

The Implementation of English Medium Instruction (EMI) at the Public Secondary Schools in South Sulawesi Indonesia: Students' Voices

Sultan Baa

Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia
Email: sultan7304@unm.ac.id

Nurul Maghfirah

Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia
Email: nurulmaghfirah.799@gmail.com

Helen Borland

Victoria University, Australia
Email: helen.borland@vu.edu.au

Received: 01 February 2023

Reviewed: 03 May 2023-28 September 2023

Accepted: 30 September 2023

Published: 30 September 2023

Abstract

This article presents analysis and discussion of research data focusing on the students' voices of English Medium of Instruction (EMI) program implementation strategies at the public secondary schools level in South Sulawesi Province. Three Public Schools that run EMI and non-EMI Programs were selected as sample of the study. The data has been drawn from student questionnaire responses and student group interviews. Seventy-seven (77) EMI students and 84 non-EMI students completed the questionnaire. Eight students from each school were selected as focus group interview participants. The data from questionnaire was analysed using SPSS Program, and the data from focus group interview was analysed using NVivo software. The study found that the Chi-square test result suggests that in these three schools, EMI and non-EMI programs have significant differences in their preferences ($p=0.000$). EMI students preferred the EMI program and non-EMI students preferred non-EMI programs. Furthermore, EMI students said they experienced difficulties studied in the program. Despite the fact that students experienced difficulties in coping with the new learning situation in the EMI program, the majority felt satisfied with the program because they realised there were some benefits. The students' interview responses also highlighted three factors detracting from EMI program implementation: lack of teachers' language support; lack of English environment in the school; and insufficient bilingual learning materials. Detailed findings will be presented and their implications discussed.

Keywords: Students' voices; EMI; public international standard school; South Sulawesi

Introduction

In the last 30 years, there has been an increasing trend towards implementing English as a medium of Instruction (EMI) in public schools in many Southeast Asian countries. This trend is not only found in the Commonwealth countries, such as Malaysia and Singapore but also in the countries such as Thailand and the Philippines. Similarly, in Indonesia, in 2006, in secondary school level, EMI was systematically introduced, with programs being conducted as one stream in specially resourced government schools, called “Rintisan Sekolah Berbasis Internasional” (public international standard schools).

Several studies in different EMI contexts have examined students’ perceptions and attitudes toward learning content subjects through the medium of a second or foreign language. Broner and Tedick (2011) Chang (2010), Evans and Morrison (2011), Corrales et al (2016), and Wesely (2010) have also explored students’ perceptions and attitudes in immersion programs. Evans and Morrison (2011) have studied students’ perceptions of language use in an immersion setting in tertiary education in Hong Kong and found that the students were more comfortable asking and answering questions in Cantonese (L1), in cases where they were expected to use English (L2). They also preferred to use Cantonese in small group activities such as seminars, tutorials and laboratory sessions. The students believed that the lectures were more engaging and stimulating when conducted in Cantonese. The use of English, in contrast, impeded rather than facilitated teaching and learning. Broner and Tedick (2011) examined the reasons why the grade 5 total Spanish immersion program in the United States decided to use L2 (English) in the context of instruction in L1 (Spanish). The students reported that they tended to use English because they found it was easier and used Spanish in order to get good scores. They also reported that “task type content and activity structure (e.g. small group versus whole class) also had an effect on L2 language use. Language-related content tasks, such as creative writing, and small group activity structures promoted L2 use” (p.181).

