

The English Language Teaching Approach and the Challenges presented by Myanmar ELT Teachers

Khin Su Su Win

Department of English, Mandalay University

Abstract: *“L1 use in the EFL classroom allows both teachers and learners to achieve some educational and occupational goals” (Enama, 2016). This study seeks to elucidate teachers' perceptions of the approaches and challenges they face in ELT domain in universities. An online semi-standardized interview was administered to assess their voices in the management of 29 novice university teachers from major cities and provinces who were appointed in 2015-2016. According to the findings of the study, the use of a bilingual approach in ELT corresponds to students' level of inequality. It is an effective tool for the teachers to reshape the learners' gap and to reduce the lethargic involvement of the trainees. According to the respondents, in ELT, they confront challenges such as time constraints, fixed course, and exam-oriented, insufficient teaching materials, deficiency of teaching pieces of training, pedagogical challenges, and class size mixed students' diverse linguistic level.*

Keywords: ELT, monolingual approaches, bilingual approach, confrontations, ELT teachers' opinions

1. Introduction

Quality of education largely depends on the quality of teachers (Thein Lwin, 2007). The successful of schooling reflects how it is viewed and accepted by the learners based on the teachers' teaching exhibitions. In the context of Myanmar English language teaching ELT, as English language is the second tongue for both teachers and learners, perhaps, both are likely to face some difficulties. Whether the teachers are novice or well-qualified, they might have to feel insecure regarding language proficiency or they might have self-doubting about the language used in ELT. Instead of how much the target language can be used fluently or how much English can be handled masterly, one of the things a person has to learn when he or she becomes a language teacher is what it means to a language teacher (Richards, 2011). To provide effective L2 for the learners, how to promote the teaching and learning process of second language L2 is taken into consideration around the globe. No one might be proficient in the second language like the native speakers as they have their mother tongue intelligibility and own identity (Canagarajah, 2001). However, language teachers should have a second language quality threshold to provide the effectively conducting the target language in ELT. That will assist to construct self-esteem, self-confidence for the novice teachers in ELT as well as for the qualified teachers.

Moreover, the teaching methods in English as a foreign/second language (EFL/ESL) classrooms are the key players to reflect the improvement of the second language L2 learners. How L2 is noticed by L2 learners and how well they master in L2 are highlighted through the mentors' effectively contributed approaches. Thus, in the present study, it will be researched into the main problems for the teachers in the Higher education of Myanmar English language teaching ELT context and will be investigated that using mother tongue L1 is the means to overcome or reduce their challenges. Because unless teachers contribute the understandably required language input, it will generate a lack of enthusiasm in learners' target language acquisition Krashen (1982).

2. Literature Review

In earlier studies, problematic situations somewhat affected in ELT are addressed as the contextually associated factors (Bax, 2003 and So & Watkins, 2005), different individual learners' background knowledge and linguistic diversity (McLaughlin, 1992, Futrell, Gomez, and Bedden 2003; Gándara), various cultures and traditions in a single country (McLaughlin 1992), class sizes with lots of learners (Büyükyavuz & İnal, 2008 and AL-Jarf, 2006), and mixed-level classrooms (Bekiryazici, 2014). "Large class sizes inhibit small group activities and individualized instruction, because of the noise level and lack of space in the classroom and due to the size of the class they do not have enough time to pay attention to each and give every student a chance to speak and participate " (AL-Jarf, 2006, p. 24). Mixed-level classrooms where learners are provided unequal assignments and activities by the teachers make the lower-level learners feel unmotivated and inferior (Bekiryazici, 2014). Moreover, significant lecturers' proper weakness in teaching methods and their educational expertise influence and affect the teachers' teaching process (McLaughlin, 1992).

Thus, challenging problems in ELT teachers have been discussing from a different point of aspects. The robust shreds of evidence for the ELT lecturers' difficulties reported by some scholars are teachers' academic convictions (Pajares, 1992), restricted materials for ELT like curriculum, syllabuses, theoretical-based pedagogies rather than practical. (Raimes, 2002 and Hu, 2003), feeble administration in the lecture hall (Freeman & Richards, 1993), and insufficient time for preparation of the tasks (Renandya & Jocabs, 2002).

In a study performed by (Khong and Saito, 2014), the major challenges for teachers are the learners' massive heritage and habits as well as different language-producing backgrounds based on the US context. They found that concerning the works of literatures the teachers use, community-based gap, conventional differences, and diverse personalities of a person are the barriers for the teachers. Moreover, they reported that the robust instructors'

academic strategies are exceptionally demanding to overcome these confrontations.

Another study by Solak and Bayar (2015) researched on the responses of the learners regarding learning English. What they reported from their study is that learners suggested materials using currently in ELT, teaching methods being employed by teachers, and professional developments of teachers like taking in-service pedagogy or schooling to brighten the qualities of teaching. Other research suggests that factors like visible teaching-learning circumstances, the trainees' considerations, and the trainers' aspects are associated with the EFL teachers' struggling (Lap and Thy, 2017).

