

Navigating English-Only Policy Through Localisation: Indonesian Maritime Students' Perspectives

Laila Puspitasari Anggraini

The Maritime Institute of Jakarta has implemented an English-Only Policy (EOP) through immersion classes to enhance students' English proficiency across all maritime disciplines. This study investigates how Indonesian maritime students perceive and navigate the EOP implementation within their local context. Using a qualitative approach, data was collected from thirty students through questionnaires and in-depth semi-structured interviews. The findings reveal that while students demonstrate strong ideological support for EOP, the realities of limited English proficiency and a predominantly non-English environment have naturally led to the development of localised English practices. Analysis shows that these localised practices, particularly code-switching and code-mixing between Indonesian and English, serve as valuable pedagogical tools and communication strategies. Rather than viewing these practices as policy violations, they emerge as effective bridges facilitating both language acquisition and cross-cultural communication within the maritime education context. This study contributes towards understanding how institutional language policies interact with local linguistic realities in specialised educational settings.

KEY WORDS

- ~ English-only policy
- ~ Localisation
- ~ Maritime education
- ~ Indonesian students
- ~ Code-switching
- ~ Code-mixing
- ~ Cross-cultural communication

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Pelayaran – Maritime Institute, Jakarta, Indonesia
e-mail: laila.puspita83@gmail.com
doi: 10.7225/toms.v15.n01.021

Received: 7 Feb 2025 / Revised: 4 Jan 2026 / Accepted: 4 Mar 2026 / Published: 20 Apr 2026

This work is licensed under



1. INTRODUCTION

The maritime industry's global nature requires a standardised communication system, with English serving as the *lingua franca* for ensuring safety and operational efficiency across international waters. Several studies have addressed the importance of English communication ability in the maritime industry and its impact on safety and efficiency at sea (Saridaki, 2023; Sia & Said, 2018; Sukomardojo & Ratnaningsih, 2020). Besides, it is also emphasised under the STCW Convention that seafarers need to have good command of spoken and written English in order to ensure effective communication and prevent misunderstandings that could lead to accidents (ITF, 2010). Accordingly, some studies have revealed that Maritime English eliminates misunderstandings, prevents accidents, and ensures safety in global maritime operations (Bocanegra Valle, 2011; Limbong et al., 2024). In addition, maritime education institutions place a high priority on helping their students become more fluent in the language to meet industry demands and adhere to international regulations. While English proficiency is already emphasised in the English curriculum in Indonesia, there is a need to specifically tailor language instruction and policies for students in maritime education (Meng et al., 2020). This is especially important as English is widely regarded as the *lingua franca* of the maritime industry, facilitating effective communication and collaboration among seafarers from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Martes, 2015). Furthermore, the facts above have led to the implementation of English-Only Policy (EOP) in maritime educations, including in Indonesia, where it strives to prepare students for the English communication requirement of their future careers.

Language policy shapes the way English is taught and used in maritime education, impacting the communication skills and cultural competence of students. (Spolsky, 2003) defined language policy as a set of managed and planned interventions supported and enforced by law and implemented by government agency. It also highlights the ways in which powerful institutions or high-level administrative decisions affect language learners and teachers in the classroom (Tollefson, 2007). In other words, language policy, set of rules, plans, and ideologies that influence how languages are used, (Spolsky, 2003) plays a crucial role in shaping educational practices. There are three main domains in language policy: language practices, language belief or ideology, and language modification (Spolsky, 2003). Language ideology or belief refers to what administrators think should be put into practice when teaching and learning a language based on theories and beliefs without examining the local context (Ko, 2008). Meanwhile, language practice is defined as what people actually do in the classroom or outside the classroom when teaching and learning a language (Spolsky, 2003). Further, he explains that language modification deals with specific efforts to modify or influence that practice by any kind of language intervention, planning, and management.

