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ELF and multilingual justice in English language teaching practices: Voices from Indonesian English teachers

Abstract

The unprecedented spread of English across geopolitical boundaries has contributed to the recurrent rise of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) studies and of “Englishes”. However, pressure from native English speakers’ norms remains feasible in many of English instructional activities in non-English speaking countries in the South, including Indonesia. This paper examines the perception of English teachers at English Literature Department in Indonesian Islamic higher education towards ELF in multilingual setting and the extent to which the ELT practices (may) accommodate multilingual justice. We collected data through a semi-structured interview with four teachers in UMI University (pseudonym) and were analyzed using Kirkpatrick’s (2018) ELF teaching framework. The findings demonstrated that a) teachers have a complex perception and ambivalent attitude towards ELF as they think ELF is important for the students; however, due to lack of support institution and colleagues, they tend to orient their teaching activities to native-English norms, and b) the current practice of ELT does not (yet) accommodate justice for multilingual learners. Bringing ELF is important to promote linguistic justice and grant students’ multilingual rights. However, a more systematic institutional policy needs to be undertaken to reinforce the teachers’ existing positive perspective towards ELF.
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Introduction

The unprecedented spread of English across geopolitical boundaries has contributed to recurrent rise of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) studies and to significant growth of multilingual speakers with English, with more dynamic and fluid characteristics (Canagarajah & Said, 2011; Graddol, 2006; Mauranen, 2018). They use English for various purposes, from business, politics, to education which leads to a remarkable transnational mobility where English competence is deemed as a linguistic capital expected to liberate socioeconomic disadvantages (Bourdieu,
This brings English to gain more privilege in education context. English has served as *lingua academica* (Phillipson, 2008, 2017), espoused by growth of English language teaching in the Outer and Expanding circle countries, publications in some journals written in English, English language requirement for enrolling to higher education institutions in the Inner Circle countries, and (English) Medium of Instruction (MoI) in several educational institutions in peripheral countries that strive for international reputation and recognition.

English language teaching in the Outer and Expanding countries, however, has still been oriented to and tacitly guided by Inner Circle English speakers’ norms that proclaim to have ‘imagined’ authority (Canagarajah, 2013; Kachru, 1992; Kimura & Canagarajah, 2018). This perspective undermines the existence of other varieties of English than THEIR English (e.g. British and American) as it views “foreign” pronunciation or accent as deficiencies in lieu of differences (Canagarajah, 2007; Jenkins, 2006; Seidlhofer, 2018). This native speakerism unilaterally claims authority over the language. Some scholars of critical applied linguistics (see Canagarajah, 2007; Pennycook, 2009, 2017; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006) have critiqued such asymmetric power since it perpetuates regime of truth of the Inner Circle English (Wahyudi, 2018) and widens marginality and inequality in language teaching (Tupas, 2015). Moreover, research on ELF have confronted the ‘unmarked and stable’ belief upon Standard English as “elusive to any linguistic definition” (Seidlhofer, 2018, p. 86).

As a global lingua franca, English has now been learned by and taught to speakers of diverse lingua-cultural backgrounds. However, pressure from native English norms remains feasible in many of English language teaching materials and assessments in non-English speaking countries in the South, including Indonesia. Most of the materials and assessments in Indonesian ELT context are oriented to native-English norms preferring British and American
instructional designs (see Manara, 2013; Wahyudi, 2018; Widodo, 2016; Zein, 2019). This situation has made multilingual Indonesian students potentially lose their multilingual rights while studying the dominating Inner circle English. The imposition on Indonesian students to perform native-like English therefore has no place of relevance at this point because they learn English as a lingua franca to help them communicate with speakers whose first language might not always be English. The adamant demand of doing so is by no means entrenching linguistic imperialism (Sugiharto, 2014; Phillipson, 2017).