Other studies, which have examined student perspectives, have been conducted in CLIL settings, such as Aguilar and Rodriguez (2012); Mahan K.R (2022); Thijssen & Ubaghs, 2011). One of the major studies conducted by Dalton-Puffer et al. (2009), for example, involved students and former students (aged 15-19 years) from vocational school in Austria using questionnaires and in-depth interviews. The results of the study demonstrated that despite some current students being perceived to have negative attitudes, the majority of CLIL students have positive attitudes towards CLIL teaching. Similarly, the majority of alumni also showed positive attitudes. In relation to the self-report in English, CLIL alumni perceived their English competence was higher than alumni with no CLIL experience. In terms of the impact of CLIL on their content subject knowledge, more than 50% of the participants felt less satisfied. Thijssen and Ubaghs (2011) studied students’ perceptions of the implementation of CLIL education in secondary schools in the Netherlands and found that students’ proficiency correlated with students’ confidence. Despite the teachers having negative views on the students’ confidence in English, the students had more positive opinions in this regard. In a university setting in Spain, Aguilar and Rodríguez (2012) demonstrated that students have positive attitudes toward CLIL teaching because the students reported the program improved their L2, especially vocabulary and listening and speaking skills.

In the content-based, low time-intensive context, researchers such as Ali, Hamid, and Moni (2011), Besar and Jali (2010), Huang (2015) and Yassin, Marsh, Tek, and Ying (2009) examined students’ attitudes and perceptions in CBI. Huang (2015) for example, demonstrated that the students show positive attitudes toward CBI learning. Most of the students were motivated to learn English in this context in terms of their learning motivation, learning anxiety and learning

achievement. Similarly, Ali et al. (2011) and Besar and Jali (2010) found that students demonstrated positive attitudes toward teaching and learning science and mathematics in English (TeSME) programs, although difficulties in comprehending maths and science through English was found to lead to decreasing motivation for studying mathematics and science.

English medium of instruction at government schools in Indonesia was conducted at 'Rintisan Sekolah Berbasis Internasional' of 'Sekolah Berbasis International' (Public International Standard School). The introduction of EMI at these schools has brought many consequences. Normally, in Indonesian public schools, Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesian) is used as medium of instruction in teaching content subjects. However, by this policy, in these schools, mathematics and science subjects (Physics, Chemistry, and Biology) were expected to be taught using English as medium of instruction. Sundusiyah (2010) points out that this change of course has some consequences, especially concerns about the teacher's competency. In addition, Gill (2012) argued that on one hand we have students who must learn maths and science in English, and on the other hand, we have teachers, who themselves have proficiency problems in the new medium of instruction. Therefore, it is interesting and important to study the students' perceptions, as researchers, such as, Lee, Y. J., Davis, R., & Li, Y. (2021), Moorhouse, B. L., & Wan, Y. (2023), argue that understanding students' perceptions has implications for making sense of students' linguistic and academic achievements. In order to explore the phenomena being studied, this current study focused on: (1) the students' satisfaction level toward EMI programs in their schools; (2) their feelings when learning maths and science in English through bilingual programs in their schools; and (3) factors that may detract from EMI program implementation in their schools.

Research method

The study applied case study design. Yin (2003a, p.14) defines case study as "the method of choice when the phenomenon under study is not readily distinguishable from its context". This research design is suitable for the current study as Yin (2003b) points out that in an evaluation context, case studies are generally used to document and analyse implementation processes, including "individuals", "organizations", "processes", "programs", "neighbourhoods", "institutions", and even "events".

Three public International standard schools (ISSs) in South Sulawesi Province which run EMI and non-EMI programs were selected as subjects of the study. Questionnaire and focus group interviews were used as data collection instruments. The questionnaire was used to gather data on the stakeholders' background and their attitudes and perceptions toward the EMI program in their schools. The questionnaire items were adapted mainly from Lambert and Tucker's (1972) questionnaire because this questionnaire design has been successfully used in the Canadian context and suitable with Indonesian context. Three questions were asked to examine the students' attitudes toward programs in their schools: (1) Do you enjoy studying English the way you do at your school now? (2) Do you prefer EMI (bilingual) classes? And (3) Do you prefer non-EMI (regular) classes? The student questionnaire participants as follows

Table 1. Students' participants for questionnaire

School	Number of students in Grade 9 sample		Number of students who completed questionnaires			
	EMI (N)	Non-EMI (N)	EMI		Non-EMI	
			(N)	(%)	(N)	(%)
A	25	30	25	100	28	93
B	27	30	27	100	30	100

