Exploring English Lecturers' Beliefs About The Use of Native Language in The EFL Context

Muhammad Hidayat[*], Gunadi Harry Sulistyo
English Language teaching, Universitas Negeri Malang
Jl. Semarang No. 5 Sumbersari 65145, Malang, East Java, Indonesia. E-mail: hidayatmhasan@gmail.com

Abstract: The beginning of the twentieth century was the time when the ELT theoreticians and academics prohibited the use of mother tongue with the assumption that teaching and learning a new language in the exclusive and monolingual approach must be better-off. After obtaining its dominance in language teaching methodology, this monolingual approach began to be questioned. Moreover, what is up-to-date in works of literature and theories is not essentially indicating what actually arrives on the scene in the EFL classroom practices. The students' own-language (OL) has survived over the years. This research explored the lecturers' beliefs about the use of own-language by focusing on certain variables in the context of EFL. The findings clearly provide shreds of evidence that their beliefs about own-language, particularly in their classroom practices, are more complicated than generally presented in the ELT literature. Subsequently, the results could offer a description of how the lecturers use the own-language based on their own beliefs. The report also confirms that own-language is unavoidable and becomes a part of new language learning. Lastly, some considerations for ELT teachers, lecturers, and further researchers are provided at the end of the discussions.

Key words: native language use, lecturers' beliefs, EFL context

Abstrak:Awal abad kedua puluh adalah saat dimana para ahli teori dan akademisi pengajaran Bahasa Inggris melarang penggunaan bahasa ibu dengan asumsi bahwa bahasa baru harus diajarkan dan dipelajari secara eksklusif dan dengan satu bahasa. Setelah memperoleh dominasinya dalam metodologi pengajaran bahasa, pendekatan monolingual ini mulai dipertanyakan. Selain itu, apa yang terbaru dalam literatur dan teori tidak serta merta mencerminkan apa yang sebenarnya terjadi dalam praktik kelas Bahasa Inggris. Kenyataannya, bahasa sendiri telah bertahan selama bertahun-tahun. Penelitian ini mengeksplorasi kepercayaan dosen tentang penggunaan bahasa sendiri dengan berfokus pada variabel-variabel tertentu dalam konteks Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris. Temuan dari penelitian ini jelas membuktikan bahwa kepercayaan mereka tentang bahasa sendiri, khususnya dalam praktik kelas, lebih rumit daripada yang umumnya disajikan dalam literatur pengajaran Bahasa Inggris. Selanjutnya, hasil penelitian ini menyajikan deskripsi tentang bagaimana umumnya para dosen menggunakan bahasa sendiri berdasarkan kepercayaan mereka. Laporan penelitian ini juga menegaskan bahwa bahasa sendiri tidak dapat dihindari dan bahkan menjadi bagian dari pembelajaran sebuah bahasa baru. Terakhir, beberapa pertimbangan untuk guru, dosen, dan peneliti selanjutnya dalam dunia pengajaran Bahasa Inggris disediakan di bagian akhir diskusi.

Kata kunci: bahasa ibu, persepsi dosen, konteks EFL

INTRODUCTION

The beginning of the twentieth century was the time when the ELT theoreticians and academics prohibited the use of mother tongue (MT) with the assumption that teaching and learning a new language in the exclusive and monolingual approach must be better-off, that is without any allusion to the use of other languages but English (G. Cook, 2010; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Hall & Cook, 2012). As the following reaction, a group of theorists and linguists joined together and crafted The Reform Movements to discard the use of MT in the process of ELT classroom (Hall & Cook, 2012). To illustrate, the ultimate teaching method used in the school was steered into a new program in language teaching called the Direct Method (DM) as an opponent of the Grammar Translation Method (GTM). From this point, Direct Method which was in agreement with Krashen's Comprehension Hypothesis which promotes the language acquisition through making the most of the target language (TL) into students' environmental exposure (Krahnke, Krashen, & Terrell, 1985) been considered as a revolution in language teaching and was leading to the emergence of other language teaching methods. To sum, they have shared the same common ground in terms of language teaching and been seen as strong opposition to using the first language (L1) in ELT classes.

However, what is up-to-date in works of literature and theories is not essentially indicating what actually arrives on the scene in the EFL classroom practices. The students' L1 has survived over the years as explained in research by Adamson (2008) which asserts that until the late of the twentieth century, GTM was practically used in China. Moreover, Thornbury (2007) notes that the practicality and the ease of implementation of such an approach is the main factor of its survival, particularly if applied in a large class. From this point, after obtaining its dominance in language teaching methodology, the monolingual approach began to be questioned. There had been several scholars who doubted of the rejection of the native language (NL) and been open for thoughtful and sagacious use of it. The rejection of L1/NL from classroom practice is considered impractical and may rob an important tool in language teaching and learning process (Macaro, 2009). Consequently, the development of the bilingual approach has been raised for the consideration of practical demand, pedagogic, cognitive as well as sociocultural benefits of the classroom practices. For instance, Skinner (1985)

