

English as a Lingua Franca Awareness of the Pre-service English Teachers in Assessing Students' Speaking Assignment

Komilie Situmorang^{1,*}, Dwi Yulianto Nugroho², Santa Maya Pramusita³,
Michael Recard Sihombing⁴

¹ Nursing Department, Faculty of Nursing, Universitas Pelita Harapan, Tangerang 15811, Indonesia

² School of Education, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Leeds, LS2 3AR, United Kingdom

³ Nursing Department, Faculty of Nursing, Universitas Pelita Harapan, Tangerang 15811, Indonesia

⁴ Teachers College, Faculty of Education, Universitas Pelita Harapan, Tangerang 15811, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

ELF;
Pre-service;
Awareness;
English Teachers

Article History:

Received : 11/10/2022

Revised : 17/04/2023

Accepted : 30/05/2023

Available Online:
30/05/2023

ABSTRACT

The permeating use of English promotes a contact language among people from multicultural backgrounds called English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). Pre-service English teachers going to the teaching practice thus need to be aware of ELF trends to engage with their students in the classroom. This study seeks to explore the ELF awareness of the pre-service English teachers in assessing the students' speaking assessment. Twenty pre-service teachers from three geographically different universities were recruited. They were asked to establish the speaking rubrics assessment based on the given video and were invited to Forum Group Discussion (FGD) for their underlying reasons for scoring. The results indicated that University A developed ELF awareness as they demonstrated open-mindedness, tolerance, less value on errors, and emphasis on intelligibility both personally and professionally. Meanwhile, Universities B and C openly state that Native speakers' English is the only proper English, and any other use beyond it is a defect. The discussion suggests that the different geographical locations may cause different exposures to speakers of English. The study suggests that pre-service English teachers actively explore the ongoing trend in English Language Teaching with the Faculty of Education to provide continuous support in the process.

How to cite (in APA style): Situmorang, K., Nugroho, D. Y., Pramusita, S. M., & Sihombing, M. R. (2023). English as a Lingua Franca Awareness of the Pre-service English Teachers in Assessing Students' Speaking Assignment. *OKARA: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 17(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.19105/ojbs.v17i1.7096>

1. INTRODUCTION

Internationalisation has encouraged countries to start opening the border for international exchange programs and adopting the use of English in many sectors to go globalized. However, it is not without debate. English used in the international context has intrigued a growing body of research where linguists have different views. The world is now an interconnected, globalized world where English is not used to validate ownership but as a practical tool and working language (Nagy, 2016). English use between speakers whose

*Corresponding Author: Komilie Situmorang  komilie.situmorang@uph.edu

2442-305X / © 2023 The Author(s), Published by Center of Language Development, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Madura, INDONESIA.

This is open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

first language is not English is now defined as English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (Jenkins, Baker, & Dewey, 2018; Jenkins & Leung, 2014).

ELF is not an alternative to standard English but a language that emerges from the interactions between two or more members of linguacultural in English (Cogo & House, 2018). ELF is used in communication "as a language of negotiation, problem-solving, and decision-maker in ever-more diverse and super-diverse context (Bayyurt & Dewey, 2020)." The emergence of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) is rooted in 1998 when Jennifer Jenkins investigated the phonology of the ELF interactions and the establishment of Lingua Franca Core (LFC) in Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English (Jenkins, Cogo, & Dewey, 2011; Seidlhofer, 2001). Besides, a previous study (Zoghbor, 2018) has also promoted LFC as the minimum requirement of intelligible communication.

Since then, English Language Teaching (ELT) has witnessed a growing body of research and a newly opened door for language teaching in expanding circles. Books and publications have been dedicated to the emergence of ELF, and more collections have concentrated on ELF's use from the perspective of language teaching (Jenkins et al., 2018). ELF is garnering attention and is such fresh air to English in the multilingual and multicultural context, and it has now become the most used English worldwide.

