

Research Article

EXPLORING THE NEED FOR A BILINGUAL APPROACH IN ENGLISH LEARNING IN AN INDONESIAN EFL TERTIARY SETTING

Sahiruddin

Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia

Abstract.

This study scrutinizes learners' perception of the bilingual (Indonesian-English) approach in an English language classroom at an Indonesian EFL tertiary setting. In particular, this study examines learners' attitudes and beliefs about first language (L1) use in the second language (L2) classroom and the functions or purposes of L1 use in the English classroom. This study employed a survey design. One hundred and ten university learners enrolled in English major (n=110) participated in this study. The data were collected through a questionnaire adopted from Hall and Cook (2013) and analyzed statistically. The result of this study revealed that the bilingual approach (L1-L2 use) was more favorable as perceived by Indonesian EFL learners, and the use of L1 in the L2 classroom in various degrees of context or purposes was preferred. This study also showed the need for a gradual shift from L1 to L2 use along with learners' English proficiency progress. The theoretical and practical implications of this study are discussed.

Corresponding Author:

Sahiruddin; email:

shrdn@ub.ac.id

Published 27 April 2023

 Publishing services provided by
 Knowledge E

Keywords: *L1 use, L2 use, bilingual, monolingual*

© Sahiruddin. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the IICB Conference Committee.

1. INTRODUCTION

The issue of English-only or monolingual and bilingual approach in language learning has attracted many extensive studies and many educators, particularly around the unresolved issues about which one is preferable between English-only or monolingual and bilingual approach that best benefits the second language (L2) learners, starting from primary education to tertiary education levels (Almoayidi, 2018; Alshehri, 2017; Auerbach, 1993; Hidayati, 2012; Macaro, 2009, 2020; Manara, 2007; Pan & Pan, 2017). Studies about English language teaching and learning have centered on two strands of research regarding the debate between the monolingual and bilingual approaches. The monolingual approach mostly centers on the ideology of monolingualism and put much attention originally on the role of native speakers in second language learning and teaching, undervaluing non-native English-speaking teachers (Johnson & Swain, 1994).


OPEN ACCESS

English-only mandate declares that second language (L2) learning should exclude the first language (L1) as it will bother the development of L2 learning. MacDonald (1993) argues that there is no need for L2 teachers to use L1 to resolve any difficulty in L2 since it could hinder L2 progression. Meanwhile, the bilingual approach advocates the need for L1 to facilitate the L2 acquisition and development while maintaining language and cultural identity and ideology (Ishino, 2022; Fang & Liu, 2020; Sundari & Febriayanti, 2021; Wong & Tian, 2022). Some scholars like Cook (2001) argue against monolingualism in the context of the communicative approach (monolingual violates principles of the communicative approach) where classroom interaction should reflect communication outside the classroom, and that the monolingual approach is hardly found outside the classroom, especially where English becomes a foreign language (Romaine, 1995).

The growing attention on bilingualism and multilingualism which has attracted many scholars in language studies has challenged the monolingual ideology in language teaching. Language teaching should value bilingual or multilingual individuals to use their full linguistic repertoires or resources in learning another language (popularly known as translanguaging). Thus, L2 learning is argued to maintain, sustain and expand bilingual or multilingual competence. It is suggested that both L1 and L2 could be productively used in the classroom to critically reflect upon learners' perspectives and experiences with language, culture, and identity. It is argued that the two languages interacted with each other in their development (Van Hell & Dijkstra, 2002). Studies show that English learners are commonly not in favor of monolingual instruction (Macaro & Lee, 2013; Rolin-lanziti & Varshney, 2008). From the teachers' perspective, Chung (2013) demonstrated that English teachers at the primary level in Korea generally did not like the English-only approach, and Lee and Lee (2011) found that English only may be suitable for advanced learners. It may be that monolingual and bilingual approach preferences may be affected by the learners' proficiency levels.