Similarly, barriers faced by the teachers are rendered approaches they use as well. For example, Nguyen, Grainger, and Carey (2016) investigated the difficulties currently meeting based on the approaches in teaching. In their study, they reported that monolingual teaching methods create more obstacles for the teachers and learners rather than using bilingual strategy in the teaching-learning process. Besides, they mentioned that apart from formal teaching and learning, jokes and small talk in the learners' first language can establish responsive class and helpful communication among the learners and educators. Moreover, the use of the L1 can build an atmosphere of confidence and friendship in the classroom as well as can develop harmony and cooperation and provide learners with feelings of security and self-confidence that motivate them and make them feel more comfortable (Peregoy & Boyle, 2013; Balosa, 2006, p.31).

Language acquisition and learner's attitudes regarding L2 are positively affected by the proper use of L1 because explaining in the awkward locution (Strohmeier and McGail, 1988; Garcia, 1991, cited in Auerbach, 1993). Moreover, they highlighted that L1 is a helpful media that facilitates the learners' language acquisition as well as negotiates their target language. Even though the L2 learners should have much exposure to L2, understanding what teachers are addressing to them is a necessary step (Enama, 2016). Due to the language barrier, L1 used in ELT is supportive and helpful for the teachers in the achievement of the teaching and learning process. Educators who view students with a deficit in their ability to think and learn are generally proponents of monolingual or all-English education programs (Smith, 1992). Thus, Butzkamm (2003, p.31) articulates the position that "The mother tongue is the master key to foreign languages, the tool which gives us the fastest, surest, most precise and most complete means of accessing a foreign language".

Looking into the studies focusing on the English-only or Monolingual approach in EFL/ESL teaching, many scholars pointed out the advantages as well as disadvantages. Butzkamm (2003) argued that employing the mother tongue systematically in L2 pedagogy had been discouraged and practically abandoned over the course of the twentieth century. For example, in Korea, although a policy of "Teaching English in English (TEE)" proposed by the Korean Ministry of Education (2000) seems to meet the parents' expectations for a higher quality of English

education, TEE method did not completely persuade the young EFL learners to get the achievement in target language acquisition. Thus, Lee (2012), based on findings, suggested that an English-only approach delivered via one English variety is neither a learner-favored one nor a cutting-edge teaching method.

On top of this, some studies highlighted logically some issues concerning the monolingual approach in ELT. Mehisto, Marsh & Frigols (2008) stated that as a medium of instruction and learning for specialized subjects, L2 is supposed to be used in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). However, Newman (2014) argued that code-switching to the first language L1 can work as an aid to the learning of both the subject contents and the second language learning. Without involving L1, CLIL cannot be an effective approach in ELT. The other monolingual approach-Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) might not be applicable in some contexts (Nguyen, et al., 2016) because it is transferred from the Western contexts (Bax, 2003 & Littlewood, 2007). Moreover, the use of the first language is strictly banned in the CLT approach and for the authentic L2 conversation, both teachers and learners must have enough horizons regarding grammatical, lexical and phonological rules.

Likewise, in Cambodia, for the English Language Teaching ELT education, a four-year English-medium instruction EMI program has been using to fulfill the development of ELT on one hand and on the other hand, challenges such as vocabulary, language-oriented instruction from the teachers render the learners less achieve learning outcomes in the empirical teaching (Keuk & Tith, 2013).

Even though the monolingual policy for the conversational English area has been utilized in Japan, the mother tongue can be a helpful tool in saving precious time for both teachers and students as well as can be a key language to create students' anxiety and reduce slow progress in language learning. (Shimizu, 2006). Moreover, the classroom environment is the most crucial place in ELT. If the use of L1 provides a dynamic and energetic area for the learners to get exposure to the second language, using L1 makes L2 succeed.

Based on the previous studies mentioned above, the fact what the writer thought was that what physical factors like classroom supervision, limited courses can make difficulties in the context of Myanmar ELT. On top of this, schoolteachers are also responsible ones who can upgrade the quality of Myanmar education. The better qualifications in their hands, the less degrading will be in the schooling. Thus, what kind of challenges for the mentors in the schooling would be was also the other crucial factor that appeared in the writer. Besides, it is noted that the monolingual approach in ELT did not show the overt achievement in the earlier papers, but it could be a language tool to advocate somewhat in second language acquisition. Moreover, fewer or no studies regarding the approaches used by Myanmar university teachers and the challenges they face in ELT have not been conducted yet. The difficulties currently confronted by ELT lectures in Myanmar context, however, have been very heavily studied

by (Soe, 2015). What she reported that in Myanmar, the local educators and the authority persons necessitate rethinking of the pedagogy in ELT to boost the education system as well as to rework the finances for teachers furnished by a government grant in the educational sector since difficulties found in ELT are associated with all these facts. The following questions inspired by Soe (2015) and motivated by the facts discussed above came out to pinpoint the educational needs and difficulties in ELT.

- 1) What are the current approaches used by Myanmar university teachers in ELT context?
- 2) What are the hardships faced by Myanmar university teachers in the ELT context?
- 3) Does the current approach used by Myanmar university teachers in the ELT also greatly reduce the teachers' challenges in the ELT context?