Canagarajah (2005) argues that multilingual speakers, like most of Indonesian English learners, might perform better whenever their linguistic repertoires are accommodated and appreciated during foreign language learning process as they have the ability to ‘negotiate’ to which linguistic choice they might aim to select for their communication purposes (Jenkins, 2006, 2015). Kirkpatrick (2018) recommended English language teachers to consider locality, shift from correctness to mutual intelligibility, regard varieties of English as differences instead of ‘foreign’, and detach from monolithic approach. His recommendation is further voiced by Musthafa, Hamied, and Zein (2019) arguing that, following the ongoing transition of Indonesian ELT pathway from nativeness to ELF, policy makers should reorient the objective of ELT in Indonesia, redesign English teachers’ proficiency policy, and empower students and teachers as ELF users. Such a practice may be of more advantages for Indonesian multilingual learners as to gain linguistic capital accumulation (Phillipson, 2017) without overlooking their multilingual rights (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2013).

**English as a lingua franca, world Englishes, and English language teaching**

The term English as Lingua Franca first appeared in 1996 in a PhD seminar where Jennifer Jenkins presented her work. It were Barbara Seidlhofer, Anna Mauranen, and Jennifer Jenkins
(and their fellow colleagues), claimed to be the three founding mothers of ELF, who eventually continued working on this field by employing different approaches, from grammar, phonology, morphology, corpus linguistics, pragmatics to conversational analysis. Seidlhofer (2005) defined ELF as the use of English by speakers who do not share the same first language. The emphasis that ELF puts is on communicative mutual understanding. In other words, ELF can be viewed as the use of English in social interaction by speakers with different first languages (Kirkpatrick, 2012).

Seidlhofer (2005) elucidated some linguistic features typical to ELF: a)–s in third person of present simple tense is often absent, b) which and who are interchangeably used, c) article in either definite or indefinite is often omitted, d) prepositions are redundantly used, and e) uncountable nouns are often pluralized. As in Indonesia and other South East Asian countries, Hashim and Letner (2014) argued that ELF speakers tend to a) predominantly use simple present tense, followed by simple past, b) rarely use articles, c) often unmark plural countable nouns, d) prevalently use discourse particles or pragmatic particles like la seems, and e), commonly use loan words when communicating with speakers who share the same first language. The aforementioned characteristics of Englishes are commonly found in the Expanding Circle countries, also in the former British or the US colonies, as they have had acquired their the mother tongues prior to learning English. The rising growth of Englishes is inevitable reality and that the number of speakers who speak English as a second or foreign language surpasses native English speakers has marked the irrelevant ideology of native speakerims.

Rarely, if ever, does ELT in the South respect students’ diverse backgrounds, be it first language, nationality, or even ethnicity. The prevalent ELT practices mainly refer to Inner Circle English which expects students acquire native-like English competence. The incorporation of
ELF into ELT is therefore of an urgent need to expose students in the South to plurilithic Englishes (Pennycook, 2009). To emphasize, it seems irrelevant for students of Outer and Expanding to study Inner Circle English norms unless they want to communicate with Inner Circle English speakers or to continue study in the center countries. Even if it is reasonable, the standard of Inner Circle English is problematic because there also appears variety of Englishes (Jenkins, 2018; Seidlhofer, 2018). The proponents of ELF criticized Inner Circle, Native English speakers as being overconfident to tell other speakers of English of what they can or cannot say, the practice to enjoy hegemony over others (Phillipson, 2008).

**The principles of EFL teaching**

Given the fact that language teaching might require a “fixed” model to which teachers or policy makers would base their curriculum, ELF is often criticized for its instability and flexibility. Jenkins, Cogo, and Dewey (2011), for example, viewed ELF not construing a single stable variety due to its alignment with multilingual diversity which involves meaning-making in communication. ELT accommodating ELF should, therefore, consider local settings (Kirkpatrick, 2012, 2018) by taking the following principles into account:

1. The linguistic target of ELT is not native speaker
2. The cultural goal of ELT is intercultural communication
3. Multilingual teachers with high proficiency is the role model for multilingual students
4. Lingua franca environment is excellent language environment for lingua franca speakers
5. Spoken English is not the same as written English
6. Assessment must be tailored to the (multi)lingua franca
The first two principles adhere to the ELF intercultural communication objective as not to be impeded to the native-speakerism accuracy but to the mutual intelligibility. The multilingual role model and lingua franca environment are of greater endeavours to detach from native English hegemony. Although Kirkpatrick (2018) did not detail how to measure English competence in multilingual setting, he suggested to revisit the predominant assessment regime which tends to devalue the students’ mother tongue accent. Whereas, appreciating the students’ use of mother tongue accent when they speak communicate in English may support equality in ELF teaching practices and guarantee their multilingual capital.

