

INDONESIAN ENGLISH AS ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE (EAL) TEACHERS' BELIEFS OF MONOLINGUALISM IN AN INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL

Keyakinan Guru Bahasa Inggris (EAL) Berkebangsaan Indonesia Tentang Monolingualisme di Sekolah Internasional

Dwi Ariyati 

Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atmajaya

Email: DWI.202200010009@student.atmajaya.ac.id

doi: <https://doi.org/10.26499/bahasa.v7i2.1563>

Article History

Received: 27 July 2025

Revised: 25 August 2025

Accepted: 26 Sept 2025

Keywords

monolingualism; EAL teachers; International School; teachers' belief

Kata-Kata Kunci

monolingualisme; guru EAL; Sekolah Internasional; keyakinan guru

Abstract

This research explores the beliefs of Indonesian EAL teachers about monolingualism, they saw it as a challenge or a benefit and how they perceived students' native language conducted in one of the International Schools in Jakarta, Indonesia. The participants of this research were three Indonesian EAL teachers who worked in an International School in Jakarta. This researched employed qualitative research, and semi-structured interviews to collect the data. For data analysis, this researched utilised thematic analysis to analyse and examine the similarity and differences from research participants response. The findings stated that Indonesian EAL teachers recognised monolingualism as a disadvantage. Furthermore, using one language in the classroom, it raised the challenges included students at the beginner level was struggling to communicate and exchange their minds if they did not know how to express themselves in English and the needed to balance content and language for the teachers. Due to these challenges, the strategies in classroom included small groups with mixed abilities of students' English level and with one country. In addition, Indonesian EAL teachers perceived students' native language as a resource that should be taught at school, and it was helpful in expressing their thoughts and understanding the material.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengeksplorasi keyakinan guru EAL Indonesia tentang monolingualisme, bagaimana mereka memandangnya sebagai tantangan atau manfaat, dan bagaimana mereka memandang bahasa ibu siswa yang dilakukan di salah satu Sekolah Internasional di Jakarta, Indonesia. Partisipan penelitian ini adalah tiga guru EAL Indonesia yang bekerja di Sekolah Internasional di Jakarta. Penelitian ini menggunakan penelitian kualitatif dan wawancara semi-terstruktur untuk mengumpulkan data. Untuk analisis data, peneliti menggunakan analisis tematik untuk menganalisis dan memeriksa persamaan dan perbedaan dari tanggapan partisipan penelitian. Temuan penelitian menyatakan bahwa guru EAL Indonesia mengakui monolingualisme sebagai kerugian. Lebih lanjut, penggunaan satu bahasa di kelas menimbulkan tantangan, termasuk siswa tingkat pemula yang kesulitan berkomunikasi dan bertukar pikiran jika mereka tidak tahu cara mengekspresikan diri dalam bahasa Inggris, serta kebutuhan untuk menyeimbangkan konten dan bahasa bagi guru. Karena tantangan ini, strategi di kelas mencakup kelompok-kelompok kecil dengan kemampuan bahasa Inggris siswa yang beragam dan dengan satu negara. Selain itu, guru EAL Indonesia memandang bahasa ibu siswa sebagai sumber daya yang harus diajarkan di sekolah, dan hal itu membantu dalam mengekspresikan pikiran mereka dan memahami materi.

How to Cite: Ariyati, Dwi. (2025). Indonesian English as Additional Language (EAL) Teachers' Beliefs of Monolingualism in an International School. *Bahasa: Jurnal Keilmuan Pendidikan dan Sastra Indonesia*, 7(2), 570—584. doi: <https://doi.org/10.26499/bahasa.v7i2.1563>

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of international schools grew in Indonesia in 2003 (Firman & Tola, 2008), and nowadays, there are around 64 international schools in Jakarta (List of International Schools in Jakarta, 2023). International School students come from diverse cultural, linguistic backgrounds and different nationalities from around the world. However, to unify students from diverse nationalities and linguistic backgrounds, these schools employ English as the medium instruction in the classroom. The prioritizes English as the language which is seen as the language of power and importance, which can lead students to believe their own native languages are less valuable. It considered as the beliefs that English is superior to other language (Spiro & Crisfield, 2018; Ascher & Pichery, 2024). This ideology reflected in English-only policies, represent the monolingual ideology, which teachers and students using one language to communicate (Rozi, 2023).

Due to monolingualism in International School which using English-only, it could create challenges in the classroom for the teachers where many of International School students might have varying range English language proficiency, from beginning to emerging level. Regarding this issue, International Schools provide English as Additional Language (EAL) program to support those students as English Language Learner who their first language is not English (Spencer, 2021). Rampton (1997) state that EAL terminology was believed to be more inclusive in order that ESL terminology was associated to racism or discrimination due to separated ESL classes from regular class (as cited in Carder, 2014). The using the monolingual language in the EAL classroom caused the teachers to play a critical role in shaping the classroom environment. Their beliefs about the importance of using only one language (monolingualism) can significantly influence how they see the students' native language in EAL classroom.

