

Intensive and Extensive Speaking: Approaches to Systematizing The Speaking Skills Courses for Undergraduate ELE Students

Chairil Anwar Korompot¹⁾

Baso Jabu²⁾

cakorompot@unm.ac.id

Abstract: This article presents a proposal to implement intensive speaking (IS) and extensive speaking (ES) approaches to teaching English speaking courses to student teachers of English in Indonesia. The courses are taught at PBI, an undergraduate English language teacher education program at a university in eastern Indonesia. Speaking courses have been taught at PBI since its first establishment over 58 years ago. However, the lack of effort to make each speaking course a part of speaking course ecology has caused problems such as unclear objectives, competency standards, materials, instructional activities, and assessment. Therefore, systematization of the speaking courses is in order. The authors' own self-initiated reviews, previous research outcomes, a review of literature indicate that the speaking courses should ideally be systematized using IS and ES. That is, IS is used to teaching the first two beginning speaking courses, and ES to teaching the other two upper-level speaking courses, and/or an additional course on teaching speaking. PBI has never considered adopting such a proposal in its own curricular revision and course development. The adoption and its justification will inform similar institutions both in Indonesia and in the other parts of the world.

Keywords: *Intensive and extensive approaches, speaking skills, students teachers of English*

Abstrak: Artikel ini menyajikan usulan bagi penerapan pendekatan intensive speaking (IS) dan extensive speaking (ES) untuk mengajarkan beberapa matakuliah (MK) keterampilan berbicara bahasa Inggris (speaking) bagi mahasiswa calon guru bahasa Inggris di Indonesia. MK-MK tersebut diajarkan di PBI, program studi sarjana pendidikan bahasa Inggris di sebuah universitas di Indonesia bagian timur. MK-MK speaking telah diajarkan di PBI sejak didirikan pertama kali lebih dari 58 tahun yang lalu. Namun, kurangnya upaya untuk membuat setiap MK speaking menjadi bagian dari ekologi MK speaking telah menyebabkan masalah seperti tujuan, standar kompetensi, bahan ajar, kegiatan instruksional, dan penilaian hasil belajar yang tidak jelas. Karena itu perlu ada sistematisasi MK-MK speaking. Hasil tinjauan mandiri, data dari penelitian sebelumnya, and kajian kepustakaan oleh kedua penulis menunjukkan bahwa dua MK speaking tersebut seyogyanya disistematisasi menggunakan IS dan ES. Artinya, IS untuk mengajarkan dua MK speaking pertama, dan ES untuk dua MK speaking yang lain pada tingkat menengah, dan/atau MK keterampilan mengajarkan speaking sebagai tambahan. PBI belum pernah mempertimbangkan usulan seperti ini dalam proses revisi kurikulum dan pengembangan MK. Penerapan dan penjelasan gagasan ini akan menambah perspektif LPTK pendidikan bahasa Inggris baik di Indonesia maupun di belahan dunia yang lain.

Kata-kata kunci: *Pendekatan intensif and ekstensif, keterampilan berbicara, mahasiswa calon guru bahasa Inggris*

¹⁾ *Teacher Educator, English Department, Faculty of Languages and Literature, Universitas Negeri Makassar, South Sulawesi*

²⁾ *Professor of ELT, English Department, Faculty of Languages and Literature, Universitas Negeri Makassar, South Sulawesi*

In initial teacher education (ITE) institutions around the world, students of undergraduate English Language Education (ELE) programs are required to pass the main English skills courses of study (also referred to as subjects), including listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These linguistic and communicative competence courses are considered as essential for developing student teachers' language proficiency (Lafayette, 1993; Vélez-Rendón, 2002), among other things.

Although the language skills are equally important and complementary, speaking skills are generally considered as the most observable ones. Therefore, in the Indonesian context of English teacher education, speaking courses have, since decades ago, been included in the main curricular components of all ELE programs in Indonesian ITEs (Mistar, 2005).

One such program is the Undergraduate English Language Education (ELE) Study Program at Universitas Negeri Makassar (UNM), an ITE university in eastern Indonesia which was first established over 58 years ago. This study program has been accredited by the National Accreditation Body (BAN-PT) with the highest grade (A) for two consecutive five-year periods, making it one of the most reputable programs at UNM and arguably in the South Sulawesi Province and eastern Indonesia region as well. For the purpose of this paper, the ELE program is referred to as PBI which stands for pendidikan bahasa Inggris (Indonesian phrase for ELE).

