Classroom Ideologies and Teaching Styles of Expatriate Monolingual and Local Multilingual Teachers in a Post-colonial Context

HEMA VANITA KESEVAN

The thesis is submitted to University College Dublin in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

SCHOOL OF IRISH, CELTIC STUDIES, IRISH FOLKLORE & LINGUISTICS

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

HEAD OF SCHOOL: PROFESSOR MÁIRE NÍ ANNRACHÁIN

PRINCIPAL SUPERVISOR: PROFESSOR BETTINA MIGGE

Abstract

The global spread of English has led many classrooms in the post-colonial contexts that teach English as a second and foreign language to pursue monolingual ideologies and to hire expatriate monolingual teachers. Monolingual teachers are posited to pursue more efficient teaching styles and classroom practices than the local teachers. However, there is very little evidence to support this claim. The few studies that have to date investigated teaching styles either did not focus on the teachers' beliefs or their classroom practices and they did not systematically compared different types of teachers in the same context. Although teachers' ideologies are deemed to be influential in shaping their classroom practices, not many studies have examined teachers' ideologies and its interconnection in classroom practices.

Using ethnography multiple case studies design, this study investigates two types of teachers' classroom practices and ideologies. It particularly seeks to understand whether, as suggested, the local multilingual and expatriate monolingual teachers pursue different teaching styles. It is specifically concerned with exploring these teachers' actual teaching styles and rationalizations of their practices, with a view to explore how their teaching styles promote interactivity among EFL learners. Based on observation and audio-video recordings data, it explores the teachers' questioning patterns in order to determine their teaching styles. Meanwhile, the interview data gathered from the teachers' attempts to gain an insight into their rationalizations about classroom practices. The interview data from the learners investigates their language learning beliefs and perspectives on the teachers' classroom practices effectiveness.

The qualitative and quantitative analyses performed on the three types of data highlights important findings. The analyses from the teachers' classroom observation and recordings indicated that both types of teachers pursue the same teaching styles. They generally employed the teacher-centred teaching style. However, there were variations in their repair strategy and turn allocations, while the interview conducted with the teachers revealed that they have different pedagogical ideologies for various underlying reasons. The analyses of the teachers' classroom interactional practices and their ideologies showed that although the teachers were aware of their rationalizations, they were observed not to efficiently practice it in their classroom lessons, several points of difference between ideologies and practices existed. The interview data from the learners indicated that they have different beliefs than some of the teachers with

regard to certain aspects of ELT practice, such as the ways turns are allocated and how corrective repair is performed.

This study provides insights into teaching and learning ideologies and actual practices of EFL teachers in the Malaysian context. In particular the findings of this study argue that the existing stereotypes about the monolingual teachers' teaching styles cannot be upheld, since there were no significant differences between teaching approaches of the two different types of teachers. The study suggests that factors such as gender, nature of training and the proficiency level of students have a much greater influence on teaching practices.

Glossary of Terms

ANOVA - Analysis of Variance

BrE - British English

CA - Conversation Analysis

CELTA - Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

CIE- Certificate in English

CLT - Communicative Language Teaching

CME- Colloquial Malaysian English

DA - Discourse Analysis

EFL - English as a Foreign Language

EIL - English as an International Language

ELF - English as Lingua Franca

ELT - English Language Teaching

EM- Expatriate monolingual

ENL - English as a Native Language

ESL - English as a Second Language

FIAC - Flanders Interactional Analysis Categories

HOD- Head of Department

IRF - Initiate response and feedback

IRE - Initiate response and evaluation

L2 - Second language

Glossary of Terms

ANOVA - Analysis of Variance

BrE - British English

CA - Conversation Analysis

CELTA - Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

CIE- Certificate in English

CLT - Communicative Language Teaching

CME- Colloquial Malaysian English

DA - Discourse Analysis

EFL - English as a Foreign Language

EIL - English as an International Language

ELF - English as Lingua Franca

ELT - English Language Teaching

EM- Expatriate monolingual

ENL - English as a Native Language

ESL - English as a Second Language

FIAC - Flanders Interactional Analysis Categories

HOD- Head of Department

IRF - Initiate response and feedback

IRE - Initiate response and evaluation

L2 - Second language

LM- Local multilingual

MalE- Manglish

ME- Malaysian English

MOE- Ministry of Education

MOHE- Ministry of Higher Education

NEP - National Education Policy

OST- Overseas Trained

SE- Singaporean English

SME- Standard Malaysian English

TCU - Turn Conversational Unit

TESL - Teaching English as a Second Language

TESOL - Teaching of English to Other Speakers of English

TRP - Transition Relevance Place

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

2. Discourse and Ideologies in Classroom

3. Background to Malaysian Context

4. Research Design and Methodology

5. Teaching Ideologies

6. The Questioning and Teaching Styles of Monolingual and Multilingual Teachers

7. Conclusion

Tables

Figures

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

The term 'globalisation' is often used when describing the global spread of the English language. Globalisation and the English language are considered to have an inextricable link, mainly for two reasons. First, globalisation functions as a driving force to strengthen the position of English as a global language; second, English plays a major role in the process of globalisation (Phillipson, 2001) by facilitating the process of international politics, economic growth, and exchanges of culture. Increasingly, as globalisation and English continue to bring people of different cultures and linguistic backgrounds together through the form of English communication, it has further entrenched the distinction between so-called native and non-native speakers (Jenkins, 2005). The former are people who were raised through English in a country where English functions as the main means of communication - so called inner-circle countries[1] according to Kachru (1986) - and mainly or only use English in their everyday lives (i.e. are monolingual). Non-native speakers are all of those who acquire English later in life (or concurrently with another language) and make regular use of other languages in their everyday lives. Nowadays people distinguish between two subgroups of the latter category, so-called second language and foreign language users. The former refers to speakers from the so called outer circle that use English as a medium of instruction in education and also in other formal contexts, while the latter are those from the so-called expanding circle who use English as an additional language. The question of native speaker-hood has also had an important impact (see Davis, 1991; Medgyes, 1994) in English language teaching (ELT) practices. It plays an eminent role

[1] According to Kachru (1986), the spread of English can be represented by three concentric circles: the inner circle, outer circle, and expanding circle. The inner circle refers to the traditional basis of English, in which English is the first and only language of the majority of the population, such as the Great Britain, United Sates, Canada, Australia, or New Zealand. Its varieties serve as norm providing as they traditionally function as models for language learning. The outer circle designates those countries that were subject to the earlier phases of the spread of English such as Anglophone Caribbean and African countries, Malaysia, and Philippines. These countries are typically former colonies of the UK and the USA. The varieties used in these regions are termed as norm developing and essentially they are both endonormative and exonormative (White, 1997). The expanding circle involves those countries that do not have a history of colonialisation, but recognize the importance of English as an international language and where it is taught as a foreign language. It involves countries like Japan, China, Indonesia, and Nepal, and the varieties used in these regions are exonormative in that they do not have their own norms but are dependent on those of the inner circle.

in defining the identity of teachers which is generally linked to issues of proficiency in certain varieties of the language.

In the field of English language education, monolingual[2] teachers are very often regarded as superior and the supposed 'ideal' language model over the multilingual teachers. Although monolingual teachers have not been empirically and conclusively established as superior to the multilingual teachers (Nayar, 1998), the perception that the former is a 'better' teacher continues to hold sway in many English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom settings. Researchers working in the field of ESL/EFL continue to debate the linguistic ability and performance skills of these two broad types of teachers, while also examining their relative merits for the teaching profession (Braine, 1999; Cook, 1999; Davis, 1991; Medgyes, 1992; Moussu & Llurda, 2008). They claimed that monolingual teachers have extensive experience as language users of the target form and thus have a better linguistic competence than the multilingual teachers. In contrast, multilingual teachers are posited to be a good learner model as they have the experience of learning the language. However, to date, we only have a comparatively small number and narrow range of empirical studies on the issue. Studies have either focused on one type of teacher (Johnson, 1992; Liu, 1999; Norton & Tang, 1997), or compared both types of teacher's practices in different classroom settings (Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Braine 2010; Harmer, 2008; Tajino, 2000). Moreover, studies have generally only examined actual teaching practices and paid little or no attention to how teachers rationalize their practice. As a result, we know very little about the teaching ideologies of both types of teachers, their practices in same context, and how their teaching and learning ideologies influence their classroom practices.

The remainder of this chapter examines the socio-political context of the teaching and learning of ESL and EFL in a multilingual context in which English is generally not used as a first language. The chapter is divided into six parts. Part one focuses on the central issues surrounding the second and foreign language classroom, and explores the notion of standard language variety and ideal language model in ESL/EFL classrooms. The second part discusses the language teaching approaches

[2] It seems inappropriate to continue to classify speakers of English into native and non-native speakers when the English language has achieved the predominant status of international language. The perpetuation of this dichotomy sustains negative perceptions about non-native speakers as being less capable than native speakers. Many of them are as (or even more) fluent and proficient in their use of English as those who were born and raised with English and (who) speak it as their only language (Jenkins, 1996a). For this reason, I follow the alternative terms; monolingual speaker and multilingual speaker as suggested by Jenkins (1996) to refer to the native and non-native speakers (see, Jenkins, 1996).

and teaching styles that are generally favoured in ESL/EFL classroom contexts. Part three focuses on the research methodologies that are traditionally used to investigate second and foreign language classroom teaching. It discusses the data collection and data analysis methods used for empirically investigating classroom and teaching practices. Part four outlines ELT teaching and learning ideologies in non-Western contexts. The fifth part presents the context of this study, providing a broad overview of English in non-Western contexts and their ELT classroom practices, focusing in particular on the Malaysian ESL/EFL classroom context. The final part outlines the present study and provides an overview of each chapter.

1.1 Issues in the Teaching of English as a Second Language (L2)

Today, English flourishes as a national language, official language, or additional language for science, technology, education, pop culture, and international finance. This movement started chiefly with trade, and trade gradually developed to colonialism which was urged by economics, internal politics, and industrial hungers (Smith, 1992). In the struggle between European powers to extend their power beyond Europe, it was Britain that proved to be the most successful and dominant power and as a result English was transplanted to almost all corners of the world and became anchored to all of its colonies. Being the main global lingua franca, it is now widely considered to be the principal gateway to social and economic advancement, and is even viewed as being key to the acquisition of knowledge. As the English language continues to expand its functions and acquire ever greater numbers of users, contrasting opinions have emerged about its spread. On the positive side, its spread is considered to enhance the economic development and prosperity of societies across the world, and to connect people of different cultures and nationalities. On the negative side, a number of scholars cite the spread of global English as posing a threat to other languages. This view is often illustrated by designating English as a 'killer language' (Phillipson, 1992). Phillipson (ibid) suggests that English achieved its dominant position due to linguistic imperialism which he defines as a process that involves the legitimation of its linguistic superiority in political discourse and language pedagogy due to the power exerted politically and economically by nations such as the United States and Great Britain. Other scholars (see Ferguson, 2006; Llurda, 2004; Pennycook, 1994; Schiffman, 1996) concur arguing that the aggressive expansion of the English language is taking place at the expense of multilingualism (Llurda, 2004), resulting in a loss of linguistic diversity and the endangerment of other languages and cultures (Ferguson, 2006). Despite

these conflicting views about the global spread of English, research on English is increasingly embracing the fact that the so-called inner circle communities are no longer the sole owners of English; they have to share ownership with the speakers of the so called outer and expanding circle speakers (Llurda, 2004).

Today it is widely accepted that English[3] is linguistically and sociolinguistically highly variable due to its use in a wide range of geographical and cultural contexts (Crystal, 2003). The growing heterogeneity of English has been challenging the dominance of England as the centre of the language. Starting from the late 20th century, England has become only one among several norm providers as other inner circle countries have also been successfully promoting their varieties and popular culture, and research on English (e.g. Jenkins, 2005; Kortmann et al., 2008; Ulrich, 2003) is celebrating the hybridity of English. However, in language teaching circles and among lay people, English continues to be equated with normative varieties, principally Standard British and nowadays also American English. Discourses about English constantly reproduce the centrality of these normative varieties, arguing that these two Standard varieties are the only 'correct' models of language use, and that they are the only 'ideal' targets of language acquisition in classroom settings where English is taught as a second or foreign language (ESL/EFL). Although English has been undergoing tremendous changes in its form and functions, there is a strong tendency to cling to the traditional English as a native language (ENL)[4] model as the final arbiter for appropriate language use (Phillipson, 2001). In a similar vein, the monolingual speakers of English from so-called inner circle countries such as Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and the United States are the preferred teachers of English. Although it is widely known that teachers from these countries do not speak English in the same way, and that there is a fair amount of internal social and/or regional variation within these countries, it is automatically assumed that teachers originating from these countries are speakers of the Standard varieties of English. Nevertheless, in many post-colonial communities, many speakers of so called nativized varieties of English consider themselves native speakers of English as they acquired English along with one or more

[3] Various language models have been suggested to legitimate the heterogeneity of English according to its cultural context and educational purposes, such as Modiano's EIL (English as International Language), Streven's World Map of English (1992), McArthur's Circle of World English (1987), and Görlach's Circle Model of English (1988) that describes the global dispositions of World Englishes.

[4] Traditionally, English is classified as ENL, ESL, and EFL. Although the terms have been helpful in understanding its role in different countries around the world, it remains problematic for a number of reasons. First, ENL varieties tend to be (implicitly) identified with standardized varieties. Second, there is a fair amount of overlap between the terms as educated speakers of all three posited types of varieties are often indistinguishable. Third, there is the assumption of homogeneity of the type "all UK citizens are speakers of ENL while all citizens of India are speakers of ESL" (Kachru, 1986).

local languages from birth. However, in the eyes of the teaching establishment, they are widely considered to be non-native speakers of English because they do not speak inner circle varieties of English, and do not make use of English for all of their communicative needs. Thus, the dichotomy of native and non-native speakers remains controversial. Its application in the field of language education is even more questionable. Arguing against the 'superiority' of the monolingual teacher, Widdowson (1994) states:

> "Teachers of English are required to teach not English as a general linguistic phenomenon but English as a subject – a subject which keeps company with others on the curriculum – history, physics, geography, and so on. Now nobody, I think would suppose that somebody who lived through a particular period of history was especially well qualified to teach it as a subject – that the best teachers of the history of the Second World War, for example, are a diminishing group of octogenarian old soldiers who have actually lived the experience. Similarly, it would be surely odd to argue that the best teachers of the geography, of say the Australian alps are Tyrolean shepherds because they have a unique intimacy with the landscape…of course these people have a wealth of intimate experience which can be drawn upon as data, and so they can serve as expert informants on certain aspects of the subject concerned. But this does not make them expert instructors" (Widdowson, 1994).

Essentially language teaching is a skill that requires pedagogical training and practice (Canagarajah, 1999:80). Thus, so-called monolingual speakers of English from inner circle countries will not automatically make good teachers purely because English is their first language and/or because they happen to speak inner circle varieties of English, and, similarly, the multilingual speakers of English with competence in multiple languages and speakers of so called nativized varieties are not automatically deficient teachers. Both types of teachers' performance in the classroom are highly dependent on their training and experience.

While there is little empirical research on the issue, the few studies that exist suggest that monolingual and multilingual teachers differ in target language competence, teaching behaviour, and approach due to differences in their linguistic competence (Arva and Medgyes, 2000). Multilingual teachers are reported to favour isolated practice of linguistic elements while the monolingual teachers are reported to prefer an integrated approach (Reves and Medgyes, 1994). Another study that investigated the teachers' language acquisition awareness suggested that the multilingual teachers have a greater awareness of the mechanisms involved in language use and acquisition (Barrios, 2002). Other studies (Liu, 1999; Nayar, 1994; Paikeday, 1985; Tsui & Bunton, 2000; Widdowson, 1994) have examined teachers'

teaching ideologies. They show that only a limited number of studies have focused on the actual teaching practices of the teachers. Yet other studies that investigated teachers' teaching practice have shown that they did not explore the teachers' teaching ideologies. Essentially, there are no studies that have examined how teachers implement their teaching ideologies in actual teaching practice.

In the case of countries like Malaysia, we know little about teachers' actual teaching practices in the EFL/ESL classroom contexts and how the teachers' teaching practices correlate with their teaching ideologies. Studies that have explored expatriate monolingual and local multilingual teachers' practices in Malaysian language classrooms have only focused on teachers' teaching beliefs (Farimah & Fatimah, 2013; Fathen et. al, 2013) and the sociolinguistics background of the teachers (Gibson & Swan, 2008). This study, in contrast, seeks to examine common assumptions regarding the teaching styles of monolingual and multilingual teachers and their implementation. Specifically, it examines how expatriate monolingual and trained multilingual teachers' classroom discourse patterns promote learner participation in the Malaysian context. It compares the teaching practices and teaching ideologies of expatriate monolingual and local Malaysian multilingual teachers in order to understand their teaching styles.

1.2 Classroom Interaction and Teaching Styles

Communication is an important aspect of language learning. In order to be a successful learner, English language learners need many opportunities to communicate in both academic and real-life social situations (Cazden, 2001). An effective teacher encourages learner participation in the classroom by devising interesting and real-life classroom activities that provide communication opportunities for learners (ibid, 2001). The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, for instance, is today widely used in many non-Western classroom contexts due to its proven effectiveness in enhancing language learning development as evidenced by research in various classroom contexts (Savignon, 1991). It focuses on interaction as the ultimate goal of language teaching and thus structures classroom interaction around real-life situations of communication (ibid, 1991). CLT promotes both fluency and accuracy in the language learning process, unlike other approaches that focus on grammar memorization techniques, with the aim of producing error-free sentences. In CLT, the learners' participation in the classroom is based on the student-centred learning that

promotes group work tasks and discussion rather than the traditional teacher-centred teaching style that relies on the teacher as a model.

In the teacher-centred teaching style, teachers tend to have full authority over the lessons and students. They assert control over the teaching and learning materials, and the ways in which students study it, instruction also tends to be frontal: teachers do most of the talking i.e., lecturing, instructing, and demonstrating while the learners listen attentively to the teachers and follow their instructions. The transformation from conventional teaching methods to a student-centred approach has also changed the roles of the teacher and learner in the classrooms. In the student-centred style, the teachers have the primary role of facilitator. They encourage the learners to participate actively instead of just 'instructing' them, and share both decision-making and the responsibility for learning with the students; the teacher essentially just guides the learning process. The student-centred teaching style increases the learners' self-learning awareness in addition to the ordinary function of knowledge sharing. In the student-centred teaching style, the construction of knowledge is shared between the teachers and learners, and learning is achieved through the students' engagement via interactive activities (Chall, 2000) with teachers providing guidance on language learning rather than simply being the model for correct speech. Student-centred learning in ESL/EFL classrooms promotes communicative language teaching (CLT) which develops language use among the learners, primarily paying attention to improving communication skills (Spada, 2007). It is argued that the implementation of a student-centred teaching approach such as CLT will facilitate language learning and produce proficient language users who are functional in real-life communication (Baker, 2005). In the EFL setting, the monolingual teachers are preferred because they are associated with an ability to devise an active communication and cooperative teaching strategy that promotes student-centred learning. Meanwhile the multilingual teachers are argued not to make effective use of CLT strategies in their classroom practices (Hue, 2012).

The CLT approach was introduced in Malaysian EFL classrooms many years ago and it has been recognised as an effective method in ELT. However, among the higher authorities in the Malaysian government there is the perception that local Malaysian teachers are not properly implementing this approach in their classrooms. The institutions and learners alike have the perception that the local multilingual teachers focus too much on the teaching of language structure using a frontal or non-interactive teaching approach. They are said to rely on the teacher-centred teaching

style that tends to exert a higher degree of authority in their classroom lessons (Raissi & Nor, 2013). In contrast, there is the widespread belief that monolingual teachers from so-called inner circle countries are typically applying a more communicative approach, and/or implement this approach better than their non-Western counterparts. Although the CLT pedagogical approach is strongly advocated in the Malaysian EFL classroom, there is scarcely any investigation into this approach on the ground. A questionnaire survey conducted with teachers in Malaysian higher education showed that the teachers are trained to use this approach (Nordin, Wahab & Dahlan, 2013). However, to date, there has been no empirical research that addresses the teachers' understanding of this approach and its implementation in the classroom.

1.3 Research on Classroom Interaction

Current research on classroom discourse views discourse or the language use in the classroom as a social means of communication and argues that it plays a crucial role in the process of language learning (Hicks, 1996). Discourse in the classroom is the central means through which new knowledge and understandings are negotiated between teachers and learners. Thus, teachers working in the classroom settings are expected to be well aware of the role of classroom discourse in the mediation of learning. The social and contextual nature of human learning has received great emphasis in research on learning and instruction (Heller, et al., 1997; Greeno, 1997). Research on classroom interaction investigates the nature of the social activities that take place in the classroom by focusing in particular on the verbal interaction of the teachers. It pays considerable attention to the practices, processes, and conditions leading to the social construction of knowledge in different learning situations (Fisher, 1993; Lemke, 1990; Palincsar, 1986; Tuyay, Jennings, & Dixon, 1995). Over the years, research has extended its analysis from external factors influencing learning processes and achievements to the student's participation in classroom lessons, and developing understanding of, the teaching and learning process in the classroom lessons (Grossen, 1994; Perret-Clermont, Perret, & Bell, 1991). Research from the former perspective helps us understand the teachers' role as facilitator in student-centred and teacher-centred teaching styles. Despite enhancing the understanding of the evolving language practice in a situated classroom setting, research in classroom interaction rarely compares teachers' actual practice with their ideologies. Classroom interaction research only focuses on language use in the particular setting and, to a certain extent, includes the influence of the social condition of the classrooms such as the learners'

behaviour. However no attempt is made to investigate either how the teachers' ideologies are manifested in their actual teaching practices, or how the teachers' actual practice correlates with their ideologies.

The audio recordings of classroom interactions or researcher's observations about classroom interaction(s) typically form the basis for making inferences about interaction structure in classroom interaction studies. Analysis of classroom interaction generally begins by focusing on a particular aspect or discourse feature in order to understand the language practice in a situated context. Questioning patterns are one variable that has figured prominently in the analysis of teachers' interactions with students as this discourse feature plays a central role in the management and conduct of a classroom lesson. It provides an insight into teachers' teaching style and allows for determining the teacher-centred and learner-centred teaching styles.

Studies on classroom discourse analysis apply a variety of approaches to investigate teachers' and learners' classroom interactions. One approach which is widely applied is Conversation Analysis (CA) as it provides a principled system for analysing naturally occurring spoken interaction in an institutionalised setting (Seedhouse, 2004). CA has played a key role within social scientific studies studying the role of language in institutional structures (Walsh, 2006). CA provides an "understanding of the methods by which participants structure their actions in an accountable way by showing the systemic organisation of talk-in-interaction" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973 as cited in Ten Have, 2001: 6-8). It attempts to account for the interactional practices that enable interlocutors in a conversation to make sense of and contribute to the interaction. According to this approach, classroom interaction is made up of many participants and there has to be a systematic procedure by which classroom members adjust their conduct so as to achieve mutual understanding. CA suggests that classroom interaction is a situated process that is enacted through classroom activities including teachers' and learners' discourses, and learning activities. Although CA has not developed a model that accounts for language acquisition, its framework has stimulated a number of analyses of socialization and learning processes in classroom contexts and other social institutions (Mondada & Doehler, 2004). The CA method has been influential in investigating interactions between native and non-native speakers in L2 learning contexts (see Marker, 2000), and also in exploring in detail interaction patterns in classroom and other instructional interactions (Markee, 2000; Mondada & Doehler, 2004; Wagner, 1996).

1.4 Ideological Framing in Target Language Orientation

A review on language studies that were conducted to examine English language teaching reported that the teachers' beliefs about teaching approaches, classroom discourse, practices, and their subject matter are all important factors in classroom decisions (Tsui, Amy & James, 2007). Teachers' ideologies influence their choices concerning what to teach, how to teach, and how to deal with learners' behaviours (Sullivan & Woods, 2008). However, it was also found that the teachers' ability to implement their beliefs is not only subject to their knowledge about a teaching approach, but is also dependent on other factors, such as the learners' culture and proficiency level, and various institutional constraints. Among those constraints is the fact that teachers are required to follow a particular curriculum and must adhere to the norms set by the institutional authorities. Various actions by teachers in the classroom, such as their manner of asking questions, allocating turns, and the type of English or varieties used in classroom interaction, are not random or neutral, but rather linked to their ideologies about languages, teaching, and learning. The ideological stance of the teachers in Malaysian language classroom settings is not homogeneous as the teachers have different social, language, and pedagogical backgrounds, and also must deal in different ways with how institutional authority is exercised (Li, 2015).

The examination of ideologies has benefited from the concept of language ideology. To study language ideology is to explore the connection between language beliefs and actual practice. It is to examine the ways speakers conceive the role and use of language, and examine how they construe their beliefs in practice. This concept of language ideology, as proposed by Kroskrity (2004), examines how and why speakers choose to use language differently from one another. Although this concept is widely used to investigate language practices in anthropological and sociolinguistics studies, the classroom investigation can also benefit from this concept. Kroskrity (2004) examines five levels of organization which exemplify language ideologies (Aueu & Wi, 2007). The first level states, "language ideologies represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group" (Kroskrity, 2004:501). That is, speakers' perceptions of language are entrenched in their social and cultural experiences and they often reflect and reproduce particular economic interests (Auer & Wi, 2007:84). The second level states that language ideologies are multiple because of the plurality of meaningful divisions within society such as class, gender and generations that have the potential to produce divergent perspectives as an index of group membership (Kroskrity, 2004). The third level argues

that members of social groups or communities do not all display the same level of awareness of local language ideologies since they are not always conscious of the language ideologies to which they subscribe (ibid, 2004). The fourth level states that language ideologies mediate between social structures and forms of talk (ibid, 2004). The last level to note is that language ideologies are intricately involved in the construction of identity (Kroskrity, 2004). The levels proposed by the concept of language ideology are apparent in many EFL classroom settings, thus it can be successfully used to address the ideological issues that are present in these types of settings. Addressing teachers' ideologies in the classroom can provide a better understanding of how teachers' ideologies are reflected in their classroom, pedagogical, and discourse practices. In particular, it can provide a better, more concrete, and empirically grounded picture of how the teachers view the persistent issues which shape their classroom practices, such as 'standard' form, English-only instructions and the different teaching approaches.

The language ideologies and policies that exist in the EFL classroom context are closely linked to the beliefs which are prevalent in institutions and among their leaders. They mainly reflect the voices and beliefs of the ruling elites that are implemented through the classroom practices. There are certain dominant beliefs that are present in the EFL classroom context, such as the monolingual teachers of English from so-called inner circle countries and those multilingual teachers from outer-circle countries who pursue different teaching ideologies and approaches. The former teachers, irrespective of training, are widely assumed to pursue a modern and communicative approach that focuses on student-centred teaching styles. The latter are identified with a traditional and less communicative teacher-centred instruction approach in which the teacher plays the dominant role in the language learning process (Burnaby and Sun, 1998). Generalisations like these are so widespread that they have become stereotypes (Littlewood & Baohua, 2011). Consequently, policymakers and gatekeepers, such as the institution and their authorities, display a strong desire towards the monolingual model and its norm. This bias is transparent in many public and private institutions that use English as a key medium of teaching because they hire increasingly greater numbers of monolingual teachers. For both the institution and learners, these teachers embody both access to the desired varieties of English and teaching models. Most of the expatriate monolingual teachers in the Malaysian context, for example, come from the 'inner circle' English-speaking countries. Although many of these expatriate teachers are capable and often have relevant experience, there are also a growing number of teachers who have never had professional language teaching training or who

have only attended short-term teaching courses, such as those that lead to the Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (CELTA). This is in contrast to the local Malaysian English teachers who are in the main professionally trained teachers. In order to teach in the Malaysian ESL/EFL classroom context, the minimum requirement is the successful completion of a 4 year university-based degree in the field of Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) or the Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).

1.5 The Empirical / Social Context of the Study

This study focuses on the EFL classroom in an outer circle country, Malaysia. Malaysia is a country located in Southeast Asia. The capital city of Malaysia is Kuala Lumpur and its administrative capital is in the federal territory of Putrajaya. Malaysia has a population of approximately 28.3 million people and this population consists of several ethnic groups such as Malay, Chinese, Indian, other indigenous groups and non-Malaysians. Bahasa Melayu is the national and official language and is used by formal institutions and on formal national occasions. The English language has established its place as an important second language for communication in both formal and informal interactions. However, it only has secondary importance over Bahasa Melayu (Thirusanku & Yunus, 2014). In addition to Bahasa Melayu and English, varieties of Chinese, Indian, and several indigenous languages are also spoken in Malaysia. Although English in Malaysia fits the criteria of ESL, for many students, especially from rural areas, English must be considered a foreign language. Since, English serves the purpose of EFL for a majority of students, the term EFL is used over ESL in this study. However, this does not mean to exclude the role of ESL for other students involved in this study.

Malaysia has a long association with English. The first contact with English took place during British rule in the late eighteen century. The development of trade promoted the emergence of a group of "English educated non-Europeans" (Lowenberg, 1986:73). These were the locals trained to aid in the British government infrastructure as lower-ranking officers and clerks. The colonial government established private and missionary schools in which English functioned as the medium of instruction for their education. English gained recognition among the local population and it was used continuously by the local administrative staff during the colonial period. English became the primary language for business (shipping, transport, commerce, etc), administration,

and the mass media (papers were published in English, films were imported). However, over time English also gradually developed into a code of informal communication, mainly because of its prestige value and ethically neutral status (ibid, 1986). This informal variety is today known under the name of Manglish and is widely used among Malaysians of all ethnic backgrounds as a language of solidarity. After Malaya[5] gained independence in 1957, Bahasa Melayu was adopted 'politically and constitutionally' as the national language and the role of English was reduced and sidelined for daily and official communication. The third National Education Policy (NEP) in 1976 re-introduced English into school and it became recognised as a 'second language' in the Malaysian education system. Learners were expected to "speak with acceptable rhythm and produce the sounds of English sufficiently well for a listener to be able to distinguish between similar words" (Haji Omar, 1982:230-231) and learners were not required to sound like or have the same level of proficiency as a native speaker from an inner circle country. The status of English as a 'second language' was further strengthened when it became a compulsory subject. These local developments, the expansion of English globally, and its status as a 'lingua franca' have changed the perception of English in Malaysia. In recent years, English has come to be viewed as an important asset and 'social capital' which plays a crucial role in elevating the social and economic status of Malaysia, in the production of knowledge, and also in competing internationally. As a result, more emphasis is given to the teaching and learning of English at all academic levels. Teachers are trained both locally and in overseas universities. Monolingual teachers are also being hired to teach in the Malaysian language classrooms as a step towards improving the standard of English in Malaysia and academic standards in the education system in general. Although English is considered a second language in the Malaysian education system, many universities use English as a medium of instruction, especially private colleges and universities[6].

Private tertiary institutions offer English-medium education as a way to attract more foreign students (Padlee, Kamaruddin & Baharun, 2010). These institutions function to provide higher education to Malaysian learners and also to foreign students. In addition, they also provide English language education mainly to foreign learners

[5] Malaysia was referred to as Malaya during the pre-independence period. Post-independence the country is known as Malaysia.

[6] The majority of government universities in Malaysia use Malay as a medium of instruction. These universities are controlled by the Ministry of Education (MOE) and a large number of their students are local Malaysians from rural and urban areas, unlike the private institutions, which have their own organization and a quite substantial contingent of international students.