3. Methodology

(a) Participants

29 participants (4 males and 25 females) from different universities were asked the created questionnaire. Only 8 respondents are from the universities in the city but the rest from the provinces. They all are under 30 years old and they are 2015-16 new appointees from the Higher Education section as well. They all belong to the same experiences regarding teaching in this field and, Master degrees are owned as the educational backgrounds. They all were provided with the training requirement for ELT in Yangon for two months after being appointed. The only different situation between them is that they all are assigned to the different universities in Myanmar.

(b) Instrument

In this paper, a two-component questionnaire was constructed based on the subjective theories developed by (Scheele and Groeben, 1988). According to them, this approach can be applied in the school field or the professional place to design the semi-standardized interview. In the first part, the personal profiles of the respondents were included and in the second section, theory-driven questions, hypotheses-directed questions, and open questions were designed to know the answers to the research questions. As all the participants are from the English department, the questions were created in English.

(c) Data collection

For the approaches currently used by the mentors in the Myanmar ELT context and the challenges facing by teachers in the teaching and learning process in L2, an online interview was implemented for this study. A semi-standardized interview questions were delivered through the email as well as via Facebook messenger to all the participants. All the participants replied the written answers in English in the provided space in the interview questions, there is no need to do transcription.

(d) Data analysis

The Phenomenological life-world analysis was also applied for the data analysis. The general purpose of the life-world analysis is to analyze the understanding of meaning. The reason for using this analysis is that a methodological basis to analyze the process of meaning-creation and meaning-

interpretation involves in the phenomenological analysis (Schutz, 1983). Initially, words and phrases were used for the purpose of data analysis and hence each response was technically coded to identify phrases or words. The Vivo Coding was then used to refine the analysis for this study. First, the codes for taking note writing were created to separate the code from the original data, and then the text sections were selected to compare text fragments for note writing. After integrating the code and adding notes to the code, the main category was developed.

4. Discussion and Results

(a) The monolingual or bilingual approach in ELT in the educational context of Myanmar

With the language tools in Myanmar, the bilingual or monolingual approaches used by the teachers in ELT may be diverse based on where the students come from, what their educational levels are, and in which universities the educators are being assigned. Listening to the voices of Myanmar ELT teachers, the bilingual approach was mostly used in language teaching. However, as the language teachers, some of them wanted to use only the English language within the period of teaching on one hand and the other hand, some complained that why they switch from L1 to L2 in teaching was because it could provide the learners with clarifying explaining. In addition, the use of L1 copes with the learners' comprehensible skill in relation to L2 and makes the learners' current level of language competence increase as in L1 contain language features and knowledge ahead of their present level (Krashen, 1982). In the second language teaching-learning process, language switch is inevitable as it appears naturally in teaching and for the weaker learners, it is the best tool in demonstrating cultural terms or unfamiliar literacy challenging (Ferguson, 2003).

Moreover, as the official language policy for foreign language teaching in Myanmar has not been issued yet, the lack of it makes teachers, trainers, and educators use of mother tongue. This is one more point to use bilingual as there is no language policy for ELT yet. Regarding code-switching (CS), the type of the majority CS used by the lecturers in Myanmar is the Inter-sentential alternation use of L1 and L2. They don't apply intra-sentential code-switching very often. This is because they are not accustomed to the latter one in ELT. Noted that teachers in Myanmar can use the former type fluently.

Interestingly, the voices from the teachers of the universities in the city and the universities in the provinces had opposite replies regarding the bilingual approach in ELT. The educators from the cities told that they speak L2 mostly in ELT as the students can catch L2 on one hand and different situation for the teachers from the district universities on the other hand. In this situation, for the latter, only classroom language was employed in ELT rather than explaining the lessons with L2 mostly. Thus, the arguments between the teachers who want to apply the monolingual approach and those who want to employ a bilingual approach in ELT create a dual condition according to their answers. However, all the participants are applying the bilingual approach in ELT now on the report of the gathering data. The appropriate and useful teaching model in ELT depends on

the mentors as they are the ones who know their language competence as well as the learners' level in the practical field. Whether bilingual or monolingual for local students, it is used based on a realistic situation rather than focusing on language fluency (Grosjean, 2010).

To make a summary of this, it is noted that the students' language outcomes from the provinces are not the same as the learners from the city. The less exposure to the target language affects the students' language performance and competence. The possible problem for this will be discussed in the following section. This is not because of the bilingual approach but because of the different physical development in the city and the region, and also available outside learning resources. Nowadays, as resources for L2 are easily accessible for the passionate L2 learners, some students with obtained a high level of proficiency and fluency can be seen in the class (Soe, 2015). However, such kinds of learners are just only a minority in the environment of the universities. In the practical field, quality bilingual education provides students with knowledge and literacy in their first language, which indirectly but powerfully aids them as they strive for English proficiency Krashen (1997). The use of L1 in ELT not only makes the students comprehensible but also enrich the require knowledge provided for the target language. Even though the teachers know very well the learners' different outcomes, why did they apply the bilingual approach rather than using the monolingual approach in ELT and what are their purpose in this regard?