Studies about the role of L1 use in the L2 classroom in many contexts reveal many benefits of L1 for reinforcing content learning in Taiwan school setting (Kao, 2022), developing English writing skills in Spanish (Escamilla, Butvilofsky, & Hopewell, 2018), negotiating identities in South Korean school and university context, (Choi, 2020; Choi, 2021; Yang & Jang, 2020), and supporting cross-linguistic transfer (Wong & Tian, 2022), that one language did not delay the development of another language development. It is suggested that both L1 and L2 could be productively used in the classroom to critically reflect upon learners' perspectives and experiences with language, culture, and identity. In Japan, learners even requested to use L1 in the L2 classroom to

complete the task given (Ishino, 2022). Fang and Liu (2020) explores stakeholders' view on the use of an English-only or bilingual approach (translanguaging) at a Chinese university revealing that translanguaging is useful for higher proficiency groups, and for lower proficiency groups, the use of English-only instruction has sometimes made learning process less meaningful. In addition, Islam (2013) explores the implementation of English instruction at the Bangladesh university level involving 37 undergraduate learners revealing that majority of learners faced problems in English-only instruction because they lack vocabulary and have a low level of proficiency so they found it easier to understand the course in L1 or Bangla, or Bangla is preferable because it helps to understand the content of the subject. Aeurbach (1993) examines English-only classrooms in ESL context revealing that L1 and/or bilingual choice are not only effective but also important for adult ESL learners at all levels, particularly for those with limited L1 literacy.

Theoretically, according to sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978) learners are situated in certain social and cultural contexts, and that learning takes place through social interaction. Bringing to L2 learning, learning development occurs on two different levels: social level or between people (interpsychological) and individual level (intrapsychological). Thus, learning L2 should be based on social interaction. In the context of English as a foreign language like in Indonesia, English-only or bilingual interaction has still been the debate about which best facilitates the L2 learning process and development. In this construct, translanguaging defined as the flexibility to use another language other than the target language, such as L1, is an essential phenomenon for the development of L2 as it is useful for metatalk, metacognition, and whispered private speech (Kibler, 2010), and that during cooperative tasks, for instance, translanguaging has been facilitative in completing the task and attending to vocabulary and grammar (Swain & Lapkin, 2000). In addition to the sociocultural perspective, the use of L1 for limited use and L2 for maximum use can be seen from a cognitive point of view regarding the input processing regarding information processing where language learners would not be able to process information which is too difficult (Krashen, 1985; Krashen & Terrell, 1988; VanPatten, 1996) and cross-linguistic transfer (Cummin, 2007, 2008) in which the idea that L1 knowledge can transfer to L2 knowledge to some extent, and that L1 knowledge is to some extent needed to process the L2 information (Macaro, 2001, 2009, 2020; Macdonald 1993).

The phenomenon of shifting from one language to another as known as translanguaging has been a common phenomenon in L2 classrooms, particularly for pedagogical functions. The term 'translanguaging' was proposed by Cen William to refer to a practice

of changing purposely the language of input and the language of output (2002, cited in García & Wei, 2014), the use of one language to reinforce the other language to increase understanding and to enhance the learners' activity in both languages. It is substantially a pedagogic theory that includes learners learning two languages through a process of deep cognitive bilingual engagement. Studies exploring the role of L1 in the L2 classroom in an Indonesian context showed inconclusive results, particularly regarding learners' perspectives (Hidayati, 2012; Manara, 2007; Sundari & Febriyanti, 2021). For instance, Manara (2007) explored nine non-native English teachers from three universities in Central Java, Indonesia to determine the perceptions and purposes of the use of L1 in their classrooms, revealing that both teachers and learners agreed that English use should be used to the most maximum level although L1 use is still permitted for pedagogical purposes dependent upon, for instance, learners' level of proficiency. Examining learners' beliefs is essential in this respect since Learners' English learning beliefs have been found to contribute to academic success (Muluaem, Mulu, & Gebremeskal, 2022). How Indonesian EFL learners perceived the use of languages other than English in English classrooms has not yet been much explored. Research to date has largely focused on teachers' perspectives on the role of L1 in the L2 classroom but has not much dealt with learners' point of view, particularly involving the role of proficiency levels in the monolingual or bilingual perspectives under any kind of theoretical framework. This study aims to examine learners' beliefs about monolingual and bilingual approaches for Indonesian EFL university learners across and between proficiency levels. This study is useful to provide teachers or language educators about the language method in the English classroom.

This paper aims at examining the learners' belief about the use of L1 in the L2 classroom across and between proficiency levels and also scrutinizes the functions or purpose of L1 use in L2 learning. This study is worth conducting as it could raise awareness among EFL teachers, learners, policymakers, and curriculum designers about the role of L1 in L2 learning.

2. METHOD

This study sheds light on the role of L1 in L2 classrooms in an Indonesian setting. This is a quantitative method study (Creswell, 2014) using a survey. Quantitative data were derived from a questionnaire consisting of ten Likert-scale items distributed to learners (adopted from Hall & Cook, 2013). The questions explored learners' beliefs about L1 use in the L2 classroom and also their reasons (or functions) for using L1 in L2 learning.

