ISSN 1991-9468 (Print), 2308-1058 (Online) http://edumag.mrsu.ru

АКАДЕМИЧЕСКАЯ ИНТЕГРАЦИЯ / ACADEMIC INTEGRATION

УДК 81’246.3:371.1

doi: 10.15507/1991-9468.109.026.202204.756-770

Original article

Beliefs about Multilingualism with Respect to Translanguaging: A Survey among Pre-Service EFL Teachers in Indonesia

G. E. Putrawan [a], ***Mahpul*** [a]✉, ***T. Sinaga*** [a], ***S. K. Poh*** [b], ***O. V. Dekhnich*** [c]

[a] *University of Lampung, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia*

[b] *Nanyang Technological University, Singapore City, Singapore*

[c] *Belgorod State National Research University, Belgorod, Russian Federation*

✉ *mahpul.1965@fkip.unila.ac.id*

Abstract

Introduction. Recently, multilingualism and translanguaging have received considerable attention and are always a topic of interest and public debate in language education. However, to our knowledge, studies on pre-service EFL teachers’ beliefs about multilingualism with respect to translanguaging in the Indonesian context have not appeared in the literature. Therefore, to address this gap, this research investigated beliefs about multilingualism with respect to translanguaging, including language separation, language use/mixing, and language support, among pre-service EFL teachers in the Indonesian context.

Materials and Methods. This study is quantitative in nature, adopting a survey research design. We collected data from 270 pre-service EFL teachers using an online Likert scale questionnaire that lacked any potentially sensitive questions. They were between the ages of 17 and 26, and were English teacher candidates majoring in English education at higher education institutions on the Indonesian islands of Sumatra, Java, Sulawesi, and Kalimantan. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, which included the percentages and frequency distributions of the participants’ Likert scale responses.

Results. The current study’s findings corroborate previous research indicating that teachers believe multilingualism and collaborative use of languages are potential assets that can benefit their students’ language learning.

Discussion and Conclusion. Language separation in EFL classrooms appears to be a point of contention for the majority of pre-service EFL teachers surveyed, with a preference for and support for multilingualism and translanguaging over language separation in EFL classrooms. They agree on the importance of using or mixing other languages in their classes. On the one hand, they believe that it is critical to avoid other language support in classrooms; on the other hand, they believe that other language support can benefit students, offering a wave of optimism about future language education. Therefore, there is a need to gradually introduce and include pedagogical translanguaging to the existing curricula. The integration of new multilingual facts and the implementation of translanguaging pedagogies are part of a larger educational renewal. There is a need to intentionally create a multilingual space (translanguaging space) in EFL classrooms to fully utilise students’ multilingual capabilities creatively and critically because today many teachers struggle to reconcile the disparities between monolingual educational policies and the realities of multilingual classrooms.

Keywords: EFL, multilingualism, translingualism, translingual approach in teaching foreign languages, pre-service teachers, survey

Acknowledgements: We would like to extend our appreciation to all pre-service EFL teachers who took part in this study. Dewi Lestari and Rella Islami, two of our students, deserve special recognition for assisting us with administrative tasks during the research. Additionally, we would like to express our gratitude to our colleagues on the Indonesian islands of Sumatra, Java, Sulawesi, and Kalimantan for assisting us with the online survey's distribution.

Funding: The reported study was funded by the Institute for Research and Community Services of Universitas Lampung (Applied Research Scheme Grant Number: 1757/UN26.21/PN/2021 dated 21 April 2021).

Conflict of interests: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

For citation: Putrawan G.E., Mahpul, Sinaga T., Poh S.K., Dekhnich O.V. Beliefs about Multilingualism with Respect to Translanguaging: A Survey among Pre-Service EFL Teachers in Indonesia. *Integration of Education*. 2022;26(4):756–770. doi: https://doi.org/10.15507/1991-9468.109.026.202204.756-770

Оригинальная статья

Отношение к мультилингвизму и транслингвизму: что думают будущие учителя английского языка в Индонезии

Г. Э. Путраван[1], Махпул[1]✉, Т. Синага[1], С. К. Пох[2], О. В. Дехнич[3]
[1] Университет Лампунга, г. Бандар-Лампунг, Индонезия
[2] Наньянский технологический университ, г. Сингапур, Сингапур
[3] Белгородский государственный национальный исследовательский университет, г. Белгород, Российская Федерация
✉ *mahpul.1965@fkip.unila.ac.id*

Аннотация

Введение. В настоящее время важную роль в обучении английскому языку играют мультилингвизм и транслингвизм. Несмотря на многочисленность публикаций по этой проблематике, практически отсутствуют исследования по изучению уровня осведомленности будущих учителей английского языка о мультилингвизме и транслингвальном подходе в обучении иностранным языкам в Индонезии. Цель исследования – анализ восприятия будущих учителей английского языка как иностранного таких явлений как мультилингвизм и траснлингвальный подход в обучении иностранным языкам, включая разделение языков, употребление языков/языковое смешение, лингвистическую интерференцию, принцип опоры на родной язык.

Материалы и методы. Для изучения проблемы было проведено анкетирование, в котором приняли участие 270 будущих учителей английского языка в возрасте 17–26 лет. Полученные данные проанализированы с помощью методов описательной статистики, которые включали процентное соотношение и частотное распределение ответов участников по шкале Лайкерта. Для определения валидности вопросника использовался анализ моментов Пирсона.

Результаты исследования. Данное исследование подтверждает выводы предыдущих изысканий, указывая на то, что учителя считают мультилингвизм и изучение иностранного языка с опорой на другие языки, в том числе родной, тем лингводидактическим потенциалом, который поможет в обучении иностранным языкам.

Обсуждение и заключение. Сделанные авторами выводы вносят вклад в развитие новых направлений педагогики, лингводидактики, социолингвистики, ведут к реформам в системе образования. Сегодня многие учителя пытаются лавировать между монолингвальными установками в образовательной политике и реальностью мультилингвального класса. Следовательно, существует потребность в создании мультилингвального (межъязыкового/транслингвального) пространства на уроках английского языка с целью использования мультилингвальных способностей обучающихся в полном объеме. Педагогика транслингвизма постепенно должна быть введена в учебные планы образовательных учреждений.

Ключевые слова: английский язык как иностранный, мультилингвизм, транслингвизм, транслингвальный подход в обучении иностранным языкам, будущий учитель, анкетирование

Финансирование: исследование подготовлено при поддержке Института исследований и общественных служб Университета Лампунга (№ гранта 1757/UN26.21/PN/2021 от 21 апреля 2021 г.).

