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ENGLISH DEPARTMENT STUDENTS’ ATTITUDES TOWARD ENGLISH-ONLY POLICY IN GROUP DISCUSSIONS IN THE CLASSROOM

Elsa Emiria Leba

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the English Department students’ attitudes, which were opinions, feelings, and behaviors toward the English-only policy in group discussions in the classroom. The attitudes would be focused on the three components: cognitive component, evaluative component, and behavioral component (Wenden, 1991; Hyrkstedt and Kajala, 1998; and Ladegaard, 2000). The data were all collected from the students at Satya Wacana Christian University, Indonesia. One main research question was asked: What are English Department students’ attitudes toward English-only Policy in group discussions in the classroom? Eighteen students participated in this study. In collecting the data, a semi-structured interview method was conducted and the data were analyzed by separating the attitudes into those three components. Then, the components would be divided again into several subcomponents based on ED students’ answers about their attitudes. The results of this study suggested that the clash attitudes, the contradictory answer between each component of the attitudes, occurred. The results were in line with a previous finding found by Petric (2002).

Keywords: English as a medium of instruction (EMI), English-only policy, Monolingual approach and method

INTRODUCTION

English Department (ED) of Satya Wacana Christian University (SWCU) created a Code of Practice (COP) that stated that all teachers must use proper English as a medium of instruction inside the classrooms.1 The COP also implies that students are expected to use English politely when communicating with teachers.2 Based on this COP, it could be said that this English as a medium of instruction (or EMI) policy suggests that all ED lecturers and students are better to constantly utilize English in teaching-learning practice. Thus, it is often found that some ED lecturers require the

1 Code of Practice. (Salatiga: Faculty of Language and Literature, Satya Wacana of Christian University, 2012), 1

2 Ibid, 7
students to regularly use English in all classroom activities. In several classroom activities, such as presentations and question-answer sessions, it is exposed that ED students still use English. However, personal observations and experiences reveal that in another classroom activity like in group discussions, students do not do the similar thing. Once it comes to talk with their peers in group discussions, the tendency to utilize either their mother tongue or L1 still occurs. It makes some ED lecturers, who follow this EMI policy, remind the students to employ English when students have an opportunity in the classroom, especially when they are in group discussions.

Talking about EMI policy in the classroom, this policy has similar characteristics with monolingual approach and method since both require using only one language, which is English, in classroom settings. According to Phillipson (1992) in Auerbach (1993), there are several myths of teaching English; (1) English is best taught monolingually; (2) the more English is taught, the better the results; and (3) if other languages are used too much, standards of English will drop.

Nonetheless, some linguistic experts like Auerbach (1993) and Cummins (2007) oppose this teaching method. Phillipson (1992) says that the ethos of monolingualism rejects the experiences of other languages, meaning it excludes the child's most intense existential experience. Rather than using monolingual approach and method, bilingual approach is seen as a better method for teaching and learning English. Rivera (1990) outlines the benefits of bilingual approach; it attracts students to participate in class and reduces affective barriers to English acquisition. Consequently, teaching English for some English users, who learn English as EFL, using their L1 is preferred.
The use of students’ L1 in classrooms to teach English is favored in helping some English students, who have other languages besides English as their L1, to learn the materials easier. Atkinson (1993) gives several reasons why the use of L1 occurs in the classroom; first, using L1 may be more efficient if there is something complicated to communicate and second, using L1 may improve students’ motivation if their attention is sustained more keenly. Abbott and Wingard (1981) also state that classes in which the students have a language in common tend to revert to use their mother tongue oral practice when the teacher does not pay much attention to them. This situation is similar with ED students’ attitudes in using the languages in group discussions in the classroom. Some ED students’ are often found to amend the language they use, from English to Indonesian, when a lecturer is not around them. Therefore, it could be said that the existence of ED lecturers is also influential.