The study was conducted in one Indonesian university involving second and third-year learners (n=110) from an English study program. Data collection was elicited through five Likert-type scale questionnaires. The questionnaire contained two clusters; statements about beliefs about L1 use in L2 learning and classroom (options from strongly disagree to strongly agree) and L1 use and reason in L2 learning (options from never to always). Statements about learners' beliefs were containing 4 items, involving the extent to which learners agree that L1 should be excluded from the L2 classroom, English should be the main language used in the classroom, the extent to which learners permit the use of L1 in the L2 classroom, and the motivation of L1 use by learners as to express cultural and linguistic identity. Meanwhile, items exploring functions or reasons for L1 use in L2 learning cover 6 items for learners. Such seven items comprise the functions of using L1 to use bilingual dictionaries or word lists, compare English grammar to the grammar of their own language, watch English-language TV/video with L1 subtitles, do translation activities, and prepare for tasks and activities in their L1 before switching to English.

Participants voluntarily participated in this study (convenient sampling), and no credits were given to participants in this study. Data collected from questionnaires were analyzed using SPSS.22, a statistical software that includes descriptive and frequency (percentage) analysis in answering research questions in this study. Since the item responses focused more on whether the participants agreed or disagree with cluster 1 (beliefs or perception statements), this study did not report the response for 'either agree or disagree since the responses did not much provide insight into their unclear positions in the perceptions of the use of L1 in the L2 teaching and learning. An Independent t-test was tabulated for comparing mean differences between responses between proficiency levels.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This study examines two main issues dealing with the learners' beliefs about the use of L1 in the L2 classroom across and between proficiency levels and the functions of using L1 in L2 classroom in an Indonesian EFL university context as elicited from five likert-type scale questionnaire. The questionnaires consist of two sections: the first sections elicited learners' beliefs in the role of L1 in L2 teaching and learning, and the second was assessing learners's reason of using L1 in the L2 teaching and learning. The instruments had a Chronbach's alpha of .70 indicating the instrument had strong reliability in tapping information from the participants about the role of L1 in the L2 classroom.

3.1. Findings

3.1.1. The Learners' Perception about the Use of L1 in the L2 Classroom

In order to uncover the beliefs or perceptions of the L2 English learners about the use of L1 in L2 teaching and learning, descriptive statistics were calculated to present means and standard deviation for each item from the 5-point Likert-scale questionnaires (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree), and also frequency scores for frequency as indexed by percentage for each item (Table 1). A total 110 learners completed the questionnaire. The questionnaire includes beliefs or perceptions toward the use of L1 in L2 English classrooms in terms of monolingual (English only) or bilingual approach (English-Indonesia) and the degree to which L1 is permitted to be used for certain points for pedagogical consideration and the motivation to use L1.

TABLE 1: Learners' Perception of the Use of L1 in the L2 Classroom.

| No | Statement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | SD |
|----|--|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|
| 1 | I believe the teacher should exclude L1 use | 6% | 23% | 41% | 20% | 10% | 3.07 | .79 |
| 2 | I believe the teacher should allow L1 use only at certain points in the lesson | 0% | 3% | 6% | 61% | 30% | 4.18 | .66 |
| 3 | English should be the main language used in the classroom | 0% | 2% | 16% | 42% | 40% | 4.21 | .77 |
| 4 | L1 use helps me express my cultural and linguistic identity more easily | 0% | 7% | 26% | 47% | 18% | 3.77 | .83 |

The table above demonstrated that most participants (82%) agreed that English should be put into maximum position in which English exposure and use should be the dominant language in the classroom (M=4.21, SD=.77). In regard to the perception of whether they support monolingual approach or English only policy in the classroom by excluding L1 in the L2 classroom, the learners displayed moderate position (M=3.07), where 30% learners agreed with the statement for implementing the monolingual approach in the classroom. 91% of learners in this context to some degree preferred a more bilingual approach or co-lingual approach in the L2 classroom where L1 use is allowed for pedagogical consideration (M=4.18, SD=.66). The nature of bilingual preference in English learning was motivated by the condition that L1 use facilitated learners to express their linguistic background knowledge and cultural identity in the L2 classroom (65%). In addition, dealing with the motivation of using L1 in the L2 classroom learners admitted that the use of L1 in the L2 classroom was not merely due to the need to express cultural and linguistic identity, suggesting many other factors existed

the reason for the use of L1 by learners in Indonesia. In sum, this evidence seems to indicate the learners' expectation that teachers provide more English exposure in their L2 learning. Since this study did not conduct an interview for data collection, it was quite challenging to define and clarify the reasons for learners' responses.