Благодарности: авторы выражают признательность всем участникам данного исследования, в особенности студентам Деви Лестари и Релла Ислами за помощь в решении организационных вопросов, а также нашим коллегам из университетов, располагающихся на индонезийских островах Суматра, Ява, Сулавеси и Калимантан, за помощь в распространении онлайн-анкеты.

Конфликт интересов: авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Для цитирования: Отношение к мультилингвизму и транслингвизму: что думают будущие учителя английского языка в Индонезии / Г. Э. Путраван [и др.] // Интеграция образования. 2022. Т. 26, № 4. С. 756–770. doi: https://doi.org/10.15507/1991-9468.109.026.202204.756-770

Introduction

Recently, multilingualism and translanguaging have received considerable attention and are always a topic of interest and public debate [1] in language education. Many investigators have turned to investigate translanguaging in the context of English as a foreign language (EFL) instructions, especially within multilingual language education (see, among others, [2–5]. From a multilingual context point of view, it is widely known that Indonesia is multicultural and multilingual with more than 700 languages spoken by 606 ethnic groups [6]. Thus, Indonesian people have ample opportunity to learn and use a variety of local languages and get involved in various cultural communications, but at the same time, when learning other languages, including foreign languages, it is a challenge for them to maintain their identity [7].

However, a long-standing monolingual assumption in EFL education remains to be in existence among teachers. In Indonesia, for example, teaching EFL using a monolingual approach is common, but there are still a few limitations, such as a strict grammar syllabus and an exam that does not require students to communicate in any way [8]. It is commonplace that teachers' and learners' shared first language (L1) and language teaching are inseparable issues [9]. Therefore, shifting from the monolingual assumptions through the use of learners' full linguistic repertoire is essential for EFL teaching and learning, and it is no doubt that one way to accomplish this is through translanguaging [10].

Translanguaging, an emerging term within bilingual education[1] [11; 12], looks at bilingualism as a sustainable and valuable resource rather than a simply tolerated move towards monolingualism [11]. This term refers to bilinguals' language practices that utilise a single linguistic repertoire which is of great value to students' further language development [13]. It is defined as an approach to language use, bilingualism, and bilingual education that views the language practices of bilinguals as one linguistic repertoire rather than two separate systems[2].

There is now much evidence to support that translanguaging plays a crucial role in EFL education. Translanguaging in the classrooms allows students to understand the content of the lesson, develop their linguistic proficiency more confidently [14; 15] and raise the consciousness of foreign/second language learning (L2) [16] that leads to the improvement of their academic achievements [17]. Teachers who are fluent in both English and their students' home language have an advantage when it comes to helping their students improve their language skills [18] because if judiciously used students' home language can help them reduce their anxiety and cognitive load [19]. Their home language does not prevent them from learning EFL [20]. Translanguaging practices help Indonesian teachers make meaning and check students' comprehension[3], explain grammar, motivate students, and encourage them during the lesson in EFL classrooms [21] that they feel more relaxed during their learning [19].

[1] García O., Wei L. Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education. 1st ed. England: Palgrave Macmillan; 2014.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Zein S. Translanguaging in the EYL Classroom as a Metadiscursive Practice: Preparing Prospective Teachers. In: Zein S., Stroupe R. (eds.) English Language Teacher Preparation in Asia: Policy, Research and Practice. New York: Routledge; 2018. p. 47–62. Available at: https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315105680-3/translanguaging-eyl-classroom-metadiscursive-practice-subhan-zein (accessed 22.06.2021).

Despite the benefits, however, teachers and prospective teachers of EFL are also reported as having two opposing viewpoints on translanguaging. Their opinions on this pedagogy are inconsistent and ambivalent [22; 23]. This implies that they are likely to continue to view L2 learning through a monolingual lens, believing that students' home language is a barrier [24; 25], not a resource for language learning[4] [26].

Although findings in the literature suggest that there is a direct relationship between teachers' beliefs and their instructional planning, decision, and practices in the classrooms [27], however to our knowledge, studies on pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about multilingualism with respect to translanguaging in the Indonesian context have not appeared in the literature. Therefore, to address this gap, this research explores beliefs about multilingualism and translanguaging among pre-service EFL teachers in their classrooms in the following research question: What are the perceptions of multilingualism with respect to translanguaging, including language separation, language use/mixing, and language support, among pre-service EFL teachers in the Indonesian context?

Literature Review

Multilingualism and Translanguaging in EFL Context. Although the monolingual view remains noticeable and dominant in mainstream education, however, since the publications of two books[5] (see [28]), many researchers have recently turned to investigate multilingualism [1].

Multilingualism plays a significant role in education and society [1]. When speaking about language, the terms bilingualism, multilingualism, and plurilingualism are included; however, the term bilingual education is used to recognise clear and exact educational efforts to help students develop their "plurilingual abilities" or to make use of the abilities to educate[6]. A series of new terms has been introduced in the literature, for example, "metrolingualism", "polylanguaging", "language meshing", and "translanguaging" [1]. In the field of education, the term bilingual education itself is an umbrella term to refer to trilingual and multilingual education. The prefix bi- does not refer to two entities, but to innumerable complex linguistic interactions. Thus, bilingual education focuses on complex language practices that enable students with plurilingual abilities to be educated[7].

Among the terms, researchers have become increasingly interested in investigating translanguaging. The term, derived from the Welsh *trawsieithu*, was coined by Cen Williams (1994, 1996[8]). This term was originally used as a pedagogical practice where students were asked to alternate between different languages for either productive or receptive purposes[9]. The term has been now extended by a large number of scholars (see, among others, [29–31]). In a short period of time, the term translanguaging has emerged eventually in the field of bilingual education and multilingualism and its definition has now evolved [1].

