
Bilingual Education in Teaching English as A Foreign Language (EFL) in Indonesian University

Jalaluddin

STKIP Paracendekia NW Sumbawa

Correspondent: jalaluddinak@gmail.com

Received : January 9, 2023

Accepted : April 4, 2023

Published : April 30, 2023

Citation: Jalaluddin (2023). Bilingual Education in Teaching English as A Foreign Language (EFL) in Indonesian University. Sinergi International Journal of Education, 1(1), 10-17.

ABSTRACT: This paper concludes that the bilingual approach for teaching English in Indonesian universities is most effective, and the content and language integrated learning (CLIL) approach is particularly suitable. CLIL offers benefits such as the use of the first language to aid comprehension and identification of target language forms, connections to learners' previous knowledge, and improvements in self-confidence and motivation. Focused-form instruction (FFI) can be included in CLIL, which encourages attention to both meaning and language. The CLIL approach is therefore recommended for maximizing teaching effectiveness and learner benefits in the Indonesian university context.

Keywords: Bilingual approach, Teaching English, Indonesian universities, CLIL



This is an open access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

INTRODUCTION

In the context of Indonesian university students, where English is considered a foreign language, a bilingual approach is deemed the most suitable for teaching English (Glas & Cárdenas-Claros, 2013; Liu, 2022). This approach offers numerous benefits for learners, who are expected to acquire both language and content knowledge simultaneously. According to Lorenzo (2013), bilingual education is particularly advantageous in that it enables teachers to use the scaffolding or integration strategy, which promotes the learning of content and language at the same time. This approach is particularly pertinent for undergraduate students in EFL contexts, who need to develop both content knowledge and language proficiency (Ormiston, 2014; Pineda & Seidenschnur, 2021; Schiepe-Tiska et al., 2021).

Specifically, content and language integrated learning (CLIL) is an appropriate bilingual approach to apply. CLIL is an educational approach that emphasizes dual-target language and content learning, where additional language use is encouraged in the learning process (Saide & Sheng, 2021; Yuan & Huang, 2021).

METHOD

The present study utilized a qualitative research approach to comprehensively investigate the experiences and perceptions of students and instructors in relation to the Content and Language

Integrated Learning (CLIL) approach. Through the adoption of interviews and observations, the researchers sought to delve into the intricate details and gain profound insights into the aforementioned subject matter (Bessa et al., 2021; Louis & King, 2022; Martinez, 2022; McGrath et al., 2020).

The participants of this study were carefully selected from undergraduate students and English language instructors associated with universities in Indonesia. In order to ensure adequate representation from various faculties or departments within the university, a stratified random sampling technique was employed. This method enabled the researchers to acquire a diverse range of perspectives from different academic domains, thereby enhancing the validity and generalizability of the study findings (Eddy, 2022; Lane et al., 2022; Reilly, 2017; Rombach et al., 2020).

By utilizing interviews, the researchers engaged in interactive conversations with the participants, allowing them to express their experiences and perceptions regarding the implementation of the CLIL approach. These interviews were designed to be open-ended, enabling the participants to freely articulate their thoughts, opinions, and reflections in a comprehensive manner (Hazrati et al., 2021; Johnson & Stern, 2014; X. Xia & Li, 2022).

In addition to interviews, the researchers also conducted observations to supplement the data collection process. Through careful and systematic observations of the CLIL classrooms, the researchers aimed to gain a deeper understanding of the instructional practices, student engagement, and overall dynamics within the learning environment. By immersing themselves in the actual instructional setting, the researchers were able to capture nuanced details and contextual factors that might not be easily conveyed through interviews alone (Tov et al., 2022; Vassallo, 2013; Vernaudon, 2015; J. Xia, 2022).