Kirkpatrick’s (2018) proposed principles respect the existing reality of Indonesian learners who are in fact bi/multilingual. It also opens spaces for the multilingual speakers to be assessed in accordance with their multilingual competence instead of monolithic determination of native-English. This proposal goes hand-in-hand with that of Shohamy’s (2011) democratic language assessment and thus reinforces Zein’s (2019) study which highlights a shift in Indonesian ELT orientation from Inner Circle English (Dewi, 2017; Manara, 2013) to English as a lingua franca. By doing so, ELF approach may potentially offer linguistic justice and diminish discrimination upon speakers of English in Indonesia and other South East Asian nations.

Social/linguistic (injustice) of English language teaching

Critical applied linguistics scholars, among others are Skutnabb-Kangas (2013), Pennycook (2009), and Phillipson (2008, 2017), have warned ELT practitioners to reduce dependency on native speakers’ norms in ELF teaching practices as it may captive learners in a shadow of native speakerism. Phillipson (2017) argued that as long as the production of (English) resources and theorisation of language are based on Inner Circle countries, the teaching of English will unlikely be free from their pressure, domination, and hegemony. If this situation
continues, ELT practices will be merely the market for native English speakers; multilingual English learners and teachers in the Expanding and Outer Circles are hegemonized as if they did not have any choices other than Inner Circle’s “standardized” English.

Holliday (2008) even urged English teachers in the South to deconstruct native-speakerism ideology by for instance “de-Centering textbooks with local teachers’ own reality” (p. 126). English learners in the peripheral countries should not be deluded to produce near-native proficiency, let alone in multilingual context. This is of important endeavour to grant linguistic ‘justice, equality, and fairness’ for multilingual students as they learn English as a lingua franca and to fight against colonialization (Dovchin, 2020; Mahboob & Golden, 2013). Indeed, Selvi (2014) has problematized the imagined authority of English native speakers which often condemns multilingual speakers by acting as custodians of the language, directing of what can and cannot be said and judging of what should and should not be used. The teaching of English in multilingual setting should benefit multilingual learners, and accommodating Kirkpatrick’s (2018) principles in ELF teaching practices may provide students with linguistic accumulation and grant linguistic justice (Phillipson, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2013).

**Related studies on ELF**

Studies on attitude and perception of ELF have been many in numbers especially in Expanding Circle contexts (see Jenkins, 2006; Mairi, 2016; Matsuda, 2003). Jenkins (2006) examined students’ perception toward English production variations, from British English to non-native English. The results demonstrated that students favoured native-English accent, while non-native English accent is negatively valued. This finding supports Matsuda’s (2003) investigation on the attitude of Japanese students who undervalued non-native English variety. This perception might be influenced by the “regime of truth” (Foucault, 1980) created by Inner Circle English, leading
the students into imagined authority of native speakers from the center. Native English speakerism ideology seems to have perpetuated the hegemony and entrenched marginalization towards multilingual.

As for the Indonesian context, ELF related-studies range from attitude and perception (Dewi, 2017; Lee et al, 2018; Mairi, 2016) to critical pedagogy and power relation (Mambu, 2019; Wahyudi & Chusna, 2019). Using students and pre-service teachers as the participants, Mairi (2016) and Lee et al. (2018) demonstrated a positive attitude towards ELF. The participants believed that ELF can provide more benefit to multilingual learners because ELF emphasizes on mutual intelligibility instead of ‘correctness’. The dominant resources and prevalent dictation of Inner Circle English in Indonesian English education setting (Manara, 2013; Zein 2019), however, Dewi (2017) elucidated contradictory outcomes. Her research revealed that Indonesian English teachers prefer to teach American or British English to their students although they are aware of Englishes since access to either American or British English materials is much easier than that to other varieties.