(b) Voices to use bilingual

In Myanmar, even though the students have been exposed to English since kindergarten, English has been teaching as a subject rather than not a language. English subject is introduced with the help of Myanmar language and mostly teacher-centered approach. Thus, it is found that the main challenges in English teaching were focusing on mostly theory-based rather than practice-based and generally teacher-centered rather than learner-centered Gökdemir (2010). Consequently, the students have less exposure to some skills such as speaking and listening. No doubt for reading and writing skills as the lessons including syntax, lexicon, and grammar have been learning since they were in the foundation class. In this way, at the higher educational level, teachers are exposed to the students with various language backgrounds in ELT classrooms.

Once the teachers from higher education educate the undergraduate students holding different language levels, they are likely to use inherently both L1 or/and L2 in ELT to cope with the language problems. What the respondents found was that using the second language in the entire lessons is impossible within the teaching period and so the language used for the students' requirements was changed frequently. The monolingual approach could not be used all the time while the learners were being taught. Thus, the instructors switched the code and swapped L2 with L1 dueto keep the interaction between the teachers and learners active. Not only that but also to let the students notice the valued skills of the language changes or code-switching (Sridhar & Sridhar, 1986).

One more purpose is that if the monolingual approach is used all the time, it is difficult to stimulate or motivate students' dynamic participation in the learning processes. According to the voices, it was also puzzled out that the individuals were not actively involved in any activities as they were not fully comprehensible and intelligible L2. To make students clarify the lessons, to get mutual understanding, to make a successful teaching-learning process, to encourage the learners especially those who belong to lower language competence, L1 plays as a crucial tool in the learning process. Such a kind of situation, the switch between L2 and L1 operates as a source for communication or conversation of the interlocutors, teachers, and students (Halliday, 1994).

Lantolf, 2011b remarked that L1 will always control the higher mental processes which construct the screen through which human beings filter perception. Accordingly, banning and restraining L1 used in ELT or the lack of employing L1 by the educators are likely to reflect to be unsuccessful teaching. Also, the learning process as the English-only tool in teaching cannot persuade the longer attention of the learners. According to data, to be changed learners' passive attitudes such as interactions group work, teamwork, and operation in doing classroom activities, teachers themselves utilized L1 as well as let the students make the use of L1.

To sum up, teachers used a much more bilingual approach in the ELT context in Myanmar. With the help of L1, students are provided with effective L2 acquisition. It was reported that teachers switched the language to support clear contributing, to make the harmony of the students' language asymmetry of, to engage the L2 learners' interest in the target language, to build a good relationship between teachers and students such as making jokes, giving comments, and to explain difficult terms (Nhan & Lai, 2012a and Nguyen et al., 2016). To create good communication among the learners and mentors, a smooth conversation is needed. Aside from the fact that teachers will have high bilingual competence and the higher competence they belong to, the higher fluency in using code-switching that will also guide the learners on how to switch between the use of L1 and L2.

(c) Challenges for teachers as well as students to implement the monolingual approach of teaching English-through-English-only in Myanmar EFL context

Although the monolingual approach (English-through-English-only) is the best in ELT, it should not be applicable in the Myanmar EFL context. There might be challenges to use that approach in ELT for both teachers and learners. Listening to the teachers' voices, time was one of the difficulties in implementing the use of English-only in ELT. Teachers performed their conducting process under the time pressure. Here in Myanmar, as it is Course book oriented and Exam-oriented education system, to cover the course within the time limit is a must for the lecturers in ELT. Applying L1 in ELT made the teachers realize that they could save time as well as could provide the learners with effective explaining. Thus, L1 can be a helpful tool in saving precious time for both teachers and students as well as alleviating students' anxiety during class time (Cook,

2002, and Shimizu, 2006). Fundamentally, time cannot be said one of the confrontations in ELT, but everything like explaining the lessons, functioning extra activities in the EFL class is concerned with the limited time. In many cases, the school curriculum that trainee teachers are, in theory, be prepared to teach, is covered in as little as one hour (Cummins, 1978). Preparing everything under the time constraint, students have less exposure to practice language skills in ELT. To save time, the teachers skipped some practical activities that might improve the learners' L2. Deficiency of practice was one of the most important aspects of English teaching (Akalm & Zengin, 2007 and Büyükyavuz & İnal, 2008). Thus, providing enough time for teachers should be one main issue in ELT for the required arrangement to enhance the learners' learning acquisition. In addition to this, the participants informed that they have no options about the course or the curriculum. They have no power to select the most suitable tasks from the courses for the learners to accomplish the educating process under the given time. Meaning that what lessons should be included or what tasks should be left out in the real situation of ELT.

Moreover, inadequate teaching-learning materials for ELT such as computer-assisted language learning, videos, technology, and social networking make the learners less exposure to the authentic L2, especially at the universities in the regions. The city universities have been provided such kind of aids but enough time to teach with the aids of such materials to cover the prescribed course, educating with the help of such materials is neglected at times. In the earlier mentioned, enough time is needed. If L2 learners are expected to get more authentic exposure regarding L2, physical materials and enough time are a must for catering powerful teaching. This finding is also reflected in the study of Çelebi (2006), Çetintaş (2010), Gedikoğlu (2005), Gökdemir (2010), and Kızıldağ (2009). They stated that one of the most significant problems in foreign language teaching was the lack and/or limitation of materials and technological utilities.