claimed the sole use of TL would slow the acquisition of meaning, specifically for the abstract instruction. Simply, avoiding the use of L1 would restrain students' capability in translating and transferring the notions, ideas or beliefs to TL. This concept is also supported by Kern, (1994), in terms of cognitive benefits, who assumed the inclusion of L1 in language learning could enhance metalinguistic awareness as the limitation of memory ability to think in two languages simultaneously. Concerning the sociocultural benefits, the use of L1 in the instructional process could boost the linguistic competence of students passing through the zone of proximal development (ZPD). Bhooth, Azman, & Ismail (2014) point out that the interpersonal aspect of L1 which is used during collaborative tasks would provide a scaffold accelerating progression through their ZPD.

Concerning the teaching and learning practices, there is an influential shift from some attempts of finding the best methods of successful teaching to the contribution of the teacher to language teaching pedagogy as an individual (Richards & Renandya, 2002:5; Brown, 2007:43). The process of classroom instructions involves teacher factor such as decision-making related to their practices (Decker & Rimm-Kaufman, 2008). The origin of study of teacher cognition was initially started with the desire of understanding the complex relationships of what teachers think, know and believe (Borg, 2009). Educational investigators were cognizant of teachers' mental lives which have the influences in their instructional choices as the evidence towards their actions (Zheng, 2013). Teachers are no longer seen as the robot of curricula designers who have a minimal role in decision making; rather they are individuals who bring their personal way of thinking, experiences, and beliefs which establish how they behave in the classroom as a novel focus of their further investigations (Pajares, 1992).

Drawing attention to the term *beliefs,* the real conception of beliefs is still hard to define and evaluate due to its complexity (Melketo, 2012). They can be defined as a personally psychological condition that has a given content that is subjective, experience-based, and accepted as true by the individual, even if the individual concedes that others may hold the alternatives (M. Borg, 2001). Specifically, they can be categorized as assumptions, appreciations, hypotheses, opinions, ideas, views, arguments, judgments, and evaluations about the world that are considered to be correct (Peacock, 2001; Khader & Jordan, 2012)

In the teaching-learning context, teachers' beliefs hold a prominent role in the instructional process. They root in teachers' past experiences, knowledge, and environment in which they have been living. All inputs they have experienced turn into the concept in their minds in which they accept as the truth, moreover if they find it proven and actionable (Larenas, Hernandez, & Navarrete, 2015). Pajares (1992) noted that teachers' beliefs might deal with the contextual factors such as their students' level, subjects taught, classroom size, and also related to their own selves namely work, roles, and responsibilities. Since teachers have faced a variety of encounters and they differed in age, ethnic, and social legacy, consequently, the way, the preference, beliefs, and practices that they bring into teaching can be distinctive (Birello, 2012). Teachers, as the reflective practitioners, may have been more affected by their beliefs rather than their acquaintance in deciding the way they establish the tasks, overcome the problems, and behave in the classroom (Williams & Burden, 1997:53"56; Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2017). Also, the process of the instructional process in the classroom is most likely to run efficiently when teachers' beliefs are in line with their actions (Xu, 2012).

In foreign language classrooms of Indonesia context, the most common shared language of the students and teacher(s) is not their first or native language. For instance, *Bahasa Indonesia*, as the official language and the language of instruction at all levels of education, is not L1 of the majority of people who may come from various regions and ethnic groups. Provided estimation, only 15% of the population can speak *Bahasa Indonesia* as their MT (SEAMEO, 2009)**.** Consequently, their L1 seems likely to be their originally familial language, also called vernacular language, such as *Javanese, Banjarese, Buginese, Sundanese, Madurese* which are spoken by tens millions of people (Ethnologue, 2005; Maryanto, 2008 as cited in SEAMEO, 2009:26"27), and for that reason, the term *L1* is somewhat problematic (Hall & Cook, 2013).

Furthermore, the term *native language* and *mother tongue* are not only sensitive terms but also somewhat vague as they combine several criteria. Those are the language in which a speaker has learned first in infancy or childhood; knows best; uses most; and shows the identity of its speaker (Johnson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 2001); another criterion of definition implies it is conceded as the language whose the speaker comprehends proficiently enough to learn academic subject at a given age level appropriately (Benson &

Kosonen, 2009 as cited in SEAMEO, 2009:27).

Based on *the Oxford Dictionary* (2008:313), the word *own,* as an adjective, is used to emphasize that somebody or something belongs to a particular person or thing and not to somebody or something else. If the words *own* and *language* are unified together, it shows that the language mentioned belongs to a specific individual(s) and/or groups. Theoretically, yet there is no adequate term of referring to students' own-language. However, some previous researchers such as G. Cook (2010), Hall & Cook, (2012, 2013) and Kerr (2016) have developed such a term *own-language* for the language that is commonly shared between a teacher(s) and students in the foreign and/or second language classrooms. In consequence, this current research draws upon the term *own-language* as the predilection to L1, NL, and MT, each of which is not satisfactory and seems rather dubious in terms of clearness as explained at the outset. Accordingly in this research, the term *own-language* (OL) always refers to *Bahasa Indonesia* in the EFL classroom context.

Some investigations related to the occurrence of OL use in a classroom were conducted, and its use to some extent depended upon the attitudes toward its acceptability and values. There are many research informing teachers to show their guilty feelings when students' OLs are spoken in class (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Macaro, 1997, 2009). Besides, Macaro (2005) reported that code-switching (CS) was majorly viewed as a necessity in teaching grammar and vocabulary, managing classrooms, and creating effective relationships with their students. Yet at the same time, it was an ill-starred tool as they felt regretful after taking advantage of it. Also, he emphasized that, as the summary of the literature reviewed, the majority of ELT teachers feel an overwhelming impression and believe that TL should be the dominant language used in their classrooms. Conversely, there is no real evidence that states ELT teachers are approving to exclude OL entirely.

In the similar vein, the debate about students' attitudes and perceptions towards OL use still remain open to discuss in some ways. For example, there are a number of research which came across positive views such as Jeanne & Varshney (2008), Brooks-Lewis (2009), Littlewood & Yu (2011), and Levine (2014), specifically in decreasing students' anxiety, facilitating learning, and constructing more humanistic classroom. However, in practice, not all teachers might hold the same beliefs as their students perceive OL use. There

is evidence that shows the beliefs and attitudes may vary among the instructional practitioners in accordance with teachers' backgrounds and the institutional policy, particularly towards the ELT teachers themselves. Regarding this, applied research into OL use started examining the prominent position of teachers' factors as one of the determinants. For example, the research conducted by Kim & Elder (2008) found that teachers believed that the balance between OL and TL use in the classroom is dependably influenced by students' and teachers' proficiency in English. Crawford (2004) discovered that teachers' beliefs about desirability and optimality of OL use showed less support for TL use as expected. The researcher found that only 26% of primary teachers were in favor of the statement that language instructions should be in TL.

Pedagogic arguments for using OL have rooted in its functions and purposes. Polio & Duff (1994) reported that teachers' OL use is reliant on both language purposes and non-language purposes. More specifically, Jeanne & Varshney (2008) have classified the pedagogic functions into two goals namely medium-oriented goals and framework goals. Medium-oriented goals include grammar instruction and translation of unknown words. Framework goals consist of classroom discipline and administration. Another function of OL use is the social goal which is helping in expressing personal concern, sympathy and also empathy during communicative breakdowns or teacher-student rapport and contact as real people (Kim & Elder, 2008). Another research found that teachers who value OL in their classrooms have more potential to establish a fair and rightful intra-class relationship between them and their students than using TL exclusively (Brooks-Lewis, 2009). Clearly, OL might benefit and serve some functions for ELT classes. Over and beyond the current issue, the concerns around OL use are more than about the language learning process and classroom management.

While the debates value the teachers' judgment in which they are expected to have a moral duty to use the students' OL wisely. The experiences of teachers in the classroom seem more powerful than a pre-determined or strategic objective in defining OL use. The determining conditions of language use would be subjective and more personal; rather than following what should be adopted such as from teacher training, school policy or curriculum guidance. Macaro (2001) has tried to investigate the role of teacher training and policy as the factors affecting the

language choice of teachers. The result implied that the policy has a little evident role in determining teachers' decision to use OL and vice-versa.

Besides, several studies strived to discover an optimal amount of OL use in classroom practices, for example, the research by Macaro (2009) and Grim (2010). There are also some studies that focused on recognizing the motives and purposes of teachers in using OL (Turnbull, 2001; Levine, 2014; Bozorgian & Fallahpour, 2015). Moreover, Kerr (2016) challenges the insight of OL exclusion which is actually not supported by comprehensive research and the policy which does not seem followed by a majority of teachers. According to him, OL use has been treated as an outsider in the major language teaching theories. Besides its absence from the discussion in ELT methodology, the topic of OL use also has been missing from most of the syllabi of pre-service training courses. As the subject, it is also seemingly infrequent in ELT conference presentations.

Related to teachers' beliefs about the use of OL in the EFL and ESL classroom contexts, some previous studies found were conducted in several diverse areas. The research by Mohebbi & Alavi (2014) investigated teachers' beliefs and perceptions about L1 use in the EFL learning context. The findings of the research revealed that for the participating English teachers, L1 was primarily pivotal in offering feedback to students, teaching novel vocabularies, elaborating grammar, building rapport, managing class, providing personal help to students, and saving time in task explanations. In contrast, they believed that it might not need to rely on students' L1 in explaining instructions for assignments or projects.

Karimian & Mohammadi (2015) and Yavuz (2012) pointed out that the participants of their research believed that instead of being ignored; L1 should carefully be used to get more benefits in EFL teachings such as shattering the mental impediments before the teaching begins as well as creating a low anxiety atmosphere for both the students and the teachers. Next, Mysliwiec (2015) examined teachers' beliefs and attitudes on the role of L1 in their teaching in the Netherlands. The findings indicated that teachers' beliefs and attitudes on the L1 were not always reflected in practices. It showed that there might be a discrepancy in actual classroom use of L1 and its desirable use.

In the ESL context, Ja'afar & Maarof (2016) addressed teachers' beliefs about CS use and its roles among students whose L1 is Malay. The findings of

the research showed that teachers mainly tended to code-switch with the intention of facilitating teaching and learning such as to explain difficult words and meaning, to guide in making interpretations, to illustrate grammar rules, to edit content and organization, and to manage the classroom. The participating teachers believed that CS is beneficial for second language learning, particularly when teachers and students share a common L1.

In the Indonesian context, Zacharias (2003) investigated the beliefs of tertiary teachers in Indonesia about the use of students' MT in learning English. The research found out that the participants believed in the judicious use of MT in the classroom as it might serve potential benefits for certain purposes. L1 should be kept to a minimum in order not to rob opportunities for the students to be exposed to English. Manara (2007) found that the teachers and students majorly believed that English should be used maximally in the classroom so as to give students maximum exposure to TL. Yet, MT is still present and used wisely in practice, and in different settings. More recent research such as Floris (2013), Muhlisin (2015), Shabir (2017) identically found out the vast majority of the participants believed that students' L1 should not be excluded and banned completely in the EFL classroom practices. Still, they also believed that the use of L1 should be as limited as possible and English, as TL ought to be the main instrument in classroom communication.

METHOD

This research is an attempt in investigating lecturers' beliefs about the OL use in the EFL context, particularly in classroom practices. From the objective and the characteristics of data, this current research is a descriptive-quantitative one. *Survey research design* is adopted as the core of the model of the research. Particularly, this research use one of progressively popular research of survey design namely *cross-sectional survey* design in which the researcher collects data at one point in time, although the time it takes to collect all the data may require anywhere from a day to a few weeks or more (Creswell, 2012; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

The research was conducted in a regional scope, in Malang City. The population derived from the English Department lecturers who teach in the accessible universities with the criteria namely; (1) the public/private university in Malang City, (2) having English Department/Program, (3) holding A-Accredited for the related program, and (4) primarily giving response letter for prolonging the research. As the result, the researcher had his access to three different universities which fulfilled the criteria mentioned and involved their English lecturers as the participants of the research. Table 1 describes the profiles of accessible universities.

The researcher decided to embrace all the English lecturers to be participated in the research, particularly to deal with the questionnaire items since the number of accessible populations was relatively small (97 participants in total). They were required to complete a closed-ended questionnaire comprising 75 items of demographic information and statements concerning their belief statements about the use of OL in the EFL context. They were required to indicate the extent to which they used OL or not in certain classroom activities; they disagreed or agreed with the statements on a 5-point Likert scale from 1=never/strongly disagree and 5=always/strongly agree. Data of the filled questionnaires were calculated in terms of the percentage scores on every item to measure the degree of overall participants' beliefs pertaining to each statement using SPSS 25.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Majority of participants in the survey reported using OL *sometimes* (54.64%), *often* (40.21%), *rarely* (3.09%), *always* (2.06%), and *never* (0%) to elaborate unclear definitions in English. Additionally, a total of 75.25% of participants also clarified and explained new words or vocabulary through their OL (*sometimes, often* and *always*). However, more than half of the lecturers in the survey reported an equally regular used of their OL to explain grammar, namely 86.92% of responses (*sometimes* 38.14%, *often* 36.08%, and *always* 12.37% respectively), 86.59 % to establish relationships and a friendly atmosphere in the classroom (*sometimes* 38.14%, *often* 36.08%, and *always* 12.37% respectively) and conversely, not to maintain their students' discipline (58.76% in total of *never* and *rarely*). OL was used less often in giving instructions to the students (68.04% in total of *sometimes, rarely, and never*), correcting their spoken errors (75.26% in total of *rarely* and *never*), giving feedback on written work (75.26% in total of *rarely* and *never)* or assessing and testing the students (81.44% in total of

rarely and *never*). Figure 1 shows the frequency of lecturers' beliefs of OL use in their classroom practices.

Consequently, within this research, a lot of participants recognized the OL roles in their classes as medium-oriented, framework-based and social functions (e.g. vocabulary and grammar explanations), instruction and classroom management (framework tasks), relationship preservation (social function). This acknowledgment is relevant to some previous research such as the research by Polio & Duff (1994) and Cook (2001). Nonetheless, it should also be noted that while OL use appears to be part of the daily classroom practices, many participants reported using only English for every single function respectively (Brooks-Lewis, 2009). Thus, there is obviously a wide variation in lecturers' practice within ELT in general.

