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ABSTRACT

This study was conducted in qualitative research aimed to discover the difference in learning behavior between bilingual Acehnese-Indonesian and monolingual Indonesian in EFL. The data of this study was obtained from the 7th grade at SMP Teuku Nyak Arif Fatih Bilingual School, Banda Aceh. The participants were five bilingual and five monolingual students. The data were collected through observation and interviews. The observation data was students’ learning behavior during English class and was analyzed in descriptive statistics (percentages). The interview data included transcripts of supporting information about the reason for the learning behavior displayed in the English classes. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed following Miles & Huberman’s interactive model analysis. Furthermore, the results of this study showed that bilingual students showed less negative behavior in terms of competence motivation, attitude toward learning, and strategy/flexibility than monolingual students, but they were found to show the same amount of attention and persistence of negative issues along with monolingual students. Meanwhile, interview findings revealed that reason from both bilingual and monolingual students displayed those issues were mostly affected by internal factors and several external factors.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Humans have to speak and communicate through language which helps them interact with each other to share various information, ideas, and feelings. The interaction among humans is done either through oral communication, written text, or body language.
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which leads to shaping a language acquisition and can be affected by some factors such as environment or learning process (formal/informal). In Aceh, monolingualism and bilingualism exist due to the various languages used by society. According to Wildan (2010), there are nine majority languages used in Aceh, those languages are Bahasa Aceh, Bahasa Gayo, Bahasa Alas, Bahasa Tamiang, Bahasa Aneuk Jamèe, Bahasa Kluet, Bahasa Singkil, and Bahasa Simeulue. The Indonesian language is used widely since it is the national language of Indonesia. It is a language that is taught in school, and used in formal settings such as in education and communication in society.

In the EFL context, monolingual Bahasa students learn English as their L2 while bilingual Acehnese- Bahasa students learn English as their L3. Behavioral differences or similarities in learning new (English) could exist due to their language background. The different number of language acquisition possibly makes learning behavior different in some aspects such as motivation, attitude, attention, and strategy toward EFL learning. Previous studies related to bilingual and monolingual learning behavior showed different results on this topic. Liando (2012) concluded that bilingual people had better learning behavior. Then Hong and Leavell (2007) concluded bilingual and monolingual show different learning strategies which indicated suggestion of different learning behaviors. Molnár (2010) concluded both bilingual and monolingual showed good learning achievement even from different socio-cultural backgrounds. Meanwhile, Karjo (2009) concluded monolingual performance was better in EFL learning. In conclusion, there is a contrast in learning behavior between bilingual and monolingual.

This research investigates learning behaviors in EFL contexts, specifically comparing monolingual Bahasa students (L2 English learners) with bilingual Acehnese-Bahasa students (L3 English learners). The novelty lies in exploring how language background, involving monolingualism and bilingualism, influences aspects like motivation, attitude, attention, and learning strategies in English acquisition. Prior studies present conflicting findings on bilingual and monolingual learning behaviors, offering varied perspectives. This research aims to contribute a nuanced understanding of these dynamics, shedding light on potential contrasts in learning behavior between monolingual and bilingual learners in the context of English as a Foreign Language.

Along with the background of this study, this research focuses on seeking information about the learning behavior difference between bilingual Acehnese-Bahasa students and monolingual Bahasa students at SMP Teuku Nyak Arif Fatih Bilingual School. The researcher would investigate the learning behavior of bilingual and monolingual students in studying English in the classroom by collecting appropriate participants, observation to collect data on learning behavior in EFL and classrooms, and interviews to collect supporting information about the reason for learning behavior reflection preserved in the transcript. The focus of this study would be on learning behavior based on McDermott’s (1999) learning behavior components including competence motivation, attitude toward learning, attention/ persistence, and strategy/ flexibility which contains 20 points of learning behavior.

To reveal further findings of this study, the research problem was formulated as follows:

1. What is the difference in learning behavior between bilingual Acehnese-Indonesian students with monolingual Indonesian students when they learn EFL at SMP Teuku Nyak Arif Fatih Bilingual School?
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Bilingual

The investigation of bilingualism is a broad and complex field. Many researchers define bilingual in various descriptions and definitions. The concept of bilingualism refers to the state of a linguistic community in which two languages are in contact with the result that two codes can be used in the same interaction. Bilingual is defined as a native-like competence in two languages to minimal proficiency in a second language (Hamers & Blanc, 2000).