Table 1. Speaking courses in PBI's 2015 Curriculum

| Year | Semester | Speaking Skills Course | Credit |
|------|----------|---|--------|
| 1 | 1 | Intensive Integrated English Course (IIEC - Speaking) | 3 |
| | 2 | Basic Speaking | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | Intermediate Speaking | 2 |
| | 4 | Advanced Speaking | 2 |

In the teaching of all the English skills courses at PBI (see the table above), speaking courses are recognized as compulsory and

conditional. This means that it is a must for all students to enroll in and pass the speaking courses, and that passing a speaking course at a lower level is a requisite for taking another speaking course at a higher level.

One of the issues with PBI's English speaking skills curriculum is that it lacks the competency standards or reference for each of the courses. The successive administrators and faculty members have not been able to work collaboratively to decide the approaches to be adopted for teaching the courses, deciding the learning outcomes, carrying out the activities, developing and using the materials, and doing the assessment.

Having been assigned to teach the speaking courses since 2005 and confronted by the above problems, the first author of this article decided to embark on an attempt at examining and investigating the English speaking curriculum at PBI. These include self-initiated reviews of the IIEC Speaking course from 2015 through to 2019, two ministry-funded research projects on Basic Speaking (Korompot, 2018; Korompot & Wello, 2017) and Intermediate Speaking course (Jabu & Korompot, 2019), and self-funded projects on the Advanced Speaking course from 2016 through to 2018.

The above efforts have led to a number of conclusions. The most important one is that PBI's English speaking curriculum should adopt the intensive speaking (IS) and extensive speaking (ES) approaches (see the table below). The rationale for these approaches is described in the ensuing sections.

Table 2. Instructional approaches proposed for teaching speaking courses at PBI

| Speaking Course | Approach |
|---|----------|
| Intensive Integrated English Course (IIEC - Speaking) | IS |
| Basic Speaking | IS |
| Intermediate Speaking | ES |
| Advanced Speaking | ES |

The above reviews and research projects were informed by a review of the literature on:

1. IS and ES;
2. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR);
3. Thematic Approach to Materials Development (TAMD) (Korompot,

- 2018); and
4. Define, Design, Develop, Disseminate (Four-D) Model (Thiagarajan, Semmel, & Semmel, 1974).

Drawing from the outcomes of two research projects on Basic Speaking conducted in 2017 and 2018, which concluded that the Basic Speaking course should be taught in an intensive way (Korompot, 2018; Korompot & Wello, 2017) due to the mixed-abilities background of the students and the nature of the course, it was decided that an empirical study on the next two speaking courses, i.e. Intermediate Speaking and Advanced Speaking, was in order. Funding for the project, however, was only recently available for a study on an instructional model for the Intermediate Speaking course (Jabu & Korompot, 2019), while funding for the Advanced Speaking and IIEC courses is expected to be available around 2021 or 2022. Nonetheless, the guiding principles for further research on the two courses have been conceptualized and are presented here, hence this piece of writing.

The purpose of this article is to provide a rationale for adopting the IS and ES approaches to teaching the English speaking courses at PBI. As previously stated, the rationale is based on the review initiatives and research studies done with the involvement of the authors and on the scholarships of IS, ES, CEFR, TAMD, and Four-D Model. Due to space, however, only a review of the literature on the IS and ES approaches is presented in the ensuing sections.

Intensive Speaking (IS)

In a nutshell, IS is essentially an extension of the earlier concept on the teaching and learning of reading skills, which is intensive reading (IR), to the teaching of speaking skills.

IR itself is defined by Bamford and Day (1997), as “careful reading...of shorter, more difficult foreign language texts with the goal of complete and detailed understanding.” This suggests that IR is a traditional way to teaching reading skills, and this is due to the following characteristics:

1. The reading materials are selected and decided by the teacher;
2. The reading activities and related activities such as grammar and vocabulary are initiated and carried out by the teacher;
3. All the reading activities are conducted in the classroom—especially those related to answering comprehension questions

- based on the reading passages; and
4. The assessment of learning outcomes is done exclusively by the teacher. (see also Al-Homoud & Schmitt, 2009).

When the definition of IR above and its principles are extended to the teaching of speaking, then the speaking equivalence for IR is IS (Korompot, 2018). According to Korompot (2018) who further interpreted the above definition, IS may be referred to as a speaking instructional approach which puts emphasis on engaging the students in oral activities in an intensive way with the guidance and help /from the teacher (teacher-led/teacher-assisted). The main aim is to develop students’ accuracy in speaking the target language.

