

6-8-2019

“They can speak English, but they don’t want to use it.” Teaching Contents through English in a Bilingual School and Policy Recommendations

Amirul Mukminin

Jambi University, Jambi, amirul.mukminin@unja.ac.id

Siti Rahma Sari

Jambi University, Jambi

Eddy Haryanto

Jambi University, Jambi

Akhmad Habibi

Jambi University, Jambi

Marzul Hidayat

Jambi University, Jambi

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Elementary Education Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended APA Citation

Mukminin, A., Sari, S. R., Haryanto, E., Habibi, A., Hidayat, M., Marzulina, L., Nurulanningsih, N., & Ikhsan, I. (2019). “They can speak English, but they don’t want to use it.” Teaching Contents through English in a Bilingual School and Policy Recommendations. *The Qualitative Report*, 24(6), 1258-1274. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol24/iss6/5>



Qualitative Research Graduate Certificate
Indulge in Culture
Exclusively Online • 18 Credits
LEARN MORE

NSU
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN
UNIVERSITY

NOVA SOUTHEASTERN

“They can speak English, but they don’t want to use it.” Teaching Contents through English in a Bilingual School and Policy Recommendations

Abstract

The growing need for English as a key to global communication, relations, and information, is noticeable in schools around the world. In response to these imperatives of global competitiveness, one of the private bilingual schools in Indonesia has adopted English as a medium of instruction (EMI). The aim of this study was to explore the implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school in teaching contents in one private bilingual school in Jambi City, Indonesia. The data were collected through demographic profiles, documents, and semi-structured in-depth interviews. The documents were used to find out the comprehensive overview of the bilingual education program while the in-depth interviews were used to ask participants to narrate their accounts and perspectives on the use of English as the medium of instruction at a micro (classroom) level. Overall, the findings of this study revealed that the successful implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school were interrelatedly challenged by teachers’ attitude and ability to use English, language policy, teaching materials, students’ English proficiency, curriculum, student assessment, and admission policy. Implications and suggestions for future research are also discussed.

Keywords

Bilingual Education, Case Study, Instruction, Teaching Content

Creative Commons License

Creative

Commons

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Attribution-

Noncommercial

4.0

License

Acknowledgements
This study had no financial supports from any parties. We are heartily indebted to the all participants in this study who had given their time for the interviews and shared their feelings and experiences with us. We also want to thank the principals of the research site who supported us to conduct the research. Additionally, we would like to say many thanks to the reviewers and The Qualitative Report for giving us a chance for publishing our research article.

Authors

Amirul Mukminin, Siti Rahma Sari, Eddy Haryanto, Akhmad Habibi, Marzul Hidayat, Lenny Marzulina, Nurulanningsih Nurulanningsih, and Ikhsan Ikhsan

”They can speak English, but they don’t want to use it.” Teaching Contents through English in a Bilingual School and Policy Recommendations

Amirul Mukminin, Siti Rahma Sari, Eddy Haryanto, Akhmad Habibi, and
Marzul Hidayat
Jambi University, Jambi City, Jambi, Indonesia

Lenny Marzulina
Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah, Palembang, South Sumatra, Indonesia

Nurullaningsih
Tridinanti University, Palembang, South Sumatra, Indonesia

Ikhsan Ikhsan
Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia,
Jakarta, Indonesia

The growing need for English as a key to global communication, relations, and information, is noticeable in schools around the world. In response to these imperatives of global competitiveness, one of the private bilingual schools in Indonesia has adopted English as a medium of instruction (EMI). The aim of this study was to explore the implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school in teaching contents in one private bilingual school in Jambi City, Indonesia. The data were collected through demographic profiles, documents, and semi-structured in-depth interviews. The documents were used to find out the comprehensive overview of the bilingual education program while the in-depth interviews were used to ask participants to narrate their accounts and perspectives on the use of English as the medium of instruction at a micro (classroom) level. Overall, the findings of this study revealed that the successful implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school were interrelatedly challenged by teachers’ attitude and ability to use English, language policy, teaching materials, students’ English proficiency, curriculum, student assessment, and admission policy. Implications and suggestions for future research are also discussed. Keywords: Bilingual Education, Case Study, Instruction, Teaching Content

In recognition of the global competitiveness, communication, relations, and information and of the prevalent use of English language throughout the world, a variety of innovative and effective programs involving students have been introduced by educational policymakers around the globe which may hold a greater promise of success for students’ cognitive, linguistic and academic achievement (Haryanto & Mukminin, 2012). One of the most promising and innovative programs is bilingual education, which is broadly defined as any “educational program that involves the use of two languages of instruction at some point in a student’s school career” (Nieto, 2000, p. 200). Meanwhile, Mackey (1968) defined bilinguals as the ones who knew more than one language to different degrees and used the

languages for a variety of purposes. Grosjean (1989) termed a bilingual as a person who had developed competencies in two or more languages. For Hamers and Blanc (2003), bilinguals are considered people having a native-like skill in two languages or at least some knowledge of a second language.

In terms of what he called a mainstream bilingual education, Baker (1993) argued that the curriculum bilingual education was delivered in two languages, conventionally half of the day in one language and half in the other. Nation (2003) addressed that the advantage of using English as a medium of class instruction, the first language, on the other side, would provide an effective way for understanding the content profoundly and immediately. Additionally, back to 1970s, Cummins (1979) argued that students who communicated with more than one language (e.g., English and student's mother tongue), their learning achievement could be increased or decreased due to the interchange of the diverse language codes.

A number of studies from the old ones to the recent ones (e.g., Admiraal, Westhoff, & Bot, 2007; Baker & de Kanter, 1981, 1983; Cummins, 1989; Danoff, Coles, McLaughlin, & Reynolds, 1978; Fakeye & Ogunji, 2009; Haryanto & Mukminin, 2012; Heugh, Diedericks, Prinsloo, Herbst, & Winnaar, 2007; Krashen, 1996; Mukminin *et al.*, 2018; Nordin, 2010; Rossell & Baker, 1996; Willig, 1985) have documented whether or not bilingual education leads positive results to students' cognitive, linguistic, and academic achievement. The findings of those studies are mixing. For example, Danoff, Coles, McLaughlin, and Reynolds (1978) concluded that students in bilingual programs did not perform better than students who did not attend bilingual programs. Also Baker and de Kanter (1981, 1983) and Rossell and Baker (1996), who conducted meta-studies on the existing evaluations or individual studies, concluded that bilingual education did not have a significant impact on student achievement at school. More specifically, Rossell and Baker (1996) concluded that transitional bilingual education programs were not a superior form of instruction for limited English proficient students. Heugh *et al.* (2007) found that the use of English as a medium of instruction did not necessarily result in better English learning. Similarly, Nordin (2010), who studied lower secondary subjects taught in English, found that students encountered language problems as well as contents' problems when English was used to learn science and mathematics. On the other hand, in their studies, Krashen (1996), Cummins (1989) and Willig (1985) indicated that bilingual education was effective, with students in well-made programs obtaining academic English and often better than children in all-English programs. Similarly, Admiraal, Westhoff, and Bot (2007) found that students attending a bilingual education school obtained higher scores for their English language proficiency in terms of oral proficiency and reading comprehension.

However, although the interests and debates on the merits of English as a language of instruction in bilingual education have continued up to now in Indonesia and around the world, the current debates over the use of English as the medium of instruction in combination with Indonesian language in several Indonesian public and private bilingual schools have not discussed the implementation of the language instruction on an everyday school life. Much of the debates over the choice of English language instruction in bilingual education seems to be politically interested, more appropriate for talk shows than for improving student success in such a school (Crawford, 2000). Classically, the debates much concentrate on program labels instead of concentrating on the quality of program implementation in classroom level, for instance, there has been a great deal of research showing that students and teachers do not fully understand the English used in the classroom as the medium of instruction (EMI) in secondary schools (Criper & Dodd, 1994; Kadegehe, 2000; Rabagumya, 1991). Additionally, research on the quality of the use of English as the medium of instruction in the classroom level in Indonesian public and private bilingual schools is still comparatively limited except for Mukminin *et al.* (2018) and Haryanto and Mukminin (2012). For example, Haryanto and

Mukminin's (2012) study showed that the implementation of English as a medium of instruction was not done well in the international standard school (another type of bilingual school in Indonesia).

The purpose of this study was to explore the implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school in teaching contents in one private bilingual school in Jambi City, Indonesia. Specifically, our investigation centered on the comprehensive overview of the bilingual education program at the research site and what barriers that teachers faced in teaching specific subjects by using English as the medium of instruction at a micro (classroom) level in one private bilingual school. To achieve the purpose of this study, we fashioned three main and broad guiding research questions: (1) What is the nature of Indonesian—English bilingual education program in one private bilingual school in Jambi, Indonesia? (2) How do the practices (e.g., teaching materials, student English proficiency, and student assessment) look like at school and classroom levels? (3) What are the major barriers that teachers face in teaching specific subjects by using English as the medium of instruction at a micro (classroom) level in one private bilingual school?

Literature Review

Language Policy

A guiding principle or principles to be employed as a basis for making plans for language use in the classroom would be included in a language policy for school. Moreover, Fishman (1973, pp. 23-24) defines language policy as the organized pursuit of solutions to language problems, typically at the national level." Thus, the terms of language policy in this study is generally believed as the result of government intervention in the linguistic practices of people under its jurisdiction.

Guiding principles exist at the micro level as well, where the concern is with the manner in which a chosen course of action is implemented in the classroom. Corson (1989) stated that language is the vehicle through which much learning takes place. Therefore, the language presented in each subject needs to be accounted for as part of a language policy. The guiding principle is that language, broadly defined, is the vehicle for learning (Corson, 1989). Teachers operating under such a guiding principle must consider carefully how students encounter language in their classrooms and how it affects their ability to acquire the knowledge/ skills specified in curriculum.

In Indonesia, English is taught and used as a foreign language. The growing need for English as a key to global communication, relations, and information, is noticeable in schools around the world. In response to these imperatives of global competitiveness, Indonesian government developed a new act on its educational system in 2003: "The government and local government shall organize at least a unit of education at all levels of education, to be developed as a unit having international standard of education" (Ministry of National Education, 2003, pp. 26-27). Looking at good opportunities they may derive from the use of the language, many schools have adopted English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) now.

Bilingual Education

Currently, there are numerous bilingual programs operating across the nations. There is a long history of bilingual education for the purposes of enrichment (e.g., private schools in the United States where students are taught in European languages) or as transitional programs for students whose home language is not the language of instruction at school (Akkari, 1998; Rossell & Baker, 1996; Thomas & Collier, 1998). In their longitudinal study, Thomas and

Collier (1998). There are three main concepts used in bilingual education that reveal important distinctions in practice: *language immersion*, *monolingual*, and *bilingual* (Hong, 2010). In terms of “Bilingual education,” it is sometimes referred to as language immersion; however, language immersion can be either bilingual or monolingual. The goal of language immersion is to achieve second language proficiency by using the second language as the primary medium of instruction: *monolingual education* accomplishes this goal by utilizing only one language as the medium of instruction; *bilingual education*, on the other hand, utilizes two languages as mediums of instruction with the goal of language proficiency in one or both of the languages used (Hong, 2010). The meaning of the term “bilingual education” (BE) may be ambiguous. It can refer to a situation in which language minority children are taught in the language of the majority group, a situation often referred to as “submersion” and aiming at the development of their skills in that language that may be foreign to them but which is dominating daily life outside school. It can also refer to “immersion,” in which a foreign language, for example a language that is not the language of the larger society, is the medium of instruction (Baker, 2002). A classic definition of bilingual education is provided by Anderson and Boyer (1970), bilingual education is instruction in two languages and the use of those two languages as mediums of instruction for any part, or all, of the school curriculum. A good example of what bilingual education is English as a Second Language (ESL) programs whereby students are submerged in English as both language of instruction and language of the curriculum content. A bilingual program must provide both content and delivery in two languages, although bilingual programs vary somewhat in how the languages get distributed across the curriculum (Baker & Jones, 1998).

With specific reference to bilingual education, the question arises as to what extent bilingual education has reflected a formal policy or set of policies. Swilla (2009) therefore concludes that having legalized private primary schools and the use of English as Medium of Instruction (MoI) in such schools, the government was not ready to state openly that English had also become MoI in primary schools. To address this question, it is useful to think of the ways in which bilingual education policies can be analyzed in terms of language aims and goals. Bilingual education policies, for example, may be designed to (a) promote English and one or more additional languages; (b) accommodate speakers of minority languages in English only instruction; (c) restrict the use of some languages, as in the case of German during World War I; or (d) repress or even eradicate languages, as during the late 19th century, when American Indian boarding schools were used for that purpose (Kloss, 1998). Among additional factors to consider, Rossell and Baker (1996) divided bilingual education types into two general categories, weak and strong, according to supposed social and linguistic aims. Weak forms, such as submersion, segregationist, and mainstream bilingual programs are said to aim either for monolingualism (either in the form of the first language loss on the part of the learners or the lack of opportunity to acquire a second language) or for limited bilingualism. Strong forms, on the other hand, are said to share the twin language aims of bilingualism (listening and speaking), and biliteracy (reading and writing).

Research on Bilingual Education

A particular effort of a group of bilingual education researchers and practitioners was documented in a 1989 study by Solis (1989) and Calderon (1986). This investigation revealed several interesting insights about research in bilingual education, how teachers perceived and used it, and how these endeavors affected their outlook toward their practice. The results suggest that helping bilingual education professionals become research informed teachers, among other things, can stimulate and encourage them to continue the important task of teaching the Language English Proficiency (LEP) population.

Bilingual education programs have been in existence for over two decades, and thus the reasonable question arises as to whether there is evidence of the relative effectiveness of the different approaches. Willig (1985), in a meta-analysis of studies of the effectiveness of bilingual education, explained that evaluation research in this area was plagued with problems ranging from poor design to bad measurement. She concluded that “most research conclusions regarding the effectiveness of bilingual education reflect weaknesses of the research itself rather than reflects of the actual programs” (p. 297). Almost all of the program evaluation studies concentrate on the effectiveness of the programs in teaching the students English, rather than focusing on students' overall academic development or factors other than traditional measures of school success (Hakuta & Garcia, 1989).

Another study which focused on evaluating language policy in bilingual school was Moulden (2005). He conducted a research on an evaluation of language policy at an independent bilingual school in Japan serving students in grades 1-12. In order to enhance an understanding of the school's programs, comparisons are drawn between them and the English immersion program at Katoh Elementary school, which establish the country's first such program. More studies, particularly from Carter and Chatfield (1986) and Krashen and Biber (1988), have followed this earlier example of describing the organizational and instructional attributes of schools and classrooms that produce academically successful bilingual students. However, even the most recent federal initiatives regarding program evaluation continue to look almost exclusively at English-language skills as the primary outcome variable (Ramirez, 1986). Additionally, Anghel, Cabrales, and Carro (2012) evaluated a program that introduced bilingual education in English and Spanish of primary education in some public schools of the Madrid region in 2004. Science, history, and geography are studied in English as a foreign language, while Spanish and Math we taught only in Spanish. The first class receiving full treatment finished Primary education in June 2010 and they took the standardized test for all 6th grade students in Madrid on the skills considered “indispensable” at that age. This test was their measure of the outcome of primary education to evaluate the program. They took several routes to control for these selection problems. The main route to control for self-selected schools was to take advantage of the test being conducted in the same schools before and after the program was implemented in 6th grade. To control for students' self-selection, they combined the use of several observable characteristics (like parents' education and occupation) with the fact that most students were already enrolled at the different schools before the program was announced. The results indicated that there was a clear negative effect on learning the subject taught in English for children whose parents had less than upper secondary education, and no clear effect for anyone on mathematical and reading skills, which were taught in Spanish.

Moreover, another research conducted by Admiraal, Westhoff, and Bot (2007) examined the effects of the use of English as the language of instruction in the first 4 years of secondary education in the Netherlands on the students' language proficiency in English and Dutch, and achievement in subject matters taught through English. Compared to a control group in regular secondary education, students attending this form of bilingual education showed higher scores for their English language proficiency in terms of oral proficiency and reading comprehension. No effects have been found for receptive word knowledge and no negative effects have been found with respect to the results of their school leaving exams at the end of secondary education for Dutch and subject matters taught through English. Finally, the study conducted by Errihani (2007) in Morocco revealed that this language policy is a top-down policy that never took into account the views of the targets whose linguistic practices aim to change. It is encountering many problems, from negative attitude, to lack of teacher training, and to lack of qualified teacher. Therefore, there is also strong resistance to this policy from different government institutions they may publicly declare their support for it, while

implicitly will work against its implementation. Consequently, it would be unrealistic to expect teaching Berber succeed in Morocco. In brief, this study sought to explore the implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school in teaching contents in one private bilingual school in Jambi City.

The Researchers

Our interest in exploring the implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school in teaching contents in one private bilingual school in Jambi City, Indonesia is because we discovered that this issue remained understudied. Therefore, through our study, we wanted to better understand the implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school in teaching contents (e.g., math, science), particularly) how the practices (e.g., teaching materials, student English proficiency, and student assessment) looked like at school and classroom levels and what major barriers that teachers faced in teaching specific subjects (e.g., math, science) by using English as the medium of instruction at a micro (classroom) level in one private bilingual school. Also, we wanted to provide information for language policy makers in local levels to help them frame any kinds of supporting programs or training for bilingual schools teachers. Authors in this study are researchers and lecturers and students in English education and education. The first author, a faculty member at one public university in Jambi, holds a PhD in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies from a United States public university. He had experience and training in qualitative research by taking various courses at a graduate level, including qualitative research methods, qualitative data analysis, and research methods in education. The second author is a doctoral student in education at one public university. The third author is a faculty member at one public university in Jambi. The fourth author is a junior teaching staff member in one public university in Jambi, Indonesia. The fifth author is a faculty member at one public university in Jambi. The sixth author is an English lecturer in a state Islamic university in South Sumatra, Indonesia. The seventh author is an Indonesian lecturer in a private university in Palembang, South Sumatra. The last author is a researcher at Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia.

Methodology of Research

Research Design, Site, and Participants

Using a qualitative case study design, we expected to explore the implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school and teachers' barriers of teaching contents at a micro (classroom) level in one private bilingual school in Jambi City, Indonesia. The case study tradition that we used in this study was Merriam's (1998) work. She (1998) stated that a qualitative case study was an intensive and holistic description, explanation, and analysis of "a bounded system" (p. 27) on phenomenon such as a person, a program, an institution, a process, a social unit, a group, and a policy. Merriam (1998) further argued that an exploratory case study was suitable when the focus of the investigation has not been examined exhaustively as is the case with the implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school and teachers' barriers of teaching contents at a micro (classroom) level in one private bilingual school. Merriam (1998) also suggested that through studying an understudied issue, scholars obtain chances for exploring relevant aspects and for providing a descriptive basis for future and larger studies. So, in our study, the case study design was chosen as the appropriate study strategy to explore the implementation of English

as a language of instruction in a bilingual school and teachers' barriers of teaching contents at a micro (classroom) level in one private bilingual school in Jambi City, Indonesia.

The setting for this study was at one private, junior bilingual school. This school serves students from different ethnic groups such as Malay, Chinese descendants, and other ethnic groups. This school uses English as a medium of instruction for teaching subjects such as math, science, and social studies while other subjects such as Indonesian, arts, computer are taught in Indonesian. In this study we focused on looking at the implementation of bilingual junior high school program (e.g., curriculum, learners' needs, programs and course goals, the selection materials, teachers, and assessment). For sampling, Creswell (2007) wrote, "The concept of purposeful sampling is used in qualitative research. This means that the inquirer selects individuals and sites for the study because they can purposefully inform an understanding of the research problems" (p. 125). In this study, we used a purposeful sampling with a convenience case strategy. Creswell (2007) wrote, "Convenience cases, which represent sites or individuals from which researchers can access and easily collect data" (p. 126). We used this strategy in selecting the research sites and participants because we had access to teachers and documents. Through the adoption of a qualitative case study approach for our study, the findings of this study should not be generalized to the other schools or participants.

The school where we conducted the study had 36 students consisting of four female and three male students of the first grade, five female and seven male students of the second grade, and five female and twelve male students of the third grade. There were eight teachers who were actively teaching in this school when the study was conducted. For the purpose of our study, at the beginning we planned to include all teachers as our participants. However, five teachers in different fields of studies were willing to participate in this study. To protect their identity as part of research ethics, we replaced their names by pseudonyms of Joko, Mega, Rani, Salsa, and Mira.

Data Collection and Analysis

We conducted this study from November 2015 to October 2016. This study drew upon a background survey, document analysis, and semi-structured and in-depth interviews. The survey was used to gather information about age, gender, educational background, working experience, and grades and subjects that participants taught. We used documents to find out the comprehensive overview of the bilingual education program at the research site. Particularly we expected that we could gain the data related to school's status, accreditation admission policy, student body, curriculum, teachers, language policy, teaching materials, and assessment. We were lucky we could get the documents such as admission policy, student body, and student assessments. Through these kinds of documents, we also expected that we could see the match between the purpose of the program and the barriers that teachers faced to implement the bilingual education program at the research site.

Moreover, this study used semi-structured and in-depth interviews, which were audio-taped and lasted between one and half hours for each participant and conducted in a private space at the school. A total of five teachers were interviewed. We asked participants to narrate their accounts and perspectives on their barriers in using English as the medium of instruction at a micro (classroom) level related to such as teaching materials, student English proficiency, and student assessment. We informed participants that their answers were confidential and that we would not distribute their responses to anyone at school. We also offered that they did not have to give their answer to any questions that we provided. Furthermore, the interviews were begun with short introductions and casual conversation to allow our participants to feel comfortable during the interviews, and they were provided with the information of the purpose of the study and asked permission for publishing the findings of the study providing we masked

all of the data such as names, places, and age, and school. In addition, their accounts were digitally recorded and responses to interview questions via a digital voice recorder. All interviews were recorded with the consent of the participants and transcribed them for data analysis. To better understand the implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school and teachers' barriers of teaching contents in one private bilingual school in Jambi City, Indonesia, our investigation specifically centred on the comprehensive overview of the bilingual education program at the research site and what barriers that teachers faced in teaching specific subjects by using English as the medium of instruction at a micro (classroom) level in one private bilingual school; we asked teachers: What are the major barriers that participants face in teaching specific subjects by using English as the medium of instruction? How do you perceive as a teacher in a bilingual school to deal with the issues of curriculum, learners' needs, programs and course goals, the selection materials, and assessment? We expected that participants would reflect the messages related to those issues in order to explore the barriers of the bilingual education, which finally would reflect the quality of program implementation in classroom level.

In qualitative research, data collection and analysis characteristically do not occur in a succeeding way (Creswell, 2007; Habibi et al., 2018; Muazza, Mukminin, Habibi, Hidayat, & Abidin, 2018; Mukminin, 2012; Mukminin, Rohayati, Putra, Habibi, & Aina, 2017; Mukminin, 2019). Instead, both data collection and analysis have an effect on each other. For our study, after we obtained the documents (e.g., reports, policy, and teacher data) from the school, we organized the data into the categories that we created such as school's status, accreditation admission policy, student body, curriculum, teachers, language policy, teaching materials, and assessment. We did this kind of analysis to avoid having too much data that would make us stuck. Similarly, after we conducted interviews with our first participant, we audiotaped, transcribed verbatim, and carefully analysed and categorized all interview data into temporary codes that we created. This process was continued for every participant. After we interviewed all participants, we reanalyzed and compared all the transcripts among the five participants to find out similarities and differences related to our codes (e.g., teachers' attitude to English language policy, teaching material resources) that we made (Glaser & Strauss, cited in Mukminin, 2012). To address the trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Mukminin, 2012; Mukminin, Kamil, Muazza, & Haryanto, 2017; Mukminin et al., 2018) of our research, one of the ways that we used was member checking (Merriam, 1998). Member check feedback was received from our participants. Also, we provided rich and thick descriptions (Maimunah et al., 2018; Merriam, 1998; Syaiful et al., 2018) related to our findings. These ways have been supportive of the trustworthiness of our research.

Ethical Considerations

This study relied on human beings as the main source of the research data. To deal with the research ethics, though in Indonesia, an IRB approval process is not common, we concealed the names of people, places, and the research site through the use of pseudonyms to keep the rights of human participants. We also convinced our participants that their participation was completely voluntary, and their accounts and answers would be confidentially treated.

Findings

Using two kinds of data sources, document and in-depth interviews, we tried to obtain a general sense of the data and to reflect on their overall meaning in order to explore the implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school and teachers'

barriers of teaching contents in one private bilingual school in Jambi City, Indonesia. Purposely, our examination centered on the comprehensive overview of the bilingual education program at the research site and what barriers that teachers faced in teaching specific subjects by using English as the medium of instruction at a micro (classroom) level in one private bilingual school. We organized our findings into two sections. The first section presents the comprehensive overview of the bilingual education program (status, accreditation, admission policy, student body, curriculum, teachers, language policy, teaching materials, and student assessment) obtained from the documents and the second sections discusses barriers or obstacles (teachers' attitude and ability to use English, teaching material resources, and students' English proficiency) obtained from the interviews.

The Overview of the Bilingual Education Program

In order to describe findings regarding the comprehensive overview of the bilingual education program in one private bilingual school in Jambi City, Indonesia, we analysed the documents such as reports, policy papers, and teacher data, admission policy reports, curriculum, student assessment, student body data, and sources of teaching materials. These documents were examined carefully to find out how the program was designed to achieve its purposes as a bilingual school that used English as the medium of instruction at a micro (classroom) level. We organized our finding as presented in Table 1 in the following.

Table 1. *The overview of the bilingual education program of the research site*

Domains	Elaboration
Status and mission	-The school is part of a group of private schools under the leadership of one foundation in Jambi. -Its mission is to enable its students to have their academic achievement in both languages, English and Indonesian.
Accreditation	The school is accredited by the provincial board of school accreditation in coordination with local education offices
Admission Policy	Admission criteria: the child does not have to talk English. If he/she does, it is considered an advantage.
Student body	Most students are native speakers of Indonesian. There are a small number of speakers of other languages such as Thai, Singaporean, or Chinese descendants.
Curriculum	The school mainly uses the Indonesian national curriculum.
Teachers	All teachers has a bachelor's degree related to their teaching subject. There is an English test as a foreign language for teachers.
Language policy	An early partial immersion program is taught. Some classes have both English and Indonesian section. English, Math, and Science are fully taught in English.
Teaching materials	Most textbooks are obtained from Indonesian publishers. But, English, Math, and Science are obtained from other countries.
Student assessment	A variety of assessment methods are to be employed (monthly test, mid- test, semester- test, school test, and national test).

From the summary presented in Table 1, it is evident that our research site as a bilingual school is part of a group of private schools under the leadership of a foundation. Its purpose is to enable its students to have their academic studies through English and Indonesian. However, although it is a kind of bilingual education school, it has no international connections with other

schools outside the country. Particularly, in terms of accreditation, the school is still accredited by the provincial board of school accreditation in coordination with local education offices (provincial). For the admission policy, it is interesting that the school accepted local and foreign students, but the potential students did not have to be able to communicate in English or in Indonesian. If students were able to use it, it was considered an advantage. We assumed that this kind of admission policy was used in order to offer the program to any interested students as it is a private school. The data from the documents that we obtained also indicated that most students are Indonesian native speakers, but they had ever lived outside the country such as Singapore, Australia, and the United States of America. Additionally, there are a small number of speakers of other languages such as Thai, Singaporean, or Chinese descendants. In this case, the crucial problem is that some teachers spoke a native language (Indonesian) mostly. It indirectly affected students' academic and linguistic development.

Another noteworthy finding from the document analysis was related to the school curriculum. Our finding indicated that the school mainly used the Indonesian national curriculum while for the teaching materials; most textbooks were obtained from Indonesian publishers. However, it is interesting that English, math, and science books are obtained from countries such as Singapore or UK. More importantly, this finding revealed that our research site as a bilingual school fully used English in the classroom only for teaching three subjects including English, math, and science, suggesting that teachers and students communicate in English inside the classroom during the teaching and learning process. Unfortunately, we had no chance for observing the teaching and learning processes in order to know the real processes.

For selecting teachers, the school required all teachers or who wanted to be a teacher to have at least a bachelor's degree related to their teaching subject and passed the English test as a foreign language. However, we could not get data related to other required documents to be a teacher at this school. We expected to see such as the GPA of its current teachers, attended training experience related to teaching in a bilingual school. We also did not get any data related to the minimum score of an English test as a foreign language for teachers. The important issue that we obtained from the document data was regarding students' assessment. Our research site as a bilingual school provided several kinds of assessment methods for their students starting from a monthly test, mid-test, semester-test, school test, to the national test. The monthly test and semester tests are teacher-made tests while the school test is made by a group of teachers in the school in cooperation with subject teachers. For the subjects (English, math, and science) taught in English, the tests were made based on the contents of the subjects by the subject teachers and they also combined the content of the tests with the ones provided by the books. We found that English as the medium of instructions was only used in the three subjects from the first to the third graders while other subjects such as Indonesian, sport, art, civic education, religion, or computer were taught in Indonesian. These kinds of practices indicated that our research site might face some problems to use English as the medium of instruction which will be presented in the following part.

Barriers of English Instruction

The potential problems for implementing any language policy in any levels/kinds of education could occur as there is always a discrepancy among the intended policy implementation in the micro level, people's beliefs, and practices. The findings of our interview data indicated that teachers in our research site as a bilingual school faced a variety of barriers of teaching contents or specific subjects by using English as the medium of instruction at a micro (classroom) level in one private bilingual school. We organized our findings and explanations through the following sub-themes.