Human bilingualism is affected by the second language acquisition process (language input and output). Language input can be acquired by interaction and learning processes either in a formal or informal setting. The step of SLA starts from a language contact situation faced by children who learn their first language (L1) from birth as the result of linguistic input in their L1-speaking home environments and develop their second language simultaneously since they are exposed to many language inputs. The children’s SLA also can happen later in childhood from input received from playmates and the learning process at school which is called sequent SLA (Verhoeven, 2000).

In addition, a study suggests that early bilingualism helps with learning languages later in life. The difference is readily seen in language learners’ brain patterns. When learning a new language, bilinguals rely more than monolinguals on the brain processes that people naturally use for their native language (Ullman et al., 2017). Grey et al. (2018) also found that bilinguals appear to learn a new language more quickly than monolinguals. Adult bilinguals have shown superior vocabulary learning and processing in an additional language as compared to monolinguals.

2.2 Monolingual

Richards and Schmidt (2002) defined monolingual as a person who has an active knowledge of only one language, though perhaps a passive knowledge of others. Monolingual also can be defined as people who use only one single language. This happened due to the limitation of language input that provides one language only (Gramling, 2016). Since monolinguals are only able to speak in one single language, this can affect the communication process. It would limit interaction with other different societies or communities. Monolingualse only receive one same language input and produce one single language output. This process happens because the environment only provides one single language.

2.3 Learning Behavior

Behavior is essentially observable physical activity (Bergner, 2011). In the context of learning behavior, students in the classroom are physically behaving and giving responses toward classroom activity, teacher, subject learning, and the learning process. Inevitably they reflect observable behaviors and those behaviors can be studied and analyzed, they could be recognized as positive or negative. Furthermore, the learning behaviors themselves are defined as observable patterns of behavior exhibited by students as they respond to learning situations and react to academic tasks. They include indicators of effective effort and attitudes toward learning, strategic problem-solving, flexibility, attention persistence, reflectivity, and responses to novelty and error. It refers to how a child learns and to the child’s preferences when engaged in learning processes and when interacting with a learning environment (Yamazaki, 2005). The correct learning behaviors
encourage learners to learn and more understanding of information. It helps students to learn (English) and reach achievement.

McDermott (1999) defined dimensions of learning behavior into four categories including competence motivation, attitude toward learning, attention-persistence, and strategy/flexibility. First is competence motivation which focuses on motivation aspects in learning. It includes components such as displaying reluctance to tackle new tasks, saying tasks too hard and making no attempt, being hesitant about giving answers, delaying answers/ waiting for hints, and trying but concentration soon fades. Second is attitude toward learning which reveals how students display their attitude during the learning process. It includes components such as disinterest toward learning activities, being too unenergetic for interest or effort, uncooperative in-class activities, unwillingness to be helped in difficulty, and easily giving up on the task.

Third is attention/persistence which displays the student’s awareness of paying attention in the classroom. The components include being easily distracted or seeking distraction, fidgeting/ squirming or leaving the seat, not sticking to tasks, responses showing a lack of attention, and not caring about attitude to success or failure. The last is strategy/flexibility which is mostly about students’ problem-solving in the learning process. It includes performing tasks in their own not the accepted way, inventing silly ways to do tasks, not working well when in a bad mood, being aggressive or hostile when frustrated, and having enterprising ideas that often fail.

2.4 English as a Foreign Language (EFL)

EFL is defined as teaching/learning English as the target language which is classified as a foreign language in that country. Foreign language means the language used outside the country. The purpose of learning a foreign language is diverse such as for tourism, communicating with native speakers, reading foreign journals, proceeding education, or job requirements. Iwai (2011) and Peng (2019) defined: English as a Foreign Language (EFL) refers to those who learn English in non-English speaking countries. As an international language, it has been taught as a compulsory subject in educational institutions from Elementary up to university level, such as in Japan (Iwai, 2011), China, and South Korea (Peng, 2019).