Teachers' Beliefs about Multilingualism. Regarding the concept of beliefs, which is considered similar to perceptions [32], it may always be confusing [1]. There are a lot of other terms used in the literature to refer to beliefs such as "attitudes, values, judgements, axioms, opinions, ideology, perceptions, conceptions, conceptual systems, preconceptions, dispositions, implicit theories, explicit theories, personal theories, internal mental processes, action strategies, rules of practice, practical principles, perspectives, repertories of understanding, and social strategy" [27]. Pajares' work was partially based on earlier research findings by Rokeach (1968), who proposed that beliefs have three

[4] García O., Wei L. Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education.
[5] May S. ed. The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and Bilingual Education. New York: Routledge; 2014. Available at: https://www.routledge.com/The-Multilingual-Turn-Implications-for-SLA-TESOL-and-Bilingual-Education/May/p/book/9780415534321 (accessed 22.06.2021).
[6] García O., Wei L. Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education.
[7] Ibid.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid.

main components, which include: (1) cognitive component, representing knowledge; (2) affective component capable of arousing emotion; (3) and a behavioural component activated when action is required (as cited in [27]). Humans always have beliefs about everything [27].

In the field of education, to be more specific, teachers' beliefs refer to "a particularly provocative form of personal knowledge that is generally defined as pre- or in-service teachers' implicit assumptions about students, learning, classrooms, and the subject matter to be taught" [33]. The belief system is just like an atom structure in which its nucleus binds different particles in a firmly fixed system. In this core-peripheral dimension, certain beliefs form the system's nucleus, and these core beliefs are more important and immune to change (Rokeach, 1968 as cited in [29]).

In terms of beliefs about multilingualism, it is reported that in-service English teachers in Poland have more multilingual awareness compared to those of pre-service. The multilingual/plurilingual awareness, however, is not solely dependent on teaching experience but also on the language learning experience [34].

Teachers positively believe that multilingualism can benefit their language learning, but not that it can benefit their students. The teachers believe that collaborative language use benefits students' language learning, but they do not use it in the classroom [35]. Thus, an assumption can be made that language hierarchies, separation of languages, and persistent monolingual assumptions at school still continue to exist. Teachers educate their students based on their own personal beliefs of monolingualism. Therefore, integrating a critical component of language awareness into teacher education and professional development needs to be taken into account [36].

In EFL classrooms, rarely have teachers activated their students' other languages. In other words, they practice a target language use only behaviour in their classrooms. To this end, teacher education curricula are expected to be designed to raise pre-service teachers' language awareness according to the current trends in language teaching approaches [37].

It is also reported that teachers and pre-service teachers support multilingual pedagogy and multilingualism, however, they also confirm their persistent views of monolingual myth [38; 39]. To put it another way, on the one hand, teachers hold positive beliefs about multilingualism. However, they fail to act congruently with their beliefs in classroom practices. On the other hand, they believe that language teaching through language separation has positive effects. In other words, they have fairly ambivalent feelings about the language teaching approach. Most of their beliefs are still influenced by the so-called monolingual myth for language teaching [40].

Materials and Methods

This study is quantitative in nature, adopting a survey research design[10]. It refers to an in-depth look and description of a specific issue, topic, or object [41], in this case, beliefs about multilingualism and translanguaging among pre-service EFL teachers in Indonesia. Surveys are frequently used in social and psychological research because they are frequently used to describe and investigate human behaviour[11].

Although survey research and questionnaires do not have to be necessarily connected in any way[12], however, we used an online Likert scale questionnaire with no questions that could be deemed sensitive[13] for data collection. Prior to collecting data, we explained in great detail the purpose of this current study to the research participants and reassured them that they would be guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality [42]. Due to the low-risk

[10] Dey I. Qualitative Data Analysis: A User-Friendly Guide for Social Scientists. London and New York: Routledge; 2005. Available at: https://www.routledge.com/Qualitative-Data-Analysis-A-User-Friendly-Guide-for-Social-Scientists/Dey/p/book/9780415058520 (accessed 22.06.2021).

[11] Straits B.C. Approaches to Social Research. New York: Oxford University Press; 2005.

[12] de Vaus D.A. Surveys in Social Research. 5th ed. New South Wales: Allen & Unwin; 2002. Available at: https://parsmodir.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/devaus.pdf (accessed 22.06.2021).

[13] Preston V. Questionnaire Survey. In: International Encyclopedia of Human Geography. Elsevier; 2009. p. 46–52.

nature of this study, we did not require written consent from participants, as their voluntary participation was interpreted as agreement.

Participants. The respondents consisted of 270 pre-service EFL teachers in the 17–26 age range. They were English teacher candidates majoring in English education in both public and private universities, 83.3% and 16.7% respectively, on Sumatra, Java, Sulawesi, and Kalimantan islands, Indonesia. They were studying to become an English teacher in primary and secondary schooling. Most of them (80.4%) were female, and the rest (19.6%) were male. Female participants appear to outnumber male participants in this study, which is in line with previous findings that schools are perceived as 'feminised' environments [43–45]. They also reported that only a small number of them (36.3%) had English teaching experience, while the rest (63.3%) did not. Regarding their ethnic groups, below is the information.

Table 1 below illustrates that the ethnic groups of the participants under investigation. Among them, the majority were Javanese, with a total of 52.2% followed by Lampung, Banjarese, Sundanese, and Padangnese, which is 16.0%, 8.9%, 6.3%, and 6.3%, respectively. There is a similar pattern in the frequency and percentage of other ethnic groups, with a total range of one participant (0.4%) – six (2.2%). In summary, the participants taking part in the study were mostly Javanese, the biggest ethnic group in Indonesia.

In terms of the participants' first language and language proficiency characteristics, it is reported that Indonesian is the first language of the majority (66.7%), followed by Javanese and Banjarese (21.2% and 5.9%, respectively). The rest of the participants (only a small number of them) consider their local languages as their first languages, ranging from 0.4–1.5% of them. In other words, the majority of them reported being first language speakers of Indonesian, the national language. As widely known that Indonesia is a multicultural and multilingual country, with a variety of ethnic groups and local languages peacefully coexist, and English is learnt as a foreign language. Illustrated in Table 2 below is the information regarding their language proficiency.