Unlike aforementioned studies, Mambu (2019) and Wahyudi and Chusna (2019) investigated ELF in relation to unequal power practice in ELF classroom exercised by teachers and students. Mambu (2019) argued that employing ELF and compelling argument might enable teachers and students to negotiate meaning and display criticality as integral parts of ELF. Taking ELF in primary private school setting, Wahyudi and Chusna (2019) demonstrated an asymmetric-yet-dynamic power relation between teacher(s) and students which often entrenched the hegemonic domination of Inner Circle English in Indonesian ELT setting. They suggested that “power-informed ELF framework” (p. 167) be incorporated for English teacher education
program as to provide open-mindedness, tolerance, and justice for Indonesian multilingual
students who are often marginalized as to speak native-like English.

This paper aims to expand the existing research by further taking English teachers with
adequate ELF background in the English Literature Department at an Indonesian Islamic Higher
Education, to critically analyse the extent to which they may resist, support, or negotiate ELF in
the ELT practice. Reconstructing the way English language is taught in the so-labelled English
Literature Department is quite complicated because, until recently, the term “English Literature”
is referred to predominantly Anglo-American literature. The teaching of English language skills
in the Department is mainly projected to equip students with the English competence that can
help students understand, appreciate, and criticize Anglo-American literature. With such an
institutional goal, the English teachers in the English Literature Department prefer exposing the
students with British and American English, regardless the fact that they have adequate
knowledge on the phenomenon of World Englishes or strong desire on the promotion of ELF to
the multilingual Indonesian learners.

Research method

This study employed interpretive paradigm with a qualitative case study (Yin, 2017) as the
approach to understand the view towards ELF in ELT practice at English literature department,
UMI university. These data characteristics also resonate Miles, Huberman, and Saldana’s (2014)
conception of qualitative paradigm which seek to focus on rigorous data elicitation. The data
were collected through a semi-structured interview with four teachers from UMI University
(pseudonym) teaching Speaking for Daily Conversation and Literal Listening courses to examine
their attitude, view, and position, as to whether they may resist, support, or negotiate ELF in ELT
practice. We also requested permission to have their course outline and teaching materials of
respective courses to further match of what is said and what is stated.

The interview results were transcribed verbatim and coded based on the emergence theme appeared such as foreign (accent), native speaker, error, communication, English variety and proficiency. The data were analyzed using Kirkpatrick’s (2018) framework of teaching English as a Lingua Franca principles: a) native speaker is not the linguistics target, b) native speakers’ culture is not the target culture, c) lingua franca environment suits lingua franca speakers, and, d) assessment must be tailored to the lingua franca contexts. We didn’t take Kirkpatrick’s (2018) two other principles – spoken English is not the same as written English and well-trained multilinguals provide the most appropriate English teachers- as we saw them less relevance to our current research. This framework emphasizes on detaching from native speakers’ dependency and underscores mutual intelligibility and intercultural communication (Jenkins, 2015) given the growth of multilingual speakers where English is used as lingua franca.

**Informants profile**

We interviewed four teachers of two different courses. We used pseudonyms to keep informants identity secret. Riya and Tedjo are mid-senior teachers at the English literature department, UMI University. Riya graduated from one of top Australian Universities with specialization in TESOL, while Tedjo completed his master degree in English language education from one of universities in East Java, Indonesia. They have been familiar with ELF since they took courses like global Englishes and intercultural communication in their master program. Riya has been teaching listening skill to the undergraduate students since the last three years and she also has an experience to teach speaking skill, while Tedjo has been teaching the listening skill for about 5 years. For speaking teachers, we interviewed Maryam and Lisa. They are permanent teachers graduated from one of Australian universities in 2012 and 2014 respectively. Their master degree
was in applied linguistics. As for Maryam, she is currently undertaking her PhD program which has enriched her understanding of ELF and World Englishes paradigm. She has been lecturing speaking course in the department for the last two consecutive years.

Each teacher in the department has the authority to develop the course outline and design the teaching materials. However, they are suggested to refer to the syllabus and curriculum developed by faculty member, board of teachers’ consortium of respective courses, and the team teaching. They usually set the goal of the course and recommend topics and materials. This scenario offers partial freedom for teachers to adjust to their class condition.

The interview was all conducted in bahasa Indonesia under their consent. We first offered them whether they might be convenient to have the interview in English, Indonesian or Javanese, given that interviewers are also fluent speakers of those languages. Bahasa Indonesia is selected to give more rapport communication during the interview and to enable us express idea or insights in the language we are most proficient. It is also beneficial to hinder potential misunderstanding when a foreign language, in this case English, is used, and to detach embedded hegemony of English.

