au/cgi/preview.cgi?article=3912&context=ajte>

To submit a revision, use the Revise Submission link on that page.

Regards,

Rozita Dass  
Editor

Australian Journal of Teacher Education

---

Re: MS #3912 - Australian Journal of Teacher Education  
Yahoo/Sent

**Rozita DASS** <r.dass@ecu.edu.au>

**To:** Soni Mirizon <smirizon@yahoo.com>

**Cc:** Ben Wadham

5 Apr 2018 at 5:57 pm

Dear authors,

The email below with attached reviews was sent to David Curtis on 3/4/18.  
I am forwarding them to you in this email.

Kind regards,

Dr Rozita Dass  
Professional Practice Coordinator / Lecturer Language & Literacy Education  
School of Education | Edith Cowan University  
Associate Editor  
Australian Journal of Teacher Education

270 Joondalup Drive | JOONDALUP WA 6027

Tel: +61 863042377

Email: [r.dass@ecu.edu.au](mailto:r.dass@ecu.edu.au)

Web: <http://www.ecu.edu.au/schools/education> | [www.ecugetready.com.au](http://www.ecugetready.com.au)

<http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/>

CRICOS Institution Provider Code 00279B

ECU is Australia's Top Ranked Public University for Student Satisfaction

Re: MS #3912 - Australian Journal of Teacher Education  
Yahoo/Sent

- **Rozita Dass** <r.dass@ecu.edu.au>

---

**To:** Soni Mirizon <smirizon@yahoo.com>

**Cc:** ben.wadham@flinders.edu.au, david.curtis@flinders.edu.au

3 Jul 2018 at 8:41 am

---

It would be good if you can put that in a separate file.

Thank you.

Kind regards

Dr Rozita Dass  
Assoc Editor  
Australian Journal of Teacher Education  
<http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/>

**ECU is Australia's Top Ranked Public University for Student Satisfaction**

<https://www.education.wa.edu.au/wa-education-awards>

Show original message

---

This e-mail is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose or use the information contained within. If you have received it in error please return it to the sender via reply e-mail and delete any record of it from your system. The information contained within is not the opinion of Edith Cowan University in general and the University accepts no liability for the accuracy of the information provided.

CRICOS IPC 00279B  
RTO PROVIDER 4756

## Manuscript 3912 Resubmission

Yahoo/Sent

**smirizon** <smirizon@yahoo.com>

**To:** [Rozita DASS](mailto:editor-ajte-3912-2343757@dcecu.bepress.com) <editor-ajte-3912-2343757@dcecu.bepress.com>

**Cc:** Ben Wadham, David Curtis

9 Jul 2018 at 10:51 pm

Dear Rozita,

I have just resubmitted Manuscript 3912 to the AJTE Website.

In your last email, you told me to separate the Table Summary and The revised manuscript in two different files.

I got a problem when I wanted to upload the documents since there was only one file that I could upload for the revised manuscript. So I uploaded the Manuscript in its provided place, while the Table Summary was uploaded in the place that was supposed to be for uploading the Cover Letter.

Do you think it's okay? Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Regards,

**Soni Mirizon**

Sriwijaya University

South Sumatera, Indonesia

Re: MS #3912 - Australian Journal of Teacher Education  
Yahoo/Sent

- **Rozita Dass** <editor-ajte-3912-2343757@ro.ecu.edu.au>
- 

**To:** Soni Mirizon <smirizon@yahoo.com>

**Cc:** The Authors, The Editors

23 Jul 2018 at 11:52 pm

---

Hi Soni,

Your article has been sent for re-review.

We will let you know of the outcome when the reviews come in.

Kind regards,

Dr Rozita Dass  
Professional Practice Coordinator/Lecturer, Language & Literacy Education  
Edith Cowan University, School of Education  
270 Joondalup Drive, Joondalup WA 6027  
Phone: 6304 2377 | Fax: 6304 5850  
Email: r.dass@ecu.edu.au  
Web: www.education.ecu.edu.au

Re: MS #3912 - Australian Journal of Teacher Education  
Yahoo/Sent

- **Rozita Dass** <editor-ajte-3912-2343757@ro.ecu.edu.au>

**To:** Soni Mirizon <smirizon@yahoo.com>

**Cc:** The Authors, The Editors

24 Oct 2018 at 10:57 pm

Dear Soni Mirizon, Ben Wadham, and David Curtis

Thank you for the revisions you have made.

We believe that your submission "Integrated Content and Language Instruction: Lecturers' Views and Classroom Instructional Practices" shows promise although we cannot accept it in its current form. We encourage you to revise your paper further in light of Reviewer #4s' feedback.

If you decide to revise and resubmit, please do so within three months to facilitate continuation of the review process.

If you resubmit, please indicate the changes you have made to the original version by including a table on the first page of the revised manuscript detailing your responses to the review's comments. In addition, using highlighting within the article will assist the reviewers to identify the changes you have made.

