

**Article**

---

<https://doi.org/10.52696/EGJQ3860>

Reprints and permission:

The Malaysian English Language Teaching Association

Corresponding Author:

[revathi@fbk.upsi.edu.my](mailto:revathi@fbk.upsi.edu.my)**Effects of “English-Only Policy” on Students’ Fluency and Motivation Level in Speaking English**

Iliana Putri Azhar

Faculty of Languages and Communication  
Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI), Malaysia

Revathi Gopal

Faculty of Languages and Communication  
Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI), Malaysia**ABSTRACT**

The study aims to examine the influence of English-only policy on students’ fluency and motivation level to speak English. The respondents of the study are 20 secondary school students in Hulu Perak who are divided into two groups; experimental group and control group. The research design of this study is quantitative through quasi-experimental and survey. A pre and post-speaking test and a questionnaire which consists of 9 items using 5-point Likert scale are used for data collection. The data is analysed through mean scores of pre and post-test between experimental and control group and the total score of each respondent. The findings of pre and post-test indicate that the mean scores in the experimental group yield a higher improvement (3.20) than in the control group (1.80). Furthermore, the survey findings show that most respondents have a moderate level of motivation (60%), followed by high motivation level (40%). It can be concluded that English-only policy is effective on students’ speaking fluency and students have moderate to high levels of motivation to speak English language in English-only policy lessons. The implication of this study is that teachers can use English-only policy in English language lessons to improve students’ speaking fluency and motivation level to speak English. Apart from that, it can be a benchmark for school administration to implement the approach at school level and for the Ministry of Education to provide training courses for teachers to ensure in-depth implementation of the teaching approach.

**KEYWORDS:** fluency, motivation level, English-only policy, speaking

## Introduction

The choice of language use in English classes has been a controversial subject of debate in English language teaching particularly in the case of English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. Researchers in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) and English Language educators have been debating about the presence of students' first language (L1) in learning ESL or EFL classrooms. Past studies have highlighted that teachers and students should avoid the use of L1 because it does not benefit the progress of English as a second language (L2). This is due to the belief that the students' first language (L1) may interfere with their second language (L2) development. Also, one of the ways to successfully acquire a target language is by giving enough exposure to the students which cannot be achieved with the frequent presence of L1. The use of L2 is not only an issue in an English classroom. In response to globalization, several countries redefine the role of English in their national curriculum. As a result, English-only policy has become a global phenomenon as it is administered in most tertiary education, especially in EFL contexts such as in China and South Korea. The English-only policy is applied in all courses to attract more foreign students meant to internalise the universities and it is also due to the awareness of the importance of the English Language to cater the global demands.

Despite the growing number of universities, secondary schools, and primary schools implementing English as a medium of instruction, also known as English-only policy, there is not enough empirical research to prove the consequences of using English rather than the first language (L1) on teaching, learning, assessing, and teacher professional development.

It is commonly believed that one of the effective ways of teaching English as a second language is by exposing students to the language as much as possible. The English-only policy is meant to immerse the students in the English-speaking environment in which they will indirectly acquire the language, instead of learning it. It is part of the techniques used by most teachers in ESL classrooms in which the only language that is allowed to be used as a medium of communication is the English language. As English-only policy deals with the enforcement of using the students' second language in the classroom as a tool of communication, it affects the students' speaking skills the most. Thus, as much as it tends to increase the students' speaking skills, it also demotivates them to use the English language.

The implications of using English at all times by both teachers and students in the classroom have been debated over the years. Some believe that using the students' mother tongue is more effective especially in teaching weak students as they cannot improve their English proficiency without knowing the language. In addition, the policy may create an uncondusive environment in the classroom which will affect their process of learning. Rusli et al. (2018) proved that 80% of 20 students of a university in Selangor responded that they feel nervous and shy when they have to speak in English. Thus, it hampers their actual potential in responding to the lesson. Apart from that, 85% of the same group of students reported that they refuse to speak in English as they do not want to commit errors in front of their classmates. It shows that the English-only policy may hinder the students' speaking skills, especially weak students, as they will choose to remain silent instead of making mistakes while speaking in English. In addition, as the researcher is a school teacher, she has experienced that some weak students in her class refused to participate in

classroom activities when they had to use English. They would be participative when they were allowed to use their L1. On the contrary, the English-only policy is seen to be effective in motivating the students to speak in the English language because speaking skills need practice which they cannot achieve outside of the classroom. 96.2% of 214 foreign students who enrolled in the English Language Center (ELC) in the United States left positive comments regarding their perspectives on English-only policy on their open-ended responses. The comments include opinions that the policy positively forces and motivates them to use and to think in English (Shvidko, 2017). These findings indicate that the policy can motivate learners to speak in English. Additionally, the researcher became driven to use English in the classroom when she was in school because that was the only chance that she had to practise it.

As discussed in the previous paragraphs, most of the studies investigated students' and teachers' perceptions towards the presence of L1 in L2 classrooms. Although there are several researches conducted to measure the effects of English-only policy on students' motivation, most of the respondents were the students at tertiary level. Therefore, this research fills the gaps as it covers the effects of the use of the English-only policy on student's speaking fluency and the respondents are at secondary level of education.

## Literature Review

### *Studies on English-only Policy in Foreign Education*

Sa'd and Qadermazi (2015) examines the function of using L1 in EFL classes with English-only policy from the EFL learners' perspective. Debates pertaining to the use of L1 in EFL classes have continued over the years. Some researchers view it as destructive, while some see it as beneficial. In Arabic contexts, Sa'd and Qadermazi (2015), mentioned that L1 use by Saudi Arabian EFL learners is probably due to learners' low proficiency and cultural norms. However, the use of L1 is seen as beneficial as it inculcates positive attitudes among learners in an Iranian context.

The study involves 60 EFL learners in an Iranian institute and the data are collected through triangulation – class observations, questionnaire and semi-structured interview. The results show most respondents favour limited use of L1 in EFL classes, while some prefer English-only policy. One of the advantages of using L1 given by the respondents is it clarifies instructions and facilitates complex concepts. Additionally, the advantage of English-only policy is it widens exposure to the language and indirectly improves listening and speaking skills.

Ekawati (2014) examines students' attitude toward monolingual approach in English classes. Monolingual approach implies using only the target language as the medium of instruction. In the Indonesian context, the researcher shares her experience when she was in school. The teacher would punish students who used Indonesian language in the classroom, thus it forced them to only communicate in English. As a practicum teacher, she applies the same approach in her classes and notices different learners' attitude in different classes.

Questionnaire is used to collect data from 103 EFL learners at a high school in Salatiga, Central Java, Indonesia. The focuses of the study are learners' learning performance, opinions and feelings

based on their experiences in English classes with a monolingual approach. The findings indicate different results from the previous study because the majority of respondents show a strong tendency towards English-only. However, the approach does not aid their learning performance efficiently (Ekawati, 2014). It shows that the approach affects them psychologically, but not cognitively.

The Department of Education of the Philippines prioritises students' need and assure they learn the English language effectively as English is deemed as an official language. In fact, English language should be used in school as it maximises students' experiences (Calosor et al., 2020). As reported by Calosor et al. (2020), a study on teachers and students' perceptions in English-only policy involves a grade 11 and a grade 12 student and 6 teachers at St. Gregory College of Valenzuela. The data is gathered through interviews and questionnaires. The results show that most respondents see English-only policy as a beneficial approach as it helps them to communicate in the language. However, some teachers refuse to implement it because they want to appreciate the mother tongue.

The research studies in three foreign countries indicate that respondents are aware of the advantages and disadvantages of English-only policy. Moreover, the assumptions and perceptions of the policy are mostly similar to Malaysian context.

#### *English-only Policy in Malaysian Education*

It is already known that there has been a long debate about the use of L1 in second language learning and teaching. Pedagogically and ideologically, one of the main reasons of arguing for this view is the belief that exclusive use of the L2 will significantly increase learners' L2 exposure, thus developing comprehensible input (Krashen, 2009), which would then facilitate learners' understanding of and production in teaching and learning (Wang & Mansouri, 2017). As a result, one of the teaching approaches used in an English classroom is English-only policy. English-only policy restricts the use of students' L1 at any time within the confines of the language school (Shvidko, 2014). In other words, it is a setting in which neither the students nor the teacher are allowed to use the L1 when they are in the class (Sa'd & Qadermazi, 2015).

A review of research studies conducted to scrutinise the influence of L1 in L2 classrooms in Malaysia reveals that L1; Bahasa Melayu, plays an important role in L2 classrooms. Musa et al. (2012) explored the English language teaching (ELT) in Malaysia and factors contributing to learners' low proficiency in the language. The results disclosed heavy interference of L1 in L2 classrooms as one of the issues in the Malaysian ELT context that leads to inaccurate use of the language, particularly in writing skills. However, Stapa and Majid (2006) mentioned that limited proficiency learners construct better essays when L1 is used to generate ideas.

The English-only policy was hardly applied in the Malaysian ELT context in the past. This might be because the main focus in the previous language teaching was writing and reading skills as a result of examinations orientation approaches. Apart from that, Manty and Shah (2017) documents most respondents agree that the English-only policy should be implemented in English class. However, the respondents prefer to use L1 to socialise with their classmates in English class.

### *Speaking Proficiency in English-only Environment*

Learners can achieve speaking proficiency by mastering sub-skills; such as pronunciation, stress, intonation, turn-taking ability, and others, instead of just being able to talk (Rianingsih, 2015). Brown (2004) mentioned that speaking comprises micro skills and macro skills. One of the micro skills includes producing speech naturally which involves suitable phrases, pause and breath groups, and sentence constituents. This micro skill is related to the definition of fluency which is defined as confidently using language with limited hesitations and natural pauses Besides, macro skills indicate speaker emphasis on larger aspects – fluency, discourse, function, style, cohesion, nonverbal communication, and strategic options.

There were some studies done related to the learners' and teachers' attitudes towards the use of English-only instruction by the teacher and whether it is effective in ELT (Sa'd & Qadermazi, 2015; Ekawati, 2014). As stated in those studies, some of the learners agreed to have such instruction in their classroom as their English proficiency improved. As they were exposed to an English-speaking environment in the classroom, they became more comfortable speaking English. The learners in classes that use English as the sole medium of instruction also had higher English proficiency than those of the more L1 tolerant classes. Moreover, they enjoyed studying in the monolingual class and supported the use of this instruction in their English classes (Rahayu & Margana, 2018).

Several studies show different results in students' speaking proficiency in an English-only environment. Shahini & Shahamirian (2017) reported that some students of an Iranian university agree that tertiary education did not improve their speaking fluency as they have inadequate exposure to the English language. This is due to the limited chance of practising it in the classrooms with their classmates and lecturers. Some of the students feel that code-switching by the teachers sometimes restricts their exposure to English (Rahayu & Margana, 2018). In addition, they do not have any contact with English native speakers in English Language Departments and their lecturers also use the native language outside of the classrooms (Shahini & Shahamirian, 2017). This is supported by Rianingsih (2016), in which one of the problems that occurs in speaking activities is sharing the same mother tongue. As a result, students tend to use it as it feels natural to them instead of communicating in a foreign language. This results in students' difficulties in speaking at the English Intensive Program

Apart from that, according to Wei (2013), most university students in the English as Medium of Instruction (EMI) environment agreed that the policy can improve their English communication abilities. However, there was probably a misconception as the students might have understood getting more chances to speak in English as improving their proficiency (Wei, 2013). Additionally, Tavakoli et al. (2016) found that there is an improvement in speech fluency among English for Academic Purposes (EAP) learners at a university when they study L2 in the target language context. Albakri (2017) reports that most of the respondents believe that learning in English can improve their English proficiency, particularly in speaking skills. Chapple (2015) also states that most of the respondents assume that EMI classes can enhance their English ability.

Despite the many positive feedbacks regarding their English proficiency in an English-only environment, there are small numbers of respondents who perceive that there is no improvement

in their proficiency (Albakri, 2017; Chapple, 2015). Additionally, Andrew (2017) reveals that EMI in Eastern University Sri Lanka does not improve speaking skills among the respondents. This is because the mean values for other English proficiency skills indicate a high level, except for speaking skills which only indicate a moderate level. Several studies were also done regarding learners' and teachers' attitudes towards the presence of L1 in the ELT process and whether the use of L1 is effective in the ELT process (Fareed et al., 2016; Mareva 2016). The findings show that there are positive attitudes towards teachers' code-switching especially since the learners perceive L1 as a tool to facilitate their learning and to foster their understanding of materials.

### *Second Language Acquisition*

Krashen's second language acquisition theories have affected language teaching and learning. The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, The Input Hypothesis and The Affective Filter Hypothesis concepts are defined in the theoretical framework. Therefore, the main focus of this section is studies that are related to the hypotheses and ELT.

Abukhattala (2013) mentioned that acquisition as in The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis is hardly obtained in Libyan EFL classes as teachers tend to focus on form than content. It is a practice in most classrooms in which learners are provided exercises on form and are always conscious of the lesson. This differs from acquiring the language, for example when learners communicate in the L1. Learners are not conscious of the form as they focus on the meaning instead. Therefore, teachers must improvise teaching techniques to assist language acquisition (Abukhattala, 2013).

Regardless of the critiques of Krashen's Input Hypothesis, some researchers agree that language input can lead to SLA. Krashen (2009) proposed that language acquisition can be achieved in formal and informal settings if learners directly participate in comprehensive language input. This is supported by Bahrani et al. (2014), in which the information entrenched in the input and its regularity contribute to learners' language acquisition. However, the sources of language input are different in informal settings between ESL and EFL contexts (Bahrani et al., 2014). In ESL contexts, learners have the opportunity to interact in English with people from other countries. This is considered as language input and can lead to SLA as supported by Long's Interaction Hypothesis; conversational interaction embellishes SLA, (Bahrani et al., 2014).

In addition, Chao (2013) finds significant influence of the theory on teaching listening. Students' listening ability can be consolidated by applying the skills in three aspects; content, input means and evaluation. Moreover, Abukhattala (2013) stated roughly tuned input is recommended in the language classroom because the input is slightly above learners' level of proficiency which can extend their acquisition. This is different from finely rough input, which is mostly practised by teachers' in a language classroom. Thus, the hypothesis should be adapted according to the teacher's circumstance to achieve the utmost result (Abukhattala, 2013).

In the Affective Filter Hypothesis, the variables consisted of anxiety, motivation and self-confidence. Among the variables, anxiety in language learning is mostly covered by researchers. There is a negative influence of anxiety on speaking performance (Sutarsyah, 2017; Salem and Dyiar, 2014). Sutarsyah (2017) mentioned that learners with a lower level of anxiety get a better

score in speaking performance than higher-level anxiety learners. Besides, Mohamed and Wahid (2009) considered foreign language speaking anxiety as a damaging factor of oral performance and speaking skills. Nervousness, which is a dominant sub-factor of anxiety, may arise when learners are not competent in using the language (Sutarsyah, 2017). Hence, encouraging learners to communicate and create authentic use of language in the classroom are needed to refrain from speaking anxiety and increase motivation and self-confidence to help learners obtain accurate and fluent speaking performance (Sutarsyah, 2017; Salem and Dyiar, 2014).

Apart from that, Nath, Mohamad and Yamat (2017) reported that learners' proficiency is possible to remain low even when they are highly motivated in learning English. It shows that the other variables; anxiety and self-confidence, can still intervene in learners' acquisition process.

### *Motivation Level in English-only Environment*

English as medium of instruction (EMI) is one of the strategies chosen by several universities which mandates English to be used as a medium of interaction in all the sectors of universities such as administration, research, and education (Kim, 2016). A previous study on Korean university students' speaking motivation under EMI policy found that the students felt motivated to learn to speak in English in the environment under the university EMI policy (Kim, 2016). Additionally, Kim (2016) stated that the university students felt comfortable with the class taught by the foreign instructors and responded positively as to the foreign instructor's contribution to their learning. One of the students stated that she was driven to speak English because of class requirements such as English presentation in a subject course. This is an example of extrinsic motivation. Atli and Ozal (2017) supported these findings as they found that among the groups that are being tested – elective, partial EMI and full EMI – the full EMI group has the strongest motivational intensity with an average of 64.2%. The study also found that the full EMI students work harder and are more focused to learn English. They also appreciate all the feedback they receive in their English classes.

On the other hand, another previous study on teachers' perception of Teaching English through English (TETE) benefits towards students in the classroom reported that about half of the teachers believed that TETE enhances learning interest (47.8%) and motivation (46.1%) of students (Kim, 2008). According to Wei (2013), the implementation of English-only instruction does not bring any significant change to students' learning anxiety, learning attitudes and learning motivation. Additionally, Calosor et al. (2020) mentioned students feel embarrassed in the English-only policy classroom and it might negatively affect their emotional security and self-worth. It also leads to lack of self-confidence and interest, nervousness while speaking and afraid of judgement.

Based on the literature review, it can be concluded that although there are several types of research have been done to identify the influence of English-only policy on students' motivation, a notable problem is not many studies have been conducted on secondary or primary school students' responses to TETE (Butler, 2004; Kim, 2002). Therefore, research on secondary school students is needed as the level of competency and attitudes between these two levels of learners are different. The findings may also yield differently (Tsao & Lin, 2004).

Besides, many researchers used a small set of survey items, for instance, just a single item for each construct. This lack of coverage lowers the validity of the scales used, and thus makes it difficult

to interpret the findings (Kim, 2008). Apart from that, most previous studies only investigated students' and teachers' perceptions of the English-only environment. Thus, empirical data is needed to determine the effects of the policy on students' speaking fluency. Meanwhile, this study covers the effects of the use of English-only policy in English lessons on student's fluency in speaking English. The result of students' performance in the speaking test will be quantitatively studied and statistically analysed. Not only that, the focus of most current research is on students' motivation in learning English; it does not focus on specific skills. There is not a lot of research that focuses on how the policy may affect their motivation in speaking in English.

## Method

### *Research Design*

The research design of this research is quantitative through quasi-experimental and survey. Quasi-experimental was used to show a cause-effect relationship between the variables – English-only Policy and students' speaking fluency in English. The type of quasi-experimental of this research is pre-test-post -test among non-equivalent groups design. The design is selected to establish a cause-effect relationship between English-only Policy and students' fluency in speaking in English. The approach is applied in two different forms of four classes. Therefore, the English-only policy was administered in one classroom – the experimental group – while another classroom was conducted in the usual medium of instruction, which is the bilingual – control group. The level of proficiency of these groups was almost similar to ensure the validity of this study. Besides, a survey was used to gather quantitative data on students' motivation level to speak in English in both classrooms.

### *Instruments*

Two research instruments are used for this study. The two instruments are: (1) a pre-and post-speaking test and (2) a motivation questionnaire. Speaking fluency is usually measured through speech rate, pause rate and disfluency markers. Speech rate can be measured by calculating the words produced per minute (WPM) inclusively and exclusively. This study focuses on an exclusive rate which refers to a number of words per minute by omitting pauses and disfluencies. A pre-and post-speaking test was conducted for experimental and control groups to identify if there is a slight change in their fluency in speaking English.

Apart from that, a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire is used as the second instrument of this study ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The questionnaire comprises two sections. Section A contains items that obtain information on the demographics of the respondents and Section B comprises 9 Likert scale items on motivation to speak English in an English-only policy classroom. The questions were adapted and adopted from Resmini (2018), Sibarani (2019), Nursanti (2016) and Pyo (2009).

## Data Analysis

The pre-and post-speaking test records are analysed through an exclusive rate in which the total number of words is divided by the total time the respondents take to deliver their speech. The result is then multiplied by 60. A comparison between the mean of test scores is used for data analysis.

Next, the questionnaire data to determine motivation level in speaking English is tabulated based on the total score of each respondent. Therefore, the total score for the items ranges from 9 to 45. Based on Toubot et al. (2018), a total score of more than 36 (above scale 4 of each item) indicates a high motivation level to speak in English, while a total score ranging from 27 – 36 (scale 3 – 4 of each item) indicates a moderate motivation level, and a total score of less than 27 (below scale 3 of each item) reflects a low level of motivation.

## Results

*Research Question 1: How Effective is the English-Only Policy Classroom on Secondary School Students' Speaking Fluency?*

The first research question examines the effectiveness of the English-only policy classroom on secondary school students' fluency in speaking English.

Table 1: Comparison of Pre-Test Score

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Pre-test Experimental Group (Wpm)</b>	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Pre-test Control Group (Wpm)</b>
<b>1</b>	82	<b>11</b>	105
<b>2</b>	60	<b>12</b>	76
<b>3</b>	47	<b>13</b>	74
<b>4</b>	86	<b>14</b>	22
<b>5</b>	73	<b>15</b>	38
<b>6</b>	61	<b>16</b>	20
<b>7</b>	126	<b>17</b>	63
<b>8</b>	102	<b>18</b>	41
<b>9</b>	100	<b>19</b>	66
<b>10</b>	72	<b>20</b>	38
<b>Total</b>	809	<b>Total</b>	543
<b>Mean</b>	80.90	<b>Mean</b>	54.30

Table 2: Difference between Experimental and Control Group (Pre-test)

<b>Total Words</b>	<b>Experimental Group</b>	<b>Control Group</b>
------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------

	(No of Participants)	Percent (%)	(No of Participants)	Percent (%)
Below 68	3	30 %	7	70 %
Above 68	7	70 %	3	30 %

Table 1 and 2 show the comparison of mean values and the differences between the experimental and control groups in the pre-test. Based on Table 1, the mean score of the experimental group in the pre-test is 80.90, while the mean score of the control group is 54.30. It can be seen that there is a distinct difference of mean results between both groups. Even though the students were selected based on their recent English examination results, the assessment was solely tested on reading and writing skills. Thus, it is an inaccurate indicator of their speaking skills which led to differences of mean value. As shown in Table 2, only 30% of the students produced less than 68 words per minute in the pre-speaking test, while the other 70% achieved above 68 words in the experimental group. This is opposed to the control group as 70% of them achieved less than 68 words.

A post-test was conducted after one-month implementation of the English-only policy in the experimental group to identify its influence on students' speaking fluency.

Table 3: Comparison of Post-Test Score

Participants	Post-test Experimental Group (Wpm)	Participants	Post-test Control Group (Wpm)
1	89	11	103
2	72	12	48
3	62	13	75
4	91	14	34
5	79	15	60
6	41	16	24
7	131	17	74
8	84	18	38
9	93	19	60
10	99	20	45
Total	841	Total	561
Mean	84.10	Mean	56.10

Table 4: Difference between Experimental and Control Group (Post-test)

Total Words	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	(No of Participants)	Percent (%)	(No of Participants)	Percent (%)
Below 68	2	20 %	7	70 %
Above 68	8	80 %	3	30 %

Table 3 and 4 show a comparison of mean values and difference between the experimental and control group in the post-test. Table 3 and 4 illustrate a slight change in the post-test results. There

is an increase of mean value in the experimental group from 80.90 to 84.10 and in the control group from 54.30 to 56.10. Apart from that, only 20% of students in the experimental group achieved below 68.

Table 5: Mean Difference between Experimental Group and Control Group

	<b>Experimental Group</b>	<b>Control Group</b>
<b>Pre Test</b>	80.90	54.30
<b>Post Test</b>	84.10	56.10
<b>Differences</b>	3.20	1.80

Table 5 shows the mean difference between the experimental and control group. Table 5 demonstrates that there is a 3.20 difference between pre-test and post-test mean value in the experimental group, whereas 1.80 difference in the control group. The differences indicate that the English-only policy in the experimental group is effective on students' speaking fluency. This is because it shows greater improvement from pre-test to post-test mean scores as compared to in the control group.

*Research Question 2: What is the Level of Motivation of Students to Speak the English Language in an English-Only Policy Classroom?*

The second research question determines the motivation levels of students in the English-only policy lesson.

Table 6: Motivation Level of Experimental Group and Control Group in Speaking English in English-only policy lesson

<b>Motivation level in speaking English</b>	<b>Experimental Group</b>		<b>Control Group</b>	
	<b>Number of respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Number of respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Low level of motivation in speaking English (total score of less than 27)	0	0	0	0
Moderate level of motivation in speaking English (total score between 27 and 36)	7	70	5	50
High level of motivation in speaking English (total score of more than 36)	3	30	5	50
<b>Total</b>	10	100	10	100

Table 6 shows the levels of motivation of the experimental and control group to speak the English language in an English-only policy lesson. Based on Table 6, most students in the experimental group scored between 27 and 36 which signify that 70% of them have a moderate level of motivation. Meanwhile, the other 30% of the students demonstrate a high level of motivation with a total score of above 36. Apart from that, students in the control group illustrate equal distribution

in moderate and high motivation level with 50% each. Besides, the results reveal that the students do not experience low motivation level in English-only policy lessons as 0% of them in both groups scored below 27.

Table 7: Overall Motivation Level in Speaking English in English-only policy lesson

Motivation level in speaking English	Number of respondents	Percentage
Low level of motivation in speaking English (total score of less than 27)	0	0
Moderate level of motivation in speaking English (total score between 27 and 36)	12	60
High level of motivation in speaking English (total score of more than 36)	8	40
<b>Total</b>	20	100

Table 7 shows the overall levels of motivation to speak in the English language in an English-only policy lesson. The results reveal that most students scored between 27 and 36 which indicates that 60% of the students have a moderate level of motivation in speaking in the English language. In addition, less than half of the students scored more than 36 which makes 40% of the students experience a high level of motivation in speaking the English language. Surprisingly, 0% of the students scored less than 27 out of 45 which reflects that none of the students has a low motivation level in speaking the English language in an English-only policy lesson.

## Discussion

The findings revealed that the respondents in the experimental group have higher proficiency after the implementation of the English-only policy as compared to the respondents in the control group. This is supported by findings in Ekawati (2014) and Sa'd and Qadermazi (2015) in which they found that the learners in class which had English as the only medium of instruction had higher English proficiency than those in the class that tolerated L1 presence. This is because several learners believed that when they had better exposure to the targeted language, they would feel complacent speaking in English. Hence, it leads to better proficiency.

As for the second research question, the respondents have a moderate to high motivation level to speak in the English language in an English-only policy lesson. This is supported by a previous study that found the university students felt motivated to learn to speak in English in the environment under the university English as a medium of instruction (EMI) policy (Kim, 2016). Also, it is found that the control group is more motivated than the experimental group. The finding contradicts Atli and Ozal (2017) that shows the full EMI group has the strongest motivational intensity compared to the other groups without full EMI. This is because students feel uncomfortable and anxious under the English-only policy environment as allowing students and instructors to choose the first language to communicate seems to lower students' anxiety, thus creating an encouraging atmosphere (Berger, 2011). Additionally, Calosor et al. (2020) stated that the English-only policy classroom negatively influences students' emotional security, self-worth, self-confidence and interest. It also causes anxiety while speaking and fear of judgement which indirectly leads to low motivation level.

Besides, as the English-only policy was not implemented in the control group, the respondents were more acceptive of and composed than the experimental group. This is because of the positive perceptions that most students have towards the English-only policy (Calosor et al., 2020; Manty & Shah, 2017; Ekawati, 2014). Students believe that the English-only policy provides wider exposure to the English language and advances speaking skills (Sa'd and Qadermazi, 2015).

Another interesting finding shows that even though the experimental group had a lower motivation level due to feeling anxious and uncomfortable in speaking the English language, they showed a better improvement of proficiency than the control group. This contradicts Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis in which SLA takes place significantly with a high affective filter; low anxiety level, high motivation and high self-confidence. As supported by Nath et al. (2017), the other factors – anxiety and self-confidence – are possible to impede the learner's acquisition process. Thus, a high motivation level may not lead to the advancement of proficiency.

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the English-only policy is effective in improving students' speaking fluency in the English language. Besides, the respondents have a moderate to high level of motivation in English-only policy lessons. Nonetheless, the respondents in the experimental group have a slightly lower motivation level which is due to a lack of self-esteem and fear of judgement.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, applying the functional approach in English language lessons enhances comprehensive students' speaking proficiency, particularly in speaking fluency. It is probably due to its main focus which is communicative functions. For instance, the teaching approach utilised in the study, which is the English-only policy, exposes students to the target language through frequent and continuous verbal use of the language in the classroom which contributes to improvement in speaking fluency. However, in the psychology context, teaching approaches can be selected based on students' motivation level to promote exceptional language acquisition. Thus, educators play a fundamental role in determining applicable teaching approaches in English language lessons as long as it caters their students' needs.

The future researcher may consider taking respondents from different levels of proficiency. This is because different levels of proficiency may yield different findings and results and give a better reflection of students' fluency and motivation level. However, the levels of proficiency are only relevant to advanced and intermediate students only as it is impossible to use English-only policy in weak classes. Apart from that, the future researcher may increase the sample size to avoid major differences between the mean values of groups and to ensure high validity and reliability of data. Furthermore, as this study only measures one element in fluency, which is words per minute, it is recommended for future research to measure the other elements in fluency to achieve thorough speaking fluency measurement. Lastly, a survey on factors contributing to students' motivation level can be conducted to identify other possible reasons that affect motivation in language learning.

## References

- Abukhattala, I. (2013). Krashen's Five Proposals on Language Learning: Are They Valid in Libyan EFL Classes. *English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 128-131.
- Andrew, A. (2017). English Medium Instructions on English Language Proficiency. *Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*, 4(4), 1-10.
- Atli, I. & Özal, D. (2017). Does English Medium Instruction (EMI) Make a Difference on Student Motivation? *Journal of Language Research (JLR)*, 1(1), 25-36.
- Albakri, S. (2017). Effects of English medium instruction on students' learning experiences and quality of education in content courses in a public college in Oman: A thesis in *TESOL (doctorate's thesis)*. University of Exeter, UK.
- Bahrani, T., Tam, S. S. & Nekoueizadeh, M. (2014). Second Language Acquisition in Informal Setting. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(8), 1714-1723.
- Berger, M. (2011). English-only policy for all? Case of a university English class in Japan. *Polyglossia*, 20, 27-43.
- Brown, H. D. 2004. *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Butler, Y. (2004). What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain to teach EFL?: Case studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(2), 245-278.
- Calosor, M., Clarito, H., Alzaga, S., Rosca, A. & San Jose, S. (2020). *Teachers and Students Perception in English Only Policy. ST Gregory College Of Valenzuela*: A thesis in strand general academic strand. St Gregory College of Valenzuela, Valenzuela.
- Chapple, J. (2015). Teaching in English is not necessarily the teaching of English. *International Education Studies*, 8(3), 1-13.
- Ekawati, S.M. (2014). Students attitude toward monolingual approach in English classes at SMA Lab Salatiga: A thesis in English Language Education (master's thesis). Satya Wacana Christian University, Salatiga, Indonesia.
- Fareed, M., S. Humayun, & H. Akhtar. (2016). English language teachers' code-switching in class: ESL learners' perceptions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 1-11.
- Krashen, S. (2009). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Inc.
- Kim, E. G, Kweon, S. & Kim, J. (2016). Korean engineering students' perceptions of English-medium instruction (EMI) and L1 use in EMI classes. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(2), 130-145.
- Kim, S. Y. (2008) Five years of teaching English through English: Responses from teachers and prospects for learners. *English Teaching*, 63(1), 51-70.
- Kim, S. Y. (2002). Teachers' perceptions about teaching English through English. *English Teaching*, 57(1), 131-148.

- Manty, M. & Shah, P.M.(2017). Students' Perception: Reasons and Opinions on the Use of First Language in English Classrooms. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 90-96.
- Mareva, R. (2016). Learners' code-switching in English as a Second Language (ESL) lessons: perspectives of four secondary school teachers in Zimbabwe. *IRA International Journal of Education and Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(1), 71-90.
- Mohamed, A. R., & Wahid, N. D. (2009). Anxiety and Speaking English as a second language among male and female business students in university Industry Selangor. *Segi Review*, 2(2), 65-84.
- Musa, N.C., & Koo, Y. L. & Azman, H. (2012). Exploring English Language Learning and Teaching In Malaysia. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 12(1) - 35-51.
- Nath, P. R., Mohamad, M., & Yamat, H. (2017). The Effects of Movies on the Affective Filter and English Acquisition of Low-Achieving English Learners. *Creative Education*, 8(8), 1357-1378.
- Nursanti, Y. (2016). Students' Perception of Teacher's Bilingual Language Use in an English Classroom. *Journal of English and Education*, 4(1), 159-176.
- Pyo, K. H. (2009). The relationship between students' perceptions of teaching English through English and their achievement. *English Teaching*, 64(1), 95-108.
- Rahayu, D.I., & Margana. (2018). Comparing the Effects of L2-based with Code-switching-based Instruction on EFL Speaking Classes. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9(5), 946-942.
- Resmini, S. (2019). EFL Students' Perception towards the Use of Bahasa Indonesia in an English Classroom. *Eltin Journal, Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, 7(1), 12-22.
- Rianingsih, R. (2015). *The Teacher Strategies in Overcoming Students' Difficulties in Speaking at English Intensive Program of Ma An-Nur Cirebon: A thesis in Islamic Education in English Language Education (bachelor's thesis)*. IAIN Syekh Nurjati Cirebon, Indonesia.
- Rusli, R., Yunus, M.Y. & Hashim, H. (2018). Low speaking proficiency among the undergraduates: why and how? *E-prosiding persidangan antarabangsa Sains Sosial dan Kemanusiaan*, 678-689.
- Sa'd, S. H. T. & Qadermazi, Z. (2015). L1 use in EFL classes with English-Only policy: Insight from triangulated data. *CEPS Journal*, 5(2), 159-175.
- Salem, A.A.M. & Dyiar, M.A.A. (2014). The relationship between speaking anxiety and oral fluency of special education Arab learners of English. *Asian Social Science*, 10(12): 170-176.
- Shahini, G. & Shahamirian, F. (2017). Improving English Speaking Fluency: The Role of Six Factors. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(6), 100-104.
- Shvidko, E. (2018). Learners' attitudes toward "English-Only" institutional policies: Language use outside the classroom. *TESL Canada Journal*, 34(2), 25-48.
- Sibarani, C. (2019). Students' Perceptions of Teachers' Use of Bahasa Indonesia in the English

- Classroom. *JET (Journal of English Teaching)*, 5(3), 217-229.
- Stapa, S.H., & Majid, A.H.A. (2006). The use of a first language in limited proficiency classes: Good, bad or ugly. *Journal e-Bangi*, 1(1), 1-12.
- Sutarsyah, C. (2017). An Analysis of Student's Speaking Anxiety and Its Effect on Speaking Performance. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(2): 143-152.
- Tavakoli, P., Campbell, C., & McCormack, J. (2016). Development of speech fluency over a short period of time: Effects of pedagogic intervention. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50, 447-471.
- Toubot, A. M., & Seng, G. H. (2018). Examining Levels and Factors of Speaking Anxiety among EFL Libyan English Undergraduate Students. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 7(5), 47-56.
- Wang, H. & Mansouri, B. (2017). Revisiting Code-Switching Practice in TESOL: A Critical Perspective. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 26(1), 1-10.
- Wei, D. (2013). The implementation of English-only policy in the tertiary EFL context in Taiwan. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 187-198.