Table 1. **Ethnic groups of the participants**

No.	Ethnic groups	Frequency	Percent
1	Javanese	141	52.2
2	Lampung	43	16.0
3	Banjarese	24	8.9
4	Sundanese	17	6.3
5	Padangnese	13	4.8
6	Bataknese	6	2.2
7	Komering	6	2.2
8	Semendo	5	1.9
9	Palembangnese	3	1.1
10	Buginese	2	0.7
11	Balinese	2	0.7
12	Dayak	2	0.7
13	Bantenese	2	0.7
14	Betawinese	1	0.4
15	Minahasan	1	0.4
16	Nias	1	0.4
17	Chinese Indonesian	1	0.4
Total		270	100.0

Table 2. **The mean score of the participants' perceived language proficiency (self-assessment)**

	Listening	Reading	Speaking	Writing
English	3.18	3.46	3.16	3.19
Indonesian	4.50	4.46	4.51	4.26
Local language	3.77	3.63	3.52	3.33

Table 2 below clearly illustrates the participants' self-reported proficiency in three languages (English, Indonesian, and local language) in terms of listening, reading, speaking, and writing skills. It is apparent that, on average, they have a high language proficiency in Indonesian and local language ($M > 3.5$), except their local language writing skill falling into the medium proficiency category ($M \geq 3$–3.5). In terms of English proficiency, on average, their proficiency falls into the medium proficiency category ($M \geq 3$–3.5).

Research Instrument and Procedure. The main instrument for data collection of this study was an online questionnaire with close-ended questions to get the participants' demographic profile and a set of statements about multilingualism and translanguaging. In the first section of the questionnaire, the demographic profile, the questions were about the participants' sex, age, ethnic groups, first language, and local language mastery. In this section, they were also required to self-assess their language proficiency in English, Indonesian, and local language on a scale of 1–5 (total mean score $M > 3.5$ = high, $M \geq 3$–3.5 = = Medium, and $M < 3$ = Low). The second section of the questionnaire consisted of a 5-point Likert scale statement with a total of 33 items that were related to beliefs about multilingualism and/or translanguaging (language separation, language use/mixing, and language support). The questionnaire was developed by Gorter and Arocena [1] with a few modifications and adjustments.

To make sure the directions and statements in the questionnaire were understandable and reasonable in length[14], prior to distribution to the participants, it was pilot tested to assess its design and appropriateness and to ensure it could achieve the purpose of the research[15]. Pearson product-moment analysis was used to determine the questionnaire's validity ($0.00 < 0.05$), which was found to be acceptable. The internal consistency of items was also checked to see if they were accurate and consistent in measuring variables, using the correlation coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha). A reliability and internal consistency score of greater than or equal to 0.60 was obtained for each item.

The participants were required to complete and return the 5-point Likert scale online questionnaire that was sent to them via an online survey tool, Google Forms. They received a WhatsApp message with a link to the online questionnaire. After a 30-day online survey carried out in April – May 2021, the results were exported to an Excel spreadsheet. In addition, our colleagues on the Indonesian islands of Sumatra, Java, Sulawesi, and Kalimantan helped disseminate the online survey to a wide range of potential participants. Finally, they were aware that by completing and returning the questionnaire, they were consenting to the use of their responses for the purpose of this research.

Data Analysis. The data collected from the participants were analysed using descriptive statistics, which included the percentages and frequency distributions of the participants' Likert scale responses[16]. The key part of the analysis was the comparison of frequencies[17] for participants' beliefs

[14] Schleef E. Written Surveys and Questionnaires in Sociolinguistics. In: Research Methods in Sociolinguistics: A Practical Guide, First. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; 2014. p. 42–57.

[15] McQuirk P.M., O'Neill P. Using Questionnaires in Qualitative Human Geography. In: Hay I., ed. Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography. Don Mills, Canada: Oxford University Press; 2016. p. 246–273. Available at: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/81226005.pdf (accessed 22.06.2021).

[16] Lau F. Methods for Survey Studies. In: Lau F., Kuziemsky C. (eds.) Handbook of eHealth Evaluation: An Evidence-based Approach. Victoria (BC): University of Victoria; 2016. p. 227–242.

[17] Ibid.

about multilingualism with respect to translanguaging including three constructs: language separation, language use/mixing, and language support. In so doing, the manner in which the information obtained is presented and described could be made more convenient and understandable [46].

Results

The main aim of the present study was to describe pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about multilingualism with respect to translanguaging, including language separation, language use/mixing, and language support in the Indonesian context. In other words, regarding beliefs about multilingualism with respect to translanguaging, we focused on three constructs: language separation, language use/mixing, and language support. The following sections contain summaries of the study's key findings.

Participants' Belief about Language Separation. The first construct is belief about language separation as illustrated in Table 3 below.

Table 3 below illustrates belief about language separation in EFL classrooms among pre-service EFL teachers. This belief was measured using six items, primarily referring to monolingual notions about using only one language at a time and exclusively using the target language in a language classroom [1]. It can be clearly seen that the majority of the participants under investigation express their neutral opinion (undecided). In other words, they neither agree nor disagree with all the six items under this construct, ranging from 28.1–40.0%. The other responses (strongly disagree and disagree vs. agree and strongly agree) to the items such as teaching a language separately without making use of other languages (Item 1), other languages must not be used in EFL classrooms (Item 3), and resource books ought to be available in one language (Item 5) also have an almost similar pattern. However, nearly half of them strongly disagree and disagree (13.3% and 33.7%, respectively) with the prohibition on asking questions in a language other than English (Item 2). Regarding the importance of using more than one language at the same time in EFL classrooms (Item 4), most of the participants agree and strongly agree with this statement, 36.7% and 10.4%, respectively. The statement on using only the target language when teaching EFL (Item 6) also has an almost similar pattern with Item 2, with participants showing strong disagreement and disagreement with the statement, 8.1% and 27%, respectively.

Participants' Belief about Language Use/Mixing. The second construct is belief about language use/mixing in EFL classrooms. The participants' responses related to this belief is illustrated in Table 4 below.

Table 4 below gives information about the participants' belief about language use/mixing in EFL classrooms, referring to the notion that languages can be used interchangeably and that mixing languages is not necessarily bad in and of itself [1].