To see the reviews, please go to the following page:

<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/cgi/preview.cgi?article=3912&context=ajte>

To submit a revision, use the Revise Submission link on that page.

Regards,

Rozita Dass  
Editor

Australian Journal of Teacher Education

---

---

Manuscript 3912 Resubmission  
Yahoo/Sent

- **smirizon** <smirizon@yahoo.com>
- 

**To:** Rozita DASS <editor-ajte-3912-2343757@dcecu.bepress.com>

**Cc:** David Curtis, Ben Wadham

7 Jan at 6:07 am

Dear Rozita,

I have just submitted the manuscript 3912 to the AJTE website.

Thank you for the opportunity to revise the manuscript that we submitted to your journal. We value the very helpful suggestions made by the reviewers. We have attended to all the reviewers' suggestions.

We trust that the revised manuscript now meets the standards required by your journal and that it will be published in a forthcoming issue of the journal. We are looking forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,

**Soni Mirizon**  
Senior Lecturer  
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education  
Sriwijaya University  
Indonesia

---



Re: MS #3912 - Australian Journal of Teacher Education2

Yahoo/Sent

- **Rozita Dass** <editor-ajte-3912-2343757@dcecu.bepress.com>

**To:** Soni Mirizon <smirizon@yahoo.com>

**Cc:** The Authors,The Editors

29 Jan at 5:05 pm

Dear Soni Mirizon, Ben Wadham, and David Curtis

Congratulations! After careful review, your article "Integrated Content and Language Instruction: Lecturers' Views and Classroom Instructional Practices" has been accepted into Australian Journal of Teacher Education subject to minor revisions.

When you are satisfied that you have addressed the reviewers' feedback, please upload your revision including a table on the first page of the revised manuscript detailing your responses to the review's comments.

Please make sure that your paper adheres to the formatting requirements at <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/styleguide.html>.

At this time we request that you download our Publication Rights Form from [http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/publication\\_rights.pdf](http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/publication_rights.pdf).

Please fill out this form and email it to [w.bartuccio@ecu.edu.au](mailto:w.bartuccio@ecu.edu.au).

The current version of your submission is available here:  
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/cgi/preview.cgi?article=3912&context=ajte>

You may also view the reviews and preview your submission on that page. To submit revisions, use the Revise Submission link on that page.

Regards,

Rozita Dass  
Editor

Australian Journal of Teacher Education

---

Manuscript 3912 Resubmission  
Yahoo/Sent

**smirizon** <smirizon@yahoo.com>

**To: Rozita Dass** <editor-ajte-3912-2343757@dcecu.bepress.com>

4 Feb at 7:58 am

Dear Rozita,

I have resubmitted the final revision of Manuscript 3912 to Australian Journal of Teacher Education website as requested. Really expect that it will be published in the AJTE soon.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

**Soni Mirizon**  
Senior Lecturer  
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education  
Sriwijaya University, South Sumatera  
Indonesia 36362

---

## REVIEWERS' COMMENTS AND REVISIONS

### Reviewer's 1 Comments and Revisions:

No	Reviewer's 1 comments	Revisions
1	<b>Comment [11]:</b> Surely we want to know what they do and whether they have the pedagogical knowledge and skills for language teaching ( <i>Abstract</i> ).	This issue is discussed in the Findings and Discussions section
2	<b>Comment [12]:</b> It would be good to mention that the study relates to the Indonesian context ( <i>Abstract</i> ).	It has been mentioned as follows: This study provides information for policy makers, teacher educators, and content teachers to understand how the policy is articulated and how it is implemented in the Indonesian teaching context.
3	<b>Comment [13]:</b> How is this possible? ( <i>Introduction</i> )	The first sentence in the first paragraph has been removed. The paragraph has been modified.
4	<b>Comment [14]:</b> Are these high schools? Are there just a few or is the plan for all schools to be SBI? ( <i>Introduction</i> )	These questions have been answered as follows: International Standard Schools [ <i>Sekolah Berstandar Internasional</i> , SBI]. Through SBI, the Indonesian government tries to build schools that are able to foster the advancement of Indonesian education. This is mandated in the Law No.20/2003 about the system of national education which authorises central and regional governments to develop at least one school in each education level as an SBI (Government of Republic Indonesia, 2003). In a similar vein, Government Decree No. 19/2005 about the Standards for National Education specifies that the central government should work together with the local government to establish at least one primary and one secondary school per district which could be promoted to SBI status (Government of Republic Indonesia, 2005). At SBI schools, English has been endorsed as the medium of instruction for content subjects, primarily Mathematics and Science.  This legislative change of integrating the teaching of content subjects and English requires schools to make relevant preparations in order to manage schooling optimally. The teacher is one of the key determinants of successful instruction in SBI.
5	<b>Comment [15]:</b> Do they just have to be proficient in English or know how to teach it? ( <i>Introduction</i> )	Yes, they have to know both, as revised below: Thus, these schools require qualified teachers who are competent in their content subject and proficient in English, as well as know how to teach it.
6	<b>Comment [16]:</b> But surely it is not without its problems? ( <i>Literature Review</i> )	No comment
7	<b>Comment [17]:</b> What does this sentence mean? It doesn't seem to say anything? ( <i>Literature Review</i> )	The sentence has been removed.
8	<b>Comment [18]:</b> By whom? ( <i>Literature Review</i> )	By the curriculum because SBIs focuses on <i>language conscious content teaching</i> curriculum, as explained below: Although teachers are qualified in both areas, yet in teaching they should not act too much on either side,