Furthermore, if the definition of IS is implemented in the ITE context in Indonesia, the application is as follows:

1. Students are directed by the lecturer to master the skills and oral elements by reciting segmentals, suprasegmentals, and complete speech;
2. Students are instructed to read aloud or perform verbal and communicative discourse tasks; and
3. Students are taught to use their listening, reading and writing skills in the oral activities they carry out, etc.

Therefore, the lecturer “runs the show” in the classroom. He or she is the one who plans and chooses teaching materials, guides and manages classroom activities and exercises, provides corrective feedback, and carries out learning assessments.

The characteristics of IS sessions indicate something very similar to the “other-regulation” approach (Thornbury, 2005: 41-48) in teaching oral skills, which is aimed at increasing awareness-raising and appropriation activities. “Other-regulation” here means that the learning process is regulated and implemented by the lecturer (“other”) and the students are at the receiving end of the process.

Extensive Speaking (ES)

ES emerged as an answer from the area of speaking skills instruction to the development of an extensive instructional approach mentioned earlier, namely extensive reading (eg Al-Homoud & Schmitt, 2009; Bamford & Day, 1997; Herder & King, 2012); extensive writing (Sun, 2010); and extensive listening (Renandya & Farrel, 2011; Renandya & Farrel, 2010; Widodo & Rozak, 2016).

Sun (2010) and Gu and Reynolds (2013)

are to be credited for extending the discourse of extensive instructional approach to the teaching of speaking. In this paper, ES is specifically used to refer to an instructional approach to teaching speaking in the context of PBI. As the oral version of ER, ES is defined by interpreting ER in the context of speaking skills instruction. The most important characteristics of an ER program are as follows:

1. Students read large amounts of printed material;
2. Students choose what they want to read;
3. Students read a variety of materials in terms of topic and genre;
4. The material students read is within their level of comprehension;
5. Students take part in post-reading activities;
6. Teachers read with their students, thus serving as role models of good readers;
7. Teachers and students keep track of student progress; and
8. Teachers provide help and guidance where needed. (Adapted from Renandya, Rajan, & Jacobs, 2009, p.184).

In their interpretation of the above characteristics, Gu and Reynolds (2013) introduced their 10 principles of ES, as shown in the table below:

Table 3. ES principles based on ER characteristics (adapted from Gu & Reynolds, 2013)

| No | ER Principles | ES Implementation |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | Material is easy. | The language produced by students must be at or below their level. |
| 2 | Provide wide variety of materials and topics. | Suggests lots of topics—related/ not related to class themes. |
| 3 | Learners can choose what they read. | Always allow “free topic” talks. |
| 4 | Learners read as much as possible. | Schedule daily time for ES work; allow additional talks via the Internet. |
| 5 | Reading purpose is pleasure. | Make activities required, but ungraded. |
| 6 | Reading is its own reward. | Make activities ungraded. |

| No | ER Principles | ES Implementation |
|----|---|--|
| 7 | Reading speed is faster rather intensive cases. | Allow students to produce independently |
| 8 | Reading individual and silent. | Not silent, of course, but talks are individual (feedback from teacher). |
| 9 | Teachers orient and guide. | Teachers do not grade but provide positive feedback and encouragement. |
| 10 | Teacher is a role model reader. | Teachers create talks on the scheduled class topics for students to listen to and interact with. |

Based on Gu and Reynolds’ description, 10 main principles of the application of ES for teaching undergraduate ELE students are proposed in this article using a framework made by Widodo and Rozak (2016). This is shown in the following table.

Table 4. The main principles of ES (Adapted from Widodo & Rozak, 2016, p. 230)

| No | ES Principle | Explanation |
|----|---|--|
| 1 | Speaking material is easy. | The level and scope of the material should fall within the remit of students’ language capacity or repertoire. |
| 2 | A variety of speaking materials in terms of a wide range of topics must be available. | Students should have access to speaking materials outside of the classroom using modern technology. |
| 3 | Students should select their own speaking topics and activities | Students should be given autonomy to decide whether to use the materials available or make their own. |

