TilburgPapers in CultureStudies

Paper 17

Linguistic biographies, expanding repertoires, and motivation in Global English language education

by

Lauren Zentz (College of Education, University of Arizona, USA)

laurenzentz@gmail.com

January 2012

Draft dissertation chapter:
Linguistic biographies, expanding repertoires, and motivation in Global English language education

The document below is a draft form of one data analysis chapter in my dissertation, *Global Language Identities and Ideologies in an Indonesian University Context*. For the purposes of this application, I have framed this chapter with an introduction and conclusion to facilitate its reading as a stand-alone document. In the chapter I present two case study analyses of students' linguistic biographies and expanding communicative repertoires as students in the English Department, and their motivations to further shape their expanding repertoires. I then relate these students' motivations in English language learning to current debates concerning English in globalization.

This chapter of my dissertation will be complemented by analysis of the sociohistorical and linguistic political contexts that locally, nationally and globally make these participants' repertoires and motivations possible. Some of the discussions that will constitute that chapter are presented in an article, "The porous borders of language and nation: English in Indonesia," which I have also included in this application.

As the reader engages with the chapter below, a brief explanation of my positionality (more details will be found in the above mentioned article) is pertinent. During the 2009-10 academic year I was a teacher-researcher in the undergraduate English Department (ED) of a university in Central Java, Indonesia. Over the course of two semesters I taught Sociolinguistics, Cross-Cultural Understanding, Introduction to Linguistics, and general speaking and writing courses. In my first semester Sociolinguistics class I invited students to participate in this year long dissertation project and eight students volunteered to do so. All of these students were in their fourth year of studies in the ED, finishing up their coursework and engaging with their required final theses. Their participation in this project included five individual and four focus group (I divided them at random into 2 groups of 4) interviews over the course of the year, as well as my joining them in activities on and off of campus.

The chapter below provides case studies of two of these research participants, under the pseudonyms of Satriya and Angelo.

**Linguistic biographies, expanding repertoires, and motivation
in Global English language education**

The critical teaching of languages, as addressed by Canagarajah (1999, 2006) and Pennycook (2001, 2010), must take into consideration the social spaces both in and outside of the classroom where students accept, negotiate, subvert and assess societal structures through language. Ethnographic methods are key to learning about these language activities and ideologies as in-depth and nuanced information is largely gained through extended periods of stay in a given locality (Canagarajah 1999). In this chapter I rely on the formal and informal experiences I shared with research participants in order to highlight attitudes and motivations toward language use locally, as well as these language learners' attitudes towards English in particular. This exploration will describe how linguistic biographies (Blommaert and Backus 2011) inform these individuals' current linguistic and communicative repertoires (Martin-Jones and Jones 2000; Garcia et al. 2007; McCarty et al. 2009; Rymes 2010), and how these together influence their attitudes toward language use and their motivations to continue to shape their unique identities in language. The chapter will conclude by relating language attitudes and motivations to debates about English target models for non-native speakers of English in expanding circle locations. Prior to analysis I present a brief description of communicative repertoires and motivation in language use.

Communicative repertoires and linguistic biographies

Blommaert and Backus (2011) recently revisit Dell Hymes' and John Gumperz' investigations of sociolinguistic systems, language functions, and fashions of speaking. Their approach to language aims to capture the processes of language in society, and as

1

such capture actions in language as they indicate our positioning and our aims to self-position (Silverstein 2004; Kramsch 2009; Pavlenko 2007) within the sociopolitical organization of our local, living contexts. Blommaert and Backus describe:

> "Repertoires are … indexical biographies, and analyzing repertoires amounts to analyzing the social and cultural itineraries followed by people, how they manoeuvered and navigated them, and how they placed themselves into the various social arenas they inhabited or visited in their lives." (2011, p. 22).

The sociolinguistic term *repertoire* early encountered in the works of Gumperz and Hymes (see Hymes 1972, 1985; Gumperz 1971, 1972) is regularly used to explore the resources people deploy and have access to in terms of stylization (Rampton 1995, 2003), use of linguistic codes (Blommaert 2005, 2010, 2011), and literacy practices (Martin-Jones and Jones 2000). Blommaert and Backus revisit the notions of linguistic and communicative competencies (cit. Hymes 1972; Gumperz and Hymes 1972; Gumperz 1982) in an effort to shed light on the nature of language acquisition and language skills assessment:

> "[L]inguistic and communicative competence should not be separate concepts, but…linguistic competence should be conceptualized *as* communicative competence, including everything that has always been included in linguistic competence as well as discourse patterns and cultural behavioral patterns" (2011, p. 7).

In this dissertation I use the phrases *communicative repertoire* (Martin-Jones and Jones 2000; McCarty et al. 2009; Rymes 2010), and *linguistic biography* (Blommaert and Backus 2011) to describe individuals' pasts, presents and futures in language. I

2

differentiate these terms, choosing to address "communicative"instead of "linguistic"

repertoires, because I found through my data analysis that talk of language in the past

often referred to linguistic codes and the activities that they co-occurred with, while

explorations into learners' motivations and talk about current and future language use

included factors far beyond mere language codes.

Communicative repertoires build on the notion that repertoires are hybrid,

translingual, and plural ("pluriliteracies") (McCarty et al. 2009; Martin-Jones and Jones

2000), and that language and literacy resources are deployed by individuals across

languages and in strategically diverse ways within individual and group norms of

communication (Gumperz 1971; Garcia et al. 2007; McCarty et al. 2009; Rymes 2010).

Our shared contexts consist of sets of possible worlds, possible identities, and possible

futures that apply uniquely to every individualized cross-tabulation of time, space, place,

and scale under their scope, and actions through language provide a map of how we

circulate through these contexts. To map individuals' linguistic biographies and

communicative repertoires, then, is to draw out how one experiences and calculates

her/his own movements in society, with language use indicating the complex,

multilayered and fluid situations that Hymes and Gumperz originally described

individuals and groups to move through.

Motivation in second or other language acquisition

In Weinreich and Saunderson's (2003) Identity Structure Analysis framework, a

present Self is composed of one's past experiences and is embodied as this present Self

plus a future, imagined Self. MacIntyre et al. (2009) prefer to explore earlier delineations

of "Possible Selves": "…a form of future-oriented self-knowledge that can be divided

into three distinct parts: the expected self, the hoped-for self and the feared self, each with varying impacts on motivation and self-regulation" (p. 46). The authors further relate this to "Self-Discrepancy Theory", as "[i]ndividuals are motivated to act in order to reaffirm their sense of identity with their present sense of self, or as a potential goal in the case of possible selves" (ibid.). Motivations to achieve an imagined self in language are recently addressed as pursuits of imagined Ideal or Ought-To Selves in the lived L2 Learning Experience (Dornyei and Ushioda 2009). Discrepancy between current and future self take the form of Ideal, Hoped-For, Ought-To and Feared Selves. Individuals weigh these extrinsic ("What I should be.") and intrinsic (What I would like/desire to be.") motivations to achieve certain identity characteristics which, as demonstrated below, often lie in individuals' perceptions of and reactions to the ways other people act.

Narrative approaches to such present, possible and future selves demonstrate individuals' reflections on how and who they are and would like to be through the different linguistic codes and communicative resources they acquire as they move through language learning trajectories (Kramsch 2009, Pavlenko 2007). Negotiations of identities in writing and in conversation present how individuals see themselves as members of their local social groupings, why they believe they find themselves in the subjectivities that they inhabit at present, and how they see those subjectivities changing in the future.