EFL students may live in a country where their first language is primarily spoken for communication and these students may be required to learn English for their academic studies, traveling activities, or business purposes (Peng, 2019). In an EFL classroom, the EFL students spend a few hours a week studying English to practice their newly acquired language skills formally at school to master the listening, speaking, reading, and writing of English.

2.5 English Learning in Indonesia

In Indonesia, English is known as a foreign language (EFL) since Indonesia is a non-English country that does not speak English. English is usually used for educational purposes and included in the curriculum of Indonesian education, it is taught widely in school, particularly in junior high school and senior high school (Alfarisy, 2021). The purpose of intercultural foreign language learning on a global level has some obvious points. First to understand and respect other languages and cultures, to understand and respect their language and cultures, to understand and respect how to connect and link with different languages and cultures, and last to develop language and culture awareness (Liddicoat, 2004).
3. RESEARCH METHODS

This research is conducted in a qualitative research method. The qualitative research method seeks to understand phenomena which aims to find an depth understanding rather than numeric data analysis (Ary et al., 2010). It was conducted in SMP Teuku Nyak Arif Fatih Bilingual School located in Banda Aceh, Aceh. The participant was chosen by purposive sampling regarding to students’ language background considering the students who were classified as bilingual Acehnese- Bahasa and monolingual Bahasa. Five bilingual and five monolingual students from grade seven were chosen to be participants in this study. The observation and interview were used to collect data taken from those students. The observation data would be students’ learning behavior in EFL classrooms based on McDermott’s (1999) learning behavior component during English class. Meanwhile, the interview data would be a transcript of students’ learning behavior information and it would be collected outside the classroom.

In collecting the data, the observation was conducted in three meetings to observe students’ learning behavior based on McDermott’s (1999) learning behavior component collected in the classroom during English class. The observation sheet for this study contained 20 components of motivation, attitude toward learning, attention/persistence, and strategy/flexibility. After the result of observing the bilingual Acehnese-Bahasa and monolingual Bahasa students’ learning behavior was found, the interview would be done to seek more information about students’ learning behavior. The interview was conducted in a semi-structured interview with an open-ended question to seek a reason (why). It was aimed to gather supporting data about their learning behavior to seek the reason for their displayed behavior. The interview was conducted in Bahasa via WhatsApp phone call.

The data from observation (students’ learning behavior) were analyzed using quantitative analyses. The existence of McDermott’s (1999) learning behavior components would be counted as 1 and the inexistence would be counted as 0. The data on the students’ learning behavior displayed in the classroom will be calculated. The accumulation was then transformed into percentages to reveal the result of each bilingual and monolingual learning behavior percentage. The data from the interview was analyzed using Miles and Huberman’s (1994) technique including data reduction, data display, and conclusion and verification. First is data reduction, the interview transcript was analyzed by eliminating irrelevant or redundant information and picking up the main points of the data interview. Second is data display, since the data had been selected the data would be displayed narratively. The last is conclusion and verification, the interview data about supporting information of bilingual and monolingual learning behavior lastly would be concluded and verified to obtain the final data of the interview.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Results

4.1.1 Competence Motivation Components

This research found that bilingual students showed few cases displayed in three components competence motivation, attitude toward learning, and strategy/flexibility. Meanwhile, monolinguals showed fewer cases and displayed only attention and persistence. The interview findings showed that the reason bilingual and monolingual students displayed those issues was affected by internal and external factors. Furthermore, the findings are displayed in the following tables.
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Table 1. Result of competence motivation components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Displays reluctance or fear to tackle new tasks</th>
<th>Says tasks too hard, makes no attempt</th>
<th>Very hesitant about giving answers</th>
<th>Delays answers, waits for hints</th>
<th>Tries, but concentration soon fades</th>
<th>Total cases existence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation findings showed that bilingual students were showing fewer cases of saying tasks too hard, being hesitant about giving answers delaying answers wait for hints during English class. Meanwhile, monolingual students were found to show fewer cases of displays of reluctance or fear to tackle new tasks and try, but concentration soon fades. In total bilingual students show fewer cases of these components with 24 cases than monolingual with 28 cases.