**Results and discussion**

On the basis of the interview data, we demonstrate two major themes regarding ELF teaching in Indonesian Islamic higher education setting: teachers’ perception and position toward ELF and linguistic (in)justice in the ELT.

**Teachers’ perception and position toward ELF in Indonesian ELT context**

Our data revealed that ELF is positively viewed and is considered important given the rapid growth of English language learners in the South. By referring to Kirkpatrick’s (2018)
framework, we first demonstrate the extent in which teachers view ELF in Indonesian Islamic higher education and then followed by detailed discussion of current ELT practices in three major concerns: English language learning target, language learning environment, and language assessment (Kirkpatrick, 2018). Our informants believe that introducing other varieties of Englishes is important for their students who are in fact multilingual.

“*You know, there are now many varieties of English, I think it is important that our students know them, not only British or American English*” (Riya, 10/10/2020)

Maryam also shared the similar notion regarding the necessity to introduce ELF to her students.

“*To me, I think it is very important that students know other varieties of English besides what they might have known such as British and American.*” (Maryam, 12/10/2020)

The other two informants responded towards the necessity of recognizing Englishes that “*it could make students more confident with their English*” [Tedjo] and “*perhaps can reduce feeling inferior because to them English is a foreign language*” [Lisa]. To them, ELF is believed to help students gain confidence and reduce inferiority. However, Tedjo’s and Lisa’s responses also provide a clear picture that Inner Circle English still enjoys its domination – as if it is a *superior* language over others, which often hinders students to perform English confidently as Lisa found in her class.

“*I always emphasize that it is okay to speak English with strong local accent [the original word was medok- [strong accent of Javanese] of for example Javanese or Madurese as long as it is understandable.*” [Lisa, 12/10/2020]

Although Lisa often found students reluctant to speak English in her class because they were afraid of making a mistake, she was confident that not making nativeness as the target
could reduce such a feeling, indicating that teacher emphasizes more on intelligibility. Her comment corresponds to ELF which underscores mutual-intelligibility over nativeness, focusing on meaning rather than forms (Hashim & Letner, 2014; Seidlhofer, 2018) and thus reflects Kirkpatrick’s (2018) ELF teaching approach in Indonesian multilingual context. It is also relevant to Musthafa et al.’s (2019) recommendation as to revisit the objective of English language teaching in Indonesia by detaching from native English ideology to ELF, that is providing students with “Englishes relevant to the ASEAN context and empower intercultural competence” (p. 179).

There seems to be an awareness among teachers regarding to which English language learning should be oriented. Their responses provide a clear indication that they try to disentangle from prevalent Inner Circle English reference as the linguistic goal (Kirkpatrick, 2018; Seidlhofer, 2018). Maryam even reported that she often showed students Indian English and Singaporean English in her class. She added, “Again to me it is okay to speak English even if the local accent is apparent. The point is on mutual understanding”.

We then asked which English they teach or aim to teach in their class.

“Since the goal to use English is for communication, I think English that is varied should be taught instead of American or British English only”. (Riya, 10/10/2020)

We further confirmed what she meant by “English that is varied”. She said that “Yeah like ELF or World Englishes” so students could also listen to “for instance Javanese English or Madurese English” which she thought important for fostering students’ confidence and language awareness (Canagarajah, 2013). This idea is also shared by Maryam and Lisa where they think that ELF is important to make students gain awareness of linguistic diversity.
“I think the concept like EFL should be introduced even from secondary schools. Indonesian students are multilingual. So If I have to choose which English to teach, I would say like EFL one” (Maryam, 12/10/2020)

Their preference toward non-conformity of native English as the “alternative” English in ELT, particularly in the courses of English for Daily Communication and Literal Listening, could be the result of their positive support toward ELF and WE. Maryam preferably chose English in English for Daily Communication as English (as a Lingua Franca) for Daily Communication to native English. Her position may help multilingual learners gain linguistic accumulation instead of disposition (Phillipson, 2017) as she does not make native English as a target (Kirkpatrick, 2018).