Angelo and Satriya: linguistic pasts, communicative presents and motivated futures in language

The analysis below presents Angelo and Satriya's linguistic biographies and current communicative repertoires, and the attributes that they are motivated to pursue as their English Department (ED) experiences move them to expand their communicative

repertoires beyond the options that they see as available to them in their home communities. It is understood here that learners' narratives and self-descriptions are social (co-)constructions and highly dependent on the narrators' interlocutor—here, myself as researcher, ED teacher, friend, foreigner, interviewer. My positionality in receiving participants' messages was highly influential in the images they presented to me, and the stances they took toward me and toward others they talked about (Duff 2011; Pavlenko 2007). I also point out that while this chapter addresses the topics of developing English language proficiency and expanding communicative repertoires, I by no means intend to assess these language users' proficiencies in any language (Duff 2011); I instead examine learners' experiences and beliefs regarding learning English as a Foreign Language and using language in communicating throughout their daily lives.

Satriya's linguistic biography

Early in life, Satriya told me, he had wanted to be an artist. He said he had excelled in drawing competitions in elementary school but then was made to turn his focus away from it in order to focus on his studies. His mom discouraged him from pursuing art as it would not guarantee him a regular salary and a secure future as, for instance, working for the government would (Satriya, Interview 4, 03/22/2010).

Throughout my interactions with Satriya over the course of the school year, I gathered a drawing of the linguistic atmosphere in which he had grown up. He described Javanese *ngoko* (an informal, peer-to-peer register) and Javanese-Indonesian to be the primary two forms of communication locally, with English as a prestige and high education marker, and Javanese *kromo* (high register) as a local and ethnic prestige marker. He grew up speaking primarily *ngoko* at home and with friends, with Indonesian

functioning as mostly an academic and pan-ethnic intra-Indonesian language, and the language of Indonesian national media and television shows. Satriya chose to major in English, he said, because he simply loved English. As he explained to me, he did not know that he loved English until about high school, when he realized that learning and speaking English was not about grammar; rather, it was about use and conversation. Before that point, Satriya had believed, as most other people continued to do through high school and beyond, that the English classroom was a place where students were forced to study something that would not be of any use in their own lives, or that they would never achieve enough proficiency in to make use of (Satriya Interview 3, 02/05/2010). He described that upon reuniting with his high school class, when he told them he was now an English major, his former peers agreed that he had made a choice that was very appropriate to the interests that he had displayed in high school.

Satriya described that nowadays, his communication took place largely in Indonesian, in most of his daily activities such as talking to his college friends, his girlfriend, who hailed from another island of Indonesia, and his debate students. Interethnic and academic relations at our university took place largely in Indonesian, and Satriya also explained that he regularly spoke in English with his ED and Debate Club peers. With regard to Javanese, while Satriya expressed the value of being able to speak its multiple registers, he also justified the fact that nobody his age really does speak them. Shifting notions of Javanese identity currently commingle with a higher scaled national identity, where Indonesian is largely replacing Javanese *kromo* in many formal situations. He stated:

> I see that the Javanese elders have become so understanding about the degradation of Javanese nowadays. They do not mind if the young people talk using Ngoko

alus [refined ngoko] to them as long as it is not Ngoko lugu [lower ngoko] which is considered as the most impolite one… (Satriya, SLX Assignment 3).

In a conversation one day, he expressed to me that the two forms of language he would be most proud to be able to speak are *kromo* and English; Indonesian, on the other hand, is there 'just to communicate', he said (fieldnotes October 19, 2009).

Satriya related his own increased use of Indonesian mostly to his university and academic life. Indonesian is a language that brings him closer to translocal, intra-national students at his university, and he also often addresses his debate students in Indonesian. In Satriya's case, he also spoke to his girlfriend in Indonesian, as she was Torajanese (Toraja is another island of Indonesia with different local languages and ethnicities, so she speaks little to no Javanese.) and not an English major (so she doesn't speak English). However, she made fun of his *medhok* ("country bumpkin") accent whenever he tried to express himself in Indonesian (fieldnotes October 19, 2009). It became clear at other times as well that Satriya understood 'his Indonesian' to be strongly ethnically marked, in a way that placed his accent low on a nationalized scale of language value. This became apparent beyond time spent with his girlfriend, when he described interactions with debate participants from Jakarta and other universities on Java. Satriya explained that he felt that the non-Javanese, elite university students he encountered did not want to get close to him and his other Javanese peers. As he wrote in an assignment:

> Even though they speak Indonesian I feel easier to get close with them compared to other debaters from UI [Universitas Indonesia, in Jakarta], STAN [Indonesian State College of Accountancy, in Jakarta], and UGM [Universitas Gadjah Mada, in Yogyakarta]. At that time, I felt that students from Jakarta and UGM do not want to close with my friends and me from [our university]. I think that the main reason why I can easily get close to them compared to other universities from Jakarta is because their accent is still close to my Javanese accent so it makes our communication easier although all of us speak using Indonesian. (Satriya, SLX Assignment 3)

In this way, on a nationalized educational scale he placed the three universities he mentioned, and their students, from two of the larger cities on Java, higher than his Javanese and smaller-university peers. The Indonesian language served as a language that unified participants in an "Indonesian space" beyond their separate localities; however, within this space a Javanese variety of Indonesian united Javanese students under a sort of 'pan-Javanese' identity that Satriya felt was lower on a nationalized value scale and that Jakarta students, whose universities and language use were higher scaled, must have held a certain disdain for.

English in Satriya's repertoire

As described in the previous section, Satriya presented his high school self to me as different from his peers at the time, who were intimidated by English.

> …there is reuni, then I said, "Aku masuk FBS." Mereka katanya, "Yah, kalau kamu lumrah." Gitu…"That's that's the place for you—belong to you." Because I love English from-- / *Dari dulu?* / From senior high school gitu, sudah suka. Jadi kaya mereka, "Ya, memang tempatmu, kamu memang bagus di situ." / *Ok.* / Jadi, ya. Tapi nggak ada kaya, "What's for?" gitu. Kalau mereka bilangnya, "Aku tu nggak mudeng." / *Ok.* / Kayanya kesane gini, "I would love to, to join ED, but I cannot speak English." Gitu.

> …there is a reunion, then I said, "I entered [the English faculty]." They said, "Yeah, for you that's appropriate." Like that. …"That's the place for you—that belongs to you." Because I loved English from-- / *From the beginning?* / From senior high school like that, I already liked it. So they were like, "Yeah, indeed that's your home, you really fit there." / *Ok.* / So, yeah. But nobody is like, "What's [English] for?" like that. For them they say, "I don't understand." / *Ok.* / The impression they give is like, "I would love to join the ED, but I cannot speak English." Like that. (Satriya, Interview 3, 02/05/2010)

It was during high school when Satriya discovered English to be a friendly subject if one approached it as another way to communicate instead of a useless set of grammar rules to memorize and recite. He did not feel the same intimidation many of his peers had felt early on, and at certain times over the course of our school year together he did

explain how English was useful in his life and how it was also in the lives of local non-English majors, as well. Many of these uses were related to the use of internet and computer applications:

> "English also has significant influence in a lot of interest, especially teenagers' interests. For example; if I want to update my status in Facebook, I have to understand some English words in Facebook, if I want to play Mafia Wars, or Grand Theft Auto, I must be able to read the instruction in English, and if I learn Adobe Photoshop to edit and design graphic, I must read the tutorials first which are, again, in English. Everyone can see how English connects to teenagers lives" (Satriya, SLX Final).

Upon entering the ED, and after some early discouraging feedback on his pronunciation from someon he described as an inexperienced teacher (Satriya, Interview 5, 05/15/2010), Satriya got himself involved in the English Debate Society (EDS). In EDS he did become an adjudicator, a position in which he judged the quality of other debators' performances. By the time he got through his year as adjudicator and finally felt skilled enough to become a debator, he had essentially aged out of the possibility of doing so. The team was already passing opportunities down to the newer EDers instead of older classmates like him (Satriya, Interview 1, 09/22/2009). He remained active in the group, though, and he also became a coach for the debate team of a high school neighboring the university.