In the Indonesian context, The Maritime Institute of Jakarta, a tertiary boarding campus under the ministry of transportation, which is a centre of maritime education in Indonesia, has been implementing EOP to its students who take an undergraduate degree. Three immersion classes for each three majors are formed and named as international class. This initial programme is applied to the first year of students, wherein the chosen ones who attend the class are given a special treatment in which all instructions, lectures, and materials are in English. In addition, the students are also required to use English in any formal and informal settings in the class. It is considered as immersion class where EOP is applied to give the students more English exposures in comparison with other classes, as well as to foster English speaking habit among the students. Immersion refers to an approach to foreign language instruction in which the class activities are conducted in a foreign language (Bostwick, 2005; Met, 1993). Studies show that immersion students do well, and may even surpass the non-immersion students with respect to verbal skills (Holobow et al., 1991; Lapkin et al., 1983; Safty, 1991). In the immersion class, students are expected to use English in both formal (lectures, assignments) and informal (conversations, group work) settings within the international class, creating a total immersion environment.

However, implementing EOP in a predominantly non-English speaking environment would need an adjustment, as suggested. Several studies have addressed the importance and effectiveness of the implementation, as well as proved the shift to localising the EOP based on the distinct local circumstances of each country or even the institution (Ko, 2008; Wei, 2013). Localised English refers to modifying English based on local culture and language habits to better fit the communication needs of local people (Shen, 2023). Localising an English-only policy in Indonesian maritime education can be considered a strategic decision that can yield significant benefits. By prioritising English proficiency, maritime educational institutions can equip their graduates with the skills necessary to succeed in the global maritime industry (Ahmmed, 2021; Rahmawati Yusi, Haryani, 2021; Windiahsari & Wen-li, 2021). Furthermore, a study in the Philippines pointed out the teachers are encouraged to use local contexts and situations to approximate real-world English use, thinking that it is effective to facilitate learning among students with varied experiences. Also, a study conducted in the Philippines has revealed that educators who are encouraged to use local contexts and situations to optimise real world English in which it helps students with different backgrounds learn more effectively (Labiste, 2019). Localised English emphasizes and encourages adapting English to specific local context, such as, accents, vocabulary, and grammar rules, special language and expressions to create better understanding within the communities (Shen, 2023). By incorporating local language elements, it helps to bridge the language gap and enhance overall communication effectiveness within the maritime education setting.

Localising EOP can also be referred to considering local contexts such as class size, teaching methods, and materials for a successful language programme in institutions (Tollefson, 2007). It is claimed to be a relevant approach to shaping a language policy for implementation on a local level by deconstructing the local context and reconstructing local knowledge (Ko, 2008). This approach allows for a more tailored and effective language programme that considers the specific needs and characteristics of the learners in a particular institution. However, in the Indonesian context, implementation of EOP has been found to be ineffective. Although EOP contributes positively to students speaking fluency (A, 2018; Azhar & Gopal, 2021), it also creates a negative impact on the existence of a strict punishment system (A, 2018), causing students to have low interest and motivation (Azhar & Gopal, 2021). Moreover, it has resulted in a limited vocabulary and lack of confidence in using the language which also hinders their progress in speaking fluency (Azhar & Gopal, 2021). Therefore, localising the policy in Indonesia context can be a proper modification of EOP. A study has found that incorporating L1 in the form of code-switching is effective for EOP in the Indonesian boarding school context (Khairunisa, 2022). A similar study in a Korean tertiary school also supports the idea by recommending the use of code-switching to enhance understanding in classroom (Ko, 2008). Incorporating L1 carefully into English learning is effectively a valuable resource that can save class time and promote L2 development (Tollefson, 2007). Additionally, code-switching can help students feel more comfortable and confident on their language learning journey. It also allows for a smoother transition between languages, enhancing overall comprehension and retention of the target language.