In sum, this study found that learners prefer a co-lingual or bilingual approach in the L2 classroom assuming more benefits of L1 use in the L2 learning in the classroom. In addition, the use of L1 in the L2 classroom is allowed to some degree for pedagogical reasons. This study also revealed different motivations for using L1 for learners in which teachers' use of L1 was more for cultural and linguistic cultural and linguistic reasons.

3.1.2. Learners' Perception of L1 Use in the L2 Classroom by L2 Proficiency Levels

In addition to the first finding, this study was also interested in examining the degree to which learners' L2 proficiency contributes to the different beliefs about L1 use in L2 instruction. This is important to assess since previous studies did not explore the role of learners' proficiency in the perception of L1 use in the L2 classroom. Learners' proficiency grouping was based on collected self-rating L2 proficiency data from learners or participants of this study involving a 1 to 5 English general proficiency scale. Learners' proficiency scale >4 was classified as a higher proficiency group (n=43) and learners' proficiency scale below <3 was regarded as a lower proficiency group (n=67).

TABLE 2: Learners' Perception on the Use of L1 in the L2 Classroom by Proficiency Group.

| Item | Statement | Low (n=67) | | High (n=43) | |
|------|--|------------|------|-------------|-----|
| | | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| 1 | I believe the teacher should exclude L1 use | 2.90 | 1.07 | 3.32 | .94 |
| 2 | I believe the teacher should allow L1 use only at certain points in the lesson | 4.25 | .63 | 4.07 | .70 |
| 3 | English should be the main language used in the classroom | 4.16 | .79 | 4.30 | .74 |
| 4 | L1 use helps me express my cultural and linguistic identity more easily | 3.81 | .89 | 3.69 | .74 |

The issue of monolingual or bilingual approach in L2 classroom can be seen from two items (I believe the teacher should exclude L1 use & English should be the main language used in the classroom). Regarding the perception of the monolingual approach where L1 use should be excluded from L2 classroom, the mean response for high proficient learners was 3.32 (SD=.94), while low proficient learners displayed a mean response of 2.90, a lower value than low proficient learners indicating that high proficient learners showed a higher agreement toward monolingual approach in the L2 classroom. Mean

differences were statistically significant at $p = .041$ as computed by independent t-test. In more detail, low proficient learners showed 23% agreement with this statement along with 39% of neutrality perception and 38% of disagreement with the statement, while more proficient learners showed 40% agreement about the monolingual approach, with 44% displaying neutrality for the statement and 16% of showing disagreement for monolingual approach. Aligned with this finding, low proficient learners showed more preference for English teachers to allow the use of L1 in the L2 classroom (see item 2). This study revealed that the higher proficiency group preferred the monolingual approach in the L2 classroom instead of the co-lingual or bilingual approach suggesting the need for the use of L1 in L2 learning. In this regard, the lower proficiency group expected more of a bilingual approach through the presence of English only in the L2 classroom.

Meanwhile, the perception toward the statement that “English should be the main language used in the classroom” low proficient learners demonstrated 39% agreement toward the statement (40% of neutrality), while more proficient learners showed 45% of agreement, 44% of neutrality, suggesting that English use in the L2 classroom is highly likely preferable for L2 development. Confirming earlier findings for overall participants, this study also found that the motivation for using L1 in the L2 classroom was not dominant due to cultural and linguistic identity (see Tables 1 and 2). Other factors contribute to the use of L1 in L2 learning. Thus, higher proficiency groups preferred the monolingual approach while lower proficiency groups preferred to have a more co-lingual or bilingual approach in L2 classrooms. In addition, both higher and lower proficiency groups showed the same beliefs and perceptions that the co-lingual or bilingual approach was preferable in an Indonesian context.

3.1.3. Functions or Purposes of L1 Use in L2 Learning

The last purpose of this study was to examine the functions or purposes of L1 use in the L2 learning setting by learners in Indonesian higher education. Descriptive and frequency information can be depicted in Table 3 below.