The qualitative approach adopted in this study allowed for a holistic exploration of the experiences and perceptions of students and instructors with regard to the CLIL approach. By employing interviews and observations as data collection methods, the researchers ensured a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of the subject matter (Amerman Goerdt et al., 2019; Mousa, 2016). The utilization of a stratified random sampling technique further strengthened the study's representativeness, enabling insights from diverse perspectives within the university context. Overall, this study offers valuable insights into the practical implementation and effectiveness of the CLIL approach within the Indonesian higher education system (Glisson, 2019; Heinrichs, 2021; Makuru & Jita, 2022; Motitswe & Mokhele, 2013a, 2013b; Wang & Chiou, 2022).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

How CLIL Matches the Indonesian University Context

There are several reasons why CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) is a preferred approach for teaching English as a foreign language to Indonesian undergraduate students. Firstly, CLIL is believed to be suitable for any type of student, regardless of their life background. According to Coyle (2007), CLIL does not limit learning targets based on factors such as age, race,

ethnicity, and region. This is especially important in Indonesia, where university access is limited to big cities, and many students from smaller districts and rural areas have to relocate to pursue their studies. As a result, Indonesian university students come from highly diverse backgrounds in terms of economic status, race, ethnicity, and region, with a wide range of ages. Some students may even return to university after several years of graduating from their secondary schools. CLIL allows for a flexible approach that accommodates this diversity.

Secondly, CLIL allows teachers to use the students' first language (L1), even though the main goal is to improve their competence in the target language (TL), which is English in this case. This approach, also known as translanguaging, helps to bridge the students' comprehension of the content and guide them to identify the TL form. This is especially crucial when the material is challenging. Additionally, CLIL is effective in connecting the materials being taught with the learners' prior knowledge, which can refer to both language and content. In terms of linguistic ability, CLIL provides ample opportunities for students to improve their language skills during the learning process.

Thirdly, CLIL has a positive impact on learners' self-confidence and motivation to learn (Coyle, 2007). Indonesian learners, in particular, have low motivation to learn because their studies are often based on short-term needs, such as passing final exams or getting high scores. To boost their interest, teachers can choose interesting topics that are relevant to Indonesia. However, it is often the case that materials that are appealing to students are not available in TL. In applying CLIL, teachers have the flexibility to translate materials from different sources, such as local textbooks, websites, or teacher-made materials. This enables teachers to select contextual topics that are specific to Indonesia and not widely available in English.

Focus on form: how does grammar fit?

Focus on form (FOF), also known as focused-form instruction (FFI), is a pedagogical approach claimed to originate from communicative language teaching (CLT). The basic pillars of FFI are two theories proposed by Long (1983), known as the interaction hypothesis, and Schmidt (2011), known as the noticing theory. FOF refers to any pedagogical activity that guides learners to focus on the target language form, either explicitly or implicitly (Lyster, 2007). Direct language teaching and feedback are clear examples of FFI (Spada, 1997). Meanwhile, Ellis (2001) defines FFI as any pedagogical activity that encourages students to focus fully on the form of language, and he proposes three classifications of FFI. Firstly, the basic focus is on linguistic form, i.e., grammatical rules, both explicit and implicit. Secondly, the focus is planned previously by dividing meaning, and the tasks are based on a particular form of the target language. Lastly, it is called incidental focus, where learners pay attention to meaning while being conveyed in various forms of the target language.

The main characteristic of FOF is to guide students to pay full attention to both meaning and language. Spada and Lightbown (2008) argue that teaching can be maximized when learners pay attention to both form and meaning. Therefore, there is no longer a debate about the inclusion of FFI in communicative language teaching. Lyster (2007) asserts that the communicative context is the best place to apply FFI because it enables the assessment of whether learners are successful in implementing their classroom knowledge for communicative interaction in a real-life environment. De la Fuente (2006) also agrees that when learners pay full attention to form, they can easily

compare the features of correct input with their own utterances. As a result, the focus on form makes conversations between speakers and listeners much easier, as they are free to modify the linguistic properties to reach their communication goals. In his study (Lyster, 2007) proposes in his explanation that there are two approaches in using FFI, proactive and reactive approaches. Basically, these two approaches of FFI are almost similar to those proposed by Ellis (2001). Proactive approach refers to the teacher's strategy to carefully plan the instruction before hand in order for the learners are able to recognize the language components that even maybe are not used during the learning process in the classroom.