As the result, bilingual approach is more useful to be applied in the classrooms for such students. The effectiveness of teaching with bilingual approach can be seen from Hemmindinger (1987), who found that bilingual approach for bilingual students allowed language and culture shock to be alleviated. In addition, Canagarajah (1999) also stated:

....even when teachers do not actively encourage the use of L1, the vernaculars find a place in second language learning in quite spontaneous and unconscious ways... remind us that we cannot isolate the classroom from the society in which it is situated. (pp. 130-131)

At this point, even if the students wish to develop their English skills better than before, the possibility to use L1 in the classroom is still high. Conversely, the main case that is intended to be investigated for this study is narrowed down only in the use of English-only in group discussions in the classroom.
Since group discussions lessen students’ passiveness as they are willing to learn together with friends and to help each other in learning the material, the use of English could be applied in group discussions. Jones (2007) states when students are working together in English; (1) they talk more; (2) share their ideas; (3) learn from each other; (4) are more involved; (5) feel more secure and less anxious; (6) use English in a meaningful, realistic way; and (7) enjoy using English to communicate. This idea is supported by Canagarajah (1999), who says that students have a tendency to seek a safe house as it enables them to experiment with language, to have an independent learning, and also to negotiate the lesson content. Group discussions could be activated as the safe house as it develops a supportive learning atmosphere.

The supportive learning atmosphere created by group discussions could help constructing students’ English skills as they have courageous to talk about the materials by exercising the language itself. Group discussions create a collaborative learning among students (and the teacher) as they can combine and share about the strategies in understanding information (Larson, 1995). Here, it means that the students are able to learn something from each other, whether it is about the materials and/or the language used to talk about about the material itself while discussing. Furthermore, Gall (1985) emphasizes that group discussion is an effective way to promote a higher-level thinking and develop students’ attitudes. As the result, group discussions can aid the students to have a meaningful learning experience while they are in the classroom.

In view of the fact, Allwright (1991) declares that the talk in the classroom is structured differently from other kinds of talk. Consequently, certain attitudes might
be created by the students when they are discussing the materials. Wenden (1991), Hyrkstedt and Kajala (1998), and Ladegaard (2000) define “attitudes” into three different components: cognitive (thought or knowledge), evaluative (feeling or emotion), and behavioral. Cognitive component talks about beliefs or perceptions about the objects of the attitude, while evaluative component explains a component about the attitude object might evoke like or dislike, aversion or commendation. For the behavioral component, it tells about predisposing people to act in certain or specific ways.

Although a lot of research had dealt with the language use in the classroom, most research in Asia focuses only on the use of L1 (see Tang, 2002). There was also still a few numbers of research in Indonesia that had an interrelated topic with this research, such as attitudes in speaking English outside the classroom (Pratisiwi, 2008) and the factors that caused students’ incompetence in using English (Mulyana, 2010). Considering its EMI policy, English was more than a subject to be learned in ED as it is also used as a means of communication by ED students. As applying monolingual approach and method in the classroom, specifically in group discussions could support ED students’ language learning, the intention to recognize students’ attitudes about it was essential. This study was conducted with a hope that it could confer some images about the reality of what ED students thought, felt, and did when it came to talk about English-only policy in their study, particularly during group discussions in the classroom. Therefore, the aim of the study was guided by one main research question: “What are English Department students’ attitudes toward English-only policy in group discussion in the classroom?”
THE STUDY (RESEARCH DESIGN)

a) Context of Study

The setting of the study was ED of SWCU in Salatiga, Central Java, Indonesia. Here, the students were prepared to be English teachers, which was why English was used as the medium of instruction for all courses. The study focused on the group discussions held in any classes that required English-only policy during discussions in the classroom.

b) The Participants

18 ED students, 17 female and 1 male, were chosen as the participants. All participants were Indonesians, whose age ranged from 21 to 24 years old. They had studied English in formal institutions for over 10 years, including 4 years they spent at ED. They were selected based on snowballing sampling. The criterions were students who were fourth year (from class year 2008 or above) and had experiences with the lecturers that required or suggested them to use English during group discussions. The reason for selecting such participants was based on the assumption that students who were considered as senior ED students had been interacting with English in a longer time than the other students who were regarded as non-senior ED students. Therefore, they might have a variety of experiences with group discussions and the use of English-only in their study.

In finding the participants, the researcher asked some friends who matched with the criteria above. After finding the promising participants, the participants were asked to remember their friends who also took the same classes with them.
Then the researcher made a list about the possible participants, asked their agreement to be the participants, and made appointments for the interview.

c) Research Instrument

The data were gathered through a semi-structured interview method for it allowed the participants to talk freely about their attitudes related to the topic and questions offered. This interview method also had a flexibility to modify the order of questions to provide opportunities for follow-up question. From 20 open-ended questions, some questions were developed by the researcher based on the main questions, while others were developed from Al-Jadidi (2009).

d) Data Gathering Method

The researcher created a list of questions in both English and Indonesian for the participants in order to let them choose which language they preferred to use during interview. A piloting was done first, by selecting an ED student, who matched with the criteria of the participants above. The piloting was done to check the validity and reliability of the interview questions. Based on the piloting, the researcher changed some questions in order to get a better answer to the research question of the study.