There were several purposes of L1 use in the L2 classroom by Indonesian learners, such as for using bilingual dictionaries or word lists, comparing English grammar to the L1 grammar, watching English language TV or video with L1 subtitles, doing translation activities or doing written translation exercises, and preparing for tasks and activities in L1 before switching to English. This study revealed that in general learners were more likely to use L1 for checking out the meaning of L2, $M=55$, $SD=.79$, followed by

TABLE 3: Functions of the Use of L1 in the L2 Classroom by Learners.

| Item | Statement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | SD |
|------|--|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|
| 1 | I use bilingual dictionaries or word list | 0% | 9% | 36% | 45% | 10% | 3.55 | .79 |
| 2 | I compare English grammar to the grammar of their own language | 3.6% | 26% | 40% | 26% | 4% | 3.02 | .92 |
| 3 | I watch English-language TV/video with L1 subtitles | 1% | 21% | 28% | 25% | 25% | 3.50 | 1.11 |
| 4 | I do translation activities | 1% | 12% | 31% | 46% | 10% | 3.51 | .87 |
| 5 | I do write translation exercises | 2% | 20% | 46% | 27% | 5% | 3.09 | .85 |
| 6 | I prepare for tasks and activities in their L1 before switching to English | 16% | 29% | 35% | 13% | 7% | 2.68 | 1.11 |

translation activities in learning the target language (M=3.51, SD=.87), comprehending English-language TV/video (M=3.50, SD=1.11), doing written-based translation exercise (M=3.09, SD=.85), comparing the L1 grammar with L1 (M=3.02, SD.92). The least favorable function of L1 use was doing any L2 tasks in the L1 prior to switching it to the L2 (M=2.68, SD=1.11).

Therefore, the function of L1 used by learners is likely to assist them to prepare to learn the L2. Learners used the L1 functionally to prepare to learn new vocabulary, do translation activities, compare L2 grammar to L1 grammar, and complete the L2 tasks and activities using L1 prior to switching to L2.

3.2. Discussion

The key findings of this study are that generally, learners support the co-lingual or bilingual approach in L2 teaching and learning. The learners believe that the use of L1 is beneficial in facilitating their own L2 learning. The use of L1 should be allowed in particular contexts for pedagogical considerations as some learning points can be easily understood by using L1, for example for cultural view difference explanation. However, the use of L1 should be restricted as English is perceived to be the main language used in the L2 classroom. They believe that more L2 exposure is helpful in developing their L2 competence. The learners' motivation in using L1 is derived from non-linguistic and cultural identity factors. These findings confirm previous studies, such as the one observed in the Korean context which was found about the role of L1 in L2 learning development (Kim & Petraki, 2009; Wang, 2019). Duff and Polio's (1990) study also demonstrated how learners were satisfied with the use of L1 by their teachers

albeit its proportion of L1 use was very high, indicating that L1 use facilitates L2 learning process and L2 proficiency development.

This study demonstrated that 91% of learners agreed with the co-lingual or bilingual approach in the L2 classroom. This value was similar to Schweers' (1999) study in the Spanish context with 90% of learners agreeing with the L1 use in the L2 classroom, and it is higher than Tang's (2002) study revealing 70% of learners in China agreed with bilingual approach and Manara's (2007) study with 50% in an Indonesian context. Despite this finding, this study confirms that English or L2 use should be put into a maximum position where L1 use should be limited and only for pedagogical purposes. This may suggest that learners are aware of the benefits of using L1 in their L2 learning, but at the same time, they want to use L2 to the fullest to maximize their L2 development. It was also found here that learners thought that teachers should allow L1 use for specific purposes or pedagogical reasons only. The use of L1 use for learners was much motivated by linguistic or cultural identity factors for facilitating their learning in the classroom setting or beyond the classroom. This finding implies that teachers should rethink the monolingual policy in L2 learning (Cummin, 2007; Yang & Jang, 2020).

Looking at the beliefs or perceptions about L1 use in terms of proficiency levels of learners, both higher and lower proficiency groups showed that support co-lingual or bilingual approach in L2 classrooms as indexed by the evidence that both groups found L1 use could facilitate L2 learning. In this regard, this study also confirms that less proficient learners require L1 use to facilitate themselves in processing the L2 (Macaro, 2001, 2009, 2020; Nation, 2003). In addition, learners who lack metalanguage in the second language, such as word meaning, grammar points, and task explanation in-depth need L1 use to learn the L2 (Manara, 2007; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Sundari & Febriyanti, 2021). This study also supports a previous study by Hidayati (2012) regarding the role of L1 in the L2 for 100 learners surveyed through a questionnaire revealing that L1 use should only be used reasonably for maximizing L2 learning, and its function includes understanding vocabulary and grammar, comprehension, and complex instruction.

