Vilnius University Press

Contents lists available at Vilnius University Press

Acta Paedagogica Vilnensia
2023, vol. 50, pp. 37–51

ISSN 1392-5016 eISSN 1648-665X
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15388/ActPaed.2023.50.3

Indonesian L2 Learners' CEFR-based Listening Proficiency: Interactions with Attitudes towards Teachers' Use of L1

Adaninggar Septi Subekti

Language Education Science Department at the Faculty of Languages and Arts
of Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
the Faculty of Education and Humanities, Universitas Kristen Duta Wacana, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
Scopus ID: 57202583019
ORCiD ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6641-0307
adaninggarsepti.2022@student.uny.ac.id,

Pratomo Widodo

Language Education Science Department at the Faculty of Languages and Arts
of Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
Scopus ID: 57205720918
pratomo@uny.ac.id

Erna Andriyanti

Language Education Science Department at the Faculty of Languages and
Arts of Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
Scopus ID: 57209566723
erna.andriyanti@uny.ac.id

Abstract. The present study was conducted to investigate Indonesian second/foreign language (L2) learners' self-rated CEFR-based listening proficiency (SR-CEFR-L) and the possible interaction with their attitudes towards teachers' use of learners' first language (L1), Indonesian, in English as L2 classes. 168 learners from non-English departments taking General English (GE) Levels 1, 2, and 3 participated in this survey study. Using the chi-square test of independence, this study found a significant difference among learners from different General English levels in their SR-CEFR-L, where the higher their GE levels the more likely they reported higher SR-CEFR-L. This study also found that generally, learners reported positive attitudes towards teachers' use of L1 in English classes. This study further found no significant association between learners' SR-CEFR-L and their attitudes towards teachers' use of L1, suggesting that regardless of how highly they rated their listening proficiency, learners generally preferred their teachers using Indonesian in teaching English. From the findings, implications are suggested along with possible contributions and suggested directions for future studies in the field.

Keywords: CEFR, self-rated CEFR-based listening proficiency (SR-CEFR-L), L1, L2, interactions

Received: 25/11/2022. **Accepted:** 01/02/2023

Indonezijos užsienio kalbos besimokančiųjų klausymo įgūdžiai pagal CEFR: sąveika su mokytojų požiūriu į indoneziečių kalbos vartojimą

Santrauka. Šis tyrimas atliktas siekiant ištirti Indonezijos antrosios (užsienio) kalbos (K2) besimokančiųjų savarankiškai vertinamą klausymo mokėjimą pagal CEFR (SR-CEFR-L) ir galimą sąveiką su jų požiūriu į mokytojų vartojamą besimokančiųjų pirmąją (indoneziečių) kalbą (K1) anglų kalbos kaip K2 pamokose. Tyrime dalyvavo 168 besimokantieji bendrosios anglų kalbos 1, 2 ir 3 lygiu iš ne anglų kalbos katedrų. Naudojant chi kvadrato nepriklausomumo testą, šiame tyrime nustatytas reikšmingas skirtumas tarp besimokančiųjų iš skirtingų bendrosios anglų kalbos lygių pagal SR-CEFR-L. Kuo aukštesnis bendrosios anglų kalbos lygis, tuo didesnė tikimybė, kad tiriamieji nurodė aukštesnį SR-CEFR-L. Šiame tyrime taip pat nustatyta, kad apskritai besimokantieji teigiamai vertino mokytojų K1 vartojimą anglų kalbos pamokose. Be to, šiame tyrime nenustatyta reikšmingo besimokančiųjų SR-CEFR-L ir jų požiūrio į mokytojų K1 vartojimą ryšio, o tai rodo, kad neatsižvelgiant į tai, kaip aukštai besimokantieji vertino savo klausymo įgūdžius, jie apskritai pageidavo, kad jų mokytojai, mokydami anglų kalbos, vartotų indoneziečių kalbą. Remiantis gautais rezultatais siūlomos išvados ir galimas indėlis bei būsimų šios srities tyrimų kryptys.
Pagrindiniai žodžiai: SR-CEFR-L, savarankiškai įvertintas klausymo mokėjimas pagal CEFR (SR-CEFR-L), užsienio kalbos mokymasis, sąveika

Introduction

Among four core activities in language learning – listening, reading, speaking, and writing – second/foreign language (L2) learners spend approximately 60% of their time reading, speaking, and writing whilst they spend 40% of their time listening (Loren et al., 2017), including listening to teachers' explanation in class. L2 listening is an intricate and complex process (Sumalinog, 2018; Vandergrift, 1999). Whilst listening, L2 learners unconsciously involve two processes called bottom-up processing and top-down processing (Chen, 2013; Flowerdew & Miller, 2005). Learners do bottom-up processing when they catch individual sounds and join them to form syllables and words. In turn, words are combined to form phrases and sentences (Gilakjani & Ahmadi, 2011). Simultaneously, learners do top-down processing as well. It is a process where learners use their background knowledge related to the listening context to decode meaning (Vandergrift, 2003).

