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Abstract
Teaching English to young learners (TEYL) has been attracting the attention of governments (as policymakers), TEYL practitioners, and students’ parents alike. For some, among various issues surrounding TEYL, issues regarding the role of students’ first language (L1), language skills to focus on, and when to start to teach English are among the critical issues in TEYL. This qualitative study assesses how academics have measured and conceived teaching English to young learners across 17 empirical studies from global and Indonesian contexts. Its specific goal is to determine what can be drawn from these investigations and what critical issues remain. Results indicate that English to young learners from the global context is divided into two opposing parties (i.e., proponents and opponents of early start). Meanwhile, Indonesian EYL practitioners (i.e., researchers, teachers, schools) and stakeholders (i.e., parents) mostly favor the early start. Yet, current research findings serve to deepen and broaden theoretical understandings of The TEYL and their impact in the particular situation of teaching English to young learners. Future research and practical implications are discussed.
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INTRODUCTION
Teaching English as an additional language to young learners surrounding the basic principles and best practices of TEYL has long since stirred quite a debate among practitioners (Arnold & Rixon, 2008, Rich, 2014). Using openly Western-based EYL (English for Young Learners) methods in non-Western environments is one example of using the native language in an English class. (Copland & Ni, 2019). Apart from using the native language in the English lesson, another critical issue raised due to the changes in trends of TEYL is the emphasis on children’s communicative skill development (Copland & Ni, 2019).

Nowadays, it is blatant that English has increasingly become more important (Zhang, 2019). As such, more and more emphasis is placed on mastering spoken language abilities. Enough is due to the spoken language ability (also known as oral communicative skill) being
the most apparent way to judge and display one's language proficiency (Carolina, 2016). Nevertheless, as a consequence, more and more EYL practitioners (i.e., teachers and policymakers) are now incorporating the mastery of oral communicative skills into the learning objectives of their EYL classes. Such emphasis results in the implementation of some communicative ELT methods—CLT (i.e., communicative language teaching) and CLIL (i.e., content and language integrated learning)—in EYL classrooms, which in turn path a way to a more critical issue such as EYL teachers’ lack of competence in its implementation.

Moreover, there is also a debate on the need and ways to incorporate the teaching of reading in English and the teaching of explicit grammar in young learners’ classrooms (Puchta, 2019, Shin & Crandell, 2018). This is outside the contended topic of EYL teachers' diverse educational backgrounds and skills (Rich, 2019; Zein, 2019), differentiated instruction for young English learners (Sullivan & Weeks, 2018), as well as the disconnection between EYL policy and practice (Kuchah, 2019), which have also provoked a prolonged discussion among EYL teachers and researchers. Another fundamental issue—dispute—caused by the emergence of different views among TEYL practitioners is one regarding the early start of teaching English to children. This issue is often discussed in Garton & Copland (2019), as it serves as an underlying cause for several other critical issues in EYL classrooms. In the teaching of English in developing world contexts (Kuchah, 2019), for instance, the early start of the teaching of English for children and its inclusion in the curriculum for primary schools are viewed as the reason behind a variety of challenges faced by both the teachers and the young learners in EYL classrooms. In addition, it is also one of the main reasons why an English-focused school and classroom environment is extremely hard to attain; insisting on using full or mainly English when the children are still very young and are too focused on playing is certainly impossible to do (Kuchah, 2019).

Additionally, the early start of teaching English to children also has some implications on delivering education and training for future teachers—service teachers (i.e., Teachers of English Young Learners’ Teacher Education or TEYLTED) (Puchta, 2019). Since English is imposed more and more on younger and younger learners, there is a growing need for a specialized pre-service teacher education that installs in the English teachers' *distinct repertoire of teaching skills and occupational knowledge to work effectively with young learners* (p.49). This is because specific teaching approaches are required in teaching English to young learners (Kersten & Rohde, 2013). Such approaches are currently absent in pre-service English teacher education, which has been focused on general English.

Critical issues such as those mentioned above are commonly a result of the different views and the evolving, ever-changing trends of TEYL spread among its practitioners. One such issue—the use of children’s native language in the English lesson, for instance—stems from the different views on the importance of L1 on L2 acquisition and the views on second language acquisition (SLA). Here, while prior, older ELT methods such as the audio-lingual method, direct method, and natural approach (for further reading on EFL methods, go to Knight (2001) all emphasize the importance of L2 and thus have limited and even forbid the use of children’s L1 in the lessons, newer studies have recently uncovered the importance of incorporating L1 into EFL classroom: providing a sense of security (Auerbach, 1993, in (Schweers, 1999), facilitating L2 understanding (Zakaria, 2013; Zulfikar, 2019), helping learners clarify and build meaning (Morahan, 2010). These findings have caused a stir in the way that EYL teaching and learning is conducted since now multilingualism is the trend, and
children’s individual identities and backgrounds are starting to be considered in EYL classrooms.