Another finding of this study is that the lower proficiency group preferred the bilingual approach while the higher proficiency group preferred the monolingual approach (English-only classroom), suggesting that higher proficiency learners are motivated to use L2 and expected the teachers also use L2 most of the time in the classroom as to get much English exposure. This finding can be interpreted that higher proficiency learners could express their language or comprehend the L2 without any linguistic issues as their proficiency level is at an advanced level. This pattern confirms the previous study about more preference for L1 use by the lower proficiency group by Storch and Aldosari

(2010) demonstrating that 17% of interaction by the lower proficiency group was held in L1 and 5% for the high proficiency group.

This study confirms Fang and Liu's (2020) study regarding the need for limited translanguaging at a Chinese university for higher proficiency groups, and for lower proficiency groups, the use of L1 has to be permitted to make their meaning-making meaningful. Aligned with this, Barahona (2020) reported that most practice for English teaching in the Chilean EFL tertiary context can be done through translanguaging, calling for effective integration of L1 in the L2 classroom. However, translanguaging often brings some barriers like the sense of isolation, for instance, perceived by international learners who could not speak the local language (English native speakers) (Gallagher, 2020; Hillman, Graham, & Eslami, 2019).

The above findings about learners' support for the co-lingual or bilingual approach support previous findings which argue that the bilingual approach was the way to develop L2 learning and that L2 use should be put in maximum position, allowing L1 use for fundamental and pedagogical purposes. The transition from high L1 use for the lower proficiency group and low L1 use for the higher proficient group should be taken into consideration by an English teacher or education institution so that the L2 learning can reach maximum outcomes and drive learners to reach a high level of English proficiency. The L1 use in the L2 context or known as the bilingual approach or translanguaging approach should be considered a scaffolding technique in L2 development (García & Wei, 2015). Learners will transition the language differently dependent upon the different points of the bilingual continuum that they have. Beginner L2 learners will have a tendency to use the L1 or to trans language as they depend much on their L1 to complete the task, while more advanced L2 learners tend to use less L1 to complete the tasks or to make meaning in L2 context (Rolin-lanziti, & Varshney, 2008; Wang, 2019).

Beside exploring learners' beliefs about L1 use, this study is also interested in examining the functions of using L1 in L2 classrooms. This study revealed that in general learners tended to often use L1 to learn new vocabulary by using bilingual dictionaries or word lists, do translation activities, compare L2 grammar to L1 grammar, understand or comprehend English language TV or video, and prepare for L2 tasks and activities using L1 before switching it to the L2. Some of the findings such as vocabulary and meaning, and grammar are in line with previous studies. For instance, Storch and Wigglesworth (2003) through pair work observation found some main functions of L1 use such as vocabulary, meaning, and grammar. In the Arabic setting, Storch and Aldosari (2010) found that Saudi Arabia learners' perception of L1 use reveals five main functions, such as task management, discussing and generating ideas, grammar deliberation,

vocabulary deliberation, and mechanic deliberation. Swain and Lapkin (2000) also found that the use of L1 is facilitative in completing the tasks in the L2 classroom.

In sum, this study revealed that the use of L1 assisted L2 learners in better understanding L2 concepts and subjects. This indicates that forcing to apply a monolingual approach (English-only) to L2 learners who are linguistically not ready will turn out to be inefficient in the teaching and learning process since learners may not understand or misunderstand the teachers' instruction or explanation. Thus, the idea of eliminating L1 from L2 classrooms should be reconsidered for pedagogical purposes in Indonesia. Both teachers and learners demonstrate similar beliefs that L1 should be used to facilitate the success of L2 teaching and learning process to reach the objectives or learning outcomes.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study revealed that learners support the use of L1 in the L2 classroom (co-lingual or bilingual approach) to facilitate L2 learning. The use of L1 is required for pedagogical purposes and some other academic considerations. The need for a maximum input of L2 exposure and use is observed in this study as it facilitates L2 learners to develop their L2 proficiency. The proportion of L1 use for the lower proficiency group seems to be higher than the one for the higher proficiency groups. In this context, language teachers should have much consideration to avoid overuse of the first language (L1) in the L2 classroom. The transition needs of L1 use from lower to higher proficiency group should be taken into account by English teachers and education parties so as to fully support the development of L2 learning. The practice of bilingual, colingual, or translanguaging activities in the L2 classroom should be put in a positive context to scaffold learners' L2 learning and development. Thus, the participants of this study had positive attitudes toward the use of L1 in an Indonesian EFL university class. L1 use mainly functions to learn new vocabulary, grammar patterns, translation activities, and completing L2 tasks.