C	25	30	25	100	26	87
Total	77	90	77	100	84	93

In addition to questionnaire, focus group interviews were used to collect data in relation to the students' perceptions and attitudes toward the implementation of EMI programs in their schools. Patton (2002:388) said "a focus group can be used at the end of a program, or even months after program completion, to gather perceptions about outcomes and impacts". The questions for focus group were adapted from Molyneux (2005). Eight (8) students from each school were selected as participants of the interview. Their profiles, as follows:

Table 1. Students' participants for interview

School	Group 1		Group 2	
	Pseudonym	Gender	Pseudonym	Gender
A	Karina	F	Himly	M
	Fatimah	M	Yeny	F
	Maya	F	Diah	F
	Masita	F	Melati	F
B	Risma	M	Ilyas	M
	Ridha	F	Ningsih	F
	Amra	F	Rafly	M
	Muhlis	F	Meidi	F
C	Ahmad	M	Faisal	M
	Dana	M	Murni	F
	Femy	F	Amelia	F
	Sandy	M	Andini	F

Results

The level of students' satisfaction toward the program

In measuring the students' satisfaction level toward EMI programs in their schools, the current study initially asked students to express their opinions about the program they were enrolled in. In the questionnaire, students were asked three questions. The first question asked in this category was: (1) Do you enjoy studying English the way you do at your school now? Table 3 below provides a summary of responses.

Table 3. Students' responses regarding enjoyment levels in studying English

Do you enjoy studying English the way you do at your school now?	School A		School B		School C	
	EMI N=25 (%)	Non-EMI N=28 (%)	EMI N=27 (%)	Non-EMI N=30 (%)	EMI N=25 (%)	Non-EMI N=26 (%)
Not enjoy	0.0	7.2	7.4	3.3	4.0	0.0
Neutral/not sure	28.0	50.0	55.6	26.7	12.0	15.4
Enjoy very much	72.0	42.9	42.9	70.0	84.0	84.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Student questionnaire responses

The data indicates that the majority of EMI students in Schools A and C enjoyed learning content subjects using English as a medium of instruction. In contrast, EMI students in School B reported mostly neutral / not sure responses. In comparing the three schools, students in the rural

School C (84%) enjoyed studying in the EMI program more than students in urban schools (A 72% and B 42.9%). In School A, EMI students reported enjoying their current program more than their peers in the non-EMI program, while in School B, interestingly, the opposite was the case where enjoyment was higher in non-EMI programs. One of the possible reasons was the higher value of English perceived by the students in rural areas (School C), while in the city (Schools A and B) it is quite common to see people who master this foreign language. Therefore, it is not surprising for urban students to see people who can speak English in their community, while for rural students; mastery a foreign language is a prestigious thing, something that the students were all aspiring to achieve.

In summary, the Chi-square analysis result suggests that the enjoyment level of studying English between EMI and non-EMI students in the three schools was quite similar, except in School B where satisfaction was significantly higher in the non-EMI group (School A, Pearson $X^2=5.440$, $p=0.245$; School B, Pearson $X^2=7.915$, $p=0.048$; and School C, Pearson $X^2=2.855$, $p=0.415$).

Students' attitudes toward their programs was also assessed by asking two questions: (1) Do you prefer EMI (bilingual) classes? And (2) Do you prefer non-EMI (regular) classes? Tables 2 and 3 below provide information about class preference by EMI (bilingual) and non-EMI (regular) classes in the three case study schools.

Table 4. Students' responses regarding EMI class preference

Do you prefer EMI classes?	School A		School B		School C	
	EMI	Non-EMI	EMI	Non-EMI	EMI	Non-EMI
	N=25 (%)	N=28 (%)	N=27 (%)	N=30 (%)	N=25 (%)	N=26 (%)
No, I don't	0	7.1	0	26.7	0	11.6
Neutral/not sure	8	89.3	7.4	53.3	8	57.7
Yes, I do	92	3.6	92.6	20	92	30.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100	100	100.0	100.0

Source: Student questionnaire responses

The responses in Table 4 indicate that virtually all EMI students in both urban and rural schools preferred the EMI program, with more than 90% agreeing in each school. In comparing EMI and non-EMI students, the data showed a high percentage (i.e. School A: 89%; School B: 53.3%; and School C: 53.3%) of non-EMI students were not sure or neutral about the statement.

