

Artikel F 03

by Artikel F 03 Artikel F 03

Submission date: 24-Mar-2022 02:49PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1791643973

File name: Artikel_03.pdf (216.91K)

Word count: 7339

Character count: 42018



The Paradigms of Teaching English across Cultures: EFL Teachers' Perspectives

Leffi Noviyenty ^{a *}, Ruly Morganna ^b, Fakhruddin ^c

^a Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup, Jl. Dr. AK Gani No. 01, Curup, Bengkulu, 39119, Indonesia

^b Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup, Jl. Dr. AK Gani No. 01, Curup, Bengkulu, 39119, Indonesia

^c Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup, Jl. Dr. AK Gani No. 01, Curup, Bengkulu, 39119, Indonesia

Abstract

The present study aimed at qualitatively probing into EFL teachers' perspectives on the paradigms of teaching English across cultures (TEAC). Five EFL teachers were purposively involved as the participants. The data were garnered from in-depth interview. This study revealed a variety of perspectives addressing TEAC paradigm. All EFL teachers showed their supporting perspectives on TEAC paradigms. They accepted the natures of English as the world lingua franca, mutual intelligibility and comprehensibility in English communication, intercultural communicative competence as the framework of English communication, supporting students to be intercultural English users, and bilingual as well as intercultural English users as EFL learning models. Their perspectives on TEAC paradigms likely indicated that they would hold these paradigms while teaching English in the classrooms. Further studies are expected to delve into the practices of TEAC so that the data could be of great references for other Indonesian EFL teachers to apply TEAC in the classrooms.

© 2017 IJCI & the Authors. Published by *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction (IJCI)*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Keywords: English, culture, teaching English across cultures

1. Introduction

In line with the emergence of the 21st century, English language is not seen as the language only owned by the native speakers. The users of English have pervaded in all over the world as depicted by Kachru's (1990) model of world Englishes. His model portrays English users that fall into inner, outer, and expanding circles. The phenomenon with respect to non-native English users who outnumber those of native ones eventually makes a convincing case for the socio-functional essence of English as the world lingua franca (Bake 2016; Deniz, Özkan, & Bayyurt, 2016; Fang, 2017; Ishikawa, 2016; Kirkpatrick, 2018; Liu, 2019; Matsuura, Rilling, Chiba, Kim, & Rini, 2016; Mauranen, 2018; Rahatlou, Fazilatfar, & Allami, 2018; Rahimi & Ruzrokh, 2016; Sherman, 2018; Si, 2018; Sung, 2015,

* Correspondence: Ruly Morganna, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup
E-mail address: rulymorganna@gmail.com

2017a, 2017b; Wright & Zheng, 2018), whereby the role of English has been a language contact among the native as well as non-native users. In addition, Rauschert and Byram (2017) propound that the users of English originally come from various cultures. When English as a language contact is used by multicultural users, an intercultural dimension in the use of English is naturally created (Byram & Wenger, 2018).

Given the issues pertinent to multiculturalism and interculturalism, the phenomena of language use amid Indonesian people are associated with the aforesaid issues. In the aspect of multiculturalism, Indonesian people are multicultural *in situ* in light of their origins which are derived from various and diverse cultures (Idris, 2020; Morganna, Sumardi, & Tarjana, 2018a, 2018b, 2020; Sukyadi, 2015). In addition, in the aspect of interculturalism as the communicative dimension of language use, the nuance of multicultural nature owned by Indonesian people has an impact on the way they use languages (both Indonesian for national communication and English for international communication), wherein they will use the two languages cross-culturally (Hamied, 2012). For instance, at the national level, when someone from Bengkulu meets one from Java, the two persons will use Indonesian language based on their own language varieties affected by the respective cultures prevailing in their own common and dominant social communities. The one from Bengkulu will use a certain dialect signifying the influences of a vernacular used in Bengkulu, and that from Java will do the same by virtue of Javanese vernacular influences. Other than language varieties, the pragmatic as well as sociolinguistic conventions, worldviews, thoughts, perceptions, and other culture-related components which they share during the on-going communication will also be diverse. The encounter of diverse cultures here is what most linguists call interculturalism in communication.

Subsequently, at the international level, when English mediates the on-going interactions, the same condition even in a more sensitized nuance of interculturalism as the abovementioned example will take place since the cultural differences among the English users are more noticeably various. Thus, the encounter of English use alongside a variety of dialects and a wide range of distinct pragmatic as well as sociolinguistic conventions, thoughts, perceptions, worldviews, and other cultural values will more vividly portray the presence of interculturalism or an intercultural dimension. It makes a convincing case that the use of English internationally always takes place within an intercultural dimension.