Several studies have captured the effectiveness of applying EOP in classroom settings. EOP plays a positive role in students' oral communication skills in terms of fluency, communicative competence, and confidence (Gregorio & Colleges, 2023). It also helps to improve listening and speaking skills (Wei, 2013). While EOP can have certain benefits, it also raises concerns and has been a subject of considerable debate. Some researchers have concluded that applying EOP in an EFL context is not favourable (Ko, 2008; Lee, 2012; Wei, 2013). A study in a tertiary EFL context in Taiwan has emphasised that the policy can hamper the interaction between teacher and students (Wei, 2013). Meanwhile, in the Korean context, it results in ambiguity for any subject matter being discussed in the classroom (Ko, 2008). Despite these challenges, some educators argue that EOP can still be beneficial in certain situations, such as preparing students for international careers or enhancing their cross-cultural communication skills (Azhar & Gopal, 2021; Berger, 2011). It is important for institutions to carefully consider the potential drawbacks and benefits of implementing EOP to make informed decisions about its use in language education. Thus, some researchers have pointed out the importance of localising EOP. English needs to be localised in order to overcome cultural differences and barriers to better meet the communication needs of local people (Shen, 2023). A study has also suggested localising EOP in order to optimise students' learning on university level (Ko, 2008). Hence, the previous studies emphasise the importance of modifying the EOP to specific cultural and linguistic contexts with a view to improving its effectiveness and relevance. Based on the background presented above, this study is aimed at exploring how the students at the Maritime Institute of Jakarta navigate and perceive the implementation of an English-Only Policy (EOP) within the immersion classroom settings. It specifically focuses on how students adapt and use language in ways that are relevant to their own learning, with particular attention to the emergence of localised language practices.

2. METHOD

This study implements a qualitative approach, utilising convenience sampling to explore students' perspectives and experiences regarding the implementation of the English-Only Policy (EOP) at the Maritime Institute of Jakarta, particularly within the context of immersion classroom settings. Qualitative approach is considered relevant because it is well-suited for learning about concepts, human behaviour, attitudes, and experiences (Kamraju, 2023). This understanding is crucial for grasping social phenomena in natural settings (Kara, 2023).

Data collection has been conducted using two primary instruments: questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. Convenience sampling has been adopted to select participants based on their accessibility and willingness to participate, which aligns with established qualitative research practices for obtaining relevant and practical data (Kamraju, 2023). The Maritime Institute comprises three majors—nautical studies, marine engineering, and port and shipping management—each with multiple classes, but only one immersion class per major, wherein English serves as the primary medium of instruction. Thirty first-year students, ten from each immersion class, have been selected due to their availability and consent to participate.

The questionnaire has been developed based on Spolsky's theoretical framework, which identifies three key aspects of language policy: ideology, practice, and modification (2003). Participants' answers have been gathered using a five-point Likert scale to assess their attitudes and perceptions regarding various aspects of EOP implementation. To obtain more detailed insights, semi-structured interviews have been conducted with three students who volunteered for further discussions.

Next, it follows Qualitative Data Analysis (QDA), with more general open-ended questions, moving towards greater precision as more information emerges to get obtain detailed explanation and interpretation of the data (Kara, 2023). The

interview data has been systematically coded according to three thematic categories aligned with the core dimensions of the English-Only Policy (EOP): ideology (beliefs), practice, and language modification within the immersion classroom context. This thematic coding framework has enabled a structured examination of the interview content, ensuring alignment with the theoretical constructs underpinning the study. By integrating data from both questionnaires and in-depth interviews, the qualitative methodology affords a holistic and nuanced understanding of students' experiences and perceptions regarding the implementation of the EOP in the immersion setting.

3. RESULTS

This section presents the results of the study exploring the implementation of the English-Only Policy (EOP) in the immersion classes and discusses their implications. As elaborated in the previous sections, the study investigates how the students navigate the complexities of EOP within their predominantly Indonesian-speaking environment.

Firstly, the study participants were thirty students, aged 18–22 years old, enrolled in semesters 2, as well as attending the immersion class which is called international class. The students' secondary education backgrounds are diverse. Twenty-two (73.3%) attended public high schools, while four (13.3%) attended private high schools. The remaining four participants (13.3%) came from international high schools.