Table 3. **Participants belief about language separation in EFL classrooms**

No.	Statements	Response				
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
1	Languages should be taught in isolation, without reference to other languages	20 (7.4%)	73 (27.0%)	76 (28.1%)	73 (27.0%)	28 (10.4%)
2	In (my) classroom it is prohibited to ask questions in another language	36 (13.3%)	91 (33.7%)	83 (30.7%)	51 (18.9%)	9 (3.3%)
3	Using other languages in the English class must be prohibited	28 (10.4%)	54 (20.0%)	108 (40.0%)	56 (20.7%)	24 (8.9%)
4	It is necessary to use more than one language at a time in English classrooms	10 (3.7%)	44 (16.3%)	89 (33.0%)	99 (36.7%)	28 (10.4%)
5	Textbooks should only be in one language	22 (8.1%)	61 (22.6%)	85 (31.5%)	65 (24.1%)	37 (13.7%)
6	I only use the target language while teaching	22 (8.1%)	73 (27%)	104 (38.5%)	53 (19.6%)	18 (6.7%)

Table 4. **Participants' belief about language use/mixing in EFL classrooms**

No.	Statements	Response				
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
1	In school, language mixing should be prohibited	61 (22.6%)	101 (37.4%)	68 (25.2%)	30 (11.1%)	10 (3.7%)
2	Other languages must be prohibited in English classrooms	19 (7.0%)	83 (30.7%)	81 (30.0%)	66 (24.4%)	21 (7.8%)
3	It is confusing to use Indonesian (or local languages) and English at the same time in English classrooms	29 (10.7%)	88 (32.6%)	82 (30.4%)	46 (17.0%)	24 (8.9%)
4	Bilinguals should try to use a single language at a time	11 (4.1%)	31 (11.5%)	95 (35.2%)	98 (36.3%)	34 (12.6%)
5	It is acceptable for students to answer in Indonesian or local languages in English classrooms	22 (8.1%)	60 (22.2%)	91 (33.7%)	70 (25.9%)	27 (10.0%)
6	It is okay for students to mix languages among friends in English classrooms	9 (3.3%)	23 (8.5%)	67 (24.8%)	118 (43.7%)	53 (19.6%)
7	It is good to use together the words of different languages in informal contexts	13 (4.8%)	24 (8.9%)	74 (27.4%)	106 (39.3%)	53 (19.6%)
8	It seems good to me that students use Indonesian and/or local languages to promote participation in English classrooms	6 (2.2%)	52 (19.3%)	80 (29.6%)	92 (34.1%)	39 (14.4%)
9	For bilinguals it is natural to use words of two languages together	6 (2.2%)	15 (5.6%)	105 (38.9%)	103 (38.1%)	40 (14.8%)

It can be seen that the participants show strong disagreement and disagreement with the prohibition of language mixing at schools (Item 1), with a total of 22.6% and 37.4%, respectively. More specifically, they also strongly disagree and disagree with the prohibition of other languages in their EFL classrooms (Item 2), 7.0% and 30.7%, respectively. This opinion also applies to Item 3 regarding the use of Indonesian, local languages and English at the same time in their EFL classrooms, with a total of 10.7% showing strong disagreement and 32.6% disagreement. By contrast, the majority of them show agreement and strong agreement with the rest of the items (Items 6–9), which include bilinguals' use of one language at a time, responding to questions in Indonesian and/or local languages, mixing languages among students, using different words of different languages in informal contexts, using Indonesian and/or local languages to promote class participation, and the naturalness of using words of two different languages together. In addition, there is also an almost similar pattern in the number of neutral responses, ranging from 24.8–38.9% of the participants expressing their neutral opinion (undecided) on the entire items under the construct of belief about language use/mixing in EFL classrooms. This means that they neither agree nor disagree with all the nine items under this construct.

Participants' Belief about Language Support. The last construct is related to belief about language support in EFL classrooms. The participants' responses to this belief are illustrated in Table 5 below.

Table 5 below shows the participants' responses to the belief about language support in EFL classrooms, with the notion underpinning this construct that knowing one language will enable learners to learn another or that contrasting languages can be beneficial [1].

It can be seen that nearly half of the participants agree (33.7%) and strongly agree (6.3%) on avoiding translations in their EFL learning (Item 1). However, they also agree and strongly agree that the use of translations in EFL classrooms is beneficial (Item 2), 33.7% and 7.4%, respectively. By contrast, nearly 40% of them express their strong disagreement (11.1%) and disagreement (28.1%) on the item stating that using Indonesian and/or local languages in EFL classrooms make it easier for them to learn English grammar (Item 3).

Table 5. **Participants' belief about language support in EFL classrooms**

No.	Statements	Response				
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
1	I try to avoid using translations in my English learning	3 (1.1%)	56 (20.7%)	103 (38.1%)	91 (33.7%)	17 (6.3%)
2	Using translations in English language classrooms is good	2 (0.7%)	30 (11.1%)	127 (47.0%)	91 (33.7%)	20 (7.4%)
3	If I use Indonesian or local languages, it will make it easier for me to master English grammar	30 (11.1%)	76 (28.1%)	86 (31.9%)	63 (23.3%)	15 (5.6%)
4	It is a good idea to sometimes use two or three languages for comparing in English classrooms	14 (5.2%)	36 (13.3%)	103 (38.1%)	92 (34.1%)	25 (9.3%)
5	It is good to compare texts written in different languages at school	6 (2.2%)	21 (7.8%)	106 (39.3%)	104 (38.5%)	33 (12.2%)
6	It is good to compare the grammar of different languages in school	4 (1.5%)	27 (10.0%)	94 (34.8%)	104 (38.5%)	41 (15.2%)
7	It is good to compare the lexicon of different languages in school	3 (1.1%)	15 (5.6%)	99 (36.7%)	121 (44.8%)	32 (11.9%)
8	Knowing Indonesian is helpful in learning English	0 (0%)	11 (4.1%)	69 (25.6%)	112 (41.5%)	78 (28.9%)
9	Knowing local languages is helpful in learning English	14 (5.2%)	66 (24.4%)	99 (36.7%)	64 (23.7%)	27 (10.0%)
10	When writing, it is worth highlighting what is similar in other languages	6 (2.2%)	27 (10.0%)	78 (28.9%)	120 (44.4%)	39 (14.4%)
11	If I know how to write a letter in Indonesian, I can use this knowledge to write letters in English	2 (0.7%)	19 (7.0%)	57 (21.1%)	122 (45.2%)	70 (25.9%)
12	Being bilingual is helpful in learning other languages	1 (0.4%)	8 (3.0%)	51 (18.9%)	113 (41.9%)	97 (35.9%)

The most common trend is the participants' responses to the rest of the statements (Items 4–12), most of them showing agreement and strong agreement on the items related to using more than one language for making a comparison, comparing written texts, grammar, and lexicons of different languages, the benefit of knowing Indonesian and local languages, the benefit of highlighting something similar in other languages, the benefit of using knowledge of how to write a letter in Indonesian and the benefit of being bilingual for learning EFL.

In addition, there is also an almost similar pattern in the number of neutral responses, ranging from 34.8–47.0% of the participants expressing their neutral opinion (undecided) on items 1–7 and 9 and 18.9–28.9% of the participants expressing their neutral opinion (undecided) on items 12, 11, 8, and 10. This indicates that they neither agree nor disagree with all the items under this construct.