| No | ES Principle | Explanation |
|----|---|---|
| 4 | Students should have the chance to use English orally as much and as frequent as possible during various stages of the course. | Opportunity for students to speak should be adequately and continually available to develop fluency, complexity, self-confidence, and accuracy in speaking English. |
| 5 | The purposes of speaking pertain to asking for and expressing opinions about local, regional, national, and international issues. | Speaking activities place much emphasis on meaningful interaction. Students need to understand the topics, know the details, and talk about them enthusiastically. |
| 6 | Frequent speaking opportunity in and outside the classroom is its own reward. | Students should spend time speaking English as part of their lived experience. This builds speaking autonomy. |
| 7 | Speaking is a meaning-making activity; it's not about saying something is correct or incorrect. | While speaking, students focus on the gist or discourse of spoken texts. They construe meaning from a certain perspective. |
| 8 | Speaking is personal. | Students speak English at their own pace and convenience. They have their own speaking agendas. |

| No | ES Principle | Explanation |
|----|---|---|
| 9 | Lecturers play roles as scaffolders and co-speakers who always support students' learning to speak and speaking to learn. | These roles are important because a teacher provides learners with a supportive learning environment. |
| 10 | Lecturers are role models of speaking. | The teacher should demonstrate how to do and sustain ES. |

Proposal for Systematization

This paper is guided by a central question: "What proposal can be made to PBI in regards to the application of IS and ES principles in the English speaking skills courses?" To provide an answer to this question, a proposal for systematization is described in the ensuing sections, each of which pertains to each of the four English speaking courses that PBI has to offer, beginning with IIEC (Speaking) and concluding with Advanced Speaking and an additional course.

To begin with, however, it is important to be aware of the generic timetable of each of the courses (see the table below).

Table 5. Generic course timetable at PBI

| Week | Activity |
|------|------------------------------|
| 1 | Introduction to the course |
| 2 | Lecture/Session/Unit/Task 1 |
| 3 | Lecture/Session/Unit/Task 2 |
| 4 | Lecture/Session/Unit/Task 3 |
| 5 | Lecture/Session/Unit/Task 4 |
| 6 | Lecture/Session/Unit/Task 5 |
| 7 | Lecture/Session/Unit/Task 6 |
| 8 | Mid-semester test |
| 9 | Lecture/Session/Unit/Task 7 |
| 10 | Lecture/Session/Unit/Task 8 |
| 11 | Lecture/Session/Unit/Task 9 |
| 12 | Lecture/Session/Unit/Task 10 |
| 13 | Lecture/Session/Unit/Task 11 |
| 14 | Lecture/Session/Unit/Task 12 |
| 15 | Lecture/Session/Unit/Task 13 |
| 16 | Final semester test |

At PBI, each course runs for approximately four months in a semester, and it consists of a total of 16 face-to-face/classroom sessions.

Due to the introduction to the course in the first session, a mid-semester examination session at the end of the second month (the first half of the semester), and a final-semester examination at the end of the fourth month (the second half of the semester), there is a total of 13 weeks available for classroom sessions. This means that there are between 6 and 7 classroom sessions in each half of the semester in which teaching and learning processes take place.

Therefore, the implementation of IS and ES approaches in the speaking courses, as well as the other courses at PBI follows the framework of the sessions described in Table 4.

Course 1: IIEC (Speaking)

IIEC (Speaking) is a course designed for providing the basics of oral English competencies to freshmen at PBI. It is a part of an intensive and integrated, four-skill course which includes listening, speaking, reading, and writing, designed for newly admitted students. Each of these courses is taught by a lecturer.

In lieu with the Semester Credit System (SKS) applied by all universities nationwide and stated in UNM academic regulations, an IIEC course carries 3 credit units (1 credit unit translates to 50 minutes of classroom session). This means that each week, an IIEC course consists of 150 minutes of classroom session, 180 minutes worth of a structured assignment, and another 180 minutes worth of an independent task.

Given the goal of IIEC (Speaking) course on developing a solid foundation for students' English proficiency, and given the mixed-abilities background of the students, it is proposed that this course be focused on developing the students' skills in pronouncing the essential English vocabulary. This consists of words, sentences, discourses, and expressions. These sets of basic vocabulary is used in various materials centered around the familiar themes such as the self, letters and numbers, family members, abilities, residence, jobs, personal belongings, qualities and quantities, food and beverages, hometowns, places, landmarks, daily routines, past experiences, future plans, etc. Referring to CEFR, IIEC is at the A1 level.

Speaking activities in IIEC will take place exclusively within the classroom and the lecturer will play a central role in developing

student's oral English proficiency, ensuring that the students are able to pronounce the words taught and used as accurately as possible.