Though theoretically, the simultaneous uses of both bottom-up and top-down processing lead to listening comprehension (Flowerdew & Miller, 2005), several factors could hamper it. For example, a high speech rate hindering learners to catch phonemes may hamper the bottom-up processing. L2 learners of English, for instance, mistake the sentence "I won't go to London" as "I want to go to London" (p. 364). Different levels of background knowledge between the speakers and the listeners could hamper the top-down processing. Generally, as L2 listening requires learners to discriminate sounds and identify vocabulary and grammar structures (Vandergrift, 1999), requiring them to be familiar with these aspects, listening poses challenges for L2 learners, hampering learners from improving their L2 listening proficiency.

Regarding this, among several worldwide language proficiency measures such as TOEFL, TOEIC, and IELTS, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) since its first publication (Council of Europe, 2001) has been emerging as a reference for language proficiency measurement in the last two decades. It is a

language-independent framework and employs an action-oriented approach (Negishi, 2012). The CEFR generally describes language ability in three broad categories: basic users, independent users, and proficient users. Each category consists of two sub-levels, A1 and A2 referring to basic users, B1 and B2 referring to independent users, as well as C1 and C2 referring to proficient users (Council of Europe, 2001). CEFR provides statements of what learners can do, known as "can-do statements" in each level for four language skills – listening, speaking, reading, and writing. An example of "can-do statements" in CEFR as found in the A2 level in the overall listening comprehension category reads "Can follow speech that is very slow and carefully articulated, with long pauses for him/her to assimilate meaning" (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 55). In 2018, CEFR is revised and among the revisions, there was the addition of Pre-A1 level due to the findings of subsequent studies after the initial publication of the CEFR in 2001 suggesting this need, for example, for learners beginning to study a language (Council of Europe, 2018).

The CEFR has become one of the most cited documents in language education worldwide as it has become a reference for instructions in various languages in Europe and beyond (Savski, 2021). For example, in several countries in Asia such as Japan, Thailand, Vietnam, and Malaysia, CEFR has been formally adopted with some modifications by their respective governments for use as an English language proficiency standard (Renandya et al., 2018). Thus, studies of the CEFR have been understandably quite widespread, for example, in Japan (Nagai & O'Dwyer, 2011; Negishi, 2012), Thailand (Anggoro & Nguyen, 2021; Foley, 2019; Franz & Teo, 2018; Waluyo, 2019), Vietnam (Ngo, 2017; Nguyen & Hamid, 2021), and Malaysia (Alih et al., 2021; Uri & Aziz, 2018). In the field of English language learning in Indonesia, in comparison, the CEFR has not gained currency, whereas as suggested in the 2021 English Proficiency Index data, Indonesia was ranked 80 out of 120 countries worldwide or 14 out of 24 countries in Asia, falling under "low proficiency band" (English Proficiency Index, 2022). Thus, using CEFR focusing on what learners can do in communication to assess Indonesian learners' English proficiency can be very strategic. Moreover, the CEFR also allows self-assessment (Glover, 2011). Glover (2011) in his study in Turkiye found that the CEFR descriptors in speaking helped raise his learner participants' awareness of their speaking skills as it provided them with a language to be used to describe their capabilities. Likewise, conducting a study where Indonesian English learners could self-assess their listening abilities using CEFR descriptors could potentially pave the way for further studies in the context where CEFR-related studies are generally still very rare, let alone in CEFR-based L2 listening.

Furthermore, L2 learners' listening abilities may greatly affect the comprehensible input, referring to input that is still understandable by learners, yet contains relevant linguistic evidence for the next step of learning or developmental sequence (Mitchell et al., 2013). For learning to optimally take place, the input should not be too simple or too complex (Mitchell et al., 2013). Concerning learners' listening abilities, teachers' speech when explaining the materials and the languages they use in giving explanations may play a part in affecting whether the input from the teachers is appropriate or too complex.

In a study in a Spanish as L2 learning context, DiCamilla and Anton (2012) reported that Spanish learners in their first year relied heavily on their first language/mother tongue (L1) to mediate performance whilst those in their fourth year used L2 much more frequently. Lewis et al. (2012) argued that teachers' use of learners' L1 can scaffold learners' understanding of the materials. However, Swain and Lapkin (2013) asserted that the use of L1 should not be random and should be purposeful, for instance, to provide the meaning of abstract vocabulary items as well as to illustrate some cross-linguistic comparisons. In line with that, a qualitative study involving Jordanian teachers of English by Algazo (2023) also reported that teachers used learners' L1, Arabic, for various purposes such as explaining difficult concepts and similarities between Arabic and English.