Table 5. Students' responses regarding non-EMI class preference

Do you prefer non-EMI classes?	School A		School B		School C	
	EMI	Non-EMI	EMI	Non-EMI	EMI	Non-EMI
	N=25 (%)	N=28 (%)	N=27 (%)	N=30 (%)	N=25 (%)	N=26 (%)
No, I don't	84.0	10.7	92.6	0.0	64.0	26.9
Neutral/not sure	16.0	25.0	3.7	26.7	32.0	53.8
Yes, I do	0.0	64.3	3.7	73.3	4.0	19.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Student questionnaire responses

Almost mirrored findings were obtained for non-EMI class preference (Table 5). The trend was the majority (more than 60%) of EMI students across these three schools did not prefer the non-EMI program. Quite a high percentage of EMI students in Schools C and A responded not sure/neutral. Surprisingly, a considerable percentage of non-EMI students in Schools C and A (School C: 26.9%, School A: 10.7%) did not prefer the program they were enrolled in. This finding could suggest that if non-EMI students were given opportunities to study in EMI programs, they might prefer English medium classes. It is notable though that almost three-quarters of non-EMI students from School B were clear about not preferring bilingual classes.

The Chi-square test result suggests that in these three schools, EMI and non-EMI programs have significant differences in their preferences ($p=0.000$). EMI students preferred the EMI program and non-EMI students preferred non-EMI programs.

Attitudes and perceptions toward bilingual learning

The EMI students commented on their feelings when learning maths and science in English through bilingual programs in their schools. All 24 students interviewed across the three schools indicated that they felt uncomfortable when they started their EMI programs. For example, a number of School A students described feeling ‘afraid’ (Fatimah), ‘stressful’ (Maya), ‘depressed’ ‘anxious’ (Karina), and ‘shocked’ (Masita). Three students in this school (Himly, Diah and Yeny) explained their feelings in more detail. Himly said: “*The first time I saw the learning system, I felt stressed*”. In addition, Diah pointed out:

Because at primary school we did not have any experience in using English, when we were exposed to the new vocabularies and also in speaking, it was difficult ... Diah, interview)

Yeny argued:

In primary school we were very rarely using English. It was only in English subject. In addition, the content was very very basic, such as grammar, and now here we have to use English for all subjects... so it was challenging (Yeny, interview).

Similarly Ningsih and Ilyas (School B) argued:

In primary school I could not speak English. Now maybe I could but mostly I felt shy, hesitant, in doubt or... In addition, if the teacher asked me to do presentation in front of the class, in front of many people, of course I was very very nervous (Ningsih,).

At first, it was like a burden ... I was stressed, because ... when I was in primary school, we just used Indonesian (Ilyas).

The same was the case for students in School C. For example, Sandy and Dana pointed out:

At the first time, I felt nervous because this was the first time we used fully in English in this school, especially when the teacher used English to teach us maths and science (Sandy).

In grade 7 I still felt nervous to speak English because this was the first time I used English in the school (Dana).

The students commented on the duration of these uncomfortable feelings. Most highlighted their feelings, such as stress, shock, hesitancy, being afraid and nervous, experienced for between six months and two years. Two School A students (Karina and Masita), for example, experienced these uncomfortable feelings “until semester 2 (six months)”, while Himly and Yeny (School B) said until “grade 8” (12 months). Dana (School C) felt stressed until the the end of grade 8.

When [I] started grade 8 my feeling was getting better and when I started grade 9 the feeling [stress] had gone (Dana).