Further studies could examine the use of L1 on the basis of subjects learned by learners. It is assumed here that the level of subject difficulty also plays a role in the decision of L1 use and the functions to be accommodated in the L2 teaching and learning process. In addition, further study could assess the different outcomes of the monolingual approach (English-only classroom) and co-lingual or bilingual approach condition in the classroom using experimental design or classroom action research in various education levels in Indonesia.

References

- [1] Almoayidi KA. The effectiveness of using L1 in second language classrooms: A controversial issue. *Theory Pract Lang Stud*. 2018;8(4):375.
- [2] Alshehri E. Using learners' first language in EFL classrooms. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*. 2017;3(1):20–33.
- [3] Auerbach ER. Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Q*. 1993;27(1):9–32.
- [4] Barahona M. The potential of translanguaging as a core teaching practice in an EFL context. *System*. 2020;95(1):1–14.
- [5] Choi J. No English, Korean only: local learners' resistance to English as a lingua franca at an 'English only' university in Korea. *Lang Intercult Commun*. 2020;21(2):276–88.
- [6] Choi LJ. English as an important but unfair resource: university learners' perception of English and English language education in South Korea. *Teach High Educ*. 2021;1–15.
- [7] Chung HY. Elementary teachers' perceptions of the policy and practice of TEE. *Journal of Research in Curriculum and Instruction*. 2013;17(3):909–29.
- [8] Cook V. Using the first language in the classroom. *Can Mod Lang Rev*. 2001;57(3):402–23.
- [9] Creswell JW. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage; 2014.
- [10] Cummins J. Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Can J Appl Linguist*. 2007;10(2):221–40. Available from: <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/19743>
- [11] Cummins J. Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumptions in bilingual education. In: Hornberger NH, editor. *Encyclopaedia of language and education*. New York: Springer; 2008. pp. 1528–38.
- [12] Duff PA, Polio CG. How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *Mod Lang J*. 1990;74(2):154–66.
- [13] Escamilla K, Butvilofsky S, Hopewell S. What gets lost when English-only writing assessment is used to assess writing proficiency in Spanish-English emerging bilingual learners? *Int Multiling Res J*. 2018;12(4):221–36.
- [14] Fang F, Liu Y. 'Using all English is not always meaningful': Stakeholders' perspectives on the use of and attitudes towards translanguaging at a Chinese university. *Lingua*. 2020;247:1–18.

- [15] Gallagher F. Considered in context: EFL teachers' views on the classroom as a bilingual space and codeswitching in shared-L1 and in multilingual contexts. *System*. 2020;91:1–13.
- [16] García O, Wei L. *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London: Palgrave MacMillan; 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>.
- [17] García O, Wei L. *Translanguaging, bilingualism, and bilingual education*. Wright WE, Boun S, García O (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education*. Wiley-Blackwell; 2015. pp. 223–240 <https://doi.org/h8r7> <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118533406.ch13>.
- [18] Hall G, Cook G. *Own-language use in ELT: Exploring global practices and attitudes*. London: British Council; 2013., Retrieved from <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/C448%20Own%20Language%20us>
- [19] Hidayati IN. Evaluating the role of L1 in teaching receptive skills and grammar in EFL classes. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 2012;1(2):17.
- [20] Hillman SK, Graham KM, Eslami ZR. Teachers' translanguaging practices at an international branch campus in Qatar. *English Teaching & Learning*. 2019;43(1):41–63.
- [21] Ishino M. Request for permission to Switch to L1: treatment for unlocatable problems in English medium of instruction classrooms. *Linguist Educ*. 2022;71(1):101074.
- [22] Islam MM. English medium instruction in the private universities in Bangladesh. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 2013;3(1):126–37.
- [23] Johnson RK, Swain M. From core to content: bridging the L2 proficiency gap in late immersion. *Lang Educ*. 1994;8(4):211–29. Available from: <https://hub.hku.hk/handle/10722/42657>
- [24] Kao YT. Exploring translanguaging in Taiwanese CLIL classes: an analysis of teachers' perceptions and practices. *Lang Cult Curriculum*. 2022;1–22.
- [25] Kibler A. Writing through two languages: first language expertise in a language minority classroom. *J Second Lang Writ*. 2010;19(3):121–42.
- [26] Kim Y, Petraki E. Learners' and teachers' use of and attitudes to L1 in the EFL classroom. *Asian EFL Journal*. 2009;11(4):58–89. Available from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/main-editions-new/students-and-teachers-use-of-and-attitudes-to-l1-in-the-efl-classroom/index.htm>
- [27] Krashen SD. *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman; 1985.
- [28] Krashen SD, Terrell TD. *The natural approach*. London: Prentice Hall; 1988.
- [29] Lee HY, Lee K. Pre-service teachers' perceptions of teaching English in English. *Studies in Foreign Language Education*. 2011;25(2):25–53.