The above skills and components mean that an IS approach to teaching should be adopted. Therefore, IIEC (Speaking) needs to be characterized and implemented as an IS course.

Course 2: Basic Speaking

Basic Speaking is the speaking course for freshmen who have passed the previous IIEC (Speaking).

As stipulated in the Semester Credit System (SKS) and UNM regulation, a Basic Speaking course carries 2 credits, which means that each of its weekly allocation consists of 100 minutes worth of classroom session, 120 minutes worth of a structured speaking assignment, and another 120 minutes worth of an independent speaking task.

The objective of this course is to further develop and solidify the basic oral English skills that the students have obtained from the previous semester. It is expected that the students are able to engage in short monologues and dialogues using the sets of basic vocabulary developed through the previous four IIEC courses and the new ones introduced in this course. In essence, students talk with each other about themselves and their immediate environment, which includes their parents, relatives, friends, neighbors, house, school, village or city, country, etc. Based on CEFR, this course is still at the A1 level.

As with IIEC (Speaking), Basic Speaking activities will take place within the classroom and the lecturer will still play a central role in developing student's oral English proficiency, making sure that the students pronounce the words and sentences correctly, and engage in basic conversations accurately, fluently, and with self-confidence.

Therefore, it is proposed that Basic Speaking is taught using an IS approach as its main principle. Nonetheless, the lecturer may allow some degree of an ES approach by enabling students to interview or compare their thoughts and feelings with students from the other cohorts.

Course 3: Intermediate Speaking

Intermediate Speaking is an upper-

beginner or lower intermediate level speaking course designed for sophomores who have passed the previous IIEC (Speaking) and Basic Speaking. In other words, it is a course for the third semester students in their second year.

As mandated by the Semester Credit System (SKS) and UNM regulation, Intermediate Speaking carries 2 credit units, each of which translates to 50 minutes. This means that each of its weekly classroom session runs for 100 minutes. It also means that the students are required to spend 120 minutes working on a structured speaking assignment and another 120 minutes on an independent speaking task.

The objective of this course is to enable the students to express their feelings and thoughts about local, regional, national, and international topics with their classmates, students in the other cohorts, and, more importantly, other people outside their campus, as long as those people speak English and agree to participate.

Based on the indicators of CEFR’s A1/A1+ level, at which Intermediate Speaking is categorized, the topics for discussion are those that are of interest or importance to students and the various communities and groups where they belong to. On local topics, for example, students discuss such things as littering, traffic jams, arranged marriages, and rich-poor gap, etc. Regional topics include such things as commuter transportation, migrant workers, flooding, clashes of ethnic group members, etc. Topics of national interest include presidential election, cigarette smoking, corruption, moving the capital city, etc. As for international topics, students talk about such things as refugee crisis, global warming and climate change, international trade and business, etc.

Since Intermediate Speaking serves as a “borderline” between the IS and ES application, the course can be done in one of the following two ways: IS+ES or ES only.

IS+ES

IS+ES refers to a formula where the first half of the course uses an IS approach and the second half of the course uses an ES approach. As shown by a recent study conducted by Jabu and Korompot (2019), the IS+ES formula is applied in the first 8 sessions of the course, as illustrated in the table 6.

Table 6. IS application in the 1st half of Intermediate Speaking course

| Week | Clas Session/On Campus Activity | Homework/ Off-Campus Activity |
|------|--|--|
| 1 | Introduction | Selecting 5 Topics from Intermediate Speaking Book |
| 2 | Classroom Session: Discussing and Ordering Selected Topics | Background Information of Topic 1 |
| 3 | Classroom Session: Topic 1 | Background Topic 2 |
| 4 | Classroom Session: Topic 2 | Background Topic 3 |
| 5 | Classroom Session: Topic 3 | Background Topic 4 |
| 6 | Classroom Session: Topic 4 | Background Topic 5 |
| 7 | Classroom Session: Topic 5 | Working with Students from the other two Cohorts to Decide Topic for MST |
| 8 | Mid-Semester Test | One-on-One Interview/Video Report |

(Jabu & Korompot, 2019: 378)

As shown above, the first half of the Intermediate Speaking course is characterized by an instructional approach that is largely intensive in nature and in its implementation.

This stage of the course begins with students choosing and ordering five of the thirteen units in the researchers’ course book for classroom discussions. It is followed by five “teacher-fronted” classroom sessions where students work in groups to discuss each of the five different topics in their groups first, and then with the other groups in their cohort, plus the lecturer, each week.