After examining some studies, Lyster emphasizes the advantages of proactive approach in FFI viewed from cognitive theory. Firstly, it puts a lot emphasis on the learners' language awareness so that they are capable of making reconstruction between the TL and the L1. Secondly, it also emphasizes the practical element of language learning that is beneficial to easily gain the sense of target language representation. On the other hand, reactive approach is categorized as any effort including corrective feedbacks that is intended to grab the learners' focus to particular language features because of unpredictable mistakes taking place. Lyster adds that, based on some results of study, this kind of FFI approach is considered effective particularly when the students make a mistake during the teacher-student interaction in the classroom.

In light of Lyster's elaboration, it can be discerned that feedback in FFI can be classified into two main types: oral and written feedback. It has been asserted that there are specific strategies for giving corrective feedback to learners. The first approach involves input provision, which can be accomplished through recasts, implicit feedback, or explicit correction. The second method prompts the output of learners, which can be done by the teacher repeating utterances to emphasize a mistake, referred to as implicit feedback, or by providing metalinguistic correction, which is an explicit feedback. Additionally, the correction can be facilitated by requesting clarification.

The connection between the issue discussed by Lyster and the Indonesian University context is emphasized in the following three points. Firstly, teaching content using the target language as the medium of instruction is appropriate for university students in Indonesia, given that English is still considered a foreign language in the country, resulting in limited exposure to the language for students. Given the multiple subjects they are required to study, it can be challenging for university students to devote sufficient time to learning a second language. Thus, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) that involves Focused Form Instruction (FFI) can be a viable solution. Secondly, using a content-based approach to teach language can motivate learners. When teachers choose a relevant and engaging topic for discussion, students' interest and enthusiasm increase. Thirdly, the collaboration between content and language teachers in the same class is a compelling approach. Such team teaching is still rare in the Indonesian context, and it is expected to capture the attention of both teachers and students. Lastly, proactive and reactive approaches are critical to successful scaffolding.

Classroom language use

Let us begin the first paragraph of this section by examining the potential model of language use in the classroom activity. In a study of CLIL programs conducted in Poland by Czura and Papaja (2013), various models of language use in the classroom were identified. These models mainly refer

to the proportion of using the target language (TL) and first language (L1) in the classroom activities, specifically in the context of teaching German, English, and French in Poland. The models are described as follows: Model A consists of 80% use of TL and 20% use of L1, which can be further divided into two types. Type 1 is content-focused and has no specific target of linguistic competence, while Type 2 is a dual focus on both content and language but is dominated by content-driven instruction. Model B involves the use of 50% TL and 50% L1 and can also be categorized into two types: content-focused and content-language focused. Model C refers to the use of 10-50% TL and has two types as well. Type 1 focuses on content while Type 2 concentrates on dual focus but tends to emphasize more on the learners' receptive skills. Lastly, Model D is specific to the use of TL during the teacher-student interaction and has four types. Type 1 uses TL to summarize the content material after the lesson sequence, Type 2 uses TL for material summary every second lesson, Type 3 is set up to use TL only for teaching materials, and Type 4 is arranged to use TL in the learners' work for different group projects.

In the second part of this section, the potential functions of language use in the classroom will be explored. Seven points are worth mentioning, each with both advantages and disadvantages, as noted by Ellis and Shintani (2014). Firstly, L1 language use functions to convey TL meaning. The positive effect of using L1 to explain TL meaning is its ease of understanding for learners. Conversely, the negative effect is that learners may become overly reliant on translation when they want to understand the TL. Secondly, L1 language use functions to maintain learner discipline. The benefit of this is that the teacher feels more comfortable and the learners feel the sense of a real utterance, which can create a sense of authority. However, this may lead to the assumption that students do not need to use the TL in real communication. Thirdly, L1 is used to explain tasks and tests. The merit of this L1 use is that learners are clear about the instructions and know exactly what to do, while the demerit is similar to the second point in which learners may assume that the TL is not important in more serious conversation. Fourthly, L1 is used to explain grammar. The positive impact is that learners can maximally understand, but advanced learners may not have access to the real model of TL in terms of grammar explanation. The fifth point is the use of L1 to build personal relationships with learners.