The interview findings showed that there were internal and external factors that influenced students to display issues in competence motivation components. First, in displaying reluctance or fear to tackle new tasks, bilingual students were affected by the internal factor of afraid being failure and the external factor of the other tasks’ existence. Meanwhile, the monolingual student was affected by external factors of the other tasks’ existence. Second, bilingual and monolingual students showed issues of saying tasks too hard, making no attempt influenced by internal factors of being unable to understand the task. Third, the reason for their hesitation to answer, was that both bilingual and monolingual students were influenced by internal factors of being not confident in elaborating their answers. Fourth, the interview findings revealed that bilingual and monolingual students both delayed answers and waited for hints because of internal factors. Most bilingual and monolingual students were afraid of making mistakes and forgetting the answer. Fifth, the reason for revealing tries but concentration soon fades from bilingual and monolingual students was influenced by internal factors. Most bilinguals forgot the answer. Meanwhile, monolingual students forgot and were unsure about the answer when they tried to state their opinion.

4.1.2 Attitude Toward Learning Components

Table 2 shows that bilingual students were shown less negative learning behavior issues showing less unenergetic interest or effort and less intention to easily give up on tasks. Meanwhile, monolingual students were found to show less disinterest toward learning activities and were unwilling to be helped with difficulty, and equally same in displaying uncooperative in-class activities along with bilingual students. In total bilingual students showed more cases in this component with 18 cases than monolingual students with 16 cases.
The interview findings showed that there were internal and external factors that influenced students to display an issue in attitude toward learning. First, in disinterest toward learning activities bilingual and monolingual students were affected by the external factor of being disinterested in learning activities. It was influenced by the lesson time. Second, bilingual and monolinguals displayed unenergetic interest or effort influenced by internal factors. Most of the bilinguals and monolinguals who showed this issue stated that they have calm personalities. Third, both bilingual and monolingual students showed uncooperative influenced by their internal factors of lack of attention toward teacher direction (bilingual) and laziness (monolingual). Fourth, the factor that caused the bilingual student to be unwilling to get help with difficulty was because internal factor of intention to do the task by herself. This issue was only displayed by a bilingual student meanwhile monolingual students were not displayed in any case of this issue. Fifth, the internal factor was found to be the reason that bilinguals easily gave up on tasks. It was because unable to understand how to accomplish the task. Meanwhile, for monolingual students, it was affected by the internal factors of being unable to understand and the external factors of other tasks’ existence.

### 4.1.3 Attention/Persistence Components

In terms of attention and persistence bilingual Acehnese-Indonesian students and monolingual Indonesian students showed very little difference, those students showed almost the same case existence of attention and persistence from the McDermott learning behavior components. Bilingual and monolingual students revealed a slight difference in easily distracted or seeking distraction, fidgeting/squirming/leaving seats, not sticking to tasks, and showing a lack of attention. In total bilingual students were found to show more cases with 18 cases than monolingual students with 16 cases.

### Table 3. Result of attention/persistence components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Easily distracted or seeks distraction</th>
<th>Fidgets, squirms, leaves seat</th>
<th>Doesn’t stick to tasks</th>
<th>Responses show a lack of attention</th>
<th>Don’t-care attitude to success or failure</th>
<th>Total cases existence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The interview findings showed that there were mostly internal factors that influenced students to display issues in attention/persistence components. First, in easily distracted or seeking distraction the internal factor of being bored and unnecessary chatting with friends in the classroom affected bilingual students, meanwhile, monolingual students were because of an internal factor of being bored and the external factor of being distracted by friends. Second, bilingual and monolingual students showed issues of fidgets, squirms, and leaving seats because of internal factors. They displayed the cases because of being bored in the classroom. Third, only one bilingual student was found to have the issue of not sticking to tasks because of being unable to understand and procrastinate, meanwhile, monolingual students did not show any case of this issue. Fourth, Bilingual students showed issues with responses showing a lack of attention was affected by internal factors of unfocused, missing teacher explanations, and lack of vocabulary understanding. And so did the monolingual student. Most of them responded with a lack of attention because of did not pay attention to the teacher’s explanation. Fifth, bilingual students showed the issue of a don’t-care attitude toward success or failure was affected by the internal factor of the perception toward the task. Meanwhile, monolingual students showed this issue was affected by internal factors same as bilingual and external factors of the other task existence.