Aspects	Items	Percentage	Description
Language practices	The frequency of English used in classroom settings among students and lecturers	69,5%	quite often
	The frequency of English used outside classroom in social settings among students	67,1%	quite often
Language ideology or belief	English is important for success in maritime industry, as well as for personal and professional development	95,2%	strongly agree
Language modification	English should be the primary language of instruction at the institute.	92,3%	strongly agree
	Students should be able to use their native language in certain contexts (e.g. informal discussions).	93,5%	strongly agree
	The institution should implement a localised English-only policy both inside and outside the classroom.	94%	strongly agree

Table 1. Questionnaire result of EOP implementation within the immersion classes

Table 1 summarises the themes representing responses to three components of English only policy. It reflects the initial perceptions and attitudes of the respondents towards EOP. In terms of language practice, respondents report using English quite often in the classroom settings (69.5%) compared to outside of class (67.1%). Meanwhile, in terms of language ideology or belief, almost all respondents (95.2%) believe that English is crucial for success in the maritime industry and for personal and professional development. In line with the questionnaire results, data from the interview indicates that students understand the need to master English for their future career preparation, which explains why students cooperate with the policy in spite of their limited speaking ability. It can be inferred that the respondents perceive EOP positively:

... Absolutely, I am on the positive side, because of this programme, we can learn to speak English, and then it's useful for our work (Nana).

...because it will be our preparation to work as an international candidate. I'm more comfortable using English now than before (Anita).

...I personally think that the Respect programme is a good programme, mainly in the maritime institute, because we will work abroad, and then implementing the Respect program will give us positive things, like getting used to English (Panji).

However, challenges on the EOP implementation are also identified. Although a large majority of respondents (92.3%) agree that English should be the primary language of instruction at the institute, the respondents also support the use of native language in certain contexts, with 93.5% agreeing that students should be able to use their native language in informal discussions. This reflects gaps faced by the respondents in adapting to the English-Only Policy. Furthermore, a modification in a form of localisation is found to be favourable. A high percentage (94%) of respondents strongly agree with

the implementation of localised English-only policy where they can use both English and Bahasa Indonesian interchangeably. Through the interview, Nana and Anita share a similar reason for the modification, which is most students' limitations in speaking English. Hence, students are using English and Bahasa Indonesian to better understand subjects in the classroom and to communicate with others in any informal situations:

... In my opinion, for friends who don't understand English, maybe it's a bit difficult (referring to lecture delivery in English for all subjects in the class). So, for me, maybe some lecturers have to mix it with Bahasa Indonesian so that we can understand (Nana).

...there is a limitation in their English ability. the big community (most students on campus) still use some words in Indonesian when speaking English ...Mostly, the community speaks Bahasa Indonesian (Anita).

Accordingly, the study has found the localisation in a form of code-mixing and code-switching. Code-switching often appears in classroom teaching and interaction. Accordingly, the study indicates that the respondents are more comfortable when the lecturers use code-switching since it supports learners' understanding of the subject:

... So, all of them are already speaking English but only a few speak entirely English.... All books are in English, sometimes they teach with PPT, both English and Bahasa Indonesian (Nana).

...Actually, my challenge is in class, ..., it's a little difficult for us to understand the lesson, (especially) it's difficult for those who start from the beginning. I think the learning source, the materials, are better to be bilingual. There are some lecturers who offer full English lessons. But there are also lecturers who use more Bahasa Indonesian even though it is international class. ... when it is hard, the teachers use Bahasa Indonesian to explain the rules. ...I think, if it's combined, it will help a lot. It's easier to combine (using English and Bahasa Indonesian). (Anita).

...I wasn't expecting much with the lecturer English abilities, almost half of them, good ones. Lecturers who use English are usually (former) seafarers who had sailed to many countries. I think they want to show us what a successful seafarer is like. ... they become our role model, to success we need to be able to speak English. They use both Bahasa Indonesian and English in the lecture. They use English for self-introduction, to share experience, and to introduce the topic. They will use Bahasa Indonesian when explaining the materials to be effective and avoid misunderstanding, I think." (Panji)

Meanwhile, in more informal interaction, it is indicated that code-mixing often appears during respondents' interactions with one another. Further, one of the respondents has also explained in the code-mixing that they use certain words that only the cadet community uses. For example, the word "salung" is neither Bahasa Indonesian nor English. The word has been used by the maritime institute students to refer to skipping class. The use of the word can indicate the speaker's intention to identify themselves with a particular group, in this case the cadet community within the institution:

...In my opinion, for friends who don't understand English, maybe it's a bit difficult (to maintain the interaction in English). So, as for me, I still use Bahasa Indonesian but mixed with some words in English (Nana)

...Actually, my challenge is in class. Outside class, I am comfortable using English to talk with the others. I can practice my English that way. We will use some words in Bahasa Indonesian if we don't know the word in English. ... yes, sometimes we also use some Bahasa Indonesian words if we don't understand each other. (Anita).