Previous research on monolingual language ideologies revealed the diverse findings on the results. Rodriguez-Izquierdo (2022) investigated monolingualism of Andalusian teachers' regarding migrant students who spoke more than one language and how the teacher perceived students home language using at school. It revealed that Andalusian teachers seen bilingualism of students as a positive factor in society however, it would cause problem in teaching process. In addition, Andalusian teacher associated students home language as an obstacle in learning process. Moreover, Andalusian teachers' belief that the prioritize of migrant student to learn Spanish because without mastering it they cannot learn the content. Furthermore, Strobbe et al. (2017) stated that teachers with Majority dominant schools influenced monolingual ideology in Flemish community due to their limited experience with students who spoke more than one language. In addition, Bourne (2007) investigated that school managers in UK seen bilingualism as a problem and pushed English-only to support EAL students (as cited in Gundarina & Simpson, 2022). On the other hand, Slaughter and Cross (2021) analyzed the challenges of a monolingual mindset in EAL classroom. The result of this research was that all three EAL teachers demonstrated the importance of student's first language in the classroom and found practical ways to subvert the dominance of English-only practice system. In addition, Constantin-Dureci (2022) investigated EAL teachers who taught in their classroom. These teachers viewed code-switching as a resource and had not seen as the problem. Similar findings were reported by

Dery et.al (2022), who explored Indonesian teachers who using English-only ideology in the classroom that needed code-switch to Indonesian due to students varying English level. The other research, Rozi (2023) indicated that Indonesian EFL teachers perceived two perspectives on monolingualism in the classroom. They justified that prepared student in globalization world, where English was necessary, contrary the used of English-only was influenced by Western culture which focused on speaking like native that symbolized of wealthy and prestige. These perspective, monolingual ideology could give benefits in the classroom and created some challenging in the classroom.

From these previous researches that see monolingual language ideologies in the classroom has conducted in Andalusia, Spain, UK, Australia and little studies that has conducted in Indonesia, particularly EAL classroom in International School. Moreover, the previous research does not investigate teacher's belief of EAL teachers regarding monolingualism in International School. According to previous research, monolingual ideology in the classroom can create challenges and often sees other languages as a problems and positions English as the dominant language (Rodriguez-Izquierdo, 2022; Strobbe et al., 2017). On the other hand, some EAL teachers seen students' native language as resource (Constantin-Dureci, 2022; Slaughter & Cross, 2021). From the previous research about EAL classroom emphasized students were migrants' pupils and the teachers' first language were English. Given this gap in research, this research aims to explore Indonesian EAL teachers' belief of monolingualism in EAL classroom in International School, which their first language is not English. The following research questions will guide this investigation: (1) What are EAL teachers' beliefs about monolingualism in the classroom? Do they see it as a challenge or a benefit? (2) How do EAL teachers perceive students using their native language in the classroom?

The aim of the research is to achieve the objectives that are in line with two research questions. First, this research explored Indonesian EAL teachers' belief about monolingualism in EAL classroom with students from different background, whether they see it as a challenge or a benefit. Moreover, to see how to see how Indonesian EAL teachers' beliefs about monolingualism influence the strategies in their classrooms. Second, this research intended to see Indonesian EAL teachers' perspective on students' native language in the classroom.

This study offers several potential contributions. Firstly, it aims to understand Indonesian EAL teachers' beliefs of monolingualism in the classroom. This knowledge can be used to develop better training and practices that support students' full linguistic repertoire. Secondly, the study seeks to explore how to create learning environments that embrace and celebrate linguistic diversity. This can lead to a more inclusive and effective educational experience for international students. In addition, the findings can be used to develop EAL teacher training programs that design the complexity of teaching in their classrooms. It could encourage International Schools policy to embrace linguistic diversity more in the classrooms.

The theoretical contribution of this study is to understand monolingualism ideology among EAL teachers. It can explore how Indonesian EAL teachers, particularly in Jakarta, perceived students' native language and implement monolingual language ideology in their classrooms.

METHODS

The participants were three high school Indonesian EAL teachers who teach English and Humanities recruited as their consent to be interviewed for this research. These teachers worked in an International School in Jakarta and taught students across a range of English proficiency, from beginners to emerging learners (Table 1). These three teachers were two females and one

male, and their ages ranged from 45 to 52 years old. Their teaching experience in EAL classrooms varied from 11 to 17 years, teaching English EAL, Humanities EAL, and Indonesia Studies. Participants' availability and willingness to participate in this study. Convenience sampling was used for these participants' selections due to the researcher's access to this specific school population (Berg, 2001). Pseudonyms were assigned to each participant throughout the study to ensure confidentiality.

The study setting was an International School in Jakarta, which provided an EAL (English as an Additional Language) classroom program. This school implements a mixed curriculum, combining the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) framework and the International Baccalaureate (IB) program for senior studies.

Table 1.
Teacher's Profile

No	Codes	Age	School Level	Gender	Teaching Experience	Subject Teaching
1	NA (Participant 1)	45	High School	Female	11 years	English EAL
2	FS (Participant 2)	52	High School	Male	15 years	English EAL, Humanities EAL and Indonesian Studies
3	ER (Participant 3)	46	High School	Female	17 years	English EAL and Humanities EAL

This research employed a qualitative approach which emphasized gaining deeper understanding of social phenomenon which investigated details experiences and perspectives from different participants (Lim, 2024). The researcher developed questions guide to explore participants' beliefs on monolingualism ideology in relation to their classroom and practices based on Ellis (2008), which stated that monolingualism is the unmarked case, monolingualism is a limitation, and monolingualism is a dangerous phenomenon. In addition to teacher's beliefs, the questions developed from Barcelos (2003) that stated beliefs affected teachers' perceptions about teaching practices that influence their activities in the classroom. Those theories assisted the researchers in explaining research question number one. These questions were trying to reveal Indonesian EAL teachers perspective of using only one language in the classroom, which they perceived as advantage or disadvantage, the challenges of using only one language and how their strategies in teaching with students in varied of linguistic background. In addition, the researcher developed a question guide to explore research question number two about Indonesian EAL teachers' perception of students' native language in the classroom according to Ruiz's (1984) work on language orientation and adapted from Rodriguez-Izquierdo (2022) questions about linguistic diversity in the classroom. In these questions, the researchers sought to unveil how teacher's perception of students native language whether it would be advantageous to learn English and or should it be taught at school. These questions can be seen in Appendix 1.