Several studies on the use of L1 in L2 classes have also been conducted in various L2 learning contexts with different L1s, for example, in the United States (US) (de la Fuente & Goldenberg, 2022), Germany (Wilden & Porsch, 2020), Turkiye (Ekmekci, 2018), Iran (Alimorad & Bidoki, 2021; Aminifard & Mehrpour, 2019), and Saudi Arabia (Tubayqi & Al Tale', 2021). The study by Aminifard and Mehrpour (2019) reported that teachers' excessive use of Farsi (learners' L1) in teaching young learners resulted in a lack of L2 input. In comparison, three experimental studies in different contexts (Alimorad & Bidoki, 2021; de la Fuente & Goldenberg, 2022; Wilden & Porsch, 2020) reported that experimental groups where learners' L1s were used for certain purposes in L2 classes outperformed the groups where only L2s were used, perhaps suggesting positive effects of purposeful uses of L1 are more common in literature.

This study

The present study seeks to answer the following research questions. Is there any significant difference among learners from different General English (GE) levels in their SR-CEFR-L? Is there any significant difference among learners with different SR-CEFR-L in their attitudes towards teachers' use of L1 in L2 instruction?

The aforementioned research objectives are formulated in light of the following rationales. First, as L2 proficiency is the main goal of L2 instruction (Moskovsky et al., 2016), it is important to see whether learners' GE levels contribute to their self-rating listening proficiency. Secondly, as several studies have suggested that the use of L1 in L2 classes could facilitate L2 learning, especially for the low achieving or beginner learners (DiCamilla & Anton, 2012; Subekti, 2018), it could be important to see whether learners' attitudes towards teachers' use of L1 differ based on their SR-CEFR-L. Intuitively speaking, the lower learners perceive their listening proficiency, the more positive their attitudes towards teachers' use of L1 to mediate their L2 learning. Furthermore, CEFR studies involving Indonesian L2 learners of English are generally still very rare (e.g.: Setyowati et al., 2022; Sulistyaningrum & Purnawati, 2021) and to the best of our knowledge, no study has been conducted to find the possible interactions between Indonesian L2 learners' CEFR-based listening proficiency and their attitudes towards the use of L1 in L2 classes, despite the potential. Hence, conducting quantitative studies in these fields in Indonesia, home to one of the largest L2 speakers of English in the world, may pave a way for further relevant studies.

Method

Research design and instruments

The present study used a quantitative design and employed a survey method where paper-based questionnaires in Indonesian, the participants' L1, were distributed. Each questionnaire set consisted of a consent form, a demographic information questionnaire, a questionnaire on learners' attitudes towards their teachers' use of L1, and the questionnaire on their SR-CEFR-L. The questionnaire on learners' attitudes towards their teachers' use of L1 consisted of four Likert-scale statements. In each statement, four responses were available, "Strongly agree", "Agree", "Disagree" and "Strongly disagree". The four statements in this questionnaire produced Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.74 and McDonald's omega coefficient of 0.74, both suggesting high internal reliability.

The questionnaire on SR-CEFR-L was adapted and translated from the original CEFR descriptors on overall listening comprehension (Council of Europe, 2018). This included pre-A1 level descriptors. An example of the statements in the questionnaire was "Can recognise concrete information (e.g. places and times) on familiar topics encountered in everyday life, provided it is delivered in slow and clear speech" (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 55). In total, there were fifteen "can do" statements representing the seven CEFR listening categories, from Pre-A1 up to C2. In each statement, there were two available responses, "Yes" and "No". From their responses, their SR-CEFR-L levels were obtained.

Setting and participants

The participants of this study were 168 learners taking General English (GE) Levels 1, 2, and 3 at a private university in Java, Indonesia in the first semester of the 2022/2023 academic year. From this number, 78 participants (46.43%) were females whilst 90 (53.57%) were males.

This study employed convenience sampling where data were collected from a conveniently available group of target participants (Dornyei, 2007; Gray, 2014). In this study, through the help of several GE class teachers, the questionnaires were distributed to learners of several GE classes in such a way that approximately the same number of participants from each of the GE levels was achieved. The targeted number of participants in each level was from 50 up to 60. At the time of the data collection, 900 learners were taking GE classes, 167 learners were taking GE Level 1, 408 taking GE Level 2, and 325 taking GE Level 3. From these numbers, eventually, 50 learners (29.8%) from Level 1, 62 learners (36.9%) from Level 2, and 56 learners (33.3%) from Level 3 participated in this study. The slight difference in number was mostly attributed to some learners' absences when the questionnaires were distributed in their classes. The mean of the participants' ages was 18.73 with 17 being the minimum and 23 being the maximum *(SD = 1.15).*

As background information, GE classes were noncredited classes, taken by learners from non-English departments at the university. At the time of their entrance to the uni-

versity, they took a placement test whose results determined whether they were in GE Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, or English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classes. The placement test was in the form of 70 multiple-choice items in the areas of listening, reading, and language use. Table 1 summarises the score range of each level.

Table 1. *The Score Range of the GE Placement Test*

Levels	Score Range
GE Level 1	0-29
GE Level 2	30- 44
GE Level 3	45-54
EAP class	55-70

Learners in the range of 0–29, for example, were placed in GE Level 1 and should pass the level before they could progress to GE Level 2, and eventually to GE Level 3. Each level needed to be completed minimum in a semester. It consisted of sixteen meetings, each of which was 150 minutes in duration and conducted once a week. Only after they passed GE Level 3, they could take the EAP classes, which were credited, in their respective departments.