		unless the curriculum focuses on either side. If the curriculum is more focused on either side of the continuum, they obviously need to demonstrate whether they are more subject-focused or more language-focused in the instruction (Snow, 1998). In SBIs, although teachers are required to be competent in their content subject and proficient in English, but since the curriculum adopts language conscious content teaching, in teaching and learning process teachers are more subject-focused.
9	<b>Comment [19]:</b> Why? ( <i>Literature Review</i> )	ibid.
10	<b>Comment [110]:</b> OK, but what evidence do we have one way or the other? ( <i>Literature Review</i> )	Evidence has been provided: Ellis, Tanaka, and Yamazaki (1994) point out that there are relatively few studies which attempted to show that comprehensible input actually leads to acquisition of new linguistic features. Additionally, there are theoretical objections to the position adopted by Krashen; for instance, it has been pointed out that the processes of comprehension and acquisition are neither the same nor related (Ellis, 1991; Faerch & Kasper, 1986; Gregg, 1984; Sharwood Smith, 1986; White, 1987).
11	<b>Comment [111]:</b> This section explains the theory but where is the empirical evidence? I would have expected a review of research into CBI. ( <i>Literature Review</i> )	Evidence has been provided: Levine and McClosky (2013) argued that learners who are advanced in the social language are not necessarily articulate in the academic language since there is no relationship between the two. Only those learners who possess academic language mastery will gain academic achievement. Research in the areas of integrated content and language instruction, such as the research in Mathematics and Science classrooms, shows that content has its own language: “[t]he language is specific or definite, precise or clearly expressed, and logical” (Levine & McClosky, 2013, p. 122). For instance, English terminology used in the subject of Mathematics may have meanings distinct from general English (Pimm, 1987). Thus, learners may flounder in their attempts to use terminology in Mathematics and, consequently could become extremely discouraged, unless the teachers provide necessary guidance (Cantoni-Harvey, 1987). Similarly, reading about Science is not the same as doing Science. In scientific texts, ideas are developed logically and associated with a number of linguistic features, such as word repetition, use of paraphrasing or semantically similar terms (Kessler & Quinn, 1987). In short, proficiency in the second or foreign language is necessary for learners to be successful in learning Mathematics and Science taught in the target language. Thus, it is the level of second or foreign language development that is one of the obvious factors influencing Mathematics and Science achievement (Levine & McClosky, 2013, p. 123). Learners need to master the language of Mathematics and Science first in order to achieve success in Mathematics and Science instruction (Lemke, 1990).
12	<b>Comment [112]:</b> We need a lot	The required information has been given:

<p>more information here. What happened in the interviews, how were they run? Were they structured? How many classroom observations were there and how were they carried out. What did the survey ask? Etc. (<i>Method</i>)</p>	<p>Data were collected through face to face semi-structured interviews with 12 lecturers, 4 classroom observations of 4 lecturers by lead author, and a survey questionnaire to which 20 lecturers responded.</p> <p>The semi-structured interviews comprised a set of key questions and were audio-recorded and lasted approximately 45-50 minutes each. The interviews were aimed to obtain information about the lecturers' academic backgrounds, teaching experiences, their views on teaching contents in English, challenges encountered, preparations made, resources and support provided, information about students' socioeconomic, linguistic, and academic backgrounds, and lecturers' instructional practices. Initially, participants were invited to take part in the interviews and were informed that participation was optional and that they had the right to withdraw at any time. Following their agreement to participate, the interview aims were revealed and they were requested to sign consent forms. The interviews took place after all the participants responded to the survey questionnaire and were conducted on the participants' most-convenient time in their offices.</p> <p>The conducted classroom observations focused on lecturers' classroom instructional practices. It was conducted to see directly how integrated content and language instruction was actually carried out in the classroom. It was meant to find out the consistency of participants' information obtained from the interviews and questionnaire. All the four classroom observations were videotaped and an observation grid was filled after consent of the participants was obtained. The observation grid that framed classroom observations was created based on the principles of second language pedagogy, content-based teaching, and task-based language teaching with the aim of recognising specific lecturer behaviour during teaching and learning content in English in the classroom which focused on six aspects: content, language, teaching and learning activities, teacher-student interaction, teaching learning sources, and environment. This means of collecting data was used to examine whether there were differences in lecturers' classroom instructional practices, to investigate the reasons for the differences, and to determine any specific influencing factors. Prior to commencing the observational mode of data collection, the participants were informed of the study's purpose and asked to sign the consent forms. They were given freedom to withdraw from the study at any time.</p> <p>The survey questionnaire aimed at obtaining information regarding lecturers' views on teaching content in English in the program. It was crucial to get their impression regarding integrated content and language instruction implementation. This questionnaire was adapted from Tan's (2009) with her permission. The questionnaire consisted of 23 statements with a four-point Likert</p>
---	--

