

EFLS IDENTITY GROWTH TOWARD EIL: A CASE STUDY IN INDONESIA

Susi Andriani Simanjuntak^{1*}, Hsi-Nancy Lien²

¹A Student of International Master Program of Department of Education and Human Potential Development, National Dong Hwa University, Shoufeng, Hualien, Taiwan, Republic of China.

¹An Associate Professor in Department of Education and Human Potential Development, National Dong Hwa University, Shoufeng, Hualien, Taiwan, Republic of China.

Corresponding author:

¹610688118@gms.ndhu.edu.tw

Keywords:

English as an International Language (EIL),
English Language Teaching,
World Englishes,
English Foreign Language Identity Orientation.

ABSTRACT:

This study determined the English teachers and the students' identity toward teaching and learning English as an international language (EIL). Here we adapted the model of three distinct White Identity orientations to EFL identity orientations by Howard, G. R. (1999). The author has designated white identity into fundamentalist, integrationist, and transformationist orientation. This study used of a qualitative case study in one of senior high school with English teachers and 2 grades in Indonesia by seeing their discourse as talk: classroom talk and teachers' and students' talk in the actual classroom and interview. Based on the results, EFLs identity was growing in some orientations. It was showed that they were fundamentalist in term of supremacy Standard English and inferiority Nonstandard English. But, the other case is they had an understanding the reality of English variations nowadays. Moreover, the results interestingly showed that they were in transformationist EFL identity when they were involved in global issue, nations, and cultures. It seemed that they were facing contradict orientation identity within themselves. Through these findings, it is very important to move forward the EFL identity of fundamentalist to integrationist and then be more transformationist EFLs. Implications and suggestions would be discussed in this study.

INTRODUCTION

English language is ours. This is the current image of English nowadays. It is omnipresent no matter where and who you are. English is not belonged to certain kind of peoples and countries, not exclusive, not used to communicate to Native Speaker of English solely. Moreover, English is mostly learned, used, and spoken by Non-native speakers than Native speaker and more increase by this time, or after a decade in [1]-[4]. We might use it for different ways (oral, written, gesture, literacy), purposes (business, tourism, information technology, and other domain) and for different lengths

of time (past, present, future, short and long term), on different occasions (home, school, public place, country home, abroad, local, international, formal, informal), but nonetheless it belonged to all of us. It is also called as a pluricentric ideology that English is for everyone or pluralistic ownership of English in [5]-[9]. Because of this expanding status, English itself has a sharp increase in the development of new varieties of English that creating an unprecedented kind of linguistic diversity. This understanding expressed English in different way perspectives such as World Englishes (hereafter WE), English as Lingua Franca (hereafter ELF), and English as International language (hereafter EIL), which had led [10] to call it as the “anti-normative paradigm” or to talkback the traditional meaning of English.

Understanding the reality of English nowadays seems contrast with the learning and the teaching English in Indonesia case, English is adopted or and adapted as a Foreign Language. English as a foreign language regions are still norm-dependent and follow the norms which is English native speakers set (i.e. often standard British or American English varieties) such as ideology, culture, and the like in [11]. It is more adopted exonormative native model or stated in [12] called this as one-dimensional norm (Standard English, native-speakerism, monoculturalism, and monolingualism). This model was used because it was necessary, superiority, intelligibility, well recorded, well documented in terms of grammars, dictionary, references tool for teacher and learners alike were accessible. The above assumptions became problematic in the current situation of English language teaching because English has been shifted from the nature English where learners got more access to communicate with non-native speakers (hereafter NNS) of the language than native speakers (hereafter NS) in [6]; [8]; [9] and [13]. This condition created the reality of English speaking world becomes lack of grammatical structure, dynamic, the tight of a standard language became more difficult to maintain in [6] and [14]. If these beliefs and attitudes of NNS toward NS norms continued, they would see themselves as inappropriate users of English since they continually showed bad picture of themselves on the English language which might not promote their multilingual or multinational identity, became more and more NNSs’ followers for NS norms. Their deficit perspective of their own NNSs’ English was characterized by errors rather than local NNS variants, and their sense of linguistic insecurity, all of which inevitably reduced their receptivity to the notion of EIL. They became the victims of an ideology that was colonized upon them in [6]; [15]; and [16].

Teaching EIL was already familiar concept or term in the current discourse. But to ‘*see how students and teachers react to this change*’ and to ‘*critically reflect on this change*’ sorely missing in the literature. Since the ideas connected to the inclusive representation of English varieties, speakers and cultures, the EIL classroom ought to foster sensitivity and a sense of responsibility among students and English teachers as well. Moreover, EIL situations called for awareness of the politics of English, including such issues as language and power, the relationship between English and various indigenous languages. That was advocating the empowerment of students with critical lenses that would allow them to use English effectively to meet their own needs while respecting the needs of others. To examining and exploring this current issue, we did this research in one of senior high schools in Tebing Tinggi, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia. This research attempts to address the gap outlined above, which contributes to the

current discourses on teaching EIL. Specifically, this study determined the English teachers and the students' identity toward teaching and learning English as international language in their classrooms by seeing the teachers and students' thinking, feeling, and acting of adopting EIL model approach. That acknowledged us about the identity of EFL teachers and learners orientation toward EIL approach in one of senior high schools at Tebing Tinggi. Then, from the data, it also gave further analysis in critical pedagogy insights that shed light on how EIL reflected the progressive education in English language teaching.

METHOD

A. Method of study

This study used of a qualitative case study of one of senior high school in Indonesia. From a methodological perspective, there are two concerns of discourse as talk. They were classroom talk and teachers' and students' talk which in this study dominantly investigated in qualitative [17]. First, discourse as talk was in classroom talk examined teacher-students interaction involved, such as students' growth, teacher cognitive styles, mode of interactions, and effect of teacher training. The second discourse talk was in English teachers' and students' talk represents to look at how people constructed meanings and actions through their talk (discourse). So in this case study, we interpreted or constructed the data in order to understand how teachers and students make sense, analyzed their talks which carried the symbolic power to regulate and thus legitimize and marginalize particular kinds discursive practices and identity possibilities.

B. Participants

There were seven English teachers in this school. Four of them were permanent teachers and three of them were nonpermanent teachers. The permanent English teachers' ages were around 40s to 50s and they already had long record in teaching both in school or and in private English course. Meanwhile, nonpermanent teachers were younger English teacher, their ages were about 25 to 30s with still new teaching experience might be it was around 2 till 8 years. There were two classes that we investigated, Grade 1 and Grade 2. Grade 1 was special class or gifted class. There are 21 students in the classroom. The students' school backgrounds were from good and prominent schools either government school or nongovernment school. Meanwhile, grade 2 consisted of struggling students, they were called poor and naughty class because most of the teachers who entered this class said that they did not study seriously, they sometimes skipped the class, the teacher needed extra energy and strong emotions when entered their class. That was why some teachers often came late or did not teach the class. There were 36 students in this classroom. Not most of the students had achievement in their study. Majority the parents' background of education were senior high school or it could see that their parents did not have formal higher education. It also could see from their parents' work their fathers mostly were entrepreneurs who work out of government and their mother as a housewife.

C. Data Collections and Data Analysis

For this study, a semi-structured interview with open-ended questions was going to use because of its flexibility and potential to encourage participants to articulate a variety of opinions [18]. During that interview, we gave the students, grade 1 and grade 2, to listen one of English variations from other countries such as Malaysia English, India English, and Hong Kong English to show how global English today is. Then, we were asking their respond about the video that they saw and heard. The second interview was after teaching each lesson. There were three topics so there were three times we interviewed them to observe teachers' and students' identities orientation growth toward EIL approach adopted from [19].

We also invited the English teachers of the school and discussed this English teaching model as our focus group in order to get their perspective, understanding, and experience about English as an international language and their students as well through interview. There were two groups focus, first there was one of English teacher who was collaborating with us in this teaching learning EIL to see how this English teacher saw, taught, and experienced in this learning teaching approach. We collected the data from our working together such as preparing the lesson, the actual teaching in the classroom (video recording and later transcribed) in-depth interview after teaching the lessons to the students. The second group was five English teachers from seven English teachers were interviewed about their beliefs about English as an international language and the teaching approach as well. They were interviewed once in different time and place. Their perspectives were included because of the position of power they hold in the classroom and possible influence they had on students' attitude and experience learning English. In interview sessions, each grade was formed in groups. Grade 1 was three groups: Tempe, No Life, and Kimoci. Grade 2 was Chihuahua, Chinchin, Starlight, and Girlsquad. The data were transcribed and coded using the coding technique adapted from [20]. There were three stages in coding the data: making the text manageable, hearing what was said, and developing theory.

RESULTS & DISCUSSIONS

A. Identity orientation toward EIL Growth before Teaching EIL approach

In grade 1 here was the very identity of the students that they had acknowledged diverse perspective toward English. Group Komoci said that they studied English because they wanted to get job, for communication internationally, midst language among different language nation, English is already everywhere, indirectly they acknowledge that English is not only for communicating with foreigner especially with native English speakers. It also connected to their interest in broader truths of English for watching movie, games, video, teacher, music, and book, song, and games for entertaining, hobby, and self-learning. From those exposures, most of the groups' members legitimate the dominance of English native language and wanted to study more about that. They clearly said that they wanted to study British and or American English. It could be seen from their choices they preferred to watch movie from American Hollywood and most of them chose to study native English language than

Englishes. Group No Life emphasized the supremacy of Standard English for some reasons. They insisted to study native English which they thought that funny, nice to listen, understandable. Group Tempe had some self-interrogation, the students noticed that other countries did not pay much attention with grammar but as long as they could understand that was fine, but they lifted the other issue here they gave comments that it was different with Indonesia people who still cared much about grammar and did not safe environment to improve English. The students' grade 1 feeling was fear to saw their English ability. They judged that their English was bad and one student said that he could not speak English well. The other group, Group Tempe, looked themselves as bad English users. They said that they were not good at English even though they had long record of English. Group No Life judged that their English was bad, messy, and not good at all. Moreover, they were not confident or had fear with their English because if they had bad English, their friends or peoples would mock them and more suggested them to speak Indonesia than English and bad attitude opinion by saying speak English for showing off. It seemed that they were oppressed because of the unsafe community to support them to speak English with their English ability. They were facing difficulties to study English because of lack vocabularies and grammar, and mistyping if it was in English writing, hard to pronounce English well, hard to respond, hard to remember the words.

These results also occurred in students of Grade 2, they wanted to learn native English, America and British English, as prominent English which is dominant to be taught, learned and used. They gave preference to this dominance English in term of accent, pronunciation, and Standard English. Based on the results, the students have awareness and affirming positive identity that English variation did not matter that was nature, they knew each person has different accent, and the most important of communication is understanding, meaning, than grammar and pronunciation. Some who agreed they welcomed it, but the rest disagreed. However, when we backed to their earlier statements of their difficulties learning English they supposed to welcome Englishes or English variations. But they were lining themselves and taught to be Standard English users, they had self-esteem linked to supremacy, Standard English is right, and deny English variations. Therefore, it made them has deficit perspective toward themselves, not well at English, far off, difficult to attain. The other deficit perspective is nation English like Indonesia, Singapore, Filipino English and so on is bad, error, and wrong English. This perspective also existed in their society which apparently expressed in laughing, mocking, unsafe face when hearing and having broken English.

B. EFL Grade 1 & Grade 2 Students' Identity toward EIL Growth after Teaching

Topic 1 the students acknowledge diverse perspective toward English function, role, and lesson. Here they did not see it only in academic perspective but also from soft skills and social issue both negative and positive of other countries. That reflected how they saw these learning experience as holistic had curiosity to seek information of world issue through English such as from the clothes, culture, food, habits, uniqueness, and technology. But having understanding of how English works in their lives had not significantly changed their mind about how good their English is. Group Kimoci after

learning this study the students judged their English was still bad, not confident, ungrammatical, under standard pronunciation, nervous, and excusing that they were foreigner language speaker. Group No Life said that they still paid attention to pronunciation and grammar when they spoke English because they perpetuated that Indonesia concerned on it and the other people would correct or mock them if they had bad English. Therefore, they yet legitimated/perpetuated dominance and Standard English centric. One student felt denial and defensive toward English variation which was accepted Indonesia English but then still kept emphasizing to have standard English learning with good grammar, good pronunciation.

When they learned first topic about Introduction from other countries, based on their explanations they had deeply personal/rewarding, honesty and empathy to what they learned. The students felt proud to be Indonesia and introduce Indonesia to other countries. They boldly said that Indonesia is not worse than other countries especially when they saw other countries with their negative issues. They saw how rich Indonesia is in terms of the unexplored of beauty of Indonesia islands and suggested fixing their habits such as lazy, ignorant, and bad discipline of Indonesia people made them got sickness then we would be more advance than other countries. One student invited her friends not to be afraid anymore toward people judgment them to study or speak English because she realized that those peoples did not want to extend their life in global aspect but she said it was different with them who hoped that they could speak English confidently fluently so in the future they could speak to other countries and by doing so she could introduce Indonesia to other countries. It seemed that she had value their learning into transformation that enlightened aversion to oppression, then learning not only about but also from other countries, and social authentic engagement.

Topic 2 the students here had broader idea of EIL that was for communication among nations and they felt excited and happy as well. They got to know many things not only for communication but also other countries' identity, cultures, and stories. They meant their drama which is deeply personal. They reflected their learning to be good Indonesia that contributed actively to make Indonesia better and better by studying hard and respectful. Besides that, their lesson led them to social action/authentic engagement and learning from other cultures. They said they were easier to share independent day of Indonesia to international students and they could promote local culture to global and from the global as well. The most important tool here is English that made them easier to communicate to other different language nations. But there were some students kept distance/isolation like in Group Kimoci here the students did not actively communicate with their international friend because of external problem (small screen and volume) and internal problem because of no idea to talk. They kind of try to avoid this calling. So just Martha spoke and the other just listener or watcher or recorder. They did not know what they wanted to asked.

In Topic 3, Most of the students had Appreciation/Respect and Enlightened aversion to oppression. It is acknowledgable for them like the function of lemonade to body, the meaning of lemonade in social meaning, and they come out to the different taste which has particular functions in social life and medical treatment. Especially when we asked their opinion about English American and Asia English speakers they chose English America but then when we asked Indonesia lecturing they also said that

they understood. That made them proud and braver to speak their English because their Indonesia English is also intelligible and they did not care any more about people's mocking or judging because it was not their affairs and they know what they know. They also had deeply personal/ rewarding: Enthusiasm/joy: They were enhanced by connecting with Englishes such as appreciating their heroes to fight for their independent. And she also learned to contribute to advance Indonesia nation especially the technology. Group Tempe felt so appreciate, they could learn this learning approach. They did not learn theory only but also they had a practical learning. In action growth, they had social action/authentic engagement and Learning from other cultures, learning from other cultures, and transformation. It could be seen from their elaborations. Tempe group through this learning, they could promote their drink to YouTube, IG with English tutorial so other countries could see and knew their drinks with Indonesia version. Group Kimoci learned from their international friend, Chakree from Thailand. They shared their drink they were making and they also asked how Thailand people called those fruit in Thailand and they found that there was similarity of their name like *rujak* and *racak*. The students also knew what their international friend fruit favorite. The students said that some of their friends improve their English significantly and boldly. It could be seen in their daily class, some students especially in this group spoke English continuously and their friend admitted sincerely that this learning English transformed them to speak English in the classroom. They had an ownership toward their lemonade like Tempe Group named their drink was yippee meant happy. Whoever drank felt happy and Group Kimoci also enthusiastically named their drink SANTUY which had a special meaning that was drink for relaxing and stay calm down.