Teachers' attitude and ability to use English. In case of bilingual education, teachers play a vital role in the teaching and learning process. They have the power to be agents of change and empowered to become proactive in their students' lives. Teachers in teaching subject (s) commonly lead to positive and negative attitudes. Both positive and negative teacher attitudes toward English particularly may produce teacher behaviours which in turn affects their achievement. The findings of study indicated that teachers' attitudes toward English language might influence their motivation to obey the rule of language policy in their schools which they might bring into the classroom. Regarding to teachers' attitudes toward the language policy implementing in the school, of five teachers that we interviewed, two teachers were very supportive with the use of English in teaching subjects such as English, math, and science. For example, Joko reported, "I fully use English in teaching. If they ask me to use Indonesian, I try to make them understand and using English with simple words."

However, the other three teachers, Rani, Mira, and Salsa did not fully use English when teaching their subjects. For instance, Rani reflected, "...I support the use of English in my school and in the classroom. But I combine between English and Indonesian while teaching the subject."

The results of our interview with the five teachers indicated that their attitudes to the use of English as the medium of instruction were likely to be supportive with the policy. However, although they realized that their school as a bilingual school required them to use English in teaching subjects such as English, math, and science, three of them did not obey the policy within their own classroom. It suggested that it seemed to be difficult for teachers like Rani, Mira, and Salsa to use full English in teaching in their own classroom. Based on our finding, this kind of attitude provides our readers a picture that one of the challenges to run a bilingual school is related to schoolteachers' English proficiency and attitude toward using English

Teaching material resources. Success in the implementation of bilingual education program will not occur if resources such as books and other teaching materials are not available, particularly, teaching materials produced in other languages. The findings of our interviews with the participants indicated that school and teachers had to use the national curriculum. However, all teaching materials were written in Indonesian and for subjects such as math, English, and science, teachers relied on their school. For these three subjects, the school bought and used books produced in Singapore. Based on our analysis of the interview data, teachers had to adapt those foreign teaching materials into the national curriculum. It was not easy for teachers. So, teachers had two sorts of barriers; first they had to deal with fitting the content of those foreign books into the national curriculum. For example, Mira reported, "For teaching materials, I must look at the curriculum and adapt the content with the curriculum. Afterwards, I use it to teach my students." Second, they had to make sure that all of their students had enough background knowledge of the content of those foreign books. If the content was too easy or too difficult, the students might not be reached the level of competence that the national curriculum required and vice versa. For example, one of the participants, Rani expressed, "For me, I use both Indonesian and Singaporean books. It is not easy and not difficult. It depends on me as a teacher to find an easy way to explain it to my students. Both are good sources."

The data above indicated that in teaching subjects such as math, science, and English, teachers faced barriers including how to adapt the content of the foreign books or teaching materials with the national curriculum. Although our research site claims itself as a bilingual school, its accreditation is still evaluated by the department of education. It implies that the school with its elements should follow the national curriculum.

Students' English proficiency. The result of our document analyses indicated that the admission policy did not require any potential students who wanted to study at the research site to have a minimum score of English proficiency. Our interview data with teachers revealed that students' willingness to speak English became one of the barriers for teachers to teach them by using English and they had to make a lot of efforts to transfer the knowledge to them especially for teaching math, English, and science. In the words of one of the participants, Rani, "They might be able to speak English, but they don't want (having no willingness)." Additionally, Joko reported, "I think most of them can speak English well, even though we know that some students didn't follow the policy." Also, Mira confidently reflected, "They can speak English, but they don't want to speak" (Mira).

Within this sub-theme, the data indicated that students might have ability to communicate in the classroom, but they were not willing to use it. Such a situation was not surprising because the analysis of the documents that we obtained revealed that the school as a bilingual one did not require its students to have minimum English ability. So, it influenced the implementation of the goal of the school to run its bilingual program. Particularly, in the classroom level, students and teachers seldom used English in the process of teaching and learning. Consequently, several complains came from parents regarding their children's English ability. Joko said, "Some parents complain about their kids' English ability. They complain that the English proficiency of their kids is getting worse. They send their kids here to improve or maintain their English ability."

Discussion

The proponents (e.g., Cummins, 1989; Krashen, 1996; Nation, 2003; Willig, 1985) of the bilingual education program claim that the use of English as the language for instruction in a bilingual classroom in addition to student's mother tongue is considered as a positive learning effort to benefit both students and the country. They also claimed that students attending a bilingual education school might increase their academic achievement. Although the findings of the previous studies are mixing, several studies have documented that bilingual education had a significant impact on student achievement at school (Cummins, 1989) and the use of English as a medium of instruction necessarily resulted in better English learning (Admiraal, Westhoff, & Bot, 2007). However, most of previous studies are from developed countries and educational system there contrasts in many important matters from Indonesia such as governance, teacher quality, environment, funding, and policies on curriculum and assessment whilst research on bilingual education in Indonesia, to our knowledge, is comparatively understudied. The purposes of this study were to explore the implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school and teachers' barriers of teaching contents in one private bilingual school in Jambi City, Indonesia.

In the context of the current study, after analyzing the documents, we found interesting findings of our study that our research site had a strong motive to be a bilingual school and wanted to help its students to be able to succeed in their academic career through using English as the medium of instruction. However, based our interviews we found that the success in implementing English as a language of instruction at a micro level was challenged by several barriers. In terms of school mission, we found that its mission was to enable its students to have their academic achievement in both languages, English and Indonesian. However, its admission policy did not require its entrants to have minimum English language proficiency. This might influence students' motivation to communicate in English in the classroom. In addition to the findings of the documents, our interview data indicated that students' unwillingness to use English had become barriers for teachers to achieve the mission of the school. In the classroom, teachers had to make efforts to encourage students to communicate in English. Due to such a

situation, some teachers mixed English and Indonesian in teaching in the classroom. Our finding is line with what Heugh et al. (2007) found that the use of English as a medium of instruction did not necessarily result in better English learning. Similarly, Nordin (2010) who studied lower secondary subjects taught in English found that students encountered language problems as well as contents' problems when English was used to learn science and mathematics.

We also found that our research site in its document indicated that only three subjects (science, English, and math) were fully taught in English while other subjects (art, sport, and computer) were taught in Indonesian. In practice, teachers were challenged by what we call, "An adaptation process." School required all teachers to use all teaching materials that were written in English and produced in Singapore. The interview data indicated that teachers had to adjust those foreign teaching materials into the national curriculum, which was not easy for them. Particularly, they needed to adjust the level of students' competence that the national curriculum required. This kind of challenge might influence the school to achieve its mission facilitating its students to have their academic achievement in both languages, English and Indonesian as a bilingual school.

Our results of documents analysis revealed that school and teachers used a variety of assessment methods including monthly test, mid-test, semester test, school test, and the national test. However, to assess students' English proficiency, school and teachers did not use any kinds of international standard tests in order to look at the effectiveness of the school implemented language policy. We assumed that they did not use the international standard tests because the tests might be expensive.

Implications and Limitations

The purposes of our study were to explore the implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school and teachers' barriers of teaching contents in one private bilingual school in Jambi City, Indonesia. Overall, the findings of this study revealed that the successful implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school in Jambi City, Indonesia were interrelatedly challenged by several barriers including teachers' attitude and ability to use English, language policy, teaching materials, students' English proficiency, curriculum, student assessment, and admission policy. Our study results shed important light on what might prevent the success of implementing a bilingual education in a non-English speaking country like Indonesia at a micro (classroom) level. What do our study results imply for the future development of bilingual education in a non-English speaking country including Indonesia, particularly?

This study has provided clear empirical evidence for educational policymakers at any levels that developing a bilingual education should consider several important elements (e.g., students' English ability, teachers' English ability, curriculum, and assessment) that will support the effective implementation of such a program in classroom level. In terms of curriculum and teaching materials, the findings of our study indicated that teachers had to make extra efforts to adjust the foreign teaching materials to the national curriculum for specific subjects. If possible, it would be good if school in this study or other schools just use teaching materials produced and written in English in the context of Indonesia. So, teachers will be a lot easier to use such teaching materials.

Regarding teachers' English and Indonesian ability, educational policymakers who are interested in developing a bilingual school should make sure that they have quality teachers to communicate in English inside and outside the classroom. Teachers are fundamental to school improvement efforts and are vital for raising the quality of learning for all students. With regards to students' English ability, admission policy should be clear on the minimum level of

English and Indonesian language proficiency that they should have to become a student in a bilingual school. However, such a policy should not discriminate students from entering the school. If they fail in the minimum level test, they should be included in English preparation classes that school should provide for them.

Our findings should be considered in light of some limitations. Although our findings may potentially offer the sort of evidence on the implementation of English as a language of instruction in a bilingual school and teachers' barriers of teaching contents in a bilingual school, our small sample size may not be representative of all Indonesian bilingual teachers and schools throughout the country. Also as our small sample size, generalizability of our findings to other Indonesian bilingual teachers and schools should be cautioned. Future quantitative or qualitative or mixed methods research may include a larger sample of Indonesian bilingual teachers and schools from different areas.

References

- Admiraal, W., Westhoff, G., & deBot, K. (2006). Evaluation of bilingual secondary education in the Netherlands: Students' language proficiency in English. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 12*(1), 75–93.
- Anderson, T., & Boyer, M. (1970). *Bilingual schooling in the United States*. Washington, DC: The USA.
- Anghel, B., Cabrales, A., & Carro, J. (2012). Evaluating a bilingual education program in Spain: The impact beyond foreign language learning. *CEPR Working Paper, 8995*.
- Akkari, A. (1998). Bilingual education: Beyond linguistic instrumentalization. *Bilingual Research Journal, 22*(2-4), 103-125.
- Baker, C. (2002). Bilingual education. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 294-303). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, K. A., & de Kanter, A. A. (1981). *Effectiveness of bilingual education: A review of the literature*. Washington, DC: Office of Planning and Budget, U.S. Department of Education.
- Baker, K. A., & de Kanter, A. A. (1983). Federal policy and the effectiveness of bilingual education. In K. A. Baker & A. A. de Kanter (Eds.), *Bilingual education: A reappraisal of federal policy* (pp. 33–86). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Baker, C. (1993). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C., & Jones, S. P. (1998). *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Calderón, M. E. (1986). *Multi-district trainer of trainer institute: A trainer of trainers model focused on the acquisition of literacy by limited-English-proficient students*. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California.
- Carter, T. P., & Chatfield, M. L. (1986). Effective bilingual schools: Implications for policy and practice. *American Journal of Education, 95*(1), 200-232.
- Corson, D. (1989). Foreign language policy at school level: FLT and cultural studies across the curriculum. *Foreign Language Annals, 22*(4), 323-338.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Crawford, J. (2000). Bilingual education: Strike two. *Rethinking Schools, 15*(2), 3-8.
- Criper, C., & Dodd, W. (1984). *Report on the teaching of the English language and its use as a medium in education*. Dar es Salaam: The British Council.
- Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research, 49*(2), 222–251.

- Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students*. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Danoff, M. N., Coles, G. J., McLaughlin, D. H., & Reynolds, D. J. (1978). *Evaluation of the impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English bilingual education program* (Vol. 3). Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research.
- Errihani, M. (2007). *Language policy in Morocco: Implications of recognizing and teaching Berber* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Chicago: University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Fakeye, D. O., & Ogunsiji, Y. (2009). English language proficiency as a predictor of academic achievement among EFL students in Nigeria. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 37(3), 490–495.
- Fishman, J. A. (1973). Bilingual education: What and why? *Florida FL Reporter*, 2 (1 & 2), 13-43.
- Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*, 36, 3–15.
- Hamers, J. F., & Blanc, M. H. A. (2003). *Bilinguality and bilingualism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Habibi, A., Mukminin, A., Johni, N., Sofwan, M., Haswandy, S., Marzulina, L., Sirozi, M., & Kasinyo, H. (2018). Investigating EFL classroom management in Pesantren: A case study. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(9), 2105-2122. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss9/6>
- Hakuta, K., & Garcia, E. E. (1989). Bilingualism and education. *American Psychologist*, 44(2), 374-379.
- Haryanto, E., & Mukminin, A. (2012). The global, the national and the local goals: English language policy implementation in an Indonesian international standard school. *Excellence in Higher Education Journal*, 3(2), 69-78
- Heugh, K., Diedericks, G., Prinsloo, C., Herbst, D., & Winnar, L. (2007). *Assessment of the language and mathematics skills of Grade 8 learners in the Western Cape in 2006*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Hong, H. (2010). Bicultural competence and its impact on team effectiveness. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 10(1), 93-120.
- Kadeghe, M. Y. (2000). *The implication of bilingual education in learning and teaching: The case of Tanzanian secondary schools* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Tanzania: University of Dar es Salaam.
- Kloss, H. (1998). *The American bilingual tradition*, Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Krashen, S. (1996). *Under attack: The case against bilingual education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.
- Krashen, S. D., & Biber, D. (1988). *On course: Bilingual education's success in California*. California: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Lincoln, S. Y., & Guba, G. E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. New York, NY: Sage Publications.
- Mackey, W. (1968). The description of bilingualism. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language* (pp. 554–584). The Hague: Mouton.
- Maimunah, Marzulina, L., Herizal, Holandyah, M., Mukminin, A., Pratama, R., & Habibi, A. (2018). Cutting the prevalence of plagiarism in the digital era: Student teachers' perceptions on plagiarism in Indonesian higher education. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 76(5), 663-677.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. San Francisco, CA: Sage.
- Ministry of National Education. (2003). *Law for education No. 20*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Department of National Education.
- Moulden, G. A. (2005). *An evaluation of language policy in a bilingual school in Japan* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University.
- Muazza, Mukminin, A., Habibi, A., Hidayat, M., & Abidin, A. (2018). Education in Indonesian Islamic boarding schools: Voices on curriculum and radicalism, teacher, and facilities. *The Islamic Quarterly*, 62(4), 507-536.
- Mukminin, A. (2012). Acculturative experiences among Indonesian graduate students in US higher education: Academic shock, adjustment, crisis, and resolution. *Excellence in Higher Education Journal*, 3(1), 14–36.
- Mukminin, A., Haryanto, E., Sutarno, S., Sari, S. R., Marzulina, M., Hadiyanto, H., & Habibi, A. (2018). Bilingual education policy and Indonesian students' learning strategies. *Elementary Education Online*, 17(3), 1204-1223.
- Mukminin, A., Kamil, D., Muazza, M., & Haryanto, E. (2017). Why teacher education? Documenting undocumented female student teachers' motives in Indonesia: A case study. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(1), 309-326. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol22/iss1/18>
- Mukminin, A., Rohayati, T., Putra, H. A., Habibi, A., & Aina, M. (2017). The long walk to quality teacher education in Indonesia: Student teachers' motives to become a teacher and policy implications. *Elementary Education Online*, 16(1), 35-59.
- Mukminin, A. (2019). Acculturative experiences among Indonesian graduate students in Dutch higher education. *Journal of International Students*, 9(2), 488-510. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v0i0.265>
- Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *ASIAN EFL Journal*, 5(2), 1–8.
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Nordin, A. (2010). *Students' perception on teaching and learning mathematics in English*. Johor, Malaysia: Faculty of Education, University Teknologi.
- Ramirez, J. D. (1986). Comparing structured English immersion and bilingual education: First-year results of a national study. *American Journal of Education*, 95(1), 122-148.
- Rossell, C. H., & Baker, K. (1996). The educational effectiveness of bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 30, 7–74.
- Rubagumya, C. M. (1991). Language promotion for educational purposes: The example of Tanzania. *International Review of Education*, 37(1), 67-85.
- Solis, A. (1989). *Use of the natural approach teaching model: Application of second language acquisition research by teachers of limited English proficient students* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.
- Syaiful, Mukminin, A., Masbirorotni, Aina, M., Habibi, A., Sari, S. R., Harja, H., & Triana, N. (2018). Preparing future teachers in Indonesia: Motives of science and non-science student teachers for entering into teacher education programs. *Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 4(11), 354-363.
- Swilla, I. N. (2009). Language of instruction in Tanzania: Contradictions between ideology, policy and implementation. *African Study Monographs*, 30(1), 1-14.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1998). Two languages are better than one. *Educational Leadership*, 55, 23-27.
- Willig, A. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research*, 55, 269–316.

Author Note

Amirul Mukminin, PhD is a faculty member of Jambi University, Indonesia. Correspondence regarding this article can be addressed directly to: amirul.mukminin@unja.ac.id

Siti Rahma Sari is a doctoral student in education in Jambi University, Indonesia.

Eddy Haryanto, PhD. is a faculty member of Jambi University, Indonesia.

Akhmad Habibi is the Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP) awardee and lecturer of Jambi University, Jambi, Indonesia.

Marzul Hidayat, PhD. is a faculty member of Jambi University, Indonesia.

Lenny Marzulina is a faculty member of State Islamic University of Raden Fatah, Palembang, South Sumatra, Indonesia.

Nurulanningsih is a faculty member of Tridinanti University, Palembang, South Sumatra, Indonesia.

Ikhsan is a researcher at Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia.

This study had no financial supports from any parties. We are heartily indebted to the all participants in this study who had given their time for the interviews and shared their feelings and experiences with us. We also want to thank the principals of the research site who supported us to conduct the research. Additionally, we would like to say many thanks to the reviewers and *The Qualitative Report* for giving us a chance for publishing our research article.

Copyright 2019: Amirul Mukminin, Siti Rahma Sari, Eddy Haryanto, Akhmad Habibi, Marzul Hidayat, Lenny Marzulina, Nurulanningsih, Ihksan Ikhsan, and Nova Southeastern University.

Article Citation

Mukminin, A., Sari, S. R., Haryanto, E., Habibi, A., Hidayat, M., Marzulina, L., Nurulanningsih, & Ikhsan, I. (2019). "They can speak English, but they don't want to use it." Teaching contents through English in a bilingual school and policy recommendations. *The Qualitative Report*, 24(6), 1258-1274. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol24/iss6/5>