		<p>response scales. The item-response options were worded positively from <i>Strongly Disagree</i>, <i>Disagree</i>, <i>Agree</i>, to <i>Strongly Agree</i>. Score ranges from 1 (minimum) to 4 (maximum). The statements in questionnaire were formulated to represent four specific factors: (1) lecturers' views towards the policy of teaching content in English (4 items); (2) lecturers' views of the support/resources provided to aid policy implementation (4 items); (3) lecturers' views of their own linguistic competence and content mastery (7 items); and (4) lecturers' impressions of students' content mastery and linguistic competence (8 items). Questionnaire validity was checked via factor analysis. Scales with high reliability (Cronbach's alpha exceeds 0.70) and relevant to a certain construct were used, while the scales with low reliability and irrelevant to a certain construct were dismissed.</p> <p>Data from interviews were recorded and transcribed followed by member checking to build the trustworthiness (Lincoln &amp; Guba, 1985). Coding process was then carried out to identify major themes. The analysis of classroom observation was based on principles of CBI by identifying whether certain indicators emerged in teaching and learning activities. The data obtained from questionnaire were analysed using descriptive statistical analysis (Allen &amp; Bennet, 2010), while the data obtained from interview and classroom observation were analysed using thematic analysis (Babbie, 2010; Rivas, 2012; Silverman, 2011). Finally, a triangulation of data from interviews, classroom observations, and questionnaire was accomplished to draw conclusion.</p>
13	<p><b>Comment [113]:</b> How do you know? How is this defined? (<i>Findings and Discussion</i>)</p>	<p>Findings from the interviews also demonstrated lecturers' positive views of integrated teaching of Mathematics and Science in English, especially among those who are proficient in English. Almost all of the respondents who were willing to participate in the interviews had very good English proficiency, although it was self-reported (see Table 1). It could be proved from the interviews sessions. English-proficient lecturers managed the interview conducted in English well, while the less-proficient ones preferred to have it conducted in mixing Bahasa and English.</p>
14	<p><b>Comment [114]:</b> Surely it is just as likely to increase the fear of getting it wrong? (<i>Findings and Discussion</i>)</p>	<p>No comment</p>
15	<p><b>Comment [115]:</b> This is rather surprising. It makes me wonder what power relationships are at work here. Do they feel obliged to say this? We need more background information about the participants, researchers and other factors that may contribute towards interpretation of the results. (<i>Findings and Discussion</i>)</p>	<p>It has been answered as follows: Similarly, lecturers with less proficiency in English, although initially disagree with the policy, were open-minded enough with the policy of teaching Mathematics and Science in English. They were aware it was their responsibility to teach the content although they are less proficient in English. It made them motivated to improve their English competence: ..... Such a comment expressed above may seem strange; how</p>

		<p>come somebody who was not really proficient in English (in productive skill, such as speaking), like participant 2, viewed the policy of teaching content in English positively, not an opposing one, like his counterparts who did not want to take part in the interviews. In the interview session, demographic data related to every participant, such as educational background, years of teaching experience, English proficiency, experience in using English in prior Education and in working, working atmosphere, power relationship, and position held at the university were asked. The data obtained showed that all of the interview participants had at least 10 years to 30 years teaching experience at the university. Half of them had doctoral degree qualification from English-speaking country universities. Although the rest had master's degree qualification, three of them completed their study in English-speaking countries. This credential indicated that they were experienced lecturers and had involved in English used as a means of instruction since they were students in higher education. It implied that at least every of them had excellent passive mastery of English (listening and reading), though it may not be the case in terms of the active mastery of English (speaking and writing) to some participants such as participant 2. Although his English active mastery was not as good as his English passive mastery, but he had an experience how importance English is in pursuing higher degree (at the time the interview was conducted, he was continuing his doctoral degree in another university in the city). His experience dealing with the importance of English in pursuing higher degree triggered him to provide such response expressed above.</p>
16	<p><b>Comment [116]:</b> One wonders how the students fared? (<i>Findings and Discussion</i>)</p>	<p>This is part of a study that included students' views but those results are not report in this paper.</p>
17	<p><b>Comment [117]:</b> As suggested above, this needs more critical discussion around the relationship between the researcher and participants as well as how the interviews were set up. What did the survey suggest? (<i>Findings and Discussion</i>)</p>	<p>The question has been answered, as follows:</p> <p>The quotes above reveal that all lecturers participating in the interviews, whether they are proficient or less proficient in English, acknowledge that the policy of integrated teaching of Mathematics and Science in English has positive impacts on their academic skills, that is, it raises their motivation to use English and increases their Content Knowledge, as expressed by participants 1, 2, 5, 7, and 11.</p> <p>Participant 5 who is proficient in English reported that her experience as the former head of the Chemistry Education study program taught her about the importance of having good English mastery. She used to attend special interest group meetings in her field where information was frequently delivered in English. This kind of meeting required her to be able to communicate and share ideas in English. In particular participants 7 and 11, although they realized that they are less proficient in English, they admitted that having good English proficiency would give them more benefits; they could access more knowledge</p>