One more difficulty mentioned by the subjects is that using English as a medium of instruction makes passive involvement of the learners. The majority of the students have lower language competence in the EFL or ELT class. Being dominated by high language competence students in-class activity, it causes them bashful or shy or less confidence. Besides, some of the L2 learners are studying under the language pressure and this can lead their pessimistic perspectives upon the target language. What the respondents found was that using L2 made the cold relationship and conversation between learners and teachers and L2 was viewed negatively by many learners. Should the learners have an unenthusiastic reflection concerning L2, learners will become unenergetic and L2 will be a heavy burden for them. The learners' negative attitude toward L2 renders a great barrier for effective teaching. It was observed that this negative attitude emanates from the fact that learners have limited competence in the language, therefore, preventing them from actively participating in classroom activities (Usó-Juan, Esther and Martínez-Flor, Alicia and Palmer Silveira, Juan Carlos, 2006).

Additionally, the text still focuses on the Anglophone world (Baker, 2015). For example, in the ELT textbook, Global (Clanfield, 2009) some lexical terms are difficult to demonstrate with the L2 as the material recognizes the global role of English. Listening to the Myanmar teachers' voice in ELT, this is one more obstacle for applying the monolingual approach. English only hinders providing fully understanding to the learners and it is a challenge for the teachers in handling the Lexis or terms in ELT. The learners are expected to equip with the effective demonstrating to be conceptualized in their comprehensible process. Unless L2 learners are advocated with the comprehensible input, it will indirectly affect the students' motivation to the language-producing lectured to them. L1 makes input much easier to understand (Cook, 2002). Choosing a language depends on the knowledge of the context and participants (Enama, 2016) and the teachers are often simply not aware of when they switch languages (Ferguson, 2003). Thus, they reported that the bilingual method was used mostly in teaching.

On top of this, big class size mixing students with different levels and massive learners are also including as challenges. It seems that English teachers do not doubt that the large size of classes is a prime impediment for efficient English teaching and learning (Bahanshal, 2013). Burmese classrooms are usually a big size – some classrooms have approximately 80 students (Thein Lwin, 2007). As learners attend overcrowded classrooms, they are not fully provided with individual take care. This may make the L2 learner's poor attitudes and motivations towards learning English (Tegang, 1993; Esou 2002; Owingo, 2005). To the teaching, even though teachers well prepare the lessons to provide the students, it is difficult to get achievement in the teaching-learning process due to the class size. Without knowing the exact level of individuals' language competence, the teachers cannot facilitate them with effectively supportive teaching methods. According to the Shrum & Glisan (2010), although teachers must know the level of language development of their learners, it is also difficult to evaluate every learner's development due to a big number of students. To inquire how much English proficiency that the learners have is not an easy job. As mentioned above, teachers are under a time constraint. To reduce the large class size as well as to cut the big number of students is not easy to handle. This will be a long-term unsolved problem, especially in countries. Although many teachers prefer teaching to small classes where all the students are approximately at the same level, this is not always possible (Bekiryazıcı, 2014). To cater effectively L2 learners in the ELT context, it is important to form individual working settings for the learners in the classroom and the learners should also have time to work independently (Tomlinson, 2001, p.5). However, in reality, the facilitators change the teaching approach and language used to adapt the massive learners with different levels in the big class. Based on the data, this kind of situation happened to the teachers who are currently working in the universities of the provinces.

Besides, in Burmese schools, many teachers enter the classroom without any training in lesson planning, curriculum management, classroom management, teaching methods, assessment and required subject knowledge (Thein Lwin, 2007). In the report of the data, teachers pointed out the

uncommonness of regular training for their personal development. This is also the thing to consider for ELT teachers. In other words, the update training is needed for the language teacher to boost their L2 as well as their teaching strategies. Thus, in the studies of Aydın (2013), Çetintaş (2010), Gedikoğlu (2005) and Karcı and Vural (2011), they found that one of the most significant problems in foreign language teaching was the lack of well-trained teachers. This lack of teacher training programs raises questions of the quality of instruction and the inadequacy of teachers' understanding of how to handle second language acquisition (SLA) (Clair 1995). Likewise, McKinley (2013) reported that "EFL was often taught in monolingual settings under the pressure of passing examinations, with less frequent class meetings, large classes and uncertain teacher training or proficiency (McKinley, 2013)."

To sum up, many challenges such as time constraint, teaching aids, the education system such as course book oriented and exam-oriented, less active of students with under language pressure, the text focused on the native country, a big number of students in a class, and lack of teachers trainings are the main obstacles to apply English-only approach in Myanmar ELT context. Thus, the bilingual approach using in the current ELT is not only the best way to confront these challenges but also the effective means in the teaching and learning process.