...Well, I think, being in two different environments, using both the Indonesian language and English language is better. Personally, when I was in high school, the environment supports English learning. My friends and I talked about English movies, songs or books. But here (STIP) the environment doesn't support me to speak English. They don't know and we don't really talk about English topics. So it depends on who is talking. If they use English, I will do so, too. But normally we use Bahasa Indonesian with some words in English or speak English with some words in Bahasa Indonesia, as when one has been caught "salung" (skipped class). (Panji)

Overall, the respondents' perspective sheds light on the potential of localising EOP to support students English learning. All respondents acknowledge the difficulty for them and students who are beginners, particularly in comprehending lectures delivered entirely in English. Additionally, they share that incorporating both English and Bahasa Indonesian, which

is identified as code-switching and code-mixing, emerges as a possible solution. It could facilitate understanding, thereby promoting a smoother learning experience.

4. DISCUSSION

The implementation of an English-Only Policy (EOP) within the immersion classes has resulted in a dynamic linguistic landscape. While the EOP aims at creating an environment where English is the primary language of instruction, what emerges as particularly noteworthy is the development of localised English practices that seem to help bridge the gap between policy requirements and practical needs. Cadets have demonstrated remarkable adaptability in creating communication strategies that combine ELF with locally understood expressions, particularly in a form of code-switching and code-mixing.

The result shows students' support for the implementation of EOP theoretically. However, it is also found that many students have limited English ability. This can be connected to language shifts, in which the shift depends on the dominant and minority groups' perceptions that influences students' social (e.g., identity, self-esteem, and psychological adjustment) and cognitive (e.g., academic achievement) (Barker et al., 2001). As a result, due to non-English environment and students' limitations of English, localised English appears in which the students speak both languages. Accordingly, localised English can be used to promote cross-cultural communication and understanding, enabling people to better adapt and understand English expressions in certain contexts (Shen, 2023). This study has revealed that while English is important based on students' perspectives, it should not be the only language used in education. Native language can play a vital role in making learning more effective and inclusive for the students. This is in line with previous research finding that suggests localisation as a way of making English more diverse and inclusive, which eliminates barriers and makes communication smoother and more effective (Shen, 2023). The policy aims to promote English proficiency, but it has led to localised language use within the maritime institute community, especially among the students.

As a result of localisation of EOP, code-switching and code-mixing are found both in formal and informal interaction. Code-switching refers to the alternating use of more than one language in the classroom by any of the classroom participants (Lin, 2017). Accordingly, the respondents share that lecturers who used to be seafarers often use English to talk about their experiences to show that successful seafarers need good English. However, when explaining complex concepts or providing context, they may revert to Indonesian, suggesting a strategic use of both languages to enhance comprehension and relevance to create a more effective learning environment (Kumari, 2024). Beyond the classroom, code-mixing is evident in the daily interactions among students. Code-mixing is defined as the change of one language to another within the same sentence (Woon & Ho, 2007). The diverse linguistic backgrounds and varying levels of English proficiency among students contribute to the mixing of English and Indonesian words. This practice reflects learners' efforts to navigate and express themselves effectively in a multilingual environment (Anastassiou & Andreou, 2017; Kumari, 2024; Nordin, 2023). Furthermore, the emergence of institution-specific terms or jargon indicates the development of a unique linguistic community. Code-mixing is connected to bilinguals' specific code, which enables an individual to express meaning, as well as to identify with a particular group (Josiane F. Hamers, 2000), in this case, to identify themselves as a part of maritime institute's community. Further, it is explained that in the Community of Practice (CoP), meaning is created through social interactions within the community and used based on shared experiences and understanding (Eckert, 2006). The shared language among the students above can be identified as the language of CoP in which a shared manner of speaking is used, reflecting the unique identity and experience of its members. Overall, code-mixing and code-switching are considered essential in language learning (Novianti & Said, 2021). Both can be effective strategies for English language learners to enhance their understanding and communication abilities (Sulianur et al., 2022).