The scope of ELF has promoted the global use of English, which is why English language teachers need to have awareness and understanding of how ELF is the language of contact globally and consider how this may contribute to language teaching, including the syllabus, materials, and method, and of course the assessment (Bayyurt & Dewey, 2020). Besides, English teachers should know how ELF facilitates mutual conversation and meaning-making instead of focusing on one standard of English. This trend is paramount because, previously, teachers have been solely teaching the standard English rules and models, thus ignoring the importance of promoting effective communication, negotiation, and authentic communication. English teachers should be informed with invaluable information about the recent language resources and various language strategies that can be used to achieve effective communication (Bayyurt & Dewey, 2020). English should be about effectiveness, confidence, and successful goal achievement instead of accuracy. Therefore, English teachers should promote and integrate it into their multilingual classrooms. The ELF awareness that teachers should have, includes (1) awareness of language and language use, (2) awareness of the instructional practice, and (3) awareness of learning (Sifakis, 2019; Soruç & Griffiths, 2021).

Previous research on pre-service teachers' ELF awareness has resulted in various findings. The study on pre-service teachers in Turkey indicated a favorable result where teachers give less emphasis to correction, and more to intelligibility, respect for linguistic identities, open-mindedness, tolerance, allowing choice, and being realistic about the use of English in the real world (Soruç & Griffiths, 2021). Pre-service teachers with higher proficiency were more capable of diversifying their communicative strategies and exposing themselves to more effective communication (Chan, 2021). English proficiency is an asset but does not necessarily guarantee successful communication if the user cannot use the strategies to make his interlocutor understands what he intends to say (Luczaj, Leonowicz-Bukala, & Kurek-Ochmanska, 2022). In addition, ELF-aware teachers were also found to be developing an understanding of integrating the ELF into the classroom context (Sifakis, 2019).

Despite the favorable finding, unfavorable findings dominate the ELT practices regarding pre-service teachers' ELF awareness. English teachers believe the stigma that

forms in a society where the native speaker of English is the one true English, thus allowing no other Englishes (Silalahi, 2021). Besides, problems regarding the implementation of the ELF have also arisen. Parents prefer to send their children to schools with native-speaker teachers and the Standard English variation (Soruç & Griffiths, 2021), and though the English teachers are fully aware of the ELF, the policy documents and the education goal that the government sets contradict the real-life teaching (Jeong, Sánchez Ruiz, & Wilhelmsson, 2022).

In Indonesia, the ELF term is unique because people rely upon the native speakers' norm as well as glorying it as the one true English (Kusumaningputri, Khazanah, Setiarini, & Sampurna, 2022). Still, it is naturally used because of the multicultural and multilingual communities. In addition, as Indonesia is in the expanding circle, English use is categorized as ELF. However, students believe that English use is centered on standard English as it is considered the most prestigious, causing hesitance in speaking without a native accent (Simanjuntak, Lien, Development, & Development, 2021). Meanwhile, a study of 10 English teachers shows the high demand for native-speaker accents, as educational institutions believe that everything from the native speaker is the best (Silalahi, 2021).

Therefore, through these contradictions, implementing ELF and preparing pre-service teachers ready to go into the teaching practice is paramount. While problems regarding students, parents, and policymakers are yet looking into the sole use of native speakers, the pre-service teachers should be aware that ELF might appear in the context as a contact language, emerging as the result of the communication. There is an urgent need for English teachers to orchestrate the ELF in teaching. Instead of questioning and debating which English should be taught, pre-service English teachers should be aware that they can harmonize the ELF perspective in the ELT. Therefore, this study served as preliminary research to determine the ELF awareness of pre-service English teachers by structuring two significant goals, including (1) the most important things to assess in speaking tasks are (2) the underlying reasons for assessing the speaking tasks. The implication of the research will be used as the basis to introduce ELF awareness to pre-service English teachers.