The interview process took 12 up to 39 minutes and the data were captured by taking notes and audio-recording. For the recording part, the interview was transcribed using the clean transcription method. There were two phases of the interview. The first phase started from some general questions about background knowledge to build a strong understanding about the topic discussed. At the second phase, the interviewer concentrated on interviewees’ attitudes and
experiences when using English in group discussions. The participants were allowed to elaborate ideas that they thought important during the interview. Then, when it was necessary, the participants were interviewed again to get clearer answers and to gather all the data relevant to the research.

e) Data Analysis

Since the research was a qualitative study framework, the data were analyzed using content/thematic analysis (Riessman, 2008) in Zacharias (2012), which meant focusing on the contents or themes appeared by the participants. At this juncture, an overview of ED students’ clash attitudes, which were about the three contradictory components of attitudes occurred, would be presented. This case was in related with a research done by Petric (2002), who discovered that clash between attitudes and behavior also happened when non-native English users wrote in English. The contradictory components of attitudes talked here were the contents/themes discussed; cognitive component, evaluative component, and behavioral component based on previous studies by Wenden (1991), Hyrkstedt and Kajala (1998), and Ladegaard (2000).

The first component, cognitive, contained the opinions, beliefs, or perceptions about English-only policy in group discussions in the classroom. This component would be separated into two sub components; they were “Agree” and “Disagree”. The sub component Agree would contain the approval viewpoints while the sub component Disagree consisted of the disapproval viewpoints.

The second component, evaluative, was about the implied feelings or emotions, for examples like, dislike, commend or condemn about English-only
policy in group discussions in the classroom. Evaluative component would have three sub components; “Positive” – the positive feelings toward the use of full English in discussions, “Neutral” – the unbiased feeling and also contradicted feeling, whether it was positive and negative, and “Negative “– the unenthusiastic feelings of the participants.

The last component, behavioral, talked about the performance in certain or specific ways in responding toward English-only policy in group discussions in the classroom. The behavioral component contained two sub components, which were “Applying English” and “Code-mixing”. The sub component Applying English included the action done in countering English-only policy in group discussions. Code-mixing was the mixing-language action of the participants.

Each sub component from each component would contain the ratio of the amount of participants who belonged to which sub components. The explanations of factors that affected the participants to create such sub components would also be attached with some theories that were related with the data. Nevertheless, it should be noted in the discussions’ section, the participants’ quotations in each sub component were attached after being selected and edited first. It meant that only the quotations that were considered to represent the sub component in the discussions that were showed. However, since it was too long to put all quotations, it was decided to edit the quotations by only putting quotations that were relevant to the research only.

At last, the conclusion part would sum up the findings and discussions section briefly. Then, the majority preference of the subcomponents from each
component of the attitudes would be disclosed to reveal the real ED students’ attitude toward English-only policy in group discussions generally. Some suggestions based on supportive theories would be presented in responding the conclusion based on the consideration of the position of English, ED students, and the ED itself.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

In revealing the attitudes of the participants, the results showed that the first component of attitudes, cognitive, had 13 participants (72.22%) who agreed to use English-only in group discussion in the classroom while the other 5 participants (27.77%) disapproved the policy. The second component of attitude, evaluative, revealed that 2 participants (11.11%) had a positive feeling, 6 participants (33.33%) were neutral, and the other 10 participants (55.55%) had a negative feeling toward the policy. The third component, behavioral, exposed that 5 participants (27.77%) claimed to apply English in group discussions and the rest 13 participants (72.22%) were known to do code-mixing instead.

The data gathered showed that the participants had a mismatch between the components of the attitudes. It meant that, even if the cognitive component explained that most of them agreed to use English-only in group discussion, the evaluative component showed that a big amount of participants still had negative feeling toward this policy. Thus, the evaluative component influenced their behavioral component. It was revealed that most participants chose to do code-mixing instead of applying English in group discussions.
Clash Attitudes

The cognitive component that had two sub components Agree and Disagree, revealed the participants’ consideration about English as an important language to be mastered in the future. It is found that most participants, 13 participants (72.22%), believed the English-only policy was good to be adapted in the classroom. The reason was that actually they believed that monolingual approach and method also played an important role in enhancing language learning.