Discussion and Conclusion

The study reported here illustrates, according to their self-reported language proficiency, that the participants are truly multilingual, which is in line with what is well known that Indonesia is a country that is rich in linguistic superdiversity with a complex linguistic ecology; hence multilingualism is common in Indonesia [6].

The findings indicate that the participants under investigation are in a neutral position when responding to the statements under the language separation construct. However, there is a clear tendency for them to support and appreciate multilingualism and translanguaging more highly than language separation in EFL classrooms, offering a wave of optimism about future language education [1] as stated in the literature within the framework of multilingualism and translanguaging that complex language practices facilitate instructions of students with multi/plurilingual abilities[18].

[18] García O., Wei L. Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education.

In terms of belief about language use/mixing in EFL classrooms, the findings corroborate previous research indicating that participants support multilingualism when it comes to translanguaging practices in EFL classrooms [35]. They support the use of features of their first language(s) to help them with English learning, indicating they are truly multilingual. Moreover, the findings are consistent with Indonesia's well-known multilingualism and multiculturalism, with more than 700 languages spoken by 606 ethnic groups [6], making its people have ample opportunity to learn and use a variety of local languages and get involved in various cultural communications, but at the same time, when learning other languages, including foreign languages, it is a challenge for them to maintain their identity [7]. Therefore, similar to what is found in other geographical regions, multilingual interaction among societies is common, as is in African countries[19].

The current study's findings also corroborate previous research indicating that teachers believe multilingualism and collaborative use of languages are potential assets that can benefit their students' language learning; however, they do not put their beliefs into action in the classrooms [39; 40]. This indicates that language hierarchies, separation of languages, and persistent monolingual assumptions at school still continue to exist today [36]. This finding slightly contradicts a previous finding that in-service teachers have more multilingual awareness than pre-service teachers [34].

Regarding the findings on the participants' beliefs about language support in EFL classrooms with the notion underpinning this construct that knowing one language will enable learners to learn another or that contrasting languages can be beneficial [1], it is clear that the current findings positively support this notion. In other words, participants (unconsciously) move away from viewing bilingualism as "two separate, rigid, and static languages" toward viewing them as "fluid, flexible, and permeable" [17] within the so-called translanguaging viewpoint. The findings bolster the argument that bilingual language practices are viewed as a single linguistic repertoire, rather than as a distinct linguistic system[20], supporting teaching activities that incorporate multiple languages in the classrooms [47]. Therefore, languages do not compete and should not be isolated; rather, knowledge of one language can aid in the learning of another, mutually supporting one another [1].

The current study has unravelled pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about multilingualism with respect to translanguaging in the Indonesian context that, to our knowledge, have not appeared in the literature. Language separation in EFL classrooms appears to be a point of contention for the majority of pre-service EFL teachers surveyed, with a preference for and support for multilingualism and translanguaging over language separation in EFL classrooms. They agree on the importance of using or mixing other languages in their classes. On the one hand, they believe that it is critical to avoid other language support in classrooms; on the other hand, they believe that other language support can benefit students. In other words, they are truly multilingual with a tendency to support and appreciate multilingualism and translanguaging more highly than language separation in EFL classrooms, offering a wave of optimism about future language education. They positively support the use of features of their first language(s) to help them with EFL learning. They (unconsciously) move away from viewing bilingualism as "two separate, rigid, and static languages" toward viewing them as "fluid, flexible, and permeable" [17] within the so-called translanguaging viewpoint.

Therefore, the findings have some implications in EFL education. Taking off from the idea of 'multilingual turn', there is a need to gradually introduce and include pedagogical translanguaging to the existing curricula. The integration of new multilingual facts and the implementation of translanguaging pedagogies are part of a larger educational renewal [1]. There is a need to intentionally create a multilingual space (translanguaging space) in EFL classrooms to fully utilise students' multilingual capabilities creatively

[19] Edwards J. Multilingualism. London and New York: Routledge; 1994.
[20] García O., Wei L. Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education.

and critically [30] because today many teachers struggle to reconcile the disparities between monolingual educational policies and the realities of multilingual classrooms (see, among others, [48–50]).

Although we believe that the findings of this current study contribute to further our understanding of this educational inquiry and offer a relatively comprehensive insight into how future EFL teachers in Indonesia look at multilingualism and translanguaging in English language teaching, however, this study is not without its shortfalls. This study only provides perspective data collected from pre-service EFL teachers; therefore, empirical evidence related to multilingual realities and translanguaging pedagogy needs to be taken into consideration in the future. Therefore, further research through naturally-occurring multilingual practices in EFL classrooms needs to be carried out. In addition, different research approaches with various instruments and data analyses need to be taken into account as well. In so doing, we believe we would be able to provide more valid and reliable findings.

REFERENCES

1. Gorter D., Arocena E. Teachers' Beliefs about Multilingualism in a Course on Translanguaging. *System*. 2020;92:102272. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102272

2. Duarte J. Translanguaging in the Context of Mainstream Multilingual Education. *International Journal of Multilingualism.* 2020;17(2):232–247. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1512607

3. Hobbs R.D. Diverse Multilingual Researchers Contribute Language Acquisition Components to an Integrated Model of Education. *International Journal of Multilingualism.* 2012;9(3):204–234. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2011.630736

4. Cenoz J., Gorter D. Focus on Multilingualism: A Study of Trilingual Writing. *The Modern Language Journal.* 2011;95(3):356–369. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01206.x

5. Cenoz J. Translanguaging in School Contexts: International Perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education.* 2017;16(4):193–198. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1327816

6. Zein S. Language Policy in Superdiverse Indonesia. 1st ed. London: Routledge; 2020. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429019739

7. Widodo H.P. Language Policy in Practice: Reframing the English Language Curriculum in the Indonesian Secondary Education Sector. In: Kirkpatrick R., ed. English Language Education Policy in Asia. Vol. 11. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing; 2016. p. 127–151. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-22464-0_6

8. Ariatna. The Need for Maintaining CLT in Indonesia. *TESOL Journal.* 2016;7(4):800–822. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.246

9. Paker T., Karaağaç Ö. The Use and Functions of Mother Tongue in EFL Classes. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences.* 2015;199:111–119. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.494