A number of students highlighted a range of reasons why they could cope with the new learning environment in the EMI program. The first reason was joining an extra English class. Karina, from School A said: “*semester two I started[sic] joined English course*”. The second reason was through more exposure to the target language. For example, Ilyas said: “*because the teacher also used English, so we were more familiar*”. Similarly, Sandy points out “*at first was very difficult, but because the teachers use it [English] everyday during maths and science, so eventually...*” (Ilyas, School B, interview, 2010).

Despite the fact that students experienced difficulties in coping with the new learning situation in the EMI program, the majority felt satisfied with the program because they realised there were some benefits. For example, Fatimah, Maya and Karina (School A) all mentioned that the program benefitted their English language development. Fatimah said “*of course, improve our English*”. Similarly Maya argued:

The advantage is... it was good because we were taught to communicate in English. Improve our vocabularies, pronunciation ... (Maya).

Some other students also believed the program improved their exposure to English. Risma (School B) saw the benefit in terms of “familiarising”. Himly, also from School A argued [we can study English from the early age]. Similarly, Ningsih (School B) said [it was good because we are taught to communicate in English since the early age]. The advantage of exposure to English was not only commented on by students in Schools A and B. Two students from School C (Femy and Murni) also believed that the EMI program is interesting as it offers more time to use English.

In other schools [regular] not much ... do not learn English much, but here that is [English] is the main focus (Femy).

The advantage of course [is] in terms of language. Maybe ISS is more advanced than other schools [regular]. In addition, here, the teachers teach better (Diah).

Three other EMI students (Karina, Masita and Andini) argued that the EMI program was good because it helped them in preparing to enter an English medium school locally or overseas. Karina, from School A said it is good if we have intentions to study at an English medium senior high school: “*...to continue my study. To continue to school which use English as main language of instuction, such as SMA 2...*”.

In addition, Amra, from School B said:

Of course if we want to enter senior high school it becomes easier, we can choose better schools. They will see, this [student] from international standard school means he/she of course is a smart student (Amra).

Masita, also from School A remarked:

And the advantage is, for example, if we want to study overseas, we don't need to learn English anymore [in the English course], it is easier if we study overseas.

However, all students explicitly indicated a preference for the native language (Indonesian) medium for learning. For example, Sandy, a student in School C said “yes, *I can understand the lesson better if the language of instruction is in Indonesian*” (Sandy, interview, 2010). Similarly, Yeny argued: “*Because we have very limited vocabularies. In addition, the lesson, like maths, was very difficult. In this situation, if we use English, it will be more confusing*” (Yeny, School A, interview, 2010). Similarly, Masita and Ningsih pointed out:

The English subject I enjoyed, but for maths it was very difficult because its language as well as the content was very difficult (Masita).

Sometimes, the unpleasant thing was because English was the medium for teaching in maths was difficult to understand. In this situation Indonesian dominated...so we could understand the lesson (Ningsih).

Factors detracting from program implementation

The EMI students in all three schools commented on factors that may detract from EMI program implementation in their schools. They highlighted three main issues which may detract from program implementation: lack of teachers' language support; lack of English environment in the school; and bilingual learning materials.

Lack of teachers' language support

Two students (Andini and Femy) argued that the lack of language support from teachers may detract from the EMI program implementation in their schools. Yeny (School A) and Andini (School C), for example, felt disappointed with teachers' English proficiency, particularly lack of fluency and said:

I am happy to study in this program, but sometimes feel disappointed, a little bit disappointed because it was not like what I expected. Normally, the international school has good facilities, but here it is ... still very minimum. Furthermore, the teachers ... not fluent in English. (Yeni).

Andini from School C provides a more detailed insight into the teachers' lack of English, focusing on comprehensibility and fluency, and identifying teacher word-by-word translation as a factor in comprehensibility. She said:

The disadvantage is, usually the teachers are difficult to understand. The teachers do not speak English fluently, sometimes, if people usually translate the sentence as an integral part, in contrast, the teacher translate it word per word, so the meaning is mixed (Andini).

In addition, both Masita (School B) and Femy (School C) refer to the mixing of Indonesian and English as an issue in terms of their ability to comprehend and develop their English.