The GE classes typically had such activities as pair-work discussions, small-group discussions, and role-plays. Typical assessments as seen from the course syllabi included writing infographics of project and business ideas, delivering presentations in groups, and making videos where learners explained their business ideas. Thus, unlike the placement test, the assessment types in the GE programmes were heavily open-ended.

Seen from the course objectives, GE Level 1 facilitated learners to be able to engage in basic English communications. GE Level 2 facilitated learners to be able to speak in public such as in group discussion and delivering presentations. Furthermore, GE Level 3 facilitated learners to be able to demonstrate their ability to present a business plan and their analysis of a social problem. CEFR was not formally used as a proficiency measurement in the programmes. However, the course objectives of GE Level 1 were approximately equal to A1-A2 of the CEFR Global Scale, those of GE Level 2 were equal to B1, whilst GE Level 3 were equal to B2. Since the GE classes were integrated classes, skills-specific course objectives, including those of listening, were not immediately visible from the class syllabi.

Ethical consideration

This study adhered to several ethical principles. First, the gatekeeper consent (Ramrathan et al., 2016) to distribute the questionnaires was obtained from the Head of the Language Centre managing the GE programmes. Secondly, a consent form was provided on the first page of the paper-based questionnaire set. It allowed the prospective participants to be informed of our identities, the objectives of this study, and their rights and responsibilities if they decided to participate (Gray, 2014). The participants could also with-

draw their participation at any time, suggesting the implementation of autonomy and voluntary participation (Israel & Hay, 2006; Vilma, 2018). Furthermore, little amount of time was required to complete the questionnaires, suggesting the implementation of beneficence and nonmaleficence in this study (Creswell, 2014).

Data analysis

After the questionnaire data were obtained from the GE class teachers helping distribute the paper-based questionnaires in their respective classes, the data were recorded in SPSS 25. All data were recorded in numerical forms. The responses to the Likert-scale questionnaire statements on attitudes towards the use of L1 were recorded as follows. The "Strongly agree" response was recorded as five points, "Agree" as four, "Disagree" as two, and "Strongly disagree" as one. The participants' responses on the Yes-No CEFR-based can-do statements on their listening proficiency determined their SR-CEFR-L levels. A nominal variable was recorded in SPSS where "1" indicated "Pre-A1", "2" indicated "A1", "3" indicated "A2", "4" indicated "B1", "5" indicated "B2", "6" indicated "C1", and "7" indicated "C2".

The chi-square tests were performed to answer the two research questions of this study. First, to answer the first question, a chi-square test was performed with two variables: GE levels and SR-CEFR-L. Then, to answer the second question, a chi-square test was performed with two variables: learners' SR-CEFR-L and their attitudes towards teachers' use of L1.

Results

Is there any significant difference among learners from different General English levels in their self-rated CEFR-based listening proficiency (SR-CEFR-L)?

From cross-tabulation, the participants' SR-CEFR-L by their GE levels were obtained and the detailed results can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. *The Participants' SR-CEFR-L by GE Levels*

GE Levels	Pre A1	A1	A2	B1	Total
1	10	23	14	3	50
2	4	20	36	2	62
3	2	3	17	34	56
Total	**16**	**46**	**67**	**39**	**168**

From Table 2, it can be seen that among seven levels of SR-CEFR-L available in the questionnaire, only the first four levels were reported. 16 participants (9.5%) were in Pre-A1, 46 participants (27.4%) in A1, 67 participants (39.9%) in A2, and 39 participants (23.2%) in B1. This suggested that the participants' SR-CEFR-L was generally low,

ranging from pre-basic user level (Pre-A1) up to early independent user level (B1). Basic user levels, both A1 and A2, became the majority with 113 participants (67.26%), with 39 participants (23.22%) and 16 participants (9.52%) in B1 and Pre-A1 levels, respectively. It could also be seen that in each GE level, there were three different SR-CEFR-L levels. It suggested that each level consisted of learners with mixed abilities ranging from Pre-A1 where learners had not acquired a generative capacity, but relied on a repertoire or words and formulaic expressions, up to B1 level, or early proficient user level.

Furthermore, to find whether there was a significant difference among learners from the three levels of GE in their SR-CEFR-L, a chi-square test of independence was performed. It was found that there was a significant difference in SR-CEFR-L among learners from different GE levels, $\chi^2 (6, 168) = 84.41, p < 0.001$. Those in the upper GE levels tended to report higher SR-CEFR-L. As illustration, 33 learners (66%) from GE Level 1 were in A1 or lower, 36 learners (58%) from GE Level 2 in A2, and 34 learners (61%) from GE Level 3 in B1.