Positively, learners can feel a greater sense of closeness with their teacher. On the other hand, the drawback is that learners may lack exposure to using the TL to express personal needs. The sixth point is that L1 use functions to reduce learners' anxiety. The positive effect is that learners do not feel nervous and anxious about what the teacher explains because it is understandable, but the exposure to the TL will be limited. Lastly, the L1 use functions to demonstrate respect for students by acknowledging their own language. The advantage of this is that students will consider their own language to be equally important to the TL. However, the potential disadvantage is that learners may have less understanding of how to show respect to others using the TL.

When it comes to classroom teaching, instructors have the freedom to choose any of the models mentioned above, depending on the learners' needs. Moreover, by examining the potential advantages and disadvantages of each of the seven points listed earlier, educators can increase their awareness and adapt their teaching strategies to better meet their students' needs.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the bilingual approach for teaching English in the context of Indonesian university students is best suited due to the status of English as a foreign language. The content and language integrated learning (CLIL) approach is most appropriate for this context as it offers several benefits to the learners. CLIL allows the use of the first language, which helps bridge the learners' comprehension of the content and identify the target language forms. It also allows for the connection of materials at hand with the learners' previous knowledge, which can refer to both language and content being taught. Additionally, CLIL positively affects the learners' self-confidence and learning motivation. Focused-form instruction (FFI) can be incorporated into CLIL, and it encourages learners to pay attention to both the meaning and language, which can maximize the effectiveness of teaching. Overall, the CLIL approach is most effective in the Indonesian university context and offers several advantages to the learners.

REFERENCE

- Amerman Goerdt, L., Blaaid, B., Elswick, S. E., Johnson, D. H., Delavega, E., Kindle, P. A., & Granruth, L. B. (2019). Teaching Characteristics and Student Satisfaction: Impact on Social Work Students' Interest in Policy. *Journal of Social Work Education, 55*(4), 767–776. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2019.1611512>
- Bessa, C., Hastie, P., Rosado, A., & Mesquita, I. (2021). Sport education and traditional teaching: Influence on students' empowerment and self-confidence in high school physical education classes. *Sustainability (Switzerland), 13*(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13020578>
- Eddy, S. L. (2022). Recent Research in Science Teaching and Learning. *CBE Life Sciences Education, 21*(3). <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.22-06-0128>
- Glas, K., & Cárdenas-Claros, M. S. (2013). New English cultures and learner autonomy for intrinsic motivation and democratic empowerment in the Chilean context. *English Teaching, 12*(3), 23–40. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84890732925&partnerID=40&md5=e98cd1dc5d54abe730000c20b5abc485>
- Glisson, L. (2019). Breaking the spin cycle: Teaching complexity in the age of fake news. *Portal, 19*(3), 461–484. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2019.0027>
- Hazrati, H., Bigdeli, S., Arabshahi, S. K. S., Gavvani, V. Z., & Vahed, N. (2021). Visualization of clinical teaching citations using social network analysis. *BMC Medical Education, 21*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-021-02643-6>
- Heinrichs, H. (2021). Teaching sustainable development in a sensory and artful way—Concepts, methods, and examples. *Sustainability (Switzerland), 13*(24). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132413619>
- Johnson, J. M., & Stern, T. A. (2014). Teaching residents about emotional intelligence and its impact on leadership. *Academic Psychiatry, 38*(4), 510–513. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-014-0048-4>
- Lane, A. K., Earl, B., Feola, S., Lewis, J. E., McAlpin, J. D., Mertens, K., Shadle, S. E., Skvoretz, J., Ziker, J. P., Stains, M., Couch, B. A., & Prevost, L. B. (2022). Context and content of