According to Krashen, second language acquisition (SLA) is a natural and subconscious process by which people learn a new language, typically occurring in immersive, real-life environments during foreign language learning (Zhao, 2008). Similarly, EOP implementation in class plays a positive role in students' fluency, communicative competence, and confidence (Gregorio & Colleges, 2023). However, this study challenges the assumptions of the English-Only Policy (EOP) and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theories by demonstrating that strict adherence to an English-only environment does not always facilitate meaningful communication or effective language acquisition. While EOP and SLA theories promote immersive exposure to English as a means to provide a natural and meaningful input, the findings reveal that such rigid policies can hinder interaction and comprehension when students possess limited English proficiency, as found in this study. Notably, the research highlights that strict EOP policies may inhibit teacher-student interaction (Wei, 2013) and create ambiguity in understanding the subject matter (Ko, 2008), contradicting the idea that immersion alone guarantees successful language acquisition. As an alternative, this study uncovers the strategic use of code-switching and code-mixing by maritime cadets as adaptive communication tools to bridge language gaps and facilitate understanding within the classroom. This practical, localised approach highlights the limitations of rigid implementation of EOP. It demonstrates that integrating multilingual practices, such as code-switching and mixing, can significantly improve comprehension and communication in specialised fields like maritime education, where clear communication and practical skills are vital for safety and efficiency (Hafita et al.,

2024). Thus, maritime educators, policymakers, and English instructors should adopt flexible language policies that incorporate strategic code-switching and mixing to enhance comprehension, communication, and interaction within multilingual maritime classrooms. Allowing these adaptive practices bridges language gaps, reduces learner anxiety, and supports clearer understanding of technical contents, thereby improving both language proficiency and maritime safety. This multilingual approach challenges rigid English-only policies, promoting more inclusive and effective language learning environments, tailored to the specialised needs of maritime cadets.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