For Indonesian people, or let us say students in the realm of education, the English education with which they will be engaged and dealt should conform to their multicultural nature and the interculturalism of English use. This condition calls for Indonesian EFL teachers' agreement on the paradigms of teaching English across cultures (hereafter as TEAC). Many prior studies have addressed the issue of TEAC, and some substantial TEAC paradigms could be absorbed from their discussions.

TEAC views English as the world lingua franca (WLF) because it is the representation of English used by people from a variety of cultural origins all over the world (Kirkpatrick, 2018; Liu & Fang, 2017; Mauranen, 2018; Sung, 2017a). Grounded in this paradigm, EFL teachers are demanded to design English materials that drive students to face cultural diversities so that students are engaged in communication within the dimension of English as WLF (Si, 2018) with its cultural differences (Xerri, 2016). In addition, the need of English education should go beyond the essences of native-speakerism (Baker, 2016). To do so, an externally pedagogical empowerment developed to help EFL teachers improve their competences of English as WLF is also needed so that the essence of English as WLF is well-embedded in their teaching paradigm (Rahatlou et al., 2018).

Because TEAC views English as WLF, the norm of linguistic competence refers to mutual intelligibility and comprehensibility (Kirkpatrick, 2018; Sherman, 2018; Wright & Zheng, 2018). The present pluralistic contexts of English communication justify the importance of intelligibility and comprehensibility maintenance while communicating using English across cultures (Matsuura et al., 2016; Rahimi & Ruzrokh, 2016). Thus, EFL teachers need to train students in order to be able to maintain their intelligible and comprehensible English use. Besides, TEAC also adheres to intercultural communicative competence which ideally frames English communication (Byram & Wenger, 2018; Galante, 2015; Kusumaningputri & Widodo, 2018; López-Rocha, 2016; Rauschert & Byram, 2017; Tolosa, Biebricher, East, & Howard, 2018; Tran & Duong, 2018). A study conducted by Badrkoohi (2018) revealed that English learning that engages students into the process of developing intercultural communicative competence can improve students' learning motivation. Subsequently, TEAC encourages students to be intercultural English users (Kirkpatrick, 2018), and bilingual and intercultural English users are the proper models of EFL learning (Kirkpatrick, 2018).

The foregoing highlight can be summarized that at least TEAC is grounded in five paradigms to be held in EFL classrooms. They extend to viewing English as WLF, prioritizing mutual intelligibility and comprehensibility in English communication, making intercultural communicative competence the norm of English communication, encouraging students to be intercultural English users, and making bilingual and intercultural English users the proper models of EFL learning. These five paradigms are required to be understood by Indonesian EFL teachers given that Indonesian students are multicultural, and English education calls for the application of TEAC in Indonesia. TEAC cannot instantly be applied before Indonesian EFL teachers embed TEAC paradigms in their pedagogical perspectives. Thus, the present study is designed to explore Indonesian EFL teachers' perspectives on the paradigms of TEAC.

2. Method

2.1. Design

This study qualitatively explored Indonesian EFL teachers' perspectives on the paradigms of TEAC. The rationale beyond the selection of this qualitative method was because this study would like to probe into the depth alongside the width of the expected data and to present appropriate detailed interpretations as well as discussion of the data. The findings revealed in this study could not be wholly generalized as some numerical data commonly do in a quantitative study. Nonetheless, this study made an effort to present the findings which were probably quite generalizable at some point if further studies would like to conform to the detailed procedures or criteria applied in this study.

2.2. Participants

The present study involved five experienced Indonesian EFL teachers who had been teaching English for more than 7 years. They aged between 30 and 40 years old. Two of them taught English in Bengkulu, and the rest three teachers taught English in central Java. They were incorporated as the participants purposively. Before officially incorporating them in this study, a couple of criteria were assigned to select them. Those criteria fell into: 1) they were adequately experienced in teaching English as a foreign language. 2) The students they taught came from various cultures. 3) They had sufficient understanding of TEAC. 4) They were interested in implementing TEAC based on their own understanding and pedagogical proficiency. In turn, 5) they were willing to voluntarily join this study as the participants.

2.3. The Technique of Collecting Data

The data were solicited from in-depth interview. The interview took place from March to May 2019. EFL teachers from Bengkulu were interviewed in a face-to-face mode, and those from central java were interviewed using Whatsapp video call. The discourse of interview was oriented towards five TEAC pedagogical paradigms: viewing English as WLF, prioritizing mutual intelligibility and comprehensibility in English communication, making intercultural communicative competence the norm of English communication, encouraging students to be intercultural English users, and making bilingual and intercultural English users the proper models of EFL learning. All information gained from interview was recorded and further transcribed. Pursuing the data was carried out by re-interviewing the participants in order to reach the data credibility.

2.4. The Technique of Data Analysis

This study made use of Miles, Huberman, and Saldana's (2014) interactive model to analyze the data. Grounded in this model, this study executed four steps consisting of data collection, data condensation, data display, and verifying conclusion. As informed in the foregoing, the data were collected from in-depth interview. The raw data recorded were

further transcribed and condensed by coding them as well as managing them resting upon the valuable themes that emerged. Pertinent to data display, the data were presented in the form of some presentations of the selected transcripts followed by the proper related interpretations as well as discussions. The last, the conclusion representing the summary of the overall data was drawn.

3. Findings

The data associated with EFL teachers' perspectives on TEAC paradigms were garnered from in-depth interview conducted from March to May 2019. The following presentation displays a number of transcripts of interview deliberately selected to represent the overall participants of this study. Some related interpretations and discussions that follow the transcripts are also provided.

3.1. EFL Teachers' Perspectives on English as the World Lingua Franca

The first TEAC paradigm negotiated to the participants was English as the world lingua franca (WLF). The following transcript of interview with participant 1 is properly selected to represent others.

The shift of English language status as the world lingua franca is very logical, and in fact what occurs today is as such. I agree with this condition because English users incorporate all people, or in other words, we can say that the users entail all of the world citizens. Then, in fact, we indeed use English based on the way we think respectively. We need to hold this view when we teach English (Participant 1).

Participant 1 viewed the status of English as the world lingua franca based on a real present situation where English was socially used not only by its native speakers but also by all non-native English users in the world. As an English teacher, she made this view one of her language paradigms. Another perspective addressed the conceptualization appertaining to the social function of English which belonged to the world citizens. Mostly any chance of international communication either with native or non-native English users was mediated by English language. In addition, participant 5 shared her perspective as follows:

It is because if we look at the existing fact, English language plays a role as a primary medium of international communication. It is automatic that English does not merely belong to certain countries, but it has naturally been used in the majority of countries in the world (Participant 5).

Participant 5 in the above transcripts drew on the facts that the tool of international communication was English, and such condition inferred that English was the world people's language. Those reasons made a convincing case for the social function of English

as the language that did not merely belong to its native speakers. The other perspective on English as the world lingua franca was shared by participant 4 as follows:

Viewing the fact that English language has increasingly developed. Thus, we will not view English as the language belonging to American or British people merely. The happening situation indicates that the English language users are so much pervasive, and by nature the cultures of the users will automatically give impact on the way English language is used. It means that we need to be flexible to see this status shift (Participant 4).

Participant 4 viewed that the extensive use of English had been successfully grown so that by nature English was used by all people with their own cultural framework.

The above selected transcripts could be categorized into three meaningful points representing EFL teachers' perspectives on WLF. First, the teachers accepted the fact that English users encompass all of the world citizens. Second, the English social function belongs to the world citizens. Third, pervasiveness of English users occurs naturally. Their perspectives indicated that they hold WLF as a TEAC paradigm.

3.2. EFL Teachers' Perspectives on Mutual Intelligibility and Comprehensibility in English Communication

As regards this paradigm, participant 1 shared her perspective on intelligibility and comprehensibility as follows:

I personally ever experienced things related to intelligibility and comprehensibility. That was when I met a friend who was not Indonesian but also not English native speaker. When using English, none of us had a native-like competence since we had different cultures and none of our cultures were similar to English native speakers'. Thus, the meaning negotiation that we dealt with during communication referred to intelligibility and comprehensibility as the standard to make a proper communicative connection. We did not focus on whether the English pronunciation, grammar, or vocabularies that we used were correct or not based on the standard of native English, but we focused on whether our ideas were appropriately conveyed and could be respectively understood or not. So, while teaching English, we should ideally always remember that intelligibility and comprehensibility are the most important to be preserved (Participant 1).

Participant 1 in the above transcript indicated that in a real English use, when used by non-native English users, never would the users have a precise native-like competence. The users' culture, one brought since the users were born as their blueprint of life, would be the framework of their English use. Thus, the meaning negotiation that would be undertaken referred more to the horizon of intelligible and comprehensible messages. That was why the participant 1 relied on intelligibility and comprehensibility as the convenient

yardstick to make a good interactive connection while communicating using English. In turn, participant 2 added:

Yes, because in using a language which is not our own language or in other words a foreign language, we will never be able to imitate the native speakers' competence. Like linguistic competence, for example, we will exactly produce utterances from that foreign language with the dialect output on the basis of our own mother language. Even though, let us say, there is someone who manages to imitate the foreign language pronunciation similar to its native speakers', other elements such as vocabularies and grammar are usually produced based on the ideational construction made of his mother language which is transferred to that foreign language output. Therefore, the most ideal conception is to refer to intelligibility and comprehensibility as the yardstick of linguistic competence (Participant 2).

Participant 2 explained that the case with respect to linguistic competence while using a foreign language (English) would always be determined by the users' cultures. She exemplified it with the presence of mother language influence towards people's (non-native English users) use of English language. Their mother languages referred to a part of their own cultures since those languages played a role as a kind of blueprint of living besides other types of cultures they had. Thus, when they used English, the product of linguistic competence such as dialect (entailing their particular varieties of English pronunciation, vocabularies, and grammar) would be highly determined by the characteristic of their mother language linguistic competence. Participant 2 even believed that although there was someone that seemed to capably use English like native speakers, it was limited on his efficacy to pronounce English in a proximate way. However, the other component like the ideational construction of his English use would be underlain by his mother language, in other words, his culture. Subsequently, participant 3 also accounted for her perspective as follows:

For me, I personally see that the most ideal point in communication is meaning conveyance. It means that if we deliver something, and the interlocutor can understand what we share, it's been enough. Concerning linguistic competence in English use, we can see that people from each country in the world also have their own accents. Thus, I think, it is not a must to have a linguistic competence which precisely resembles the Standard English, but it's ideal to refer to intelligibility and comprehensibility (Participant 3).

Participant 3 explained that the fundamental principle of English communication was meaning conveyance. The adequacy of meaning conveyance extended to how far the given meanings could be accepted and understood by the interlocutors. If the yardstick of English communication was subjected to English native speakers' linguistic competence, it would be impossible to do by non-native English users since they had a variety of English accents as highly influenced by their own mother languages and cultures. This made a case for

shaping the adequacy of English communication into the meaning conveyance whose linguistic competence was represented by to what extent the English utterances reached the sense of intelligibility and comprehensibility.

The above selected transcripts could be classified into three meaningful points representing EFL teachers' perspectives on mutual intelligibility and comprehensibility in English communication. First, the teachers understood that preserving mutual intelligibility and comprehensibility could connect non-native dialectical English in an appropriate way during communication. Second, they perceived that it is impossible to totally imitate native English linguistic competence. Third, they opined that understandable messages or meanings are the key to communication..

3.3. EFL Teachers' Perspectives on Making *Intercultural Communicative Competence the Norm of English Communication*

With respect to making *intercultural communicative competence the norm of English communication*, Participant 1 came up with her perspective as follows:

It is because in fact the English language users consist of people from diverse cultures so that in communication we need to consider where our interlocutors come from, what their cultures are like, and so on. Thus, I like ICC as English communicative framework (Participant 1).

Participant 1 accounted for the importance of intercultural communicative competence (ICC) because the cultures or origins had by the interlocutors in English communication as led by ICC principle were the need and necessity to successfully make a proper connection in English communication. ICC in fact facilitated non-native English users for that sort of need. Participant 3 added:

CC formulated *on the basis of English native speakers' cultures* is too specific. In reality, we Indonesian people more often meet and communicate using English with people who are not English native speakers. We even seldom encounter English native speakers. Then, those non-native English speakers that we meet absolutely come from different cultures. By that, why should we rely on the framework of CC that is entirely native-speakerism while mostly the people who communicate using English with us are non-native ones? And they use their own cultures as the framework of their English use. In my opinion, ICC that is purposefully designed for cross-cultural communication is conveniently ideal to be the English communicative framework (Participant 3).

Participant 3 in the above transcript criticized communicative competence (CC) principle because this principle was merely oriented to English use framed by native English cultures. In the meantime, as found in the existing fact that occurred in Indonesia, Indonesian people more often met and communicated with non-native English users rather

than native ones. It meant that predominant English communication that took place around Indonesian people is the communication with non-native English users along with their cultural varieties as the communicative framework. Thus, to reach a successful English communication, ICC principle with its otherness sensitivity played a pivotal role to facilitate Indonesian people to be good English users. Subsequently, participant 5 also came up with her perspective as follows:

CC is fundamentally framed to lead us to communicate like English native speakers, doesn't it? For me, it's better to rely on ICC since in reality not all people use English on the basis of English native speakers' culture as conceptualized in the CC framework. Furthermore, in my opinion, culture refers to the nature which is brought and developed since the owner was born. It does not make sense for me if someone has to leave aside his own cultural framework that has been embedded since he was born, and then he has to replace that culture with English native speakers' culture as conceptualized in CC when he is using English (Participant 5).

Participant 5 initiated her conception with rejecting the sense of communicative competence (CC) theory that was developed based on native English communication alongside native English cultures. She preferred to support intercultural communicative competence (ICC) theory since it met the nature that non-native English users' cultures would always lay beyond their particularity of English use. She also had a conception that one's culture had been a big part of his life since he was born. Thus, it was not reasonable if one's culture should constantly be changed into native English culture when he was learning or using English. The same notion was also shared by participant 3 as shown in the following interview transcript.

From CC perspective, English communication is subjected to native-speakerism. Furthermore, ICC comes up with improving the nature of English communication and makes all people with their typical multiculturalism can use English and communicate properly. I agree with ICC even if it is applied in English learning classrooms. Another important thing offered by ICC is that we have to really understand our own cultures before discerning others' cultures. I really take my stance on it (Participant 3).

As explained by participant 3, the principle of intercultural communicative competence (ICC) helped facilitate multicultural people to manage to communicate using English appropriately. Another merit offered by ICC was that it helped people deeply understand their own cultures before comprehending others' so that a proper communicative connection was well-established while using English. ICC enhanced critical cultural understanding in this sense.

The above selected transcripts could be categorized into four meaningful points representing EFL teachers' perspectives on making intercultural communicative competence the norm of English communication. First, the teachers viewed that ICC leads

English users to consider otherness while being engaged in communication. Second, they saw that ICC fits the likelihood of English communication in Indonesian context that is more to non-native sense with a cross-cultural dimension. Third, they viewed that ICC conforms to the fact that one's culture as a blueprint cannot be replaced by others. Fourth, they understood that ICC enhances critical cultural awareness.

3.4. EFL Teachers' Perspectives on Encouraging *Students to be Intercultural English Users*

In association with encouraging *students to be intercultural English users*, Participant 1 shared her perspective as follows:

In my opinion, ideally learning English also needs to run together with learning cultures, those of ours, English native speakers, and other non-native English users of Indonesian people. Why? Because we cannot always expect that we will always use English with the native speakers. It is so much possible that we'll deal with a condition where we use English to communicate with a number of non-native English people. The same thing will also be dealt with our students in the future. Becoming intercultural English users plays a pivotal role (Participant 1).

Participant 1 brought a context that it was highly possible that English communication took place among non-native English users and occurred in a cross-cultural dimension. Thus, if referred back to the process of English learning, it was needed to learn both English language itself and the users' cultures. In addition to this, it was also considered necessary for English learning to be projected to facilitate learners to be intercultural English users. In addition, participant 3 added:

It is because I often find out while watching TV that a number of people use English using their own dialects. It seems that the case like this has been going on naturally. Russian people use English with Russian dialects, Japanese people do the same, and Indonesian people do that too. Besides dialect, the way they think and communicate has also been constructed from their own cultures. The facts as such underline the need that students are really necessary to be intercultural English users, and they should not merely be programmed to capably use English like native speakers. The students should be capable of using English to both native and non-native English speakers (Participant 3).

Participant 3 explained that a wide range of English users had their own dialects while using English. In addition to dialectal varieties, the ideational construction had by those people were also diverse depending on their own cultures as the blueprint of living that they had to socialize and negotiate meanings while they were communicating. Both dialects and ideational construction of non-native English users had entirely differed from those of native English users. Thus, to deal with such natural situation, it was necessary to be intercultural English users so that cross-cultural English use can be successfully

dealt with in a proper way. Furthermore, the following transcript of interview with participant 4 addresses a similar issue.

Well, we have been dealing with a globalized era, right? It's only by surfing on the internet; the access of cross-cultural communication with people from other countries is very easy. Such condition basically requires an understanding that people's cultures are various. Then, we have to also manage to tolerate the differences. Therefore, if we really want to apply an EFL learning that is based on the natural needs and the existing facts, the logical target of EFL learning is to be intercultural English users. It is even not meaningful if we master a native-like English competence, but we finally tend to be struck for stereotype conflict because of our yardstick, as we have been staying in the concept that cannot easily accept different pronunciation produced by our non-native English interlocutors that are not on the basis of native English standard. In fact, though it is not natively standardized, we have been able to catch the representative words meant beyond the pronunciation differences (Participant 4).

Participant 4 supported if the output of EFL learning went to facilitate students to be intercultural English users because the present situation associated with English use tended more to be cross-cultural communication such as what commonly took place on the internet or social media. She agreed with encouraging students to be intercultural English users so that they could avoid stereotype conflict and maintain successful English communication.

The above selected transcripts could be classified into three meaningful points representing EFL teachers' perspectives on encouraging students to be intercultural English users. First, they viewed that this TEAC paradigm aligns with the nature of English use entailing communication with either native or non-native users. Second, they thought that this TEAC paradigm conforms to the fact that ones' culture typifies their typical English variety. Third, they viewed that this TEAC paradigm conforms to the nature of cross-cultural English use.

3.5. EFL Teachers' Perspectives on Making Bilingual and Intercultural English Users the Proper Models of EFL Learning

As regards making bilingual and intercultural English users the proper models of EFL learning, Participant 2 shared her perspective as follows:

In my opinion, one of the appropriate ways in order that the learners can be intercultural English users, besides teaching them with ICC as the communicative framework, the learners are also needed to be exposed with the models with the characteristics: they are not English native speakers, but they can use English well and master intercultural communicative competence (Participant 2).

Participant 2 in the above transcript made a case for the importance of modeling English learning with non-native intercultural English users because this way could support learners to be intercultural English users besides teaching them with intercultural communicative competence (ICC) as the communicative framework. Such point is also espoused by participant 4 as depicted in the following interview transcript.

It is because if the models are English native speakers, the modeling process tends to only be based on the audios or videos whose themes are limited so that those sources cannot be made creative by the teachers. On the other hand, if the models of EFL learning are non-native English users who master proper English and ICC, the models as such will be easier to be found around our environment. The English teachers themselves can even be the appropriate models of EFL learning (Participant 4).

Participant 4 in the above transcript even emphasized that the appropriate models of EFL learning that met the students' context could even be the English teachers themselves. She indicated that non-native intercultural English users as the models were likely easy to be found rather than native ones.

The above selected transcripts could be categorized into two meaningful points representing EFL teachers' perspectives on making bilingual and intercultural users the models of EFL learning. First, they viewed that this TEAC paradigm promotes the mastery of ICC. Second, they viewed that bilingual and intercultural English users can be accessed easily.

4. Discussion

As revealed in the findings of this study, all EFL teachers show their supporting perspectives on TEAC paradigms. They accept the natures of English as the world lingua franca, mutual intelligibility and comprehensibility in English communication, intercultural communicative competence as the framework of English communication, supporting students to be intercultural English users, and bilingual as well as intercultural English users as EFL learning models. Their perspectives on TEAC paradigms likely show that they will hold these paradigms while teaching English in the classroom.

The findings of the present study align with the studies undertaken by Sung (2015, 2017b) who explored non-native English users' perception of English as a lingua franca and their global identities, Fuse, Navichkova, and Alloggio (2018) who revealed non-native bilingual English users' positive perception on intelligibility preservation, Estaji and Rahimi (2018) who revealed EFL teachers' positive perception of intercultural communicative competence, and Kirkpatrick (2018) who promoted that EFL learning

should encourage students to be intercultural English users, and bilingual and intercultural English users are the ideal EFL learning models.

However, many prior studies argued that mere EFL teachers' paradigmatic stance *vis-a-vis* TEAC could not highly guarantee that the teachers would consistently hold TEAC paradigms in the classrooms. The studies conducted by Deniz, Özkan, and Bayyurt (2016); and Brunsmeier (2017) have demonstrated that albeit EFL educators cognitively view cross-cultural English teaching in a positive way, their teaching practices are not consistently correlated with their perspectives. To deal with such condition, the provision of intercultural training programs are recommended for the sake of helping teachers hold the consistency of their perspectives on TEAC paradigms (Deniz et al., 2016; Oranje & Smith, 2017; Rahatlou et al., 2018; Tolosa et al., 2018). In addition, reflecting on Puntney's (2016) study, developing intercultural-based curriculum will pave the way for the success of TEAC.

Positive oriented perspectives on TEAC paradigms shared by Indonesian EFL teachers manifest that they are sufficiently ready to hold TEAC paradigms while teaching English in the classrooms. This study invites Indonesian government to help develop Intercultural English curriculum and provide EFL teachers with intercultural English teaching training for the sake of backing up EFL teachers to fulfill Indonesian multicultural students' needs in learning English.

5. Conclusions

This study has found out that all EFL teachers show their supporting perspectives on TEAC paradigms. With respect to English as the world lingua franca, the EFL teachers accepted the fact that English users encompass all of the world citizens; the English social function belongs to the world citizens; and the pervasiveness of English users occurs naturally. Concerning mutual intelligibility and comprehensibility in English communication, the EFL teachers understood that preserving mutual intelligibility and comprehensibility could connect non-native dialectical English in an appropriate way during communication; they perceived that it is impossible to totally imitate native English linguistic competence; and they opined that understandable messages or meanings are the key to communication. Associated with intercultural communicative competence, the EFL teachers viewed that ICC leads English users to consider otherness while being engaged in communication; they saw that ICC fits the likelihood of English communication in Indonesian context that is more to non-native sense with a cross-cultural dimension; they viewed that ICC conforms to the fact that one's culture as a blueprint cannot be replaced by others'; and they understood that ICC enhances critical cultural awareness. Pertinent to encouraging students to be intercultural English users, the EFL teachers viewed that this TEAC paradigm aligns with the nature of English use entailing communication with either native or non-native users; they thought that this TEAC paradigm conforms to the

fact that ones' culture typifies their typical English variety; and they viewed that this TEAC paradigm conforms to the nature of cross-cultural English use. The last, with regard to making bilingual and intercultural English users the models of EFL learning, the EFL teachers viewed that this TEAC paradigm promotes the mastery of ICC; and they viewed that bilingual and intercultural English users are easily accessed models.

The present study is limited on EFL teachers' paradigmatic views *vis-a-vis* teaching English across cultures. Further studies are expected to delve into the practices of teaching English across cultures so that the data could be of great references for other Indonesian EFL teachers to apply TEAC in the classrooms.

References

- Badrkoohi, A. (2018). The relationship between demotivation and intercultural communicative competence. *Cogent Education*, 5(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1531741>
- Baker, W. (2016). English as an academic lingua franca and intercultural awareness: student mobility in the transcultural university. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 16(3), 437–451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2016.1168053>
- Brunsmeyer, S. (2017). Primary teachers' knowledge when initiating intercultural communicative competence. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(1), 143–155. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.327>
- Byram, M., & Wenger, M. (2018). Making a difference: Language teaching for intercultural and international dialogue. *Foreign Language Annals*, (December 2017), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12319>
- Deniz, E., Özkan, Y., & Bayyurt, Y. (2016). English as a lingua franca: Reflections on ELF-related issues by pre-service English language teachers in Turkey. *The Reading Matrix*, 16(2), 144–161.
- Estaji, M., & Rahimi, A. (2018). Exploring Teachers' Perception of Intercultural Communicative Competence and their Practices for Teaching Culture in EFL Classrooms. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 6(2), 1–18.
- Fang, F. G. (2017). World Englishes or English as a Lingua Franca: Where does English in China stand? *English Today*, 33(1), 19–24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078415000668>
- Fuse, A., Navichkova, Y., & Alloggio, K. (2018). Perception of intelligibility and qualities of non-native accented speakers. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2017.12.006>
- Galante, A. (2015). Intercultural communicative competence in English language teaching: Towards validation of student identity. *Brazilian English Language Journal*, 6(1), 29–39. <https://doi.org/10.15448/2178-3640.2015.1.20188>
- Hamied, F. A. (2012). English in Multicultural and Multilingual Indonesian Education. *Multilingual Education*, 1(English as an International Language in Asia: Implications for Language Education), 63–78. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4578-0_5
- Idris, M. M. (2020). Assessing intercultural competence (IC) of state junior high school English teachers in Yogyakarta. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(3), 628–636. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i3.23213>

- Ishikawa, T. (2016). World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca: Conceptualising the legitimacy of Asian people's English. *Asian Englishes*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2016.1171672>
- Kachru, B. B. (1990). World Englishes and applied linguistics. *World Englishes*, 9(1), 3–20.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2018). The development of English as a lingua franca in ASEAN. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 138–150). New York: Routledge.
- Kusumaningputri, R., & Widodo, H. P. (2018). Promoting Indonesian university students' critical intercultural awareness in tertiary EAL classrooms: The use of digital photograph-mediated intercultural tasks. *System*, 72, 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.10.003>
- Liu, J., & Fang, F. (Gabriel). (2017). Perceptions, awareness and perceived effects of home culture on intercultural communication: Perspectives of university students in China. *System*, 67, 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.04.003>
- Liu, K. L. (2019). Student perspectives on language and culture Teaching in EFL: Implications for intercultural approach. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 9(2), 1–20.
- López-Rocha, S. (2016). Intercultural communicative competence: creating awareness and promoting skills in the language classroom. In C. Gorla, O. Speicher, & S. Stollhans (Eds.), *Innovative language teaching and learning at university: enhancing participation and collaboration* (pp. 105–111).
- Matsuura, H., Rilling, S., Chiba, R., Kim, E. J., & Rini, N. (2016). Intelligibility and comprehensibility in English as a lingua franca: nativized English in Japanese. *Asian Englishes*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2016.1234359>
- Mauranen, A. (2018). Conceptualising ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & D. Martin (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 7–24). New York: Routledge.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, California 91320: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Morganna, R., Sumardi, S., & Tarjana, S. S. (2018a). Teaching Culture: The Prevailing Stance of Indonesian EFL Teachers. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 5(4), 317–330. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v5i4.169>
- Morganna, R., Sumardi, & Tarjana, S. S. (2018b). Immersion vs. construction: The portrayals of culture in Indonesian EFL learning paradigm. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(2), 283–304. Retrieved from <https://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/969/385>
- Morganna, R., Sumardi, & Tarjana, S. S. (2020). Tertiary English students' attitudes towards intercultural language learning. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(3), 657–665. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i3.23216>
- Oranje, J., & Smith, L. F. (2017). Language teacher cognitions and intercultural language teaching: The New Zealand perspective. *Language Teaching Research*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817691319>
- Punteney, K. (2016). Deliberations on the development of an intercultural competence curriculum. *Intercultural Education*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2016.1145457>
- Rahatlou, M. B., Fazilatfar, A. M., & Allami, H. (2018). English as a lingua franca in Iran:

- An attitudinal investigation into the in-service teachers. *Cogent Education*, 5(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1499215>
- Rahimi, M., & Ruzrokh, S. (2016). The impact of teaching Lingua Franca Core on English as a foreign language learners' intelligibility and attitudes towards English pronunciation. *Asian Englishes*, (1–16). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2016.1173466>
- Rauschert, P., & Byram, M. (2017). Service learning and intercultural citizenship in foreign-language education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, (July), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2017.1337722>
- Sherman, T. (2018). ELF and the EU/wider Europe. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 115–125). New York: Routledge.
- Si, J. (2018). English as a native language, World Englishes and English as a lingua franca-informed materials: acceptance, perceptions and attitudes of Chinese English learners. *Asian Englishes*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2018.1544700>
- Sukyadi, D. (2015). The teaching of English at secondary schools in Indonesia. *Secondary School English Education in Asia: From Policy to Practice*, 123–147.
- Sung, C. C. M. (2015). ESL university students' perceptions of their global identities in English as a lingua franca communication: A case study at an international university in Hong Kong. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-015-0263-0>
- Sung, C. C. M. (2017a). Exploring language identities in English as a lingua franca communication: experiences of bilingual university students in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 0(0), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1347138>
- Sung, C. C. M. (2017b). Investigating perceptions of English as a lingua franca in Hong Kong: The case of university students. *English Today*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078417000293>
- Tolosa, C., Biebricher, C., East, M., & Howard, J. (2018). Intercultural language teaching as a catalyst for teacher inquiry. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 70, 227–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.11.027>
- Tran, T. Q., & Duong, T. M. (2018). The effectiveness of the intercultural language communicative teaching model for EFL learners. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 3(6), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-018-0048-0>
- Wright, S., & Zheng, L. (2018). Language as system and language as dialogic creativity: The difficulties of teaching English as a lingua franca in the classroom. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 506–517). New York: Routledge.
- Xerri, D. (2016). Teaching and learning English in a multicultural classroom: strategies and opportunities. *Journal for Multicultural Education*, 10(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JME-04-2015-0012>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Artikel F 03

ORIGINALITY REPORT

10%

SIMILARITY INDEX

9%

INTERNET SOURCES

3%

PUBLICATIONS

2%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	ERIC.ed.gov Internet Source	1 %
2	iojet.org Internet Source	1 %
3	journal.iaincurup.ac.id Internet Source	1 %
4	www.acarindex.com Internet Source	1 %
5	Submitted to Eastern Nazarene College Student Paper	1 %
6	Submitted to Higher Education Commission Pakistan Student Paper	1 %
7	ijmmu.com Internet Source	1 %
8	journal.uny.ac.id Internet Source	1 %
9	www.e-iji.net Internet Source	1 %

10	e-theses.iaincurup.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
11	Leffi Noviyenti. "EFL Islamic Elementary Students' Anxiety in Learning English", AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan, 2021 Publication	<1 %
12	Submitted to Gaziantep Aniversitesi Student Paper	<1 %
13	doaj.org Internet Source	<1 %
14	Mohammad Barzegar Rahatlou, Ali Mohammad Fazilatfar, Hamid Allami. "English as a Lingua Franca in Iran: An attitudinal investigation into the in-service teachers", Cogent Education, 2018 Publication	<1 %
15	etheses.whiterose.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
16	Submitted to CSU, Fullerton Student Paper	<1 %
17	Mohammad Ahmadi Safa, Somayeh Tofighi. "Intercultural communicative competence beliefs and practices of Iranian pre-service and in-service EFL teachers", Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 2021 Publication	<1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 10 words

Exclude bibliography On