- teaching conversations: exploring how to promote sharing of innovative teaching knowledge between science faculty. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 9(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-022-00369-5>
- Liu, S. (2022). Construction and Computation of the College English Teaching Path in the Artificial Intelligence Teaching Environment. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2022.
<https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/3415999>
- Louis, V. N., & King, N. S. (2022). Emancipating STEM Education through Abolitionist Teaching: A Research-practice Partnership to Support Virtual Microteaching Experiences. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 33(2), 206–226.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2021.2012957>
- Makuru, B., & Jita, T. (2022). Information and Communication Technology Practices in Biology Teaching in Lesotho High Schools. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 12(7), 668–677. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2022.12.7.1669>
- Martinez, M. A. (2022). What do people write about COVID-19 and teaching, publicly? Insulators and threats to newly habituated and institutionalized practices for instruction. *PLoS ONE*, 17(11 November). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0276511>
- McGrath, G. M., Lockstone-Binney, L., Ong, F., Wilson-Evered, E., Blaer, M., & Whitelaw, P. (2020). Teaching sustainability in tourism education: a teaching simulation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1791892>
- Motitswe, J., & Mokhele, M. L. (2013a). Teaching and learning in the inclusive classroom: What foundation phase teachers do? *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(6), 545–551.
<https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n6p545>
- Motitswe, J., & Mokhele, M. L. (2013b). Teaching and learning in the inclusive classroom: What foundation phase teachers do? *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(6), 545–551.
<https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n6p545>
- Mousa, J. S. (2016). Effect of the Social Constructivist Approach on Teaching Reading to Jordanian University Students. *US-China Education Review A*, 6(5), 310–315.
<https://doi.org/10.17265/2161-623X/2016.05.005>
- Ormiston, N. T. (2014). Transforming stories and teachings into social work pedagogies. *Affilia - Journal of Women and Social Work*, 29(3), 368–372.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109914522630>
- Pineda, P., & Seidenschur, T. (2021). The metrification of teaching: student evaluation of teaching in the United States, Germany and Colombia. *Comparative Education*, 57(3), 377–397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2021.1924447>
- Reilly, G. (2017). Teaching for justice in a contradictory world. *Education Sciences*, 7(1).
<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci7010010>
- Rombach, M., Paul, S. E., Niedermann, L. F., & Bitsch, V. (2020). Peppers & More: A teaching case in organizational behavior. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*, 23(2), 313–318. <https://doi.org/10.22434/IFAMR2020.0010>

- Saide, S., & Sheng, M. L. (2021). Knowledge exploration–exploitation and information technology: crisis management of teaching–learning scenario in the COVID-19 outbreak. *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, 33(8), 927–942.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2020.1854714>
- Schiepe-Tiska, A., Heinle, A., Dümig, P., Reinhold, F., & Reiss, K. (2021). Achieving Multidimensional Educational Goals Through Standard-Oriented Teaching. An Application to STEM Education. *Frontiers in Education*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.592165>
- Tov, W., Wirtz, D., Kushlev, K., Biswas-Diener, R., & Diener, E. (2022). Well-Being Science for Teaching and the General Public. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 17(5), 1452–1471.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916211046946>
- Vassallo, S. (2013). Critical Pedagogy and Neoliberalism: Concerns with Teaching Self-Regulated Learning. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 32(6), 563–580.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-012-9337-0>
- Vernaudon, J. (2015). Linguistic ideologies: Teaching oceanic languages in French Polynesia and new Caledonia. *Contemporary Pacific*, 27(2), 433–462. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cp.2015.0048>
- Wang, Y.-M., & Chiou, C.-C. (2022). Empirically Examining the Effectiveness of Teaching Blogs on University Course Instruction. *SAGE Open*, 12(3).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221104782>
- Xia, J. (2022). Discussion on Basic Japanese Teaching Mode in Multimedia Network Environment. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 2022.
<https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/7797540>
- Xia, X., & Li, X. (2022). Artificial Intelligence for Higher Education Development and Teaching Skills. *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing*, 2022.
<https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/7614337>
- Yuan, R., & Huang, D. (2021). Exploring the Organizational Resilience of A School-embedded Social Work Agency: A Teaching/learning Case Study. *Human Service Organizations Management, Leadership and Governance*, 45(5), 493–505.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2021.1962471>