Not really satisfied...because the teachers sometimes use English, sometimes Indonesian. There are teachers who do not really understand English, so yeah ... (Masita).

Sometimes, the teachers who teach [in EMI program] mixed Indonesian and English. Not all the teachers know English, do they? So they used mixed (Femy).

Therefore, students said the teachers' qualifications needed to be upgraded, such as by attending teacher professional development. For example, Ningsih, a student from School B argued:

Training or workshop...training for teachers who have been elected to teach at bilingual class. Therefore, the students can understand what the teachers said...if the teachers do not understand how about the students...who are taught (Ningsih).

Lack of English environment

Lack of English environment in the school also becomes a factor which may detract from EMI program implementation. The first disadvantage was lack of support from teachers. For example, Muhlis, a student in School B argued:

For maths we used English very rarely. In Science, such as biology and physics sometimes we used English (Muhlis).

In addition, one student from School C (Sandy) argued that his fellow students also do not support the English environment in his school.

...here in this school, there was no support from friends at school. Usually outside the classroom ... no English, everyone speak Indonesian (Sandy).

In order to improve the English exposure, in School B, there was a school policy to encourage their students to use English. Unfortunately, the program has not been supported widely by the school community and is no longer applied.

We used to have an 'English day' program. At the time, every Saturday between 8am to 11am we have to use English. If we do not know its English, for instance, we can write in a paper But unfortunately it only happened for several weeks (Amra).

Good teacher has to apply a new initiative so they can improve. Like Ma'am Hamidah (pseudonym) when we were in grade 7 she used to use a 'fine' strategy, so we are afraid to use Indonesian and this improved our confidence to speak (Amra).

Bilingual learning materials

Some students mentioned an issue of EMI implementation related to the use of learning materials (books). There were two different views in relation to whether learning material should be bilingual or fully in English. The majority of the students in interviews believed that bilingual

books were helpful because they accommodated their limited English proficiency. For example, Ridha, a student from School B said:

For students who have limited English proficiency maybe they can learn one by one from the books. In the book, there was an English and Indonesian version, isn't it? So, if we do not know one word we can read (Ridha).

Similarly, Dana from School C argued:

For me, it is better bilingual first. Because if it is full English we usually do not understand, little bit difficult if we want to translate it, isn't it? Because English has not only one meaning, so it is better if bilingual first (Dana).

In contrast, three students (Himly, Diah and Ningsih) preferred that teachers used English exclusively. For example, Himly from School A said: “*focus on the English first, do not mix*”. Similarly, Diah, also from School A said:

For me, it is better if teacher used full English. So, once we use English ...we are consistent [sic] use English, do not mixed with Indonesian again. If we want to produce a good ISS student output, it is better full English (Diah).

In addition, Ningsih from School B said:

Actually, full English because this school is still pilot, so English needs to be improved (Ningsih).

Discussion

The student questionnaire data indicated that most students in these three schools were happy in studying in the programs in which they had enrolled. The interview data, however, suggested that the majority of EMI students, when in Grade 7, had experienced some difficulties coping with the new learning situation. This is consistent with findings in other contexts. Researchers (García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2018); Wesely, 2010, 2012) have discussed the effect on school students of being introduced to a new learning environment. García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2018), for example, contended that the students' main difficulties in immersion programs is difficulties in understanding the teacher's language of instruction. Similarly, research studies in the Asian context, such as in Malaysia (Ali et al., 2011; Haron, Gapor, Masran, & Nor, 2008) or Hong Kong (Evans, 2009; Evans & Morrison, 2011; Marsh, Hau, & Kong, 2000) provide similar findings in that the main issue for the success of the bilingual program in those countries is the language problem.