2. METHOD

This study was designed in the qualitative framework intending to explore the pre-service awareness of the existence of the ELF. The study involved 20 students from three universities in different geographical sites. University A was in the heart of Jakarta, University B was in the heart of Medan, and University C was in the suburb of Palembang. No predetermined number in qualitative data as the point of data collection is data saturation (Mason, 2010). The participants were pre-service English teachers who had passed the Language Testing class and received a minimum B score. The participation was entirely voluntary and in no way affected their grades.

The data collection included two steps. First, the students were asked to assess the video tasks; second, they were invited to a focus group discussion/interview (FGD) to scrutinize the reasons for assessing the speaking video (Dornyei, 2007).

The video assessment aimed to "expose a group of pre-service teachers to a variety of awareness-raising tasks and to investigate their view of the ELF-aware teacher following participation in these activities" (Soruç & Griffiths, 2021). The FGD was conducted per university and facilitated in Bahasa Indonesia and English. Each university had a different

schedule, so they would have more room to speak with friends. The data were analyzed in two steps. The first data analysis was document analysis, where the components of the rubric composed by the students were sorted from the most picked to the least in percentage. Then a rudimentary analysis was given of each data. Second, the focus group discussion data were coded and themed to support the findings in the document analysis. The participants' explanations were quoted to support the analysis made. To reduce bias and add triangulation, three researchers joined the FGD, one as the primary interviewer and the other as the observer. Each researcher analyzed the data separately and then sat together to discuss the findings and established themes.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Rubric Components

The findings of the rubric's components were sorted per university category. The data was arranged from the least to the most significantly picked components in the rubrics. The components were presented in percentages calculated from the appearance in the rubrics. The findings from 10 participants from the A university indicated the components as follows:

Table 1
Rubric components from University A

No	Components	Frequency	%
1	Fluency	1	2.4
2	Vocabulary	1	2.4
3	Grammar	4	9.5
4	Pronunciation	6	14.3
5	Content	8	19.0
6	Duration	7	16.7
7	Delivery (Cs)	15	35.7
Total data		42	100.00

The finding from University A indicates that the students have a range of components they include in the rubrics. The participants valued delivery, including facial expressions and performance, to be an essential component (35%), followed by content and language (19%). Meanwhile, other essential components, such as grammar, vocabulary, and fluency, come with a lower percentage.

Table 2
Rubrics component from University B

No	Components	Frequency	%
1	Vocabulary	3	17.6
2	Fluency	3	17.6
3	Understanding	1	5.9
4	Grammar	3	17.6
5	Pronunciation	7	41.2
Total data		17	100.0

The finding from University B indicates that the participants based their video scoring on the technical components. Pronunciation and intonation are valued as the essential components (41.2%), followed by vocabulary, fluency, and grammar, each 17.6%, respectively. Meanwhile, the understanding appeared once.

Table 3
Rubrics component from University C

No	Components	Frequency	%
1	Understanding	2	7.1
2	Interactive Communication	2	7.1
3	Fluency	4	14.3
4	Grammar	6	21.4
5	Vocabulary	5	17.9
6	Pronunciation	9	32.1
	Total data	28	100.0

The finding from University C highlights pronunciation as the most valued component of the students' video task (32.1%). Grammar (21.4%) and vocabulary (17.9). Understanding and interactive communication appear twice each, with 7.1%, respectively.

3.2 Pre-service Underlying Reasons for Assessing the Video Task

3.2.1 Early ELF Awareness

Through the data analysis, participants emphasized that content, delivery, and intelligibility were the essential components of the speaking assessment. Participants from University A indicate that they have early awareness of the ELF. The statements produced through the focus group discussion imply that they have had exposure to the usage of ELF.

- (1) *"For me, the most important thing is content; speaking is about delivering the message, and others get it. So, grammar is useless if the message is not delivered and understood by others (content)."*
- (2) *"The delivery is most important in speaking because it is how the message is delivered. We may not fully understand all the talk, but through the pace, the emphasis, and the gesture, we may get the meanings said (strategies)."*
- (3) *"I uphold a principle that I am not teaching them to have a native speaker proficiency but how they send the meaning to others through their English proficiency (intelligibility)."*

In addition, the participants express their attitudes toward their students' English. There is an indication of their growing ELF awareness.

- (1) *"Students have different cultural identities and backgrounds that influence their speaking, but it's fine long as the meaning is delivered. Students speaking in Javanese will still be intelligible to us."*
- (2) *"If students speak unlike natives, it's okay because we are not natives. Our task is to give them exposure instead of imposing."*
- (3) *"Students speaking is not intended to impress others, and they shouldn't be embarrassed about it because the way they speak indicates their identities."*

On the other sides, through the FGD, the participants revealed that they still wish to have a specific accent, yet they are fully aware that it is not the most important thing for them. Some choose British English for the seemingly cool sound, while others choose American English for it is widely used and is part of popular culture.

- (1) *"I prefer British English but am not currently after it because I am still trying to improve my basic speaking skills."*
- (2) *"I prefer American English because Indonesian use American English the most. Even in the working place, I found that American English is mainly used."*
- (3) *"British and American English are both challenging in their ways, but I wouldn't impose one of them on the students. Let the students decide on their own English."*

Regarding future use, the participants have an early understanding of their ELF teaching and assessment practices. The participants note their awareness of what they will do in the classroom later.

- (1) *"We are taught that we teach pronunciation and phonology not to have the native likeness but to be intelligible and understood by others."*
- (2) *"I will not just adopt the rubrics that are being widely used now because I now know it is no longer relevant to the students and the objectives that I want them to achieve. I will consider gestures and speaking strategies and how they deliver meaning."*
- (3) *"Currently, the assessment is only based on grammatical errors and perfect pronunciation. I aim at meaningful conversation, which is content-based and intelligible to others."*

The findings highlight at least four categories, including awareness of the speaking components assessed, attitudes toward students' English, personal preference for English mastery, and future teaching reflection. Through these four categories, the participants consistently indicate their awareness of the existence of the ELF in communication.

3.2.2 Unfamiliarity with ELT

From the data analysis, Universities B and C show the same trend indicating unfamiliarity with ELF terms and uses. The speaking assessment revolves around vocabulary, pronunciation, intonation, and grammar.

- (1) *"I am not sure if the speaking is good or not. I am just basing my assessment on whenever it sounds just 'wow!'"*
- (2) *"I pay attention to how students usually say 'sea' instead of 'she.'"*
- (3) *"I think people should have a standard way of speaking because it will cause problems. I once heard a Thai saying, 'Why you se-mile,' and it's confusing. In addition, I also listened to an Indian changing 't' to 'd' in saying, 'Dell me.' No offense, but that speaking is a bit strange to me."*

In terms of students' English use, the participants express their attitudes if their students are speaking with local dialects.

- (1) *"There is no problem with students using it, but as teachers, we comply with the curriculum, thus basing the assessment on standard English."*
- (2) *"Students can indeed use their local dialects, but at school, they will only be taught real English."*

- (3) *"I know students have backgrounds and other reasons to speak with local dialects. Still, I will teach them only native English because having a specific accent will open many job opportunities for them and have added value to their self-worth."*

In addition to their choice of standard English use in the classroom, they also express their preference for mastering one type of English. The preference is supported by valid reasons, as can be seen as follows:

- (1) *"I aim to have native likeness because tourists speak English by born and grow up in English-speaking countries. It is so cool to hear them speaking, the accent, the fluency. I dream of having a British accent and now practice for it."*
- (2) *"I want a native-like accent because it is more interesting and easier to understand."*
- (3) *"As someone who will work in the academic context, I want to sound like a native because standard English is the language of academics. I want to work in an international school where language use is the native accent."*

Consistently, the participants from Universities B and C have stated their preferences and attitudes toward having a native speaker's accent and proficiency. Therefore, in future use in classroom practice, some state that they will stick to the current curriculum. Meanwhile, others are more concerned about improving the teachers to have native speakers like competency.

- (1) *"The current curriculum design has been purposefully designed. I think I will just add the speaking intonation to weigh more on the assessment. If my students have a British accent, I will encourage them to keep practicing."*
- (2) *"We'll need the training for teachers to be equipped with native English against those in the international schools."*
- (3) *"We must be committed to designing attractive learning situations and speaking English in the school area."*

A similar analysis was done on the participants' data from universities B and C involving the awareness regarding the speaking components assessed, the attitudes toward students' English, their personal preference for English mastery, and future teaching reflection.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Rubric Components

There are two contrasting trends seen in the result of the rubric components. University A indicates that grammar, vocabulary, and fluency are no longer valued as the main components of a speaking task. Instead, delivery, contents, and duration are weighed more important. Delivery here is defined as the communication strategies, contents are the meanings delivered, and duration is how to get the talk done short and precise. Presumably, the students have been informed of the importance of effective communication (Bayyurt & Dewey, 2020). Therefore, there is an early awareness where these students understand flexibility in assessing. They no longer base their assessment solely on technical things but more on the process of task completion and meaning-making (Soruç & Griffiths, 2021).

Meanwhile, the findings of University B and C indicate that the scoring rubrics are based on pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary, which are all forms-based. Very little process of sending information and meaning-making is given consideration for scoring. This

finding indicates an inclination to use one specific English reference, causing the scoring process's inflexibility. Correctness and acceptability are based on the native speaker's likeness (Kaur & Raman, 2014).

The rubrics are composed by the pre-service English teachers based on their understanding of how they should score their future students' assignments. From the data and the analysis, it is concluded that students who have an early understanding of ELF comprise rubrics differently from those who hold close to the native speakers' English norms.

4.2 Pre-service Underlying Reasons for Assessing the Video Task

4.2.1 Early ELF Awareness

The result from the data analysis indicated early exposure to ELF, so the participants have demonstrated in their awareness when designing the assessment rubrics. Their awareness is reflected in four points, including awareness of the speaking components assessed, attitudes toward students' English, personal preference for English mastery, and future teaching reflection.

First, they are aware that they should focus on getting the message across rather than the forms used. The participants demonstrate their tolerance, choice, and realistic language expectation through their English use. Less focus on forms and grammar has been one of the signs of ELF awareness because many of the teaching practices in EFL today teach grammar as the most important thing. Besides, the participants have been aware that when conversing, they should focus on how to deliver the message. The excerpts include 'body gesture' and 'emphasis,' which highlight their practice through their language use. Lastly, they also note that the English they teach is not to meet the native proficiency but to communicate. These findings are prominent in indicating University A's ELF awareness. As mentioned in the previous studies, pre-service teachers respecting intelligibility, less focus on grammar errors, and are realistic with their English use are ELF-aware teachers (Soruç & Griffiths, 2021).

Second, as Indonesians, they are aware that students speaking English might be influenced by their cultural backgrounds. However, long as they are intelligible, the student achieves the goal of the tasks. Additionally, the participants indicate that their students will not be able to hide their cultural backgrounds as they come from multilingual contexts building multilingual classrooms. Imposing them to one type of English is undoubtedly unwise, let alone base the assessment on that specific English. In this case, the participants express their open-mindedness to the intelligibility and the possibility of assessing the communication strategies believed to promote ELF in the global market (Cogo & Pitzl, 2013). This finding also highlights four results by Soruc and Griffith (2021) that show respect for cultural backgrounds, tolerance, open-mindedness, and choices.

Third, though they have their English preference, they know it is not the focus of language learning. The students explicitly define their English mastery preference; British and American. They are aware that these standard Englishes are marketable, but they prefer to be competent language users. This finding resonates with Sifakis's language use awareness (Sifakis, 2019), and Yalçın et al. are finding the teachers' language awareness to be competent users rather than identified as non-native speaker teachers (Yalçın, Bayyurt, & Alahdab, 2020).

Fourth, they reflect on their future teaching practice, and they will redesign the assessments to meet the tasks rather than to meet the curriculum demands. Participants, as opposed to current assessment forms, realize that they must consider changes in future language teaching. There is a clear direction for the participants to promote and integrate ELF in their future multilingual classrooms' syllabus, materials, methods, and assessments (Bayyurt & Dewey, 2020). Accordingly, these participants from A University have demonstrated awareness of language use, awareness in instructional practice, and awareness of learning based on Sifakis (Sifakis, 2019). With all this said, as suggested by the previous research, the participants of A university have expressed the attitude of ELF-aware, and their capability of noticing and exercising communicative strategies (Chan, 2021) suggests that these pre-service teachers have higher academic attainment and English proficiency level that enable them to use communicative strategies and diversify their language forms. As a result, they accept and communicate well with those in formal and informal academic situations, even if it does not use the native speakers' form.

4.2.2 Unfamiliarity with ELF

The similar analysis was done on the data from the three universities. However, there are major differences in the findings. While the first discussion has shown early awareness through practices, the following discussion indicates the unfamiliarity with ELF. This discussion will elaborate on the speaking components assessed, their attitudes towards the English assessed, personal English preference, and future teaching reflection.

First, through the rubrics established, the data has shown early findings that these participants view native proficiency as the real deal. Rather than paying attention to the meaning sent, the participants first hear the fanciness of the speaking and how it enchants them. Then, they pay attention to forms in detail, mentioning the difference of how should 'she' /ʃi/ should be different from /si:/. In addition, reflecting their inflexibility toward cultural identities highlights their ELF un-awareness. The participants take the examples of Thai English of 'se-mile' and Indian English of 'dell me' to indicate their preference toward the native speakers' proficiency. Other Englishes that are out of native speakers English are deficient and inferior. Participants indeed have no ideas of the Lingua Franca Core (LFC) that have been widely promoted as the minimum requirement of intelligible communication (Zoghbor, 2018). They believe there is only one true English and any English that does not conform to standard English is 'funny' and has no market value (Kaur, 2014; Wilang, 2021). One of the arguable reasons to discuss this is the geographic location of both universities. Compared to University A, which is at the center of the capital city, these two universities are in the suburb and has less exposure to English used by foreigners. So, there is an assumption that a foreigner is defined as either American or British. So, upon hearing people who use culturally-influenced English, they find it funny and awkward. Valuing the native speaker's accent as the correct and proper English is not unique in pre-service English teachers' study of ELF awareness. Similar findings have been found in previous studies where pre-service teachers highly value native speakers more than the communication process (Kaur & Raman, 2014).

Second, regarding their attitudes to students' English, the participants indicate their consistency in using authentic proper English. They express that curriculum itself requires standard English to be taught. Therefore, they will stick to teaching it as they view that having native speakers' accents and proficiency will provide them with opportunities and add their self-value. Arguably the stigma that develops in society and the policymakers

influences the perspective of the pre-service teachers as they uphold the native speakers' English as the must-have competence. Especially in Indonesia, the same concern has also been expressed where teachers perceived that English is only either BrE or AmE, and mastering one of them will sell them better in the market. This finding is highlighted by (Silalahi, 2021) in a study about teachers' perception toward the non-native English varieties.

Third, diving into their English preference, university B and C participants do not hide that they idolize the native speakers' proficiency. A few of the many reasons they state for their choices include the coolness of the native accent, its easy use, familiarity, and the fact that it is the language of the international school. There are two main points to be highlighted here; personal value and market value. The participants are realistic about their goals of using English and market needs. Parents and schools are inextricably linked by the English offered. So, these pre-service teachers know that if they want to be marketable in the schools and in the parents' eyes, they must own this English (Him, 2018). Therefore, it is conflicting, yet pre-service English teachers need more exposure to EFL as the contact language for people from different backgrounds.

Fourth, adding to all the explanations they provided, the participants find that the current curriculum is exemplary and needs no changes in assessment and concern for ELF. They are more concerned with accent teaching so they can compete with the standard of international schools. Besides, they are also worried about how to design an exciting classroom. These findings from B and C University show that the students have no exposure yet to the ELF and thus are not ELF-aware.

5. CONCLUSION

The study examines the pre-service English teachers' rubrics and explores the underlying reasons behind the rubric establishment. The finding highlights two contrasting facts. On the one hand, communicative strategies and content are highlighted as essential in speaking tasks. They support the claim by demonstrating their open-mindedness, less value on grammar errors, cultural tolerance, and the value on intelligibility through personal and professional reflection. On the other hand, less exposure to various speakers of English contributes to ELF unfamiliarity. This situation provokes them to think that the only English speaker is American or British. The discussions also reveal the centeredness of native speakers' English and their perspectives toward ELF English as a defect. The present study, therefore, unmask the difference in ELF awareness in the pre-service English teachers in three different universities in three different locations in Indonesia. The study then provides three significant suggestions to the related stakeholders. First, the pre-service English teachers should actively explore the growing trend as they will teach the students soon. Second, the faculty of teachers' training, being aware of the ongoing trend, should facilitate the pre-service English teachers with the help needed to develop themselves personally and professionally. Exposures to Englishes and trends may be needed. Third, the policymakers may emphasize less on acquiring native proficiency in the curriculum establishment, allowing the English marketization and fear of speaking due to not having the native speakers' proficiency. This study, however, is only conducted on a limited scale and number of participants. Therefore, the result only represents a little coverage of the uncovered truth of ELF awareness of pre-service English teachers. Besides, this study required the participants to have passed the language testing with a minimum of B. In light

of this, future studies are expected to uncover ELF awareness from a bigger scale and number of participants to generate more findings to the body of the research. Besides, looking at the pre-service English teachers' perspective from various academic years will also extend our understanding of how far teachers, faculty, and policymakers should take action to raise ELF awareness.

Acknowledgment

The writers greatly appreciate the participants for their time and readiness to participate in this research. This study will not be possible without their participation. We also would like to thank the Head of Teachers College, Universitas Pelita Harapan, The Head of the English Department of Universitas Musi Caritas Palembang, and Universitas Katolik Santo Thomas Medan for allowing us to contact the participants.

Availability of Data and Materials

Not Applicable

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This work was supported by the LPPM Universitas Pelita Harapan under Research Number 446/LPPM-UPH/XII/2021 and Grant Number P-40-FoN/XII/2021.

Authors' Contribution

Komilie Situmorang worked on the project, and the main conceptual ideas wrote the manuscript. Dwi Y Nugroho worked on transcribing the data interview and providing raw analysis. Santa Maya Pramusita collaborated in collecting the data and providing software for interviews and schedules. Michael Recard Sihombing contacted participants and distributed the informed consent forms.

Authors' Information

KOMILIE SITUMORANG is an English Lecturer at the Faculty of Nursing, Universitas Pelita Harapan. Her research interests include English as a Medium of Instruction, English as Lingua Franca, and Pragmatic in Language Use.

Email: komilie.situmorang@uph.edu; ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1481-485X>

DWI YULIANTO NUGROHO is a Ph.D. student at the School of Education, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Leeds. His research interests include Task-based Language Teaching, Technology Enhanced Language Learning, and English Specific Purpose.

Email: ed16dyn@leeds.ac.uk; ORCID <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3826-9232>

SANTA MAYA PRAMUSITA is an English Lecturer at the Faculty of Nursing, Universitas Pelita Harapan. Her research interests include Educational Psychology, Discourse Analysis, and Technology Enhanced Language Learning.

Email: santa.pramusita@uph.edu; ORCID <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-8679-2605>

MICHAEL RECARD SIHOMBING is a Lecturer in the Teacher College, Universitas Pelita Harapan. His research interest includes Teacher Education and Technology Enhanced Language Learning.

Email: michael.recard@uph.edu; ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7644-3735>

REFERENCES

- Bayyurt, Y., & Dewey, M. (2020). Locating ELF in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 74(4), 369–376. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccaa048>
- Chan, J. Y. H. (2021). Bridging the Gap Between ELF and L2 Learners' Use of Communication Strategies: Rethinking Current L2 Assessment and Teaching Practices. *System*, 101(July). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102609>

- Cogo, A., & House, J. (2018). The Pragmatics of ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 210–223). London: Routledge.
- Cogo, A., & Pitzl, M. L. (2013). English as a Lingua Franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics (United Kingdom)*, 23(3), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12048>
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics (Oxford Applied Linguistics)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Him, C. Y. J. (2018). Contexts, Problems and Solutions in International Communication: Insights for Teaching English as a Lingua Franca. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, 15(2), 257–275. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.2.1.257>
- Jenkins, J., Baker, W., & Dewey, M. (2018). *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*. London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of Developments in Research into English as a Lingua Franca. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 281–315. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000115>
- Jenkins, J., & Leung, C. (2014). English as a Lingua Franca. *The Companion to Language Assessment*, 4, 1604–1616.
- Jeong, H., Sánchez Ruiz, R., & Wilhelmsson, G. (2022). Spanish and Swedish Pre-Service Teachers' ELF User Attitudes Towards English and its Users. *Changing English*, 29(2), 189–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2021.2022976>
- Kaur, P. (2014). Attitudes Towards English as a Lingua Franca. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 214–221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.029>
- Kaur, P., & Raman, A. (2014). Exploring Native Speaker and Non-native Speaker Accents: The English as a Lingua Franca Perspective. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 155, 253–259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.10.288>
- Kusumaningputri, R., Khazanah, D., Setiarini, R., & Sampurna, H. (2022). English as a Lingua Franca in the Eyes of Indonesian In-service Teachers: Attitudes and Beliefs. *REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, 4(1), 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.v4i1.9538>
- Luczaj, K., Leonowicz-Bukala, I., & Kurek-Ochmanska, O. (2022). English as a Lingua Franca? The Limits of Everyday English-language Communication in Polish Academia. *English for Specific Purposes*, 66, 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.11.002>
- Mason, M. (2010). Sample Size and Saturation in PhD Studies Using Qualitative Interviews. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 11(3).
- Nagy, T. (2016). English as a Lingua Franca and Its Implications for Teaching English as a Foreign Language. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, 8(2), 155–166. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ausp-2016-0024>
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a Conceptual Gap: The Case for a Description of English as a Lingua Franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics (United Kingdom)*, 11(2), 133–158.

- Sifakis, N. C. (2019). ELF Awareness in English Language Teaching: Principles and Processes. *Applied Linguistics*, 40(2), 288–306. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx034>
- Silalahi, R. M. (2021). Nativespeakerism and World Englishes: Teachers Perception Towards Non-Native English Varieties. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, 11(2), 143–152. <https://doi.org/10.30813/jelc.v11i2.2609>
- Simanjuntak, S. A., & Lien, H.-N. (2021). Toward an Understanding of Plurality: A Case Study of Teaching and Learning English as an International Language (EIL) Approach in an Indonesia Senior High School. *Acitya: Journal of Teaching and Education*, 3(2), 210–225. <https://doi.org/10.30650/ajte.v3i2.2208>
- Soruç, A., & Griffiths, C. (2021). Inspiring Pre-service English Language Teachers to Become ELF-aware. *RELC Journal*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211001966>
- Wilang, J., & Siripol, P. (2021). Let's Move It Move It: Thais' Attitude Toward English as a Lingua Franca. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12(5), 716–723. doi: <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1205.10>
- Yalçın, Ş., Bayyurt, Y., & Alahdab, B. R. (2020). Triggering effect of CLIL practice on English as a lingua franca awareness. *ELT Journal*, 74(4), 387–397. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccaa044>
- Zoghbor, W. S. (2018). Teaching English Pronunciation to Multi-Dialect First Language Learners: The Revival of the Lingua Franca Core (LFC). *System*, 78, 1–14. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.06.008>