ARTICLE

The Preferences of Students and Lecturers toward Dominant English and or World Englishes (WE)

Ribut Wahyudi * , *Mazroatul Ishlahiyah* , *Mira Shartika*

English Literature Study Program, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim, Malang 65144, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This article aimed to discuss lecturers' and students' preferences on Standard English and/or World Englishes (WE), including their resonance with Linguicism and native speakerism. The research used purposive sampling after a short survey and employed thematic analysis. The data from lecturers and students were generated through semi-structured interviews. The findings showed that, although mostly the lecturers and students operated themselves with dominant standard English (British and American English), a lecturer with a gender studies and world cinema background performed a critical perspective, and also by students. The disciplinary course, mainstream or critical perspectives of study during post-graduate studies, domestic or study abroad experience, shaped lecturers' positioning toward Standard English for lecturers. Interestingly, for students, even though they perpetuated native speakerism and linguicism, two students mixing languages in the classroom emerged during the learning process. The student's mixing of languages could be explored further, whether it was a sign of limited English proficiency or an unavoidable translingual practice. However, it was beyond the scope of this paper. Thus, we recommend that this be researched in the future. The research suggests that teachers could introduce English or Englishes for students majoring in English literature and/or the English education department, and open the possibilities for students to translanguage in the classroom within a reasonable proportion.

Keywords: Standard English; World Englishes; Linguicism; Native-Speakerism

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Ribut Wahyudi, English Literature Study Program, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim, Malang 65144, Indonesia; Email: ribut@bsi.uin-malang.ac.id

1. Introduction

The studies on English can range from its origins and historical development (Baugh & Cable[1]), its spread through colonialism (Pennycook[2]), to the spread of English through technology, economy, and media (Crystal[3]). In this paper, we only focused on students' and lecturers' understanding and preferences of English/Englishes as a result of the current realities of where there is a contestation between those who support Standard English (e.g., British and American English) and those who propose World Englishes. As with Standard English, the precise use of English using the following grammars and canon dictionaries has been dominant (Quirk[4]; Hickey[5]), and we directly turn to the literature of World Englishes.

Kachru[6] argues that two different diasporas cause the spread of English and give rise to status in the language. This opinion was later strengthened by Kachru & Nelson[7], stating that the first diaspora occurred in the Inner Circle, where English spread from North America to several countries. In contrast, the second diaspora occurred because people who had received English training were asked to spread English to several other countries.

However, even though World Englishes [WE] have been widely discussed, applied, and researched by many researchers, WE in Indonesia has only recently been investigated. Limited previous studies have been conducted on whether it is related to the issue of lecturers' and students' preference of Standard English or World Englishes in higher education under the Ministry of Religious Affairs. This study is worth doing and aims to answer the following questions:

1. What do English students and lecturers think of Standard English or World Englishes?
2. What do English students and lecturers prefer: Standard English/or World Englishes?
3. Why do English students and lecturers prefer Standard English or World Englishes?

The significance of answering the above question is to map students' and lecturers' understanding of standard English or other alternative type of Englishes, as well as their preferences and the reasons behind them. It is still important to answer those questions as the students' and lecturers' understanding of the Standard English and/or WE might impact how they do in the classroom (Wahyudi[8]).

This study is still relevant as it is underexplored in the Indonesian Islamic universities under the Ministry of Religious Affairs. Unpacking this would add more insights into standard English and WE and offer what kinds of policy and pedagogical implications can be drawn from the study.

The following are the relevant literature to answer the above questions.

2. Literature Review

This chapter reviews the relevant theories applied in this research and a brief evaluation of the previous studies to highlight the gap in the study.

Bolton[9] asserts that WE means "a localized form of English" and is used worldwide. This means that English is now considered an international lingua franca. Kachru[6] introduced three concentric circles to conceptualize the global spread of English: inner, outer, and developing circles. According to Kachru, these circles correspond to English as a mother tongue, ESL, and EFL. In addition, Crystal[3] shows the number of English speakers in each circle.

The following is the definition given by Crystal[3] following Kachru[6] to the three circles:

1. The Inner Circle: namely "the traditional base of English, which is the primary language", which includes countries such as the United States, United Kingdom, Ireland, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand;
2. Outer Circle: refers to countries where English is spoken as a second language (ESL) and where the primary use of English is for communication, institutional, and official purposes, for example, in Singapore, India, and Malawi.
3. The Expanding Circle: namely, the arrangement of English without a history of colonization in parts of the inner circle area and where English is spoken and taught as a foreign language (EFL), for example, in China, Japan, and Greece.

Yano[10] critiqued Kachru's[6] concentric Circles, arguing that English varieties in the Outer Circles have "become increasingly established" (p. 122). Moreover, the continued flow of immigrants and international students who pursue their degrees in Inner Circle Countries has obscured the

boundaries of the three concentric Circles.

Another critique came from Saraceni[11]. He proposed the relocation of English as a new framework for understanding WE. In addition, according to him, the English diversity issues is merely based on each nation, because it has "somewhat shaky sociolinguistic proponents" (p. 181), tends to exclude rather than include, and can also be "dangerous" by creating such "separation" for British people (e.g., Nigerians, Indians, Singaporeans), which is constructed as undesirable. The relocation of English represents a shift away from seeing English as an extension of Anglo-American culture, and framing it through the practice of individual English language users. In that context, English is "de-Anglicised" and is seen as "a widely situated linguistic repertoire" Saraceni[7].

Therefore, we use Kachru's concentric circles[1], Yano's[10] criticism, Phillipson's and Skutnabb-Kangas'[11] linguicism as well as Canagarajah's and Said's[9] native speakerism when analysing the data in this present study.

For Linguicism, Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas[11] describe a hierarchy among languages where English is usually privileged and positioned at the top. This Linguistics involves stigmatizing the dominant languages as mere dialects or vernaculars, then glorifying the dominant language (its superiority) and rationalizing the relationship between the languages, with the benefits of the dominant language.

Another crucial concept in the SE vs. WE is the notion of native speakerism. Canagarajah & Said[12] explain that the discourse of native speakerism revolves around (a) the authorities of the language with the superior competence, (b) native speaker competence as the target, and (c) the native speaker is considered to be the best teacher to teach the language.

Inspired by, among others, Canagarajah[13] translingual practice and Garcia & Wei[14] translingual practice, Wahyudi[15,16] allowed his students (in an Indonesian Islamic University setting) to use national languages in the classroom up to (25–30%) in addition to the use of English. This allowed the students to be more expressive in presentations and assignments. He still encouraged the students to use 70–75% English because the students in his class are from the English literature department, where the students have used English(es). However, his permission for students to use 25–30% has opened space for students to use his/her

multiple linguistic repertoires and social justice. Agustin and Wahyudi[17] revealed that the students' use of translanguaging is partly affected by the students' lack of English fluency.

Previous Studies of Standard English (SE) and World Englishes (WE)

Several studies have shown student perceptions of using Standard English and World Englishes in the Indonesian context. First, Dewi[18] examined Indonesian lecturers', teachers', and students' perceptions of English about their communication, cultural, national, and religious identities. The results revealed various perceptions towards English, in which "some references to Caucasians as potential interlocutors are found even though the participants believe that English has been used among 'non-native' speakers and that the relationship between English and the West is diminishing" (p. 1) and "the participants also view English as either not related or positively related to their national, religious, and ethnic identities" (p. 1).

Second, He[19] analyzed university students' and teachers' language attitudes and pedagogic implications towards China English and world Englishes. He's study showed different results for students and teachers' participants, in which students had positive attitudes to China English and teachers had a greater preference for standard English. Additionally, stakeholders should take into consideration the difference in students' and teachers' attitudes when developing a pedagogic framework that is more practical and efficient.

Third, Sa'd[20] investigated Iranian students' attitude toward world English (WE), e.g., Standard English and World Englishes (WEs), e.g., varieties of Englishes. The research findings showed that students considered the standard and the only legitimate spoken English to be that of the US and the UK. This aligned with Wahyudi's[8] study that American and British English have become a regime of truth.

Next, Almegren[21] inquired into Saudi students' attitudes towards World Englishes. The findings indicated Saudi students' awareness of English language varieties with various attitudes regarding the World Englishes' dissimilar varieties. Additionally, students mainly considered the type of English used in the UK and the US as the only variety of

Standard English. In addition, most students did not consider other world English varieties as standard English. Finally, most students preferred non-native teachers, in this case, Saudi teachers, to teach English in their class, although they acknowledged native teachers' superiority.

Through the lens of Foucauldian subjectivity and interdisciplinary approach, Wahyudi's [8] dissertation found that the lecturers' constructions of World Englishes were complex: ranging from the valorisation, the ambivalent position, and the acceptance of World Englishes. The lecturer with non-TESOL with an MA and PhD in non-TESOL from an English-speaking country who were teaching Cross-Cultural Understanding (CCU) course at an Islamic University (IU), aligned himself with Inner Circle English while the lecturer who was also teaching CCU at Multi-Religious University (MRU), with post-colonial background who gained Master's degree German accepted the varieties of Englishes, even though there were still traces of standard English dominant in his answer. The junior female lecturer (JFL) from MRU (with an MA in Literature) from an English-speaking country) She said that she did not allow students to use English in the CCU course, but when it happened in the classroom, the lecturer did not mind. JFL tolerated this because she said some students' proficiency still could not reach the 'real English'. That suggests that in a content course such as CCU, the lecturer's educational background and students' competence shape the lecturers' positioning toward Englishes. The lecturers (with TESOL background) in the Argumentative Writing course were ambivalent; they acknowledged the existence of World Englishes but could not adopt it in the course. This suggests that disciplinary practice in this course is challenging to negotiate.

Iranian students' preference and ownership of Standard English or world Englishes, conducted by Tahmasbi, Hashemifardnia, and Namaziandost [22]. The findings of this study covered "most participants' views skewed toward supporting WEs", most participants' willingness "to call English as EFL learners' property", and their positive views for both SE and WEs. However, most appreciated "the prestigious stance of SE" (p. 83).

Irham et al. [23] conducted semi-structured interviews with lecturers at UMI University in Indonesia about their perceptions toward ELF and the possibility of them accommodating multilingual justice orientation in teaching. Even though lecturers had a favorable attitude toward ELF for students, due to institutional and collegial support, they tended to orient their teaching toward native English norms.

Harsanti & Menara [24] investigated Native Speakerism among teachers at a private school in Jakarta. The researchers conducted individual interviews with English teachers at that school. They found traces of native-speakerism among teachers who see English from purist perspectives. In other words, the teachers favour Inner Circle English, e.g., British and American English. This position is manifested in their teaching practices, where a native speaker is positioned as the role model.

Suroso [25] explored the lecturers' views on WE in English Language Teaching (ELT) from three lecturers from a private university in Sleman, Yogyakarta. The lecturers, accordingly, showed similarities and differences. The similarity lies in the use of WE in honest communication. In contrast, for classroom teaching, one lecturer still used textbooks from American and British, the second lecturer, while acknowledging the variations of Englishes, will not use them in the classroom. It can be assumed that this respondent uses dominant English in the classroom. One lecturer suggests a more critical position by not obliging the students to 'worship' American or British English. What is missing from this research is what has/have shaped lecturers' different subjectivities toward WE when applied in the classroom. For example, whether or not their educational and disciplinary background shapes the way they position Standard and WE, as discussed by Wahyudi [8].

Imelwati, Putri, and Sesmiyanti [26] investigate preservice English teachers' perception and attitude toward the World Englishes paradigm. They revealed that the participants still prefer Inner Circle English (e.g., American and British English) in the learning process. However, the students recognize and understand English variations in the non-academic context. Furthermore, these students are also interested in and using more about WE.

Wahyudi [16] allowed his university students to use English, Indonesian, and the local language in students' essays of the interculturality class. Using this approach, the student, Rosa, reported that her writing became more expressive. Inspired by his post-colonial and post-structural informed works, Wahyudi allowed the students' multilingual repertoires to destabilise the dominance of English.

Wahyudi[27] investigated three English students (passing 7th semester students) with Post-Structuralism and Deconstruction and Interculturality in Language Studies Courses, where post-structural and post-colonial thoughts informed the students' critical readings. Using Unequal Englishes (Tupas & Rubdy[28]) as a lens to analyze students' positions, he found that students opted for a liberating position, in that they no longer privilege British and American English and appreciate more varieties of English. The students also narrated their desirable and undesirable experiences while enrolling in other undergraduate courses, the formation of subjectivity about English, and later the deconstruction of their subjectivity toward dominant English.

Aisy and Wahyudi[29] investigate four English department students in the seventh semester about their preference for English. Using Saraceni[30] Space, Culture, Ideology and Psychology Model, to understand the students' preference for various Englishes. The researchers found that most students still favor American English. Even though more detailed investigations have been conducted, the students' stances can be categorized into different positions ranging from upbeat, contradictory, and negative attitudes toward varieties of Englishes. A range of factors, such as habit, motivation, family, social, educational, and environmental factors, shape their preferences.

Suminar & Gunawan[31] examined 32 second-year English students' perception of WE in English Language Teaching. They found that most students had the same perceptions, defining WE as the diversity of English used in a particular region. The students also said that they get some benefits from learning WE. However, they faced problems, among others, because many people are still unfamiliar with the WE concept, so they could not apply what they learnt. Students were not able to easily understand the speaker's accent and pronunciation.

However, the studies related explicitly to lecturers' and students' preferences on Standard Englishes and World Englishes from the English Department of Islamic Universities under the Ministry of Religious Affairs in Indonesia, such as those in the research questions of this study, are still underexplored. Therefore, this research aims to address the gap.

3. Methods

3.1. Research Design

This research first used a mixed-method approach in that it first questionnaires followed by semi-structured interviews, because the number of respondents willing to participate were limited so we decided to use entirely qualitative research, that is by considering the naturally occurring verbal data, considering the importance of context, and the importance of considering different and contingent factors including historical, social and political context which possibly construct nuanced meaning (Creswell[32]; O'Farrell[33]; Wahyudi[8]).

3.2. Research Participants

Three lecturers and three students were recruited from three different State Islamic Universities in Java, Indonesia. The criteria for participants' selections are as follows: Lecturers teach English in the English Literature/Education Department in a university under the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MoRA). Students study English in the English Literature/Education Department at a university under MoRA. They know or understand or have heard of the terms American English, British English, Australian English, or other types of English from the inner circle countries. They know or understand or have heard of the terms Singaporean English, Indian English, or other types of English from the outer circle countries. They know or understand or have heard of the terms Indonesian English, Chinese English, Japanese English, or other types of English from the expanding circle countries. They are willing to participate as research participants by filling out the consent form.

Semi-purposive sampling was used to select the participants. We call it semi-purposive sampling because it was not purposive, as they were selected based on their previous answers in the short survey. However, in pure purposive sampling, no prior short survey is needed. In purposive sampling, the participant is selected on purpose, which results in a greater possibility of participants generating rich data (Ahmed[34]).

The pseudonym was applied by only writing the initial of the participant (for the non-identification of the respondent

as a part of an ethical procedure in research).

The lecturer, Bu I gained her Master's Degree in American Studies from an Indonesian university and a doctoral degree in World Cinema from an English-speaking country, teaches at the English Literature Study Program. The lecturer N gained her Master's and Doctoral Degree in Linguistics from Indonesian Universities (she is teaching at the English Language Education Department), and the lecturer A gained her Bachelor's and Master's Degree in English Language Education (at the English Language Education Department from Indonesian universities).

I (Student 1) am from the English Literature Study Program, while S (Student 2) and Sy (Student 3) are from the English Language Education Department.

3.3. Data Collection

The data were collected through semi-structured interviews with students and lecturers. In contrast, for students, the data were initially collected through a survey to select the potential respondents, followed by semi-structured interviews. A list of guiding interview questions is provided in the **Appendix A**. The interviews were conducted in Bahasa Indonesia (except if the participant wanted to use English). The use of Bahasa Indonesia is to help participants express their feelings (Wahyudi & Chusna[35]). The data were collected from May to September 2023.

3.4. Data Analysis

The data analysis was done by looking at the participants' results of the questionnaire and interview answers, which were transcribed. The researchers further checked the transcriptions to ensure their accuracy. The data were also analyzed using Kachru's[6] three concentric circles, Yano's[10] and Saraceni's[6,7] theories, Phillipson's & Skutnabb-Kangas'[11] Linguicism, and Canagarajah's & Said's[12] Native Speakerism. The findings were then compared and contrasted with the previous studies. We employed Braun's and Clark's[35] thematic analysis in the analysis. These scholars define thematic analysis as a way to identify, analyze, and report patterns in the data. As this kind of analysis is flexible including its use of using theme available in the existing theoretical framework (Braun & Clark[36]), we then decided to Kachru's three concentric circles, Yano's[10]

criticism toward this concentric circles, Saraceni's[37,38] relocation of English, Phillipson[11] et al. linguiscism, and Canagarajah's and Said's[12] native speakerism.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Students' Preference for Standard English or World Englishes

There is an agreement among students from different universities that Standard English refers to British and American English(es) as the consensus in academia. However, a critical negotiation is also performed by a respondent toward these two dominant varieties, especially in pronunciation.

The student refers to Standard English (SE) as American and British English in the following quote. Furthermore, she associated SE with grammar, morphology, TOEFL, and formal context.

> Standard English is English that is mutually agreed to be the correct English, either in grammar or morphology. As in the formal writing, maybe that is a TOEFL. In America, there is a standard of English, and in England, there is a standard of English.
>
> (I - Student 1)

In the above answer, the student refers to grammar, morphology, written language, and TOEFL as examples of Standard English. This resonates with Kachru's & Nelson's[7] explanation that the word StandardStandard relates to Received Pronunciation (RP) in the UK, dictionaries, grammar rather than pronunciation, and also to primarily written language (p. 95). It also refers to the power and ideology rather than language (p. 95).

In the subsequent answer, the student explains that SE is the collectively agreed language in a country and that Indian, Malaysian, and Singaporean are considered variations of the former.

> "I think English is the Standard English is a language that is agreed and made standard in a country... the variation may be that the American English then there is Indian, Malaysian, and Singaporean Englishes."
>
> (S - Student 2)

Contrary to the first student respondent, the second respondent only shared a consensus regarding Standard English. This second respondent seems to categorize British, American, Indian, Malaysian, and Singaporean as belonging to one's cluster. As for the second category, the student may not have read Kachru's [6] and or Crystal's [3] concentric circles where English is divided into inner, outer, and expanding circles.

In the following, the student explains that she mixed English with other languages (e.g., Indonesian) in the context of the presentation. She did this because she was anxious. In that context, she no longer focused on any accent. She just uttered the language unconsciously as long as it was English.

> If it is time for a presentation, the language is sometimes mixed. Because even if we are nervous in our presentation, we do not focus on accents or use American English, so sometimes it is just about getting it out that is important to say in English.
>
> (S - Student 2)

The above answer shows the common phenomenon for students presenting in the Indonesian EFL classroom. Agustin & Wahyudi [17] revealed why students mix languages during presentations. Those reasons are the difficulty in expressing ideas in English and beyond control, for the clarity of material presentation, and easier comprehension.

The respondent adjusted herself by the interlocutor. Should the one she meets be a native speaker, she adjusted accordingly.

> "You want to align yourself with who you are when you are invited to communicate. If I meet native speakers, I want to talk like a native speaker. If I meet an Indonesian, then I adjust it".
>
> (S - Student 2)

The above respondent, when wishing to speak like a native speaker, signals that she valorizes the native speaker. That statement implies that 'native speaker' is seen as the target model. Canagarajah & Said [12] explain that the discourse around native speakerism is based on the idea that a native speaker has the right and superiority of the language. The student's answer confirms Adalta's and Arsyad's [39] survey on English department students' beliefs that a native speaker is the best.

Unlike the common assumption, the student claimed that she sees no hierarchy among languages, as their use depends on everyone's needs.

> "If I'm more likely to have no hierarchy, it's because the main use depends on the needs of each user and each use is different."
>
> (S - Student 2)

In the above statement, the second student respondent said there is no hierarchy among languages, but she contradicts her former statement. This is because she previously favored native speakerism. Native speaker is usually associated with British and or American speakers of English, not the speakers of Indian or Malaysian English. Thus, favoring native speakerism still entails linguicism, supporting the hierarchy among languages (Canagarajah & Said [12]).

Another student respondent refers to Standard English (SE) as the recognized language, with BAE as an example. However, she explained that the current practice of British and American English (BAE) accents is unnecessary.

> Standard English is a recognized language. So, in the old days, people tended to speak English with a British or American accent. However, as time went by, English can be used and has been acknowledged that it does not have to use the accents of British or American, but Javanese people can use any Javanese accent, and Sundanese people with a Sundanese accent.
>
> (Sy - Student 3)

The second student respondent's answer above is normative regarding British and American as representing Standard English. However, the interesting part is when she said someone's accent can be Javanese, Sundanese, and Indian. In terms of accent, she appeared to have seen the local accent as no problem. That also suggests she creates a space to negotiate British and American English. She might have encountered the critical discourses toward Standard English. This positioning resembles Wahyudi's [27] work, where his students are more relaxed, allowing them to tolerate their use or others' use of local accent when speaking English after passing the Post-Structuralism and Deconstruction course. The respondent's positioning reflects local situated practice (Saraceni [37,38]) where English has been de-anglicized (relo-

cated).

The following respondent, the student, refers to WE as a variation of SE. She then contextualized the variation into the Jaksel language.

> World Englishes tend to like the variation used in countries like Singapore or India, as it is English variation…Well, that is why English is a foreign language used using the Indonesian language style, so that, for example, South Jakarta people also speak English using South Jakarta accent. It also includes one of the examples of the World Englishes.
>
> (I - Student 1)

The first student's respondent's answer of World Englishes refers to the outer circles of English, e.g., Singapore, India (Kachru[6]; Crystal[3]). Her example of the Jakarta Selatan (Jaksel) English is interesting because she categorised it into World Englishes. This suggests that Jaksel's English might be seen as equal to those of Indian or Singaporean English, that is in the outer circle rather than the expanding circle if seen from Kachruvian concentric circles.

4.1.1. Native vs. Non-Native Binary Prevails

The binary opposition of Native vs. Non-Native explicitly emerged in the following student's answer.

> "For English, I categorized myself as a non-native because English wasn't the first language I learned when I was a kid."
>
> (I - Student 1)

In the above statement, the first student respondent categorised herself into the mainstream categorisation as a non-native speaker. Wahyudi[40] challenges this dichotomy of native versus non-native, as the latter is always constructed as inferior. Using Kachru's & Nelson's[2] term, non-native is of 'second-class'. Furthermore, Wahyudi[40] encouraged us to change the subject from 'non-native' to multilingual speaker to gain more benefits.

English as a motivating factor and as a pleasure

The respondent below explained that there are many driving factors for English, and achieving this language brings pleasure.

> "Maybe it's because I like it, I am motivated by many things, because I want to talk smoothly,

so I feel the achievement of it myself, like there's a pleasure of its own..."
>
> (I - Student 1)

The first student respondent likes all the motivating factors. What is missing, however, is the reason why she likes English. The construction of global English as representing modernity and progress (Bunce et al.[41]) might have shaped her subjectivity, or the promise of linguistic capital and neoliberal force associated with English might have caught her attention (Sung-Yul Park[42]). All these possibilities of English promise might have shaped his pleasure and desire (see Wahyudi[8]).

4.1.2. Translingualism/Translanguaging Practices or Students' Limited Fluency

In the following answer, the student does translanguaging or translingual practice. It is no problem for her as long as it is understood.

> "I think that when I speak English, sometimes I mix it with some other languages like Java or Indonesia and I think it's OK as long as it can be understood by someone else."
>
> (I - Student 1)

The student's statement above shows an interesting case where she mixed several languages, such as English, Javanese, and Indonesian. She has practised translingual writing. This act for her is acceptable as long as others understand it. What she does is in line with Wahyudi's[16] finding that the lecturer in the classroom can use English and other languages when writing an Interculturality assignment. Rosa exercised her agency using English, Indonesian, and her local South Sumatra language. This made Rosa's writing expressive and interculturally interesting.

The student associated WE as the language used in the communication context. Unconfidently, she said the prefix and the suffix.

> "My understanding of WE are a language that in ancient times it was defined as a communication language in its era like that as a means of communication. WE it might be this added prefix, suffix, that's it."
>
> (Sy - Student 3)

In the above case, the respondent reduced World En-

glishes into a means of communication, even though it may go beyond that (Kachru & Nelson[7]). As also shown elsewhere in this article, WE are commonly allowed in the (informal) communication and usually have the second-class status (Kachru & Nelson[7]). In the above context, the respondent operates within the dominant paradigm.

The student sees that local accented English is standard and helps her and others at the beginner level. The demand for vocabulary and a Western accent is argued to be difficult as the student(s) is/are not fluent yet. Therefore, permission to use local accented English helps students.

> It is normal and it really helps me and my friends out there who are beginners to learn English because when we are just learning English, we are required to memorize its vocabulary. Also, we were not fluent in speaking, so we were asked to follow the Western accents, which wasn't easy. The permission to use accented English (English with a local accent) is very helpful for us who want to learn a foreign language.
>
> (Sy - Student 3)

The respondent's positioning above is interesting because someone's English with a local accent is considered normal. The rationalization is that it is helpful for beginners. Using Hamid's[43] term, she "makes sense of the world and construct the truth about herself through knowledge, experience and tool" (local accent) she has access to (pp. 19–20).

The student answered as if she were an English teacher, and then she would position herself as follows:

> If I am positioned as an English teacher to cope with or follow up on the phenomenon, it is no problem if it does not change English's structure or standards. Changing the accent according to the learners' background makes it easier for someone to learn.
>
> (Sy - Student 3)

The interesting part from the above statement is that the respondent notices the space to negotiate Standard English, which is her acceptance of using English with a local accent as long as it does not change the structure. This means that for her, structure is a non-negotiable thing. This respondent positions grammar as the property of Inner Circle countries

(norm provider), where an expanding circle, such as Indonesia, is the norm receiver (Kachru & Nelson[7])

In the following answer, the student highlights the practice of mixing American and British English in terms of vocabulary. She further explains that lecturers have differing preferences for British and American English.

For students, English may still be mixed; sometimes students use vocabulary mixed with American, British, or vice versa. However, one of the lecturers mainly used the British accent when speaking. Some other lecturers use American English.

> "I usually mixed (British and American), primarily using vocabulary with American speech..."
>
> (Sy – Student 3)

In the above answers, the respondent translanguaged between British and American. This confirms that mixing languages or doing translingual practice or translanguaging in the Indonesian EFL context is real (as also shown by the former respondent). Lu and Horner[44] explain that in the translingual approach, "(a) language is seen as dynamic process of structuration, (b) reading and writing is integrated related act of translation and transformation, and (c) the relations between language and language users, and the temporal—spatial contexts and consequences of language acts as co-constitutive" (p. 27). However, the student's mixing of the languages can be seen as her limited language skills, as documented in Agustin & Wahyudi[17].

> If I look at myself, maybe I am still my version, Mom. Learning to follow the American version, we want to learn to follow American English. But there is a small quantity of a trace of Javanese accent…a little bit (American English).
>
> (Sy - Student 3)

The fact that the respondent cannot escape from her (light) Javanese accent which makes her categorize herself as someone in between shows that both American English, Javanese and the respondent herself as the language user act as co-constitutive, meaning all of these languages and subjects are integrated as in point (Lu & Horner[44]). Also, the respondent feels it is necessary to claim herself as an intermediate speaker, where she has a disposition to position

herself as a translingual practitioner.

4.1.3. Native vs. Non-Native Prevails

The following student positions herself as a non-native speaker but not a multilingual speaker; other foreign languages she learned were not at a satisfying level.

> "I myself may be in a non-native speaker not multilingual speakers yeah not also because when I was Diploma 1 and high school, I also learned Mandarin and Germany so it's not only English."
>
> (Sy – Student 3)

She categorized herself as a non-native rather than a multilingual speaker just because she does not master other foreign languages. She speaks Indonesian and most probably Javanese, as she comes from a city with a strong Javanese society, and is not counted as a multilingual speaker. Her understanding of a multilingual speaker contradicts Kramsch's[45] elaboration of a multilingual subject, which includes all languages used daily, regardless of the fluency in all languages.

4.1.4. Linguicism Uninterrupted

The following student placed American and British English at the top compared to other varieties, and that native speaker is her target model.

> So, I position Americans and British [English] at the top. If possible, to be very similar to native speakers, why not? However, if we have studied, we have pushed ourselves to try to be native-like, but we failed so that we will return to our versions.
>
> (Sy - Student 3)

In the above statement, the respondent still positions American and British English at the top. This means that other languages are placed in the lower position (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas[11]). However, if pushing herself to study like a 'native speaker' fails, she would return to her version. Even though, in the end, it is realistic, she might not be aware that wishing to be a native is a myth (Pawlicka & Pawlicki[46]).

4.2. Lecturers' Preference on Standard English versus World Englishes

The lecturers' preference on Standard English and/or World Englishes appeared to be shaped by their discipline practice (the departments they are teaching), the presence of direct exposure of the respondent in the English-speaking country while completing Doctoral studies, and the readings they have read.

In the following, the lecturer (Bu A) refers to the origin of English (Qibla) that we need to refer to:

> Well, because maybe English comes from there. It is like the mother who becomes the Qibla. It is impossible. Even though it is multiple, we still have to have something like the priest or something that we have to…
>
> (Bu A)

In the above answer, when saying that "English comes from there", she implied that there is the origin or centre. This is made more evident when she said Qibla, a reference point. Her understanding of Standard English here reflects the structural thoughts where the centre or origin is believed to exist (Grbich[47]). Her expression, "even though it is multiple," implied that she knows many forms of Englishes. This suggests that despite her positioning for Standard Englishes, she is aware that there are multiple forms of Englishes today. This also indicates that there are dominant and alternative forms of Englishes.

When (Wahyudi) clarified whether Qibla means reference, the lecturer confirmed it. She further explained that Qibla means Standard English. She made examples of IELTS and TOEFL of that Standard.

> Yes, it is a reference. I mean Standard English, which is more internationally recognized, Sir. Because it is accepted or recognized, it is different, right? …maybe it is like World Englishes is accepted…if we want to take the IELTS test, we do our best to learn British English or at least know the vocabulary. We also do the TOEFL test like that. As far as I understand, Koreans and people from other countries also

have two tests, TOEFL and IELTS. So, it is very influential as a reference.

<div align="right">(Bu A)</div>

In the above answer, Bu A confirmed that Qibla means reference. She further explained that it also means "standard English," which is "internationally recognized and accepted". To clarify, she mentioned TOEFL and IELTS as examples of Standard English, which is an influential reference. Her mention of these international exams suggests that Standard English is American and British English for her, respectively, as TOEFL is an American product while IELTS is a British product. This confirms the previous study that British and American remain the reference for truth (Lauder[48]; Gandana & Parr[49]; Wahyudi[8,50]).

In the following, the lecturer illustrated Indian English as an example of WE and its difficulty in being standardized to Standard English.

> For me, that is the English language used in the World, and it does not only refer to those two; for example, it could also be an Indian English accent. Indians have a definite sense of their own, for example, Priyanka Chopra, who has lived in America for a long time, but the accent is still Indian English. Things like that are complicated to standardize, or may look British or American. However, World English is more universal. English is used in the World, maybe it is communicated or something else, what I know is that in World English, accent does not matter. In the past, the score of speaking English would be good if it was similar to that of a native speaker. So, people were trying their best to speak natively. Now, it is accepted, whatever the accent is, and the important thing is that the pronunciation of the vocabulary is correct.

<div align="right">(Bu A)</div>

In the above quote, Bu A draws a real example to help her explain her understanding of World Englishes. She mentions that Indians (as an example of Englishes) "have a definite sense of their own" while mentioning an artist with an Indian English accent, despite the artist's long period in the United States. Bu A's explanation resonates with Mahboob's[51] explanation about Pakistani English representing Asian Islamic sensitivities. This suggests that English(es) used by people from post-colonial countries represents particular sensitivities as they are constructed by the local context (Kachru[6]). Her statement "…things like that are complicated to standardize or to make it look like British or American…" suggests that she positions Indian English as non-standard and less prestigious than British and American English. She positions Indian and British/American English into a hierarchical structure (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas[11]).

The lecturer below claimed that her English is Standard English. Although uncertain, she refers to her English as " American and Javanglish (Javanese English).

> I have ever worked with the American organization, Sir. Four years, so. Peace Corps, Sir…That is right. I cannot speak with a British accent. I have tried, but still cannot. I have a student who can speak a lot like Harry Potter; the accent and style are the same. However, I cannot; I might be more focused on America. However, I am not sure if I am American or not. Maybe it is Javanglish, but in class, yes, I am standard, Sir, I speak Standard English.

<div align="right">(Bu A)</div>

The above quote suggests that Bu A, even though she identified herself as leaning toward American English, is not sure, as she also signals that her English may also be "Javanglish," which is Javanese English. This suggests that her English may not purely be American English, but I can still carry the traces of her local Javanese accent. This suggests her English reflects Southern English, where English has been subject to the forces of indigenization and reinvention (Hamid[43]).

Like many other mainstream teachers, the lecturer (Bu A) placed BAE at the top of the linguistic hierarchy.

> Yes, American (and British) English both are more prestigious. For example, a film like Indian English still has a little thought in me, "if oh this isn't originally English". How come I am racist because it is innate, maybe because I am also an old product? Millennials or Gen Z have been familiar with it since childhood.

<div align="center">11</div>

At the same time, I am a product that is only used in British or American movies with lots of American English. So, for example, now that there are a lot of Indian films using English too, with their style or Korean or something else, I thought, "This is not originally English." I still have thoughts like that, sorry, Sir. Literature people are usually more open-minded.

(Bu A)

The above quote strengthens her former stance of seeing languages hierarchically, where British and American are positioned at the top (see Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas[11]). At the same time, Indian English, for her, is "not originally English" and thus she only pays a little attention to it. This is a real example of how one's subjectivity (according to Foucault) shapes the way she acts and behaves (Walshaw[52]). Bu A's statement "I am an old product" might suggest that the younger generations may have different views. At the same time, her utterance "literature people are usually more open-minded" suggests that she is strict and that the reason for this might be triggered by the disciplinary practice in her department, e.g., English Language Education, where she should perform as a model for his students. Her comparison with "literature people" who are said to be open-minded resonates with Kuteeva & Ayre's[53] argument that there are disciplinary variations in the use of English and that these variations reflect "product of different knowledge-making practices and educational goals" (p. 533).

The lecturer below explained how a native speaker remains the target model.

As far as I can remember, there are no rules, Sir. I mean, when we were compiling the curriculum. We also discussed that, but the output of speaking MBKM (Merdeka Belajar Kampus Merdeka) is to be able to speak mostly like a native. However, the criteria for being native are not explained. It is in CPL (learning outcome).

> "…Yes, native and non-native. …So the natives are more British and American, even in RPS (one semester learning plan), the RPS appears to native speakers like that, Sir".

(Bu A)

The above statements show that native-speakerism is entrenched in her department. The binary dichotomy between native and non-native is perpetuated with British and American as the regime of truth (Wahyudi[8]). In that regard, native speakerism has become knowledge in her discipline, where true or false is sanctioned accordingly. This also resonates with Harsanti's & Manara's[24] study, which revealed traces of native speakerism among English teachers in Indonesian schools.

In the following, the lecturer discusses British English, grammar, and structure to exclude non-standard Englishes.

> Yes. I have a student who has a Madurese accent. So, sometimes I do not think "oh, the accent has to be British, it has to be this". The most important thing is that students know and can practice it. However, daily conversation is up to them. They can use anything as long as the grammar and structure are correct.

(Bu A)

The above quote indicates that Bu A is in a dilemma when encountering that one of her students has "a Madurese accent". In her thought, the accent "has to be British," which students should "know and practice". In this case, British English reflects her desire and is implemented in her teaching. This confirms Wahyudi's[8] finding that Standard English(es) is/are entrenched in the university curriculum and have turned into knowledge which have successfully shaped teachers' desire. The lecturer also uses grammar and structure as a mechanism to exclude non-standard English (Kachru & Nelson[7]).

The second lecturer (Bu N) constructs WE as a variety, and SE is used formally.

> OK. If I were to teach World Englishes or the variety, I would introduce World Englishes if the students need more understanding of the subject or the material about World English, mainly related to pronunciation and accent, and would introduce the segmental phonemes. However, for Standard English, it will be used in formal situations, especially for education and publications, such as the author or literary works. When communication is formal, it is used in Standard English.

(Bu N)

In the above quote, Bu N sees WE as a variety that deals

with pronunciation and accent, whereas Standard English is used for formal situations, such as in the publication. This position is similar to the position taken by the first lecturer. In the later answer, Bu N said that British and American English represent Standard English. This supports former studies that these two are hegemonic (Gandana & Parr[49]; Wahyudi[8,50]).

The second respondent below positioned British English at the top and also expressed her appreciation when speaking to a native speaker.

> It could be both of them. However, for the primary aspect, British English is the highest compared to American English. Because Americans sometimes reduce for their ease and Black English or slang, etc. British English is the highest...It is easier for us to understand how native speakers conduct communication, and it is easier for us to communicate using strong or weak forms. It depends on us.
>
> (Bu N)

The interesting aspect of the above answer is the hierarchical category made by Bu N, in which British English is positioned as the highest compared to American English. She argues that reduction, black English, or slang among Americans are stigmatized parts that position them lower (see Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas[11]). Further, she explains that mastering suprasegmental phonemes would help students understand native speakers. This suggests two things: first, her answer reflects his professional knowledge as her undergraduate, master's, and doctoral studies are in Linguistics. Secondly, she used the word native speaker without any critical objection. This indicates that she still positions herself within the dominant paradigm.

When Wahyudi asked whether English is the symbol of modernity, the lecturer explained English's dominance and benefits. However, at the end of the statement, she aspires to promote locality.

> It could be so in a positive way. Because English is an international language, it is used in any field or subject and dominates. It is used dominantly around the World and in almost every book publication. In anything written in English, people who master this automatically,

that could be modernized and adaptable, and are not left behind. So, they could adjust any field, I think, so it is a lucky for us, a good chance for us to master this. English is only a medium. We also have to develop ways to prevent our dialect or the Javanese local, and we could promote it to other people or the native speaker.

> (Bu N)

Bu N explains that people who master English are "modernized, adaptable, and not left behind". These keywords resonate with the position of English in the global context, which is "equated with modernity, progress and consumerism" (Bunce et al.[41], p. 3). However, she aspired to maintain and promote the Javanese language to native speakers. Even though it might not be easy (Coleman[54]), she seemed to aspire that globality (represented by English) and locality (represented by Javanese) can both exist.

In the following, the second lecturer answered that she uses British English. She also further explained the benefit of mastering English.

British English. My student said, "Miss, it's very strange because it is rather difficult."

> It is a pleasure because it will be much better than when we are forced to learn English. There are false, and they feel insecure. So that is why I motivate my students. If English is your first choice in this school, you must consider it well. What will you have to do with this? It is a pleasure for me because we could develop our communication, socio-pragmatics, and other competencies by learning English. Communication strategies are essential when communicating with everyone in this World and different situations. As an English lecturer, how can we enhance our professional network, and professional development is also important. Don't you think so? Getting knowledge and chances is a pleasure, such as joining or participating in an open program.
>
> (Bu N)

The quote suggests that English has successfully shaped Bu N's pleasure and desire because, as she argues, it could

develop a professional network and professional development. This resonates with a former study that English has successfully shaped pleasure and desire (Wahyudi[8]). This suggests that she may never or very little be exposed to the critical counter discourses toward Standard English.

The third lecturer below refers to the British Standard. Furthermore, she explained her personal use of English.

> "Oh yes, it only focuses on pronunciation, but on the academic side it still has to be according to their standards. So I'll talk about it".
>
> (Bu I)

> Mr. Wahyudi: What do you mean by British Standard?
>
> Academic standards, the academics are British, right? I do not know, but what is clear to me is that first, I am Indonesian, and second, I am Muslim. When I spoke about masculinity, speaking of masculinity, it is not only the practice of masculinity, but also the body, right? So, I was cautious about mentioning the vital term for them. If it is academic, feel free to talk about it like that. So, when mentioning vital organs, I used another language.
>
> (Bu I)

In the above answer, Bu I refers to Standard English as academic Standard, which means British. She firstly mentioned that 'pronunciation' is an example of being standard in the context of her students at the university. Then she contextualised the term academic standard in her doctoral study in an English-speaking country, that is, her reluctance to use a direct term for a vital organ. In contrast, for her, in the academic context, it has to be spelled as it is. When referring to the Standard for her student, she refers to professional knowledge where the term standard, among others, is associated with pronunciation (Kachru & Nelson[7]).

The third lecturer (Bu I) below explained the turning point of her positioning toward English.

But usually, the lecturer is asking students to use standard English, but after I came back from there (UK).

> I did not dare to say that anymore, I mean I also like my students to keep them there either for work or college, so yes, loh jarene Bu I ngene

> tibak e kayak ngene (it was said like that, but it is in reality like this – Javanese language). However, that is what I am introducing you to. So, I cannot get to it right now, I refuse to teach pronunciation because if I ever did, I would be confident. However, as soon as I got back from there (UK), I am sorry, I mean, it turns out the English is in what pronunciation is, people across the globe speak it globally, or the same, but the natives are willing to accept that difference, while we do not accept.
>
> (Bu I)

The above answer means that her direct experience has contested the mainstream understanding that pronunciation has to be standard. This means she reconstructed her subjectivity on standard pronunciation due to her doctoral experience and the fact that the native speaker has posed no problem with it. Her experience above resonates to the study conducted by (Barnawi & Le Ha[55], p. 259) that Western trained TESOL graduates have taken the benefits of being trained overseas "to teach effectively and to appropriate their given privileged status in the home contexts. They have also appeared to do so with awareness and with a strong sense of agency" (p. 259).

Like many others, the third lecturer (Bu I) categorized WE as a variety with confidence as an additional component.

> If the World Englishes is the variety of English used around the World based on their confidence. So, my students, for example, have been taught this example because the English language in Indonesia is very American, yes, the writing is often read "ofen", right? Moreover, if "often" is wrong. However, when I was in England, everybody said "often."
>
> (Bu I)

However, Bu I's understanding of WE as a variety resonates with the existing, WE literature (Kachru & Nelson[7]). However, when she relates, WE with one's 'confidence', she brings the issue of a more personal sense in English.

The lecturer's experience of doing doctoral study in an English-speaking country has made her position all languages as equal.

> "But when I came back from there, English, in

pronunciation, spoken by people around the World is not the same but natives are willing to accept the difference, which we don't accept. Yes. Equal (all varieties of English)"

(Bu I).

In the following, the third lecturer (Bu I) explained why she considered all varieties of English as equal.

There are two. I was taking IELTS, Sir. IELTS is from England, English people say, "You do not have to be like us, just use your own English". Then, secondly, many friends from America also study in England. They use English. Those from Australia are not as expressive as Americans. If the American did say directly to the British, "Why do you never speak clearly? That is the first. The second, "Do you have to speak fast?" English people babble; Americans speak clearly. Even though they both use English, it is difficult for Americans to understand English.

(Bu I)

Bu I's statement above problematizes the idea of linguistic hierarchy (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas[11]). She deconstructs the linguistic hierarchy by relating to her own experience when taking IELTS and when being told by English people that "You do not have to be like us, just use your own English," as well as each other's accusations between British and American speakers about each other's English. The respondent uses the English people's openness toward diversity of English and the rivalry between British and American English speakers to challenge linguicism.

The findings of this study resonate with Dewi's[18] and Wahyudi's[8] study that, in general, British and American English continue to be the reference and other Englishes are less respected. This indicated Linguicism. However, there is also the opinion that there is no hierarchy among all languages, making English not privileged (Wahyudi[40]). Our findings also show similarity with He[19]'s research that standardized English is preferable in a formal context. More specifically, our students prefer American English as it is considered clear (cf. Aisy & Wahyudi[29]). There is also no student's resistance to using English with a local accent, as found in Wahyudi's[27] study. At the same time, there are differing opinions on lecturers' preference for English,

from American, British, and lecturers who are not specifically faithful to these two (cf. Suroso[25]). Our research also parallels with Sa'd's[20] study, where British and American Englishes (BAE) are mainly acknowledged as the type. Similar to Amelgren[21], our study also underlines that BAE are regarded as the only standard. Our study is also in line with Tahmasbi et al.'s[22] study, which says that although students respected the prestigious position of Standard English, they did not resist World Englishes (cf Suminar & Gunawan[31]). Our study is also in tune with Imelwati et al.'s[26] research showing Indonesian pre-service student teachers in the study. This study shows that although they prefer Inner Circle English in their formal learning context, they appreciate World Englishes.

Despite the similarity of our findings with previous studies, our discussion on Linguistic hierarchy (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas[11]) and Native-Speakerism (Canagarajah & Said[12]) is more complex for example lecturer's understanding of standard English and or WE appeared to be shaped by disciplinary practice e.g., Bu A and also the real exposure in the English-speaking country, e.g., Bu I. The regime of truth, e.g., American and British English, has also partly shaped students' preferences.

5. Conclusions

The lecturers' thoughts about Standard English and World Englishes were shaped by the dominance of British and or American Englishes (BAE), which has become a regime of truth (Wahyudi[8]). However, whether or not they position BAE at the top of the linguistic hierarchy is constructed by at least three factors: disciplinary practice, whether or not the lecturers have studied abroad in an English-speaking country, and the professional knowledge they gain from their post-graduate studies (e.g., critical/post-colonial background). The lecturer with a literature background and doctoral studies in an English-speaking country, majoring in world cinema, and exposed to gender and post-colonial studies, could escape linguicism. In contrast, two other lecturers from English Language Education with domestic post-graduate studies operate within the dominant Standard English paradigm.

Like lecturers, all the students' respondents also considered Standard English as BAE and English used in a formal

context. Therefore, linguicism remained for two students, and native speakerism continues uninterrupted. However, when it comes to practice, two students mixed English with other languages, e.g., Indonesian and or local. This might suggest two possibilities: students' limited ability in English, as was the case reported by one lecturer in Wahyudi's[13] study, or the phenomenon of translingual/translanguaging practice is naturally inherent in the process of learning English (Agustin & Wahyudi[17]). Students' experience with English varies, e.g., from uneasiness in the presentation to creating pleasure. This necessitates that students' English learning needs be seen from their desirable or undesirable life experiences due to Unequal Englishes (Tupas & Rubdy[28]).

We recommend that the English Department (both English Literature and English Education Study Program) introduce lecturers and students to the critical perspectives on WE, such as linguicism, native speakerism, Unequal Englishes, and translingual practice, to students and lecturers so that students' learning processes are more enlightening and theoretically justified.

6. Patents

A patent resulting from the work is EC002023112633 and is accessible from: http://repository.uin-malang.ac.id/17248/2/17248.pdf.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, R.W.; methodology, R.W, M.I., and M.S.; validation, R.W., M.I. and M.S.; formal analysis, R.W., M.I. and M.S.; investigation, R.W., M.I. and M.S.; resources, R.W., M.I. and M.S.; data curation, R.W.; writing—original draft preparation, R.W., M.I. and M.S.; writing—review and editing, R.W.; visualization, R.W., M.I., and M.S.; supervision, R.W., M.I. and M.S.; project administration, M.I. and M.S.; funding acquisition, M.I. and M.S. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

Institutional Review Board Statement

There is no research ethic committee at our university. However, we enacted ethical principles during the research process.

Informed Consent Statement

All the respondents in this study have provided informed consent.

Data Availability Statement

The data are available upon request.

Acknowledgments

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results.

Appendix A

A list of (guiding) interview questions:

1. What do you think of standard English and World Englishes?
2. What do you prefer between them?
3. Why do you prefer standard English or World Englishes?
4. Are you aware of Linguiscism? What do you think?
5. Are you aware of Native speakerism? What do you think?

References

[1] Baugh, A.C., Cable, T., 2002. A history of the English language (5th ed). Routledge: London, UK.

[2] Pennycook, A., 1998. English and the discourses of colonialism. Routledge: London, UK.

[3] Crystal, D., 2003. English as a global language. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.

[4] Quirk, R., 1990. Language varieties and standard language. English Today. 6(1), 3–10. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078400004454

[5] Hickey, R., 2012. Standards of English: Codified Varieties around the World. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.

[6] Kachru, B.B., 1992. World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. Language Teaching. 25(1), 1–14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800006583

[7] Kachru, Y., Nelson, C.L., 2006. World Englishes in Asian Context. Hong Kong University Press: Hong Kong, China.

[8] Wahyudi, R., 2018. Situating English Language Teaching in Indonesia within a Critical, Global Dialogue of Theories: A Case Study of Teaching Argumentative Writing and Cross-Cultural Understanding Courses [PhD Thesis]. Victoria University of Wellington: Wellington, New Zealand.

[9] Bolton, K., 2005. World Englishes. In: Davis, A., Elder, C. (eds.). The Handbook of Applied Linguistics. Blackwell: Oxford, UK. pp. 367–396.

[10] Yano, Y., 2001. World Englishes in 2000 and beyond. World Englishes. 20(2), 119–131. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00204

[11] Phillipson, R., Skutnabb-Kangas, T., 2013. Linguistic imperialism and endangered languages. In: Bathia, T.K., Ritchie, W.C. (eds.). The handbook of multilingualism and bilingualism. Wiley-Blackwell: West Sussex, UK. pp. 495–516.

[12] Canagarajah, S., Said, B.S., 2011. Linguistic Imperialism. In: Simpson, J. (eds.). The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 388–400.

[13] Canagarajah, S., 2013. Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations. Routledge: London, UK.

[14] Garcia, O., Li, W., 2014. Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education. Springer: Cham, Switzerland.

[15] Wahyudi, R., 2023. Translanguaging practices to express emotion, identity, agency, and social justice. In: Raza, K., Reynolds, D., Coombe, C. (eds.). Handbook of Multilingual TESOL in Practice. Springer: Singapore. pp. 507–517.

[16] Wahyudi, R., 2023. Destabilising English through translingual practice: a case study. Changing English. 30(3), 275–285. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/135868 4X.2023.2204219

[17] Agustin, S., Wahyudi, R., 2024. Indonesian university students' practices and perspectives on translanguaging. Journal on English as a Foreign Language. 14(1), 238–260. DOI: https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v14i1.7817

[18] Dewi, A., 2014. Perception of English in relation to communication and identity: a study of Indonesian lecturers, teachers, and tertiary students. Journal of Asian Pacific Communication. 24(1), 1–20. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/japc.24.1.01dew

[19] 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. DOI: https://caes.hku.hk/ajal/index.php/ajal/article/view/129

[20] Sa'd, S.H.T., 2018. World English and World Englishes: Perspectives of language learners in Iran. Journal of World Languages. 5(1), 1–22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/21698252.2018.1500151

[21] Almegren, A., 2018. Saudi students' attitude towards World Englishes. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature. 7(4), 238–247. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.4p.238

[22] Tahmasbi, S., Hashemifardnia, A., Namaziandost, E., 2019. Standard English or world Englishes: Issues of ownership and preference. Journal of Teaching English Language Studies. 7(3), 83–98.

[23] Irham, Huda, M., Sari, R., et al., 2021. ELF and multilingual justice in English language teaching practices: Voices from Indonesian English lecturers. Asian Englishes. 24(3), 263–278. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2021.1949779

[24] Harsanti, H.R., Manara, C., 2021. I have to teach the 'English' English: Native speakerism ideology among the English teachers. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics. 11(2), 330–340. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i2.26379

[25] Suroso, R.F., 2022. Indonesian English lecturers' views on World Englishes in English language teaching: Qualitative inquiry. ETERNAL (English Teaching Journal). 13(1), 2614–1639. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26877/eternal.v13i1.10804

[26] Imelwati, S., Putri, Y.R., Sesmiyanti, 2023. Students' perceptions and attitudes toward World Englishes paradigm. Journal of English Education and Teaching. 7(4), 959–968. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.7.4.956-968

[27] Wahyudi, R., 2024. Students' critical voices and (re)positioning toward "standard Englishes". In: Tupas, R. (eds.). Investigating Unequal Englishes Understanding, Researching and Analysing Inequalities of the Englishes of the World. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 89–102.

[28] Tupas, R., Rubdy, R., 2015. Introduction: From world

Englishes to unequal Englishes. In: Tupas, R. (eds.). Unequal Englishes: The politics of Englishes today. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, UK. pp. 1–17.

[29] Aisy, L.R., Wahyudi, R., 2024. Exploring Z generation attitudes toward varieties of English(es). LANGUAGE LITERACY: Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching. 8(1), 324–345. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v8i1.9183

[30] Saraceni, M., 2010. The Relocation of English. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, UK.

[31] Suminar, R., Gunawan, M.H., 2024. World Englishes in English Language Teaching (ELT): Students' perceptions. ELTIN Journal: Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia. 12(2), 217–234.

[32] Creswell, J.W., 2003. Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Sage: London, UK.

[33] O'Farrell, C., 2005. Michel Foucault. Sage Publication: London, UK.

[34] Ahmed, S.K., 2024. How to choose a sampling technique and determine sample size for research: A simplified guide for research. Oral Oncology Reports. 12, 100662. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oor.2024.100662

[35] Wahyudi, R., Chusna, S., 2018. Learning from a teacher's classroom discourses to re-modify the ELF framework in the ASEAN context. In: Zein, S. (eds.). Teacher Education for English as a Lingua Franca Perspectives from Indonesia. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 156–172.

[36] Braun, V., Clark, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in Psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology. 3(2), 77–101. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

[37] Saraceni, M., 2009. Relocating English: Towards a new paradigm for English in the world. Language and Intercultural Communication. 9(3), 175–186. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/14708470902748830

[38] Saraceni, M., 2011. Reflections on the rhetorics on the (re-)location of English. Changing English. 18(3), 277–285. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2011.602830

[39] Adalta, F.A., Arsyad, S., 2023. Native speaker ideology among EFL students in English language learning and teaching: A survey study. Journal of English for Specific Purposes. 2(2), 36–46. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33369/espindonesia.v2i2.28051

[40] Wahyudi, R., 2021. A Transnational TEGCOM Practitioner's Multiple Subjectivities and Critical Classroom Negotiations in the Indonesian University Context. In: Jain, R., Yazan, B., Canagarajah, S. (eds.). Transnational Identities and Practices in English Language Teaching: Critical Inquiries from Diverse Practitioners. Multilingual Matters: Bristol, UK. pp. 240–258.

[41] Bunce, P., Phillipson, R., Rapatahana, V., et al., 2016. Introduction. In: Bunce, P., Phillipson, R., Rapatahana, V., Tupas, R. (eds.). Why English? Confronting the Hydra. Multilingual Matters: Bristol, UK. pp. 1–20.

[42] Park, S.-Y.J., 2011. The promise of English: linguistic capital and the neoliberal worker in the South Korean job market. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. 14(4), 443–455. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.573067

[43] Hamid, M.O., 2022. English as a Southern Language. Language in Society. 52(3), 409–432. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404522000069

[44] Lu, M.-Z., Horner, B., 2013. Translingual literacy and matters of agency. In: Canagarajah, A.S. (eds.). Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classroom. Routledge: New York, NY, USA. pp. 26–38.

[45] Kramsch, C., 2006. Multilingual subject. International Journal of Applied Linguistics. 16(1), 97–109. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2006.00109.x

[46] Pawlicka, A, Choraś, M., Pawlicki, M., 2021. Opening up a discussion on the native speaker myth in science. Accountability in Research. 29(7), 477–481. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2021.1960514

[47] Grbich, C., 2003. New approaches in social research. Sage: London, UK.

[48] Lauder, A., 2008. The status and function of English in Indonesia: A review of key factors. Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia. 12(1), 9–20. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7454/mssh.v12i1.128

[49] Gandana, I., Parr, G., 2013. Professional identity, curriculum and teaching Intercultural Communication: An Indonesian case study. Language, Culture and Curriculum. 26(3), 229–246. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2013.833620

[50] Wahyudi, R., 2021. Critically Negotiating British and American Englishes: Voices from Indonesia. In: Yamaghuci, T., Jariah, M.J., Kaur, S. (eds.). Voices in Texts and Contexts. Sunway University Press: Bandar Sunway, Malaysia. pp. 193–217.

[51] Mahboob, A., 2009. English as an Islamic Language. World Englishes. 28(2), 175–189. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01583.x

[52] Walshaw, M., 2007. Working with Foucault in Education. Sense Publisher: Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

[53] Kuteeva, M., Airey, J., 2014. Disciplinary differences in the use of English in higher education: reflections on recent language policy developments. Higher Education. 67, 533–549. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9660-6

[54] Coleman, H., 2016. The English language as Naga in Indonesia. In: Bunce, P., Phillipson, R., Rapatahana, V., Tupas, R. (eds.). Why English? Confronting the Hydra. Multilingual Matters: Bristol, UK. pp. 59–71.

[55] Barnawi, O.Z., Le Ha, P., 2015. From western TESOL classrooms to home practice: A case study with two 'privileged' Saudi teachers. Critical Studies in Education. 56(2), 259–276. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2014.951949