The students reported different ways of coping with the new learning situation in EMI programs. Firstly, they reported increased familiarisation with English as the medium of instruction in maths and science subjects, during Grades 7 in Semesters 2 and 8, thus enabling them to cope more successfully with the new learning situation. In addition, all students overcame their lack of familiarity with English by joining private English courses in addition to their regular school English classes. It can be argued that the challenging situation, as a result of their participation in bilingual program, led to the enhancement of their interest in and focus on learning L2, motivated also by fear of failing the tests. Researchers (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975, 1990; Grabe

& Stoller, 1997; Snow, Met, & Genesee, 1989) argue that interest in content potentially leads to an increase in learners' intrinsic motivation to learn. For example, Snow et al. (1989) pointed out that in this respect "content provides a primary motivational incentive for language learning in so far as it is interesting and of some value to the learner and therefore worth learning" (p. 202). Many empirical research studies in different contexts (Besar & Jali, 2010; Dalton-Puffer et al., 2009; Thijssen & Ubaghs, 2011; Yassin et al., 2009) similarly found that content-based instruction potentially increases students' motivation and interest in studying the second language.

Despite the majority of students reporting having positive attitudes toward EMI program implementation in their schools, some students claimed to prefer learning maths and science in L1 (Indonesian). They argued that maths and science were difficult subjects, even when they were taught in the native language. Moreover, if they were taught in a second/foreign language, it was perceived that it made it more difficult. This condition was worsened by many factors related to the approach in implementing EMI, such as lack of language support from teachers and lack of an English environment at school. Research studies in different contexts (Ali et al., 2011; Gill, 2012; Hashim, 2003; Maasum, Maarof, Zakaria, & Yamat, 2012; Qiang, 2000) provide similar findings. For example, Ali et al. (2011, p. 165) studied students' perceptions of participation in the TeSME program in Malaysia. The study found that one of the main challenges for students in this program were cultural and linguistic factors. Although Malaysia is a multi-ethnic society, where English is expected to be the medium of communication in the wider society, in fact, English is not essential for daily communication because most people prefer to use bahasa Melayu (Malaysian language). A not dissimilar situation was found in the current study in Indonesian secondary school setting that English has a very limited role in the social life of the community and is not used widely as a medium of communication.

Conclusion

Based on the finding above, it can be concluded that despite the fact that students experienced difficulties in coping with the new learning situation in the EMI program, the majority felt satisfied with the program because they realised there were some benefits. If EMI program would like to be successfully implemented in Indonesian government schools, several aspects need to be paid attention, such as providing qualified bilingual teachers, creating more English environment at the school, and providing adequate bilingual materials. Further research on the current policy of Indonesian bilingual program need to be conducted to reveal the update outcome of EMI implementation in Indonesia.

Declaration of conflicting interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest in this work.

Funding acknowledgements

No funding was received for this paper.

References

- Aguilar, M., & Rodríguez, R. (2012). Lecturer and student perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish university. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(2), 183-197.
- Ali, N. L., Hamid, M. O., & Moni, K. (2011). English in primary education in Malaysia: Policies, outcomes and stakeholders' lived experiences. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 12(2), 147-166.

- Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural Education: Its effects on students' racial and gender role attitudes. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 359-469). New York: Macmillan.
- Besar, J. A., & Jali, F. M. (2010). Pemansuhan dasar PPSMI: Tinjauan daripada perspektif parti politik, ahli akademik dan NGO serta pengalaman di sekolah [Abolition of the PPSMI policy: Review from the perspectives of political parties, academics and NGOs, as well as experience in school] *Jurnal Melayu*, 5, 177-197.
- Broner, M. A., & Tedick, D. J. (2011). Talking in the fifth-grade classroom: Language use in an early, total Spanish immersion program. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian, & T. W. Fortune (Eds.), *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (pp. 166-186). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). Play and intrinsic rewards. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 15, 41-63.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Hüttner, J., Schindelegger, V., & Smit, U. (2009). Technology-geeks speak out: What students think about vocational CLIL. *International CLIL Research Journal*, 1(2), 17-26.
- Evans, S. (2009). The medium of instruction in Hong Kong revisited: Policy and practice in the reformed Chinese and English streams. *Research Papers in Education*, 24(3), 287-309.
- Evans, S., & Morrison, B. (2011). The student experience of English-medium higher education in Hong Kong. *Language and Education*, 25(2), 147-162.
- Fortune, T. W. (2001). *Understanding immersion students: Oral language use as a mediator of social interaction in the classroom* PhD Dissertation. University of Minnesota. Minneapolis.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2018). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English learners*. Teachers College Press.
- Ghadessy, M., & Nicol, M. (2002). Attitude change in bilingual education: The case of Brunei Darussalam. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(2), 113-128.
- Gill, S. K. (2012). The complexities of re-reversal of language in education policy in Malaysia. In A. Kirkpatrick & Sussex (Eds.), *English as an International Language in Asia* (pp. 63-78). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (1997). Content-based instruction: Research foundations. In S. B. Stryker & B. L. Leaven (Eds.), *The content-based instruction in foreign language education: Models and methods* (pp. 5-21). Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Haron, I., Gapor, A. L., Masran, M. N., & Nor, M. M. (2008). Kesan dasar pengajaran matematik dan sains dalam bahasa Inggris di sekolah rendah [The first impression of the teaching of mathematics and science in English in primary school]. *Tengok-tengok Kelah Kelih*. Retrieved from <http://tengokkelih.blogspot.com.au/2009/05/kesan-dasar-pengajaran-matematik-dan.html>
- Hashim, A. (2003). Language policies and language education issues in Malaysia. *Babel or behemoth: language trends in Asia*, 1, 93.
- Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1972). *Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.
- Lee, Y. J., Davis, R., & Li, Y. (2021). Chinese International Graduate Students' Perceptions of

- English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) Courses at a Korean University. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 18(3), 995.
- Maasum, T. N. R. T. M., Maarof, N., Zakaria, E., & Yamat, H. (2012). Content-based instruction needs and challenges in diversified literacy context. *US-China Foreign Language*, 10(3), 999-1004. Retrieved from <http://0-search.ebscohost.com.library.vu.edu.au/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ehh&AN=76164290&site=ehost-live>
- Mahan, K. R. (2022). The comprehending teacher: Scaffolding in content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *The Language Learning Journal*, 50(1), 74-88.
- Marsh, H. W., Hau, K.-T., & Kong, C.-K. (2000). Late immersion and language of instruction in Hong Kong high schools: Achievement growth in language and non-language subjects. *Harvard Educational Review*, 70(3), 1-29.
- Molyneux, P. D. (2005). *Transportable literacies and transformative pedagogies: An investigation of the tensions and choices in the provision of education for bilingualism and biliteracy*. (PhD), The University of Melbourne, Melbourne.
- Moorhouse, B. L., & Wan, Y. (2023). Students' Experiences of English-Medium Instruction at the Postgraduate Level: Challenges and Sustainable Support for Success. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 3243.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*: 3th edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Qiang, Y. (2000). *Bilingual education, cognitive development and school achievement: A study of the bilingual education programs for Tibetan children*. (Doctoral). Institute of International Education, Stockholm University,
- Snow, M. A., Met, M., & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(2), 201-217.
- Sundusiyah, A. (2010). *Teachers in International-Standard Schools: What is missing? What can be improved? What does it take?* Paper presented at the Indonesian Student International Conference (ISIC) 2010, Melbourne.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1982). *Evaluating bilingual education: A Canadian case study*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Thijssen, W., & Ubaghs, L. (2011). Teachers' and students' perceptions of the effects of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) chemistry education: A case study at a secondary school in the Netherlands.
- Wesely, P. M. (2010). Language learning motivation in early adolescents: Using mixed methods research to explore contradiction. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 4(4), 295-312.
- Wesely, P. M. (2012). Learner attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs in language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(s1), s98-s117.
- Yassin, S. M., Marsh, D., Tek, O. E., & Ying, L. Y. (2009). Learners' perceptions towards the teaching of science through English in Malaysia: A quantitative analysis. *In Depth*, 1(2), 3.
- Yin, R. K. (2003a). *Application of case study research (Second edition)*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yin, R. K. (2003b). *Case study research: Design and methods (Second edition)*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications