ETERNAL (English Teaching Journal)
http://journal.upgris.ac.id/index.php/eternal/index
Volume 13, No. 1, February 2022
ISSN: 2086-5473 (Print); ISSN: 2614-1639 (Online) DOI : https://doi.org/10.26877/eternal.v13i1.10804

Indonesian English Lecturers' Views on World Englishes in English Language Teaching: A Qualitative Inquiry

Rasyid Fahmi Suroso
English Education Department, Universitas Islam Indonesia, Sleman
rfsuroso@gmail.com

Abstract. This study investigates English lecturers' views on World Englishes in English Language Teaching (ELT). For this purpose, three English lecturers from a private university in Sleman were interviewed. The results revealed the divergence in acknowledging and applying World Englishes (ie. Non-native varieties of English) in the classroom. The finding of this study showed five major themes: (a) English as a communication tool, (b) Experience in communicating with native speakers (and/or non-native speakers), (c) The uniqueness of the use of World Englishes, (d) English teaching method applied by lecturers, (e) World Englishes, Global Englishes, and other relevant aspects to discuss.

Keywords: lecturers' views, lecturers' perception, World Englishes, English as an International Language, English as a Lingua Franca

INTRODUCTION

The number of English users reaches nearly two billion in the world and continues to grow (Schneider, 2011). English has spread so widely that several experts give the term 'global language status' to it (Crystal, 2003; Jenkins, 2015). English as a lingua Franca (Seidlhofer, 2011), International English (McKay, 2012), and World Englishes (Kachru & Nelson, 2006; Kirkpatrick, 2007) are new names that have emerged due to the rapid growth of English as an international language (EIL).

In English Language Teaching (ELT) context, traditionally, General American (American English) and Received Pronunciation (British English) has been considered as the primary goal for second-language learners (McKay, 2012). However, Kirkpatrick (2007) proposed 'a localized version of the language' that is Lingua Franca model (ELF).

In World Englishes (WE) paradigm, Kachru (1985, 1992) divided the spread of English into three concentric circles: the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and Expanding Circle. Furthermore, Kachru (1992) writes that the division of concentric circles is based on historical, sociolinguistic and literary contexts.

There has been an increasing number of studies that focus on exploring the views, perceptions, and beliefs of teachers in World Englishes within ELT in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context (Ahn, 2015; He, 2015; Lim, 2019; Sadeghpour & Sharifian, 2017). However, there are relatively few published studies on Indonesian English higher education

lecturers' perception of WE within ELT in EFL context. To fill out the gap, the purpose of this study is to investigate a group of Indonesian English lecturers regarding their perception towards World Englishes in English language teaching.

METHOD

This study uses a qualitative research method and employs thematic analysis as a research design (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis is employed to determine, analyse, and present the theme from data that has been obtained. This study is designed to investigate the view on World Englishes among lecturers in Indonesia.

The participants of this study are three English lecturers from several faculties in one of Indonesia private universities. The researcher determines that the participants should have been teaching English for at least two years. All participants are Indonesian citizens. Therefore, the researcher considered that another criterion is—participants have visited a country where English is used as the first (the inner circle) or the second language (the outer circle). This is to ensure that participants have the exposure to distinguish Englishes (as we know that in Indonesia, English is considered as a foreign language).

An in-depth interview is used as the primary instrument of the study. The researcher applied a semi-structured interview where the research questions were developed before the researcher interviewed the participants. The in-depth interview emphasizes how the view on World Englishes among lecturers in ELT context in Indonesia.

The researcher interviews the participants in shifts. The interview is conducted online since the number of Covid-19 cases is rising. The researcher records the whole process of interview utilizing *Zoom* application. The interview is used as the only primary data.

Thematic analysis is used by the researcher as a qualitative data analysis method. This method is employed to determine, analyse, and present the theme and describe the data in detail (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Braun & Clarke (2006) write six steps-of-thematic-analysis in detail as follows:

Step 1: Familiarizing myself with the data. The first step in analysing data is the most crucial and affects the subsequent steps. In simple terms, the most basic thing a researcher needs to do is 'familiarize' with the data. The way that can be taken is to re-read the data. If the data is in the form of audio (verbal data), then what needs to be carried out is verbatim transcription. This step may seem 'time-consuming' and 'boring', but it is a good way to familiarize oneself with verbal data (Riessman, 1993). Another reason is that verbatim transcription can 'keep' the natural meaning (Poland, 2002).

Step 2: Generating initial codes. After familiarizing with the data, the researcher can start producing initial codes from the data. Generally, initial codes are different from themes (themes are broader than codes). In this step, Braun & Clarke suggested that researchers write

down as many codes as possible because it is feasible that there are interesting things that can be investigated from these codes.

Step 3: Searching for themes. The third step can be commenced after the researcher obtains the codes that have been compiled. Then, the researcher will focus on a broader range of themes. Various codes that have been obtained in the second step will be classified as potential themes. It is important for the researcher to thoroughly analyse the codes and to consider what kind of code fits into what theme.

Step 4: Reviewing themes. After potential themes are obtained, the researcher will 'refine' the themes. According to Braun & Clarke (2006), there are two main reasons why a theme is 'eliminated'. First, there is not enough data to support this theme. Second, the data is too 'diverse'. Meanwhile, Patton (1990) proposed two terms *internal homogeneity* and *external heterogeneity* to indicate whether potential themes are worthy of being a theme or not. This phase consists of two levels of reviewing. Level one reviews the code, while level two reviews potential themes.

Step 5: Defining and naming themes. Braun & Clarke (2006) provide one way to examine the extent to which researchers understand the definition of a theme - namely by seeing whether the researcher can describe the scope and content of each theme. If researchers are unable to do this, further 'refinement' of that theme may need to be undertaken. Regarding the 'naming' of the theme, Braun & Clarke (2006) suggest that the name is *concise, punchy*, and *immediately give the reader a sense of what the theme is about*

Step 6: Producing the report. The final step includes two things: final analysis and report writing. It is important to ascertain the purpose of writing the report, whether for publication or for submitting assignments, such as a thesis. Braun & Clarke (2006) emphasizes that report writing is not just showing and providing data. Report writing is necessary to provide 'an analytic narrative' that can describe the stories about the data (go beyond the description of the data).

The researcher reviews the credibility of the method by communicating the data to the academic counsellor and confirming data to all of the participants (Widodo, 2014). The researcher reviews conformability by conducting audit and verification (Ibrahim, 2015).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

English as a Communication Tool

More than two decades ago, a leading expert on linguistics, David Crystal, estimated that there were more than 1.1 billion English speakers with details of 320 million using it as a first language, 225 million using it as a second language (and/or as an additional language), and 600 million who learn it as a foreign language (1997, as cited in Graddol, 2000). By 2021, according to *Statista* report, there are 1.35 billion English speakers – and continuing to grow – with varying levels of proficiency. Meanwhile, reports from South China Morning

Post and The Washington Post have a higher rough estimate that there are 1.5 billion of the world's population who speak English. At this point, the researcher considers that English is indeed a communication tool around the world.

In viewing the purpose of learning English, the participants tend to have the same opinion.

> *For me, what's important is the English that we speak could be used to communicate with other people (BIK/MAW/I2/L371-373).*

> *I reckon that the 'end result' is more about the ability to communicate, as far as I can see (BIK/YAN/I3/L707-708).*

Based on the data above, Mrs MAW and Mrs YAN believe that communication is the main goal of learning English. Not only English, but in learning any language, the main purpose is to be able to use the language.

> *I could say that variety and accent aren't important anymore, what's significant is that we understand what we're talking about and people understand what they want to hear so that interaction occurs (BIK/AMU/I1/L385-389).*

Meanwhile, Mr AMU emphasizes in more detail that other aspects can be put aside since what's needed is the understanding between the speaker and the listener.

Experience in Communicating with Native Speakers (and/or Non-native Speakers)

Each participant has unique and diverse experiences, both in duration and in the countries visited. Mr AMU has been living in the UK for more than five years to earn his doctoral degree. He has also visited various countries in Asia such as Japan, Thailand, Cambodia, and Malaysia. Mrs MAW has visited three countries: Singapore, England, and South Korea – to attend several conferences. Meanwhile, Mrs YAN has been back-and-forth to Malaysia four to five times.

> *My supervisor was a Brit, and definitely, he spoke very fast. Since he had a lot of experience in guiding 'non-native English speaker' students, he always said this from the very beginning, "Bring a recorder before the class started, so you don't keep confirming what I explain during face-to-face supervision." I could quite catch his explanation actually, but when I got home, I tried to listen again to check the extent of my understanding. It turned out that there were some details that I failed to notice (PB/AMU/I1/L787-803).*

Although living in Southampton, England for more than five years, Mr AMU admits that it is still quite challenging to listen to native speakers. A study conducted by Rahimirad & Moini (2015) showed a similar result. MA graduates in Iran (according to Kachru's concentric circle, Iran is one of the members of the expanding circle) find it difficult to listen to native speakers because of *the fast delivery of speech.*

> *Years ago, I took a train from Malang to Jogja. I sat next to a woman from, from Czech, or Slovakia. I don't really remember where she came from. She asked a lot of questions*

> *about my religion since she knew I was a lecturer at an Islamic university. As a matter of fact, she asked many things related to Islam. Then, all of a sudden, she went, "I like the way you explained things, I totally understand what you mean". I was surprised, to be honest. I think she was struggling to understand my explanation (PB/AMU/I/L646-661).*
>
> *It means that my position to be myself with my English 'style', is the right thing to do, in that context (PB/AMU/I1/L671-673).*

Mr AMU encounters a special experience when interacting with a non-native speaker in Indonesia. Talking with a woman from Slovakia (or Czech), Mr AMU was quite shocked to know the fact that she could fully understand what Mr AMU is saying. Mr AMU regards that 'being himself' is the right action. The researcher presumes that what is implied by being himself is not trying to imitate an American or British accent.

> *They (Mrs YAN's students) used Google Translate - they could survive with it. One time, they ordered a taxi, they wrote something in Indonesian and then translated it into Mandarin, then showed it to the driver, things like that PB/YAN/I3/L667-670).*

Meanwhile, Mrs YAN recounts her students' experience while in Tianjin, China. After failing to communicate using English, her students try to use a translation tool and also nonverbal communication. "It worked", Mrs YAN claims.

The Uniqueness of the Use of World Englishes

Deterding (2013) divides English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) features into two types: Lingua Franca Core (LFC) and Non-Lingua Franca Core. LFC, in brief, is the pronunciation that non-native speakers need to achieve in order to be understood by international English speakers, while Non-LFC can be interpreted as a more flexible pronunciation in its application. One of the features of Non-LFC is the frequent use of Dark-L.

> *When I was in Cambodia, right after attending a conference, a tuktuk driver offered me, 'go to pele?' Pele? What is pele? Definitely that pele is not a football player, but he went, 'go to pele, go to pele, I take you, I take you," with his hands, he formed this (AMU's index finger and thumb form a triangle), 'big, big pele' pelle? Big? Wait a minute... ah I see, pele is probably a palace, right? But he called it pele, because it was influenced by the way he spoke Cambodian. I mean, that's ELF (KI/AMU/I1/L318-323).*

In American English (General American English), there are two ways of pronouncing the L sound, Light L and Dark L. The IPA transcription for Light L is /l/, for example in the words *like* and *clean*. Meanwhile, the IPA transcription for Dark L is /ɬ/ [some dictionaries still write it as /l/], like in the words *pull* and *ball*.

The excerpt above shows a real example of non-native speakers' utterance – Cambodia is one of the members of expanding circle countries. Instead of using Light L, the tuktuk driver uses Dark L when pronouncing 'palace' (/ˈpæləs/) which became 'pele' (/peɬe/). As for the unspoken '-ce' (/əs/) snippet, the researcher assumes that it is just part of the tuktuk driver's idiolect.

The extract also shows how the tuktuk driver employs nonverbal communication. The tuktuk driver provides additional information by forming a triangle using his fingers, whether it is intentional or not – which Mr AMU eventually interprets as a 'palace'.

> *In Southampton, they have different styles and accents from Londoners or even Birmingham people. Literally different. The way they speak are very smooth and lilting. 'Excuse me, can I help you please?' (AMU tried imitating Southampton people's speech style) (KI/AMU/I1/L342-348).*

With more than five years of experience in the UK, Mr AMU is well aware of the variations that arise in several counties, regions, towns, and cities in the UK. A variation, adapting Trask and Stockwell (2007), is 'observable differences' in a language. A judge certainly doesn't talk like a bank clerk. A high school student doesn't talk like a doctoral graduate. As a matter of fact, we, as individuals, are not homogeneous. We don't speak in the same way when we are in the university, for example, and when we are at home. The examples above are aspects of sociolinguistics. For the linguistic aspect, some instances are vocabulary (lexicon) and grammar (syntax).

In the excerpt above, Mr AMU utters, "excuse me, can I help you please?" with a Southampton accent – although the researcher is not able to confirm the 'legitimacy' of the accent. Mr AMU continued, "...different from Londoners or even Birmingham people." Through this sentence, the researcher believes that we need to redefine the term 'British English'. In a simple definition, British English is English that spoken and used by the people of Britain. Britain (also known as Great Britain) refers to an island consisting of three countries: Wales, England and Scotland. As we know, Southampton, London, Birmingham are cities located in England – which are part of Britain. Therefore, the researcher considers that the concept of British English becomes vague.

> *You know, what surprised me the most was when I had a workshop in Manchester. Their English, at some point, sounds like ours. They would say 'thank you very much' (pronunciation of 'much' is based on the spelling m u c h) instead of very much (pronunciation as it is). --- KI/AMU/I1 (L366-372)*

Mr AMU expressed his astonishment after noticing a major mistake and even non-standards in a country that is often considered the 'owner' of English. If we take a look at two of the most prominent dictionaries in the world – the Cambridge Dictionary and the Oxford Learner's Dictionary – we will find the IPA transcription /mʌtʃ/ for 'much'. However, the Manchester people, or at least the Manchester people that Mr AMU met, pronounce it as /mʊtʃ/.

To confirm this, we can look at a comprehensive work by Hughes, Trudgill, and Watt (2013, 5th edition). Those three renowned writers collected more than twenty accents and dialects in the United Kingdom. The Manchester accent, also known as Mancunian, is quite distinctive compared to the Received Pronunciation, for example. Manchester people tend to replace the vowel /ʌ/ with /ʊ/. *Put* and *Putt* will be considered as homophones, using the

vowel /ʊ/. Another characteristic is the tendency to omit the /h/ sound at the beginning of words (e.g. horrible).

> *Indonesian people, as far as I observe, have a specific way of writing English. It's not entirely wrong, but sometimes it's not quite straightforward, not straight to the point. For example, "Prays to Allah, the Almighty, salawat and salaam to our prophet Muhammad" and "I do apologise for the mistakes". On several occasions, it's not necessarily needed (KI/YAN/I3/L337-343).*

Mrs YAN identifies characteristics of Indonesians when writing in English: less straightforward and not to-the-point. Not only in written style, even in spoken speech, has it tended sometimes considered too pleonastic. Ms YAN's students often end their presentations with 'I do apologise for all the mistakes' which according to Ms YAN, is not really necessary. This is reinforced by research by Arsyad and Adila (2017) who reviewed forty journal articles in four Indonesian journals with the Scopus index. The result shows that Indonesians tend to be 'presenting positive justification' rather than 'evaluating other writers' work'.

English Teaching Method applied by Lecturers

> *So, as of 2015, my teaching method was still influenced by monolingual ideology, Standard English norms, and native speaker norms. But definitely, when I return to Indonesia, I will undeniably change that. I will no longer insist... um, for example, 'you have to – you have to imitate native speakers' no, it's not gonna happen. Some of them don't even talk properly (probably refers to the 'much' earlier). I don't think it's fair (CM/AMU/I1/L683-691).*

> *When you claim that 'someone's wrong', it simply means you're holding native-speakerism philosophy (ICV/AMU/I1/L429-431).*

From the excerpts above, Mr AMU openly expresses that monolingual ideology influenced his teaching method from the very beginning of his teaching career to 2015 – before he continued his doctoral education. In a simple sense, monolingual ideology is a belief in which only one language is needed in an interaction or communication. This ideology is considered problematic (Peel, 2001) not only because it ignores the fact that there are other languages that live and are widely used in society, but also neglect the reality that there is always something unique and even exclusive in each language.

Meanwhile, the term 'native-speakerism' appears at least four times in the interview with Mr AMU. This term appears as a continuation of the monolingual ideology, which distinguishes between 'native speakers' and 'non-native speakers' (Jenkins, 2000, as cited in Holliday, 2006). Moreover, Holliday (2006) defines native-speakerism as an ideology which views that 'native-speaker' teachers represent 'western culture' and are authoritative towards English language and English language teaching methodology.

> *Personally, I still refer to the native speaker norm. My teaching method is based on the textbooks. Usually, the textbooks are still imported from England or American publishers (CM/MAW/I2/L176-180).*

> *My viewpoint is more of introducing these variations to students, but not to be taught. 'This is Indian English, this is Malaysian English,' but it won't be used practically in the classroom (CM/MAW/I2/L240-243).*

> *I won't oblige students to be like American English or British English speakers, or worship British or American English, no (CM/MAW/I2/L275-277).*

Mrs MAW denotes her perspective regarding the practice of the 'native speaker norm' in her teaching method. Mrs MAW mentions that her teaching resources came from textbooks published by 'English-speaking country' publishers, such as the United States and the United Kingdom. In addition, Mrs MAW believes that variations of English can be taught to students but not for practical use in a classroom. At the same time, Mrs MAW does not require her students to duplicate or even glorify British or American English.

From that point, it seems there is a gap between the use of textbooks published by the United States and the United Kingdom as a teaching reference, and the lenience that Mrs MAW gives her students to choose whether to use British or American English or neither of them. This is understandable considering written English (books, articles, etc.) seems stricter, and the grammar is relatively homogeneous. In contrast, spoken English (conversation, audio, etc.) is more flexible and varied.

World Englishes, Global Englishes, and Other Relevant Aspects to Discuss

> *There are two major perspectives when it comes to Global Englishes (GE), English as an International Language (EIL) and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). If it's EIL, English as an International Language, it talked about the English varieties that existed in the British colonies, like Singlish, Malaysian English, they were colonized by the British Empire, right? However, Lingua Franca didn't talk about that. It described how people with their respective characters can communicate in English (WGT/AMU/I1/L277-292).*

> *The paradigm or perspective of GE never made a parameter: standards, Standard English norms, never. Global Englishes saw language as a function of communication. So, it's not about whether you're right or wrong. Remember, it's not just American or British English. Every English variation can be taught to the students (WGT/AMU/I1/L476-489).*

Of the three participants, the term 'Global Englishes' only appears in the interview with Mr AMU since he has been studying this topic profoundly, especially when he continued his PhD in the UK. According to Crystal, English achieves a global status since it has a 'special role' in nearly every country (2003). 'Special roles' itself has two main facets. First, as an official language. Second, as a language used as a mandatory subject in one's education system. Ethnologue, a language research centre, noted that in 2021, 55 countries establish English as an official language (French is in second place recognized by 29 countries, Arabic is in third place recognized by 26 countries), de jure (legally recognized) and de facto (used

in daily conversation). Meanwhile, concerning the second aspect, the University of Winnipeg (located in Manitoba, Canada) compiles various official documents and publications from 183 countries. The result shows that 142 countries (including Indonesia) enact English as a mandatory subject of national education policy. It seems that to this day, English is the only language that has gained a global language status.

In the matter of Global Englishes (GE), Mr AMU affirms there are two branches of GE: English as an International Language (EIL) and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). EIL, as Mr AMU said, discusses countless variations in a language, while ELF deals with how humans use a language to communicate.

Numerous previous papers have discussed the definition, limitations, and scope of EIL and ELF. Slightly different from Mr AMU's outlook, Sharifian (2009) views that EIL is not just variations in English but more of the fact that those many variations make English a language of international and 'intercultural' communication. A similar understanding comes from Dewi, who discerns EIL paradigm does not refer to certain variations of the English language, but rather to its function in international communication (2012). Meanwhile, McKay (2018) describes that there are two roles of EIL, first as a type (or varieties) of English, second as a way of using English.

In the realm of ELT and TESOL, it is common seeing various terms to be overlap. Several terms are even more difficult to identify its boundaries. Two terms whose meanings are often used interchangeably are EIL and ELF. EIL, as described above, is defined as the English used in international communication without emphasizing one particular variation. Moderately contrasting from EIL, according to House (1999, as cited in McKay, 2018), ELF is English spoken by speakers who do not use English as their mother tongue. The implication is that every native speaker is excluded from the discussion of ELF. ELF is also often referred to as 'a contact language' (Seidlhofer, 2004, as cited in Ur, 2010) and 'a bridging language' since it is bridging speakers from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

> *World Englishes is English variations appear in countries where English is the official language or joint-official language. That's the reason why people in those countries regard that variations are something normal. On the contrary, Indonesians, who consider English as a foreign language, has not yet reached WE level as we are still learning English from the inner circle country (WGT/MAW/I2/L111-120).*

The term "World Englishes" (WE) can be viewed from three points of view (Bolton, 2004). The first definition of WE is every variety of English worldwide. When referring to the concentric circles of Kachru (1992), this includes the inner circle, outer circle, and expanding circle. The second definition is narrower, referring to English variations exist in three regions: West Africa (Nigerian English, Caribbean (Jamaican English), and Asia (Hong Kong English, Malaysian English, Indian English, Singaporean English, etc.). The third definition emphasizes the view that all varieties of English are equal in international communication. From the three perspectives, Mrs MAW tends to perceive it in the second sense.

> *As to Indonesian English variation, I don't think we're there yet (WGT/MAW/I2/L201-202).*

Based on the extract above, Mrs MAW comes up with the term 'Indonesian English' which means English spoken by Indonesians and adapted it into Indonesian language rules. Mrs MAW also emphasizes that in Indonesia there seems to be no sign that so-called Indonesian English will be used in the near future considering that countries in the expanding circle (Kachru, 1992) are still learning English based on exonormative (tending to rely on British or American English) native speaker model (Monfared, 2020).

The researcher traces back to one of the Web Corpus, *English Corpora: iWeb Corpus*. The website consists of approximately 14 billion words sourced from 22 million web pages. The term *Indonesian English* only appears seven times. Only two of them refer to an English variation. It seems that Indonesian English is not quite a popular term to use, at least on those wide ranges of websites.

> *I can say that we are a contender – a strong contender in English Language Teaching, especially in more varied use of English (WGT/YAN/I3/L236-239).*

Mrs YAN shows optimism that in the future, Indonesia will probably have its own variation. Even more, it could be a policy in the formal education system in Indonesia. Nonetheless, the endonormative view (tending to rely on local rules and norms) is unusual in expanding circle countries and more popular in outer circle countries (Monfared & Khatib, 2018).

CONCLUSION

This study aimed at investigating the lecturers' view on World Englishes in English Language Teaching. Based on the interview. The researcher found that lecturers are in the same position when it comes to language learning, that communication is the main purpose. However, there is a significant difference among lecturers regarding the use of World Englishes (i.e. non-native English varieties) in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Ahn, H. (2015). Awareness of and attitudes to Asian Englishes: a study of English teachers in South Korea. *Asian Englishes*, *17*(2), 132–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2015.1036602

Arsyad, S., & Adila, D. (2017). Using local style when writing in English: the citing behaviour of Indonesian authors in English research article introductions. *Asian Englishes, 20*(2), 170–185. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2017.1327835

Bolton, K. (2004). World Englishes. In C. Davies, A; Elder (Ed.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *3*(2), 77–101.

Countries in which English language is a mandatory or an optional subject. (2021). Retrieved 27 November 2021, from The University of Winnipeg website: https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/global-english-education/countries-in-which-english-is-mandatory-or-optional-subject.html

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deterding, D. (2013). *Misunderstandings in English as a Lingua Franca: an analysis of ELF interactions in South-East Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dewi, A. (2012). English as an international language: an overview. *UII Journal of English and Education*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.20885/jee.vol6.iss2.art1

Graddol, D. (2000). *The future of English*. Liverpool: The British Council.

He, D. (2015). University students' and teachers' perceptions of China English and World Englishes: Language attitudes and pedagogic implications. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *2*(2), 65–76.

Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, *60*(4), 385–387. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl030

Hughes, A., Trudgill, P., & Watt, D. (2012). *English accents and dialects: an introduction to social and regional varieties of British English* (5th ed.). London: Routledge.

Ibrahim. (2015). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Pontianak: Perpustakaan Nasional.

iWeb: The Intelligent Web-based Corpus. (n.d.). Retrieved 19 November 2021, from English Corpora website: https://www.english-corpora.org/iweb/

Jenkins, J. (2015). *Global Englishes: A resource book for students* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y; Nelson., & C. L. (Ed.). (2006). *The Handbook of World Englishes*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistics realism: the English language in the outer cirle. In H. G. Quirk, R., & Widdowson (Ed.), *English in the world: teaching and learning the language and literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). World Englishes: approaches, issues, and resources. *Language Teaching*, *25*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800006583

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Language Information. (2021). Retrieved 15 November 2021, from Ethnologue: Languages of the World website: https://www.ethnologue.com/about/language-info#LgUse

Lim, S. (2020). A critical analysis of Cambodian teachers' cognition about World Englishes and English language teaching. *Asian Englishes*, *22*(1), 85–100. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2019.1645994

Lopez, A. L. (2015). In graphics: a world of languages - and how many speak them. Retrieved 26 November 2021, from South China Morning Post website: ttps://www.scmp.com/infographics/article/1810040/infographic-world-languages?page=all

McKay, S. L. (2012). Principles of teaching English as an international language. In W. A. Alsagoff, L; McKay, S. L; Renandya (Ed.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language*. New York: Routledge.

McKay, S. L. (2018). English as an international language: what it is and what it means for pedagogy. *RELC Journal*, *49*(1), 9–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217738817

Monfared, A., & Mozaheb, M. A. (2020). Exonormativity, endonormativity or multilingualism: teachers' attitudes towards pronunciation issues in three kachruvian circles. *Journal of English as an International Language*, *15*(2), 27–51.

Monfared, A., & Khatib, M. (2018). English or englishes? Outer and expanding circle teachers' awareness of and attitudes towards their own variants of english in ESL/EFL teaching contexts. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *43*(2), 56–75. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n2.4

Noack, R., & Gamio, L. (2015). The world's languages in 7 maps and charts. Retrieved 28 November 2021, from The Washington Post website: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2015/04/23/the-worlds-languages-in-7-maps-and-charts/

Patton, M. Q. (2003). Qualitative research & evaluation methods. In *Revista de Administração Contemporânea* (3rd ed., Vol. 7). Thousand Oaks: SAGE. https://doi.org/10.1590/s1415-65552003000200018

Peel, Q. (2001). The monotony of monoglots. *Language Learning Journal*, *23*(1), 13–14. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730185200041

Poland, B. D. (2002). Transcription quality. In A. B. Gubrium, J. F; Holstein, J. A; Marvasti (Ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Interview Research* (pp. 629–649). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Rahimirad, M., & Moini, M. R. (2015). The challenges of listening to academic lecturers for EAP learners and the impact of metacognition on academic lecturue listening comprehension. *SAGE Open*, *5*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015590609

Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. Newsbury Park: SAGE.

Sadeghpour, M., & Sharifian, F. (2017). English language teachers' perceptions of World Englishes: the elephants in the room. *Asian Englishes, 19*(3), 242–258. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2017.1362782

Schneider, E. W. (2011). *English around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seidlhofer, B. (2012). Understanding English as a Lingua Franca. *Applied Linguistics*, *33*(4), 463–465. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams035

Sharifian, F. (2009). *English as an international language: perspective and pedagogical issues*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Szmigiera, M. (2021). The most spoken languages worldwide in 2021. Retrieved 21 November 2021, from Statista website: https://www.statista.com/statistics/266808/the-most-spoken-languages-worldwide/

Trask, R. L. (2007). *Language and linguistics: the key concepts* (2nd ed.; P. Stockwell, Ed.). New York: Routledge.

Ur, P. (2010). English as a lingua franca: a teacher's perspective. *Cadernos de Letras*, *27*, 85–92.

Widodo, H. P. (2014). Methodological considerations in interview data transcription. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language*, *3*(1), 101–107. Retrieved from https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/methodological-considerations-interview-data/docview/1625463330/se-2