4.1.4 Strategy/Flexibility Components

Bilingual Acehnese-Indonesian students reported having less negative behavior in learning strategy and flexibility in cognitive strategy. According to the data from the table above, bilingual students showed cases of not performing well when in bad mood issues. Meanwhile, monolingual Indonesian students revealed cases of inventing silly ways to do tasks, not performing well when in a bad mood, and having enterprising ideas that often fail. In total bilingual students revealed fewer cases of existence with two cases than monolingual students with eight cases of existence.

Table 4. Result of strategy/flexibility components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Performs tasks on own, not accepted way</th>
<th>Invents silly ways to do tasks</th>
<th>Doesn’t work well when in a bad mood</th>
<th>Aggressive or hostile when frustrated</th>
<th>Has enterprising ideas that often fail</th>
<th>Total cases existence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interview findings showed that the issue revealed in strategy/flexibility was affected by internal and external factors. First, there was no case of students performing tasks in their own not accepted way. Bilingual and monolingual students in the interview section stated that they did not perform tasks on their own it was always based on the teacher’s direction and demand, second Only one monolingual students were found showing issues of inventing a silly way to do a task because of incorrectly interpreting the task, meanwhile bilingual students did not show any case of this issue. Third, the interview section revealed that both the reasons bilingual and monolingual students showed that they don’t work well when in a bad mood because of external factors of having problem relationships with their friend or their condition. Fourth, based on the information revealed in the observation result there were none of the bilingual and monolingual students showed issues of being aggressive or hostile when frustrated. Referring to information from the interview findings they turned out to be more passive in class activity rather than being aggressive or hostile when frustrated. Fifth, a monolingual student was found to have the issue of having enterprising ideas that often fail more than bilingual students. She was affected by the internal factor of being less focused in class.

In summary, bilingual students revealed 24 cases of issues in competence motivation, seven cases of issues in attitude toward learning, 18 cases of issues in attention and persistence, and two cases of issues in strategy and flexibility. In total bilingual students revealed 51 cases of issues in 16 components of McDermott learning behavior, which means that bilingual students revealed 80% of the McDermott learning behavior components. The components they did not show were performing tasks on their own not accepting ways, inventing silly ways to do tasks, being aggressive or hostile when frustrated, and having enterprising ideas that often fail.

Meanwhile, monolingual students revealed 28 cases of issues in competence motivation, 13 cases of issues in attitude toward learning, 16 cases of issues in attention and persistence, and eight cases of issues in strategy and flexibility. In total, there were 65 cases of issues shown by monolingual students in 17 components of McDermott learning behavior, which means monolingual students revealed 85% of the McDermott learning behavior components. The components they did not show were unwillingness to be helped, performing tasks on their own not accepting way, and being aggressive or hostile when frustrated. In conclusion, monolingual students revealed more McDermott learning behavior components cases with 65 than bilingual students with 51 cases. They revealed the different percentages, bilingual with 80% and monolingual with 85% of total learning behavior components.

4.2 Discussion

Based on the result of this study, SMP Teuku Nyak Arif Fatih Bilingual School showed that the amount of McDermott’s (1999) learning behavior components was mostly shown by monolingual students during the English class. Meanwhile, for the interview result, the reason stated by bilingual and monolingual students for displaying that learning behavior was mostly affected by internal factors. The bilingual students showed less negative behavior in three components competence motivation, attitude toward learning, and strategy/flexibility. In terms of competence motivation, bilingual students were found to be saying tasks too hard, hesitant about giving answers, and delaying answers by waiting for hints during English class. It proves that students with different language backgrounds in this case bilingual (Acehnese- Bahasa students)
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develop strong thinking skills (Pandey, 2013), remembering (Bialystok, 2001), and have an easier time learning another language (Jessner, 2008). It revealed that bilingual Acehnese-Bahasa students performed English better in terms of competence motivation than monolingual Bahasa students.