The survey included a summary of the lecturers ' overall beliefs about the use of their OL in their teaching, a number of reasons for and against their use of OL in the classroom practice, and a debate on the relationship between OL use and class variables such as learning age, the level of the English language proficiency and group size.

The lectures vastly indicated that they endeavor to reject or restrict the use of their OL. 76.29% in total of participants *strongly agree* (28.87%) and *agree* (47.42%) to exclude their OL, with 73.5% stating that they make use of their OL merely at particular parts of the classroom sessions (19.59% *strongly agree* and 45.36% *agree*, respectively). The findings of this research are consistent and supporting the findings of the previous research by Hall & Cook (2013). They found that 61.4% of the respondents *strongly agree* and *agree* with excluding OL use. Additionally, they also found that 73.5% of the participants reported that they permit OL to be used only at particular parts of the lesson. Therefore, seemingly, the data show that the participating lecturers persist to refuse to use their OL in the context of the ELT classroom. And yet, as we have seen, in their classes, survey participants had reported a significant amount of their OL activities. Thus, these data seem to be a paradox.

Clearly, the data from the survey do not appear as crystal clear as expected. To illustrate, even though the overwhelming majority evidently believe that English should be the primary code used in the class (less than 10% of participants *disagreed*), more than one-third of the participants *disagreed* with the statement "I try to exclude the use of own-language." Likewise, the 64.95% in total of the participants who allow their OL to be used only in certain sections of

a lesson (19.59% *strongly agree* and 45.36% *agree*, respectively) may suggest an understanding of unavoidability.

Nonetheless, this particular set of responses, superficially, represents an attempt of some participants for the optimal position of Macaro (1997) in which the use of OL at certain points during a lesson is considered important. In addition, only about one-third of survey participants (20.62% in total) show their guilty feelings as other languages were spoken, meaning the findings are contradictive with some previous research (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; Macaro, 2009; Littlewood & Yu, 2011) which informed that EFL teachers showed a sense of guilt when students' L1 are spoken in their classroom practices.

What is more, is that most participants of this research (55.21% in total) accepted that using OL helped students communicate their cultural and linguistic identity in the classroom more easily. This finding is supporting the previous research (Hall & Cook, 2013) with a similar fashion. Therefore, the survey data indicated that the beliefs and attitudes of the participants about the use of OL are more nuanced than sometimes understood. Those who facilitated the use of OL in class are not necessarily as the instances of the poor practice of teaching and learning but seem to be representative of ELT practitioners in general, notwithstanding the teaching approach in ELT that has been, in the main, disregarded by pieces of literature in the previous century. Essentially, the findings data strengthen what Macaro (2005) had suggested that several English teachers comprehend the significance of English as the primary language in the classroom, but not necessarily as the only language spoken. Besides, it is seemingly portrayed that the behaviors and activities of English teachers/lecturers in their OL might be correlated with distinctive aspects like teachers' teaching experience, institution type, and the professional context.

Figure 3 and Figure 4 below portray that the participants typically assessed the statements indicating the shortcomings of the over-use of OL in the class as being more formidable than that could be classified as helpful of OL practices in general. This pattern is actually in line with the findings and discussion of the general beliefs of the participants already mentioned, thus in this manner, the participants considered English as the primary language in the classroom (Macaro, 2005) and allow the use of OL at certain parts of lessons only. Nonetheless, the more detailed

examination of the data shows that some key arguments seem to be more conceivable than others for the participants. As shown in Figure 3, the possibility of OL use to rob students' opportunity in English practices, particularly in speaking and listening skills, was obviously ascertained as the most convincing argument against OL use. Additionally, the belief of interference of OL (negative transfer) to English was viewed as a less important issue.

Correspondingly, when asked about the case for OL use (Figure 4), the two strongest arguments (with the highest total responses of 56.7% and 54.64% respectively) are their beliefs that "students like to use *Bahasa Indonesia* in class" and its role in fostering students' collaborative works among them. Furthermore, another very practical argument that "conveying meaning through *Bahasa Indonesia* is useful since it saves time" was quite well appreciated on top (41.24% for *strong argument*). These depicted responses may be reassuring and consistent with and for those who propose the judicious use of OL in the classroom (Macaro, 2009; Edstrom, 2006), as it seems to approve that the way the lecturers act of decision-making in the class is potentially determined more on learning and pedagogy issues as well as practicality and convenience.

Figure 5 below shows that most survey participants believed OL use was more applicable with elementary students than for advanced-level students (argument 1), with 71.14% in total of agreement with this argument and only 7.21% in total of disagreement. On the other hand, with younger students (argument 2) and/or with larger classes (argument 3), most participants hardly believe that OL use is more appropriate for them. Obviously, there may have been a likelihood for younger students to learn English at a lower level than older students, yet based on many participating lecturers involved in this research, the degree of their OL use should not be decided by age solely.

Nevertheless, the beliefs about the connection between the students' OL background/characteristics and its use in the ELT classroom practices are less straightforward. While many other participants were unsure of the significance of OL background (50.52%), they seemingly had an insignificant predisposition (42.27% for disagreement) to argue that OL is more acceptable in the condition where the students' OL differs greatly from English (argument 4). Besides, most responses (56.64% in total of agreement) showed that OL use is more appropriate

to classes in which students and the lecturers themselves share the same OL (argument 5). A slight tendency of interest groups was against this belief (22.68% in total of disagreement) probably on the grounds that OL should be discouraged rather than arguing whether it is correspondingly applicable for students who share their OL as opposed to those who do not.

Furthermore, the participating lecturers assessed the professional context along with the culture of their institutions. Also, they were to consider the degree of policymakers required English-only classrooms or, in converse, permitted OL use in real practices. As shown in Figure 6, the survey participants implied that the institutions supporting English-only policy and discouraging OL use give the impression to predominate in several contexts.

Whereas the vast majority of participating lecturers advocated that they own their authorities in determining the apocopate balance of English and OL use in the instructional process (21.65% for *strongly agree* and 44.33% for *agree*), 58.7% in total of participants believed that their institution should require English-only instruction. Yet apparently, the evidence shows on the contrary from the identical view towards the OL use that is often unnoticed in professional and academic literature. Explicitly, 18.55% in total responses stated that the institutions are not requiring English-instructions exclusively, although nearly half of participants (31.11%) results either disagree or neither agree nor disagree that students expected their ELT classrooms to be taught in English only. In a similar fashion, lecturers' beliefs about the policy of the minister of education indicate that despite the fact that English-only instruction is preferred (48.45% in total of agreement), a considerable minority (50.5%) seems to be providing no strong lead on the problem.

As recapped, even there is an investigated trend on the subject of English-only policies in the views of policymakers, schools, and students, a crucial number of the group believed that English-only instruction is not commonly a conventional pattern across the governmental agents. 52.57% of fellow of participants preferred (14.43% for *strongly agree* and 38.14% for *agree*) with English-only policy as shown by the results, a greater percentage of the participating lecturers seem to encourage English-only instruction than do the ministry of education and their students.

As Figure 7 shown, the participants reported predominantly that the pre-service and in-service

teacher training experiences they had rejected the use of OL in their classroom practices (Argument 1 and 3), and it seems reasonable to conclude that the beliefs and supportive opinions of many lecturers to English-only instruction stem in the educational practices. But, given English-only emphasis on ELT instruction, many participating lecturers, interestingly, were in favor of the commonality of discussion of OL use at professional conferences (argument 2). They were also aware of the recent re-emergence of controversy on the use of OL (argument 4 and 5), indicating that the importance of OL use is more universally recognized at the practitioner level than indicated by analytical research and professional training. Likewise, summarizing the status of the current professional discussion on the subject, a lecturer commented on the questionnaire indicating the rareness of discussion pertaining to OL presented in the professional conferences, however, they believed that it should be common to see lecturers addressing this issue among themselves at professional ELT conferences. Instead of a recent renewed interest in the use of OL, the controversy, indeed, has always been there among practitioners and between them in many contexts.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This section offers the conclusion of the research, followed by suggestions. The suggestions here are intended for EFL teachers and lecturers who need to improve their performance inside the classroom practices. Also, it is aimed to further researchers who are willing to explore deeper in the teachers' beliefs about OL use involving other variables and issues.

The findings provide strong evidence of the extensive use of OL in ELT and offer a framework for researchers intending to further investigate the phenomena. The researcher also focused on trying to give English educators with a helpful resource; verifying the applicability of the use of OL and dealing with some kind of propositions of the way and the reason for the OL of students have a significant role in ELT classroom practices. We expect that this research inspires teachers and/or lecturers to consider the implementation of OL in their classroom lives.

Most of the lecturers claimed to use OL to clarify at the time while the ideas in English are confusing and to describe the words or phrases and syntactical structures where they felt that it was appropriate. Plenty

of the subjects also remarked the role of OL use in building a good relationship between them and their students and also in developing a potentially good classroom atmosphere.

The substantial numbers of the participants involved in this research were not expressing guilty feelings while employing languages other than English during the classroom practices. The participating lecturers appeared to embrace more complex and distinctive viewpoints and behavior towards their OL use.

The participants, in the main, were in favor of that it is English that needs to be the primary language implemented in the classroom. The majority of them were not willing to entirely exclude OL, but only permit it to be used in some sections of the lesson. The degree to which of the occurrence in a prepared and rational fashion clearly demands more examination.

The substantial proportions of the participants declared their agreement that using OL is considered more suitable for English language students at the lower level compared to that those at the higher level. However, they did not conclude that student age, the size of class or the characteristics of OL would influence the degree to which it would be used in the real classroom practices.

Meanwhile, the majority of the lecturers responded that they should determine their own decision on the amount and frequency of OL employment in their classrooms. They also commonly recognized that their institutions, students frequently demand English-only classes where it is appropriate. In the interim, their pre-and in-service teacher training programs are primarily linked to the discouragement of OL utilization the ELT classroom practices. Intriguingly, and maybe even incoherently, the ministry of education has been described less clearly as to support sources for English-only instruction. Therefore, given the widespread implementation of OL use in the class practices, a limitation of commitment with the phenomena remains within ELT at a wider level of the theory or methodology. This is a challenge if the exploration for the best and optimal use of OL in the ELT context is to be more established, and also if English teachers and lecturers need to be encouraged in their inquiry for the purposeful use of their OL.

The position of OL implementation in the ELT clearly compels further examination and discussion, both by methodologists, teachers, lecturers, and other

ELT practitioners. Considering the very small scope of the research, the proportion of responses from the survey could be even greater and theoretically limited, thus with a sufficient number of interviews, and real classroom observations, it would indeed be beneficial to delve deeper into the data and expand the research to consider further inter-group variability within ELT context. That being said, the researcher assumes that the research is methodologically relevant and that the instruments established in this research offer a good framework for further analysis of the following investigation, to explore, for example, in more specific and detailed settings where the use of OL is more predominant, at which a broad range of English-language teaching contexts discuss distinction of practices and beliefs in the use of OL.

On the whole, ultimately, the research suggests that the lecturers' beliefs about OL use and their activities in the classroom practices are more nuanced than are conclusively understood. Even though there are differences between persons and the groups of participating lecturers, the survey reveals that OL use is an integrated part of the ELT classroom process. And the practitioners, whereas understanding the importance of English in the classroom, do believe the useful functions of OL use in their instructional process. There seems to be a potential disparity between the conventional ELT literature and the real activities on the field, a distance that should trigger further inquiry within English language teaching of this essential issue.

REFERENCES

Adamson, B. (2008). Fashions in Language Teaching Methodology. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 604–622). London: Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470757000.ch24

Bhooth, A., Azman, H., & Ismail, K. (2014). The Role of the L1 as a Scaffolding Tool in the EFL Reading Classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 118,* 76–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.011

Birello, M. (2012). Interview: Teacher Cognition and Language Teacher Education: Beliefs and Practice. A Conversation with Simon Borg. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature, 5*(2), 88–

94. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.464

Borg, M. (2001). Key Concepts in ELT: Teachers' Beliefs. *ELT Journal, 55,* 186–188. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/55.2.186

Borg, S. (2009). Introducing Language Teacher Cognition. Retrieved from https://docplayer.net/21093215-Introducing-language-teacher-cognition.html

Bozorgian, H., & Fallahpour, S. (2015). Teachers' and students' amount and purpose of L1 use: English as foreign language (EFL) classrooms in Iran. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 3*(2), 67–81. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1127239.pdf

Brooks-Lewis, K. A. (2009). Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L1 in foreign language teaching and learning. *Applied Linguistics, 30*(2), 216–235. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn051

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson Education ESL.

Butzkamm, W., & Caldwell, A. W. (2009). *The Bilingual Reform: A Paradigm Shift in Foreign Language Teaching.* Tubingen: Narr Studienbücher. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr084

Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in Language Teaching: An Argument for Reassessment.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 53*(3), 402–423. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402

Crawford, J. (2004). Language Choices in the Foreign Language Classroom: Target Language or the Learners' First Language? *RELC Journal, 35*(1), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820403500103

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.

Decker, L. E., & Rimm-Kaufman, S. E. (2008). Personality Characteristics and Teacher Beliefs among Pre-Service Teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(2), 45–64.

Edstrom, A. (2006). L1 Use in the L2 Classroom: One Teacher's Self-Evaluation. *The Canadian Modern Language Review / La Revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes, 63*(2), 275–292. https://doi.org/10.1353/cml.2007.0002

Floris, F. (2013). Exploring Teachers Beliefs on the Teaching of English in English Language Courses in Indonesia. *Philippine ESL Journal, 11,* 4–24.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gilakjani, A. P., & Sabouri, N. B. (2017). Teachers' Beliefs in

English Language Teaching and Learning: A Review of the Literature. *English Language Teaching, 10*(4), 78–86. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n4p78

Grim, F. (2010). L1 in the L2 Classroom at the Secondary and College Levels: A Comparison of Functions and Use by Teachers. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 7*(2), 193–209. Retrieved from http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v7n22010/grim.htm

Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching, 45*(3), 271–308. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000067

Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2013). *Own-language use in ELT: exploring global practices and attitudes. British Council Teaching English ELT Research Papers 13-01.* London. Retrieved from www.britishcouncil.org

Ja'afar, N. S. B., & Maarof, N. B. (2016). RETRACTED: Teachers' Beliefs of Code Switching in the ESL Classroom. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, 4*(4), 212–222. https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2016.44030

Jeanne, R.-I., & Varshney, R. (2008). Students' Views Regarding the Use of the First Language: An Exploratory Study in a Tertiary Context Maximizing Target Language Use. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 65*(2), 249–273. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.65.2.249

Johnson, D., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2001). Linguistic Genocide in Education: Or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights? *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(2), 345–346. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587658

Karimian, Z., & Mohammadi, S. (2015). Teacher's Use of First Language in EFL Classrooms. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 2*(3), 61–71.

Kern, R. G. (1994). The role of mental translation in second language reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16*(4), 441–461. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100013450

Kerr, P. (2016). The learner's own language. *ExELL, 3*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1515/exell-2016-0007

Khader, F. R. (2012). Teachers' Pedagogical Beliefs and Actual Classroom Practices in Social Studies Instruction. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research, 2*(1), 73–92.

Kim, S. H. O., & Elder, C. (2008). Target Language Use in Foreign Language Classrooms: Practices and Perceptions of Two Native Speaker Teachers in New Zealand. *Language Culture and Curriculum, 21*(2), 167–185. https://doi.org/10.2167/lcc348.0

Krahnke, K. J., Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1985). The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(3), 591–603. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586280

Larenas, C. D., Hernandez, P. A., & Navarrete, M. O. (2015).

A Case Study on EFL Teachers' Beliefs About the Teaching and Learning of English in Public Education. *Porta Linguarum, 23,* 171–186.

Levine, G. S. (2014). Principles for code choice in the foreign language classroom: A focus on grammaring. *Language Teaching, 47*(3), 332–348. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498

Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching, 44*(1), 64–77. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444809990310

Macaro, E. (1997). *Target Language, Collaborative Learning and Autonomy (Modern Language in Practice).* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing Student Teachers' Codeswitching in Foreign Language Classrooms: Theories and Decision Making. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(4), 531–548. https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00124

Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 Classroom: A Communication and Learning Strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-Native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession* (pp. 63–84). Amsterdam: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-24565-0_5

Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring 'optimal' use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning* (pp. 35–49). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691972-005

Manara, C. (2007). The Use of L1 Support: Teachers' and Students' Opinions and Practices in an Indonesian Context. *THE JOURNAL OF ASIA TEFL, 4*(1), 145–178.

Melketo, T. A. (2012). Exploring Tensions between English Teachers' Beliefs and Practices in Teaching Writing. *The International Higher Education Teaching and Learning Association, 2,* 98–114.

Mohebbi, H., & Alavi, S. M. (2014). Teachers' First Language Use in Second Language Learning Classroom Context: A Questionnaire-based Study. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature, 7*(4), 57–73. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.539

Muhlisin. (2015). Teachers' Beliefs and Students' Perceptions of Bilingual Use in Indonesian EFL Classrooms: Identity and Classroom Discourse. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 9*(24), 8–12.

Mysliwiec, J. (2015). *The Use of the First Language in the Dutch EFL Classroom/ : An Analysis of Teachers' Beliefs and Practices.* University of Leicester.

Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary. (2008) (4th ed.). Oxford:

Oxford University Press.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning Up a Messy Construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(3), 307–332. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307

Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-service ESL teachers' beliefs about second language learning: A longitudinal study. *System, 29,* 177–195. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00010-0

Polio, C. G., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' Language Use in University Foreign Language Classrooms: A Qualitative Analysis of English and Target Language Alternation. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(3), 313–326. https://doi.org/10.2307/330110

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SEAMEO. (2009). *Mother Tongue as Bridge Language of Instruction: Policies and Experiences in Southeast Asia.* (K. Kosonen & C. Young, Eds.). Klongtoey, Bangkok: The Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) Secretariat. Retrieved from www.seameo.org

Shabir, M. (2017). Student-Teachers' Beliefs on the Use of L1 in EFL Classroom: A Global Perspective. *English Language Teaching, 10*(4), 45–52. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n4p45

Skinner, D. C. (1985). Access to meaning: The anatomy of the language/learning connection. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 6*(2), 97–116. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1985.9994190

Thornbury, S. (2006). *An A-Z of ELT* (1st ed.). Oxford: MacMillan. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm039

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a Role for the L1 in Second and Foreign Language Teaching, But…. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(4), 531–540. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.4.531

Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach (Cambridge Language Teaching Library).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Xu, L. (2012). The Role of Teachers' Beliefs in the Language Teaching-learning Process. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(7), 1397–1402. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.7.1397-1402

Yavuz, F. (2012). The Attitudes of English Teachers about the Use of L1 in the Teaching of L2. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46,* 4339–4344. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.251

Zacharias, N. T. (2003). *A survey of tertiary teachers' beliefs about English language teaching in Indonesia with regard to the role of English as a global language. Unpublished MA thesis, Thailand University.*

Zheng, H. (2013). Teachers' beliefs and practices: a dynamic and complex relationship. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(3), 331–343. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2013.809051