Based on the background described previously, the researchers address these and other issues in this review, which is the first to focus primarily on teaching English to young learners. The researchers give a detailed study of the demands and effects of teaching English to young learners relevant to practitioners, based on peer-reviewed research published from 1978 to 2022. Then, the researchers look for empirical research that has attempted to examine the topic of teaching English to young learners from teachers’ and scholars’ perspectives in the global and Indonesian context. Moreover, we address the significance of significant results from this body of research for research and practice.

**METHOD**

The data in this study were collected from publications on TEYL in international and Indonesian contexts. Using internet resources such as Google Scholar, Elsevier, Routledge, and PsycInfo, we first identified studies relevant to teaching English to young learners from 1978 to 2022. After that, we used the following inclusion criteria to determine relevant literature: 1. The paper was published in both English and Indonesian, 2. It was empirical research rather than a review, meta-analysis, or conceptual piece, 3. Except for scale validation research, the paper must have been published in a peer-reviewed publication. The inclusion criteria given above were satisfied by seventeen empirical research.

As the study aimed to generate ideas on preferences for TEYL, the data were proposals or ideas, which could be based on research and propositions. Data analysis was carried out by looking at tendencies, often followed by arguments, for supporting or opposing TEYL for particular age groups. Conclusions were drawn from the general tendency of arguments contained in each of the two contexts, together with the arguments they put forward. Although we do not give in-depth reviews of these studies (since they were not specifically planned to investigate the TYEL), we have occasionally referred to their findings as suitable for the purposes of this review. The table below summarizes some studies on teaching English to young learners in global and Indonesian contexts between 1978 to 2022.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kersten, K. &amp; Rohde, A. (2013)</td>
<td>Teaching English to Young Learners: Critical Issues in Language Teaching with 3-12 Year Olds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copland F et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Challenges in teaching English to young learners: Global perspectives and local realities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Indonesian Views

Damar et al. (2013) Teaching English to Young Learners: Through the Eyes of EFL Teacher Trainers

Zein, S. (2019) Classroom management for teaching English to young learners

Susanty et al. (2021) Promoting English learning from home to Indonesian families: an alternative approach to learning foreign languages at an early age


### FINDING AND DISCUSSION

**Global Views on TEYL**

The inclusion of English earlier and earlier in education is due to a number of reasons and justifications. One such reason—the main reason, perhaps—is that the world citizens perceive English as exceptionally important in today’s world. Nowadays, not only is it the world’s most spoken language (i.e., by 2022, around 1.5 billion people will be speaking English around the globe, but it is also the language that drives growth and international development, increases competitiveness as well as changes one’s life (British Council, 2013). Wanting their children to be able to obtain these benefits, parents all over the globe have wanted their children to master English and, as such, pressure the government into including English early in education (Enever & Moon, 2009; Gimenez, 2009; Hu, 2007 in Copland et al., 2014; Garton & Copland, 2015).

Regarding justification, the proponents of the early start of English usually base their arguments on Chomsky’s Language Acquisition Device theory and its implication: the belief that children learn and acquire an L2 better than their adult counterparts (Seville-Troike & Barto, 2016). In addition, the work of Krashen et al. (1979) is also among those which they refer to, mainly due to its most well-known conclusion: language learners (LL) who begin their second language acquisition early during their childhood are generally more proficient than the L.L.s who start their learning as adults. The fact that children can learn better than adults is also supported by other works from other scholars: MacSwan and Pray (2005) and Hartshorne et al. (2018). However, despite being backed up by a major theory on language...
acquisition and the works mentioned above, the basic argument of the early-start proponents is still a topic of debate. This is in light of some findings from a study by Snow and Hoefnagel-Höhle (1978) conducted before Krashen et al.’s work in 1979.

Here, though the findings from Snow and Hoefnagel-Höhle (1978) do resonate with Krashen, et al.’s (1979) conclusion, there are some points in the findings of Snow and Hoefnagel-Höhle’s (1978) works that are often overlooked. These findings suggest that the 3 to 5-year-old subject group has the worst score out of the other groups, while the 8–10-year-old subject group and the 12-15 group both have the best control of the L2. These findings imply that the notion of ‘the younger, the better’ for language acquisition does not always apply. In addition, Snow & Hoefnagel-Höhle's (1978) findings also show that there is no immediate urgency to teach English to elementary-school-aged children (8-10 years old) since the same outcome can be achieved even if English is introduced later in high school level (12-15 years old).