The stage concludes with a mid-semester test session in which each student reports the results of their individual task

(i.e. interviewing a student from the other two cohorts about what they want to talk to the lecturer about during the mid-semester test). The second stage is to a large extent extensive in nature and its implementation, as the next table shows.

Table 7. IS application in the 1st half of Intermediate Speaking course

| Week | Clas Session/On Campus Activity | Homework/ Off-Campus Activity |
|------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 9 | Introduction | Topic Selection |
| 10 | Classroom Session: Selecting Topic | Literature Review |
| 11 | Classroom Session: Literature Review | Instrument Development |
| 12 | Classroom Session: Instrument | Data Collection |
| 13 | Off Campus Session: Data Collection | Poster Preparation (Stage 1) |
| 14 | Classroom Session: Poster Design & Content | (Poster Preparation (Stage 2)) |
| 15 | Poster Presentation | Peer-Interview |
| 16 | Final Semester Test | One-on-One Interview/Video Report |

(Jabu & Korompot, 2019, p. 378)

As shown in the table above, the second half of the Intermediate Speaking course is characterized by ES almost exclusively in which students carried out a mini research project.

The stage begins with students selecting one topic, either from the 13 topics in the course book or one that they choose for themselves, for their final ES projects (poster presentation and post-presentation peer-interview). It is followed by five weeks of ES project work where students work with their group mates to review the literature, develop instruments, collect data, and

prepare for their final ES projects. Sessions are divided between those done inside the classroom and outside. In addition, students were given weekly group assignments by submitting written logs and uploading video reports on YouTube. The logs were intended for documenting the groups' learning and reflection, while the videos were for documenting their ES activities and making them familiar with reporting their work in the digital format.

The stage concludes first with a poster session, then with a peer-interview task, and finally with each student reporting the results of their individual task (i.e. interviewing a student from the other two cohorts about what they presented in the poster session).

ES Only

ES Only refers to a formula where the whole Intermediate Speaking course uses an ES approach exclusively.

To implement the exclusive ES approach, the lecturer may design the course in a certain way as long he or she applies the ES principles. However, for an easy implementation, a lecturer can simply extend the ES approach used in the second half of the course in the previous IS+ES model. That is, by getting the students to work on two poster presentation projects—one in the first half of the course and another one in the other half. See the table below for an illustration.

Table 8. Exclusive application of ES approach in Intermediate Speaking course (ES Only)

| Wk | 1 st Session | Homework |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | Introduction | Topic selection |
| 2 | Selecting the topic | Literature review |
| 3 | Literature review | Instruments |
| 4 | Instruments | Data collection |
| 5 | Data collection | Preparation (1) |
| 6 | Poster design | Preparation (2) |
| 7 | Poster presentation | Peer-interview |
| 8 | Mid-semester test | Face to face session/video report |
| 2nd Session | | |
| 9 | Introduction | Topic selection |
| 10 | Selecting the topic | Literature review |

| Wk | 1 st Session | Homework |
|----|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 11 | Literature review | Instruments |
| 12 | Instruments | Data collection |
| 13 | Data collection | Preparation (1) |
| 14 | Poster design | Preparation (2) |
| 15 | Poster presentation | Peer-interview |
| 16 | Final semester test | Face to face session/video report |

*Wk=Week

As previously implied, the above model is offered only as an alternative concept to applying the ES approach in teaching the Intermediate Speaking course. It is argued, however, that ES approach should be applied in half or the entire Intermediate Speaking course. ES is also proposed for teaching the course that comes after it, which is Advanced Speaking.

Course 4: Advanced Speaking

Advanced Speaking is an intermediate/upper-intermediate level speaking course available for sophomores who have passed the previous IIEC (Speaking), Basic Speaking, and Intermediate Speaking courses. It is offered to the fourth semester students in their second year.

Advanced Speaking carries 2 credit units, meaning that each of its weekly classroom session is 100 minutes long. This also means that students taking this course must spend 120 minutes of their time to work on a structured speaking assignment and another 120 minutes on an independent speaking task, both of which at the advanced level.

Unlike Basic Speaking which aims at conversation and Intermediate Speaking which aims at completing a presentation project, Advanced Speaking, in the author’s opinion based on teaching experience, should be geared towards public speaking. This is because public speaking is considered one of the most challenging speaking skills to be mastered, and it is one that future teachers of English should master after all.

Therefore, the objective of Advanced Speaking should be to enable the students to give public speeches in English in an educational context. In addition, to further enhance students’ exposure to 21st century technology, the speeches should be made available online. Given the nature of the course, it is suggested that Advanced

Speaking apply both ES and IS with a 75-25 proportion (75% ES and 25% IS).

The above suggestion is based on an experiment conducted by the first author with his Advanced Speaking classes in the past two years. In these classes, the students were given the choice to work individually or in groups to prepare for their individual speeches which are in the forms similar to Pecha Kucha (for their mid-semester task) and to TEDx talk (for their final semester task).

Pecha Kucha (PK) is a form of presentation or storytelling in which the presenter shows the audience 20 slides and talk about each slide for 20 seconds. Therefore, the talk is 6 minutes and 40 seconds long. PK’s “talk less, show more” format was created in 2003 by Astrid Klein and Mark Dytham of Klein-Dytham Architecture (KDa) in Tokyo, Japan. Since then, PK has inspired many people, and the format has been used by speakers all over the world to talk about various topics, including education, and in various settings, including schools and universities. PK was first used at UNM in the first author’s Advanced Speaking class in 2019.

TED stands for technology, entertainment, and design. It was established in 1984 by Harry Marks and Richard Saul Wurman, both of whom are American graphic designers, to enable people to come together and talk about technology, entertainment, and design ideas. TED has since then broadened its coverage to include talks on many scientific, cultural, political, and academic topics. Although the formal TED conferences are officially owned and curated, communities and organizations around the world can organize their own TED talks called TEDx. They are required to apply for a license from TED organization to be able to hold a TEDx event. The first TEDx-like speeches at UNM were made by the first author’s Advanced Speaking students in 2018.

Table 9. Application of IS and ES Approach proposed for Advanced Speaking Course

| Wk | 1 st Session | Homework |
|----|--|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Introduction | Topic selection |
| 2 | Selecting the topic | Main points of talk |
| 3 | Classroom session: Main points of talk | Developing main points of talk |

| Wk | 1 st Session | Homework |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| 4 | Classroom session: Presentation of main points devel- oped | Developing main points into a talk |
| 5 | Classroom session: Talk rehearsal 1 | Revision 1 |
| 6 | Classroom session: Talk rehearsal 2 | Revision 2 |
| 7 | Pecha Kucha-like presentation ses- sions | Peer-interview |
| 8 | Mid-semester test: Face to face session/ video report | |
| 2 nd Session | | |
| 9 | Introduction | Topic selection |
| 10 | Selecting the topic | Main points of talk |
| 11 | Classroom session: Main points of talk | Developing main points of talk |
| 12 | Classroom session: Presentation of main points developed | Developing main points into a talk |
| 13 | Classroom session: Talk rehearsal 1 | Revision 1 |
| 14 | Classroom session: Talk rehearsal 2 | Revision 2 |
| 15 | TEDx-like presentation sessions | Peer-interview |
| 16 | Final semester test: Face to face session/ video report | N/A |

*Wk=Week

As shown in the above table, the course is divided into two main parts. The first part is where the PK-like presentation is the goal of the activities, and in the second part it is the TEDx-like talk being the goal. Each of the presentations is followed by peer-interview assignment the results of which are reported to the lecturer during a mid-term test and final term test respectively.

The activities in the lead up to the two main events may be held in the classroom where students attend workshop-style sessions with the lecturer and classmates to discuss their work, or outside the classroom where they work with their classmates or students from the other cohorts to complete their tasks. Each session is followed by a homework assignment to interview a classmate or a student from another cohort which should be completed in a week's time. Additional task

to be given during the sessions may be in the form of weekly/bi-weekly video reports that students must upload onto their cohort's YouTube channel.

Given the nature of the activities described above (or their alternatives), it may be concluded that Advanced Speaking should be characterized by an ES approach.

Course 5: Teaching Speaking Skills

Teaching Speaking Skills is a course proposed to top off all the speaking courses the students have had so far. In fact, the authors are of the opinion that each English language skills/component course (listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar, vocabulary, translation, etc.) at an ITE should be concluded by a pedagogic skills course in the relevant area. In 2016, the first author of this article experimented with this approach when teaching his Advanced Speaking classes. The peer-teaching sessions in these classes were found to be extremely effective in giving the students the opportunity to teach speaking skills in particular and English in general that most of the students had never had before.

A Teaching Speaking Skills course, or a similar course indicated above, may be conducted using the IS only model, ES only model, IS+ES model, or any other combination. The sessions may be delivered in two parts, i.e. theory in the first half and teaching practice (peer teaching and feedback) in the second half, or they may consist exclusively of peer teaching and feedback sessions.

CONCLUSION

The authors have argued for the implementation of English speaking courses for student teachers of English in the Indonesian context in terms of IS and ES as instructional approaches. Being the setting for the proposal, PBI has never officially considered structuring and standardizing its four speaking skills courses in this way before. That is, making the first two courses characterized by an IS approach and the other two courses by an ES approach. Neither has PBI considered introducing a speaking skills-specific English teaching course that enables its student teachers to actually practice teaching the skills in a peer-teaching setting. This paper has provided the necessary argument and justification for the above proposal, which may benefit further curricular revision and course development

at PBI and similar institutions in Indonesia and the rest of the world.

REFERENCES

- Al-Homoud, F., & Schmitt, N. (2009). Extensive reading in a challenging environment: a comparison of extensive and intensive reading approaches in Saudi Arabia. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(4), 383–401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168809341508>
- Bamford, J., & Day, R. R. (1997). Extensive reading: What is it? Why bother? *Language Teacher-Kyoto-JALT-*, 21, 6–8.
- Gu, S., & Reynolds, E. D. (2013). Imagining extensive speaking for Korean EFL. *Modern English Education*, 14(4), 81–108.
- Herder, S., & King, R. (2012). Extensive writing: Another fluency approach for EFL Learners. *Extensive Reading World Congress Proceedings*, 1, 128–130.
- Jabu, B., & Korompot, C. A. (2019). Intensive and Extensive Speaking Instructional Approaches: Model pembelajaran keterampilan berbicara tingkat menengah bagi mahasiswa calon guru bahasa Inggris. In A. S. Ahmar (Ed.), *Seminar Nasional LP2M UNM* (pp. 374–380). Makassar: LP2M UNM.
- Korompot, C. A. (2018). Integrating CEFR, thematic contents, and intensive instruction in developing speaking materials for first-year English language teacher trainees. In S. Madya, F. A. Hamied, W. A. Renandya, C. Coombe, & Y. Basthomi (Eds.), *ELT in Asia in the Digital Era: Global Citizenship and Identity* (pp. 119–128). London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Korompot, C. A., & Wello, B. (2017). Pengembangan Model Komunikasi Bahasa Inggris dengan Materi Tematik dan Perkuliahan Intensif Berbasis Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) pada Perkuliahan Basic Speaking. Makassar.
- Lafayette, R. C. (1993). Subject-matter content: What every foreign language teacher needs to know. *Developing Language Teachers for a Changing World*, 124–158.
- Mistar, J. (2005). Teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) in Indonesia. *Teaching English to the World: History, Curriculum, and Practice*, 75–85.
- Renandya, W. A., & Farrel, T. (2011). Extensive listening in the second language classroom. *Innovation and Creativity in ELT Methodology*, 28–41.
- Renandya, W. A., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2010). ‘Teacher, the tape is too fast!’ Extensive listening in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 65(1), 52–59.
- Renandya, W. A., Rajan, B. R. S., & Jacobs, G. M. (2009). Extensive Reading with Adult ESL Learners of English as a Second Language (pp. 182–198). pp. 182–198. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829903000103>
- Sun, Y. (2010). Extensive writing in foreign-language classrooms: A blogging approach. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 47(3), 327–339.
- Thiagarajan, S., Semmel, D. S., & Semmel, M. I. (1974). *Instructional Development for Training Teachers of Exceptional Children: A Sourcebook*.
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Longman.
- Vélez-Rendón, G. (2002). Second language teacher education: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(4), 457–467.
- Widodo, H. P., & Rozak, R. R. (2016). Engaging student teachers in collaborative and reflective online video-assisted extensive listening in an Indonesian initial teacher education (ITE) context. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 13(2), 229–244.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This article is based partially on the results of a PNPB research project granted by the Postgraduate School of Universitas Negeri Makassar (UNM), which was funded by DIPA UNM No. SP DIPA – 042.01.2.400964/2019, dated 5 December 2018, based on UNM Rector’s Decree No. 3577/UN36/PM/2019 dated 29 March 2019, and administered by the Research and Community Services Center (LP2M) of UNM