

THE ROUTLEDGE INTERNATIONAL HANDBOOK OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION IN INDONESIA

Edited by Subhan Zein and Fuad Abdul Hamied

First published 2026

ISBN: 9781032506166 (hbk)

ISBN: 9781032506197 (pbk)

ISBN: 9781003399308 (ebk)

27

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY, TEACHER KNOWLEDGE BASE, AND TEACHER DEVELOPMENT

Yanty Wirza and Anita Triastuti

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

DOI: 10.4324/9781003399308-31



ROUTLEDGE

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY, TEACHER KNOWLEDGE BASE, AND TEACHER DEVELOPMENT

Yanty Wirza and Anita Triastuti

Introduction

The teacher knowledge base has been widely accepted as one of the crucial and determining aspects of teaching as a profession. Shulman (1986, 1987) identified different fundamental knowledge bases: content knowledge (CK), pedagogical knowledge (PK), and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), and later, the inclusion of ICT in the technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPCK). Undeniably, the different aspects of the teacher knowledge base in the complex interplays of teaching require teachers to continually develop their knowledge and competencies to stay up-to-date and relevant to the demands of the profession. Specifically, in the English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, the teacher's knowledge base of English in terms of the attainment and enhancement over time in sustainable professional development, as well as the provision of adequate support and facilitation, are eminently intermingling within the complex social, cultural, and political phenomena. Simply put, the teacher's knowledge base cannot be decontextualized from the ideology, policy, and sociocultural practices working at different levels within a certain context (see Chapter 5, this volume, on ideology and discourse of English).

In an attempt to respond to the demand of fast-changing societies in the globalized world, Freeman (2020) called for the reconceptualization of English teachers' sources of knowledge base and the influence of social, historical, professional, and political contexts. These sources of knowledge base assume the profound significance of the context-specific circumstances in which the teaching and learning take place. Examining the English teachers' knowledge base in superdiverse Indonesia (Zein et al., 2020) necessitates careful and comprehensive unpacking of the complex interplays of contributing factors in examining the teacher knowledge base. Superdiversity as defined by Vertovec (2019) constitutes as a vast multilingual and multicultural society with high demographic diversity and urban development with significant diversification, which now characterize many societies in the world (see Chapter 3, this volume, on English and Indonesia's sociolinguistic situation). While works have been done

on certain aspects of the teacher knowledge base, one key aspect begs deeper examination of the language ideology and its role in shaping the teacher knowledge base. The manifestation of language ideology can be seen in the language planning and policy and language practice and pedagogy. In fact, language ideologies are a powerful driver behind language planning and policy (Tupas, 2010). Tupas argues that in light of English's status as a global language, any leaning toward a certain perspective and variety of English will inevitably create certain ethical, political, as well as economy implications about ideology, power, standardization, and pedagogy. In this light, Zein (2020) utilized the perspective of superdiversity to illustrate the Indonesian rich linguistic diversity, the complexity and dynamic of the language practices, ideology, and policy including the language-in-education policy. Critical examination of the interplay of language ideology and its roles in shaping English teachers' knowledge base is of particular importance as language ideology often works in the subconscious mind and is often taken for granted. For those involved in research and education particularly, it is imperative to be fully aware of the constellations of language ideologies at play underlying the assumptions, beliefs, and practices in the immediate and broader contexts.

In the Indonesian context, the issues of English teacher competence and their knowledge base have been of great concern for decades (see Zein et al., 2020 for a review). Concerns dealing with Indonesian teachers' English knowledge, skills, proficiency have been reported in studies (Lie et al., 2019; Renandya et al., 2018), as have concerns regarding pedagogical competence (Drajati et al., 2018; Prasjojo et al., 2020), professional development (Kuncahya & Basikin, 2019), and ICT utilization (Mahdum et al., 2019). However, noticeable from the literature is the lack of discussion on the ideological and political aspects which could potentially explain, at least partly, the current situation of English language education and teacher knowledge base in the country. Thus, this chapter aims at presenting a discussion on the roles of language ideology in the building of the Indonesian English teaching force. Furthermore, in light of the dynamic development of the various English varieties and the emergence of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) in the Asia region and in the world more broadly, this chapter is dedicated as a call to action to strengthen the ideologically- and politically-conscious highly competent English teachers to implement English pedagogy with the ELF framework.

In the sections that follow, we present the theoretical framework of the knowledge base in English and language teacher education, language ideology, and language planning and policy. We then present the current research issues and major contributions propose ways to move forward toward the implementation of English pedagogy with the ELF framework.

Theoretical Framework and Contextual Background

Teacher Knowledge Base in English Language Teacher Education

The teacher knowledge base was introduced by Shulman (1987) along with his model of pedagogical reasoning. In his conceptualization, teachers' sound pedagogical reasoning is channeled to the multifaceted interaction of their knowledge base. Studies on L2 teacher education have documented the intricate interplay of knowledge categories composing teacher knowledge base (e.g. Myhill et al., 2013; Niakaris & Kiely, 2014; Sanchez & Borg, 2014). The conceptualization of the teacher knowledge base in this line of research essentially covers content and pedagogical knowledge of English language teacher education, and the institutional delivery comprising how student teachers apply their Content Knowledge

(CK) and Pedagogical Knowledge (PK) for their instructional purposes (Johnson, 2009; Tedick, 2005). Tedick (2005, p. xviii) defines the language teacher knowledge base as “what [they] need to know and understand to be effective teachers and how that knowledge is incorporated into second language teacher education”. Such conceptualization reflects its initial scope that covers behavioral prescriptions based on effectiveness studies as represented in teachers’ CK, PK, and PCK, pedagogical reasoning, and the need to contextualize teachers’ teaching within its surrounding social, cultural, political, and educational contexts. As further termed in their study, the first two scopes are defined as “all profession-related insights” (Verloop et al., 2001, p. 443). Such insights are rooted in the teachers’ articulation of their formal and practical knowledge and beliefs.

In response to the changing roles of language teachers, from previously being seen as passive transmitters of knowledge rather than as curriculum makers and developers, the concern for expanding the knowledge base of language teacher has evolved. This requires them to be aware of sociocultural and socio-political contexts in the local and global stage affecting the changing sociolinguistic reality of their instruction (Dogancay-Aktuna, 2006).

The recognition that English no longer solely belongs to its Anglophone origins requires a shift in the teacher knowledge base—urging English teachers not only to teach it as a second or foreign language but also to embrace a paradigm of English as a lingua franca (e.g., Liu et al., 2017; Sakhiyya et al., 2018; Zein, 2018; Zein et al., 2020) and as an international language (e.g., McKay, 2009; Nguyen et al., 2020). The need to locally and socio-culturally recontextualize English is evident in the “recultured English language” (Stockton, 2018, p. 131) which removed the hegemonic western ideologies and cultures seen in the character-based curricula, to be replaced by local wisdom, nationalism, and national identity (unity in diversity) in the locally-produced materials. Hence, teachers’ understanding of their expanding roles within socio-culturally and multi-linguistically diverse contexts entails the expanding scope of the English language teacher knowledge base for preparing English learners to be competent users of English while navigating their linguistic and cultural identities.

Nature of Teacher Knowledge Base

The nature of the teacher knowledge base has been largely depicted in the activity of language teaching and learning which captures the interplay of teachers’ knowledge base, their “formal educational scholarship” (Shulman, 1987, p. 10), their experience, and their beliefs. Research (e.g., Howey & Grossman, 1989; Johnston & Goettsch, 2000; Konig et al., 2016; Richards et al., 1995; Sanchez & Borg, 2014; Woods & Akir, 2011) has confirmed that teacher knowledge categories within the teacher knowledge base are conceptualized in a delicate, interwoven, dynamic, and multifaceted manner. Teacher knowledge categories reciprocally influence each other and constitute multidimensional constructs (Konig et al., 2016). Studies on pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) development have largely exhibited the interaction and intersection of pedagogical knowledge (PK) and content knowledge (CK) in shaping teachers’ PCK. This intersection has brought into play such categories of PCK for teaching reading as knowledge about text (KAT), knowledge about reading instruction (KARI) (Irvine-Niakaris & Kiely, 2015), and those of PCK for teaching literary texts (Howey & Grossman, 1989) and grammar (GPCK) (Sanchez & Borg, 2014). Explorations

of teachers' PCK development have also proven that the existence of grammatical content knowledge (GPCK) in isolation with GPCCK is insufficient to better facilitate student learning (Johnston & Goettsch, 2000; Myhill et al., 2013).

The teacher knowledge base is also related to teachers' teaching experience (Asl et al., 2014; Atay et al., 2010). Yet, teaching experience is not an absolute determinant of shaping a teacher's knowledge base. Teachers' professional development is deemed imperative for teachers excelling in the conceptualization of their knowledge base (Asl et al., 2014; Huang, 2007; Smith & Anagnostopoulos, 2008; Walker, 2012) and teachers' professional education is essential as the initial foundation for developing the teacher knowledge base (Howey & Grossman, 1989; Richards et al., 1995). In the study by Sanchez and Borg (2014), teachers' conceptualizations of GPCK in their classroom practices were strongly affected by the nature of their micro and macro contexts, which influenced their decisions regarding how to make grammar explanations more understandable to their students. Meanwhile, Wette (2010) found that teachers' conceptualization of professional knowledge demonstrated teachers' efforts in connecting learners and the instructional curriculum to contextual constraints.

Language Ideology and Language Planning and Policy

Language ideology is concerned with the attributes, the value of a language, and its relation to political, social, and cultural practices (Blommaert, 2006; Woolard, 1992; Woolard & Scheffelin, 1994), which "index the political economic interests of individual speakers, ethnic and other interest groups, and nation-states" (Kroskrity, 2015, p. 95). Language Planning and Policy (LPP) is always motivated by the language ideology behind it (Ricento, 2000). The LPP in most countries typically commenced to serve the purpose of nation-building to create a sense of national unity and regulate the status of other existing languages for peaceful and effective communication (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2020; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008). The formulation, the interpretation, and the implementation of LPP at the macro and micro levels involve numerous actors from the government agencies to the wide range of stakeholders affected by the policy (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2020; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Spolsky, 2021). The policies and regulations issued by the policymakers to a large extent determine the programs run and the facilitation and support available to improve the education.

Diallo and Liddicoat (2014) observe that, specifically in relation to English language policy in Asia, there has been a mismatch between the policy and pedagogy, mostly driven by the fact that the English competencies and achievements are relatively low across the board. In addition, teachers' welfare and teaching conditions and their professionalism present other challenges to address. These indicate that policies concerning English education and pedagogy have not worked effectively in improving the English language education, including the significant area of teachers' knowledge base (Zein et al., 2020). Regarding this, Reimers (2020) argued that educational change should accommodate comprehensive dimensions covering the cultural, psychological, professional, institutional, and political aspects which will determine the appropriate policy to develop, manage, and administer programs to continually enhance the teachers' quality across all aspects of teacher competencies. Reimers further asserted that the political perspective in educational change affects the interests of many groups and relates closely to the national politics and interests which may be in conflict.

English and Language Ideology in Indonesia

Early after its independence, Indonesia decided to make English, which was considered the language of “a free world”, the first foreign language to diminish the pervasive influence of communism in the region (Muhammad, 2003). Lauder (2008) and Zein (2019) observed that Indonesia has been very careful and strategic in its policies positioning English in terms of weighing the national interests. Lauder called this “a love-hate view of English” (p. 14), whereas Zein termed it “a love triangle situation” (p. 4), where on the one hand, the government acknowledges the values of English in the global communication, but on the other hand, there are negative sentiments toward English out of fear that English might threaten the dominant status of Indonesian and the existence of the indigenous languages. Zein’s (2020) illustrations on Indonesia’s superdiversity sought re-orientation of the language-in-education policy with regard to the ideological standpoint on how it influences the regulations, access, facilities, and practices. The “recultured” English (Stockton, 2018) is one stark evident of such ideological moves.

Despite the stark disparities in the beliefs, attitudes, and abilities in English, most Indonesians are generally in favor of acquiring better competencies in English due to its utility in bringing about upward mobility and broader economic, social, and cultural opportunities (Lauder, 2020; Zein, 2019; Zein et al., 2020; Zentz, 2017). Moreover, as the main literacy sponsor (Brandt, 1998; Wirza, 2020), the government has made efforts to improve the Indonesian English teachers’ qualifications, knowledge base, and competencies through various initiatives and programs. However, more effective and rigorous efforts should be made to enhance the development of Indonesian English teachers toward becoming a highly competent, socio-politically conscious teaching force who are aware of the interplays of English ideologies in the world and the impacts they have on their teaching and their students’ learning experiences and outcomes.

Current Research Issues

This section reviews the broader literature on teacher knowledge base development and its relation to the language ideology and language planning. It examines the complex interplays among the interconnecting factors that come into play at the level of conception, policy, and practice in an Indonesian context all the while carrying the main arguments towards establishing English as a lingua franca.

Strengthening Indonesian English Teacher Knowledge Base and Competence

The notion of the teacher knowledge base (Shulman, 1987) in Indonesia has been represented in the government regulations (MOEC, 2007, 2021). The regulation has determined four competencies required to be a professional teacher: pedagogical, professional, personal, and social competencies. The essential expectations within pedagogical competence fall into teachers’ knowledge and skills in developing their instructional curriculum which is centered around accommodating students’ learning needs to maximize student learning and potential. Professional competence refers to teachers’ mastery of the English language as a subject matter, including teachers’ knowledge and skills of the English language both as a language system and as a means of communication. Meanwhile personal and social competences are teachers’ abilities to be a good role model for students and to extend good relations as well

as effective communication to students and parents (see Chapter 25, this volume, on teacher standards).

Research on the English teacher knowledge base in Indonesia has shown efforts to investigate the development of Indonesian English teacher knowledge base. Some particular scopes of research on English teacher knowledge base included the profile of the English teacher knowledge base (e.g., Anugerahwati & Saukah, 2010), the development of the teacher knowledge base through classroom practices (e.g., Aisyah et al., 2021) and teacher professional development, including reflecting practice (e.g., Irmawati et al., 2017; Munifatullah et al., 2016; Sari et al., 2021), the relation of the teacher knowledge base and teaching experience (e.g., Ibrahim, 2016), the teacher knowledge base and students' learning motivation (e.g., Maryani & Martaningsih, 2015), and the portrayal of the teacher knowledge base and teachers' instructional practices (e.g., Anggreni et al., 2020). Some studies have examined the English pre-service teachers' perception of their initial teacher knowledge base (e.g., Drajiati et al., 2018; Triastuti, 2020). Indonesian teachers of English tend to positively perceive the extent they have developed their knowledge base even though their positive perception is not evident in their instructional practices. Meanwhile, in the case of pre-service teachers of English, the TPACK framework can be a means to see whether they can manage to integrate technology to enhance their instructional practices (see Chapter 26).

The empirical findings on the teacher knowledge base in Indonesia have shown that teachers had, to some extent, developed their knowledge base; however, the development of their knowledge base is insufficient (e.g., Anggreni et al., 2020; Ibrahim, 2016; Sari et al., 2021). The insufficiency of their knowledge base is depicted, for example, in their inadequate conceptualization of their PCK in their instructional practices and in their basic innovation of their instructional technology representing their TPACK. Many of these studies have intensively highlighted the knowledge base which seems disconnected to the macro landscape of English language in the national and international scales. Therefore, it is crucial to call for the reconceptualization of the teacher knowledge base which drives more teacher awareness to the expanding use and function of English within a particular socio-cultural and socio-political context, including an awareness of the language ideology behind the Indonesian language policy and planning, English as a lingua franca, and general ELT theories development.

Towards Politically-Conscious Indonesian English teachers

Building politically-conscious teachers has now gained more traction via supporting the notion that teachers are not expected only to be competent in the subject matter they teach (TPACK) but also have active engagement in the critical issues of inequality in society, both locally and globally. One of the most important and burning issues relates to linguistic imperialism which revolves around the hegemony and domination of Anglocentric English at the global stage (Pennycook, 1998; Phillipson, 1992, 2013; Tollefson, 1991). The issues around native speakerism seem to be a lingering concern for Indonesian EFL teachers in examining their identity as non-native English speakers (NNES). While the concept has been seriously challenged and debunked (Braine, 2013; Canagarajah, 2013; Kachru, 2005; Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Medgyes, 1992), many Indonesian English teachers still hold the belief that native speakers of English are the ideal role models for teaching English (Andreani & Dewi, 2017; Zein, 2018), an indication of a sense of inferiority as NNES in asserting their competencies

and professional identity as English teachers (Qoyyimah et al., 2020; Zacharias, 2016), which needs to be addressed (see Chapter 33, this volume, on pluricentric English).

Meanwhile, scholars have asserted that English in Indonesia has changed in the past decades mainly through the ubiquitous utility of technology that provides exposure to English especially to the young generation (Kirkpatrick, 2012; Lie et al., 2019; Zein et al., 2020). In many parts of the world, the diversity of Englishes in their uses, statuses, and functions denote the reality of English pluricentricity which encompasses the concepts of World Englishes (Kirkpatrick, 2014; Kachru, 2005), English as an International Language (EIL) (McKay, 2009; Kirkpatrick, 2012), and English as a lingua franca (Baker, 2015; Canagarajah, 2007; Jenkins, 2007, 2015; MacKenzie, 2014; Seidlehofer, 2011). To date, discourses around the notion of the pluricentricity of English have been conducted in higher education institutions, but teachers are generally excluded from the conversation. Little has been learned about how the strong penetration of English has affected the Indonesian EFL teachers' awareness, advocacy, or their teaching practice (Adityarini, 2014). Backed by studies mentioned earlier, our observation also informs us that most English teachers' lack of knowledge base also depicts the low awareness of the ideological and sociopolitical interplays in their pedagogy.

Windows to see how ideology works in teaching practice are through the language used and learning resources utilized. In the typical Indonesian English classes, the mixing of codes is the norm rather than an exception. English teachers would switch to Indonesian or local language(s) in explaining the lessons, giving instructions and manage the class. One ought to ask how this code-switching practice affects the English learning process and the students' English acquisition and attainment (Treffers-Daller, 2024). To some extent, this is now understood to illustrate translanguaging practice, whereby multilingual speakers employ all their whole linguistic repertoire across language labels and boundaries to make sense of the multilingual world (Garcia, 2009; Otheguy et al., 2015; Wei, 2022). Translanguaging and code-switching might have overlaps but Wei (2022) maintained that translanguaging possesses three reconstitutive aspects: (1) reconstitution of the linguistic features, genres, and styles; (2) reconstitution of the language status imposed by certain ideologies and nation-state; and (3) reconstitution of the power relation of the mono/bi/multilingual users. In the English classroom in Indonesia, studies have shown that code-switching practices have facilitated better interaction, scaffolding, reinforcement of the materials and culture-specific issues (e.g. Cahyani et al., 2018; Sundari, 2017), missing the ideological motives underlying the practice.

Having said that, cautions need to be made when we call this (productive) pedagogical translanguaging. Some serious concerns have been voiced regarding the overuse of the L1 in the English classrooms as it may impair the content of the lesson delivery, reduce the learners' opportunity for better exposure and practice, as well as lower attainment (Treffers-Daller, 2024; Sundari, 2017). Students in Sundari's study preferred that the teacher used more English in the classroom. This concern is somewhat in line with our observation that some English teachers almost exclusively use other languages but English in their English class. This resonates as the consequences of generally low Indonesian EFL teachers' English knowledge base and proficiency (Lamb & Coleman, 2008; Lie et al., 2019; Renandya et al., 2018) and lack of content and pedagogical qualification and competence (Lengkanawati, 2015). On the English proficiency front, particularly, Renandya et al. (2018) called for the urgent need for establishing standards for English teachers' proficiency that is still currently unavailable. With regard to pedagogical translanguaging, carefully planned, intentional, and strategic

practice (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020, 2021) is required with higher level of teachers' TPACK overall competencies to ensure students' learning progression, mastery, and attainment. As can be inferred from these studies, Indonesian English teachers have not properly and effectively performed pedagogical translanguaging. It should be in the interest of the policymakers to enhance the teachers' knowledge base to improve the Indonesian ELT knowledge base and competencies in the language and education policy.

A Call for a Multilingual Language Education with ELF Framework

Currently, ELT in the Indonesian context needs to undergo critical reconceptualization and reformulation and move toward to the English as a lingua franca (ELF) framework (Hamied, 2021; Zein, 2018; Zein et al., 2020). ELF is defined as a "language of choice among speakers who come from different linguacultural backgrounds" (Jenkins, 2009, p. 200), and is hybrid in nature (Canagarajah, 2007). It is "overtly consensus oriented, cooperative, and mutually supportive" (Seidlhofer, 2004, p. 219). For decades now, ELF has represented the dominant type of communication in English worldwide as ELF is inclusive to mono/bi/multilingual and NNES–NNES and NNES–NES interactions (Jenkins, 2009, 2015; Jenkins et al., 2011; Seidlhofer, 2011), transcending all English speakers in Kachruvian three concentric circles. Jenkins et al. (2011) reviewed the development of ELF, the linguistic fluidity of ELF, as well as the English Lingua Franca Core and non-core features. As asserted by Kirkpatrick (e.g., 2008, 2012, 2020) on multiple occasions, English in ASEAN (Association of South East Asian Nations) already functions as a lingua franca, further stating that English as a sole working language in ASEAN has expedited this phenomenon.

With regard to the ELF pedagogical framework, Kirkpatrick (2018) proposed some principles serving as guidelines for formulating ELF in an Indonesian context. As interactants in the ELF communication come from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, the main goal of ELF communication is mutual intelligibility, which generally means the level of mutual understanding achieved. Conceptually, intelligibility encompasses three interrelated processes with increasing complexity: intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability (Smith, 1992; Smith & Nelson, 2019). Smith (1992) further elaborated these concepts: intelligibility, the lowest of the three, constitutes the ability to recognize most of the words or other sentence-level elements in an utterance and assess that the utterance is generally grammatically appropriate. Comprehensibility, the second stage, means the ability to recognize the meanings attached to the words or expressions and generally could capture the possible meaning of the utterance. Interpretability, the most complex of the three, is the ability to capture the intended intentionality of an utterance which include the social and cultural aspects involved. As intelligibility is embedded in the specific interactional and sociocultural situation, it carries also the ideological issues (Rajadurai, 2007) that should be navigated. In the ELF pedagogical framework, Indonesian English teachers should be competent to perform the dynamic, mutual, and negotiation process and model them for their students.

Concerning teachers as the role model in ELF framework, Kirkpatrick (2018) asserted that "well-trained multilingual (teachers)" would serve as the most appropriate English teachers and would be "excellent role models" (p. 145) for the students. Baker (2015) argued that good modeling is key to successful ELF pedagogy as teachers serve as the agents of change with the mastery of the subject matter, have high commitment and positive attitudes, and are reflective and lifelong learners themselves. Infused with ELF, pedagogical translanguaging would be most effective with well-trained English teachers. They would be able to teach

English in the Indonesia multilingual/multicultural context and use Indonesian and other local languages productively and show the local embeddedness of English to serve their communication intents (Sakhiyyah et al., 2018; Sugiharto, 2020; Zein, 2020) to achieve the pedagogical goals. Importantly, the assessment should also be tailored to the ELF framework, whereby the benchmarks for assessment should shift from the standardized native speaker's norms to the ELF-informed assessment regime. Overall, these would be promising and could potentially work "as long as [the teachers'] own proficiency levels are high" (Kirkpatrick, 2018, p. 144).

Scholars maintained that ELF is arguably a much better fit for ELT in the Indonesian superdiverse context (Hamied, 2021; Zein, 2018; Zein et al., 2020) in order to move away from the native-speakerism ideology and to give productive space for the Indonesian emerging, recultured variety of English (Lauder, 2020; Stockton, 2018). Further, it affords teachers and students agency in their multilingual communicative conduct and interactions to forge their own linguistic and cultural identity and solidarity (Zein, 2019). It allows for intercultural learning and exchanges without a fixation on the native speaker's cultures (Kirkpatrick, 2018). Highly competent and well-trained Indonesian English teachers should be able to utilize ELF framework for opportunities for cultural learning about other international cultures and promoting Indonesian cultures. Teachers should also be aware that students' learning experience and identity are also influenced and shaped by the social, cultural, and political aspects (Wirza, 2018), and that English learning and communication with the ELF framework would provide a better learning environment where they feel more secure and accommodated.

However, in proposing the ELF pedagogical framework, Kirkpatrick (2018) realized that the ELF approach could be challenging as "ELF does not constitute a stable single variety of English" (p. 144) which aligns with ELF linguistic fluidity (Jenkins et al., 2011). This could present constraints for the Indonesian English teachers whose knowledge base and competencies are not yet solid or at the necessary standards to perform the ELF-informed pedagogy. That said, much of what has been presented in this section is quite ambitious, unless concerted efforts are made in the right direction to realize the policy and the implementation of the ELF pedagogy by the government bodies and other stakeholders involved to improve the Indonesian English teachers' knowledge base, competence, and sustainable professional development (see Chapter 4, this volume, on English language education policy).

Conclusion and Future Directions

This chapter has presented a discussion on the Indonesian English teachers' knowledge base and its relation to issues of language ideology and language planning and policy in the superdiverse Indonesian context. English has served as the means of communication for people with different linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds for centuries and most likely it will keep its place in the even more connected and globalized world. In an Indonesian context, while the status of English remains the most significant foreign language, the roles of English have increasingly taken more strategic functions in the gaining of wider opportunities and upward mobility. With the current official status of English as a foreign language (Lauder, 2020; Zein, 2019) and the policy to ensure strengthening of the national identity and preservation of local languages and cultures (Zein et al., 2020), the support for English language education is at best illustrated as ambivalent, as many studies indicated improvement

has not been significantly accomplished. English use in and outside the school context has increasingly painted wider discrepancies in that the pervasive penetration of English via various channels and media in the lives of Indonesian younger generation is apparent while the formal, government-sponsored English programs seem to be having a hard time catching up, particularly in preparing and building highly qualified, proficient, and competent English teachers. To quote Kumaravadivelu (2006), to “accelerate the changes and agency on the periphery communities... the philosophical, pedagogical and attitudinal investments that are absolutely essential for any meaningful relocation of the TESOL activity” (p. 23). In other words, the investment toward establishing and empowering teachers who are politically conscious of the pluricentricity of English, equipped with sufficient knowledge base, proficiency, and competencies in TPACK, should be made a high priority.

Moving forward, however, it is extremely crucial to critically reflect on the current situation of English language education in Indonesia whereby multiple aspects from the policy, practice, and resource management require profound improvement, particularly the teachers’ knowledge base and competencies (Sakhiyya et al., 2018). The proposal for adopting the ELF framework within multilingual language education (Musthafa et al., 2018; Zein, 2018; Zein et al., 2020) should be appreciated as it is deemed appropriate for the Indonesia superdiverse context to navigate the language ideology of the state and multilingual and multicultural context in the region and beyond. Indonesians are very accustomed to and accommodative to linguistic variations as *Bahasa Indonesia* itself serves as a lingua franca in the archipelago. ELF allows for a less intimidating learning environment for multilingual English learners with mutual intelligibility as the main goal with its characteristics of a dynamic, negotiated, and supportive nature of interaction. The work toward the awareness of ELF in the Indonesian ELT has started to materialize but it needs to be backed up by the policy to reformulate the English curriculum, and providing teacher preparation programs, training, and other supporting resources in order to implement it at scale. At the policy front, ELF-informed educational policy and curriculum should be carefully established (see Chapter 4, this volume, on English language education policy). As for the Indonesian ELT teachers, ELF-informed pedagogy should be taken as being politically-conscious, where they need to be highly proficient and competent (Sugiharto, 2020) to ensure that the learners get the optimal learning experience to achieve the highest English attainment and the best prospects of being productive global citizens.

References

- Adityarini, H. (2014). *An examination of the suitability of a pluricentric model of English language teaching for primary education in Indonesia*. [Unpublished PhD thesis]. Curtin University.
- Aisyah, R. N., Setiawan, S., & Munir, A. (2021). Technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) in action: Unraveling Indonesian English as a foreign language teachers’ TPACK by implementing telegram. *Computer Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal*, 22(3), 17–32.
- Andreani, W., & Dewi, U. P. (2017). English teaching in post-colonialism discourse: EFL students’ perception toward English and native English teachers in Indonesia. *Advanced Science Letters*, 23(2), 1193–1196. <https://doi.org/10.1166/asl.2017.7536>
- Anggreni, N. P. D., Utami, I. L. P., & Dewi, K. S. (2020). English teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge: The degree of consistency between perception and implementation. *ELT-Echo*, 5(2), 66–78. <https://doi.org/10.24235/eltecho.v5i2.6743>
- Anugerahwati, M., & Saukah, A. (2010). Professional competence of English teachers in Indonesia: A profile of exemplary teachers. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(2), 47–59.

- Asl, E. S., Asl, N. S., & Asl, A. S. (2014). The erosion of EFL teachers' content and pedagogical content knowledge throughout the years of teaching experience. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1599–1605. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.583>
- Atay, D., Karlioglu, O., & Kurt, G. (2010). The pedagogical content knowledge development of prospective teachers through an experiential task. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 1421–1425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.212>
- Baker, W. (2015). Culture and complexity through English as a lingua franca: Rethinking competences and pedagogy in ELT. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(1), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2015-0005>
- Blommaert, J. (2006). Language ideology. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 510–522). Elsevier.
- Braine, G. (2013). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Routledge.
- Brandt, D. (1998). Sponsors of literacy. *College Composition and Communication*, 49(2), 165–185. <https://doi.org/10.2307/358929>
- Cahyani, H., de Courcy, M., & Barnett, J. (2018). Teachers' code-switching in bilingual classrooms: Exploring pedagogical and sociocultural functions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(4), 465–479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1189509>
- Canagarajah, S. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 923–939. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00678.x>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). Interrogating the “native speaker fallacy”: Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77–92). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315045368>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 300–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009029384>
- Diallo, I., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2014). Planning language teaching: An argument for the place of pedagogy in language policy and planning. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 9(2), 110–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18334105.2014.11082024>
- Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (2006). Expanding the socio-cultural knowledge base of TESOL Teacher Education. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(3), 278–295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908310608668768>
- Drajati, N. A., Tan, L., Haryati, S., Rochsantiningsih, D., & Zainnuri, H. (2018). Investigating English language teachers in developing TPACK and multimodal literacy. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 575–582. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9806>
- Freeman, D. (2020). Arguing for a knowledge-base in language teacher education, then (1998) and now (2018). *Language Teaching Research*, 24(1), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818777534>
- García, O. (2009). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a name? *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(2), 322–326. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00172.x>
- Hamied, F. A. (2021). An introduction. In F. A. Hamied (Ed.), *Literacies, culture, and society in the context of 4.0 Industrial Revolution* (pp. 1–8). Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Howey, K. R., & Grossman, P. L. (1989). A study in contrast: Sources of pedagogical content knowledge for secondary English. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40, 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002248718904000504>
- Huang, Y. (2007). How teachers develop their professional knowledge in English study groups in Taiwan. *Educational Research & Review*, 2(3), 036–045.
- Ibrahim, B. (2016). Pedagogical content knowledge for teaching English. *English Education Journal*, 7(2), 155–167.
- Irmawati, D. K., Widiati, U., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2017). How do Indonesian professional English teachers develop their pedagogical competence in teaching implementation? *Arab World English Journal*, 8(1), 293–307. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/vq7sy>
- Irvine-Niakaris, C., & Kiely, R. (2015). Reading comprehension in test preparation classes: An analysis of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(2), 369–392. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.189>
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.

- Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 200–207. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01582.x>
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 281–315. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000115>
- Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice*, 2(3), 49–85. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eip-2015-0003>
- Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. Routledge.
- Johnston, B., & Goettsch, K. (2000). In search of the knowledge base of language teaching: Explanations by experienced teachers. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56(3), 437–468. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.56.3.437>
- Kachru, B. B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the canon* (Vol. 1). Hong Kong University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.28.3.07mes>
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2008). English as the official working language of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN): Features and strategies. *English Today*, 24(2), 27–34. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078408000175>
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English in ASEAN: Implications for regional multilingualism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(4), 331–344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.661433>
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). World Englishes and local cultures. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and culture* (pp. 460–470). Routledge.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2018). From EFL to ELF: The time is right. In S. Zein (Ed.), *Teacher education for English as a lingua franca* (pp. 191–203). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203730522-11>
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2020). English as an ASEAN lingua franca. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 725–740). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118791882.ch32>
- Kirkpatrick, A., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2020). English and language policies in East and Southeast Asia. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 81–105). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118791882.ch4>
- Konig, J., Lammerding, S., Nold, G., Rohde, A., Straub, S., & Tachtsoglou, S. (2016). Teachers' professional knowledge for teaching English as a foreign language: Assessing the outcome of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(4), 320–337. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487116644956>
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2015). Language ideologies: Emergence, elaboration, and application. In N. Bonvillian (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of linguistic anthropology* (pp. 95–108). Routledge.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). Dangerous liaison: Globalization, empire and TESOL. In J. Edge (Ed.), *(Re-) locating TESOL in an age of empire* (pp. 1–26). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kuncuhya, A. O., & Basikin, B. (2019). Professional development challenges for Indonesian English teachers. In S. Madya, W. A. Renandya, M. Oda, A. Triastuti, A. Ashadi, E. Andriyanti, & N. Hidayanto (Eds.), *English linguistics, literature, and language teaching in a changing era* (pp. 108–114). Routledge.
- Lamb, M., & Coleman, H. (2008). Literacy in English and the transformation of self and society in post-Soeharto Indonesia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(2), 189–205. <https://doi.org/10.2167/beb493.0>
- Lauder, A. (2008). The status and function of English in Indonesia: A review of key factors. *Makara, Sosial Humaniora*, 12, 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.7454/mssh.v12i1.128>
- Lauder, A. F. (2020). English in Indonesia. In K. Bolton, W. Botha, & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds.), *The handbook of Asian Englishes* (pp. 605–627). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118791882.ch26>
- Lengkanawati, N. S. (2015). EFL teachers' competence in the context of English curriculum 2004: Implications for EFL teacher education. *TEFLIN Journal*, 16(1), 79–92. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v16i1/79-92>
- Liddicoat, A., & Baldauf, R. B. (2008). Language planning in local contexts: Agents, contexts and interactions. In A. Liddicoat & R. Baldauf Jr (Eds.), *Language planning and policy: Language planning in local contexts* (pp. 3–17). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690647-002>

- Lie, A., Tamah, S. M., Trianawaty, T., Triwidayati, K. R., & Jemadi, F. (2019). English proficiency of secondary school teachers in Indonesia. *Beyond Words*, 7(2), 86–100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33508/bw.v7i2.1950>
- Liu, Y., Fisher, L., Forbes, K., & Evans, M. (2017). The knowledge base of teaching in linguistically diverse contexts: 10 grounded principles of multilingual classroom pedagogy for EAL. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 17(4), 378–395. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2017.1368136>
- MacKenzie, I. (2014). *English as a lingua franca: Theorizing and teaching English*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315890081>
- Mahdum, M., Hadriana, H., & Safriyanti, M. (2019). Exploring teacher perceptions and motivations to ICT Use in learning activities in Indonesia. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 18, 293–317. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4366>
- Maryani, L., & Martaningsih, S. T. (2015). Correlation between teachers' PCK (pedagogical content knowledge) and students' motivation in primary school. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 4(1), 38–44. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v4i1.4490>
- McKay, S. L. (2009). English as an international language: Where we are and where we need to go. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 5, 27–54.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, 46(4), 340–349. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.4.340>
- Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC). (2007). *Law No. 14 on Standard of academic qualification and teacher competence*.
- Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC). (2021). *Law No. 57 on Standard of national education*.
- Muhammad, G. (2003). *Celebrating Indonesia*. Ford Foundation.
- Munifatullah, F., Musthafa, B., & Sundayana, W. (2016). Indonesian EFL teachers professional knowledge development during their participation in TSG: A case study. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 62–72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n8p62>
- Musthafa, B., Hamied, F. A., & Zein, S. (2018). Enhancing the quality of Indonesian teachers in the EFL era: Policy recommendations. In S. Zein (Ed.), *Teacher education for English as a lingua franca: Perspectives from Indonesia* (pp. 175–190). Routledge.
- Myhill, D., Jones, S., & Watson, A. (2013). Grammar matters: How teachers' grammatical knowledge impacts on the teaching of writing. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 36(2), 77–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.07.005>
- Nguyen, T. T. M., Marlina, R., & Cao, T. H. P. (2020). How textbooks prepare students to use English in global contexts? An evaluation of the Vietnamese English textbooks from an English as an international language (EIL) perspective. *Asian Englishes*, 23(2), 184–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2020.1717794>
- Niakaris, C. I., & Kiely, R. (2014). Reading comprehension test preparation classes: An analysis of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(2), 369–392. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.189>
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>
- Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0718.pub2>
- Phillipson, R. (2013). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203857175>
- Prasojo, L. D., Habibi, A., Mukminin, A., & Yaakob, M. F. M. (2020). Domains of technological pedagogical and content knowledge: Factor analysis of Indonesian in-service EFL teachers. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(4), 593–608. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13437a>
- Qoyyimah, U., Singh, P., Exley, B., Doherty, C., & Agustawan, Y. (2020). Professional identity and imagined student identity of EIL teachers in Islamic schools. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 22(2), 121–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1833726>
- Rajadurai, J. (2007). Intelligibility studies: A consideration of empirical and ideological issues. *World Englishes*, 26(1), 87–98. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2007.00490.x>

- Reimers, F. M. (2020). Thinking multidimensionally about ambitious educational change. In F. M. Reimers (Ed.), *Audacious education purposes* (pp. 1–46). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41882-3_1
- Renandya, W. A., Hamied, F. A., & Nurkamto, J. (2018). English language proficiency in Indonesia: Issues and prospects. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(3), 618–629. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.3.4.618>
- Ricento, T. (Ed.). (2000). *Ideology, politics, and language policies*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.6>
- Richards, J. C., Li, B., & Tang, A. (1995). A comparison of pedagogical reasoning skills in novice and experienced ESL teachers. *RELC Journal*, 26(2), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829502600201>
- Sakhiyya, Z., Agustien, H. I. R., & Pratama, H. (2018). The reconceptualisation of knowledge base in the pre-service teacher education curriculum: Towards ELF pedagogy. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 49–56. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i1.11464>
- Sanchez, H. S., & Borg, S. (2014). Insights into L2 teachers' pedagogical content knowledge: A cognitive perspective on their grammar explanations. *System*, 44, 45–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.02.005>
- Sari, Y. R., Drajati, N. A., So, H.-J., & Sumardi, S. (2021). Enhancing EFL teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) competence through reflective practice. *TEFLIN Journal*, 32(1), 117–133. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v32i1/117-133>
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209–239. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000145>
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004>
- Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22.
- Smith, E. R., & Anagnostopoulos, D. (2008). Developing pedagogical content knowledge for literature-based discussions in a cross-institutional network. *English Education*, 41(1), 39–65.
- Smith, L. E. (1992). Spread of English and issues of intelligibility. In B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed., pp. 75–90). University of Illinois Press.
- Smith, L. E., & Nelson, C. L. (2019). World Englishes and issues of intelligibility. In C. L. Nelson, Z. G. Proshina, & D. R. Davis (Eds.), *The handbook of World Englishes* (2nd ed., pp. 430–446). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Spolsky, B. (2021). *Rethinking language policy*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Stockton, R. J. (2018). Recultured language in Indonesian English language teaching. *Indonesian JELT: Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 13(2), 131–153. <https://doi.org/10.25170/ijelt.v13i2.1454>
- Sugiharto, S. (2020). From policies as entities to policies as engagements: Transforming English language teachers into ELF-aware practitioners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 30(3), 413–428. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12293>
- Sundari, H. (2017). Classroom interaction in teaching English as a foreign language at lower secondary schools in Indonesia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(6), 147–154.
- Tedick, D. J. (Ed.). (2005). *Second language teacher education: International perspectives*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. Addison-Wesley Longman.
- Treffers-Daller, J. (2024). Unraveling translanguaging: A critical appraisal. *ELT Journal*, 78(1), 64–71. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccad058>
- Triastuti, A. (2020). Assessing English pre-service teachers' knowledge base of teaching: Linking knowledge and self-portrayal. *TEFLIN Journal*, 31(1), 108–138. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v31i1/108-138>
- Tupas, R. (2010). Which norms in everyday practice and why? In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 567–579). Routledge.

- Verloop, N., van Driel, J., & Meijer, P. (2001). Teacher knowledge and the knowledge base of teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 35, 441–461. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355\(02\)00003-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(02)00003-4)
- Vertovec, S. (2019). Talking around superdiversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 42(1), 125–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1406128>
- Walker, E. (2012). Literacy-oriented pedagogy in the advice of experienced language teachers as prospective practicum assessors. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 7(2), 182–198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2012.657605>
- Wei, L. (2022). Translanguaging as a political stance: Implications for English language education. *ELT Journal*, 76(2), 172–182. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab083>
- Wette, R. (2010). Professional knowledge in action: How experienced ESOL teachers respond to feedback from learners within syllabus and contextual constraints. *System*, 38, 569–579. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.09.017>
- Wirza, Y. (2020). Literacy sponsorship, language ideologies, and identity construction of EFL learners and users. In H. Lee & B. Spolsky (Eds.), *Localizing global English* (pp. 125–138). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003082705-9>
- Wirza, Y. (2018). A narrative case study of Indonesian EFL learners' identities. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 473–481. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v8i2.13313>
- Woods, D., & Cakir, H. (2011). Two dimensions of teacher knowledge: The case of communicative language teaching. *System*, 39, 381–390. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.010>
- Woolard, K. A. (1992). Language ideology: Issues and approaches. *Pragmatics*, 2(3), 235–249. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.2.3.01woo>
- Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23(1), 55–82. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.23.100194.000415>
- Zacharias, N. T. (2016). Exploring identity construction of student teachers practicing ELF pedagogy in a microteaching course. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 26(2), 321–339. <https://doi.org/10.1075/japc.26.2.08zac>
- Zein, S. (2018). From EFL to ELF: Implications for teacher education. In S. Zein (Ed.), *Teacher education for English as a lingua franca* (pp. 21–40). Routledge.
- Zein, S. (2019). English, multilingualism and globalisation in Indonesia: A love triangle: Why Indonesia should move towards multilingual education. *English Today*, 35(1), 48–53. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026607841800010X>
- Zein, S. (2020). *Language policy in superdiverse Indonesia*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429019739>
- Zein, S., Sukyadi, D., Hamied, F. A., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2020). English language education in Indonesia: A review of research (2011–2019). *Language Teaching*, 53(4), 491–523. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208>
- Zentz, L. (2017). *Statehood, scale, and hierarchy: History, language, and identity in Indonesia* (Vol. 9). Multilingual Matters.