Despite these distinctive results, learners' performance was generally lagging behind the objectives stipulated in the syllabi. For example, the highest SR-CEFR-L in GE Level 3 was B1 whilst as suggested by the course syllabus, learners should have reached approximately B2. Furthermore, the majority of learners in GE Level 2 were in A1 and A2, whilst the course syllabus suggested they should have reached approximately B1. The point to take away is that even though there was a significant SR-CEFR-L difference among learners from different GE levels where learners of the upper GE levels tended to report higher SR-CEFR-L, their progress was slower than that required by the GE programmes.

Is there any significant difference among learners with different self-rated CEFR-based listening proficiency (SR-CEFR-L) in their attitudes towards teachers' use of L1 in L2 classes?

To be able to answer the aforementioned research question, the data on learners' attitudes towards teachers' use of L1 in L2 classes were obtained. Through descriptive statistics, this study found that from four questionnaire items with a 1–5 score range per item and a 4–20 score range for all four items, the composite mean score was 14.95 *(SD = 2.80)*. This suggested that generally, the learner participants reported positive attitudes towards teachers' use of L1 in English class. The detailed results can be seen in Table 3.

From Table 3, it was found that apart from item number four, the participants' responses in the first three items suggested highly positive attitudes indicated with agreement from 88.1%, 80.3%, and 91.7% of the participants in items one, two, and three, respectively. They generally supported the use of Indonesian to explain new vocabulary items, complex grammatical points, and difficult concepts in English classes. In comparison, as indicated in the fourth item, only 57.7% of the participants supported the use of Indonesian in giving instructions in English classes with the other 42.3% indicating their disagreement.

Table 3. *Learners' Attitudes towards Teachers' Use of L1 in L2 Classes*

No	Statements	Mean Scores	*SD*	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
1.	I like it better when my lecturers use Indonesian to explain new vocabulary items in English classes.	3.95	.84	19.6	68.50	11.30	.60
2.	I like it better when my lecturers use Indonesian to explain complex grammatical points.	3.70	.907	9.50	70.80	19.00	.60
3.	I like it better when my lecturers use Indonesian to explain difficult concepts or ideas in English classes.	4.10	.79	27.40	64.30	7.70	.60
4.	I like it better when my lecturers use Indonesian to give instructions in English classes.	3.20	1.15	8.30	49.40	38.70	3.60

Furthermore, to find whether there was a significant difference among learners with different SR-CEFR-L in their attitudes towards teachers' use of L1, a chi-square test was performed. Through the test, this study found that there was no significant difference in learners' attitudes towards the use of L1 attributed to their SR-CEFR-L, χ^2 *(39, 168) = 54.12, p > 0.05.* This finding suggested that learners' attitudes towards teachers' use of L1 barely had any interaction with their SR-CEFR-L. In other words, seen from learners' fairly positive attitudes towards the use of L1 in English class, regardless of how good they rated their L2 listening proficiency as measured with the CEFR descriptors, they tended to like it better when their teachers used Indonesian, their L1, in their English classes.

Discussion

The study found that learners' SR-CEFR-L was generally low, ranging from Pre-A1 up to B1 and that in each GE level, there were learners with Pre-A1, A1, A2, and B1, suggesting mixed abilities. The finding on the relatively low level of proficiency seemed to resonate with what Kirkpatrick (2007) asserted regarding English instruction in Indonesia. He mentioned that albeit being taught English for several years, Indonesian learners seemed to have limited English capability despite completing courses (Kirkpatrick, 2007). In non-English department contexts similar to the present study, studies in Saudi Arabia and Indonesia (Shah et al., 2013; Sulistiyo, 2016) reported findings that may help explain the relatively low level of proficiency among learners in the present study. In Saudi Arabia, Shah et al. (2013) reported that many learners took English classes for grades or for passing the classes as required in their curriculum with little or no motivation to

improve their proficiency. Similarly, a study by Sulistiyo (2016) in Indonesia reported that teaching English to learners from non-English departments was not a success story. Learners' exposure to English was largely confined to classroom use and even so some learners attending classes were not motivated enough to learn due to the English courses being compulsory (Sulistiyo, 2016). In line with that, in Turkiye, Karabiyik (2019) also reported low engagement among L2 learners taking intensive English programmes conducted by the Preparatory Language School at the university. These aforementioned studies could give some kind of explanation why despite the levelling up in their GE programmes, the learner participants' proficiency did not seem to progress much.

This study also found diverse SR-CEFR-L levels in the same GE levels. This diversity could be attributed to several possible factors. First, a semester duration of each GE level with very limited English exposure outside the class may be barely sufficient to help improve the proficiency of some learners starting the GE programmes from GE Level 1, indicating low achievement in the placement test. This factor may have been combined with types of assessment making it possible for some learners to pass the level despite little improvement in L2 proficiency. Such assessment types as group projects whilst often reported to promote collaboration may also make it possible for some learners to 'hide' themselves behind more able peers (Subekti, 2018), allowing them to obtain credit, including grades, more than their due. The issue of mixed-ability learners may not be unique to this Indonesian context. The same issue was also reported in Korea (Smith, 2019) and United Arab Emirates (Zakarneh et al., 2020). English teachers in the study by Zakarneh et al. (2020) reported that managing mixed-ability classes poses challenges such as maintaining learners' interest and selecting materials with the right amount of challenge. The diversity may further hamper learners' learning progress which, as evidenced by the finding, was already slow.