		<p>since most resources are written in English. Being qualified in their subject area and mastering English skills, they believed, could make them able to access more information in their disciplines. If they are resourceful, they would become knowledgeable and able to develop their professionalism in doing their job well.</p> <p>This information is not contradictory to the data obtained from survey. Although there were some lecturers with limited English proficiency taking part in the survey and showed sentiments towards the policy of integrated teaching of Mathematics and Science in English but they did not participate in the interviews. Only those who are proficient and less proficient in English fulfilled the invitation for the interviews; and both expressed their positive views on the policy.</p> <p>During the data collection process, the participants were very informative and felt free in expressing their views. They were not obliged to say something against their views. Although the lead researcher also worked in the same faculty in the university as the participants did, but they worked in different department. They sometime met in certain official events held by the faculty. They know and respect each other as colleagues and maintain collegial relationship. However, the lead researcher was not involved and was not part of the integrated teaching of Mathematics and Science in English policy implementation managed by the faculty. In conducting this study the researcher put himself as an outsider in order to obtain valid and reliable data.</p>
18	<p><b>Comment [118]:</b> To help with English? (<i>Findings and Discussion</i>)</p>	<p>Yes, both content and English, as indicated in the following revision:</p> <p>This was meant to provide students with different learning resources available from various sources. For example, participant 4 taught Calculus 1 subject using textbook discussing <i>Definite Integral</i> topic, then he supplied the students with handouts he wrote or research articles written by other authors, but were related to the same discussed topic. This way would provide students with alternative additional information to understand the topic previously discussed in the classroom. In addition, some self-study English resources related to the language features used in the content discussed were also provided, such as the use of passive construction, clauses, modality, etc. to support the understanding of the learning materials.</p>
19	<p><b>Comment [119]:</b> It's difficult to imagine what this might involve, without further explanation or examples. (<i>Findings and Discussion</i>)</p>	<p>Further explanation and example are given, as follows:</p> <p>Since ISSTE students encountered more challenges in studying content in English and the program demanded more of them, lecturers thought that they deserved to learn more than the mainstream students hoping that it would help students in understanding the teaching materials. As other lecturers, participant 4 reported that he was aware of the challenge that students faced in learning content in English since not every students possessed good English proficiency. Therefore, one of the ways to assist students was through enriching the content taught</p>



		<p>by providing broader range of resources related to content taught in the classroom such as handouts, papers, and online sources written in English. This was meant to provide students with different learning resources available from various sources. For example, participant 4 taught Calculus 1 subject using textbook discussing <i>Definite Integral</i> topic, then he supplied the students with handouts he wrote or research articles written by other authors, but were related to the same discussed topic. This way would provide students with alternative additional information to understand the topic previously discussed in the classroom. In addition, some self-study English resources related to the language features used in the content discussed were also provided, such as the use of passive construction, clauses, modality, etc. to support the understanding of the learning materials. During classroom observation, it was witnessed that this maths lecturer tried his best in presenting a topic in the Calculus 1 class using English as clear as possible and at the end of the meeting he gave such supplementary materials to learn after class.</p>
20	<p><b>Comment [120]:</b> It seems a shame that they had to be teaching in English before they adopted what should be common methods in any class. (<i>Findings and Discussion</i>)</p>	<p>When classroom observation was carried out in participant's 3 class while she was teaching the <i>Animal Structure</i> subject in <i>Terrestrial Animal Respiratory</i> topic, she put students in group works to have discussion and presentations. Students made use of ICT to search for learning materials, downloaded animation from internet, prepared slide presentations, and took turns giving presentations. Making most use of ICT was possible in this class since the internet connection was free and fully available in the university. Furthermore, ICT use was relevant when the teaching is conducted in English because so many more online resources are available in English compared with Bahasa.</p>
21	<p><b>Comment [121]:</b> We could have done with this information earlier. (<i>Conclusion and Implications</i>)</p>	<p>Information has been added. See comments above about reporting dissonant views when we report the favourable ones in the <i>Findings and Discussion</i> section in the article.</p>
22	<p><b>Comment [122]:</b> So, the university lecturers are training high school teachers who I presume will also be expected to teach in English. It would be more revealing to know what the trainees thought. (<i>Conclusion and Implications</i>)</p>	<p>This concern has been answered below: Lecturers' views on the implementation of integrated Mathematics and Science teaching in English had impacts on their classroom instructional practices. When they taught the ISSTE classes they applied different approaches, which they did not do when they taught the same content subjects in the mainstream classes. Modifications were made in enriching content taught, applying appropriate teaching methods or strategies, making use of various teaching media, and assessing students learning. They were meant to assist students to understand the content taught in English and to reach the target of the program. They realised that they were training prospective secondary school teachers who were also expected to teach content in English later. This effort was certainly not easy to do since it was related to students' readiness in learning content in English, as well. Although not all students seemed to show the readiness, these lecturers were willing to take the chance of doing</p>

		their best. Yet, it was not possible to discuss what the students thought due to the word limit for this paper.
23	<b>Comment [123]:</b> Or they wanted to keep their jobs? ( <i>Conclusion and Implications</i> )	This question has been answered, as follows: However, they were motivated to improve their English competence. They were willing to make efforts, as they saw positive sides of teaching and learning content in English (Brown, 2007). Strong attachment to the institution where they were working was also another factor that made them available for the program. They graduated their first degrees from this university and were promoted to be permanent lecturers. It made them really involved with their profession and wanted to make their best for the program; not simply wanted to keep their jobs. When confirmed, findings from classroom observation were in line with it.
24	<b>Comment [124]:</b> So is there any focus on language teaching pedagogy? Where do they fit in the spectrum presented in the lit review? ( <i>Conclusion and Implications</i> )	The answers are provided as follows: Thus, those modifications may help students understand content taught in English to some extent but will depend mainly on the students' English proficiency. At this stage of learning, students are in the stage where context-embeddedness is either high or low but cognitive demand increases (as figured in quadrant III and IV of Cummin's framework). At this point, students face more difficult topics which require more demanding language proficiency. Thus, the use of supports that lecturers provided, e.g. applying appropriate teaching methods or strategies, making use of various teaching media, assessing students learning, and enriching content taught through online resources and additional English language resources can reduce the cognitive load imposed by the requirement for students to understand complex concepts while also having to understand technical terms in a foreign language. In other words, no matter what sophisticated teaching methods or strategies are applied and/or diverse teaching media used by lecturers, they will not be much help in making students understand the content taught in English if the students' English proficiency is still limited. It implies that effective implementation of integrated Mathematics and Science teaching in English should also be supported by students' good English proficiency. What lack from the lecturers' instructional practices was that there was no focus on teaching language. Focus was mainly put on teaching content. There was no overt attention of English provided related to the content taught. Since this was the case, students' linguistic and cognitive development is disadvantaged. In other words, if content is simply taught through a foreign or second language without overt attention to linguistic support, learners' second or foreign language proficiency is unlikely to develop (Cummins, 1981; Snow, Met, & Genesee, 1989).
25	<b>Comment [125]:</b> And the pedagogy for language teaching?? ( <i>Conclusion and Implications</i> )	Yes, certainly required, as explained below: Moreover, lecturers' very good English proficiency would not suffice; it should also be accompanied by their pedagogy for language teaching, their knowledge about

		<p>Content-Based Instruction framework and how it works in their teaching context. In most cases where students are expected to learn a second or foreign language, the teachers would have specialist pedagogical knowledge about language teaching. Although in majority these lecturers were English-proficient and had experience in English medium instruction during their prior study but they lacked of pedagogy for language teaching. In addition, they were unfamiliar with the Content-Based Instruction framework. Horn (2011) claims that in order to manage successful integrated content and language instruction, content teacher should ideally possess advanced language skills and the pedagogy for language teaching that will support him or her to fulfil the need of a range of language-use tasks which include classroom management practices and CBI framework.</p>
26	<p><b>Comment [126]:</b> Overall, I would have expected some critical discussion of these surprising findings that teachers view these potentially threatening changes in a purely positive manner. Why would they? I would like to see consideration of how much we can rely on what the participants reported in terms of their attitude, and also the attitudes of the trainee teachers. We need an evaluation of how credible and reliable these reports are. (<i>Conclusion and Implications</i>)</p>	<p>This comment has been addressed by some comments made above and the following statement:  In addition, what also lacked from the instructional practices in this program was the absence of collaboration or partnership between the content-specialist with language-specialist. Collaborative work or partnership between Mathematics and Science lecturers and lecturers of English within the institution should have been made and put into practice. It can take many forms. It may be in terms of team teaching, where a lecturer of English helps content lecturers discuss language aspects or skills during teaching and learning activities in class. It may take form of support for content lecturers before class in terms of language aspects or skills they need to discuss with students or of arranging what language aspects or skills need to be included in content curriculum at the time of its development. Another form may be content lecturers can ask for language lecturers' assistance to correct tasks or tests they have administered (Dale &amp; Turner, 2012, p. 21). Sustained content and English lecturers collaboration may also be in the forms of consultation (seeking advice from each other), information exchange (sharing information with regard to students), shared decision-making (coming together to arrive at a consensus on a certain action), and cooperative participation (co-teaching, co-development of curriculum) (Pawan &amp; Ortloff, 2011, p. 466). Research showed that the majority of content-area specialist interactions are characterized by cooperation, collaboration, and/or team teaching (Dunley-Evans &amp; St. John, 1998; Teemant et al, 1996).  All in all, lecturers' views towards the integrated teaching of Mathematics and Science in English policy may affect their classroom instructional practices. As indicated by the findings of this study, lecturers' positive views were the reflection of their good English proficiency, strong attachment to their institution, strong pedagogical knowledge, and relevant content area qualification. These credentials contributed to the teaching modifications in their classroom instructional practices. Such</p>

		<p>modifications were aimed to assist students in learning the content in English. It may be helpful to some extent, but it still depends on the students' English proficiency and readiness to learn, as well. Lecturers' pedagogical competence for language teaching in addition to strong content knowledge mastery is definitely required. Besides, collaboration or partnership between content-area and English specialists is also demanded. Last but not least, lecturers' understanding on how CBI works in integrated teaching of Mathematics and Science in English context is compulsory and needs to put it into practices in order to succeed in implementing the program.</p>
--	--	---

### Reviewer's 3 Comments and Revisions:

No	Reviewer's 3 comments	Revisions
1	<p>There is an interesting gap in the way in which this article is set up. Despite the title of the article, there is no reference at all to Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). There is no inherent reason not to pursue this study as an example of Content Based Instruction (CBI), but the absence of any reference to one of the most rapidly increasing approaches to this kind of endeavour, and one that has come to dominate over the last few years is surprising. It suggests (a possibly unwarranted) lack of familiarity with current literature that needs to be addressed.</p>	<p>This reviewer's 3 first point asks about CLIL. Information about CLIL has been added in the <i>Literature Review</i> section of the article, as follows.</p> <p>A similar instructional approach, one of the most rapidly increasing approaches to this kind of endeavour and has come to dominate over the last few years in European context is <i>content and language integrated learning</i> (CLIL) (Marsh, 2002). This approach is a blend of both language teaching and content teaching, as opposed to a separation of each (Marsh, 2008). Coyle, Hood, and Marsh (2010, p. 1) describe CLIL as "a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language. That is, in the teaching and learning process, there is a focus not only on content, and not only on language. Each is interwoven, even if the emphasis is greater on one or the other at a given time". CLIL is implemented in contexts where an additional language (not the prominently used language of the context) is used for teaching and learning content or school subjects other than the language itself (Marsh &amp; Lange, 1999). CLIL has been rendered into various formations within and across countries, indicated by diversities in terms of curricula, targeted content area, selected languages, selected students, materials, teaching methodology, assessment, and teacher training (Marsh, Maljers &amp; Hartiala, 2001).</p> <p>If both definitions are examined, CBI and CLIL essentially refer to educational settings where a language other than the students' mother tongue is used as a medium of instruction to learn content. This is a dual-focused educational approach in which a second or foreign language is used for learning and teaching both content and language (Coyle, Hood &amp; Marsh, 2010; Dalton-Puffer, 2007).</p>

2	<p>A second gap is in the transition from the data to the findings. Although the methods of analysing the data are reported, the findings are presented uncritically. There is little sense of how the specific examples cited relate to the broad thread of the responses or to the individual circumstances of the responders. It is, broadly speaking, unusual for a cohort of staff in this kind of situation to respond universally positively to the challenges to their own English proficiency that engaging with content teaching represents. This is not to throw doubt on the findings, but rather to indicate that we need to understand more about who the respondents are, how their life histories have shaped their paths to this institutional positioning and why they have responded in this particular way. At the moment, none of this information is presented. How do the four responses cited in the first findings section relate to the responses from the other 16 members of staff? Which ones came from interviews? Which ones from the survey? Was it the relationship between survey and interview responses? Can the responses be equated? Who conducted the interviews? What is the relationship between the interviewer and the respondents and between the interviewer and the program as a whole? Was the survey anonymous? Which language was the survey/interview conducted in? Are the responses in the original language or have they been translated?</p>	<p>This reviewer's 3 second point relates to some of the points made by Reviewer 1. These comments have been addressed by following many of R1's comments as stated in the article, such as:</p> <p>The participants of the study were the lecturers of Mathematics Education, Biology Education, Physics Education, and Chemistry Education, in the Mathematics and Science Department of the Faculty of Education in an Indonesian university selected purposively. They were appointed teaching this program based on some criteria such as having at least ten years teaching experience, possessing excellent or good English proficiency, having experience studying overseas for their higher degrees and qualified in subject areas taught (as stated in the <i>Method</i> section of the article)</p> <p>As indicated by the findings of this study, lecturers' positive views were the reflection of their good English proficiency, strong attachment to their institution, strong pedagogical knowledge, and relevant content area qualification. These credentials contributed to the teaching modifications in their classroom instructional practices (as stated in the <i>Conclusions and Implications</i> section of the article).</p> <p>The four responses cited in the first findings represented the other 8 members of the staff participating in the interviews. The data from the survey were represented in the summary, while the ones from the interviews were represented in quotes, as indicated in the revisions of the <i>Findings and Discussion</i> section.</p> <p>The lead researcher conducted the interviews. He worked in the same faculty as the respondents, as indicated in the <i>Findings and Discussion</i> section, as follows:</p> <p>During the data collection process, the participants were very informative and felt free in expressing their views. They were not obliged to say something against their views. Although the lead researcher also worked in the same faculty in the university as the participants did, but they worked in different department. They sometime met in certain official events held by the faculty. They know and respect each other as colleagues and maintain collegial relationship. However, the lead researcher was not involved and was not part of the integrated teaching of Mathematics and Science in English policy implementation managed by the faculty. In conducting this study the researcher put himself as an outsider in order to obtain valid and reliable data.</p> <p>The survey was not anonymous. The respondents were asked to write their names on the questionnaire. This was meant to double check the data from survey and interviews.</p> <p>The survey questionnaire was written in both English</p>
---	--	--