REFERENCES

- A, I., 2018. Improving students' English-speaking skills through behaviour modification in Indonesian Islamic boarding schools. *Indonesian Journal of English Teaching*, 7(2), pp. 146–156. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.15642/ijet2.2018.7.2.146-156>
- Ahmed, R., 2021. A framework for maritime English language planning in Bangladeshi maritime education and training institutes. *SN Social Sciences*, 1(7). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-021-00188-5>
- Anastassiou, F. and Andreou, G., 2017. Factors associated with code mixing and code switching of multilingual children: an overview. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 4(3), pp. 13–26.
- Azhar, I.P. and Gopal, R., 2021. Effects of 'English-only policy' on students' fluency and motivation level in speaking English. *The English Teacher*, 50(3), pp. 157–172. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.52696/EGJQ3860>
- Barker, V., Giles, H., Noels, K., Duck, J., Hecht, M.L. and Clément, R., 2001. The English-only movement: a communication analysis of changing perceptions of language vitality. *Journal of Communication*, 51(1), pp. 3–37. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2001.tb02870.x>
- Berger, M., 2011. English-only policy for all? Case of a university English class in Japan. *Polyglossia*, 20, pp. 27–43.
- Bocanegra Valle, A., 2011. The language of seafaring: standardized conventions and discursive features in speech communications. *International Journal of English Studies*, 11(1), pp. 35–. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2011/1/137091>
- Bostwick, M., 2005. What is immersion? In: *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Bilingualism*, pp. 1–4.
- Eckert, P., 2006. Communities of practice. In: *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, pp. 683–685. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/01276-1>
- Gregorio, N.A. and Colleges, G.S., 2023. The role of English-only policy towards the oral communication skills of English major students at Good Samaritan Colleges. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.18183.16800>
- Hafita, Y.A., Sumarta, R.P., Riyanto, B. and Sulistiono, A., 2024. A comprehensive needs analysis of maritime English for ship machinery students. *Exposure: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 13(2), pp. 554–569. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.26618/exposure.v13i2.15389>
- Holobow, N.E., Genesee, F. and Lambert, W.E., 1991. The effectiveness of a foreign language immersion program for children from different ethnic and social class backgrounds: report 2. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 12(2), pp. 179–198. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716400009139>
- International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF), 2010. *STCW: A guide for seafarers: taking into account the 2010 Manila amendments*.
- Hamers, J.F. and Blanc, M.B., 2000. *Bilinguality and bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kamraju, M., 2023. Indonesian Journal of Teaching in Science. *Indonesian Journal of Teaching in Science*, 4(2), pp. 165–176.
- Kara, H., 2023. Qualitative data analysis. In: *Research and evaluation for busy students and practitioners*, pp. 187–202. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.51952/9781447366263.ch012>
- Khairunisa, S.K., 2022. A sociolinguistic study: Indonesian-English code-switching employed by teacher on English learning at Al-Hidayah Boarding School. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.36418/syntax-idea.v4i11.1992>
- Ko, M.H., 2008. Localizing English-only policy at a university English reading program in Korea. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 5(4), pp. 141–162.
- Kumari, S., 2024. Code-mixing and code-switching in multilingual classrooms: enhancing second language acquisition of English. *Chetana International Journal of Education*, 9(2), pp. 9–16.
- Labiste, J.L., 2019. Contextualization in English language education: navigating the place of maritime culture in Philippine English language teaching. *Asian EFL Journal*, 23, pp. 83–108.
- Lapkin, S., Swain, M. and Argue, V., 1983. *French immersion: the trial balloon that flew*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Lee, J.H., 2012. Reassessment of English-only approach in EFL context in view of young learners' attitudes, language proficiency and vocabulary knowledge. *Multilingual Education*, 2(1), pp. 1–11. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/2191-5059-2-5>
- Limbong, S., Chandra, A., Tandibura, F. and Hafita, Y.A., 2024. The convergence of maritime English and green shipping: enhancing collaboration through effective communication. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-628-4>

- Lin, A.M.Y., 2017. Research methods in language and education. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02249-9>
- Martes, L., 2015. Revision of IMO model course 3.17 maritime English: focus on maritime English to auxiliary personnel. *TransNav*, 9(3), pp. 309–313. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.12716/1001.09.03.02>
- Meng, L., Mei, S. and Wenhui, H., 2020. Expand the research and practice of the training path of English for military cadets. In: *Proceedings*, pp. 114–117. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200826.024>
- Met, M., 1993. Foreign language immersion programs. *CAL Digest*, pp. 1–5.
- Nordin, N.R.M., 2023. Code-switching and code-mixing among users of social media. *Jurnal Javanologi*, 6(2), p. 1267. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.20961/javanologi.v6i2.75114>
- Novianti, R. and Said, M., 2021. The use of code-switching and code-mixing in English teaching-learning process. *Deiksis*, 13(1), p. 82. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.30998/deiksis.v13i1.8491>
- Rahmawati Yusi and Haryani, S.D., 2021. The linkage of maritime English syllabi with the students' needs in port and shipping.
- Safty, A., 1991. French immersion in Canada: theory and practice. *International Review of Education*, 37(4), pp. 473–488. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00597622>
- Saridaki, E., 2023. The necessity of maritime English for the shipping industry. *Journal of Academic Social Resources*, 8(45), pp. 1908–1913. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.29228/asrjournal.67256>
- Shen, J., 2023. Research on English education in the context of global localization, 6, pp. 82–87. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.23977/langl.2023.061313>
- Sia, T. and Said, M.H., 2018. The importance of maritime English proficiency in marine-related undergraduate programs. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.23977/msmi.2018.82633>
- Spolsky, B., 2003. *Language policy: key topics in sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sukomardojo, T. and Ratnaningsih, D., 2020. The use of e-learning in maritime English learning can improve vocabulary skill of cadets majoring in electro-technical officer shipping. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business Development*, 3(4), pp. 390–398. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.29138/ijeabd.v3i4.1200>
- Sulianur, S., Qalyubi, I. and Sabarun, S., 2022. The use of code-switching and code-mixing in public speaking class at higher education Islamic. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 5(4), pp. 806–816.
- Tollefson, J.W., 2007. *International handbook of English language teaching*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-46301-8>
- Wei, D.D., 2013. The implementation of English-only policy in the tertiary EFL context in Taiwan. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), p. 187. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v2i2.164>
- Windiahsari and Wen-li, T., 2021. English for seafarers: need analysis and course design for cadets. In: *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Conference on Applied Linguistics*, pp. 633–637.
- Woon, J. and Ho, Y., 2007. Code-mixing: linguistic form and socio-cultural meaning. *International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*, 21, pp. 8.
- Zhao, R., 2008. The value of SLA main theories on foreign language learning and teaching in vocational colleges. *International Education Studies*, 1(3), pp. 118–122. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v1n3p118>

QUESTIONNAIRE: ENGLISH-ONLY POLICY DOMAINS

Thank you for participating in this research. Your opinion is very valuable to us. This research aims to identify the implementation of the RESPECT (English-Only Policy) programme, where cadets are required to use English within the educational environment and during lectures in international classes where all subjects are delivered in English.

The information you have provide for this research is confidential.

Items	Likert Scale
How often is English used in lectures?	1 2 3 4 5 never <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> always
How often is English used in group discussions in class?	1 2 3 4 5 never <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> always
How often are assignments and exams conducted in English?	1 2 3 4 5 never <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> always
How often do students and faculty interact in English outside of class?	1 2 3 4 5 never <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> always
How often is English used in informal gatherings (e.g., student clubs, social events)?	1 2 3 4 5 never <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> always
Do you agree that English is vital for success in the maritime industry?	1 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> strongly agree
Do you agree that English is important for personal and professional development to seafarers or maritime human resources?	1 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> strongly agree
Do you agree that English should be the primary language of instruction at the institute?	1 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> strongly agree
Do you agree students should be able to use their native language in certain contexts (e.g., informal discussions, chatting with friends, consulting or talking with lecturer)?	1 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> strongly agree
Do you agree that the institution should implement localising English only policy both inside and outside classroom?	1 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> strongly agree
Speaking only English in class helps me improve my fluency.	1 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> strongly agree
I feel comfortable expressing myself in English during class discussions.	1 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> strongly agree
The English-only policy makes it difficult for me to understand some non-language-related subjects.	1 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> strongly agree
The current policy motivates me to learn English outside of class.	1 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> strongly agree
The current policy motivates me to speak English outside of class.	1 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> strongly agree
I believe there are situations where using Bahasa Indonesian would be more helpful for learning.	1 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> strongly agree
Do you agree with the implementation of the English-only policy at STIP?	1 2 3 4 5 Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> strongly agree

Do you think the English-only policy will increase cadets' listening comprehension?	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree
Do you think the English-only pedagogy will enhance cadets' English abilities?	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree
Do you think that in the whole English instruction students will have difficulty in responding to the questions in English?	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree
Do you think the whole English instruction can improve students' English communication abilities?	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree
When students cannot understand what a teacher is saying in English, could they ask the teacher to explain it in Bahasa Indonesian?	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree
Lecturers should use only English in English classrooms.	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree
Lecturers should use only English for all subjects in classroom.	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree
I prefer English-only instruction because it gives me more opportunities to be exposed to English.	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree
The more English cadets use in the classroom, the better they will be at communicating in English.	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree
I believe that, regardless of how much English cadets choose to use, the lecturer should use English at all times in the classroom.	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree
When I don't know a word in English, I prefer to have it explained to me in English, rather than Bahasa Indonesian.	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree
An English-only explanation is necessary because the international class should provide a maximum amount of English.	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree
If understandable, I prefer English-only instructions to Bahasa Indonesian instructions.	1 Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree