

One Teacher Struggles to Integrate EIL Approaches in A Microteaching Class: An Action Research Project

Nugrahenny T. Zacharias

Satya Wacana Christian University

ABSTRACT

Recently the concept of English as an international language (EIL) has been pervasively encouraged in the TESOL education. Applied Linguistics have been strongly encouraged the inclusion of teaching EIL perspectives and highlighted the positive contributions of EIL to bilingual English students' agency and identity construction. Whereas studies analyzing the extent to which teaching approaches accommodating EIL perspectives have been growing in number, little is actually known about teachers' experiences in implementing EIL approaches in their classrooms. This study reports an action research project conducted in a Microteaching course in a pre-service teacher education program in Indonesia. In particular, it aims to explore how twelve bilingual English student teachers (BESTs) understand the EIL concepts. It also attempts to document how they navigate their teaching to accommodate such concepts. Data were collected from teaching journals, focus groups and individual interviews. The study found that students have fragmented and surface understanding of EIL. BESTs perceive EIL merely as exposing the cultural content of the materials and relate them to students' culture. Many of them are of the opinions that EIL is not appropriate to teach grammar and pronunciation. All of them acknowledge the positive contributions of EIL to their self-esteem as beginning bilingual English teachers. Pedagogical implication of the study toward pre-service teacher education programs will be discussed at the end of the paper.

Key words: English as an international language, native speakers, bilingual English speakers, World Englishes, and culture.

WHY EIL APPROACHES IN A MICROTEACHING CLASS?

The present study came about from my strong concern when teaching English in a pre-service teacher education program, which continues to be informed by the inner-circle orientation to ELT. Using Kachru's (1992, p. 356) most influential and widely used model of English users profile, the inner circle countries refer to countries where English is most often used as a first language (a mother tongue) such as the US, the UK and Australia. The people from these countries are traditionally known as the native speakers or Monolingual English Speakers (MES) and their English are seen as the norm and standard in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA). In the present study, I will use the term 'native speaker paradigm' and 'inner circle orientation' interchangeably to refer to teaching approaches that position native speakers and their English as the only norm.

In the context where the present study takes place, favoritism of native-speaker paradigm is evidence in the pervasive use of MESs from the US and Australia to teach speaking courses, cross-culture understanding (CCU) courses, as well as writing courses, among others. I do not totally disagree with employing MES teachers (hereafter, MESTs) as they can illustrate that even people from the traditionally inner-circle countries do, indeed, speak different Englishes. However, exclusively employing MESTs from inner-circle countries will do unjust to portray the changing sociolinguistic realities of English users, which recently have become extensively diverse. The exclusive use of MESTs in teacher education program specifically will project wrong information, that is, ideal English teachers are those from the inner-circle countries. Therefore, as pointed out by Matsuda (2003a; 2005), the curriculum in teacher education programs need to be adapted to accommodate awareness of the evolving and changing landscape of English and English users.

Indeed, the pervasive use of native-speaker paradigm is not uncommon in Asia. Studies on English Language Teaching (ELT) practices in Japan, for example, illustrate that English continues to be taught as an inner-circle language, based almost exclusively on American or British English (Iwata et al., 2002; Matsuda, 2003a). A survey of 100 English teachers in Indonesia that I conducted in 2003 found that these teachers continued to have a marked preference for native speakers English teachers to teach skill courses, but not linguistic or content courses. Although many teachers were not necessarily perceived their nonnativeness as a weakness, the majority of them showed a preference towards inner-circle models and norms.

I am not suggesting that teaching English with an inner-circle orientation is wrong. In fact, it might be arguably appropriate for students who might need and want to function in inner circle countries. However, it is important to remember that even these students might encounter and involve in practices where awareness of other English varieties is necessary and even crucial to enhance communication effectiveness. Matsuda (2005) warns that only exposing learners to inner circle English may lead to "confusion and resistance" (p.721). Students can question the legitimacy of the Englishes not represented in the classroom and even worst, develop negative attitudes towards them. Therefore, Canagarajah maintains that the purpose of teaching English now is to enable learners to shuttle between different communities of English users and use and this, I believe can only be achieved through the teaching of English with English as an International Language (EIL) orientations. Following McKay (2010) I will use the term 'English as an International Language' as an umbrella term to refer to the use of English between bilingual English speakers, whether sharing the same culture or not, as well as between bilingual and monolingual English speakers.

For EIL approaches to have a strong hold in the ELT landscape, I am of the opinion that the teachers themselves need to be made aware of the current landscape of English (also in Matsuda, 2003b; Renandya, 2011; Zacharias, 2002). This includes providing a space for teachers to examine, and if necessary, reformulate their beliefs surrounding the ownership of English. Without such efforts, teachers cannot develop a favorable attitude toward EIL. Ironically, the reality at the classroom level shows that many teachers are less enthusiastic in embracing the EIL models of teaching English (Jenkins, 2007). Realizing the determining role of teacher education programs to the success of EIL implementation, a study focuses on the extent to which student-teachers actually negotiate and respond to the teaching of English with EIL orientation, is needed.

It is therefore befitting to conduct a study focusing on bilingual English student-teachers' (for convenience, BESTs) experiences of teaching English with EIL orientations. The term 'bilingual' is used in the broadest sense to refer to people who speak two language and more. This paper intends to be a response to the call made by Matsuda (2003a) to incorporate EIL orientations to the teaching of English in teacher education programs. In particular, the present study aims to document BESTs' understandings and the challenges they face when teaching English with EIL orientation as well as in designing lesson plans and teaching materials.

THE STUDY

The present study is situated in a four-year pre-service teacher education in the Faculty of Language and Literature in a private university in Indonesia. Data were collected through focus groups, individual interviews, and teaching journals. The two major research questions guiding the study are: (1) What are BESTs understandings of EIL? and (2) What are the benefits and difficulties of integrating EIL in their mini lessons? The 12 BESTs who participated in this study were all registered in my Microteaching class. All of them were in their early twenties and at the third and fourth year. As with any Indonesians, they are bilinguals or trilinguals with at least, Indonesian, the lingua franca of Indonesia, and one local language. All the names mentioned are pseudonyms.

The data were collected in a Microteaching course, where I was the class instructor. The course runs for two hours a week over 14 weeks with approximately 12 students in a class. In the course, each student has the opportunity to conduct a 15-20 minute mini-lesson for 3 times throughout the class. The data for the present study were collected after students conducted their first mini-lesson, which were conducted in week 3, 4 and 5. After conducting a mini lesson, they are expected to write a reflective journal focusing on how they accommodated EIL approaches, their feelings while doing so, as well as the difficulties they encounter.

When studying how BESTs incorporates EIL approaches in their mini lessons, I use the action research framework adapted from Burns (2010) and Richards and Lockhart (1994). The data were analyzed through content analysis of focus group and individual interview transcripts and teaching journals. Each focus group and individual interview were audiotaped and then, transcribed for analysis. The participant statements from transcripts and teaching journal were analyzed for recurring patterns (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and then, coded according to the categories/themes relevant to the research questions. The analysis included an examination of expressed attitudes, contradictions, and conceptualizations concerning key issues related to their understandings, the benefits of EIL as well as the difficulties they faced when integrating EIL concepts in their lesson plans and mini-lesson. It would be impractical to include all the data here. Thus, I have selected several typical examples of the responses to illustrate the extent to which the research questions were addressed.

APPROACHES TO COURSE DESIGN

Stage One: Identifying students' awareness of EIL issues

To explore how far students have understood the concept, I decided to distribute initial questionnaires at the first week of the Microteaching class. The questionnaire consists of three open ended items address the following questions:

1. What do you understand with the term 'English as an international language'?
2. Do you think teaching English now is different from teaching English in the past? Explain your answer.
3. Who you think should be the model in teaching English? Explain why.

The qualitative analysis of the questionnaires illustrates that the majority of the participants do not see MESTs as the best English teachers. In fact, many of them prefer their senior high school teachers, local Indonesians as the models of good English teachers. The reasons for such preferences, among others, are clear pronunciation, a good motivator and well-organized lesson. Other students state that anyone can be good model of English teachers as long as they have knowledge and skills in teaching English. Among the 12 BESTs, only three students who think MESTs as the best English teachers for reasons such as, compared to local teachers, they are more respectful and attentive to students' works as well as more relaxed in teaching. One student mentions MESTs are good models because they "already know about English" (Ndandut, pseudonym). What is interesting about these comments is that the reasons stated, for the most part, go way beyond nativeness. For them, good English teachers have more to do with the way they organize their teaching, teaching skill and expertise as well as personality factors. The finding from the initial questionnaires illustrates the context-dependability of students' perception of the best English teacher.

From the questionnaires, I also learn that all the participants are of the opinion that teaching English now should be different from teaching English in the past. All of them are aware that English now is the "international" or "global" language of the world. Although the participants give no elaboration as how the teaching of English now and then should be different, the findings of the questionnaire has given me indications as the extent to which I need to expose students to EIL concepts during the presentation and workshop on EIL.

Stage Two: Presenting and discussing EIL approaches to English language teaching

The findings of the questionnaire has taught me that issues associated with teaching English as an inner-circle language versus English as an International Language need to be explained prior to expecting BESTs to accommodate the concepts in their lesson plans and mini lessons. Due to the burgeoning of literature discussing EIL approaches and my limited time in discussing issues of EIL, my challenge was pinpointing and explaining EIL approaches in a way so that the participants, who might be new to the concept, could accommodate them in their mini lessons.

At the planning stage of the action research cycle, I decided that I would start with giving presentation comparing the purpose of teaching English in the past, which was mostly informed by the native-speaker paradigm and the present, which should be centered on bilingual English speakers. The themes of the presentation were adapted from Burns (2005):

- Which models?
- Which standard?
- Which teachers?
- Whose culture?

I added the last theme, Whose culture?, not addressed in Burns' because of the traditional assumption that learning English entailed learning the cultures of native speakers. By contrast, the

issues of culture in the EIL approaches nowadays including using English to express the users' cultures as well as learning other English users' cultures and not necessarily, the native speakers' cultures (McKay, 2010).

Stage Three: Refocusing students' tasks

To make it easier for BESTs to focus on accommodating the EIL approaches, each BEST needs to develop a mini lesson around one input text for approximately 20-minute mini lesson. The input texts are all taken from *Touchstones*, a required course book for an Integrated Course, a course students in the department need to take at the first year. The titles of the input texts are: *Everything must go on line!*, *What do you have in your refrigerator?*, and *She was telling me...* I deliberately chose those three texts because they are heavily informed by the inner-circle cultures and lifestyles. The reason for choosing such texts is because during the teaching practicum, BESTs do not have the liberty to choose the textbooks. These textbooks are more often informed by inner-circle countries' English and cultures. The input texts also stimulate students to adapt the text to accommodate EIL approaches.

Stage Four: Monitoring students' experience in the process of integrating the EIL concepts

To document the process of integrating the EIL into their mini-lessons, I asked them to write a teaching journal before and after the mini lesson. I choose the name 'learning journal' because it highlights the significance of "progressive conscious reflection" (Moser, 2005, p. 92) when the student-teachers attempt to accommodate EIL in their lesson plans as well as mini-lessons. The teaching journals follow Burns' (2010) and Richards and Lockhart (1994) action research cycle of topic, planning, action, and reflection.

FINDINGS

"Teaching English with EIL approaches means making room for students' cultures"

The first focus of the study is BESTs' understandings of teaching English with EIL approaches. For many of them, teaching English with EIL approaches is equal to making rooms for students' cultures. Although they seem to have remarkably common understanding of the place for students' cultures in EIL approaches, their opinions vary with regards to which student's cultures should be represented. In a country consisting of hundreds of cultures, the answer to the question of which students' cultures should be accommodated in EIL approach is certainly not straightforward.

For Rum, students' cultures mean particular traits and life styles familiar to local students. In the mini-lesson, she used the input text "Everything on line" as a platform to discuss how students treated their old unwanted stuff. She was aware that the input text was "very Western" because selling old stuff on line was uncommon in Salatiga, where Internet are only used by at least the middle-class. People more often sell their old unwanted stuff, locally known as "rosokan," to second-hand markets or mobile cars. At the end of her mini lesson, she asked the students to write their experiences of selling their old stuff.

Similar to Rum, the students' cultures Nisa represented in the classroom are the ones close to the students:

...perhaps we can start by exposing things in Salatiga because students learn English in Salatiga so I make them aware of the culture in Salatiga. I think that's more beneficial than exposing them to the culture of the UK people, for example, because they haven't lived in the UK (Nisa, focus group, 2/9/2011, my translation)

Different from many BESTs who tend to start teaching by exposing the Western cultural content of the input text, Nisa preferred to start with the cultural content familiar to the local students. Therefore, when teaching in Salatiga, she would start by making students' aware of the cultures and life styles in Salatiga. Then, perhaps, gradually transitioned to the Western cultures.

Benny put forward practicality reasons when responding to the question which students' cultures he would expose through English. For him, he would expose any local cultures that were available on line. He also highlighted the importance of making the students aware of the diversity within one nation. For example, when conducting the mini lesson of the input text "She was telling me [that she was engaged]," he decided to expose students to two accompanying texts, describing the engagement practices in Java and Batak. I found Benny's attempt to bring in two, instead of one, is significant to the way he comprehends EIL. It shows that for him, it is important for students to be made aware of the diversity within one nation.

For many BESTs, EIL is not only making rooms for students' cultures but also the cultures from the inner-circle countries. For Rika and Rhani, exposing students to Western cultures are important so that students can compare and contrast their cultures to those of the Western's. One student-teacher, Lida, felt the understanding of Western cultures should come before exposing students to the local cultures:

Actually English comes from the Western countries so it has its own cultures and we also have our own cultures so nothing wrong with introducing students to Western cultures first and then exposing them to our culture (Lida, focus group, 5/10/2011)

For many participants, English continues to be closely associated with inner circle countries. In fact, Lida's comment shows that the cultures of the inner circle can serve as a stepping stone to discuss students' cultures.

Other than integrating student cultures into the materials, many BESTs express their doubts and even, question whether EIL concepts can be integrated into other teaching areas such as the teaching of grammar. During the focus groups, Ida, for example, continued to believe that EIL could not be integrated in the teaching grammar because:

... the [US] grammar is already standard so if we teach the students' other grammar it will be considered wrong

For Ida, students need to learn the standard grammar because they are more likely to encounter them in academic arenas where most Indonesian students will use English for. For these student-teachers, issues of acceptability and correctness appear to be their main concerns. The grammar from the US is considered correct and is widely accepted rather than World Englishes' grammar. Additionally, Ida seems to develop the understanding that exposing learners to other varieties of English is equal to asking the learners to acquire them; grammar norms which she considered incorrect.

"I am not sure if my materials and lesson plan are EIL enough"

The second focus of the study is to explore students' stated difficulties in implementing the EIL approaches. In the focus groups and individual interviews, all the participants admitted that they were aware that English has now become the lingua franca of the world. Because of this changing role of English, a very few participants suspect that the way English is taught now and in the past should be different although they only have a vague idea of those differences. Many participants admit feeling surprise knowing from the EIL presentation in the Microteaching class, that the global role of English has in fact brought implications to the ways it was taught.

A common theme gathered from the focus groups, individual interviews and the teaching journals is the concerns if their lesson plans are "EIL enough" to use Rum's word. One participant who felt that way is Nisa:

Honestly I did not really know about EIL rules, so I can't determine whether my teaching material is right or wrong. What I meant EIL rules is more about the regulation and the principle of teaching EIL. For me EIL just consider student culture in teaching and I don't know whether teaching EIL is only about culture or not. Is it only about the materials, pronunciation and content? Or maybe it is also about linguistic and grammar? (Nisa, Teaching Journal 1)

Nisa's word choice in reflecting on teaching with EIL approaches as written in the teaching Journal 1, is significant to the way she understood EIL concepts. She uses words such as 'rules,' 'regulation' and 'principle' to describe EIL approaches. By using such words, Nisa perceives EIL as equal to "prototypical methods" (Kumaravadivelu, 2003, p. 540) such as Grammar-Translation and Audiolingual methods, where there is prescribed classroom techniques that teachers 'need' to follow. With this conceptualization, it is, therefore, not surprising when she was concerned with the way she did her mini lesson ("Honestly I did not really know about EIL rules, so I can determine whether my teaching material is right or wrong").

Despite Nisa seemingly strong understanding of EIL as making rooms for students' cultures, it is interesting to see how she questioned her understanding at the end of the excerpt ("I don't know whether teaching EIL is only about culture or not. Is it only about the materials, pronunciation and content? Or maybe it is also about linguistic and grammar?"). A similar doubt is also expressed by Eny:

In applying EIL approach, I felt I just used one way which is comparing western cultures to the local cultures. I felt it was not enough. It will not be good if a teacher who teaches English using EIL approaches only use comparison. I thought I only apply a fraction of EIL even though I do not know in what other ways I can teach EIL (Eny, Teaching journal)

Indeed, participants' doubts of EIL are not uncommon. When I asked if there were any last comments at the end of focus groups and individual interviews, Lia and Rani, for example, asked whether the ways they taught and understood EIL were correct.

Some participants note that EIL is difficult because it was lack of teacher model. In his post-teaching journal, Benny wrote:

As a student-teacher when I teach, I will subconsciously model the way my teachers teach. However, because I have never had teachers who teach English with EIL approaches, I became not sure whether I have accommodated the EIL approach or not.

A similar comment is put forward by Ria. During the focus group, she felt challenged to integrate EIL approaches into the teaching grammar but she did not know how to do it.

Benny's and Ria's remarks underline the importance of teacher as one significant source of teaching techniques and methodology (Richards & Lockhart, 1994). It also shows that in the context of the study, EIL has not become part of the teaching pedagogy of English teachers.

"I feel proud teaching with EIL approaches"

Despite students' limited understandings of EIL approaches and how to implement them in the classroom, interestingly all of the participants are to some extent quite positive about their student-teaching experiences. They described the experiences of implementing EIL approaches as "challenging," "interesting," and "rewarding." Several students point out that EIL are, indeed, necessary both for bilingual English students and teachers. Nisa, for example, stated during the focus group that EIL materials, could stimulate silent students, like herself, to give more active contribution in the classroom.

For Lida, EIL approaches provide a space for students to share about their cultures; an opportunity that, perhaps, is somewhat limited in Western-based teaching approaches:

What I like [about EIL approaches] is the involvement of student culture ... so student can share their culture... like in the mini lesson the input text is about Western engagement culture... with EIL approaches I can ask the students to talk about the engagement culture and ritual in their own cultures... I like it because the students can share their culture and I, the teacher, can obtain new knowledge from them although I am confused which students' cultures should I accommodate (Lida, focus group, 5/10/2011)

From Lida remark, we can see that EIL approaches open doors to students' cultures. When conducting the mini lesson, after exposing students to the engagement ritual in the US, she developed a series of questions for students to discuss the engagement ritual in their own cultures. Despite Lida's excitement of implementing EIL approach, she was ambivalent about which students' cultures should be represented in the classroom.

EIL approaches are not only beneficial for students but also for teachers. For a beginning teacher, Nisa felt her confidence grow when teaching using EIL approach. Prior to knowing EIL, she felt her position was limited to be the follower of US models:

Nisa : ...before EIL I felt I have to teach in a certain way, needs to use a certain English, a certain pronunciation...

I : What kinds of English? What kinds of Pronunciation?

Nisa : Like the US ...

(Nisa, focus group, 12/9/2011)

Nisa's comment implies an element of liberation from the confining nature of US-led models. She describes teaching English "before" as more prescriptive because she needed to teach English in a certain way.

A slightly similar comment comes from Rani. During the focus group, Rhani expressed her excitement of using the approaches:

I like it when I don't need to follow Western rules when teaching English. If we use Western materials, I do not understand... the idioms, the culture. EIL approaches give me the freedom

to choose the materials that are more appropriate for my students. It also allows me to choose my own methodology (Rhani, focus group, 5/10/2011, my translation)

What I found interesting is Rani's strong belief of EIL despite her fuzzy understanding of EIL approaches. She felt EIL empowered local teachers, like herself, to choose materials and teaching methodology suitable to the local context. Ran's comment also indicates the lack of accessibility factor of Western-based teaching materials for local teachers because of the idioms and cultural content of those texts.

Perhaps, one participant who shows the most excitement when integrating EIL approaches is Anthi. Among all of the BESTs, she is the only one who creates an accompanying listening text featuring herself and one of her friend. When asked why she chose Javanese English speakers, she explained during the focus group that she would like to give an opportunity for Javanese English. Based on her experience in the listening class, the models were always Westerners because of the stereotypical assumption that native speakers were fluent and speak comprehensible English. From her standpoint, Indonesians provided better models because their English were clear and easily to be understood.

Not only did Anthi see the benefits of teaching EIL, she felt proud in integrating the approach:

I : How do you feel after teaching using EIL approaches?

Anthi : I feel proud because I just realize that local culture can be considered in teaching English as an international language ... it can be included in the teaching materials.

I : Do you think it is necessary to teach EIL?

Anthi : I think it's necessary because this is a new innovation in the teaching of English now because it's different from teaching English then ... in the past if we learn English we also need to learn the culture without including the local culture even a little bit.

(Anthi, individual interview, 13/10/2011, my translation)

For Anthi, EIL approaches give some sorts of validation to the students' cultures. Implicit in her remark is the strong pride she felt because her culture, the local culture, has a place or "can be included" in the English language teaching landscape.

REFLECTION AND EVALUATION

There are two aims of the present study. First is to explore students' understanding of EIL concepts and second, to explore students' stated benefits and difficulties when integrating EIL in the mini lessons. Students exposed to a new methodology have mixed reaction, as become apparent in this project when they discussed their feelings in the focus groups and individual interviews. Although all of the BESTs are aware of the global role of English as stated in the initial questionnaires as well as focus groups and individual interviews, many of them admitted that they did not expect that the global role of English has any bearings to the way English is taught in the classroom. In fact, this findings correspond to Modiano (2009). When he discusses the current status of EIL in the European Union (EU), he observes that while some teachers have come to a sense of the global role of English, they continue to feel uncertain about its implications for classroom practices.

One of the significant concepts of EIL is reexamining the relationship between language and culture. In the native-speaker paradigm, it is taken for granted that the teaching of English needs to

be accompanied with the exposure and learning of the inner-circle countries' cultures. In the EIL paradigm, however, McKay (2002) explains the inner circle cultures alone can no longer provide adequate culture content. Teachers need to include the culture from the learners' cultures. In fact, this is one of EIL concepts that all the BESTs appear to embrace the most. Although they have different ideas of what constitute 'local cultures,' t all the participants address students' cultures to a different extent in their mini lessons.

While some BESTs do believe that students' cultures have a legitimate place in EIL, their places are still considered supplementary to Western cultures. For a variety of reasons, BESTs continue to believe that exposing students to Western cultures is important. Although this may be translated as illustrating some sort of continued attachment to inner circle cultures, I support Matsuda (2009) that the notion of EIL cannot be conveniently separated from the 'default' curriculum. In the Microteaching class, the 'default' curriculum is represented through the input texts, which expose the cultures of the US.

As far as teaching grammar is concerned, many participants seem to be reluctant and hesitant to expose students' to other varieties of English. This is understandable because of the lack of "observability" factor (Rogers, 1983, p. 231), which according to Roger (1983) is defined as "how visible an innovation is" (p.231). Rogers examines variables affecting the rate at which innovations are adopted. He postulates that an individual is more likely to adopt innovation that they are familiar with. The hesitancy of the participants in employing EIL approach, an approach that is considered an innovation in Indonesia, in the teaching of grammar might be due to the invisibility or under representation of EIL grammar(s). Even Rani, who is eager to integrate EIL grammar, is confused on how to do it.

Despite the empowering force of EIL, the doubts, questions and concerns when integrating EIL into their mini lessons illustrate the significant role of modeling. Therefore, continued efforts to bring EIL concepts into the classroom and teacher education programs are crucial. Maley (2009) notes that teachers, at the most part, will teach what they are able to teach. Maley's idea is also shared by Kirkpatrick's (2007). Based on Kirkpatrick's observation on local Chinese English teachers, they tend to teach "the model that they have themselves have learned" (p.192). For EIL to take a firm hold in ELT landscape in the expanding circle countries such as Indonesia, EIL needs to be part of the knowledge base that inform teacher pedagogy and education (also in Matsuda, 2003a, 2005, 2009). Therefore, this present study contributes a worthwhile contribution in this area.

The most encouraging finding from the present study is that despite students' somewhat fuzzy understandings of EIL, many BESTs are very willing to do a "paradigm hop" (Brown, 1993, p. 60) and are enthusiastic on implementing the approach. One possible explanation is because the EIL approach, as pointed out by Nisa and Anthi, is empowering for local English teachers. In fact, many of these student-teachers admitted that EIL approaches increase their confident-level as beginning English teachers. Although teaching with EIL approaches is not necessarily easier, for once Anthi felt that her presence as an Indonesian English teacher is validated because she allows to bring in her culture which were suppressed or even 'backgrounded' under the native-speaker paradigm.

Among other things the relative success of the project is the result of maximizing "dialogizing" spaces in the form of focus groups, individual interviews, and reflective journals. Together these venues create a safe atmosphere for an ongoing discussion on how EIL can be best

integrated in the teaching of English within students' contexts. Brown (1993) argues that for a paradigm shift to occur certain conditions need to be fulfilled. The present study suggests that the integration of EIL needs to be accompanied by providing safe and reflexive spaces allowing the learners' to interact, process, and discuss the new concepts. Discussing the participants' experience of integrating EIL concepts in their mini-lessons is not only beneficial for the students but also for me, the teacher. I can gain new understandings and awareness on how the student-teachers develop their understanding and even, navigate their insecurity and hesitancy in using the approaches.

CONCLUSION

The project described here represents a first attempt to integrate EIL into a Microteaching class. In the project, the student-teaching experience was built around integrating EIL concepts into teaching as well as developing lesson plans and materials. Unfortunately, because of time constraints, I cannot provide ample time for the BESTs to process the approach and even, examine their beliefs surrounding the ownership of English that I have tried to address in my presentation and workshop on EIL. Therefore, more times need to be allocated for EIL approaches so students can have ample time in processing them. This can be done by integrating EIL approaches into existing curriculum in teacher education programs either by combining it with existing courses or addressing it as a stand alone course.

In conclusion, I would like to point out factors that play important roles in the successful implementation of any teaching techniques: enjoyment and challenge. The BESTs who took part in this small-scale action research project had a great time experimenting the EIL approach. I have witnessed their excitement and their confident level grow when they are given the opportunity to bring something meaningful to their lives. The classroom is a place for learning but most importantly, it is a place where both the teacher and students feel validated and their voices are heard. And I can think of no better way to share who we are than through teaching English within the EIL framework.

REFERENCES

- Brown, K. (1993). World Englishes in TESOL programs: An infusion model of curricular innovation. *World Englishes*, 12(1), 59-73.
- Burns, A. (2005). Interrogating new worlds in English language teaching. In A. Burns (Ed.), *Teaching English from a global perspective* (pp. 1-18). Alexandria: TESOL, Inc.
- Burns, A. (2010). *Doing action research in English language teaching: A guide for practitioners*. New York: Routledge.
- Iwata, Y., Ogawa, M., Wen, Q., Sakamoto, E., Takarada, M., & Horio, A. (2002). Exposure to different cultures through English textbooks [Electronic Version]. *ASTE Newsletter*, 46. Retrieved March 11, 2010 from <http://www.bun-eido.co.jp/aste/aste46.htm>
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. New York: Oxford.
- Kachru, B. (1992). *The Other tongue: English across cultures (2nd ed.)*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kumaravivelu, B. (2003). Critical Language Pedagogy: A postmethod perspective on English language teaching. *World Englishes*, 22(4), 539-550.

- Maley, A. (2009). ELF: A teacher's perspective. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 9(3), 187-200.
- Matsuda, A. (2003a). Incorporating World Englishes in Teaching English as an International Language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 719-729.
- Matsuda, A. (2003b). The ownership of English: A perspective of Japanese high school students. *World Englishes*, 37(719-729).
- Matsuda, A. (2005). Preparing future users of English as an international language. In A. Burns (Ed.), *Teaching English from a global perspective* (pp. 63-74). Virginia: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.
- Matsuda, A. (2009). Desirable but not necessary? The place of World Englishes and Englishes as an International language in English teacher preparation programs in Japan. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 169-189). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. L. (2010). English as an International Language. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Education* (pp. 89-115). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Modiano. (2009). EIL, Native-speakerism and the Failure of European ELT. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 58-80). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Moser, J. (2005). Using language-focused learning journals on a task-based course. In C. Edwards & J. Willis (Eds.), *Teachers exploring tasks in English language teaching* (pp. 78-88): Palgrave.
- Renandya, W. A. (2011). *Teacher roles in EIL*. Paper presented at the Paper presented at the English Department, Faculty of Language and Literature.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rogers, E. (1983). *Diffusion of Innovations (3rd ed.)*. New York: The Free Press.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2002). Different tongues, diverse voices, the same language? *English EDU: Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(2).