		and Bahasa in order to provide an ease for the respondents to choose which language they were comfortable with so that they would give the most appropriate answers based on their choices. The interviews were conducted in either English or Bahasa. English-proficient participants preferred the interviews given in English, while less English-proficient participants asked the interviews in Bahasa. Responses in Bahasa were then translated into English (as indicated in the <i>Method</i> section).
3	<p>There are quotes from participants 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12. There are no quotes from any participant with a number greater than 12. Does this mean that the responses are all from people who completed the interview (even if some of the responses are survey responses)? Are Participants 7 and 10 2 of the 3 respondents who disagreed with the goals of the program? Which participants were observed?</p>	<p>This reviewer's 3 third point has been addressed as follows.</p> <p>There were 20 lecturers responded to the survey but only 12 of them participated in the interviews. Those quotes are from those who completed the interviews. Findings from the survey questionnaire revealed that more lecturers had positive views towards the policy of integrated content and language instruction or integrated teaching of Mathematics and Science in English which was indicated by the mean score of the responses: 2.75 (68.7%) for <i>factor 1</i>; 3.00 (75%) for <i>factor 2</i>; 3.28 (82%) for <i>factor 3</i>; and 2.37 (59%) for <i>factor 4</i> respectively. In average, 71% of the lecturers showed positive views towards the policy, while the other 29% expressed an alternative view. When the demographic data of the latter were further examined, it was revealed that their English proficiency was limited; therefore it was logical why they expressed an alternative view. Explanation about this was given in the <i>Lecturers' Views towards Integrated Content and Language Instruction</i> section of the article, Findings from the interviews also demonstrated lecturers' positive views of integrated teaching of Mathematics and Science in English, especially among those who are proficient in English. Almost all of the respondents who were willing to participate in the interviews had very good English proficiency, although it was self-reported (see Table 1). It could be proved from the interviews sessions. English-proficient lecturers managed the interview conducted in English well, while the less-proficient ones preferred to have it conducted in mixing Bahasa and English. Demographic data indicated that most of those who participated in the interviews did have better English proficiency. Of those 12 participants taking part in the interviews, classroom observations were conducted to the classes of participant 3 (Biology Education class), participants 4 (Mathematics Education class), participant 6 (Physics Education class), and participant 10 (Chemistry Education class). Explanation about this was given in the <i>Impacts on Classroom Instructional Practices</i> section of the article.</p>
4	In the conclusion, it is stated that 3/12 of the interviewees disagreed with the approach. We don't know	<p>This reviewer's 3 final point can be addressed as follows.</p> <p>Actually there were three interview participants who</p>

	<p>which ones they were and how they are represented in the data.</p> <p>The conclusion also states that there is a connection between lecturers' (higher) proficiency in English and the enthusiasm with which they embraced the program, but there is no evidence presented to support this claim.</p>	<p>disagreed with the policy (3 out of 12—participants 2, 7, and 11) as indicated in the quotes and explanation about the quotes. However, they managed to be involved teaching in the program with certain reasons as indicated, as represented in the quotes and their explanations.</p> <p>Findings of this study reveal that lecturers positive views on the implementation of integrated Mathematics and Science teaching in English was the reflection of their good proficiency in English in addition to their experience using English in prior education studying overseas for postgraduate degrees in English-speaking community (as indicated in the participants' demography of survey data). They were confident teaching content in English (as indicated in the quotes of interview data). Explanation about this has been added in the <i>Conclusion and Implications</i> section of the article.</p>
5	<p>This article needs substantially more work. The findings are potentially very interesting since they appear to be a case of a positive embrace of a challenging approach to teaching. However, at the same time, the report makes clear that this embrace is not universal. What this means is that we need to understand much more about which teachers responded in which ways and why. We need more information about the research process itself, the context of the innovation, the demographics/life histories of the staff who replied and the relationships between different responses. If these different kinds of information can be connected into a story of why/how university staff can be enabled to positively embrace challenging innovations to practice, a significant contribution will have been made, but that requires much more work than the current version, which appears to want to generalise on the basis of partial and disconnected extracts identified on the basis of unclear criteria.</p>	<p>These comments have been addressed in the revisions made in the whole article.</p>