(d) Voices regarding the policy on the use of classroom languages in foreign language education

In this regard, according to the history of the language policy in Myanmar, after being an independent country, the policy on the medium of instruction was announced by the Ministry of Education in 1958. In the pre-university and university levels, only English was used (Thein Lwin, 2000). In 1965, on behalf of the English language, the Burmese language was used as the media in the universities. "English was removed from the curriculum until a change in policy took place that led to a moderate revival of English in the mid-1980s" (Kirkpatrick, 2007, p-82). Consequently, Myanmar is now considered as one of the countries in the expanded circle. In other words, this is the result of removing English as the medium of instruction in ELT. Myanmar's English language identity took place in the outer circle country in the past. According to the world English Paradigm, Myanmar had been regarded as the outer circle country before the country was governed by the military dictatorship (Kirkpatrick, 2007). In 1982, English language education was reintroduced from standard 0 as a second language. Even though English was reused as the medium of instruction in universities in 1982, it would seem that English proficiency declined and began to fall among the global community since that time. Also, the teaching-learning aids and update teaching methods for ELT could not be available because of the social dealing with the international society who disliked the actions of the military government.

According to the Myanmar Education Law issued on 30 September 2014, section 43 states that "Instruction can be in Myanmar or English or in a combination of Myanmar and English" (see Khin Khin Aye & Sercombe, P., 2014). In the study of (Thein Lwin, 2011), English is used as the second

language in middle school. At the university level, both Burmese and English are used as the medium of instruction. English is the medium of instruction only in the Honors and Masters classes at the university level. These are the official policies on the paper in one side, and in the practical schooling, different voices were heard by the respondents to a survey. It stated that some teachers wanted an effective policy for ELT on one hand and the other side, difficulties might have occurred. Two sounds were appeared based on the universities they are working on now.

Speaker 29: *regarding the national policy on the use of classroom languages in EFL, I think the monolingual approach of using English is a good idea.*

Speaker 10: *it is good especially for the universities in cities*

Speaker 17: *just setting a national policy is not enough to achieve the goal. Have to think ways to implement in a real-life situation.*

Speaker 19: *it should be better if the authority sets suitable rules and regulations for the medium of instruction*

Speaker 23: *teachers have to face difficulties*

Teachers from cities wanted the language policy that will apply to the monolingual approach as students having high proficiency request to be taught in English and they prefer the monolingual approach. Unlike the cities, in the provinces, teachers have been facing learners with different language competence. Only a handful of L2 students belong to proficiency like the learners in the city. Thus, the monolingual policy will not pertain to every university in Myanmar. Even in developed countries such as The United States, only twenty-seven states have been successful in adopting official English-only laws (McNelly, 2014). Thus, Auerbach (1993) argues that the bilingual policy is not only effective but necessary for adult ESL students by providing positive results of recent studies with L1 use in ESL classrooms. However, whether the monolingual or bilingual policy in Myanmar ELT, the language policy for ELT should offer not only the students to get access to the equal right for the instruction but also the teachers to be language stability in ELT as the scaffolding. Accordingly, the language policy is needed to provide the students with equal education, to assist the teachers to be equal uniformity in teaching L2.

5. Conclusion

The insufficient human resources for language teaching keep the low language outcomes as well as the lack of providing well-training consistently for the ELT teachers from the higher education renders the little progress for the L2 learners. The study showed that many positive impacts can be seen concerning the bilingual approach in the target language teaching and learning process. In the Myanmar ELT context, there are still deficient supplies to apply the English-only approach. Banning L1 use in the ELT class is not a good way for both teachers and learners. As earlier mentioned, L1 is the main source to enrich L2. For both trainers and trainees in ELT class, a lot of benefits for L2 are provided implicitly with the help of L1. Moreover, this study addressed the challenges faced by Myanmar university teachers by listening to their voices and implied to support the teachers' personal needs regarding ELT. There might be

one option in ELT that is to build mutual understanding and mutual respects between what the students' learning purposes are and what the teachers' teaching purposes in ELT. As the answers of only a few teachers were focused, future research should be considered the opinions regarding teaching methods from teachers as well as should listen to the learners' voice.