Extract 1:
The use of English should be emphasized. Learning a language, if it is not uttered, it is useless. It is good if English is used constantly in the class. The exposure [of English] does help us to learn more. (Participant 2 and 9)

The participants thought that learning English as a subject should be done by using English itself as the medium of instruction. They would get two advantages at the same time: first, they could talk about the material which made them knowledgeable, and second, their English skills would be more fluent. This was similar with what Phillipson (1992) in Auerbach (1993) said about the myths that English was the best taught monolingually and the more English was exposed, the better was the results.

Interestingly, in agreeing with the application of English-only policy, the participants thought that some requirements should be taken into consideration.

Extract 2:
As long as we acquire many English vocabulary, even the advance ones, it is okay. If people can do it, it is fine. But if they cannot, just speak Indonesian. For beginners, English-only maybe still hard so we end up with nothing. (Participant 4 and 13)

It was agreeable to use English-only as long as the users had a proper competence to do it. Also, it was preferred that the lecturers used code-mixing in explaining the material for the English students in beginner level since their English ability was
considered low. Nevertheless, if the students were considered able to receive English-only policy, the level of English exposure could be elevated.

On the other hand, only 5 participants (27.77%) claimed to oppose to English-only policy for it was not an effective learning method. Standing as EFL where Indonesian people still saw English as a prestigious language made them hesitate to use English.

Extract 3:
*It is not really interesting. Not all people use English in a daily conversation. Sometimes, when people try to speak English, they are considered showing off. If I talk in English with my friends, who are Javanese, not with English-native speakers, I feel that it is not me. Also, for a learning purpose, if my friend is in the same level with me, it is not helpful.* (Participant 5)

English was taught in schools but it did not play an essential role in national or social life (Broughton, Brumfit, Flavell, Hill, and Pincas, 1980). Thus, some participants saw the application of English in less formal settings, like group discussions, as unnecessary since they were interacting with other Indonesian peers. They also did not see any advantages if they practiced English with their friends for they all had equal competence.

The role of L1 was also considered important in helping them acquire English. The L1 was still needed when various Indonesian terms could not be expressed in English and when they wanted their ideas to be sufficiently delivered.

Extract 4:
*In sharing and discussions, ideas are the most important thing so if we cannot express them, we can use Indonesian or the mother tongue. I have some difficulties in understanding my friends’ unclear utterances. Thus, I am not willing to listen to them. I prefer code-mixing, it is more effective.* (Participant 15 and 16)

This condition was supported by Canagarajah (1999) who stated that even when teachers did not actively encourage the use of L1; the vernaculars found a place in L2
language learning spontaneously and unconsciously. They were not only learning English, but also used it to discuss the materials outside the language. Hence, it was more important to understand the material clearly than to focus on the language. Also, they wanted to avoid the difficulties in comprehending their friends’ pronunciations as not all of them could pronounce English words accurately and fluently.

Regardless of the approval of most participants’ cognitive component toward the English-only policy, most of them were still found to have negative feeling when applying this policy. Therefore, it could be stated that having approval opinion in most participants’ cognitive component did not always mean that there would be a high tendency to have a positive feeling in their evaluative component. Evaluative component, which had three sub components; Positive, Neutral, and Negative feeling, exposed that only 2 participants (11.11%), gave a truly positive response. The reason was that their interests in their future jobs might affect their beliefs in learning language.

Extract 5:
Learning a language, if you want to learn it fast, use it. If you want to learn English fast, use English... Of course I am happy. It’s more challenging. (Participant 7)

The participants’ philosophy of learning by doing shaped the way they perceived the English-only policy. Both participants stated to have a preference to go abroad that made them have such learning belief. Their belief was similar to what Klein (1986) declared, in order to communicate, a language had to be learned and in order to learn it, we had to communicate. They believed more exposure of English could give higher competence. Thus, they did not mind using the language when they had an opportunity to do it.
Another sub component revealed was the neutral feeling from the participants. About 6 participants (33.33%), claimed to feel unbiased about using English-only in group discussions. The length time of language learning in ED with other English learners somehow influenced their attitudes toward English.

Extract 6:
When I was in earlier stages, I felt annoyed, confused, embarrassed and unprepared to speak English fully as I was unable to do it. Now I am relax about it. The more we deal with English, the easier to use it. It is okay. For me, it does not have something special. (Participant 3 and 13)

It could be seen that the exposure level of English affected the participants’ feeling. Even if in their first years in learning in ED they felt frustrated, as they got increasing experience of English they began to adapt with the policy because their competence developed. Although they did not claim to be fond of the policy, it was clear that their negative feeling was decreased.

