Teaching Culture: The Prevailing Stance of Indonesian EFL Teachers

Ruly Morganna[*]; Sumardi Sumardi; Sri Samiati Tarjana

Department of English Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sebelas Maret University, Indonesia
Email: rulymorganna@gmail.com

Abstract

The view of culture in EFL learning is growing from modernist to postmodernist perspective (Kramsch., 2013). Such growth gives impacts on the view and implementation of EFL learning. Accordingly, this study investigated the prevailing stance of Indonesian EFL teachers regarding teaching cultures. The stance in this sense was explored from the teachers' paradigm to practice. This study engaged 17 English teachers with a variety of experiences, and they were purposively selected from different schools. This study revealed evidence that although the nature of Indonesian people were multicultural, and the essence of English as an International language was as a mediator of cross-cultural communication, dominantly Indonesian EFL teachers, the subjects of this study, still stood on modernist perspective and had not incorporated the nuance of multiculturality and interculturality as an important part of EFL learning. Only few of them did otherwise with postmodernist perspective. As an implication, this study really supported Indonesian English teachers to take a stance on postmodernist perspective in executing EFL learning to meet the students' nature and that of English as a global language. The contribution offered by this study is to give evidence prevailing to Indonesian EFL learning and insights promoting its development in order for the curriculum can help systemize the nuance of multiculturality and interculturality in EFL learning.

Keywords: Indonesian EFL Learning; EFL Teachers' Stance; Teaching Culture; English as an International Language;

Introduction

Since the emergence of 21st century, the advancement of technology grows extensively, and by nature this massive growth is also felt by Indonesian people. For instance, the prevalent access to Internet which almost strikes all Indonesian society generates a natural impact to the width of communicative dimension had by today's generation of Indonesian people. Through using Internet they deal with cross-cultural communication in which a part of this communication is carried out using English because they meet a lot of people coming from various cultural backgrounds and from different countries. The state of cross-cultural communication in this sense intrinsically implies that they need to master intercultural competence so that they can successfully sustain a cross-cultural communication without being impeded or even ended by stereotype conflict (Byram., 1997; Byram., Gribkova., & Starkey., 2002).

Other than the importance of intercultural competence as the effect of technological growth, this competence is also considered necessary for Indonesian people because geographically Indonesia is an archipelagic country. There are about 250 million citizens whose origins are multicultural (Sukyadi., 2015). This nature needs to be a primary consideration to realize the issue of multiculturality in Indonesian educational context (Hamied., 2012). It certainly also includes the notion of applying EFL learning which should be sensitive to the nature of multiculturality and the promotion of intercultural communication. A very logical reason to support this view to Indonesian EFL learning is that in fact even when using national Indonesian language, Indonesian people with their multicultural nature use Indonesian language interculturally to maintain a successful communication. By this sense, the stance of English as a foreign language when used by Indonesian people will play the same role as Indonesian language in the sense of multiculturality as the people's nature and interculturality as the communication practice. Thus, promoting intercultural EFL learning or its practice within cross-cultural communication is inevitably important by virtue of Indonesian people's nature.

If related back to the history of English as a foreign language teaching, Kramsch (2013) presents her review about how culture is growingly viewed. In her review, culture is seen from two main perspectives, modernist and post-modernist. In modernist perspective, culture is also seen from two views so-called humanistic view where the term culture is generally called by big C that refers to common knowledge taught in schools like arts and literatures, and one called by small c brought from pragmatic view in that it is perceived as native speakers' ways in dealing with their customs. Culture as small c is what is taught under communicative language teaching method (CLT). With using this method, the target of EFL learning is proposed to teach students to master English native-like competence.

However, since the emergence of 21st century, the modernist perspective has been less popular in the circle of non-native English teachers' paradigm because there is no any evidence from researches which attest to second or foreign language students' achievement at the level of native speakers' competence. The fact shows that such goal is not achievable. Accordingly, there emerges postmodernist perspective of viewing culture in EFL learning. This perspective sees culture as discourse and identity. As discourse, culture is seen as social semiotic construction that is dynamically constructed and reconstructed during communication. The process of cultural construction and reconstruction in this sense represents a struggle to find a third cultural position while people from different cultures interact one another (Kramsch., 1995). As identity, even though it takes a process of cultural reconstruction while people are interacting, they still maintain their own cultural identity brought as a blueprint from their family or social communities. Globally, the postmodernist perspective of seeing culture becomes the most currently global stream of EFL learning up to nowadays.

The natural effect of technological advancement promoting extensive cross-cultural communication, the nature of multiculturality of Indonesian people, and the stream of EFL learning which is working up to nowadays become the milestone of this study to ask Indonesian English teachers about their prevailing stance of EFL learning. By this, this study works on revealing the teachers' stance on the basis of their paradigm and practice in relation to teaching culture in Indonesian EFL classrooms so that EFL learning in Indonesia meets the nature of English use as an international language and the nature of Indonesian students who are multicultural. Expectedly, this study contributes to give insights to Indonesian EFL teachers about the importance of incorporating the nuance of multiculturality and interculturality in EFL learning, and to give scientific evidence to promote Indonesian EFL curriculum development systemizing the multicultural and intercultural nuance.

Literature Review
What is Culture?

Culture is systemized patterned behavior representing the way of living (Chastain., 1988; Lado., 1957; Peck., 1998). It works as a blueprint brought from familial circle and setting people to capably deal with social convention (Larson & Smalley., 1972; Trivonovitch., 1980). In addition, it is also regarded as a social construct made of self and other perceptions (Kramsch., 1993). Besides being viewed as behavioral domain, culture in the context of communication is also defined in the perspective of discourse where it comprises interactive skills and social knowledge other than that of language systems (McCarthy & Carter., 1994). It is a social semiotic playing a role like language in communication, and it even has its own unique grammar consisting of particular social and political structures, personal trajectories, underlying universal cultural process, and particular cultural products (Holliday., 2013). It depicts the membership of discourse community sharing a common belief, social space, and history (Kramsch., 1998).

Furthermore, another extensive, representative and comprehensive view about culture is offered by Liddicoat, Papademetre, Scarino, & Kohler (2003); Scarino & Liddicoat (2009) in that culture is portrayed as the framework of living, communicating and sharing meanings. This framework also underlies an elaborate system of attitude, value, belief, convention, behavior, practice, ritual, lifestyle, concepts, artifacts, and institution.

The Relationship Between Language and Culture

To clearly see the relationship, it is necessary to highlight the nature of language in prior. The most current and comprehensive view of language goes to an emphasis that it is a social semiotic which is functional for communication to express, create, and interpret meanings, and for sustaining social and interpersonal relationship (Halliday., 1978; Kramsch., 2013; Liddicoat et al., 2003; Scarino & Liddicoat., 2009). Thus, taking into consideration about the essence of expressing, producing, and interpreting meanings, the three acts are naturally carried out under the framework of culture, the way of living. In communication the meanings represent thoughts or perceptions people have, and these inevitably manifest in their cultural values (Wardhaugh., 2006). This notion corroborates that culture gives impact to interactions among people (Elmes., 2013), and the cultural interaction in this sense is mediated by language (Assemi., Saleh., Asayeshh., & Janfaza., 2012). In addition, scientifically the phenomena of language use encountered in either spoken or written discourse are interwoven to culture and society (Kaplan., 1966; Wierzbicka., 1986). To sum up, the relationship between language and culture is clear where it is identified that culture always becomes the framework or underlies anytime language is used during communication.

In order to support the concept depicting a close relationship between language and culture, Crozet & Liddicoat (1999) draw a portrayal of culture and language distribution. This distributive presentation makes clear that world knowledge refers to culture in context, spoken and written genres indicate culture in general structure of text, pragmatic norms represent culture within shorter unit of text, norm of interaction refers to culture in organization of units of text, and grammar, lexicon kinesics, or prosody pronunciation represents culture in linguistic structures, words, syntax, or non-verbal semiotic.

Whose Culture Should be Taught in EFL Learning?

Even since the popularity of communicative language teaching (CLT), culture has been an integral part of EFL learning. However, principally the view of culture embedded in CLT refers to native-speakers' cultural orientation where the learners need to immerse into merely native speakers' culture (Kramsch., 2013). Pedagogically through CLT, the integration of culture is prospectively executed by cultural exposure and immersion both inside and outside of the classroom. However, such pedagogical concept lets culture remain inaccessible in a real practice of EFL learning (Crozet & Liddicoat, 1999), and such exposure and immersion are not scientifically proven to be effective in promoting the understanding and awareness of culture (Kramsch., 1993). In addition, the notion of communicative competence underlying CLT basically accounts for the view of how a communication takes place between two or more speakers having the same culture (Byram., 1997). This concept becomes a deficiency of CLT to promote the learners' success to learn English as a foreign language where the role of this language is in fact as an international language whose users are those coming from various cultural backgrounds.

Accordingly, it is expected that the stream of EFL learning goes to practicing interculturality (Byram., 1997). By this sense, in relation to whose culture to be taught in EFL learning, it is needed to incorporate at least the culture underlying the foreign language and the first language learners have (Crozet & Liddicoat., 1997; Fitz Gerald., 1999; Kramsch., 1993). Furthermore, teaching cultures lying on both first and second language carried out through the process of discovery will promote students' awareness and critical thinking (Allen., 2004). Engaging both first and second linguaculture is considered the most appropriate and logical principle to be applied in EFL classroom so that either the teacher or students have an opportunity to view the foreign culture from their own cultural perspective and find the proper position to make connection to communicate across cultures (Byram., Gribkova., & Starkey., 2002; Kramsch., 2009).

When to Teach Culture in EFL Learning?

Since the relative nature between culture and language indicates that culture coats each part of language use, the notion of when to teach culture is then considered meticulously by today's English educators. The old paradigm classifying the issue of teaching culture to be executed only after students have mastered adequate linguistic competence or gained some prospective levels of English proficiency is now redefined into that culture should be taught even from the beginning when students deal with EFL learning.

The above shift is supported by a lot of scientific views such as: 1) In the context of foreign or second language use, any kind of communication with people from other languages will go on within the circle of cultural act (Kramsch., 1993); 2) The pervasiveness of culture interwoven to every part of language leads to a notion that the delay of teaching culture is not necessary any longer. In addition, the practice of teaching culture initiated from the beginning should also comprise spoken and written dimension of language use (Scarino & Liddicoat., 2009); 3) Since communicative competence is redefined to deal with the nature of cross-cultural understanding, the practice of EFL learning should be to teach not only linguistic, sociolinguistic and discourse competence, but also intercultural competence from the beginning of EFL learning (Byram et al., 2002); 4) Crozet & Liddicoat (1999) also attests to the importance of teaching culture even from the beginning level of learners' English proficiency. It is necessary since even from the very basic EFL material like greetings has gone to cross-cultural dimension. By this, it is needed for EFL teachers to integrate cultural knowledge and exploration practice since the beginning level.

How to Teach Culture in EFL Learning?

The notion of teaching culture in EFL learning basically should be brought into the actual essence of how English is functionally used. English is in fact an international language where this language is used by people from all over the world and not only by its native speakers. The most appropriate stance of communication which needs to be set in EFL learning is one that depicts a communication across culture by virtue of the fact that the English users are ones coming from various cultural backgrounds. Since teaching language is also teaching culture, the stream of teaching culture in EFL classroom should be sensitized to the essence of interculturality.

The sense of interculturality takes into account the condition of encounter between people having different cultural backgrounds (Dervin., Gajardo., & Lavanchy., 2011). If grounded to the context of EFL learning in the classroom, the fundamental concept of interculturality itself is not actually meant to be the way of teaching that makes students deal with a lot of cultural knowledge merely, but it is emphasized on the essence of facilitating students to be prospective intercultural speakers, ones being capably receptive to the differences without the likelihood to end up interaction with stereotype conflict but to still sensitize the awareness of maintaining their cultural identity (Hua., 2013). In line with the purpose leading students to be intercultural speakers, there has been purposed a set of competence students need to master so-called intercultural communicative competence (Byram., 1997). This comprises linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse competence and intercultural competence that consists of 1) attitude; 2) knowledge; 3) skills of comparison, interpreting, and relating; 4) skills of discovery and interaction, and 5) critical cultural awareness. Basically there are a lot of intercultural competence models proposed by several related experts. However the one proposed by (Byram., 1997) is mostly used by second or foreign language teachers to deal with the issue of interculturality in language learning. This sense is by virtue of the ease to comprehend and apply his model in second or foreign language teaching.

In teaching and learning practice of English as a second or foreign language, the notion of interculturality is designed into a teaching principle to help teachers find the ease and the core of facilitating students to be intercultural speakers. Of various principles offered by several related experts, the authors elicit one suggested by Scarino & Liddicoat (2009) with their intercultural language teaching principles to be presented in this article inasmuch as this offer is appropriately comprehensive and applicable. The following will highlight the pillars of intercultural language teaching principles as proposed by (Scarino & Liddicoat., 2009):

Active Construction

Learning includes purposeful and active involvement in creating and interpreting meanings while interacting with others, and keeping reflecting, thinking carefully, or realizing one's self and others in communication, and continuously thinking carefully of meaning making for a variety of contexts. It is actually not only understanding facts of related cultures, but also feeling, thinking, and changing intercultural beings.

Making Connection

There are two steps of development in learning process. First, learning develops interpersonally as it happens through interaction. Second, it develops intrapersonally as the process of knowledge construction within the mind of an individual. In the interpersonal development process, the schemata or previous knowledge is faced to construct new insights by means of connecting, reorganizing, elaborating, and extending their understanding. During these processes, constant links are made between:

a) Language and culture and learning;

b) Previous or existing conception and new understandings;

c) Language and thinking;

d) First language and additional language(s);

e) Previous experiences and new experiences;

f) The intercultural self and intracultural self and others

Interaction

The essence of interaction is to continuously developing one's understanding towards the relationship between the conceptualization of his language and culture and that of others. Meaning construction and negotiation within a variety of perspectives had by diverse participants happen during interaction. This circle helps each participant joining the interaction to learn and also build intercultural experiences from one another.

Reflection

In learning, reflection means to realize or become aware of thinking, knowing, and learning process about languages (either first or additional) and cultures (both one's own and others'). The reflection in this sense also involves understanding the relationship and concept of diversity, identity, experiences, and intercultural thoughts and feelings.

Responsibility

In the process of learning, its development is dependent upon learners' disposition, attitude, and values. While the communication or interaction is undertaken within the learning process, it includes accepting responsibility for one's way of interacting with others within and across languages and cultures.

Methodology

This study was carried out qualitatively and engaged 17 Indonesian English teachers, who had been teaching English with various experiences, from different schools. In addition, other than their experiences, those teachers were considered relevant and appropriate to be the subjects of this study because they were adequately knowledgeable in regard to their professionalism as English teachers. Furthermore, they had also been learning about English pedagogy at the graduate program in one of favorite universities in Indonesia. Therefore, they were potentially capable of providing the expected data of this study. This study used an open-ended questionnaire to probe into the prospective data, and in-depth interview was further undertaken to pursue the clarity of data. The data of this study were then analyzed using interactive model of data analysis as suggested by Miles & Huberman (1984). The process of data analysis comprised data collection, data reduction, data display, and verifying conclusion.

Result and Discussion

The teachers' stance about teaching culture is seen from the given information ranging from teaching paradigm to practice in EFL learning. The authors use two headings, native-speakerism (NS) and non-native-speakerism (NNS), to code and display the stance of teaching culture from what the teachers perceive to be appropriate in EFL learning itself. Within each heading, it is presented some notions having been classified and quoted from some teachers only, but any information taken from each of them has been analyzed and considered so that it is displayed to represent other teachers' notions which work on the same line. Of 17 teachers, there are 12 teachers stay on NS, and 5 teachers agree with NNS.

NS View

The likelihood of NS view conveyed by the teachers fit into the application of communicative language teaching in Indonesian EFL learning. It was initiated by that all teachers with this view agreed with targeting EFL learning on the basis of native speakers' competence. For example, teacher 2 said:

"Saat mengajar, saya meminta murid untuk berusaha menguasai pronunciation, vocabulry, dan grammar bahasa Inggris dengan lancar seperti penutur asli, orang Amerika atau orang Inggris."

That statement stressed on the idea of leading students to make an effort while learning English to master pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar like English native speakers' competence, for example American or British people. Such goal of learning English tends to give an implication that the culture taught in the classroom is only native-speakers' culture such as the modernist perspective of viewing Culture in EFL learning (Kramsch., 2013).

NS view was also depicted from the communicative competence theory assumed to be effective as the basis of EFL learning. For instance, teacher 3 said:

"Dalam menganalisis kemampuan bahasa Inggris murid, saya berpatok pada teorinya Dell Hymes tentang communicative competence."

The aforementioned statement said that teacher 3 used Hymes' (1972) communicative competence theory as the basis for evaluating students' English proficiency. In relation to this notion, Byram (1997) explains that the stream of Hymes' (1972) communicative competence portrays the condition of interaction taking place between first language users within the same community. It means that the sense of culture taught in this concept is English native-speakers' culture.

In addition, most teachers with this view also suggested using English native speakers as the best model in EFL learning. For example, teacher 4 said:

"Menurut pandangan saya penutur asli bahasa Inggris adalah model yang paling relevan dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing."

That statement indicated that teacher 4 endorsed English native speakers as the most appropriate model to be exemplified for students in EFL learning. however if grounded to the implication of teaching culture, this notion implies that the taught culture is English native speakers' culture only (Byram et al., 2002).

In teaching culture, all the teachers under this view engulfed the nuance of EFL classroom with American and British culture because they believed that the two cultures were the most representative ones for native speakers' use of English language. For example, teacher 13 said:

"Saat ngajar di kelas, kultur yang saya ajarkan adalah kulturnya Amerika dan kulturnya Inggris. Misal saat mengajarkan ujaran-ujaran yang biasa digunakan saat belanja. Di sini, karena saya merujuk materi dari buku yang ditulis oleh penutur asli bahasa Inggris, otomatis nama-nama benda yang terlibat dalam ujaran jual beli tersebut adalah benda-benda yang umum di jual di Amerika atau Inggris. Yah seperti contoh di buku karena materinya menggunakan ujaran yang autentik."

The above statements indicated that teacher 13 used two cultures, American and British, while teaching English. She exemplified it with sharing her experience when she was teaching common English utterances used for shopping. Because she relied on the authentic materials like dialogues taken from an English book written by English native speakers, it was automatic that the nuance of cultures referred to both American and British, for example stuffs or things commonly bought or sold in American or British stores. However even though such use of authentic materials in this perspective sounds amazing, a negative effect towards students' cultural awareness also tends to strike inasmuch as they do not have any given opportunity to experience a real use of English as an International language. Such cultural nuance will make no sense for English use when students communicate with people coming from non-native English countries (Crozet & Liddicoat., 1999).

Further negotiation went to the issue of when to teach cultures in EFL learning. There were three varieties of cultural teaching practice in this context as proposed by the teachers. For instance, the first variety was portrayed by teacher 4 who said:

"Saya mengajarkan kultur dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris bila kondisi memungkinkan saja karena saya yakin komunikasi bahasa Inggris tetap bisa berjalan bila murid sudah memiliki kosa kata, kemampuan grammar, dan kemampuan mengartiulasikan kata yang cukup. Yang penting murid terus di fasilisatsi dengan input berupa "listening" dari audio autentik dan "reading" dari teks autentik pula."

That statement explained that teaching culture in EFL learning could be done only when the condition was possible because the teacher believed that English communication could be done and maintained if students had adequate competence on vocabularies, grammar, and pronunciation. This teacher also believed that the importance which should be aware of was that the teacher always facilitated students with listening and reading activities based on authentic materials. This notion implies that the teacher tends to focus on merely prioritizing students' linguistic competence while teaching English. The sense of authentic materials mentioned by the teacher also refers to native speakers' sources. It is indicated that when the condition is possible to teach culture in EFL classroom, the culture tends to be native speakers'. The sense of when to teach culture here refers to only when it is necessary in accordance with a consideration towards the class context.

The second variety went in line with teacher 9's way of teaching culture who said:

"Saya akan mengajarkan kultur bila murid saya sudah menguasai pronunciation, vocabulary, dan grammar yang cukup dalam bahasa Inggris."

That statement told that she would teach EFL students culture when they had mastered sufficient proficiency in English pronunciation, vocabularies, and grammar. Subsequently the third variety of teaching culture was represented by teacher 12's statement saying:

"Secara tak langsung saat mengajar, saya sudah mengajarkan kutur sejak awal. Misal saat mengajarkan materi daily activity, saya memberikan input kepada murid berupa video seorang English native speaker yang bercerita aktvitas sehari-hari dia. Otomatis nuansa kulturnya adalah kultur dia yang saya ekspos ke murid."

Teacher 12 stated that she automatically taught culture from the beginning of EFL learning. For instance, when she was teaching a basic material like daily activity, she initiated the class by giving input to students through presenting a native English speaker's video telling about his daily routines. By this condition, it was automatic that the nuance of culture exposed to students was that of native speaker. If grounded to the case of when to teach culture, it is illustrated that culture is thought from the beginning through exposure. In brief, the three varieties of when to teach culture seem to become a sort of practical convention carried out by teachers who believe native-speakerism is an appropriate stance in EFL learning.

NNS View

NNS view in these findings inclined to the teachers' promotion in applying an intercultural approach in Indonesian EFL learning. It was initiated by teacher 1 who said:

"Menurut saya, pembelajaran bahasa Inggris yang ideal itu dilakukan dengan konsep yang interkultural dimana komunikasi bahasa Inggris yang disimulasikan diarahkan pada kondisi komunikasi orang dalam kultur yang berbeda. Dengan demikian praktek pembelajaran bahasa Inggris di sekolah sejalan dengan fungsi utama bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa international" Sementara untuk kompetensi lingistik misal salah satunya pronunciation, menurut saya lingua franca core adalah standar yang paling relevan karena merujuk pada fungsi keterpahaman internasional."

That notion depicted that an ideal EFL learning was one carried out with intercultural concept where English communication was simulated to the encounter of people from different cultures. In addition to linguistic competence, for example pronunciation, teacher 1 agreed with using lingua franca core as to help students reach international intelligibility. Thus, the practice of intercultural EFL learning goes in line with the main function of English as an international language. If grounded to the existing literature, such notion is also postulated in the concept of EFL learning proposed by Byram (1997). From this notion, the sense of teaching culture in EFL learning broadens to incorporate both the first and second linguaculture (Crozet & Liddicoat., 1999). She then added the following statement.

"Bila arah pembelajaran bahasa Inggris itu intercultural, maka intercultural communicative competence adalah target pembelajaran bahasa inggris yang paling sesuai."

It meant that if the practice of EFL learning was set to be intercultural, targeting intercultural communicative competence was the most appropriate goal for students. In the existing literature, the same notion is also promoted by Hua (2013).

Continuously, the other view of NNS was given by teacher 16 who said:

"Menurut saya pembelajaran yang interkultual sangat sesuai diterapkan dalam pembelajran bahasa Inggris di Indonesia. Untuk menerapkan ini menurut saya gurunya tidak mesti harus pernah tinggal di berbagai negara yang kulturnya beda-beda."

The above information indicated that intercultural English learning was really suitable for Indonesian context, and to apply this kind of learning did not mean that the teachers should have ever been living in various countries whose cultures varied. Byram, Gribkova, & Starkey (2002) also support this sort of notion. She continuously added:

"Dalam prakteknya, pendekatan interkultural dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris di Indonesia sejatinya mesti melingkupi seluruh aspek pembelajaran baik dari segi materi ajar yang interkultural, sistem komunikasi lisan maupun tulis yang interkultural, bahkan evluasi

pembelajaran yang lebih bersifat formatif seperti dengan terus mengobservasi atau membuat portfolio perkembangan kemampuan bahasa Inggris murid yang berlandaskan konsep atau perspektif intercultural."

That notion emphasized that to practice an intercultural EFL learning approach in Indonesia, it should cover all learning aspects including intercultural learning materials, intercultural communication system from both spoken and written communication, and even learning evaluation which should be more formative by sustainably observing or using portfolio to evaluate students' English proficiency development on the basis of intercultural perspective. This view is in line with the practice of intercultural language learning as proposed by Scarino & Liddicoat (2009).

Then teacher 14 continued to talk about the reason why she considered intercultural EFL learning crucial for Indonesia.

"Pembelajar bahasa Inggris jaman sekarang dari kecil sudah akrab dengan komunikasi yang luas di media sosial. Secara natural saja area komunikasi mereka sudah mempertemukan mereka dengan lawan bicara dari berbagai kultur di media sosial. Oleh karena itu, arah pembelajaran bahasa Inggris juga sejatinya musti mengikuti kondisi natural mereka yang komunikasinya lintas budaya."

She said that today's students had been deeply dealing with extensive communication in social media. Naturally their communication area set them to meet interlocutors coming from various cultures through social media. Therefore, the stream of English learning should intrinsically go along with their natural condition whose communication took place across culture.

The other, teacher 11 argued about the unreasonable aspect of native-speakerism behind her promotion to intercultural approach of EFL learning.

"Menurut pandangan saya, pembelajaran bahasa Inggris yang menargetkan kompetensi penutur asli untuk konteks Indonesia itu adalah konsep yang tidak logis karena memiliki target belajar yang tidak mungkin bisa tercapai, sementara pembelajaran bahasa Inggris yang interkultural adalah arah pemberalajaran yang sangat logis karena berbasis kondisi natural para murid yang sejatinya multikultural (tiap individu memiliki khas kultur yang mereka bawa dari lingkungan sosial masing-masing."

The above idea said that targeting English native speakers' competence as the goal of EFL learning was not logical since it was an unachievable target. On the other hand, an intercultural approach of EFL learning was logical by virtue of its basis considering Indonesian students' nature of multiculturality that they brought from their social community. In the existing literature, such notion has also been argued by Byram et al. (2002). The rejection of native-speakerism was also conveyed by teacher 17 who said:

"Pembelajaran bahsa Inggris yang berbasis native-speakerism akan menghilangkan identitas sosial pembelajar karena mereka akan mengubah identitas sosial dan cara pandang mereka seperti English native speakers dengan kulturnya native speakers pula."

The aforementioned statement indicated that native-speakerism in EFL learning would lead students to lose their own social identity because they would change their identity and views of living like English native-speakers' culture. Such notion is in line with the arguments posed by Byram et al. (2002) regarding their rejection to native-speakerism approach in EFL learning.

In regard to whose culture to be taught, all teachers with this view agreed with involving native speakers' culture like American or British culture and also Indonesian culture followed by various local cultures around students' environment. For example teacher 11 said:

"Saya sering menyisipkan beberap kultur dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris misalnya dengan menyajikan murid saya video yang berisi komunikasi anatara seorang selebritis Indonesia dengan temannya yang berasal dari Amerika. Selebritis Indonesianya menggunakan bahasa Inggris, namun aksen dia saat berbahasa Inggris tetap menggambarkan kultur asli dia (orang sunda). Terus grammar bahasa Inggris dia juga sangat menggambarkan struktur terjemahan dari Ide bahasa Indonesia yang ditransfer ke dalam ujaran bahasa Inggris. Kondisi seperti ini unik sekali karena menggambarkan komunikasi yang lintas budaya. Saya terangkan kepada murid saya, bahwa kita penutur asing dalam bahasa Inggris tidak akan bisa berbahasa Inggris persis kayak native speaker. Karena pola fikir kita berpatok pada kultur yang kita punya sehingga penyampaian ide kita otomatis tetap akan merepresentasikan ide dari kultur kita yang ditransfer ke dalam bahasa Inggris. Kondisi ini nggak salah justru kondisi ini memperlihatkan bahwa selebritis ini tetap mempertahankan identitas dia sebagai orang Indonesia. Namun kita tetap harus belajar untuk mengujarkan bahasa Inggris yang dapat dipahami oleh lawan bicara kita."

That statement illustrated her experience of teaching some cultures inserted in EFL learning with presenting a video containing a cross-cultural English communication between an Indonesian celebrity and his friend from America. From the video, the Indonesian celebrity used English but his accent represented his own culture as Sudanese (one of local cultures in Indonesia). His English grammar also indicated that he transferred Indonesian idea conveyance into English utterances. She told students that such communication was unique since it portrayed an English communication across culture. She also told her students that as foreign English users they could not entirely speak English like native speakers because their mindset would be on the basis of their cultural framework which was realized into English utterances. She said that the way an Indonesian celebrity spoke English like in that video was not wrong, and even it indicated that he as Indonesian still maintained his Indonesian identity. However, the teacher added to students that as EFL learners they should always care about and also maintain the intelligibility of their English even though the communicative framework was Indonesian culture.

The teacher's explanation shown in that statement sheds a light on the idea of introducing students to critical culture awareness for maintaining their own identity brought from their social community (Byram et al., 2002). The varieties of culture taught in EFL classroom from the teacher's illustration account for the engagement of both first and second linguaculture (Byram., 1997; Byram et al., 2002; Crozet & Liddicoat., 1999; FitzGerald., 1999; Kramsch., 1993; Liddicoat et al., 2003; Scarino & Liddicoat., 2009). In addition, regarding when to teach culture in EFL learning, all teachers in this view also promoted to teach culture in EFL learning from the beginning because they believed that every part of language was cultural, and the conduction should have been across culture as well.

Implication

As revealed by this study in that of 17 teachers, there were 12 teachers stood on native-speakerism and only 5 teachers took a stance on non-native-speakerism in the context teaching culture in EFL learning in Indonesia, it is evident that dominantly the subjects of this study do not take the nature of multiculturality in Indonesia as the primary consideration for facilitating students to be successful users of English as an International language. In addition, as an International language, English is in fact used by all people in the world, those coming from various cultures becoming their framework of using English. The findings of this study attest to only few of the subjects who bring the nuance of Indonesian multiculturality in EFL learning through the application of intercultural English learning. If grounded to nowadays stream of EFL learning, the execution of EFL learning is promoted to bring the nature of

multiculturality into the nuance of intercultural communication (Byram et al., 2002; Kramsch., 2013; Liddicoat et al., 2003; Scarino & Liddicoat., 2009), so that the students can be successful intercultural English users who maintain their own identity and have appropriate critical cultural understanding.

As the last point, it is really important for Indonesian English teachers to profoundly consider the essence of teaching English as an International language or a foreign language. As an English teacher and one having high interest in following the progress of EFL learning in Indonesia, the authors really recommend Indonesian EFL teachers to start changing their old-fashioned stance of EFL learning, so-called modernist perspective or native-speakerism which tends to be the ambassador of English native speakers' culture, into postmodernist perspective or non-native-speakerism which facilitates students to be intercultural English speakers through a learning process that cares about and brings the nuance of multiculturality and interculturality in English use. This stance is in fact also appropriate to Indonesian students who are naturally multicultural people. In addition, it is also expected that Indonesian EFL curriculum developers incorporate the nuance of multiculturality and interculturality of EFL learning in curricular system order for the teachers get a big encouragement from the designed system.

Conclusion

In regard to Indonesian EFL teachers' stance of teaching culture in EFL learning, it is revealed that of 17 English teachers 12 teachers take a stance under the perspective of native-speakerism (NS), and 5 teachers do under the perspective of non-native-speakerism (NNS). From paradigm to practice, those behind NS view prefer to conduct EFL learning using communicative language teaching principles, and those behind NNS view prefer to execute EFL learning using intercultural language learning approach. As an implication, dominantly the teachers, the subjects of this study, have not taken into consideration the essence of multiculturality as the nature of Indonesian people, and interculturality as the nature of English use by virtue of English as an International language. It is really recommended for Indonesian English teachers to start leaving aside modernist perspective and realizing postmodernist perspective for EFL learning so that the nuance of multiculturality and interculturality is incorporated in the classroom to facilitate students to be prospectively successful English users. It is also expected that Indonesian EFL curriculum promotes the essence of multiculturality and interculturality in EFL learning.

Acknowledgement

References

Allen, L. Q. (2004). Implementing a culture portfolio project within a constructivist paradigm. Foreign Language Annals, 37(2): 232–239. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2004.tb02196.x.

Assemi, A., Saleh, S., Asayeshh, M. E., & Janfaza, E. (2012). Culture within Language. International Conference on Language, Medias and Culture, 33, 78–82. Retrieved from http://www.ipedr.com/vol33/016-ICLMC2012-L00052.pdf.

Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence. Frankfurt Lodge, UK: Multilingual Matters LTD. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/KNNnzc.

Byram, M., Gribkova, B., & Starkey, H. (2002). Developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching: A practical introduction for teachers. Strasbourg: the Council of Europe. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/ZtWKYh.

Chastain, K. (1988). Developing second-language skills. USA: HBJ Publishers.

Crozet, C., & Liddicoat, A. J. (1997). Teaching culture as an integrated part of language: An Introduction. Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 14: 1–22.

Crozet, C., & Liddicoat, A. J. (1999). The challenge of intercultural language teaching: Engaging with culture in the classroom. In J. Lo Bianco, A. J. Liddicoat, & C. Crozet (Eds.), Striving for the Third Place: Intercultural Competence through Language Education (p. 113). Melbourne: Language Australia.

Crozet, C., & Liddicoat, A. J. (1999). Turning promises into practices: the challenges ofintercultural language teaching. Australian Language Matters, 7(1): 3–4, 12.

Dervin, F., Gajardo, A., & Lavanchy, A. (2011). Politics of Interculturality (1st ed.). 12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/uiHS55.

Elmes, D. (2013). The relationship between language and culture. 鹿屋体育大学学術研究紀要, 46: 11–17. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02412.x.

FitzGerald, H. (1999). What culture do we teach? In J. Lo Bianco, A. J. Liddicoat, & C. Crozet (Eds.), Striving for the Third Place: Intercultural Competence through Language Education. (p. 127). Melbourne: Language Australia.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). Language as social semiotic. the interpretation of Language andMeaning. London: Edward Arnold.

Hamied, F. A. (2012). English in Multicultural and Multilingual Indonesian Education. Multilingual Education, 1 (English as an International Language in Asia: Implications for Language Education), 63–78. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4578-0_5.

Holliday, A. (2013). Understanding intercultural communication: Negotiating a grammar of culture. New York: Routledge. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/NnE2Ef.

Hua, Z. (2013). Exploring Intercultural Communication. Exploring Intercultural Communication: Language in Action. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203798539.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. (J. B. Pride & J. Holmes, Eds.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. Language Learning, 16(1 2): 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1966.tb00804.x.

Kramsch, C. (1995). The cultural component of language teaching. Language, Culture and Curriculum, 8(2): 83–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908319509525192.

Kramsch, C. (1998). Language and culture. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/WvcjnF.

Kramsch, C. (2009). Third culture and language education. In V. Cook & W. Li (Eds.), Contemporary Applied Linguistics (p. 233–254). London, England: Continuum.

Kramsch, C. (2013). Culture in foreign language teaching. Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 1(1): 57–78. Retrieved from www.urmia.ac.ir/ijltr.

Kramsch, C. J. (1993). Context and culture in language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lado, R. (1957). How to compare two cultures. Ann Arbor University of Michigan Press.

Larson, D. N., & Smalley, W. A. (1972). Becoming bilingual: A guide to language learning. New Canaan, C.N: Practical Anthropology.

Liddicoat, A. J., Papademetre, L., Scarino, A., & Kohler, M. (2003). Intercultural language learning. Australia: Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training. Retrieved from http://www1.curriculum.edu.au/nalsas/pdf/intercultural.pdf.

McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (1994). Language as discourse: Perspectives for language teaching. London: Longman.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods. California: SAGE publications Inc.

Peck, D. (1998). Teaching culture : Beyond language. Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute. Retrieved from http://teachersinstitute.yale.edu/curriculum/units/1984/3/84.03.06.x.html.

Scarino, A., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2009). Teaching and learning languages: A guide. Australia: GEON Impact Printing Pty Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203082423.

Sukyadi, D. (2015). The teaching of English at secondary schools in Indonesia. Secondary School English Education in Asia: From Policy to Practice, 123–147.

Trivonovitch, G. J. (1980). Culture learning and culture teaching (In Croft,). Cambridge, Mass: Withrop Publishers. Inc.

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics (5th ed.). 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA: Blackwell Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2003.0268.

Wierzbicka, A. (1986). Does language reflect culture? Evidence from Australian English. Language in Society, 15(3): 349–373. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500011805.

Copyrights