Satriya's expanding communicative repertoire

In this section I explore how Satriya's participation in English language related activities shaped his communicative repertoire far beyond the addition of an English language code. The spaces where Satriya used English in daily life remained limited to the few contexts associated with interactions with ED and EDS peers, and some internet resources and computer applications. Through Satriya's descriptions I also noted,

though, that these contextually limited uses for English also remained specific to certain

functions of self-expression; functions which he claimed he had never been able to carry

out in the languages in which he grew up. English was a language in which Satriya

opined, rejected, disagreed, debated (Satriya, Interview 1, 09/22/2009). He described

how these behaviors had been strongly disallowed while he was growing up, in both

home and school contexts. Over the year it became clear, however, that these new

behaviors were expanding for Satriya beyond his communications in English. One day

Satriya described to me how the critical thinking skills that he had learned through the

ED and EDS could sometimes backfire if he tried to employ them in contexts outside of

English language and his EDS peers:

> *Do you think that that way of critical thinking is, apa. Where you can apply that in your life outside of FBS atau [or], will it be accepted by other people in your life? Gitu? Who maybe haven't learned like that or— /* Things that I don't like is that some people still not open minded. I mean, when we give suggestion like that then it will be considered an offended--eh, an offen--an offense to them. For example, when I have a karang taruna e--village meeting…Forum, but by the teenagers there. When I offer a suggestion, not, direct—eh—not-- Instead of they understand it first—instead of understanding my point first, but that there will be that, they said, I'm trying to show off. Like that. / *Oh do they really?* / For example if I fix something but too direct cut to the point then—then they will said "Ya why don't you do it then?" Then just, they just give it to me. I give the suggestion for e—one of the committee but they dare me like that. Ok, you—And then I will say "You don't want it then just give it to me." Like that. So it's not more mutual understanding or mutual suggestion from both of us but, it become more kind of conflict between us. (Satriya, Interview 5, 05/16/2010)

When describing these situations to me, Satriya did not question whether he had

been right or wrong; he simply found that the way his peers acted was unacceptable. I

presume that he felt a safety in describing the situation this way in conversation with me

because I was a person with whom he associated those same critical thinking skills that

he was trying to deploy. Our shared beliefs allowed him to stabilize himself in a way of thinking that to many of his community members was foreign. His critical thinking skills, Satriya came to find out, were not welcome everywhere, and this one time in his village meeting, when he tried to employ those skills within a different context and a different language from where he had learned them, his comments were received as snobby and unwelcome.

Satriya's peers rejected his violation of communicative custom in a language in which he was fluent. In the spaces where those critical thinking skills were acceptable in communication, however—generally in interactions with ED and especially EDS members—it was then the English language that ended up making Satriya feel disempowered. As he described, it was harder for him to feel empowered when his "attention is just right on my tongue" as it was when he spoke English (Satriya, SLX Assignment 3). Furthermore, this laborsome language production through English was not just physically difficult; Satriya mentioned in our third interview that it even made him feel emasculated! He pointed out to me that he felt like he sounded girly when he spoke English.

> *Dan apakah kamu merasa seperti apa, berubah kalau pakai bahasa Inggris? Berubah perasaan kamu atau, like personality atau, kebanggaan?* / I feel like, oh, no, when I speak like somehow, I don't know, like, girly. Too girly mungkin. / *Like apa?* / Cewek, terlalu cewek. / *Girly?* / Iya. Ngomongnya kaya--iramanya, when I speaking this is my intonation. Then I will like, slowing down and up and like that, kaya cewek, terlalu cewek, I don't know. / *(tertawa)* / Iya, itu kaya--gimana ya Bu. This is my Indonesian, jadi, ngomongku kalau orang Indonesia gi**ni int**onas**i**nya. But when I speak in English somehow, my intonation will change. I don't know, it goes up and down and, it sounds so not me. Gitu like that. / *Ok* / Kaya bukan aku, kaya terlalu cewek kayae, apa? Probably because the teacher, most of us are in e--are--female. / *Ok.* / Then, they speak like this…Ya, dan most of—in girl intonation. I don't know, because my role model is a girl, then I don't realize that I've already followed them. But after all my—because of my English is medhok, then it help me to show—like, I still man. / *Oh.* / Kayanya gitu. Walaupun, for me little bit like girly, but somehow my Javanese help me to show that I am medhok and, because medhok is considered, for me, a little bit rough, gitu. Jadinya agak 'Ya. This is a man.' Gitu. / *So, kalau bicara bahasa Inggris medhok itu merasa lebih--* / Jantan / *Jantan, gitu?* / Iya, lebih--lebih cowok. / *Cowok.* / But if totally using English intonation then so--eh, ya--will be sound so girly.

And do you feel like what, you change if you use English? Change your feeling or, like personality or, pride? / I feel like, oh, no, when I speak like somehow, I don't know, like, girly. Too girly maybe. / *Like what?* / Girly, too girly. / *Girly?* / Yeah. My speech is like—the intonation, when I'm speaking this is my intonation. / *Oh.* / Then I will like, slowing down and up and like that, like a girl, too girly, I don't know. / *(laughter)* / Yeah, it's like, how do I explain it ma'am. This is my Indonesian, so, my speech as an Indonesian person the intonation is like this. But when I speak in English somehow, my intonation will change. I don't know, it goes up and down and, it sounds so not me. Like that. / *Ok.* / Like it's not me, like too girly like, what? Probably because the teacher, most of us are in uh—are— female. / *Ok.* / Then, they speak like this…Yeah, and most of—in girl intonation. I don't know, because my role model is a girl, then I don't realize that I've already followed them. But after all my—because of my English is medhok, then it help me to show—like, I'm still a man. / *Oh.* / It seems like that. Even though, for me it's a little bit like girly, but somehow my Javanese helps me to show that I am medhok and, because medhok is considered, for me, a little bit rough, like that. So it's a little "Yeah. This is a man." Like that. / *So, if you speak medhok English it feels more--* / Masculine. / *Masculine, like that?* / Yeah, more—more guy. / *Guy.* / But if I'm totally using English intonation then so—uh, yeah—will sound so girly. (Satriya, Interview 3, 02/05/2010)

He hypothesized that this characteristic of his English speaking could be due to the fact that the majority of his English Department teachers were female. However, and interestingly, the same *medhok*-ness that Satriya claimed that his girlfriend had demeaned him for, and that he felt created distance between his peers and students from more prestigious universities on Java, here gave him a sense of value, strength or rootedness when speaking English. In English, his *medhok*-ness asserted his worth as a Javanese man.

The addition to Satriya's communicative repertoire of not only English, but also of the critical thinking skills that he had learned through English language educational spaces, presented some destabilizing forces to Satriya's local identity. He tried to incorporate his new critical thinking skills outside of the spaces where he'd learned them, but found that he was not welcome to do so. And when he spoke a language that would allow him to freely express these skills, he found himself clumsy and effeminate.

Analysis of Satriya's repertoire: stabilizing the self in an expanding communicative identity

The spaces where Satriya found that he could use his critical thinking skills were largely associated with the ED and EDS; however, at these times the unwieldy English language itself undercut the force with which he had wanted to convey his sentiments. When Satriya did not fully achieve this ideal sense of empowerment, he then stabilized his identity with another aspect of the same quality that in Indonesian he was demeaned for presenting. His imperfection as *medhok* Javanese Indonesian subject now served to counterbalance a felt sense of effemination by tapping into his sense of masculinity as a Javanese man speaking in English.

Despite this felt lack of control that Satriya conveyed to me over the English language, he shared with me that even though he had difficulties in producing English, a certain piece of his identity might very well be at home as a speaker of the English language:

> I feel so comfort when I speak Javanese. However, I often feel awkward when I speak Indonesian to people who are especially skilled Indonesian speakers because I do a lot of code switching from Indonesian to Javanese whenever I think the Indonesian words cannot bring my expression as good as Javanese. As the result, they seem to get difficulties to get my messages. I think Javanese is the language where I belong to. Nevertheless, I also feel so comfort when I speak English as long as I speak English in certain context. I also feel that English can carry out my intention or feeling compared to Indonesian. For example, I can translate English to Javanese and Javanese to English rather than English to Indonesian and vice versa in translation class. Is English also the place where I belong? (Satriya, SLX Assignment 3)

In our year together, Satriya continued to develop an aptitude at navigating his expanding linguistic and communicative repertoires. He was shaping and re-shaping the ways in which he used languages in his local context, the ways that he conveyed messages through those languages, and the ways in which he viewed himself in relation

to local others. Through English he maintained a unique cohort of friends, peers, and students with whom he could speak English, largely in contexts behind closed doors, in academically-related (including and especially in Debate) spaces that were simultaneously within and outside of his local Javanese- and Indonesian-language dominated spaces. As he advanced through schooling, the presence of Indonesian and English increased in his daily life. Indonesian seemed just a language of circumstance for him, garnering, as he described it to me, little affective attachment and even a sense of being demeaned for being his Javanese self in Indonesian, while at the same time there was strong motivation by necessity for its use as the common academic and inter-ethnic Indonesian language. Satriya maintained a strong pride in being Javanese, however, and although it could devalue his sense of identity in a national marketplace, when he spoke English, his *medhok* masculinity actually helped him to feel more secure. He wanted English in his life: he would continue to include it as a part of his repertoire, but he would remain fully Javanese, *medhok*, and Indonesian while speaking it.

The critical thinking skills that Satriya gained in ED and EDS activities made him feel empowered and useful in situations that merited critical thinking. However, this style of interaction was not always a welcome addition in his local Javanese society, and so he found that sometimes this skill set pushed him to the periphery of his home culture. His developing critical thinking skills had blended across all of his languages, demonstrating how his education in the English faculty, in expanding his repertoire of linguistic codes, had done much more: it had changed his outlook on life and his ways of communicating and thinking in his local Javanese and Indonesian communities.

Angelo's linguistic biography

Though Angelo had not necessarily anticipated majoring in English in college, he demonstrated that he was drawn to it early in life because of its affective allure in media and advertising outlets, among others. Having grown up in a fairly large city and in a Chinese-Indonesian family, the forms of language he grew up speaking were informal Indonesian and Javanese, and mixtures thereof, with occasional Chinese terms employed as well (I cannot speak to the frequency of these terms as he only twice relayed any to me: once in a journal piece where he quoted elder family members speaking in Javanese-Indonesian but using the Chinese terms *Zhongguo ren* and *Indi ren* for Chinese and Indonesian ethnicities, respectively (Angelo, Journal entry, 01/19/2010); and one time he spoke to me in Mandarin, which I did not understand (Angelo, Interview 5, 05/15/2010)). Due to this and an absence of Javanese language in written forms, popular culture, and the formal interactions in which Angelo participated, he claimed that he had never had much interest in learning formalized registers of Javanese. Indonesian was his preferred language for formal interactions with elders (whereas traditional Javanese culture would expect the use of formal registers of Javanese that are currently declining in use), and mixtures of Indonesian and Javanese were suitable for other Indonesian friends across ethnicities.

English held for Angelo a certain prestige from early on. When he described to me some of his early classroom language learning experiences, he claimed that he'd always been motivated to learn English and to excel in English courses. Learning Javanese in the classroom, however, seemed utterly irrelevant, as what was taught there (*kromo*, largely formal language) was not the Javanese language that people actually used in his communities (*ngoko*, informal Javanese).

Memang dari awal memang udah suka dulu. / *OK. Lebih suka bahasa Inggris?* / Apanya? / *Jadi lebih suka bahasa Inggris?* / Ya. Dari dulu. / *Apakah kelasnya sendiri lebih menarik atau apa? Kenapa berbeda?*/ Nggak juga sih. Kalau aku, pengalamanku pribadi memang karena mindset-nya. / OK / Dari awal itu udah nganu—jadi pelajaran bahasa Jawa waktu kecil, yang pertama kali aku dapat itu udah nggak enak. / *Ehe* / Udah nggak enak, jadi dipaksa harus bisa menulis Jawa, dipaksa harus tahu bahasa Krama, terus bahasa gini, gini, gini itu jadi nggak suka. / *Ya. OK.* / Tapi kalau bahasa Inggris, bahkan sebelum belajar, sebelum tahu pelajarannya itu sendiri tu udah nggak asing tho. Kan aku, soalnya aku apa ya, suka main game. Suka nonton film. Jadi sebelum tahu pelajaran bahasa Inggris itu sendiri, exposurenya udah ada. / *OK* / Kalau main game pasti pakai bahasa Inggris, kan? "New game." "Continue." Atau judul-judulnya itu pasti exposurenya sudah ada. / *Ya* / Film kan juga. "The End." / *Aha* / Terus misalnya apa ya, dulu film apa sich, "The apa" gitu. Terus sampai aku tanyakan, "'The itu', apa artinya?" Terus e, "'Mommy' itu apa?" "'Mommy' itu ini." "Bedanya sama mother apa?" Gitu. / *OK, OK. The exposure.* / He'e exposurenya…Dari sebelumnya udah ada exposure ke sana jadi kan nggak asing kan. / *Iya* / Justru dan justru karena nggak asing itu, mempelajarinya juga, "Lho, ini kan yang waktu itu aku pernah baca," "Ini kan waktu itu yang aku pernah lihat." / *OK. Tetapi juga ada exposure bahasa Jawa?* / Sangat minim. / *OK* / Sangat minim. Karena di keluargaku nggak ada yang bisa bahasa Jawa one hundred percent. Termasuk yang sampai aksara Jawanya dan sampai, termasuk bahasa krama-kramanya yang ini itu nggak ada yang seratus persen bisa. Dan itu memang aku pertama kali belajar itu murni baru, sangat bener-bener baru. / *OK* / Diperkenalkan dengan huruf Jawa baru. Dan aku nggak merasa interested, merasa, "Useless lah belajar ini semua." So, I learned that not because I want to but because I have to.

Indeed from early on I already like [English]. / *Okay. You preferred English?* / What? / *So you like English more?* / Yeah. From the beginning. / *Were the classes alone more interesting or what? Why was it different?* / Not that either. For me, my own personal experience was indeed because of my mindset. / *Okay.* / From the beginning already—so Javanese classes when I was little, from the very first time it already didn't feel good. / *U-huh.* / It already didn't feel good, so I was forced, had to be able to write in Javanese, forced to know kromo, forced in language this, this, this like that so I didn't like it. / *Yeah. Okay.* / But for English, even before studying it, before knowing the class material alone it already wasn't foreign. You see for me, the thing is I what, liked to play games. Like to watch films. So before I knew about English class material, I already had exposure to it. / *Okay.* / When playing games for sure they use English, right? "New game." "Continue." Or titles like that for sure there was already exposure. / *Yeah.* / Films, too. "The End." / *Uh-huh.* / Then for example what yeah, early on whatever film, "The what", like that. That to the point where I would ask, "'The that', what's that mean?" Then uh, "'Mommy', what's that?" "'Mommy' that's this." "What's the difference between that and 'mother'?" Like that. / *Okay, okay. The exposure.* / Uh-huh, the exposure. From beforehand there was already exposure in that vein so like it wasn't foreign, see. / *Yeah.* / And directly because it wasn't foreign, studying it too was like "Hey, this I've read this before," "This I've seen before." / *Okay but there was also exposure to Javanese?* / So minimal. / *Okay.* / So minimal. Because in my family nobody can speak one hundred percent Javanese. Including Javanese script and kromo that's like this or like that, nobody can one hundred percent. And that the first time I studied it pure, it was truly really new. / *Okay.* / Introduced to new Javanese script. And I didn't feel interested, I felt, "Well this is useless studying all of this." So, I learned that not because I want to but because I have to. (Angelo, Interview 2, 11/27/2009).

Angelo did not come from a family of Javanese L1 speakers, and had never seen Javanese in print before entering a classroom. Nobody spoke the language he was being taught there. It was a formal register of Javanese, and a writing system that was barely in use currently, and he saw no purpose for its use. English, on the other hand, was everywhere in little bits and pieces. On TV, in films, in video games. Seeing those words in such attractive places piqued Angelo's curiosity, and with that Angelo was able to take off and excel in an English language classroom. On the other hand, Javanese class was just a drag; a forced and unwelcome lesson; a place where he got bad grades.

Despite having pursued the language learning focus stream in his high schooling (Angelo, Interview 1, 10/06/2010), Angelo entered the ED not entirely of his own will. He had first preferred to go to Bali or Jakarta to enter a hospitality school, but his family had wanted him to stay closer to home. Then, upon picking the only university close enough to home but not in the same town, Angelo had wanted to major in Arts, with a focus on music. However, his family vetoed this as well, claiming that arts were for private lessons; they were not a substantial nor lucrative enough topic area for him to take on as a major (Angelo, Interview 1, 10/06/2010). So Angelo stuck with English and pursued his musical interests outside of coursework, eventually managing to add in a minor alongside his English major. While at university, Angelo was highly motivated to be involved academically and in extracurriculars, from his choral clubs to ED leadership and organizational activities, as well as volunteer English teaching in the community.

Angelo's motivation

Throughout many of our conversations I deduced some of Angelo's motivations based on his statements about preferred habitus and styles that he described to me through his descriptions of other people, which included, similar with Satriya's expanding repertoire, much more than language *per se*.

Em... do you think that e... caranya yang kamu sekarang belajar untuk menjadi guru, apakah cara mengajar sama dengan cara mengajar guru-guru yang kamu pernah... pernah punya di... / Well I was influence by some of the teachers I have ever... some teachers who have ever taught me. By means of... the way I speak. The way I... the way I speak, the way I teach, the way I prepare the materials it was like, ya somehow influenced... influence by them. / *By who?* / Many people said that the way I speak ya, you know e, the I—the way I speak especially in, ya in speaking, I sound like [prof 1]. Because ya--iya like this one. I'm not as fluent as her, but ya, ya, the "ya, ya". / *O, oke. Alright. Okay.* / It was very [prof 1]. Terus very [prof 1]. And teaching style, I mean how I act in classroom is like e... you know, a mixture between... I don't know, maybe [prof 2] and Rosa. … Ya. I should say yes. I admire Rosa's speaking. Rosa being a person actually. Rosa being a teacher, Rosa being a manager, Rosa being a director. And I admire also [prof 1]. Not admire actually but, ya, because I'm like, like quite close to [prof 1]. / *Oke, oke. So, itu lebih ke personal?* / Personal, karena.... karena merasa dekat, jadi mengambil kelasnya. Dan sering mengambil kelasnya. / *Okay. What do you admire about [prof 1]?* / Admire not really sih. Not really admire but-- / *Kenapa bisa dekat?* / E—maksudnya apa ya? E, ya, she talks fluently, and—very very fluently and apa ya. Explanation itu clear enough gitu lho. Very clear. Jadi, ndak apa namanya--ya explanation-nya itu gampang diterima, mudah diterima.

Do you think that the way that you now study to become a teacher, is your way of teaching the same as the ways of teaching of teachers that you've ever had in.. / Well I was influence by some of the teachers I have ever... some teachers who have ever taught me. By means of... the way I speak. The way I... the way I speak, the way I teach, the way I prepare the materials it was like, ya somehow influenced... influence by them. / *By who?* / Many people said that the way I speak ya, you know e, the I—the way I speak especially in, ya in speaking, I sound like [prof 1]. Because ya--iya like this one. I'm not as fluent as her, but ya, ya, the "ya, ya". / *O, oke. Alright. Okay.* / It was very [prof 1]. Then very [prof 1]. And teaching style, I mean how I act in classroom is like e... you know, a mixture between... I don't know, maybe [prof 2] and Rosa. … Ya. I should say yes. I admire Rosa's speaking. Rosa being a person actually. Rosa being a teacher, Rosa being a manager, Rosa being a director. And I admire also [prof 1]. Not admire actually but, ya, because I'm like, like quite close to [prof 1]. / *Okay. What do you admire about [prof 1]?* / Admire not really sih. Not really admire but— / *How come you're close?* / I mean what ya, ya she talks fluently and—very very fluently and what ya, explanation it's clear enough, like that. Very clear. So, it's not what it is, ya the explanation is easily received, easily received. (Angelo, Interview 5, 05/15/2010).

We spoke many times over the year about Rosa, and I would say that she was one of Angelo's most admired ED faculty members. My friendship with her may have

primed Angelo to talk about her more with me than he would have about other members of the faculty, but she did stand out among faculty to many students.

Angelo admired Rosa's habitus—the ways in which she presented herself. To him, Rosa was somebody who had high standards, who did not put up with anybody's "stuff", and who I myself as a "Westerner" could have direct, Western-style confrontations with, instead of the indirect communication style commonly attributed to Javanese culture and which he distanced himself from ideologically:

> Sementara kalau orang, orang di budaya timur seperti di—di Ambon, atau di Poso, atau mungkin di Western culture, mereka cenderung lebih direct. / E... / Dalam artian-- / *I think sangat tergantung.* / If there is a conflict or ada sesuatu nggak suka atau apa, nggak disuka dari seseorang, e, for example, e, we have a problem, then you as—sebagai orang dari budaya Western apakah akan nggrundel with Rosa or PA or et cetera, and said Angelo is like this or Angelo is like that atau you just talk to me directly? 'I feel irritated because you e-e-e-e.' Gitu. / *Kalau saya sendiri, biasanya lebih direct.* / The second one, kan? / *Iya.* / Nah, I myself prefer the same method...

> All the while if people, people in Eastern culture like in Ambon or in Poso, or maybe in Western culture, the tend to be more direct. / *Uh--* / In the sense-- / *I think that really depends.* / If there is a conflict or there's something they don't like or what, something someone they don't like about someone, uh, for example, uh, we have a problem, then you as—as a person from a Western culture are you going to talk behind their back with Rosa or PA or et cetera, and say Angelo is like this or Angelo is like that or you just talk to me directly? 'I feel irritated because you blah blah blah.' Like that. / *For me personally, usually more direct.* / The second one, right? / *Yeah.* / Now, I myself prefer the same method. (Angelo, Interview 2, 11/27/2009).

Another time when Rosa came up as the topic of conversation, he described her very positively, using such adjectives as "tough", "elegant", and *mandiri* [independent], and he also stated (more than once over the course of the year) that he admired Rosa because of a response she had once given to a class he was in, where she claimed, as I paraphrased in my fieldnotes, "There are 20,000-30,000 people here. Do you think I'm gonna spend my time making sure every one of them likes me?" (Fieldnotes, Jan 10, 2010 and Wawancara 4).

Analysis of Angelo's motivation

19

I highlight in Angelo's positioning of Rosa, and of himself in relation to her, an aspect of his "Ideal Self" (Dornyei and Ushioda, 2009). This is a characteristic that he already may see himself as possessing to some degree, but that he wishes to increase in himself. The discrepancy between his current self and an ideal, or "possible" self (MacIntyre et al. 2009), that which still kept his own self-perceived identity somewhat wanting for what he saw in Rosa's, formed a potential source of motivation for Angelo. This motivation indeed went beyond, but encompassed English. Angelo admired Rosa's "high standards" (Angelo, Interview 2, 11/27/2009), but he also wanted to acquire perhaps a bit of "English the way Rosa does it". This English was represented to a small extent in the form of language Rosa used as an English instructor (Angelo, Interview 5, 05/15/2010); but Angelo more often addressed the ways that she acted when she spoke both English *and* Indonesian. Rosa presented herself, in local contexts, speaking both Indonesian and English (with only some Javanese as she was raised on a different island of Indonesia), as a member of the local and national communities as well as with globalized or Western, elite sensibilities—independence, impressive standards, comfort in the fact that it is probable that she will displease some people; and these are the qualities that Angelo wished to emulate in any language.

Discussion: Expanding repertoires and motivation

The intent of this analysis has been to examine language use and motivation in expanding linguistic repertoires. As seen in this analysis, these participants' language use and also the habitus characteristics (Bourdieu 1991), presentations of self (Goffman 1959), and new and different ways of thinking that they learned through their experiences in the ED interwove, and formed individuals not just with new languages but with new

repertoires that included and transcended clearly defined linguistic code-bound notions of languages and of second language acquisition. This analysis has shown that when second language acquisition takes place, a socialization complex that is at once uniquely individual, strongly influenced by prior socialization, and simultaneously tied to collective ED, Javanese, and Indonesian experiences informs language acquisition and the expansion of communicative skills across linguistic codes. ED students take most of the same classes, share the same professors and geographical location; but all have diverse biographies, current interests, and future desires, and it is these individual forces that shape their motivations, desires for continuing socializations, and expanding communicative repertoires, which are based partly in and inseparably from explicit choice among language codes.

The above analysis is relevant to language acquisition and its influences to a broader extent on individuals' communicative resources across contexts. In the specific case at hand, where participants are learners of English, their attitudes and motivations as English language learners and speakers tie directly into conversations surrounding the nature of the spread and teaching of English in EFL contexts and globally as well. I here turn to a brief analysis of how Angelo and Satriya presented their thoughts to me with regard to who speaks English and how it should be spoken by themselves as non-native speakers of the language who live outside of "central" English countries (Kachru 1985, 2005).

English in Globalization: an Indonesian Perspective

Who should we sound like?

Current debates of how English should be taught in periphery and expanding circle (Kachru 2005) countries range from adamant support of standardized native speaker target varieties (usually General American or Received Pronunciation, see Jenkins (2007)), to attempts at standardizing a Lingua Franca Core that contains the basic amount of characteristics necessary for speakers to come together from anywhere around the world and communicate successfully with each other (Jenkins 2000, 2007). Critical pedagogies of English language education in peripheral countries promote learner choice of English target language form based on learners' specific needs and individual interests (Canagarajah 1999, 2006; Jenkins 2007). They acknowledge, however, the daunting amount of gatekeeping mechanisms holding in place a system of global English hegemony where learners, teachers, and researchers, in central, peripheral, and expanding circle locations, both tacitly and explicitly endorse native-speaker (NS) models of English and of English speakers (Jenkins 2007).

A rather urgent topic in current ESL literature, then, revolves around whom the English language belongs to, who English language learners should sound like or model their speech after, and whether and how much English's spread can really be treated as globally democratizing, locally meaningful, or hegemony in full force. Many models have theorized the spread and impact of English (Kachru 2005; Phillipson 1992, 2008; Bolton 2000; Gupta 1998), whether English language learners identify with a global English community (Ryan 2006; Lamb 2004, 2009), and many suggestions have been offered regarding who should teach English and how it should be taught to non-native speakers (Canagarajah 2006, 2007, 2008; Pennycook 2001; Jenkins 2007). In this section

I turn to Satriya and Angelo's statements concerning the importance that they place on

who English belongs to and how English should be used.

Satriya

As described in the previous section, until high school Satriya had joined his peers

in really not taking much interest in English. It was just another course requirement that

seemed irrelevant to the actual life skills they might make use of. It was not until high

school that Satriya learned that English was not a set of rules to be followed, but rather a

communicative resource (Satriya, Interview 3, 02/05/2010). As such, his change in

attitude toward the language allowed him to take more command of it and to seek out

ways to be a successful communicator through it. Satriya largely sought out this

communicative fluency in the Debate Society, where the focus as he explained it to me

lay largely in getting one's point across clearly and in the format required for debate

competitions.

> …coherence…The main point if people speak utterance they right is, the point is
> that being e reader or hearer oriented, right? People will get their points. So, e, I
> learn it from English Department that I use—I had to use this, e, these urutan,
> these steps first. To make it become, e, more—make people understand you. I
> ever learned that people—when people, couldn't und—from their expressions
> when they didn't understand me, then if I don't, e if I—if the people cannot
> understand that, then I have to change my e, my what. My speaking—no, not my
> speaking. My, mengganti caraku [change my way]. The way I share it. (Satriya,
> Interview 5, 05/16/2010)

This was a rule that Satriya had learned both generally for speaking to any interlocutor, as

well as a teaching strategy as he went through his student teaching practicum: "…we

don't force the students to understand us, but we make ourselves become, eh, make

ourselves understandable for the students" (Satriya, Interview 5, 05/16/2010). It was also

a strategy he adopted in his role as high school debate club coach: "this debate club, it is not a grammar club, so I allow them to make a mistake in grammar" (ibid.).

Satriya recognized that grammar was not where it was at because he was a non-native speaker: "My grammar still me—messed up. Ehe. For the accuracy, em, ya, basically because we are not native, I think that, that's okay for me. I'm not person who bother on the matter of grammar" (ibid.). In fact, he located a role model among the ED faculty who had been able to demonstrate to him that English does not belong to "native speakers".

> Because he is not a native-oriented. I mean that we should have--use Western as our bible. I mean, western kind of the bible but, we have our own language, we has our own English. That's why, as lo-- He believe that as long our meaning is intelligible then that's okay, totally okay then. That's why I like his English. Atau, we are—the English is intelligible but that doesn't mean we can say, e, say without—e say whatever instead of we want but still there is a rule. I mean, still there is—coherence is still important. Then content is still important. So, it is not totally that you can make your own English but, you should still follow the rules of English. That's the point of learning English I guess. That's—that's why I feel that he is a good learner of English. That, ya, we are not—we don't have to follow the western, but ya we have to follow on the certain aspect. (Satriya, Interview 5, 05/16/11)

This professor had made a very strong impression on Satriya by conveying that learning English does not mean sounding like a Westerner—"we have our own English." English, while still a formalized language with rules that need to be followed in order for basic understanding to take place, belonged to English language learners and native speakers alike.

Contradictorily, however, Satriya admitted later in the same interview that he wanted to learn from native speakers. An assistant debate coach, who was a guest teacher from the US, really impressed Satriya with her "explanations", "analog[ies]", and "supporting evidence" with such "coherence". He pointed out:

And compared to me, I only speak on the second level, only about until the explanations, but I cannot bring the analogy really down to earth because, ya, my students are senior high school. They don't really understand uh, uh, the explanation of why Century Banks should not given uh, any bail out. (Satriya, Interview 5, 05/16/2010)

It seems that Satriya felt limited from achieving a Western and NS proficiency and argument structure not only by his limited English language skills but also by the understanding level that his students had regarding the topic material (Indonesia at the time was undergoing the same bank bailouts that the US and many other governments around the world were carrying out at the time). He couldn't express the message he wanted with the clarity he wanted because he felt limited by both his own non-native English and his young NNS audience, it seemed.

In a final statement, Satriya reveals a belief that Western forms of argumentation, and communication in general, are superior to local norms:

> So [US assistant] can really give us more analogy—I don't know probably the just your own method. The method of Westerners? I don't know. That's what-- / *The method of Westerners, the debate method?* / No, not debate. The, ya, when you speak or when you write or when you convey your points to the people. Is that the way you compare it? Because it makes me, "Bingo. Ya, we got it." / *You're your debate style?* / No, not the debate style, no. I mean, every day. The writing style-- / *Ok.* / The way you speak. / *Like, are you asking is our--* / Those native speakers-- / *Right* / Have a some method as you, or some procedures when they speak to others or write for others? / *Mungkin tidak semua.[Maybe not everyone.]* (Satriya, Interview 5, 05/16/2010).

While Satriya was clearly willing to declare an ideology concerning language use where US English is not in hegemonic control of English as it globalizes, when it came down to conveying one's point, it seems that Satriya still believed US styles to reign supreme.

Angelo

> …I think kalau Indonesia jadi, mastery priority nggak juga. Kalau bahasa inggris jadi mastery priority, mungkin. Mungkin, karena, in-school curriculum bahkan dari elementary kan juga pasti

orang, se—sekarang setiap sekolah pasti ada pelajaran bahasa inggris. Gitu lho. Itu mungkin a— itu mungkin juga karena, e, they realize the role of English as a—an international language.

…I think as for Indonesian, mastery priority no. But English as a master priority, maybe. Maybe, because in-school curriculum even from elementary also for sure people, now every school for sure has English. Like that. That's maybe—that's maybe also because, uh, they realize the role of English as an international language. (Angelo, Interview 2, 11/27/2009)

Angelo recognized that English is clearly an instrument that people must procure in order to get a leg up in the professional world. However, the coolness factor in English is not to be dismissed: much English use among his fellow Indonesians, he claimed, was because it was a cool tool to be able to show off.

> *Kalau belajar bahasa Inggris apakah itu terlihat mem... mewesternisasikan diri atau apakah itu terlihat e... belajar bahasa Inggris saja?* / Ya.... sebenarnya tergantung orangnya sih. Ada yang mem... belajar Inggris karena ya mem... memang butuh. Ingin dan butuh. Ada yang ingin supaya terlihat wah. Tergantung orangnya.

> *Study English is that seen as Westernizing oneself or is it seen as study English only?* / Ya, actually it depends on the person. There are some who study English because ya, they really need to, want and need. There are some who want to so they're seen as flashy. It depends on the person. (Angelo, Interview 5, 05/15/2010)

When I asked Angelo questions revolving around the ownership of English, he, much like Satriya, claimed that English is not the property of "native speakers", that there were local Indonesian models of English speakers that he preferred to model himself after for reasons both of personal closeness and personal and professional style.

> *In terms of a person, who would you like to sound like kalau bicara bahas—kalau ngomong bahasa Inggris e... who would you like to sound like?* / Excuse me? / *Like... mungkin kalau dosen-dosen FBS atau kalau nonton televisi... Is there like an accent or way of speaking yang kamu mau mengimitasi... berimita... imitate atau...* / No, tapi kalau fluency mungkin ya [prof1], [prof2], Rosa ya. / *Is it important to you to sound like a native speaker atau...* / No. / *No? Kenapa tidak?* / Yang penting fluent dan yang, yang penting, yang penting e, people can understand what—what I say.

> *In terms of a person, who would you like to sound like if speaking—if talking in English. Who would you like to sound like?* / Excuse me? / *Like, maybe if the FBS professors, or if you watch TV…Is there like an accent or way of speaking that you want to imitate or…* / No, but if fluency maybe ya [prof1], [prof2], Rosa ya. /

Is it important to you to sound like a native speaker or... / No. / *No? Why not?* / What's important is to be fluent and what's important, what's important, people can understand what—what I say. (Angelo, Interview 5, 05/15/2010)

However, his belief about this democratic state of English was, like Satriya's, rather permeable, where a sense of "proper English" is still deferred specifically to speakers of US standardized English over other NS varieties:

Learning English misalnya, learning English or learning foreign language kan selalu diajarkan bahasa Indonesia--bahasa Inggris yang baku, kan? / *Ehe* / Termasuk pronunciation atau aksen kan juga diajarkan, proper American--proper English. Not, not apa, Australian English yang "Ya, you know lah," just like this. And just like what [AUS visiting professor] said. [AUS visiting professor]'s accent is Australian, kan? / *Ya.* / And when she said "You perform" and "Will you perform [tudaɪ]?" OK. "[tudaɪ]. [daɪ]. [daɪ]." "Oh [tudeɪ]." I mean [tudeɪ]—OK he means "[tudeɪ]." OK. / (*L laughs*)

Learning English for example, learning English or learning foreign langauge see it's always proper English that's taught, right? / *U-huh.* / Including pronunciation or accent, it's also proper American—proper English that's taught. Not, not what, Australian English that's "Ya, you know lah," just like this. And just like what [AUS visiting professor] said. [AUS visiting professor]'s accent is Australian, right? / *Ya.* / And when he said "You perform," and "Will you perform [tudaɪ]?" OK. "[tudaɪ]. [daɪ]. [daɪ]." "Oh [tudeɪ]." I mean [tudeɪ]—OK he means "[tudeɪ]." OK. / (*L laughs*) (Angelo, Interview 2, 11/27/2009)

In part due to Australia's proximity and closer relationship among the four primary English language nations with Indonesia, the presence of Australian visiting scholars and teachers was common in our department (with US teachers no less present). However, Angelo was not the only focus group participant over the course of the year to express to me his difficulty in understanding Australian accents. The ideology surrounding this difficulty tended to be that Australian English is "weird" or difficult to understand (Dian, Interview 3, February 2, 2010); however, I assert that this clearly relates to amounts of exposure to speaking styles, where Western hemisphere and especially North American Englishes are taught and flow through Indonesian media,

entertainment, and internet resources with much greater frequency than do Australian

dialects.

Global English and the regulation of linguistic form

The last bit of evidence I offer with regard to hegemony in English globally is that

the TOEFL is a standardized test that relies on US and UK standards for English

proficiency (Jenkins 2007).

> …English itu pentingnya karena gini aja. Sebatas—itu bahasa internasional. If you can master English or if you know English, it will be—it will be easier for you to get a job, atau, to pass TOEFL, karena kan, sekarang institution apa pun kalau, job qualification kan paling nggak TOEFL. Jadi, tolak ukur kepentingannya itu, diukur dari, e, itu. The--what is it--the advantages you will get if you can master English.

> ….English its importance is because of just this. To the point—it's an international language. If you can master English or if you know English, it will be—it will be easier for you to get a job, or, to pass TOEFL, because see, now any institution if, their job qualification is especially TOEFL. So, the benchmark of its importance, measured by that. The advantages you will get if you can master English. (Angelo Interview 2, 11/27/2009)

It is clear that regulation of English still resides largely in the control that obligatory

TOEFL examination exerts over English language learners' proficiency targets, thus

guaranteeing General American English's necessity as the model standard for English

language learning globally.

Discussion: Attitudes and motivation toward Global English

The two focus group participants highlighted here presented ambivalent attitudes

toward target speaker models that they gravitated to—between US Standardized English

and native Indonesian ways of speaking English; between teachers who transcended the

limitations of local cultural norms and those who consciously inserted those norms into

their Englishing. Angelo and Satriya clearly were driven to learn English, and in their

language ideological statements to me this drive was directed little toward Western

standards. For Satriya, English created new spaces in which he could express himself: it opened up new worlds in terms of technology and education, and it was a language in which he had learned to express himself in ways that had previously been discouraged in his lifetime. For Angelo, English was perhaps a means to an end. A secure way to get through college, as well as a foot still in the door were he to return to a "humanistik" career. All of these needs and goals remain driven by the local market and context, where English is suited to many local purposes. However, these local purposes in the current context of globalization are impossible to separate from Western and especially US forms of and uses for English.

Conclusion

Repertoires, biographies and motivation in global English

This chapter's data analysis has explored communicative repertoires as they represent what a person does with and through language, when, where, why, and how. Stances taken (Jaffe 2009), identities presented, and subjectivities negotiated in each interaction with my informants gave me insight into how their linguistic biographies and communicative repertoires informed their current ideologies and motivations, and how through stances taken they not only relayed their present selves to me but also laid out plans, or at least expressed desires, for who their future selves would become. In our conversations, Satriya and Angelo demonstrated their motivations to use certain languages in certain places and spaces, and beyond but still inclusive of language, they described the people and characteristics that they did and planned to identify with in order to achieve their future ideal selves, as language users as well members of local, national, and global societies.

The aim here has been to explore how language users' reflections on and descriptions of their own linguistic and communicative repertoires can convey the possible functions of language in a historically situated locality. Individuals' repertoires are clearly unique: individuals move, feel, and find inspiration emotionally, relationally, and contextually through languaging (see Pennycook's (2006) "Englishing"). Their repertoires are similar in a macro sense, as Angelo and Satriya live within shared histories in Indonesian, postcolonial and global macro contexts that have laid before them possible language codes and possible ways of communicating through those languages. Within these contexts, however, their individual repertoires and motivations were quite unique: peer groups in English Debate Society and the arts; professors who inspired them to be more Javanese, Indonesian, or Western; ethnic affiliations; and career goals and aspirations, formed these two participants into unique individuals with different ways of using language and relating themselves to their local society, despite their participation using the same learning materials, with the same peers and professors in the English faculty.

In their daily lives, much of the skills taught through these two students' English Department courses and extracurricular experiences with English provided them with critical thinking skills that offered a different lens through which to examine their local cultures and their places within them, enabling them to approach local issues in new and critical ways. Their exposure to Indonesian professors of English from different places and cultures, as well as to US and Australia-origin faculty members and teaching assistants, exposed them to habituses and attitudes that were novel, inspiring, and challenging to their notions of locally possible ways of being and relating to others.

Furthermore, while these new ideas were often appropriated within the context of an English language education, they bled across languages and became a part of these learners' routine ways of thinking and doing—of their summative communicative repertoires.

English in globalization

By exploring these two English majors' motivations to speak and act in certain ways in their expanding linguistic and communicative repertoires, this analysis has also provided insight into attitudes toward English in globalization. While I found Western/US hegemonic control over the English language to be well in place, its local and personal usefulness to these two learners also portrayed nuanced complexities in their local contexts. The English language created a space (one among many not limited to English language use) for them to participate in globalization and to assert local identity amid the hegemonic forces of globalization; it was also a place to expand their identities and communicative repertoires beyond the options available in Javanese and Indonesian national spaces. In the Indonesian university context explored here, professors in leadership roles presented to students their general attitudes in life as well as their attitudes toward localized ways of deploying English. Regarding the latter, these two students assumed ideological stances that claim that locally marked uses of English are desirable and welcome as part of the global English speaking community, while also conveying that in Indonesia, English is cool and attached to images of sophistication, intelligence, prestige, and wealth, whether those be Indonesia-specific or specific to White and US/Western images.

In my research I encountered beliefs that Western/US styles of conveying arguments—learned in English language environments—were much more effective than local ways of argumentation; that native speaker dialects of English other than US standard English were generally hard to understand and generally not to be imitated; and that the TOEFL reigned supreme as the primary test of Indonesian learners' English proficiency. Thus, while some teachers and learners of English are critically moving to encourage its democratization, it appears that center and native-speaker English (Kachru 2005), controlled by the few and learned and used by billions more, remains English learners' and periphery speakers' target model. As a field of critical applied linguists and language educators, we may be heartened to know that critical awareness among teachers and learners of English is spreading; however, the agenda of curricula and critical pedagogies that encompass the teaching, learning, and politics of English (Canagarajah 1999, 2008; Pennycook 2001, 2010; Jenkins 2007) must continue to be pushed as far as the reach of the language itself.

References

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse*: *a critical introduction.* New York: Cambridge
    University Press.
Blommaert, J. (2010). *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. New York: Cambridge
    University Press.
Blommaert, J. & Backus, A. (2011). Repertoires revisited: 'knowing language' in
    superdiversity. *Working Papers in Urban Literacies*, 67.
Bolton, Kingsley. 2000. The sociolinguistics of Hong Kong and the space for Hong Kong
    English. *World Englishes* 19(3). 265-285.
Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power.* Thompson, J.B. (ed.).
    Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Canagarajah, A.S. (1999). *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. New
    York: Oxford University Press.
Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Negotiating the local in English as a Lingua Franca. *Annual
    Review of Applied Linguistics 26*, 197-218.
Canagarajah, A.S. (2007). Lingua Franca English, Multilingual Communities, and
    Language Acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal 91*, 923-939.
Canagarajah, A.S. 2008. The politics of English Laguage Teaching. In Stephen May and
    Nancy Hornberger (eds), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Volume 1,* 2nd
    edn. Boston, MA: Springer Science+Business Media LLC.
Dornyei, Z. & Ushioda, E. (2009). Motivation, Language Identities and the L2 Self: a
    theoretical overview. *Motivation, Language Identity, and the L2 Self.* Buffalo,
    NY: Multilingual Matters.
Duff, P. (2011). Identity, agency, and second language acquisition. In S.M. Gass & A.
    Mackey. *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition,* pp. London:
    Routledge.
García, O., Bartlett, L., & Kleifgen, J. (2009). From biliteracy to pluriliteracies. In P.
    Auer & L. Wei (Eds.), *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingua
    Communication* (pp. 207–228). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor
    Books, Doubleday.
Gupta, Anthea Fraser. 1998. The situation of English in Singapore. In Joseph A. Foley,
    Thiru Kandiah, Bao Zhiming, Anthea Fraser Gupta, Lubna Alsagoff, Ho Chee
    Lick, Lionel Wee, Ismail S. Talib, Wendy Bokhorst-Heng (eds.), *English in new
    cultural contexts: reflections from Singapore*, 106-126. New York: Oxford
    University Press.
Gumperz, J. (1971). *Language in social groups*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University
    Press.
Gumperz, J. (1972). Introduction. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.) *Directions in
    Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (pp. 1-25). New York: Holt,
    Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
Hymes, D. (1985). Toward linguistic competence. *AILA Review*: 9-23.
Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz &
    D. Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of
    Communication* (pp. 35-71). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Jaffe, A. (2009). Introduction: the sociolinguistics of stance. In *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. New York : Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In Randolph Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (eds.), *English in the World: teaching and learning the language and literatures, 11-30*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. 2005. *Asian Englishes: beyond the canon*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kramsch, C. (2009). *The Multilingual Subject: What Foreign Language Learners Say about their Experience and Why it Matters.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lamb, M. (2004). Integrative motivation in a globalizing world. *System 32*: 3-19.

Lamb, M. (2009). Situating the L2 Self: Two Indonesian school learners of English. In *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

MacIntyre, P.D., Mackinnon, S.P. & Clément, R. (2009). Toward the development of a scale to assess possible selves as a source of language learning motivation. In *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Martin-Jones, M., & Jones, K. (2000). Introduction: Multilingual literacies. In M. Martin-Jones & K. Jones (Eds.) *Multilingual literacies: Reading and writing in different worlds* (pp. 1–15). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

McCarty, T.L., Romero-Little, M.E., Warhol, L., & Zepeda, O. (2009). Indigenous youth as language policy makers. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education 8*: 291–306.

Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics 28*(2): 163–188.

Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice.* New York: Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2001). Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Press.

Pennycook, Alastair. 2006. The myth of English as an international language. In Sinfree Makoni & Alastair Pennycook (eds.), *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages,* 90-115. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Phillipson, Robert. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, Robert. 2008. The linguistic imperialism of the neoliberal empire. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 5(1). 1-43.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.

Rampton, B. (2003). Hegemony, social class, and stylisation. *Pragmatics 13*(1): 49-84.

Ryan, S. (2006). Language Learning Motivation within the Context of Globalisation: An L2 Self within an Imagined Global Community. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: an International Journal 3*(1): 23–45.

Rymes, B. (2010). Classroom discourse analysis: a focus on communicative repertoires. In N.H. Hornberger & S.L. McKay (eds.). *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Silverstein, M. (2004). 'Cultural' concepts and the language-culture nexus. *Current Anthropology 45*(5): 621-652.

Weinreich, P. & Saunderson, W. (2003). *Analysing Identity: cross-cultural, societal, and clinical contexts*. New York: Routledge.