- [30] Macaro E. Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: theories and decision making. *Mod Lang J.* 2001;85(4):531–48. Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1193074>
- [31] Macaro E. Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring “optimal” use. In: Turnbull M, Dailey-O’Cain J, editors. *First language use in second and foreign language learning.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters; 2009. pp. 35–50.
- [32] Macaro E. Exploring the role of language in English medium instruction. *Int J Biling Educ Biling.* 2020;23(3):263–76.
- [33] Macaro E, Lee JH. Teacher language background, codeswitching, and English-only instruction: does age make a difference to learners' attitudes? *TESOL Q.* 2013;47(4):717–42.
- [34] Macdonald C. *Using the target language.* Cheltenham: Mary Glasgow; 1993.
- [35] Manara C. The use of L1 support: Teachers' and learners' opinions and practices in an Indonesian context the use of L1 support: Teachers' and learners' opinions and practices in an Indonesian Context. *The Journal of Asia TEFL.* 2007;4(1):145–78. Available from: https://www.asiatefl.org/main/download_pdf.php?i=311&c=1419314384&fn=4_1_07.pdf
- [36] Muluaem YG, Mulu YE, Gebremeskal TG. Effects of English learning beliefs on English achievement: academic emotions as mediators. *Heliyon.* 2022 Jun;8(7):e09829.
- [37] Nation P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *Asian EFL Journal,* 5(2), 1–8. Retrieved from <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/main-editions-new/the-role-of-the-first-language-in-foreign-language-learning/index.htm>
- [38] Pan Y, Pan Y. The use of L1 in the foreign language classroom. *Colomb Appl Linguist J.* 2017;12(2):87.
- [39] Rolin-lanziti J, Varshney R. Learners' views regarding the use of the First Language: an exploratory study in a tertiary context maximising target language use. *Can Mod Lang Rev.* 2008;65(2):249–73.
- [40] Romaine S. *Bilingualism.* 2nd ed. Malden: Blackwell Publishers; 1995.
- [41] Schweers CW Jr. Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum.* 1999;37(2):6–9.
- [42] Sharma K. Mother tongue use in English classroom. *Journal of NELTA.* 2006;11(1-2):80–7.
- [43] Storch N, Aldosari A. Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class. *Lang Teach Res.* 2010;14(4):355–75.

- [44] Storch N, Wigglesworth G. Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Q.* 2003;37(4):760–70.
- [45] Sundari H, Febriyanti RH. The use of first language (L1) in EFL classrooms: Teachers' practices and perspectives. *Int J Educ.* 2021;14(1):70–7.
- [46] Swain M, Lapkin S. Task-based second language learning: the uses of the first language. *Lang Teach Res.* 2000;4(3):251–74.
- [47] Tang J. Using L1 in the English classroom. *English Teaching Forum.* 2002;40(1):36–43.
- [48] Van Hell JG, Dijkstra T. Foreign language knowledge can influence native language performance in exclusively native contexts. *Psychon Bull Rev.* 2002 Dec;9(4):780–9.
- [49] VanPatten B. *Input processing and grammar instruction in second language acquisition.* Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group; 1996.
- [50] Vygotsky LS. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 1978.
- [51] Wang D. Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: learners and teachers' attitudes and practices. *Int J Biling Educ Biling.* 2019;22(2):138–49.
- [52] Wong KM, Tian Z. Chinese-English dual language bilingual education in the United States. *J Multilingual Multicult Dev.* 2022;43(6):477–86.
- [53] Yang J, Jang IC. The everyday politics of English-only policy in an EFL language school: Practices, ideologies, and identities of Korean bilingual teachers. *Int J Biling Educ Biling.* 2020;25(3):1088–100.