The next thing was the location where the participants were studying that affected the way they felt about English-only policy. It was believed that applying English in group discussions in the classroom created a protected spot for them to practice the language.

Extract 7:
My feeling is impartial as it is an English class. ...since it is in an English class so people will not stare at you. If we do not try to use English, and use Indonesia, at least our friends will remind us. (Participant 6)

Jones (2007) explained that students were inclined to learn from each other, be more involved, and felt more secure and less anxious if they worked together in English. At this point, since the peers in group discussions were also English learners, they did not think that it was something bizarre to speak English in English classes. They felt more
secure to use English in group discussions, rather than applied it outside classroom with the people who were not ED students.

Nevertheless, it was found that more than half of the participants, 10 participants (55.55%), considered the application of such policy disturbing. The reason was that they still considered English as only a subject, not a means of communication.

Extract 8:
I am confused. We cannot speak English as it is difficult to find the words to express the idea in English. It feels unsatisfied to express the opinion. Speaking English pushes us not to speak as it makes us to feel inflexible. (Participant 4, 14, and 15)

The participants felt under-pressure when they were talking in English. Since English is not their L1, the ideas to convey seemed to be undelivered well as they felt the English vocabulary did not cover all points they had. Thus, they were not as active as when they used Indonesian. Atkinson (1993) supported this idea by saying that the reasons to include L1 in the classroom were because it was more efficient if there was something complicated to communicate and it improved students’ motivation to learn if their attention was sustained more keenly.

Even if most participants claimed to like student-centered activities in the classroom, they thought group discussions could not be used as a means to raise a friendly atmosphere during the application of English-only. When they were using English, they thought they were “analyzed” by their peers. This situation made them feel burdened as they thought they had to be a perfect English user.

Extract 9:
I am afraid that there will be an unsympathetic response. Even though the venue was filled with the ED students, but it does not feel right to utilize English persistently. People will think negative thing like we are showing off. (Participant 16)
The participants also emphasized the lack of relaxing atmosphere like joking with other friends. It was in contrast with Canagarajah (1999) who said a *safe house* formed from group discussions could aid students’ learning. Group discussions failed to act as the *safe house* for the participants as they felt intimidated about what other peers in group would think of them. The reason why they could feel such a way was that doing any performance in L2 was likely to challenge an individual’s self-concept as a competent communicator, which might lead to embarrassment (Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope, 1986).

There were two kinds of behavior that happened in group discussions in the classroom when English-only policy was applied; Applying English and Code-mixing. The cognitive component showed most participants’ agreement with English-only policy. In contrast, their evaluative component informed that a big number of participants still felt negative toward the policy. As a consequence, it could be said that the negative feeling created from the policy had an effect on their behavior that made them not to apply English-only although they agreed with this policy. There were barely 5 participants (27.77%) who claimed applying English in group discussions if the lecturer told them to do so.

Extract 10:

*If a lecturer asks me to speak English all-the-time, I will give my best to speak English as I could as possible.* (Participant 5 and 9)

The participants explained that usually the use of English depended on the kinds of the lecturer. If the lecturer followed the rule of English-only, then they would use English, but if the lecturer did not, then they would not use it either. They might do this because they felt that it was safer to do English-only based on the lecturer’s regulation as the other friends would not think they were showing off.
Mastering the materials also influenced students’ use of English in group discussions. It was found that the easier the material, the higher the willingness to use English.

Extract 11:
*It depends on what’s being questioned here. If I already understand the topic, usually I will use English. If I don’t, I will use Indonesian.* (Participant 8)

Here, knowing the material well made the participants eager to use English since they probably knew the vocabularies used in the material. Thus, if they were more knowledgeable, they would be more confident to use English.

It was exposed that a large amount of participants, 13 participants (72.22%), had a tendency to do code-mixing during discussions. It happened based on the assumption that some of them still believed that it was tolerable if they received materials using monolingual approach and method. However, most participants still preferred to apply bilingual approach when it came to perform English. Hence, it made the participants used Indonesian first as the warm-up language before applying English.