EFL Grade 2 Students' Identity Orientation toward EIL Growth after Teaching

We saw from their feedback response they connected to their learning with authentic engagement, active seeking and enthusiasm to participate in global issue and tried to study English seriously to extend their existence as global citizen. In topic 2, the students had interest broader of learning English especially in the era of technology (instagram, Facebook, twitter, WA). The students said that they connected with international issue through their hobby, favorite actress, and music. They were more encouraged, and more joyful learning English with this EIL approach than their previous learning with their permanent teacher. They learned about and from other culture as well. Group Starlight had awareness about issue in Kyrgyzstan about how kidnapping occurred there like Rizky felt empathy to know the condition of Kyrgyzstan issue. When we asked the students' opinion about different culture between Indonesia and other culture, they students said that they tried to see it holistically and comprehensively, first by knowing the people, the culture, habits, and belief of the community. If it is good and prosperous they would like to imitate it but if it is negative they respected and learned not to be influenced. Fajar was actively seeking interest to watch news from CNN through this opportunity he could know world news and elevate his knowledge. Topic 3, the students' identity orientation, some students had legitimate/perpetuated dominance. Even though, I tried to lead them to see the population, the effectiveness of nonnative speakers that highly potential to meet and closer with their identity as nonnative English speakers than native English speakers. They responded

that was India or nonnative English speaking. But, Widya especially kept trying to choose America English such as more interesting, most used in schools and private English institution, English books, devices (like hand phone, laptop, computer, and *etcetera*). Group Chihuahua, students preferred to hear American because it is pure, basic, and easier. Meanwhile, India was funny from the accent. But, Group Starlight and Chinchin did deep interrogation which was not just seeing the accent but also the speakers' presentation and styles that attracted them. The students' feeling was enthusiasm and honest. They were excited, that was one of the students waiting for. They learned from other culture like Coca cola as favorite in Vietnam youth peoples however the students did not. They thought that soft drink is not good for health and it can be used for cleaning toilet. The students had empathy toward negative issue in India, also about kidnaping that lucky them there is few cases in Indonesia, the students saw Indonesia as country need to be fixing in term of the people mindset, habits, and attitude. They also got social action/ authentic engagement. When they face difficult to understand their friend talked they say "sorry" and "say again" or making communicative competence. Citra from Chinchin group shared their drink to her social media that made her friend gave command and asked her how to make it. But, when the students were having interaction with their international friends, most of the students especially the struggling ones had distance or isolation to talk to her or him afraid if she asked but she would hard to answer the questions. They still concerned on vocabulary and tenses in their mind while they were trying to speak. They just got the information based on what they asked without any actively seeking.

C. EFL English Teachers' Identity Orientation toward EIL Growth

In term of their thinking, based on the results the English teachers seemed to deny, avoid, perpetuate the dominance, and had distance toward EIL approach in term of their preferences, students' cases follow students' textbook, the limited allocation, not urgent it could be learned at the real place in the future, and due to their responsibility as common English teacher. The other statements' was nonstandard English was an error. They also had self-esteem linked to supremacy because English material that emphasizing subject matter of English (structure, grammar, test, not culture, and based on students' willingness). The English teacher had awareness of how English as dynamic language which fluid to change based on the countries, peoples, times, globalization, role and language function. But knowing this progressive of English they still failed to see as movement to teach English with this current development instead it was still moved by victim's perspective and personal than institutional. Therefore, some of the English teachers were facing defensive, perplex, fear, avoidance and shaped their teaching actively inner centric teaching in term of the teaching materials and classroom formal and informal situations and the unknowing of English nations and cultures treated the culture as the same as native perspective or monoculture. These perspectives both factors internal and external that led teachers taught the students with autocratic/directive teaching style. For our Teaching partners, In our last interview, she said thanked to me to share this paradigm, approach, teaching learning that motivate her, illuminate her teaching style and method, and she is hoping to have and carry on this spirit till she is getting old and what she remembered or