Furthermore, bilingual students were found to show fewer negative learning behavior issues in terms of attitude toward learning than monolingual students. They were found to show less unenergetic interest or effort, and less intention to easily give up on tasks. This finding was supported by Pandey (2013) that bilinguals can develop strong thinking skills, suggesting that bilingual students make an effort to accomplish tasks. Since bilingualism can improve critical thinking, it enhances learning motivation and problem-solving (Tarighat et al., 2019) so they can give more effort and intention into solving the task. This also leads bilingual Acehnese-Bahasa students to be unwilling to be helped with difficulty because they have stronger learning motivation and critical thinking in solving the problem.

In terms of attention and persistence bilingual Acehnese-Bahasa students and monolingual Bahasa students showed almost the same case existence. Bilingual and monolingual students revealed a slight difference in easily distracted or seeking distraction, fidgeting/squirming/leaving the seat, not sticking to the task, and responses showing a lack of attention. This finding is contradicted by Bialystok (2001) bilingual has better focus than monolingual. This finding also contradicted Grundy et al. (2023) who in his research stated that some studies reported speaking two or more languages improves executive functioning in tasks that recruit inhibition, working memory, and cognitive flexibility. Furthermore, bilingual Acehnese-Bahasa students reported having less negative behavior learning strategy and flexibility in cognitive strategy.

The internal factors reflected in bilingual and monolingual students were unconfident, anxiety about making mistakes, unable to understand, and emotional condition (bad mood). Further research about anxiety about making mistakes in EFL stated that it is a common issue especially when speaking. Research done in Swedish lower secondary schools reported that some students are worried about making mistakes in English class (Cabrera-Solano et al., 2019). Students can show reluctance in English class due to fear of making mistakes and lack of confidence (Savaşçı, 2013). Emotional condition such as a bad mood refers to a negative emotion that leads to motivation and attention decrease; it reduces academic performance (Lewis et al., 2011). Meanwhile, students were unable to understand English because of low English proficiency (Savaşçı, 2013). The external factor that existed in disinterest toward learning activities from bilingual Acehnese-Bahasa students and monolingual Bahasa students was affected by external factors. The external factor was the learning time which was almost midday/lunch break time. They stated that the morning class is fresher than the afternoon class. This external effect of learning time proved that time of day plays a significant part in students’ achievement (Wile & Shouppe, 2011). This is supported by the finding that students were performing better in the morning than afternoon in English class (Mulenga & Mukuka, 2016).

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the result of this study it found that bilingual students showed less case displayed in three components of competence motivation, attitude toward learning, and strategy/flexibility. Meanwhile, monolinguals showed fewer cases and displayed only
attention and persistence. In addition, the interview findings revealed the reason bilingual and monolingual students displayed those issues which were affected by internal and external factors.

The McDermott (1999) learning behavior components were mostly shown by monolingual students during the English class. Furthermore, the interview results showed that the reason stated by bilingual and monolingual students for displaying those learning behaviors was mostly affected by internal factors. Bilingual Acehnese-Bahasa students were found to outperform the monolingual Bahasa students in terms of less existence of McDermott’s (1999) learning behavior issue in three components, competence motivation, attitude toward learning, and strategy/ flexibility. However bilingual and monolingual students showed slight differences in cases accumulation of attention and persistence issues into each other, they mostly had the same case existence frequency. In addition, the finding of bilingual and monolingual students showed the same case frequency in attention and persistence. This was contradicted by Bialystok (2001) and Grundy et al. (2023) that agrees bilinguals have better focus than monolinguals.

According to the research findings, the researchers provided some suggestions addressed to English teachers and other researchers. For teachers, the finding of this research found the existence of different behaviors among bilingual and monolingual students. This research is expected to encourage teachers to find appropriate methods and techniques used in teaching EFL by considering students’ language backgrounds. As well as for students, should be aware of their language background and recognize their learning behavior to prevent negative behavior, instead of encouraging positive behavior. For the researcher, since this research was conducted in a private female school and involved participants in the same grade, all of the students were considered to have less external difference. Further research done in public schools with diverse grades of students has a probability of revealing different results to this study. So it may lead to more information regarding students’ background differences.

REFERENCES