Our informants appear to understand ELF as a communication vehicle of people from different first language backgrounds (Seidlhofer, 2018) where mutual intelligibility is considered more important than the form (of English). Their perspective embraces the functional and pragmatic view of ELF which regard native-speaker competence “neither expected nor necessarily beneficial” (Sung, 2017). Under this view, inaccurate pronunciation or flawed grammatical use is not a major concern for the fact that the purpose of communicating with people from different lingua-cultural background is mutual understanding (Jenkins, 2006; Kirkpatrick, 2018). As long as what they say or communicated is understood, although with mistakes in grammar, such a communication is considered successful. Those positive attitudes of ELF and desire to introduce ELF in their class might be the results of their academic trajectories as Maryam said that her PhD journey has made her more aware of ELF and World Englishes.

Aligned to Kirkpatrick’s’ (2018) second principle of ELF teaching in the South, we questioned the current exposure, environment, and practice of ELT they encounter. Our
informants reported that the current ELT practice in the English Literature Department does not fully correspond to that of ELF principle(s). Efforts to introduce ELF seem to be dependent upon individual teacher’s initiative. It thus echoes Nur’Aini, Affini, and Setyorini’s (2019) study on pre-service English teachers as they receive inadequate support and training from the institution so that initiative to introduce ELF in ELT practices lies on teachers’ own preference.

“As far as I know, the ELT in Indonesian context, in this university in particular, remains static in Communicative Language Teaching. It is from at least in the syllabus that I observed. I don’t think there appears an ELF. The course outline that I design based on the syllabus also does not directly refer to ELF but I introduce it in my class.” (Riya, 10/10/2020).

Lisa also found the similar case in the course she taught in which the native English speakers’ norms remain dominant and tend to still enjoy their hegemony in the syllabus she used. Although she reported in the earlier response that she welcomed Englishes variety in her class, her teaching resources were mostly adopted from Inner-Circle English like the UK.

“The English we teach here I think follow the native English rules with American English becomes the most preferred one by either students or teachers. For resources, I personally often take from British council however. That is of course more oriented to native English than ELF”. (Lisa, 12/10/2020).

Lisa’s comment voices the remaining pressure of native English as a reference of truth (Wahyudi, 2018; Zein, 2019) since British and American are preferred over other Englishes. Although Lisa is aware about the necessity to refer to ELF as she commented earlier, there seems no ample support from her current surrounding environment. We assume that this situation might be influenced by the way the English Literature Department defined “English” which refers to Anglo-American. It is reaffirmed by Tedjo’s statement that familiarization to native-English,
although he is aware of ELF, is necessary to help students understand Anglo-American literary works they will encounter in the following semesters.

“In fact, they will enrol in English Drama, English Prose, and English Poetry classes in the second and third year that they have to watch and listen to British and American plays like William Shakespeare, Oscar Wilde, or Arthur Miller. So listening materials from British or American are still relevance I think.” (Tedjo, 12/10/2020).

It illuminates that due to institutional demand to refer “English” to Inner circle variety, for example favouring literary works of Anglo-American authors, teachers’ even with adequate ELF background and awareness have limited choice to, for instance, confront the prevalent reference of English in their practices.

In terms of EFL-based assessment that Kirkpatrick (2018) proposed, we found the informants’ ambivalent attitude. Although ELF is positively viewed, the learning outcomes (LOs) of both courses are apparently oriented to target native-English. Speaking for Daily Conversation, Literal Listening, and other skill courses are projected to acquire English proficiency equal to TOEFL score of 525 or higher. To help students get such a TOEFL score target, the teachers are demanded to equip students with adequate norms of native English, which might make ELF have no place of relevance and perpetuate the native-English assessment-based regime (see Hasim & Letner, 2014; Kirkpatrick, 2018; Mustafa et al., 2019; Seidlhofer, 2018).

In Maryam’s case, she did not always refer to the existing speaking rubric suggested by the department but emphasized on mutual understanding and ability to negotiate meaning when communicating in English with speakers from different first language backgrounds.
“I do not always refer to the existing rubric which highlights accuracy and fluency for example. I think as long as their speaking understandable, it is okay. .........I accommodate the aspects of understandability and communicativeness instead”. (Maryam, 10/10/2020)

Maryam further reported that she did not disregard or undervalue local accent yet encouraged students to speak whatever English they can insofar as it is understandable. Such a positive act of respecting varieties of Englishes in the classroom resonates the spirit of “ELF communicative strategy” (Kirkpatrick, 2018, p. 144) which appreciates locality and creativity of meaning-making process (Canagarajah, 2013; Pennycook, 2009). Like Maryam, Tedjo stated

“I think it is hardly possible to produce native-like students. Frankly speaking, I always emphasize that what is important in communication (with foreigners) is (mutual) understanding”. (Tedjo, 10/10/2020)

In more practical level, Tedjo said that he often tried to also bring many other forms of Englishes into the class; however, he could not bring examples of Indonesian English which he thinks important to raise his multilingual students’ awareness upon linguistic diversity. His response seems to provide spaces of linguistic justice for Indonesian multilingual students in the sense that he did not force his students to perform like native and he didn’t make nativeness as linguistic and cultural goal (Kirkpatrick, 2018; Seidlhofer, 2018).

However, we found ambivalent attitude when we asked specifically about how the informants value or measure the pronunciation in particular. Although they appreciated students’ use of local accent, Lisa and Maryam coincidently also emphasize on the consistency of pronunciation reference, as to whether it is based on Oxford or Longman dictionary.
“But they have to be consistent, whether to use Oxford or Longman for the pronunciation. Because different pronunciation might lead into different meaning” (Lisa, 10/10/2020)

“It is okay to speak English with local accent but the pronunciation must be consistent. They can use British or American. But in the class, they are suggested to bring Oxford Pocket Dictionary” (Maryam, 12/10/2020).

It is evident that in the earlier data they display non-conformity over native speakers’ norms. On the other hand, the later data demonstrated that they seem to be captivated by native speakerism when, in the teaching practice, they direct students’ pronunciation to the ‘standard’ English pronunciation of either British with Oxford Dictionary or American with Longman Dictionary of American English. Such ambivalent attitudes were also apparent in Murata and Jenkins’ (2009) and Sung’s (2017) studies in which their participants were likely to accept variety of English, the non-standard, yet value homogeneity in order to grant mutual understanding among speakers with different first languages. This result might add nuance to the complexity of teachers’ perception and position towards ELF which is pivotal and influential for which ‘English’ model to bring into the classroom.

What we could not clarify is how such responses do present in the classroom since we did not carry out classroom observation. The course outlines however, as we have mentioned earlier, do not incorporate variety of English(s) or underlines intercultural communication as one of considerable learning outcomes. If what they said aligned with the instructional activities, that they have strived to negotiate native English norms in the syllabus and course outline by providing spaces for non-native English variety and respecting locality in using English, we could view it as a partial resistance to the domination of Inner Circle English regime of the ELT
practice in the South which needs to be supported by other scholars, teachers, and policy makers. To study Inner Circle English is unlikely necessary unless students have a clear and vivid goal to, for instance, studying in Inner Circle countries since the success in interacting with people from different lingua cultural backgrounds, let alone to get success at the workplace, is not necessarily related to the acquisition of native English norms (see Kubota, 2011).

**Linguistic (in)justice in ELT**

Issues on (in)justice in multilingual education, the situation where students are empowered through the use of multiple languages as medium of instruction instead of monolithic approach, have been widely outspoken since the last decades (Phillipson, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006, 2013). The majority practices of ELT in Outer and Expanding circle countries are reported to entrench hegemony of native English norms normalized through infrastructures such as English as a medium of instruction over other available languages to students, materials and resources adopted uncritically from British Council or American Corner, and massive recruitment of native English teachers with higher privileges compared to non-native English teachers (Mahboob & Golden, 2013; Selvi, 2014). Multilingual students who study English as a lingua franca are often unfortunate due to the prevalent domination of ‘standard’ English ideology which regards ‘foreign’ accents as deficiencies. Our informants’ reported that the assessments remain captivated by nativeness norms as they limit the reference to the Inner Circle English. Within such a practice, multilingual Indonesian English learners are quite unlucky as not to have democratic assessment approach (Shohamy, 2011).