The data collection for this research, the researcher adopted in-depth interviews after finalizing research questions which explore participants' experiences and understand perspectives along with beliefs about monolingualism and students' native language in the classroom (Loewen & Plonsky, 2017). By using in-depth interviews, the researcher was able to get details information of participants point of view, experiences and feelings about particular topic (Rutledge & Hogg, 2020). The interview was conducted in 30-45 minutes and utilized in the Indonesian language. The interview transcript was written verbatim and will be analyzed using descriptive methods.

The data analysis in this study followed the framework of Miles and Huberman (1994), which comprises three main stages including data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing. Stage one, data reduction, interview transcripts were selected, focused and simplified (Mezmir, 2020). The data were then categorized into themes that occurred during the interviews. Each interview was examined to identify the Indonesian EAL teachers' perspectives on monolingualism in the classroom and the use of student's native language. The coding categories in each interview were then identified into five categories. Stage two, data display, in this stage the researcher displayed and presented the key concept of the findings with narrative description, utilized the interview excerpts linked to the codes to provide evidence for identified themes and sub-themes (Kallon & Colvin, 2022). Last stage, conclusion drawing, the themes were analyzed To interpret the data and formulate the study's conclusions.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The result findings would be names were coded to protect teachers' anonymity. NA represents participant 1, FS represents participant 2, and ER represents participant 3. Direct quotations are included in the findings to illustrate participants' perspectives of multilingualism and students' native language. The results of this study are presented to answer two research questions. The first research question was about teachers' belief about monolingualism, they discovered that monolingualism as disadvantage in the classroom, what challenges about using only one language (English) in the classroom, and how they strategies inside the classroom where many students with diverse linguistic background to overcome their challenges. Indonesian EAL teachers' identified that it was a disadvantage to use only one language in the classroom with diverse students' language backgrounds. In addition, it was challenging when using only one language in the classroom which students in EAL classroom mostly spoke English as a second language and they were beginner level in English. Furthermore, to overcome those challenges, Indonesian EAL teachers utilize strategies including small group discussions which establish mixed abilities, or put the students who had the same nationalities. Indonesian EAL teachers considered that those strategies would benefit their students to improve their English competencies. The second research question is about how Indonesian EAL teachers' perception of students' native language. Indonesian EAL teachers revealed that students native language is the resource to learn the other language and should be taught at school. It would give the benefit for students as the fundamental to learn or formulate when procession language acquisition. Direct quotations are included in the findings to illustrate participants' perspectives of multilingualism and students' native language.

Monolingualism: Disadvantage Using One Language in the Classroom

The findings revealed that all participants believed that it would be a disadvantage to use one language (English-only) in the classroom, and they expressed different reasons why using only one language is a disadvantage. Participant 2 (FS) expressed that students at the beginner level would be disadvantaged using one language only. However, for students with emerging English levels, English could only be an advantage because it motivates them to move with native students. Artieda (2017) explored first language for beginner level learners were essential to construct their targeted language. On the other hand, participants 1 (NA) and 3 (ER) believe that the disadvantage of using English only in the classroom due to students' native language was important to formulate their answers and understand the content and lesson they were studying as Ellis (2008) mentioned that monolingualism as a limitation where these teachers promote the

benefit using another language and speaking one language only will less advantage. Indonesian EAL teachers believed that using English only in the classroom is a disadvantage that impacts their teaching and activities in the classroom, which allows the students to use their native language in the classroom. Barcelos (2003) stated that beliefs influence the perceptions teachers have about teaching and learning and affect their activities in the classroom.

Excerpt 1 below explains participant 1 point of view on using one language in the classroom:

Excerpt 1 (NA, participant 1)

“Jika itu ditetapkan seratus persen, itu akan merugikan. Tetapi jika dia (English-only) diterapkan sesuai dengan kondisi [...] jika ya seperti saya bilang tadi dari awal sampai akhir harus English-only nggak akan bisa membantu peserta didik. Tapi kalau ada dimana mereka boleh menggunakan Bahasa Ibu menurut saya itu sangat berguna sekali. [...] Bahasa ibu sangat diperlukan sekali untuk mereka bisa memformulasikan jawaban yang mereka berikan kepada guru. Jadi saya nggak pernah seratus persen sepanjang pelajaran itu, harus menggunakan Bahasa Inggris.”

“If it is applied 100%, it will be disadvantage. However, if it (English-only) apply according to the situation [...] Like I said earlier, If English-only should apply from beginning to end of the class, it will not be able to help students. But if there is a situation where students’ native language can be used, it will be very useful. Students’ native language is very necessary for them to able to formulate the answer they give to the teacher. So I never use 100% in whole lesson using English-only.”

Participant 1 believed that if English-only was applied in whole class activities, it could be a disadvantage for the students and not help them. She believed that students’ native language would be very useful in the classroom in formulating answers for the teachers. The idea from Participant 1 has a similar perspective to that of Participant 3, who believes that the student’s native language supports the students in understanding the content.

Excerpt 2 (ER, participant 3)

“Kerugian, tidak memperbolehkan Bahasa ibunya untuk dipakai di kelas. [...] Jadi kita kasih tau sama siswanya hari ini cuma Bahasa Inggris aja karena fokusnya di speaking, just English. Tetapi di luar dari itu, misalkan memang nggak ada target yang dicapai untuk bisa anak-anak memahami instruksi, karena mereka kan berasal dari negara yang berbeda dan menggunakan Bahasa yang berbeda pula. Jadi penggunaan Bahasa ibu sebenarnya membantu mereka untuk memahami konten, memahami pelajaran yang mereka yang sedang mereka pelajari.”

“Disadvantage, for not allowing students’ native language used in the classroom. [...] so we tell students, today using English-only in the class because we focus on speaking, just English. However, apart from that, there is no target to achieve for students to understand the instruction, because they are from different nationality and use different language also. So, the use of students’ native language actually helps them to understand the content, lessons they are studying.”

Participant 3 believed that using only one language in the classroom is a disadvantage. However, if the content was about speaking activity, she would use English-only. She thought that the student’s native language could help them understand the content and lessons that they were studying. On the other hand, participant 2 also believed that he experienced the disadvantage of using English-only in the classroom because his students were at beginner levels of English in his classroom. However, he explained that students who were in emerging level, English-only could be an advantage due to motivating them to move to native students, as claimed in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 3 (FS, participant 2)

“Untuk pemula agak susah kayaknya itu merugikan murid karena lebih banyak materi yang disampaikan itu harus dalam Bahasa Inggris. Tetapi mereka juga diminta untuk membaca, mereka juga diminta untuk merangkum gitu. Kalau hanya khusus Bahasa Inggris untuk pemula agak susah. Tetapi untuk tingkat anak-anak yang sudah tidak belajar sebagai pemula, maka English-only itu keuntungan karena sebagai motivasi supaya mereka tidak ada di program, di departemen kami lagi, supaya bisa masuk bersama anak-anak native ya.”

“For students who are in beginners level, it’s a little bit difficult and disadvantage for students because most of the material presented in English. But they are also asked to read, summarise. If it is English-only especially for beginners, it’s a bit difficult. But for the level of students who are no longer as beginner, English-only is an advantage because it is a motivation so that they are no longer in EAL program, and they are able to join with native student.”

Monolingualism: Challenges Using English-Only in the Classroom

Indonesian EAL teachers share the challenges of using English-only in the classroom and expressed their perspective on the challenges of using only one language in the classroom. Indonesian EAL teachers in International Schools believed that the challenges they faced in the classroom regarding the use of monolingual language might come from the students with a beginner level of English. As mentioned in participants 2 (FS) and 3 (ER), how could they address the content and lesson in the material in English to make these students understand it. Dobinson and Buchori (2016) revealed that EAL teachers felt pressure to meet the expectations of curriculum and strategies for teaching EAL students. Moreover, Miller, Windle, and Yazdanpanah (2014) explored the challenges faced by EAL teachers when they taught in EAL classrooms, including the pressure to balance the content and the focus of the language. Participant 1 (NA) also thought that it was a challenge for students at the beginner level to communicate and exchange their minds if they did not know how to express themselves in English. Participant 1 mentioned that a student’s native language is important. Garcia Jimenez (2024) explored that allowing L1 beginner-level students in language acquisition would facilitate and give an advantage to them to clarify difficult materials and create a comfortable learning atmosphere. Furthermore, students perceived it would be advantageous to them to understand the topic material when they felt uncertain and anxious about their English language abilities.

As participant 2 mentioned that students in beginner-level English because they were new in English, and he needed to address the material as claimed in the following below.

Excerpt 4 (FS, participant 2)

“Karena di kelas saya itu ada tingkatan berbahasa Inggrisnya, karena saya bekerja di departemen EAL. Bahasa Inggrisnya sebagai Bahasa kedua ya. Jadi kalau untuk di kelas saya hanya Inggris saja, saya akan mengalami kesulitan karena tingkat Bahasa Inggris murid saya yang memang benar-bener baru. Jadi kalau hanya Inggris saja sedangkan saya juga harus menyampaikan materi topik, nah itu akan saya akan mengalami kesulitan untuk anak-anak yang baru, lagi berkenalan dengan berkenalan Bahasa Inggris.”

“Because in my class, there are students with various English-level. I work in EAL department which English as second language. So, if I apply English-only, I will experience difficulties because my students are new in English. So, if I use only English and I also have to address the content material, I will experience difficulties for new students who are just new of English.”

Participant 2 could believe that students in his classroom saw English as their second language because his students were new to English, and he needed to address the topic material in English. These arguments are also similar to those of ER; Participant 3 expressed that she did not have any difficulties related to the English language; however, she ensured that students with no English were able to understand the material, as claimed in the excerpt below.

Excerpt 5 (ER, participant 3)

“Ohh mungkin penggunaan Bahasa Inggris, nggak ada kesulitan. Tetapi bagaimana kita bisa mengupayakan anak-anak yang Bahasa Inggrisnya kurang atau tidak ada sama sekali bisa mengerti pelajaran menggunakan Bahasa Asing ini, gitu.”

“Oh, it could be there is no difficulties of using English. However, how can we ensure that students whose English is limited or no English at all to understand the lessons using foreign language, that's it”

Participants 2 and 3 shared the similarities of challenges they faced in using only one language in the classroom. They saw the challenges from their point of view. However, Participant 1 expressed that she used to implement English-only instruction in the classroom and changed that perspective due to situations in the classroom. Participant 1 assumed that the challenges she faced were when students were at the beginning level of English because they needed translation. Participant 1 emphasized that a student's native language is important.

Excerpt 6 (NA, participant 1)

“Oh iya pastinya. Oleh karena itu lah saya merubah kebijaksanaan di kelas. Jadi awalnya English-only tetapi bagaimana mereka bisa bertukar pikiran kalau mereka sendiri tidak tahu caranya untuk menjawab dengan Bahasa Inggris gitu loh. Nah jadi, misalnya ada yang beginning level, itu sangat rendah sekali. Mereka berkomunikasi dengan saya pun tetap harus menggunakan translation. Nah itu kan berarti kembali ke Bahasa ibu mereka juga. Ya jadi nggak ideal untuk diterapkan seratus persen. Tapi jika seperti saya bilang tidak seratus persen itu sangat membantu sekali.”

“Oh yes of course. That's why I changed the policy in the classroom. At the beginning (years of teaching) I used to apply English-only but how students could exchange their ideas if they don't know to answer in English language. For example, there are students in beginning level, who English is very low. They have to use translation to communicate with me (teachers). It means it goes back to their native language. So, it is not ideal if it applies 100%. But if I said, it is not 100% percent, it will be very helpful.”

Monolingualism: Small Group Strategies in the Classroom

The other findings was reflected in participants related to teachers' strategies in EAL classrooms with students from different linguistic backgrounds. In an EAL classroom, where students could not be at the same level of language level, participants 1 (NA) and 3 (ER) used mixed abilities strategies, which combined students who were at the beginner level of English with students who were in emerging English. Gravelle (2005) explored that students in small groups might complete tasks of varying abilities and have a flexible time frame to complete them (as cited in Reid, 2015). Small group interaction could provide a learning experience for students, and practice through task repetition might be advantageous to students with low proficiency (Pinter, 2007). Moreover, Participant 2 (FS) also had strategies similar to those of Participant 1, where he would group students who came from the same countries so that students could feel comfortable with the task. This strategy might allow the students in the classroom to use their native language to discuss their tasks. Using their native language could reduce students' anxiety and create a relaxing environment for students who learned English as their second language (Bruen & Kelly, 2014; Choi & Leung, 2017).

Participant 1 believed that they created a small group of mixed abilities ranging from beginner level to emerging level with students who come from the same country, as represented in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 7 (NA, participant 1)

“Itu biasanya saya usahakan mereka levelnya (English) beda supaya level yang tinggi membantu yang level rendah. Karena biasanya kalau level rendah biasanya malu untuk mengungkapkan pendapat atau

pikirannya. Jadi level yang tinggi dan rendah digabung, diusahakan yang satu negara, supaya mereka berdiskusi itu dengan Bahasa Ibu mereka, seperti itu.”

“I usually try to combine the students at different levels (English) so students with higher level of English support the students who are in beginner level. Because students who are in beginner level reluctant to express their opinions or thought. So students who are in higher and beginner levels are combined, then they come from same countries to discuss with their native language.”

Participant 1 strategies in the EAL classroom emphasized mixed abilities of varying English levels from beginner to emerging with the same country. This practice was also implemented by Participant 2, who grouped the students who came from the same country in their activities. It is shown in the following excerpt below.

Excerpt 8 (FS, participant 2)

“Kalau untuk yang belajar Bahasa (English), baru belajar Bahasa lebih menguntungkan buat si murid kalau mereka ada teman satu Bahasa gitu sebenarnya. Jadi yang pertama perhatian saya adalah mereka yang penting nyaman dulu dengan kondisi tugasnya gitu. Jadi kalau tugasnya memang harus berpasangan, pasti saya cari pasangan yang satu Bahasa gitu.”

“For those who are new in English learning, it will be beneficial for students who have same language (same countries). So my first concern is that important to feel comfortable with their work condition. So if the task requires in pairs, I will definitely partner the students who speak the same language.”

Participant 2 had similar strategies to Participant 1, which put the students with the same linguistic background in one group. Participant 2 believed that students should feel comfortable first, which is why he grouped them with students from the same countries. On the other hand, Participant 3 had strategies similar to those of Participant 1, which mixed abilities. However, Participant 3 identified the assignment first because she thought that mixed abilities have a weakness that students with beginner level would not learn (the lesson).

Excerpt 9 (ER, participant 3)

“Kalau saya cenderung dilihat dulu tingkat kesulitannya. Apabila memang kesulitannya susah banget berarti mix abilities itu lebih bagus. Jadi siswa dengan kemampuan Bahasa Inggris yang kurang digabungkan untuk bekerja dengan mereka yang Bahasa Inggrisnya sudah lebih bagus. [...] Jeleknya mix abilities itu adalah ketika, karena sering dibantu anak-anak yang level Bahasa Inggrisnya rendah, dengan mereka yang Bahasa Inggrisnya lebih bagus kecenderungannya adalah mereka tidak akan belajar.”

“I tend to look at the task difficulties first. If the task is really challenging, it means mix abilities are better. So, students who beginner level of English combine to work with students who emerging level. [...] The lack of mix abilities is when students who are in beginner level tend to get help from students who are in higher level, the tendency is that they will not learn (the lesson).”

Teachers’ Perception about Student Native Language: The Advantage of using Students’ Native Language to Learn English

Indonesian EAL teachers had positive views regarding the advantage of using students’ native language to learn English. All participants thought that students’ native would be very helpful for students to learn the other language. Indonesian EAL teachers’ perception of students’ native language as a resource where these teachers see all languages as valuable tools to help the students formulate their answers in English and understand the material quickly. Ruiz (1984) explored language as a resource, which meant that this approach allows students to use their native language in the classroom to create programs to acquire the second language better, and it

would make students more confident, making the learning process and environment more positive (as cited in Rodriguez-Izquierdo, 2022).

As mentioned in Participant 1, it is realized that students' native language is used to process the data, acquire the other language, and have a strong structure of their language repertoire, as represented in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 10 (NA, participant 1)

"yah karena bagaimanapun mereka pasti mengolah data, mengolah apa yang mereka terima itu (bahasa Inggris) dalam Bahasa ibu gitu. Jadi itu sangat wajar sekali dan malah akan sangat membantu mereka untuk punya struktur yang kuat gitu loh dalam memformulasikan Bahasa mereka ke dalam Inggris maksudnya gitu."

"Well, they need to process the data, receive English language to translate in students' native language. So that's very natural and will help them to have strong structure to formulate their language into English. That's what it means."

This idea of a student's native language is important to support students to have a good structure to formulate into English. Moreover, this statement also have the similar comments from participant 3 that assumed that students' language to understand English quickly and better for the learning as claimed in this following excerpt.

Excerpt 11 (ER, participant 3)

"it's keuntungan pastinya karena dengan menggunakan Bahasa Ibu, kita bisa mengerti sesuatu lebih cepat, lebih baik pula untuk pelajaran. Kalau menurut saya itu merupakan keuntungan karena apa? [...] The only language that we know is our own language, hanya Bahasa ibu kita yang kita tau. Lantas tidak diperbolehkan menggunakan Bahasa ibu. Apa yang terjadi dengan anak itu? Dia tidak akan ngomong apa-apa"

"It's beneficial because by using our native language, we can understand things more quickly and also better for the learning. In my opinion, it is beneficial because of what? [...] the only language that we know is our own native language. If we don't allow using students' native language, what will happen with the student? He/she will not say anything."

On the other hand, Participant 2 assumed that students native language would help student to process understanding material swiftly and the structure of their targeted language. Participants two also belived that if students had a good structure in their native language, it would be seen also when they learned their targeted language, as claimed in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 12 (FS, participant 2)

"Tergantung situasi, tetapi kalau seorang punya Bahasa ibu yang baik sebenarnya Bahasa asingnya lebih mudah ya untuk dia pakai gitu. Jadi ketauan sebenarnya kalau Bahasa Inggrisnya bagus tuh biasanya teman-teman akan tau kalau Bahasa Jepangnya misalnya rapih atau struktur Bahasa yang dia pakai serius banget, maksudnya dia lebih teratur Bahasa yang dia pakai. Jadi ada manfaatnya dalam kondisi yang beda-beda. Untuk materi tidak masalah sih kalau untuk Bahasa Ibu. Lebih mudah malah jadi lebih cepat proses untuk penyerapan materi. Jadi misalnya belajar struktur Bahasa inggris pun, dia harus tau struktur Bahasanya apa dalam Bahasa Jepangnya apa, urutan kata kerjanya dimana, jadi untuk pembanding lebih baik menggunakan Bahasa Ibu."

"It depends on the situation, but if someone has a good mother tongue, it is actually easier for them to use foreign languages. So it is actually obvious that if their English is good, usually their friends will know if their Japanese (language), for example, is neat or the language structure they use is very serious tone, meaning that their language is more organized. So there are benefits in different conditions. For material, it doesn't matter if it's for their mother tongue. It's easier and even makes the process of absorbing the

material faster. So for example, learning English structure, they have to know what the language structure is in Japanese, what the order of the verbs is, so for comparison it's better to use their mother tongue.”

Teachers’ Perception about Student Native Language: Students’ Native Language Should be Taught in International School

Indonesian EAL teachers perceived that it would be a great opportunity for students to learn their native language at school. Indonesian EAL teachers agreed that it would be great if the schools were able to provide students with their native language because it would strengthen their native language, distinguish the language structure between their native language and English, and express their thoughts or minds, as mentioned in participants 1 and 2. Ammar, Ligthbrown, and Spada (2010) explored that target language learning can be improved by helping students identify the differences between their native language and target language and providing support to practice using the target language. Participant 3 also perceived it could be great if the school could provide students’ native classes according to how many nationalities there are at school or offer it as an extracurricular. Khetagury, Zangaladne & Albay (2011) explored that learners might face difficulties in understanding the targeted language. L1 facilitated the learning process to their targeted language led them to achieve their target language. Using students’ native language contributed to maximizing the targeted language, helping students identify the differences between their native language and target (Shin, Dixon & Choi, 2020). Moreover, Rospel (2019) stated that the use of L1 can be beneficial for learners to learn a targeted language in a foreign language classroom, give them control over their learning, and could be the scaffolding tool to lead their accomplished performance in the targeted language.

Participant 2 identified that it would be a great opportunity if the school could provide lessons to practice students’ native language because students would strengthen their structure and leave an impression when they mastered the target language, as claimed in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 13 (FS, participant 2)

“Jadi gini Bahasa ibu itu sebenarnya membantu sekali ya untuk belajar Bahasa asing ya. Jadi di sekolah itu sebenarnya kalau ada Bahasa ibunya dia latih lagi, mungkin saya lebih suka gitu karena mereka akan menguatkan Bahasa ibunya nanti dia bisa tau apa tuh struktur-struktur yang berbeda dari Bahasa Ibunya. [...] Jadi biasanya untuk remaja lebih membekas nantinya kalau sudah selesai itu. (menguasai Bahasanya)”

“Students native language is actually very helpful for learning foreign language. If there is a chance at school to practice their native language, I prefer that because they will strengthen their native language and they will be able to recognise the structure that are difference from their native language. [...] so usually for teenager, it will leave the impression later when they master it (the language).

This perspective, also supported by Participant 1, stated that students’ native language should be taught in International Schools to express what they think, and if they cannot express their thought in their native language, they also struggle to express themselves in the other language, as presented in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 14 (NA, participant 1)

“Menurut saya harus (diajarkan di sekolah). Bahasa itu kan yang sebagai kerangka pikiran kita gitu loh. Kita mengekspresikan apa yang kita tau, apa yang kita rasakan itu kan melalui Bahasa. Nah kalau Bahasa ibunya aja nggak diajarin, nanti mereka kan kesulitan banget untuk mengungkapkan ke dalam Bahasa lain gitu loh, Makanya itu penting banget.”

“I think it should (be taught at school). Language is the framework for our thought, you know. We express what we know, what we feel through language. Well, if students’ native language did not teach at school, it would be difficult for them to express it in another language. That’s why it’s really important.”

So, participant 2 assumed that it was important for schools to provide students with native language classes. Moreover, Participant 3 also agreed that it would be great if the school were able to provide subject classes for students’ native language or if it could be offered as an extracurricular activity, as in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 15 (ER, participant 3)

“Kalau di sekolah ini karena settingnya (sekolah) internasional, kalau memang kita menawarkan subject foreign language other than English, harusnya disediakan sesuai dengan nationalities yang ada, gitu. Misalnya kita dalam satu sekolah ini ada lima negara, bolehlah ditawarkan mata pelajaran Bahasa asing lainnya. Misalnya ada Spanyol belajar Bahasa Spanyol. Atau mungkin bisa ditawarkan dalam bentuk ekstrakur.”

“In this school because the setting is International School, if we offer foreign language other than English, they should be provided based on existing nationalities. For example, if we have five nationalities in one school, it could be offered the other foreign language (other than English). For example, there is Spanish student learn Spanish language. Or it could be offered as extracurricular.”

CONCLUSION

The finding result of this research answered the purpose of the research which Indonesian EAL teacher’s belief of monolingualism in an International School and how they perceived student’s native language. This research drew the result that Indonesian EAL teachers’ beliefs about monolingualism in the classroom which they believed that using only one language (English language) in the classroom was a disadvantage if it applied 100% during the lesson. In addition, students who were at beginner level of English would struggle to use only one language in the classroom; in this perspective, Indonesian EAL teachers believe that students’ native language might be very helpful in formulating answers, expressing their thoughts during the class and understand the materials of the lesson. Indonesian EAL teachers faced challenges in the classroom using one language, including the need to address the materials and not only teach English as the language. The other challenges mentioned by the participant are hard for beginner-level students to understand the content and also to communicate because they need to use translation to speak with the teachers. The strategies used by Indonesian EAL teachers include mixing abilities with raging levels from beginner to emerging levels of English in small groups and considering students who are from the same linguistic background.

Indonesian EAL teachers perceived students’ native language as a resource for them to learn English. It will help students develop their language structure in their native language and also their target language, advance their understanding of the material topics quickly, and have common perceptions. International EAL teachers also perceived that International Schools should consider offering or opening students’ native language classes or extracurricular activities to strengthen their native language, acknowledge structure differences between their native language and English, and express themselves more effectively.

However, this study has some limitations, including the small sample size of participants and also the data collected from Indonesian EAL teachers. A wide range of participants could be helpful, from main subject teachers (maths and science) and language teachers in mainstream

class perspectives from anglophone countries. It could compare the perspectives of Indonesian EAL teachers, language teachers in the mainstream, and subject teachers to understand their ideas of monolingualism at international schools. This study also relies on interviews without observations from actual classroom practice. It could provide observations to strengthen the results of the study and align with the interviews. Lastly, this study did not collect information about the Indonesian EAL teachers' training program they received. It could influence their view of using students' native language in the classroom.

The implication of this study is to construct a teacher training program that embraces translanguaging in the classroom and some strategies for teachers who have a range of English levels in the classroom to integrate students' language more effectively. The other implication for international schools that promote diversity is that they should consider a flexible approach for allowing students to use their native language in the classroom, particularly in the EAL classroom.

REFERENCES

- Ammar, A., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2010). Awareness of L1/L2 Differences: Does it Matter?. *Language Awareness*, 19(2), 129—146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658411003746612>
- Artieda, G. (2017). The Role of L1 Literacy and Reading Habits on The L2 Achievement of Adult Learners of English as a Foreign Language. *System*, 66, 168—176. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.03.020>
- Ascher, H. R., & Pichery, K. M. (2024). Language Policy in English as a Medium of Instruction Schools: A Multilingual Approach. In *Handbook of Research on Critical Issues and Global Trends in International Education* (pp. 260—283). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-8795-2.ch011>
- Barcelos, A. M. F. (2003). Teachers' and Students' Beliefs Within a Deweyan framework: Conflict and Influence. In P. Kalaja, & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New research approaches* (pp. 171—199). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Science*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Bruen, J., & Kelly, N. (2014). Using a Shared L1 to Reduce Cognitive Overload and Anxiety Levels in The L2 Classroom. *The Language Learning Journal*, 45(3), 368—381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.908405>
- Carder, M. (2014). Tracing The Path of ESL Provision in International Schools Over the Last Four Decades. *International Schools Journal*, 34(1), 85—96.
- Choi, T. H., & Leung, C. (2017). Uses of First and Foreign Languages as Learning Resources in a Foreign Language Classroom. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 14(4), 587. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2017.14.4.1.587>
- Constantin-Dureci, G. (2022). Challenging Dominant Language Ideology in the Adult ESL Classroom: A Case Study. *Studies in Applied Linguistics & TESOL*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.52214/salt.v22i1.8726>
- Dobinson, T., & Buchori, S. (2016). Catering for EAL/D Students' Language Needs in Mainstream Classes: Early Childhood Teachers' Perspectives and Practices in One Australian Setting. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, 41(2), 32-52. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n2.3>

- Ellis, E. M. (2008). *Defining and Investigating Monolingualism*. Sociolinguistic Studies. https://www.academia.edu/10752950/Defining_and_investigating_monolingualism
- Firman, H. & Tola. (2008). The Future of Schooling in Indonesia. *Journal of International Cooperation in Education*, 11(1), 71–84. <https://cice.hiroshima-u.ac.jp/wp-content/uploads/publications/Journal11-1/11-1-6.pdf>
- García Jiménez, S. P. (2024). The Use of L1 in a Beginner L2 English Classroom: A Case Study in Mexico. *Open Journal for Studies in Linguistics*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.32591/coas.ojsl.0702.02059g>
- Gundarina, O., & Simpson, J. (2022). A Monolingual Approach in an English Primary School: Practices and Implications. *Language and education*, 36(6), 523—543. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2021.1945084>
- Kallon, I. I., & Colvin, C. J. (2022). A Qualitative Exploration of Continuity of TB Care in Clinics After Discharge from Hospitals in Cape Town, South Africa. *BMC Health Services Research*, 22(1), 1489. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-08880-9>
- Khetaguri, T., Zangaladze, M., & Albay, M. (2016). The Benefits of Using L1 in Foreign Language Learning Process. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 2(3), 24—26. <https://www.ijsses.tiu.edu.iq/index.php/ijsses/article/view/602>
- Lim, W. M. (2025). What is Qualitative Research? An Overview and Guidelines. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 33(2), 199—229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14413582241264619>
- List of every International School in Jakarta.(2024). @IntSchoolsDB. <https://www.international-schools-database.com/in/jakarta>
- Mezmir, E. A. (2020). Qualitative Data Analysis: An Overview of Data Reduction, Data Display, and Interpretation. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 10(21), 15—27. <https://doi.org/10.7176/RHSS/10-21-02>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage.
- Miller, J., Windle, J. A., & Yazdanpanah, L. K. (2014). Planning Lessons for Refugee-Background Students: Challenges and Strategies. *International Journal of Pedagogies & Learning*, 9(1), 38—48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18334105.2014.11082018>
- Phakiti, A. (2014). *Experimental Research Methods in Language Learning*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Pinter, A. (2007). Some Benefits of Peer-Peer Interaction: 10-Year-Old Children Practicing with a Communication Task. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(2), 189—207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807074>
- Raspel, L. (2019). *Teachers' and Students' Language Use in Foreign Language Classroom: An Analysis of The Role of L1 in Target Language Learning* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Portsmouth).
- Reid, K. N. (2015). *A Case Study of the Experiences of Small Group Work for Newly Arrived EAL Pupils in a Secondary School: Perceptions of Teachers, Teaching Assistants and Pupils* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick).
- Rodríguez-Izquierdo, R. M. (2022). Monolingual Ideologies of Andalusian Teachers in the Multilingual Schools' Context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(7), 2482–2494. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1918627>
- Rozi, N. (2023). English Language Teaching in Indonesia: Monolingual and Multilingual Practices. *K@ta*, 25(00), 88—95. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.25.00.88-95>

- Rutledge, P. B., & Hogg, J. L. C. (2020). In-Depth Interviews. *The international encyclopedia of media psychology*, 1—7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119011071.iemp0019>
- Shin, J. Y., Dixon, L. Q., & Choi, Y. (2020). An updated review on use of L1 in foreign language classrooms. *Journal of multilingual and multicultural development*, 41(5), 406-419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1684928>
- Slaughter, Y., & Cross, R. (2021). Challenging The Monolingual Mindset: Understanding Plurilingual Pedagogies in English as an Additional Language (EAL) Classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(1), 39—60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820938819>
- Spencer, J. (2021). Understanding EAL: International Secondary School Teachers' Experiences and Attitudes in Ukraine and Eastern Europe. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 20(2), 171—186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14752409211033749>
- Spiro J., & Crisfield E. (2018). *Linguistic and Cultural Innovation in Schools: The Languages Challenge*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Strobbe, L., Van Der Wildt, A., Van Avermaet, P., Van Gorp, K., Van den Branden, K., & Van Houtte, M. (2017). How School Teams Perceive and Handle Multilingualism: The Impact of a School's Pupil Composition. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 64, 93—104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.01.023>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is to completed Current Research in Applied Linguistics subject in Master Degree at Atmajaya University.