Furthermore, it was found that there was a significant difference in SR-CEFR-L among learners from different GE levels where the higher their level, the higher their SR-CEFR-L. This suggested that as learners passed GE levels, they were more confident with their L2 listening proficiency, evidenced by higher self-rating, albeit the majority being in the basic user levels. This finding may suggest that GE levels, despite perhaps slowly, could successfully improve learners' L2 listening proficiency. This may be attributed to constant exposure to English, albeit limited to one session a week, through teachers' instructions, audio-visual materials, and communicative activities necessitating them to sharpen their listening skills. This finding may also imply that contrary to the findings of several studies suggesting that generally, learners from the non-English department were generally low achieving (Shah et al., 2013; Sulistiyo, 2016), as far as the present study was concerned, they learned, albeit slowly.

Nevertheless, as far as GE programmes are concerned, seen from learners' SR-CEFR-L levels which were generally lower than the expected proficiency stipulated in the course syllabi, the design of programmes may need to be evaluated. That is because the results may suggest that some learners had passed GE levels regardless of not meeting the course objectives. Those involved in the programmes may approach the issue

through evaluating the types of assessment and ensure they can measure learners' individual performances. They may also need to balance the English exposure learners obtain in the programmes with the learning objectives. Rather than having 'wishful' learning objectives in the syllabi, they perhaps need to determine learning objectives actually feasible to be optimally achieved in the programmes.

Moreover, this study also found that generally, learners favoured teachers' use of Indonesian to explain new vocabulary items, difficult concepts and complex grammatical points. These findings may be closely related to their generally low SR-CEFR-L with the majority being at basic user levels. Lewis et al. (2012) asserted that teachers' use of L1 in L2 classes can serve as a scaffolding for helping low-proficient learners in the learning process. Regarding this, teacher participants in a qualitative study in Indonesia by Subekti (2018), for example, acknowledged that when they switched their explanations from English to Indonesian, they could see some learners were more relaxed and less tense in class. However, Swain and Lapkin (2013) asserted that the use of L1 should be purposeful, for instance, to illustrate cross-linguistic comparison and abstract vocabulary items and should not be random. That may explain why 42.3% of the participants disagreed with teachers' use of Indonesian in giving instructions. They may have considered teachers' instructions delivered in English quite understandable for them and as such, they may not see the need for their teachers to use Indonesian instead. Besides, if teachers' instructions were also delivered in Indonesian, they may have even less exposure to English during the GE classes. In this case, teachers should continually assess their practices to maintain comprehensible input for learners. This includes whether to use L2, including the pace of the delivery and the dictions used or use learners' L1 for certain purposes. That is because, as Mitchell et al. (2013) asserted, for optimal learning, the input should be comprehensible for learners, not too simple and not too complex.

Next, this study found that there was no interaction between learners' SR-CEFR-L and their attitudes towards teachers' use of L1. DiCamilla and Anton (2012) in a Spanish as L2 context in the US found that L2 learners of Spanish used less L1 (English) as they progressed in their study. In this respect, the participants of the present study and those of the study by DiCamilla and Anton (2012) could have different attitudes towards the use of L1. American learners of Spanish may have more exposure to Spanish outside class, for example, through interactions with Hispanic friends. Besides, the country shares a direct border with Mexico whose population speaks Spanish. In comparison, for learners in the present study, the English class sessions were very probably the only opportunity they had to get intensive English exposure. Hence, they may not see the immediate advantage of their English mastery in daily life.

Learners' generally positive attitude towards the use of Indonesian by their English teachers regardless of their SR-CEFR-L could also be explained on a more positive note. The majority of them, 129 of 168 participants, were in pre-basic and basic user levels whilst the other 39 rated themselves to be in the early proficient user level. These participants' levels may explain why they preferred their teachers to use Indonesian in English classes. They may find it difficult to understand, for example, difficult concepts, new

vocabulary items and complex grammatical points if delivered in full English. Regarding this, a qualitative study involving Jordanian teachers of English by Algazo (2023) reported that teachers used learners' L1, Arabic, for various purposes such as explaining difficult concepts and similarities between Arabic and English. This kind of conformity between learners' attitudes towards L1 use in the present study and teachers' views in the study by Algazo (2023) may suggest that in L2 learning, the role of L1 may be very difficult to deny, especially when both learners and teachers shared it (Sali, 2014). Besides, a recent experimental study in the US by de la Fuente and Goldenberg (2022) reported that the L2 proficiency of learners in the experimental group taught using the combination of Spanish (L2) and English (L1) improved significantly higher than that in the group taught solely using learners' L2. Hence, rather than denying its existence, teachers could use their shared L1 for optimal L2 learning by continually exercising when, how, to whom, and for what purpose they use L1.

Conclusion

In summary, several main findings of this study can be highlighted. The study found that there was a significant difference among learner participants from the three levels of GE in their SR-CEFR-L, indicating that the higher their GE level, the higher they tended to rate their listening proficiency. Furthermore, this study found that there was no significant difference among learners with different SR-CEFR-L levels in their attitudes towards teachers' use of L1 in L2 classes. It suggested that regardless of how high (or low) they rated their L2 listening proficiency, they generally preferred their teachers to use Indonesian in teaching in English classes.

The following are the possible limitations of this study. First, the learner participants may not be very familiar with the CEFR self-descriptors considering the GE programmes did not implement CEFR in its curricula. To a certain extent, this may compromise the quality of the data on SR-CEFR-L considering that the participants may have read such statements for the first time when they participated in this study. Second, the self-report nature of the CEFR listening proficiency variable in this study may have been bound to have an obvious weakness of overestimation or underestimation of one's real L2 listening proficiency.

Notwithstanding the aforementioned limitations, the present study contributes to the exploration of L2 learners' CEFR-based listening proficiency and the possible interaction with their attitudes towards the use of L1 in English classes in a relatively under-researched Indonesian context. This study despite being quantitative involved a rather limited number of participants from a university. That being said and considering that such studies in the Indonesian context are still relatively scarce, the findings of this study could be considered with caution and treated as an exploration warranting further investigations involving more participants. Despite that, this study could pave the way for further investigations in the field of CEFR in English instruction in Indonesia by giving an early 'picture' to be further confirmed or contested by future researchers with more thorough investigations.

Lastly, pedagogical implications can be suggested. Learners reported positive attitudes towards teachers' use of Indonesian in English classes regardless of their SR-CEFR-L, including B1 indicating an independent user. In the case of low-proficient learners, the intelligibility issue seemed to be the case. However, some B1 level learners could have preferred the use of Indonesian because it was much easier to understand with minimum effort, indicating an unwillingness to exert optimum effort for learning. In this case, teachers should continually reflect on their day-to-day practices ensuring the right amount of challenge for learners considering (and, at times, despite) their preference.

References

Algazo, M. (2023). Functions of L1 use in the L2 classes: Jordanian EFL teachers' perspectives. *World Journal of English Language*, *13*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n1p1

Alih, N. A. C., Raof, A. H. A., & Yusof, M. A. M. (2021). Policy change implementation: The case of the CEFR in Malaysian ESL classrooms. *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, *6*(2), 296–317. https://doi.org/dx.doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol6iss2pp296-317

Alimorad, Z., & Bidoki, M. S. Z. (2021). The effect of using the native language as a pedagogic intervention on Iranian EFL learners' complexity of English oral productions. *Porta Linguarum*, 36, 83–99. https://doi.org/10.30827/PORTALIN.V0I36.15745

Aminifard, Y., & Mehrpour, S. (2019). Mother tongue use in young Iranian EFL learners' classroom: Helpful scaffold or debilitating crutch? *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, *19*(2), 77–85.

Anggoro, K. J., & Nguyen, A. N. (2021). Students' perceptions with different CEFR levels on foreign teachers using L1 in EFL instruction. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *8*(3), 1177–1193. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i3.19629

Chen, A. (2013). EFL listeners' strategy development and listening problems: A process-based study. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, *10*(3), 81–101.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press.

Council of Europe. (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, and assessment - Companion volume with new descriptors*. Council of Europe.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Sage Publications, Inc.

de la Fuente, M. J., & Goldenberg, C. (2022). Understanding the role of the first language (L1) in instructed second language acquisition (ISLA): Effects of using a principled approach to L1 in the beginner foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, *26*(5), 943–962. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820921882

DiCamilla, F. J., & Anton, M. (2012). Functions of L1 in the collaborative interaction of beginning and advanced second language learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 160–188.

Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics* (First edit). Oxford University Press.

Ekmekci, E. (2018). Target versus native language use in foreign language classes: Perspectives of students and instructors. *International Education Studies*, *11*(5), 74. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v11n5p74

English Proficiency Index. (2022). *The world's largest ranking of countries and regions by English skills: Based on test results of 2m adults in 112 countries & regions*. https://www.ef.sg/epi/

Flowerdew, J., & Miller, L. (2005). *Second language listening*. Cambridge University Press.

Foley, J. (2019). Issues on the initial impact of CEFR in Thailand and the region. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *9*(2), 359–370. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20233

Franz, J., & Teo, A. (2018). 'A2 is normal' – Thai secondary school English teachers' encounters with the CEFR. *RELC Journal*, *49*(3), 322–338. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217738816

Gilakjani, A. P., & Ahmadi, M. R. (2011). A study of factors affecting EFL learners' English listening comprehension and the strategies for improvement. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *2*(5), 977–988. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.5.977-988

Glover, P. (2011). Using CEFR level descriptors to raise university students' awareness of their speaking skills. *Language Awareness*, *20*(2), 121–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2011.555556

Gray, D. E. (2014). *Doing research in the real world* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications, Ltd.

Israel, M., & Hay, I. (2006). *Research ethics for social scientists*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Karabiyik, C. (Ufuk U. (2019). The relationship between student engagement and tertiary level English language learners ' achievement. *International Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, *6*(2), 281–293.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *18*(7), 655–670. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490

Loren, F. T. A., Andayani, A., & Setiawan, B. (2017). The use of learning media on listening skill in teaching Indonesian to speakers of other language (TISOL). *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, *11*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v11i1.7625

Mitchell, R., Myles, F., & Marsden, E. (2013). *Second language learning theories* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Moskovsky, C., Racheva, S., Assulaimani, T., & Harkins, J. (2016). The L2 motivational self system and L2 achievement: A study of Saudi EFL learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100, 1–14.

Nagai, N., & O'Dwyer, F. (2011). The actual and potential impacts of the CEFR on language education in Japan. *Synergies Europe*, 6, 141–152.

Negishi, M. (2012). The development of the CEFR-J: Where we are, where we are going. *New Prospects for Foreign Language Teaching in Higher Education*, 3, 105–116.

Ngo, X. M. (2017). Diffusion of the CEFR among Vietnamese teachers: A mixed methods investigation. *Asian EFL Journal*, *19*(1), 7–32.

Nguyen, V. H., & Hamid, M. O. (2021). The CEFR as a national language policy in Vietnam: Insights from a sociogenetic analysis. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1715416

Ramrathan, L., Grange, L., & Shawa, L. B. (2016). Ethics in educational research. In *Education studies for initial teacher development* (pp. 432–443).

Renandya, W. A., Hamied, F. A., & Nurkamto, J. (2018). English language proficiency in Indonesia: Issues and prospects. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *15*(3), 618–629. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.3.4.618

Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System*, *42*, 308–318. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.021

Savski, K. (2021). CEFR as language policy: Opportunities and challenges for local agency in a global era. *The Malaysian English Language Teaching Association*, *50*(2021), 60–70. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.52696/AIDE2513

Setyowati, R., Setiawati, B., & Khurniawati, D. R. (2022). A study of English communicative competence at the tertiary level of education based on CEFR. *Frasa: English Literature and Education Journal*, *3*(1), 7–14.

Shah, S. A., Hussain, M. A., & Nasseef, O. A. (2013). Factors impacting EFL teaching: An exploratory study in the Saudi Arabian context. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, *4*(3), 104–123.

Smith, S. (2019). Foundations and frameworks for second language mixed- ability classes. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, *128*(08), 117–128. www.ajhssr.com

Subekti, A. S. (2018). An exploration of foreign language anxiety in the Indonesian university context: Learners' and teachers' voices. *TEFLIN Journal*, *29*(2), 219–244.

Sulistiyo, U. (2016). Learning English as a foreign language in an Indonesian university: A study of non-English department students' preferred activities inside and outside the classroom. *IJET*, *5*(1), 1–26.

Sulistyaningrum, S. D., & Purnawati, P. (2021). Incorporating CEFR bands and ICT-competences in grammar syllabuses of English Language Education Study Program in Indonesia. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *11*(2), 335–357. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v11i2.2863

Sumalinog, G. (2018). Listening anxiety in focus: The case of the foreign university students in the Philippines. *International Journal of Current Research*, *10*(7), 71366–71371. https://doi.org/10.24941/ijcr.31620.07.2018

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2013). A Vygotskian sociocultural perspective on immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *1*(1), 101–129. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.1.1.05swa

Tubayqi, K. A., & Al Tale', M. A. (2021). Mother tongue use in beginner EFL grammar classes in Saudi Arabia: A case study. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, *12*(December), 349–365. https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol12no4.23

Uri, N. F. M., & Aziz, M. S. A. (2018). Implementation of CEFR in Malaysia: Teachers' awareness and the challenges. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, *24*(3), 168–183. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2403-13

Vandergrift, L. (1999). Facilitating second language listening comprehension: Acquiring successful strategies. *ELT Journal*, *53*(3), 168–176.

Vandergrift, L. (2003). Orchestrating strategy use: Towards a model of the skilled L2 listener. *Language Learning*, *53*(3), 461–494. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00232

Vilma, Z. (2018). Implementing ethical principles in social research: Challenges, possibilities and limitations. *Vocational Training: Research And Realities*, *29*(1), 19–43. https://doi.org/10.2478/vtrr-2018-0003

Waluyo, B. (2019). Thai first-year university students' English proficiency on CEFR levels: A case study of Walailak University, Thailand. *The New English Teacher*, *13*(2), 51–71.

Wilden, E., & Porsch, R. (2020). Teachers' self-reported L1 and L2 use and self-assessed L2 proficiency in primary EFL education. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *10*(3), 631–655. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2020.10.3.9

Zakarneh, B., Ramahi, N. A., & Mahmoud, M. (2020). Challenges of teaching English language classes of slow and fast learners in the United Arab Emirates universities. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *9*(1), 256–269. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n1p256