References

- [1] Akalın, S. & Zengin, B. (2007). Türkiye'de halkın yabancı dil ile ilgili algıları. [The Attitude of People towards Foreign Language in Turkey]. *Journal of Language and Linguistics Studies*, 3(1), 181-200.
- [2] AL-Jarf, R. (2006). Large student enrollments in EFL programs: Challenges and consequences. *Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 8(4), 8-34.
- [3] Auerbach, E. R. (1993). "Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom" *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32.
- [4] Aydin, S. (2013). Teachers' perceptions about the use of computers in EFL teaching and learning: the case of Turkey, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 26:3, 214-233.
- [5] Bahanshal, D.(2013). The Effect of Large Classes on English Teaching and Learning in Saudi <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272688719>
- [6] Baker, W. (2015). Culture and complexity through English as a lingua franca *JELF* 2015; 4(1): 9 – 30.
- [7] Balosa, D. (2006). Three examples of better English learning through the L1. *Essential Teacher* 3.1, 28-31.
- [8] Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal* 57.3, 278-287.
- [9] Bekiryazici, M. (2004). Teaching Mixed-Level Classes with A Vygotskian Perspective 5th World Conference on Learning, Teaching and Educational Leadership, WCLTA 2014
- [10] Butzkamm, W. (2003). We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma. *Language Learning Journal*, 28(1), 29–39.
- [11] Buyukyavuz O. & Inal. S. (2008). A descriptive study on Turkish teachers of English regarding their professional needs, efforts for development and available resources. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 10: 215-234.
- [12] Canagarajah, S. (2001). Constructing hybrid postcolonial subjects: Codeswitching in Jaffna classrooms. In M. Heller & M. Martin-Jones (eds.), *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference*. Westport, CT & London: Ablex, 193-212.
- [13] Çelebi, D. (2006). Türkiye'de anadili eğitimi ve yabancı dil öğretimi. [The Mother Tongue and Foreign Language Education in Turkey]. *Erciyes Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 21 (2), 285-307.
- [14] Çetintaş, B. (2010). Türkiye'de yabancı dil Eğitim ve öğretiminin sürekliliği. [The Sustainability of Foreign Language Education in Turkey]. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 6, (1), 65-74.
- [15] Clair, N. (1995). "Mainstream Classroom Teachers and ESL Students." *TESOL Quarterly* 29(1): 189–196.
- [16] Clanfield, L. (2009). *Global*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- [17] Cook, V. (2002). Background to the L2 user. In V. Cook (ed.), *Portraits of the L2 User*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 1-28.
- [18] Cummins, J. (1978). Metalinguistic development of children in bilingual education programs: Data from Irish and Canadian Ukrainian-English programs. In M. Paradis (ed.), *Aspects of Bilingualism*. Columbia: Hornbeam Press.
- [19] Enama, P. (2016). The Impact of English-only and Bilingual Approaches to EFL Instruction on Low-achieving Bilinguals in Cameroon: An Empirical Study *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 19-30, January 2016
- [20] Esou, M. N. (2002). Motivations for Francophone Cameroonians towards learning English as a lingua franca: A case study of GBPS Biyem-Assi Group II and the Yaounde Pilot Linguistic Center. Unpublished dissertation for the award of a DIPES II in EFL/ESL teaching. Yaoundé: Higher Teacher Training College.
- [21] Ferguson, G. (2003). Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts. In S. Makoni & U. H. Meinhof (eds.), *Africa and Applied Linguistics*. AILA Review 16. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [22] Freeman, D., & Richards, J. C. (1993), "Conceptions of teaching and the education of second language teachers", *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(2), 193-216.
- [23] Futrell, M., J. Gomez, and D. Bedden. 2003. "Teaching the Children of a New America: The Challenge of Diversity." *Phi Delta Kappan* 84 (5): 381–385.
- [24] Garcia. (1991). *Education of Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students: Effective Instructional Practices* Santa Cruz, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- [25] Gedikoğlu, T. (2005). Avrupa Birliği sürecinde Türk eğitim sistemi: sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. [Turkish Education System during the process of accession to European Union: problems and suggestions]. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(1), 66-80.
- [26] Gökdemir, C. V. (2010). Üniversitelerimizde verilen yabancı dil öğretimindeki başarı durumumuz. [The state of success in Foreign Language Education at our universities]. *Erzurum Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6 (2), 251-264.
- [27] Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [28] Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- [29] Hu, G. (2003), "English language teaching in China: Regional differences and contributing factors", *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 24(4), 290-318.
- [30] Karci, C.,& Vural, R.A. (2011). Teachers' views with regard to teaching English in multigraded classrooms. *Elementary Education Online*, 10 (2), 593-607.
- [31] Keuk, C.,&Tith, M. (2013). The Enactment of English-medium Instruction (EMI) Undergraduate Program in Cambodia: Students' voices. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language*. Volume 2, Number 2
- [32] Khin Khin Aye & Sercombe, P. (2014). *Language Education and Nation-Building in Myanmar*. Education Policy Enquiry Committee, Burma (1946). The Report of the Education Policy National Education Law (2014), Republic of the Union of Myanmar, Parliamentary law No.41.