Different from the arguments of the early start proponents, which date back to the 1900s, arguments of the early start opponents have only recently gained their spotlights in the field of EYL. One scholar who successfully brought this issue to the public is Fiona and Copland, a professor in the field of TESOL. In her talk for 2014’s IATEFL Conference, Copland (2014, in Kostoulas, 2014) mentioned 4 (four) main critical issues or themes surrounding ELT provision, namely: (a) children as language learners (i.e., researches on the effects of ELT in children only have partial coverage, in that it focuses on children born and raised in bilingual environment, and not those who are actually taught English in formal schools; the urgency to teach English at younger ages has suppressed the learning of literacy and numeracy, both of which are undoubtfully much more important); (b) social and economic issues (i.e., provision of EYL mostly benefits children of higher social and economic status and might in turn result in more social discrepancy among the children of different socioeconomic status; the promised outcome of EYL provisions are yet to be achieved); (c) policy (i.e., most countries delivering EYL are lacking competent teachers to teach effective EYL since most teachers are only qualified to teach either children or English, not both; emphasis on communicative skills as the outcome of EYL might result in 'mismatch in cultures of education' as the teachers’ skills and classroom conditions might not support communicative-based ELT methods); and (d) pupil’s well-being (i.e., young learners are too young, they have yet to have any instrumental motivation; provision of English so early in education might result in the devaluing of local languages).

Based on geographical contexts, it can be seen that despite the varied historical backgrounds of English, be it an ex-colonial language or purely a foreign language, teaching English to young learners in African countries has been practiced more for political reasons, that is to maintain control over the colony and in several cases by degrading the role of the student’s mother tongue (M.T.) resulting in low quality of education in general (Ssentanda & Ngwaru, 2019). At later stages, however, numerous research and projects have been attempting to find the best ways of teaching English to students without having to lose their proficiency in their M.Ts” (Ibid). The practice of TEYL in Latin American countries is not much different from that in African countries. Despite the identified problems, such as specialized teacher preparation and appropriate teaching resources, English has been promoted to be taught to equip learners for international communication and the workplace (Miller et al., 2019), even to children under five.
The status and practice of teaching English to young learners in the Pacific Island countries are slightly different from those previously mentioned countries. Here, English is taught as a compulsory subject in addition to each country’s vernacular(s) (Willans, 2019). In most countries in this region, English is taught from year one and has two main roles: a language of ‘written purposes’ and a language for international socioeconomic, environmental, and political transactions (Ibid). As seen from the discussion on the two opposing views on EYL provisions above, more justifications are certainly required to provide English at such an early age. Nevertheless: despite the current debate among TEYL practitioners, EYL provision has already been widely spread around the globe, and such a critical issue has thus entered the Indonesian context.

**Indonesian Views on TEYL**

Indonesians are among the majority of people who highly regard English. Plentiful Indonesian parents want to teach their children English early on (Diniyah, 2017), aiming to develop English-Indonesian bilingualism in their children to secure both the social and economic advantages it brings (Fata et al., 2022). As such, English has started to be incorporated into Indonesian elementary schools’ curricula and classes and has even been introduced in kindergartens (Maili, 2018). In addition, private after-school courses are also highly popular among enthusiastic parents and their young children (Susanty et al., 2021).

Indonesian education practitioners are also hoping in the early-start English bandwagon; Indonesian scholars such as Harun (2014), Khairani (2016), Maili (2018), and Nasution (2016) are all emphasizing the importance of teaching English from a young age. Thus, they suggest that English lessons should continue to be taught in elementary schools. More specifically, Khairani (2016) regards that English education would be ideal if started at an early age (i.e., before 12 years of age, when the children are within their golden age of 2 to 7 years old). This is backed by the argument that within such an age range, children are perceived as capable of learning any language and, in turn, achieving native speaker-like competence.

Here, the same spirit and views on EYL are also shared by Indonesian teachers. Oktaviani and Fauzan (2017) reported that Indonesian teachers perceive that the learners who study English early will have a better mastery of English, which will, in turn, help them obtain social and economic benefits and a good job in the future. The same finding (i.e., that Indonesian teachers think that it is better to start learning English early) is also discovered by Damar et al. (2013). Even further, Damar et al. (2013) reported that the teachers—English teachers, for that matter—would like to see English implemented and taught as early as the preschool and first grade of Elementary schools. Such a statement from the teachers thus resonates with Khairani’s (2016) argument above.

**CONCLUSION**

Understanding the essence of children’s language learning, education is also directly tied to policy, which means that the curricular journey has become one of the determinants of English language education’s sustainability. However, it turns out that Indonesian’s perspective on the early start in teaching English to young learners is quite different from that of foreign scholars and practitioners. As seen from the reflection above, while the foreign scholars are divided into two opposing parties (i.e., proponents and opponents of early start), Indonesian EYL practitioners (i.e., researchers, teachers, schools) and stakeholders
(i.e., parents) are mostly in favor of the *early start*. Interestingly enough, such a view circulates all elements of society despite the government’s—through its most recent policy on education and curriculum—insistence on deleting English for primary school (and lower) education level.

Thus, such a phenomenon reveals how highly English is regarded in Indonesian. Above all, whether or not to support and implement the *early start* should be based on informed judgment. Surely, the decision to be made should use comprehensive research results on all related aspects of TEYL. Furthermore, the researcher gives different techniques for learning English to respond to young learners learning issues, as well as what the ideal instructor should implement to perform well in the classroom. This research offers teachers and policymakers a comprehensive picture of TEYL Global and Indonesia. Additionally, this work aims to catalyze future researchers to produce more advanced outcomes.
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