When asked of which speaking rubric that Lisa used in her speaking class, she said

“I used the existing rubric that has been developed by teachers’ consortium. It is a 5-scale rubric which covers grammar vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and pronunciation.”
We asked her permission to have her sample rubric and found a) fluency: [**Very good to good:**] Speech is smooth and effortless, but *perceptively non-native* in speed and evenness. **Excellent:** Speech on all professional and general topics *as smooth and effortless as a native speaker’s*, and b) pronunciation [**Good to average:**] Errors never appear with understanding. **Excellent:** *Native pronunciation, with no trace of foreign accent.* Non-native variety under such a rubric is undesired and even penalized as to have a lower mark in terms of pronunciation and fluency aspects.

Maryam underscores that the recent ELT syllabus and course outline she used might not be relevant to multilingual learners nor providing them with linguistic justice as they are oriented to Inner English English – given the fact that ultimate goal of the students’ learning English language skills at the English Literature Department is to be able to understand, appreciate, and criticize Anglo-American literature. Exposing the students with varieties of Englishes neither substantially contribute to the achievement of such a goal nor really respect multilingual learners’ rights (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2013). There are complex issues that trigger the prevalent injustice in the practice of ELT that Maryam has experienced.

“It is not easy to teach English (as a lingua franca) here. Some colleagues remain too dependent to native English. As an English teacher, I will be mocked by my colleagues if I don’t speak like native English speaker. I feel ashamed, you know. Besides, the resources for our teaching activities are dominated by British or American”. (Maryam, 12/10/2020)

This situation highlights the practice of linguistic discrimination– treating non-native English speakers as deficient, mocking at speakers who don’t speak like natives, that appears in our informant’ recent ELT practice. To devalue foreign English accent which students or teachers use in the classroom corresponds to the so-called “linguistic racism” (see Dovchin,
The lack of support for ELF from the colleagues, given the imagined ‘standard’ English regime, has hindered the achievement of linguistic justice for Indonesian multilingual learners. We further asked Maryam as to whether her current English teaching offers ‘justice, equality, and fairness’ to her students. She said

“I think our curriculum remains too close to American or British. Most of materials I use are also from British council which thus I think, in my own opinion, it is not fair enough or adhere to English as a Lingua franca principles”. (Maryam, 12/10/2020)

Although she tried to introduce Englishes in her class, the environment of her recent ELT does not seem to accommodate linguistic justice. Under this condition, multilingual students are unlikely to be creative during meaning-making process, an important integral part of communication (Canagarajah, 2013), since they have been limited and captivated within the shadow of native speakerism.

Lisa’s and Maryam’s responses demonstrated the reiterated preference to American or British English as they are mostly desired by most of students and teachers in the department. Regardless the informants’ adequate ELF background, the teaching environments, be it colleagues, materials, and policies, do not yet firmly stand on Indonesian multilingual learners’ side in the present research context. It seems that there is a need to further foster linguistic justice and grant multilingual learners’ rights in the ELT given that stakeholders and policy makers involved in the instructional practices are still vulnerable to native speakerism.

Conclusion

Our findings have demonstrated that English language teachers at English Literature Department in Indonesian Islamic higher education have a complex perception and ambivalent attitude towards ELF. On one hand, they view that teaching of ELF is important to promote linguistic
justice for Indonesian multilingual learners. On the other hand, they are prone to refer to
standard, British and American English in their teaching practices, particularly on the assessment
aspects of pronunciation and accuracy. This ambivalence might appear due to the lack of support
from the institution and colleagues. As the department projects the ultimate goal of teaching
English skills to bridge students understand, appreciate, and criticize Anglo-American literature,
the teachers tend to design the instructional activities that correspond to British and American
English. The situation is even more paradoxical as some of the teachers’ colleagues expect our
informants to be ideal role models who are able to produce native-like English.

This paper explicated teachers’ desperate struggle to negotiate their positive attitudes
towards ELF in a seemingly less supporting ELT setting since there seems to be a strong
pressure from the regime of Inner Circle English norms circulated and operated in the teachers’
surrounding environment. Bringing ELF to the classroom is important to promote linguistic
justice and grant the students’ multilingual learners’ rights. However, more systematic
institutional policy needs to be undertaken to reinforce the teachers’ existing positive perception
on ELF.
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