- [33] Khong, H.& Saito, E. (2014) Challenges confronting teachers of English language learners
- [34] <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263691300>
- [35] Kızıldag, A. (2009). Teaching English in Turkey: Dialogues with teachers about the challenges in public primary schools. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, Vol.1, Issue 3, June 2009.
- [36] Kodero, H. M. N., Misigo, B. L., Owino, E. A., and Simiyu, C. K. (2011). The salient characteristics of trained ineffective teachers in secondary schools in Kenya. *SAGE Open* 1, 8–10. doi:10.1177/2158244011434102
- [37] Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.
- [38] Krashen, S. (1997). "Why Bilingual Education?". ERIC Digest ED403101. <http://ericae.net/>
- [39] Lantolf, J. P. (2011b). The Sociocultural approach to second language acquisition: Sociocultural theory, second language acquisition, and artificial L2 development. In *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 24–47). London: Routledge.
- [40] Lap. Trinh Q & Thy. Huynh Vuong, U. (2017). EFL Teachers' Challenges in Maximizing Classroom Interaction Studies in English Language Teaching ISSN, Vol. 5, No. 4, 2017 www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/selt
- [41] Lee. J. H. (2012) Reassessment of English-only approach in EFL context in view of young learners' attitudes, language proficiency, and vocabulary knowledge Lee *Multilingual Education* 2012, 2:5
- [42] <http://www.multilingual-education.com/content/2/1/5>
- [43] Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching* 40, 243-249. maximizing target language use. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 65
- [44] McKinley, J. (2013). Displaying Critical Thinking in EFL Academic Writing: A Discussion of Japanese to English Contrastive Rhetoric. *RELC Journal* 0(0) 1-14. DOI: 10.1177/0033688213488386
- [45] McLaughlin, B. (1992). Myths and Misconceptions about Second Language Learning: What Every Teacher Needs to Unlearn. Educational Practice Report No. 5. Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- [46] McNelly, C. A. (2014). Language Learning Policy through the Lens of Language as a Problem, as a Right, and as a Resource Crawford, J. (2014, December). *Issues in U.S. Language Policy* <http://www.languagepolicy.net/archives/langleg.htm>
- [47] Mehisto, P., D. Marsh & M. J. Frigols (2008). *Uncovering CLIL*. UK: Macmillan.
- [48] Newman, I. H. (2014). Code-switching: Using L1 and L2 in bilingual education – The case of Asturias. M.A. thesis, University of Oviedo, Asturias, Spain.
- [49] Nguyen, N.T. (2016) Code-switching in English Language Ed. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 6, No. 7, pp. 1333-1340
- [50] Nhan, N. T. & H. T. Lai (2012a). The current state of the art in ELT with special reference to the use of the first language in EFL classes in Vietnam. *Language in India* 12.3, 558-575.
- [51] Owingo, F. A. (2005). Attitudes and motivation of Francophone Cameroonian secondary school learners of English. Unpublished dissertation for the award of a DIPES II in TEFL/TESL. Yaounde: Higher Teacher Training College.
- [52] Pajares, M. F. (1992). "Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct", *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332.
- [53] Perego, S. F. & O. F. Boyle. (2013). Reading, writing and learning in ESL: A resource book for teaching K-12 English learners (6th ed.). With contributions by Karen Cadiero-Kaplan. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- [54] Raimes, A. (2002). Ten steps in planning a writing course and training teachers of writing. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 306-314). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [55] Richards, Jack C. (2011). The role of vocabulary teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 10: 77-89. Rolin-Ianziti, Jeanne, and Rachel Varshney. 2008. Students' views regarding the use of the first language: An exploratory study in a tertiary context.
- [56] Renandya, W. A., & Jacobs, G. M. (2002). Extensive reading: Why aren't we all doing it. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 295-302). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [57] Scheele, B. and Groeben, N. (1988) *Diahg-Konsens-Methoden zur Rekonstruktion Subjektiver Theorien*. Tübingen: Francke.
- [58] Schütze, F. (1983) "Biographieforschung und Narratives Interview," *Neue Praxis*, 3:283-93.
- [59] Shimizu, Makiko (2006). Monolingual or Bilingual Policy in the Classroom Pedagogical implications of L1 use in the Japanese EFL classroom.
- [60] Shrum, J. L. & E. W. Glisan. (2010). *Teacher's handbook. Contextualized language instruction* (4th edn.). Boston, MA: Heinle.
- [61] Smith, D. (1992). Encouraging Students' Participation in Large Classes: A Modest Proposal. *Teaching Sociology*, 20(4), 337-339. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1318983>.
- [62] Soe, T (2015) A Study of Contemporary Trends and Challenges of English Language Teaching in Myanmar International Conference on Burma/Myanmar Studies Burma/Myanmarin Transition: Connectivity, Changes and Challenges University Academic Service Centre (UNISERV), Chiang Mai University, Thailand, 24--25 July 2015
- [63] Solak, E. & Bayar, A. (2015) Current Challenges in English Language Learning in Turkish EFL Context. *Participatory Educational Research (PER)* Vol. 2(1), pp 106-115, April 2015
- [64] So, W. W. M., & Watkins, D. A. (2005), "From beginning teacher education to professional teaching: A study of the thinking of Hong Kong primary science teachers", *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 521-545.
- [65] Sridhar, K. & Sridhar, S. (1986). Bridging the paradigm gap: Second language acquisition theory and indigenized varieties of English. *World Englishes* 5.1, 3-14.

- [66] Strohmeier, B. & McGail, L. (1988). On FOCUS: Photographs and Writings by Students Boston, M A: El Centro del Cardenal.
- [67] Tegang, J. B. (1993). Procedures for grammar teaching in the 5e English as a foreign language classes of some government schools in Yaounde. Unpublished dissertation submitted for the award of a DIPES II in TEFL/TESL. Yaoundé: Higher Teacher Training College.
- [68] Thein Lwin. (2007) Education and Democracy in Burma: Decentralization and Classroom-Level Educational Reform International Forum for Democratic studies
- [69] Thein Lwin. (2011) Languages, Identities, and Education – in Relation to Burma/Myanmar Retrieved from www.thingkingclassroom.org
- [70] Tomlinson, C. A. (2001) *How to Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-ability Classrooms*. ASCD product No, 101043.
- [71] Usó-Juan, Esther and Martínez-Flor, Alicia and Palmer Silveira, Juan Carlos (2006). “Developing communicative competence through writing”. In E. Usó-Juan and A. Martínez-Flor, eds., *Current Trends in the Development and Teaching of the Four Language Skills*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 397-414.