impressed most is learning through this method is not only learning the topic but they learned more than that like soft skills and build them learn more constructively.

CONCLUSION

Did they feel their English was broken? They did. Did they feel very struggling learning English? They did. Did they know all the suffering learning English would not stop the reality and students' needs getting through? They did. Were they exposed to technology and globalization? They were. Did they said understands is more important than grammatical structure? They said it was. Does English move dynamically and rapidly? They said it is. Is every nation different English variation? They said it was. Did students want both Standard English and nonstandard English as they notice unattainable to be native like? They did. What is EIL? EIL is embracing the native and nonnative English both concerning linguistics features (content) and language used (process). Does EIL approach match with students' wants? Yes it is. Did struggling and proficiency students need EIL approach? Yes it was. Did the students learn beyond English by EIL? They did. Did EIL work help them facing the world? It did. Did English teachers want to mediate or facilitate effective and efficient English learning for their students? Did English teachers want the best for their students? Did English teacher know the students' needs? They did. Is anyone able to deficit our perspective toward our nation English? Is anyone perfect in English? Is anyone able to take students' right to preserve their identity, tribe, people, nation, language? Is anyone able to block and steal the students' right to cultivate bright future? None, no one should take it from them. The students and English teachers have right of their own and should breakthrough their self-blaming, their deficit perspective, their institution which did not stand for them, destructive perspective among their society, and casted away another political issue which aligned with progressive education. Am I as English teacher, or are you as English teacher, or are they as English teacher wrong? Is it late for us to fix it? No, it is not. Is it good that we remind ourselves of this? It is.

REFERENCES

- [1] Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [2] Crystal, D. (2006). *Language and the internet*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] McKay, S. L. (2003). EIL curriculum development. *RELC Journal*, 34(1), 31–47.
- [4] Graddol, D. (2006). *English next: Why global English may mean the end of 'English as a Foreign Language*. London: British Council.
- [5] Kachru, Y., and L.E. Smith. (2008). *Cultures, contexts and World Englishes*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.
- [6] Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- [7] McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [8] Sharifian, F. (2009). *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- [9] Sharifian, F. (2011). *Cultural conceptualisations and language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins & Co.
- [10] Kubota, R. (2012). The politics of EIL: Toward border-crossing communication in and beyond English. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language* (pp. 55–69). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- [11] Kumaravadivelu, B. (2008). *Cultural globalization and language education*. Yale University Press.
- [12] Manara, C. (2012). *Intercultural dialogue and English language teaching: Indonesian teacher educators' narratives of professional learning*. Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia.
- [13] McKay, S. L. (2012). Principles of teaching English as an international language. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 28–46). New York: Routledge.
- [14] Matsuda, A. (2002). "International understanding" through teaching world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 21(3), 436–440.
- [15] Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes*. London: Routledge.
- [16] Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua franca: Attitude and Identity*. Oxford University Press.
- [17] Skukauskaite, A., Rangel, J., Rodriguez, L. G., & Ramón, D. K. (2015). Understanding Classroom Discourse and Interaction: Qualitative Perspectives. in Markee, Numa. (Eds). *The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction*. West Sussex: John Wiley& Sons.
- [18] Flick, U. (2006). *An introduction to qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.
- [19] Howard, G. R. (1999). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- [20] Auerbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative studies in psychology. Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis*. New York University Press.