10. Heugh K.A., Li A., Song Y. Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the Teaching of and Through English: Rethinking Linguistic Boundaries in an Australian University. In: Fenton-Smith B., Humphries P., Walkinshaw I. (eds.) English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific: Issues and Challenges from Policy to Pedagogy. Dordrecht: Springer; 2017. p. 259–279. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-51976-0_14

11. MacSwan J. A Multilingual Perspective on Translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal.* 2017;54(1):167–201. doi: https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216683935

12. Garcia O. Education, Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the 21st Century. In: Skutnabb-Kangas T., Phillipson R., Mohanty A.K., Panda M. (eds.) Social Justice through Multilingual Education. Bristol; Buffalo & Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.; 2009. p. 140–158. doi: https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691910-011

13. Slaughter Y., Cross R. Challenging the Monolingual Mindset: Understanding Plurilingual Pedagogies in English as an Additional Language (EAL) Classrooms. *Language Teaching Research.* 2021;25(1):39–60. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820938

14. Romanowski P. Translanguaging in the Polish Educational Context: Lessons Learnt from IB Schools. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature.* 2019;12(1):5–24. doi: https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.795

15. Nagy T. On Translanguaging and Its Role in Foreign Language Teaching. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica.* 2018;10(2):41–53. doi: https://doi.org/10.2478/ausp-2018-0012

16. Motlhaka H.A., Makalela L. Translanguaging in an Academic Writing Class: Implications for a Dialogic Pedagogy. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies.* 2016;34(3):251–260. doi: https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2016.1250356

17. Beres A.M. An Overview of Translanguaging: 20 Years of 'Giving Voice to Those Who Do Not Speak'. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts.* 2015;1(1):103–118. doi: https://doi.org/10.1075/ttmc.1.1.05ber

18. Copland F., Yonetsugi E. Teaching English to Young Learners: Supporting the Case for the Bilingual Native English Speaker Teacher. *Classroom Discourse*. 2016;7(3):221–238. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2016.1192050

19. Kelly N., Bruen J. Translation as a Pedagogical Tool in the Foreign Language Classroom: A Qualitative Study of Attitudes and Behaviours. *Language Teaching Research.* 2014;19(2):150–168. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541

20. Rasman. To Translanguage or Not to Translanguage? The Multilingual Practice in an Indonesian EFL Classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics.* 2018;7(3):687–694. doi: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9819

21. Zainil Y. Pedagogical Practices of Code-Switching in EFL Classrooms in Padang, Indonesia. In: Social Sciences on Sustainable Development for World Challenge: The First Economics, Law, Education and Humanities International Conference. 2019. p. 634–643. doi: https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i14.4343

22. Wang D. Translanguaging in Chinese Foreign Language Classrooms: Students and Teachers' Attitudes and Practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.* 2019;22(2):138–149. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1231773

23. Escobar C.F., Dillard-Paltrineri E. Professors' and Students' Conflicting Beliefs about Translanguaging in the EFL Classroom: Dismantling the Monolingual Bias. *Revista Lenguas Modernas.* 2015;(23):301–328. doi: https://doi.org/10.15517/rlm.v0i23.22355

24. Burton J., Rajendram S. Translanguaging-as-Resource: University ESL Instructors' Language Orientations and Attitudes Toward Translanguaging. *TESL Canada Journal.* 2019;36(1):21–47. doi: https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v36i1.1301

25. Yuvayapan F. Translanguaging in EFL Classrooms: Teachers' Perceptions and Practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies.* 2019;15(2):678–694. doi: https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.586811

26. Al-Bataineh A., Gallagher K. Attitudes towards Translanguaging: How Future Teachers Perceive the Meshing of Arabic and English in Children's Storybooks. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.* 2021;24(3):386–400. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1471039

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

28. Conteh J., Meier G. The Multilingual Turn in Languages Education: Opportunities and Challenges. Bristol: Multilingual Matters; 2014. doi: https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783092246

29. Creese A., Blackledge A. Translanguaging and Identity in Educational Settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics.* 2015;35:20–35. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233

30. Wei L. Moment Analysis and Translanguaging Space: Discursive Construction of Identities by Multilingual Chinese Youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics.* 2011;43(5):1222–1235. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035

31. Lewis G., Jones B., Baker C. Translanguaging: Origins and Development from School to Street and Beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation.* 2012;18(7):641–654. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488

32. Lee J.S., Lee K., Arifah Drajati N. Preservice English Teachers' Perceptions of English as an International Language in Indonesia and Korea. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development.* 2019;40(3):230–243. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1503669

33. Kagan D.M. Implications of Research on Teacher Belief. *Educational Psychologist.* 1992;27(1):65–90. doi: https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2701_6

34. Otwinowska A. Does Multilingualism Influence Plurilingual Awareness of Polish Teachers of English? *International Journal of Multilingualism.* 2014;11(1):97–119. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2013.820730

35. Haukås Å. Teachers' Beliefs about Multilingualism and a Multilingual Pedagogical Approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism.* 2016;13(1):1–18. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2015.1041960

36. Young A.S. Unpacking Teachers' Language Ideologies: Attitudes, Beliefs, and Practiced Language Policies in Schools in Alsace, France. *Language Awareness.* 2014;23(1–2):157–171. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2013.863902

37. Dégi Z. Teachers' Beliefs Regarding Non-Target Language Use in the EFL Classroom. *The Journal of Linguistic and Intercultural Education.* 2016;9(1):19–30.

38. Portolés L., Martí O. Teachers' Beliefs about Multilingual Pedagogies and the Role of Initial Training. *International Journal of Multilingualism.* 2020;17(2):248–264. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1515206

39. Tarnanen M., Palviainen Å. Finnish Teachers as Policy Agents in a Changing Society. *Language and Education.* 2018;32(5):428–443. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2018.1490747

40. Egaña E.A., Cenoz J., Gorter D. Teachers ' Beliefs in Multilingual Education in the Basque Country and in Friesland. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education.* 2015;3(2):169–193. doi: https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.3.2.01aro

41. Ponto J. Understanding and Evaluating Survey Research. *Journal of the Advanced Practitioner in Oncology.* 2015;6(2):168–171. doi: https://doi.org/10.6004/JADPRO.2015.6.2.9

42. Singer E. Ethical Issues in Surveys. In: de Leeuw E.D., Hox J.J., Dillman D.A. (eds.) Internatoinal Handbook of Survey Methodolog. 1st Ed. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2008. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203843123

43. Skelton C. The 'Feminisation of Schooling' or 'Re-Masculinising' Primary Education?[1]. *International Studies in Sociology of Education.* 2002;12(1):77–96. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/09620210200200084

44. Carrington B. A Quintessentially Feminine Domain? Student Teachers' Constructions of Primary Teaching as a Career. *Educational Studies.* 2002;28(3):287–303. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/0305569022000003735

45. Heinz M., Keane E., Davison K. Gender in Initial Teacher Education: Entry Patterns, Intersectionality and a Dialectic Rationale for Diverse Masculinities in Schooling. *European Journal of Teacher Education.* 2021. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2021.1890709

46. Ho R. Handbook of Univariate and Multivariate Data Analysis with IBM SPSS. 2nd ed. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2013. doi: https://doi.org/10.1201/b15605

47. Cenoz J., Gorter D. Minority Languages and Sustainable Translanguaging: Threat or Opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development.* 2017;38(10):901–912. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1284855

48. Costley T., Leung C. Putting Translanguaging into Practice: A View from England. *System.* 2020;92:102270. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102270

49. Kirsch C. Opening Minds to Translanguaging Pedagogies. *System*. 2020;92:102271. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102271

50. Galante A. Pedagogical Translanguaging in a Multilingual English Program in Canada: Student and Teacher Perspectives of Challenges. *System.* 2020;92:102274. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102274

Submitted 30.12.2021; approved after reviewing 14.03.2022; accepted for publication 21.03.2022.
Поступила 30.12.2021; одобрена после рецензирования 14.03.2022; принята к публикации 21.03.2022.

About the authors:

Gede E. Putrawan, Lecturer at the Department of Language Education and Arts, University of Lampung (No. 1 Jl. Prof. Dr. Sumantri Brojonegoro, Bandar Lampung 35145, Indonesia), **ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7717-3634**, **Scopus ID: 57209692412**, **Researcher ID: AAM-8595-2021**, gputrawan08@fkip.unila.ac.id

Mahpul, Senior Lecturer at the Department of Language Education and Arts, University of Lampung (No. 1 Jl. Prof. Dr. Sumantri Brojonegoro, Bandar Lampung 35145, Indonesia), Ph.D. (Language Education), **ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3916-2608**, **Scopus ID: 57191896104**, mahpul.1965@fkip.unila.ac.id

Tuntun Sinaga, Lecturer at the Department of Language Education and Arts, University of Lampung (No. 1 Jl. Prof. Dr. Sumantri Brojonegoro, Bandar Lampung 35145, Indonesia), Ph.D. (Language and Culture), **ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3716-3765**, **Scopus ID: 57216651896**, tuntun.sinaga@fkip.unila.ac.id

Son K. Poh, Senior Lecturer at the English Language & Literature Academic Group at National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University (50 Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798, Singapore), Ph.D. (Language Education), **ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1192-4044**, **Scopus ID: 57395610600**, soonkoh.poh@nie.edu.sg

Olga V. Dekhnich, Deputy Director for Science and Research of the Institute of Intercultural Communication and International Relations, Associate Professor of the Chair of English Philology and Cross-Cultural Communication, Belgorod State National Research University (85 Pobedy St., Belgorod 308015, Russian Federation), Cand.Sci. (Philol.), Associate Professor, **ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6088-2656**, **Scopus ID: 56436702200**, **Researcher ID: AAM-9877-2020**, dekhnich@bsu.edu.ru

Contribution of the authors:

G. E. Putrawan – conceptualization; literature review; critical analysis; data collection; data analysis; discussion; implications; original draft preparation.

Mahpul – literature review; critical analysis; data analysis; conclusion and implication drawings; writing review and editing.

T. Sinaga – critical analysis; visualization; revisions; conclusion and implication drawings.

S. K. Poh – critical analysis, revisions; presentation of findings; conclusion drawing; writing review and editing.

O. V. Dekhnich – literature review; critical analysis; Russian part assistance; organizational guidance and editing.

All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Об авторах:

Путраван Геде Эке, преподаватель департамента языкового образования и искусств Университета Лампунга (35145, Индонезия, г. Бандар-Лампунг, ул. проф. доктора Сумантри Броджонегоро, д. 1), **ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7717-3634**, **Scopus ID: 57209692412**, **Researcher ID: AAM-8595-2021**, gputrawan08@fkip.unila.ac.id

Махпул, старший преподаватель департамента языкового образования и искусств Университета Лампунга (35145, Индонезия, г. Бандар-Лампунг, ул. проф. доктора Сумантри Броджонегоро, д. 1), доктор философии (языковое образование), **ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3916-2608**, **Scopus ID: 57191896104**, mahpul.1965@fkip.unila.ac.id

Синага Тунтун, преподаватель департамента языкового образования и искусств Университета Лампунга (35145, Индонезия, г. Бандар-Лампунг, ул. проф. доктора Сумантри Броджонегоро, д. 1), **ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3716-3765**, **Scopus ID: 57216651896**, tuntun.sinaga@fkip.unila.ac.id

Пох Сон Кох, старший преподаватель академической группы английского языка и литературы Национального института образования Наньянского технологического университа (639798, Сингапур, г. Сингапур, пр. Наньян, д. 50), доктор философии (языковое образование), **ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1192-4044**, **Scopus ID: 57395610600**, soonkoh.poh@nie.edu.sg

Дехнич Ольга Витальевна, заместитель директора Института межкультурной коммуникации и международных отношений по научной деятельности, доцент кафедры английской филологии и межкультурной коммуникации Белгородского государственного национального исследовательского университета (308015, Российская Федерация, г. Белгород, ул. Победы, д. 85), кандидат филологических наук, доцент, **ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6088-2656**, **Scopus ID: 56436702200**, **Researcher ID: AAM-9877-2020**, dekhnich@bsu.edu.ru

Заявленный вклад авторов:

Г. Э. Путраван – разработка концепции; обзор литературы; критический анализ; сбор и анализ данных; обсуждение; написание первоначального варианта рукописи.

Махпул – обзор литературы; критический анализ; оформление выводов; доработка текста.

Т. Синага – критический анализ; визуализация данных; оформление выводов.

С. К. Пох – критический анализ; презентация результатов исследования; оформление выводов.

О. В. Дехнич – обзор литературы; критический анализ; русскоязычная часть рукописи; организационные решения; редактирование.

Все авторы прочитали и одобрили окончательный вариант рукописи.