Extract 12:
*Sometimes I make jokes using Indonesian first... then I am back to English.* (Participant 3)

The participants’ action was in line with Auerbach’s (1993) statement that when the learner was willing to experiment and take risks with English, starting with L1 provided a sense of security. They believed if they spoke bilingually, their friends would be more interested to speak English. Thus, this was comparable to what Rivera (1990) outlined that bilingual approach attracted students to participate in class and reduced affective barriers to the English acquisition.
The lecturers were also one of the factors that affected the language selection of the participants. The participants were likely to use English if the lecturer, who was strict to apply EMI (or English as the medium of the instruction) policy in the classroom, was near them. Nonetheless, they would alter the language into Indonesian if the lecturer could not hear their discussion.

Extract 13:
If the lecturer walks around in the classroom, and we get warned, we will use English. Two or three minutes later when the lecturer was not around anymore we will use Indonesian, or even Javanese. (Participant 6 and 16)

The participants’ behavior during discussions was in line with what Jones (2007) and Abbott and Wingard (1981) stated that despite the teacher efforts, a class in which the students had a language in common, they tended to revert to use their mother tongue oral practice when the teacher did not pay much attention to them.

Furthermore, the tendency not to talk about the language rather than the material discussed was revealed.

Extract 14:
...speaking English in discussions but when we are stuck, it will takes time to think the English words. Later we will think the English itself, not the thing we are discussing. (Participant 1 and 12)

The participants considered that English-only policy was lack of efficiency in time in discussions since they still had to figure out the English words. This situation was similar to Krashen’s (1982) argument that L1 could be a helpful tool in saving precious time for teachers and students during limited class time. As the policy made them need more time to finish the discussions, the participants chose to do code-mixing instead.
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

As a conclusion, this small-case study showed that clash attitudes happened between the components of the participants. The cognitive component divulged 3 participants (72.22%) to approve and only 5 participants (27.77%) to disapprove the policy. The factors that shaped their agreement were their belief that monolingual method and approach actually had contributions to their learning and also the English-only policy should be done to those who were competent to deal with this policy. While the factors that influenced their disagreement were the position of English as EFL in Indonesia and the important role of L1 in assisting their learning.

The evaluative component found 2 participants (11.11%) positive, 6 participants (33.33%) neutral, and 10 participants (55.55%) negative toward the policy. The participants with positive feeling believed the viewpoint of learning English by practicing English. The neutral participants felt unbiased because of the decreasing of the negative feeling due to the length time of learning English, and the application of English in group discussions created a safe house for them. Whereas the participants with negative feeling considered English simply as a subject and speaking English in group discussions with friends made them feel being examined.

The behavioral component uncovered that 5 participants (27.77%) alleged to apply English in group discussions and 13 participants (72.22%) stated to do code-mixing. The factors that affected the participants to apply English were the lecturers’ strictness to apply the English-only policy and the proper knowledge had related to the materials discussed. The rest participants did code-mixing due to their belief in
bilingual approach as a release-tension learning method, the existence of the lecturers who followed the policy around them, and the efficiency in time whilst discussing.

The factors mentioned above are the factors that influence the participants to have such subcomponents in each component of the attitudes. Even so, it should be noted that each factor in each sub component might also be the factor that influenced another sub component. Nonetheless, those factors were only put into certain subcomponents based on the majority answer of the participants. Thus, in summing up this research based on the majority preference from each subcomponent of ED students, it is found that the cognitive component had 13 participants (72.22%) agreed with the policy, while the evaluative component had 10 participants (55.55%) obtained a negative feeling toward the policy, and the behavioral component had 13 participants (72.22%) did code-mixing in discussions.

Despite most participants’ opinion of using English-only, it could be seen that the feelings built from the application affected the way they behaved when it came to do discussions. However, seeing that most of the participants agree with the EMI (English as a medium of instruction) policy and ED of SWCU itself have declared the preference to apply this policy in the classroom, ED should start being aware about the policy’s benefits for its students’ English skills. Jones (2007) supports this idea by advising teachers to persuade students to speak English in English class as it may be their only chance to speak English. This suggestion is drawn based on the reason that ED students can be claimed to rarely in touch with English if they are not in college assignments, or related with the Internet and have limit places to practice English outside the campus.
Regarding to the difficulties in employing the policy, such as there are only several lecturers who apply EMI policy and there are several factors that affected ED students not to apply the policy, two methods can be done in overcoming the difficulties. First, ED could raise the lecturers’ awareness of the benefits of the policy as it has been revealed that most ED students agree with this policy. Second, ED could start attracting the students to apply English in group discussions in the classroom by allowing ED students to use a small capacity of English phrases or sentences in discussions during their first years in ED first. Then, when ED students have achieved a level where their English competence is considered sufficient, the capacity of using English in group discussions could be expanded.

In relation to the limitations of this study, which are the number of the participants (n=18) and the data collection method (semi-structured interview method), further study needs to be done by involving a larger number of participants and other supporting data collection methods since it could produce more reliable conclusions and solutions. This research is done with a hope that ED of SWCU, who consists of the lecturers and students, would be more aware with the benefits of its EMI policy in the classroom and be inspired to do another research that could find better methods to discover and deal with the factors that affected ED students’ attitudes toward English-only policy in group discussions.
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APPENDIX

The Sample of the Interview Data:

Participant 11
Class that requires using English in discussions : Speaking 4

+ : *Udah* berapa lama belajar bahasa Inggris?
- : Kira-kira 12 tahun kali ya?
+ : Seberapa sering kamu menggunakan atau berinteraksi dengan bahasa Inggris dalam kehidupan kamu?
+ : Nah, kenapa kamu pilih untuk belajar bahasa Inggris?
+ : Kamu tadi bilangnya suka *trus* enak. Apa aja dari bahasa Inggris yang membuat kamu suka?
+ : Menurut kamu, tadi 'kan aspek-aspek, *skill-skill* yang penting. *Nah, kalo* misalnya cara belajar. Cara belajar bahasa Inggris yang baik *tu* *gimana*?
+ : Tadi 'kan kamu bahas sedikit soal orang lain bilangnya sombong, bahasa Inggris. Itu kenapa?

Jadi pendapat kamu penggunaan bahasa Inggris dalam kehidupan Indonesia sehari-hari itu gimana?


Menurut pendapat kamu sendiri approach apa yang lebih efektif, bilingual atau monolingual?

Kalo untuk kelas bahasa Inggris khususnya itu yang paling efektif ya monolingual soalnya kita 'kan belajar bahasa Inggris gak boleh setengah-setengah, harus full. Jadi kalo misalnya belajar bahasa Inggris ya pakenya bahasa Inggris terus cuma kadang ada anak yang kemampuan berbahasa Inggrisnya masih dibawah gitu, jadi ya bisa dibantu pake dikit bahasa Indonesia cuma aku saranin sih pakenya full English gitu. Nah, kalo bahasa Inggris dipake di dalam kelas terus, nanti kita bisa sdikit-sdikit 'kan kita gak sadar, kita udah mahir berbicara gitu. Jadi efektif dan efisien dipake di dalam kelas.

Efektifnya piye?

Efektifnya itu melatih kita ngomong, terus 'kan itu 'kan emang tuntutan jadi ya emang harus, jadi ya gimana? Juga itu 'kan membawa satu keuntungan sendiri bagi kita kalo seumpama di dalam kelas pake bahasa Inggris gitu 'kan kita jadi lebih bisa ngomong trus bisa memahami arti.
+: Dari *classroom activities* yang ada di kelas, kamu lebih suka yang mana, *group work* atau *in pairs* atau *individual* atau *teacher-centered*, atau gimana?

+: Di dalam kelas ada *classroom activity*. *Nah*, kegiatan dalam kelas apa yang membuat kamu cenderung untuk menggunakan bahasa Inggris?
-: Biasanya *kalo group discussion* pakanya bahasa Indonesia *sih*. *Cuma kalo* nanti hasil dari diskusi baru *pake* bahasa Inggris. *Jadi pas kita* mengutarakan pendapat *tu pakenya* bahasa Indonesia soalnya kadang ada kata-kata tertentu yang di bahasa Inggris kita *gak* tahu jadi kita lebih memilih, *eh* aku lebih memilih untuk *pake* bahasa Indonesia.

+: Menurut kamu tuh kelompok diskusi itu apa *sih*?
-: *Group discussion*, kelompok diskusi itu menurutku kelompok yang terdiri dari dua orang atau lebih yang menjadi satu berdiskusi tentang satu topik yang menjadi permasalahan. *Jadi, seumpama disuruh, classroom activity* gitu *'kan* pasti nanti ada *group discussion*. *Nah, tapi gimana* beberapa pikiran itu menjadi satu dan disampaikan ke *temen-temen* lain yang ada di kelas. *Jadi yang diutamakan di grup diskusi itu ya*, kebersamaan terus tanggung jawab, terus satunya keputusan bersama.

+: Seberapa sering kamu mengalami *group discussion* dalam kelas?
-: *Sering banget*. Hampir tiap mata kuliah ada *group discussion*.

+: *Kalo misalnya* dalam kelompok diskusi itu *kamu* aktif?
-: *Kadang aktif, kadang pasif*. *Aktif* pas aku familiar sama topik sama permasalahan, yang ada itu aku bisa menyampaikannya. *Tapi kalo* pasifnya pas aku lagi *males*, jadi aku cuma pertama dengerin temen-temen yang lain terus baru aku *nambah-nambahin*.

+: Misalnya itu kamu buka *pake* bahasa Inggris. Kamu *gimana*?
-: *Yaa nanti kita* juga membalasnya *pake* bahasa Inggris. *Soalnya 'kan* itu harus ada yang mengawali. *Seumpama* aku, satu kelompok lima orang ada yang satu yang *pake* bahasa Inggris jadi diskusinya *pake* bahasa Inggris. *Bagi aku* gak masalah selama kita bisa *mengutarakan* pendapat kita masing-masing, terus ada kekesalan itu *gak* masalah. *Ya, gak* ada *problem-lah*.

+: *Waktu misalnya* teman kamu buka bahasa Inggris kamu *perasaannya gimana*?
-: *Perasaannya “Wah, mikir nih.”* *Gimana* caranya *pake* bahasa Inggris yang baik *grammar-nya* baik, terus pendapatku juga bagus. *Intinya gitu*.

+: Waktu misalnya teman kamu buka bahasa Inggris kamu *perasaannya gimana*?
-: *Perasaannya “Wah, mikir nih.”* *Gimana* caranya *pake* bahasa Inggris yang baik *grammar-nya* baik, terus pendapatku juga bagus. *Intinya gitu*.

+: *Kalo misalnya* dia buka *pake* bahasa Indonesia?
-: *Perasaanku* lebih santai kayak daripada *kalo* diskusi *pake* bahasa Inggris soalnya jujur *aja ya*, aku *'kan gak* belum begitu fasih bahasa Inggris jadi *kalo pake* bahasa Inggris kadang takut, takut salah, padahal *'kan* mereka juga *gak*

+: Kalo kamu yang buka diskusi kelompok gitu, kamu lebih pilih pake bahasa apa waktu mau diskusi?


+: Ada gak hal-hal yang mempengaruhi kenapa kamu pilih untuk pake bahasa Indonesia selain dari bahasa Inggrisnya sendiri. Misalnya faktor-faktor dari luar?


+: Terlepas dari preference kamu untuk pake bahasa Indonesia. Apa pendapat kamu kalo menggunakan English all-the-time waktu dalam kelompok diskusi di kelas?


+: Kalo pendapatmu piye?


+: Misalnya, kamu kan tadi bilangnya bagus tapi kaku juga. Ada gak pengalaman kayak, yang buat kamu, pengalaman dalam kelas yang kamu alami sampai kamu berpikir demikian?

yang prefer ke English nah jadi dia dimanapun bahasa Inggris. Kalo menurutku aku aneh aja kalo ngomong sama dia.

+: Nah, ‘kan udah dijelasin sdikit soal opini kamu, Ran. Nah, kalo misalnya kamu lagi diskusi pake bahasa Indonesia terus disuruh English sama dosen, kamu ngapain?

+: Habis kamu pake English, waktu lagi ngomong sama temen di grup diskusi, perasaan kamu gimana?

+: Kalo gurunya ada gimana?
- : Ya nanti berubah pake bahasa Inggris lagi.

+: Tadi dari menggunakan bahasa Inggris secara terus menerus di kelompok diskusi bilangnya kayak kaku sama serius. Tantangan lainnya?

+: Ada hal lain yang ingin kamu tambahkan?
- : English all-the-time in group discussion itu bagus. Kita anak English Department. Saya juga sebenarnya menuntut semua group discussion itu pake bahasa Inggris cuma kadang ada istilah tertentu yang kita gak tahu di bahasa Inggris, nah kita switch ke bahasa Indonesia. Jadi berusaha pake bahasa Inggris dulu tapi kalo di tengah ada masalah sama vocab kita bisa pake bahasa Indonesia ato pake istilah lain di bahasa Inggris atau vocab yang lebih gampang, lebih mengekspresikan pendapat yang kita punya.