



Novice English Teachers' Perceptions of English as an International Language: A Study of Private Sector Schools (Peshawar)

¹Sanjeeda Rehman, ²Muhammad Waqar Ali

¹Peshawar Model Girls High School, rehmansanjii321@gmail.com

²Assistant Professor, Department of English, Islamia College Peshawar, waqarali@icp.edu.pk

Article Info

Corresponding author: M. W. Ali
waqarali@icp.edu.pk

Keywords:

Teachers' perception
EIL, EFL
L1 identity,
Language ownership
English accent

Abstract

The study uses a quantitative research methodology to examine how in-service English teachers in Peshawar, Pakistan feel about L1 identity, Non-Native Speakers' (NNS) English accents, language ownership, and the legitimacy of language usage by NNSs. Fifty in-service instructors were given a meticulously designed questionnaire that was organized around each variable adopted from different research studies (Curran & Chern, 2017; Ren et al., 2016; Rahatlou et al., 2018). Descriptive statistics including frequency, means, percentage, and standard deviations, are applied to the quantitative data to identify response dispersion and central patterns. There are differences in opinions regarding students learning English based on Native Speaker (NS) models, even if there is agreement that successful communication should come before native-like competency. The findings provide light on the intricate interactions between historical, cultural, and educational elements that shaped the perspectives of the participants. Kumaravadivelu (2012) highlights a multifaceted perspective formed by colonial legacies and internal and external constraints, as seen by the coexistence of varied perspectives on language ownership and pride in Non-native accents. Divergent perspectives on students acquiring English highlight the impact of learning environments.

Introduction

In Pakistan, using English in official settings has come to represent educated people (Haidar, 2018). English communication skills and autonomy are highly appreciated for both academic performance and professional growth in universities, where it is also the medium of teaching (Shahid et al., 2020). English has been the primary language of teaching in schools due to the desire to engage at the national and international levels as well as the belief that it is the language of civilized people (Ashraf and Tsegay, 2015). Even though Urdu is Pakistan's official language, English is frequently utilized in the fields of commerce, education, and government. With a plethora of public sector universities and English academies offering courses in English language proficiency, attempts have been made to enhance the instruction of English as a foreign language in Pakistan (Soomro et al., 2016). Nonetheless, research indicates that student's English proficiency is inadequate, even if it's deemed essential for obtaining high-level jobs (Rashid et al., 2022). Although the literature provides no evidence for it, teaching NS varieties and relegating the importance of teaching local varieties could be one of the many reasons since students are exposed to NS varieties only inside the classroom. Their exposure to NNS varieties outside of the classroom is for a much longer duration which leads to English language acquisition deficiency. The current study ventures out to inquire about the perceptions of novice English instructors of Peshawar in the field teaching in Private schools towards English as an International Language (EIL), particularly about the acceptability and authority of their Non-native accent.

With the expansion of English, lots of different English dialects or varieties have emerged because of the inevitable intervention of NNSs' mother tongues. L2 researchers often find themselves border-patrolling different

English territories to clarify the distinction between these varieties. Among these L2 researchers, Kachru (1990) came forth with his three circles model consisting of an Inner Circle where English is the prime language spoken (NSs), an Outer Circle which utilizes English as an official and institutional mode of communication, and an Expanding Circle wherein NNSs learn English as a second language, to categorize different English varieties sprouting in different areas and because of different historical reasons. Along with many reasons for English widespread use, British colonization efforts and America's technological advancement leading to globalization are the most common ones. Kachruvian model while emphasizing pluricentricity and multivocality of English, has also been criticized for misleading and misbelieving that the inner circle nations are the legitimate proprietors of English by presenting them as norm-providers. Alsagoff (2012) argues that the Kachruvian model fails to acknowledge the macro-acquisition of English where entire communities adopt English simultaneously (Brutt-Griffler, 2002). It fails to throw light on the deterritorialization or decentralization of English from its lands of origin where English ascends beyond geographical boundaries (Canagarajah, 2005). It also gives a false picture of EIL learners who presumably according to this model replicate or mirror NSs (Alsagoff, 2012).

ELF (English as a lingua franca) or EIL stands in stark contrast to EFL (English as a foreign language) and ESL (English as a second language) which focus on teaching a particular NS variety to NNSs in an ELT classroom and go totally against EIL ideology. However, teaching EFL in the context of migration is acceptable since the main objective is to acquire the capability of conversing with NSs, hence gaining native-like competency is required but in the specific scenario of communication among NNSs, EFL can prove to be a wrong choice. The pragmatic and cultural learning objectives of EIL differ from those of EFL/ESL because it focuses not only on particular language nuances but incorporates broader societal and cultural appropriateness (Gu, 2018).

Literature Review

Since its genesis, EIL or ELF has been under tight scrutiny by language researchers and practitioners and criticized for its theoretical and practical foundations that are unable to smoothly apply EIL norms in the actual classroom setting (Sowden, 2012). As Sung (2018) points out, one of the causes is the dearth of empirical research done to demonstrate the real-world application of the pedagogic implications of EIL norms. Sowden's (2012) criticism directed toward EIL practices focuses on how to differentiate between Standard English norms and persistent errors. According to Seidlhofer (2011), this criticism though previously important is not justifiable anymore because with the growth of EIL, its pedagogical foundations have also taken a new direction which does not want to establish new variants of English. The impact of these contradictory opinions and reactions can be mitigated by highlighting Marlina's (2014) perspective in this sense. For Marlina (2014), these opposing views are not negative rebellious signs but are just spontaneous reactions against the new way of thinking about EIL, especially by those who have not yet familiarized themselves with this new ideology.

These criticisms find their basis in the linguistic features of English and are quite trivial as compared to broader societal issues that English has been held responsible for generating. EIL has a historical background rooted in the British Empire's colonization efforts (Kachru, 1983) and the subsequent global influence of the United States which has led to the development of American and British English. These assortments are most often called standard varieties and hold more significance than any other varieties. As Philipson (1992) argues these standard English varieties act as an impetus for linguistic imperialism. Conversely, Crystal (2003) advocates for linguistic liberalism which highlights the values of social justice and democracy. Social justice and democracy along with linguistic liberalism emphasize the importance of the usage and modification of English by marginalized and underprivileged groups. According to Smith (1976), this ideology acts as a beacon of hope for Outer Circle and Expanding Circle countries' English speakers and gives them authority over English to de-nationalize and re-nationalize it (as cited in McKay, 2002). This ideology, in other words, sums up the theoretical and practical basis of EIL.

The concept of EIL has rightfully surfaced an important issue concerning the proprietorship of English since the democratization of English enables Non-native English speakers to re-nationalize it resulting in nativized varieties. According to Rajagopalan (2004), any language is believed to belong to its NS because they outnumber the NNS but English with its glocal (i.e. global and local) perspective and usage challenges this assumption. English is used as L2 by more English speakers than as their L1. Additionally, the number of NNSs of English exceeds that of NSs, who

use English to communicate globally across linguistic and cultural divides (Canagarajah, 2005): compared to 400 million native English speakers, approximately 1 billion individuals are estimated to use EIL (Crystal, 2006).

NS competence or native speakerism means showing inclination or favoritism towards NSs' varieties like British and American varieties. McKay (2012) talks about the distinction between EFL and EIL. He believes that the over-reliance of L2 pedagogy on NS norms is inappropriate since NNSs don't have to achieve native-like competence whose interlocutors are mostly NNSs. Correspondingly, Cook (1999) calls it "the comparative fallacy" of imposing NS rules on L2 learners. So, NNS teachers advocating for teaching native competence is completely an odd and illogical idea because they do not use the model of NSs. NNS teachers supporting the NS model underestimate the importance of Non-native learners' multilingual and multicultural repertoire. For Kirkpatrick (2007), NNS teachers teaching native competence to NNS learners is completely useless since achieving this is way out of their league because their local languages are inevitably going to intervene.

The NS model is therefore no longer regarded as the effective framework for learning because it falls short of accommodating the diverse needs of NNS learners. Consequently, a need for a more comprehensive model that realizes the global needs of L2 learners has emerged. EIL learning targets involve not only linguistic forms but also awareness of diversity, negotiation of varieties, and sociolinguistic competence (Canagarajah, 2006). The major principle undermined here is that if wider communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries and international intelligibility are the core characteristics of EIL, then it is not favorable to teach a NS model which is "communicatively redundant or even counter-productive" in the EIL context (Seidlofer, 2005, p. 340).

Research on EIL or EFL has sparked debates on whether L2 pedagogy should focus on teaching NS competence (standard English) or broaden its scope to accommodate teaching EIL pedagogic norms. Lots of perception and attitudinal research have been conducted across outer circle countries to elucidate the perception held by NNS English teachers in this regard. The rationale behind choosing prospective English instructors is that they are the ones who will need to undergo an attitude shift about EIL and, as Jenkins (1998) argues, should be prepared with the tools to help their students undergo similar changes in the future. The majority of Iranian instructors have conflicting opinions about EIL and the NSs model, according to the bulk of research carried out in Iran through questionnaire survey but the in-depth analysis of the interviews of the respondents highlighted the favored perceptions held by Iranian teachers towards Native speakerism (Rahatlou et. al, 2018).

On the other hand, Khatib and Monfarid (2017) found that Iranian teachers are more open to accepting Native American variety as compared to Indian teachers who show a preference for British English variety. This could be the result of Iran's enmity with American military forces and the British government's long history of colonization efforts in India. Silalahi et al., (2023) recent attitudinal survey of Indonesian English teachers revealed that the conventional EFL paradigm continues to be the focus of Indonesia's English teacher education programs. It also showed how much Indonesians rely on the model of the native English speaker, even if they were open to ELF and other English dialects. The participants' beliefs about ELF were limited by their ideological evaluations of native English vs other dialects.

Monfared (2019) looked at how OC and EC instructors felt about their unique English dialects. The paper offers statistics from two contexts—EFL (Iran and Turkey) and ESL (India and Malaysia); both place a growing emphasis on teaching and studying English. The investigation revealed that the political and historical contexts of the two circles may have shaped how each nation's educational policies and the identities of its English instructors were developed. In the Iranian and Turkish EFL environments, teachers reported a higher prejudice against their English accent and a predilection for native American English pronunciation. Language instructors in Malaysia and India, conversely, who were exposed to native and Non-native English speakers in their communities—especially British speakers—placed great regard for both kinds.

Although the subject of EIL is gaining popularity in Pakistan, little research has been done on the opinions of in-service Pakistani teachers concerning EIL-related matters. It is therefore considered vital to investigate instructors' opinions about EIL-related concepts in this under-explored country where EIL interactions are common because of tourism attractions. Because of the influence that instructors' attitudes have on students' attitudes (Crismore et al., 1996), the researcher has examined teachers' attitudes. In light of the fact that language policies may have an impact on individuals' attitudes, Lewis (1981) highlights the significance of examining the attitudes of educators (as mentioned in Baker 1992, p. 262). As a result, it can be challenging for ELF researchers to change teachers' mindsets

if they are unaware of how they currently feel about issues related to ELF. The reasoning behind selecting future English teachers is that they will be the ones to experience an attitude change about EIL and, as Jenkins (1998) contends, need to be equipped with the resources necessary to assist their students in going through such transformations in the future. Furthermore, there is a pressing need for further ELF research in Asia since, as Sung and Matthew (2015, p. 313) state, the field is still relatively new in this region.

Research Objectives

The objectives of this research are:

1. To explore the perceptions of in-service novice English instructors from Peshawar regarding their Non-native accent.
2. To find out how the NS accent and its association with identity are viewed by Peshawari in-service rookie English instructors.
3. To discover how the in-service novice English instructors in Peshawar feel about their ownership claim to the English language.
4. To investigate how in-service novice English instructors feel about the genuineness of their English usage.

Research Methodology

This study employs a quantitative research design which entails gathering and analyzing numerical data (Sharma et al., 2023). Research strategies that use quantitative measurements have an advantage since they add significantly to the necessary body of data in terms of evidence (Walker, 2005).

Instrument

Adapting a 5-point Likert scale, an 18-item questionnaire with two main sections was first created in order to collect the data for the current study. The first section asked questions about demographic details and the following section asked the participants to rate their agreement with topics pertaining to EIL on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In order to do this, a thorough analysis was conducted of the relevant literature in order to retrieve the principles relevant to ELF, as well as the current surveys crafted to investigate instructors' and students' views about ELF. A few of the statements were based on the EIL tenets, while others were adapted from a handful of the surveys (Curran & Chern, 2017; Ren et al., 2016; Rahatlou et al., 2018). Thus, eighteen statements were written and categorized into four groups to inspect the participants' attitudes toward: (1) their Non-native English accent (S1-S5); (2) identity and NS accent (S6-S8); (3) the claim that NNSs own the English language (S9-S12); and (4) the authenticity of English used by NNSs (S13-S18S).

To test the questionnaire's dependability, 10 in-service teachers participated in a pilot study. The Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = .72$) reliability test findings indicated that the internal consistency of the questionnaire was relatively robust.

Participants

Fifty in-service teachers from private schools (male=15; female=35) volunteered in order to answer the study questions. They had been English teachers at various levels in a variety of Peshawar-based private schools, including Army Public School, IIUI School, Cantonment Public School, and City School. Their ages varied from 23 to 25 and they had two to three years of expertise instructing English.

Results

The present study employs a quantitative research design for the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data. That's why this section particularly deals with numerical data. To reach a valid conclusion, the researcher has applied descriptive statistics to find out the percentage, frequency, central tendency (mean), and measure of dispersion or spread (standard deviation) of data points around the mean to highlight the deviation of individual responses from the average. This section is divided into four parts and each part deals with each research question respectively.

Perception of their own Non-native English accent

The first research question of the present study aimed to investigate the attitudes of Non-native English instructors toward their own accents. For this purpose, 5 statements from the total 18 statements were specified for this variable. Overall, all the participants of the study showed a positive attitude towards their own accent as seen by their total ratings' high mean score ($M=3.84$). The descriptive statistics reveal that the in-service instructors appeared to be proud of their English accents (Table 1: S1). All of the participants had a generally good opinion: 10 (20%) and 40 (80%) individuals respectively somewhat agreed and agreed with the statement.

The participants' attitudes on their accent's understandability and permissibility to both NSs and NNSs were examined in the final four items. As seen by the high mean score of their judgments, individuals generally had strong opinions about the acceptability and intelligibility of their English accent. All participants conceded to the view that their accent is comprehensible for NSs (Table 1: S2) and to NNSs (Table 1: S3); however, a higher mean for S2 ($M=3.80$) than for S3 ($M=3.74$) indicates they are more confident about NSs than about NNSs. Concerning acceptability of their accent, none disagreed with S4 and S5. Two-third of them (64%) moderately agreed and one-third (36%) slightly agreed that their accent is acceptable to NSs. Likewise, almost equal number of participants either moderately or strongly opined about the acceptability of their accent to NNSs. Unlike the difference between S2 and S3, Table 1 shows stronger consensus on acceptance of accent to NNSs (S4; $M=4.22$) than to NSs (S5; $M=3.64$).

| Table 1: Attitudes toward their Non-native English accent | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Statements | In-service teachers (n=50) | | | | | | |
| | SD= strongly disagree; D= Disagree; SmA= Somewhat Agree; MA=Moderately Agree; SA= Strongly Agree | | | | | | |
| | Mean (SD) | | SD | D | SmA | MA | SA |
| S1. I am proud of my English accent. | 3.80 (.40) | Frequency | 0 | 0 | 10 | 40 | 0 |
| | | Percentage | 0 | 0 | 20 | 80 | 0 |
| S2. I think my accent is intelligible to NSs when I speak English. | 3.80 (.40) | Frequency | 0 | 0 | 10 | 40 | 0 |
| | | Percentage | 0 | 0 | 20 | 80 | 0 |
| S3. I think my accent is intelligible to NNSs when I speak English. | 3.74 (.77) | Frequency | 0 | 0 | 23 | 17 | 10 |
| | | Percentage | 0 | 0 | 46 | 34 | 20 |
| S4. I think my accent is acceptable to NSs when I speak English. | 3.64 (.48) | Frequency | 0 | 0 | 18 | 32 | 0 |
| | | Percentage | 0 | 0 | 36 | 64 | 0 |
| S5. I think my accent is acceptable to NNSs when I speak English. | 4.22 (.76) | Frequency | 0 | 0 | 10 | 19 | 21 |
| | | Percentage | 0 | 0 | 20 | 38 | 42 |

Participants' attitudes toward the L1 accent and identity

The study's second research question sought to understand the perspectives of Non-native English instructors on their L1 identity and accent. Three of the eighteen statements in total were designated for this variable for this reason. A high mean score of their overall scores ($M=3.30$) suggests that teachers in the field generally like to be identified as Pakistani based on their English accent.

Upon closer inspection of the statements in this group, it was discovered that S6 had the lowest mean score ($M=2.60$) among the participants' assessments (see Table 2). As shown in the data that 4 (8%) respondents strongly disagreed and 27 (54%) participants disagreed with the statement. More than half of the participants did not agree that they would prefer to be recognized as NSs by their accent. Nevertheless, some (38%) wanted to be identified with NSs. On the contrary, all the participants showed fairly positive attitudes towards S7 ($M=3.58$) and S8 ($M=3.74$) as

evidenced by the high mean score of their overall scores. This implies that the majority of the population, except only 10 (20%) participants in S7, tends to retain their local accent and therefore their indigenous identity when communicating in English showing an aspiration to speak English with an indigenous Pakistani accent.

| Table 2: Attitudes toward the NS accent and its connection with identity | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------|----|----|-----|----|----|
| Statements | In-service teachers (N=50) | | | | | | |
| | SD= strongly disagree; D= Disagree; SmA= Somewhat Agree; MA=Moderately Agree; SA= Strongly Agree | | | | | | |
| | Mean (SD) | | SD | D | SmA | MA | SA |
| S6. I would like to be identified as a NS of English through my English accent. | 2.60 (1.10) | Frequency | 4 | 27 | 9 | 5 | 5 |
| | | Percentage | 8 | 54 | 18 | 10 | 10 |
| S7. I would like to speak English with a Pakistani accent because I am a Pakistani. | 3.58 (.90) | Frequency | 0 | 10 | 5 | 31 | 4 |
| | | Percentage | 0 | 20 | 10 | 62 | 8 |
| S8. I feel okay if someone recognizes my nationality through my English accent. | 3.74 (.44) | Frequency | 0 | 0 | 13 | 37 | 0 |
| | | Percentage | 0 | 0 | 26 | 74 | 0 |

Attitudes toward ownership of English

The current study also sought to understand the participants' perspectives on NSSs' ownership of the English language authority. The third category of the research questionnaire had four statements. By giving this category the highest grade (M = 3.57), the Pakistani in-service instructors in the sample generally showed a positive attitude toward the authority of NSSs (Table 3).

Based on the replies of fifty in-service teachers, the survey's findings shed light on their opinions on the authority and ownership of Non-native English speakers in the context of the language. With a mean score of 3.02 (SD = 1.34), the respondents showed a mixed opinion about S9, which asks whether English belongs only to NSs. Significantly, 54% of respondents disagreed, indicating a general belief that English is not just for NSs.

With a mean score of 3.66 (SD = 1.06), S10, which addressed the right of NNSs to possess the English language, had a more favorable reaction. The majority of respondents (72% moderately or strongly agreed) seem to hold the view that Non-native English speakers are in control of the language. A mean score of 3.22 (SD = 1.32) was obtained for S11, which examined the ability of NNSs to adapt English to their requirements. This score falls between strongly disagree and strongly agree. There was acceptance of the premise that NNSs may adapt English to their requirements, as indicated by the 56% of participants who moderately or strongly agreed with this statement. The use of native languages by NNSs to prevent misunderstandings in English communication was the subject of S12, which garnered a high mean score of 4.40 (SD = 0.80). This indicates that 90% of teachers strongly agreed that NNSs can effectively use their native languages to prevent misunderstandings when communicating in English.

| Table 3: Attitudes toward their claim to ownership of the English language | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|----|---|-----|----|----|
| Statements | In-service teachers (N=50) | | | | | | |
| | SD= strongly disagree; D= Disagree; SmA= Somewhat Agree; MA=Moderately Agree; SA= Strongly Agree | | | | | | |
| | Mean (SD) | | SD | D | SmA | MA | SA |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------------|----|----|---|----|----|
| S9. I think English belongs to NSs. | 3.02 (1.34) | Frequency | 4 | 23 | 0 | 14 | 9 |
| | | Percentage | 8 | 46 | 0 | 28 | 18 |
| S10. I think NNSs of English have the authority to own the English language. | 3.66 (1.06) | Frequency | 4 | 5 | 0 | 36 | 5 |
| | | Percentage | 8 | 10 | 0 | 72 | 10 |
| S11. I think NNSs of English have the authority to modify English based on their needs. | 3.22 (1.32) | Frequency | 4 | 18 | 0 | 19 | 9 |
| | | Percentage | 8 | 36 | 0 | 38 | 18 |
| S12. I think NNSs of English can use the languages they know to avoid misunderstanding when communicating in English. | 4.40 (.80) | Frequency | 5 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 12 |
| | | Percentage | 10 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 24 |

Attitudes toward the authenticity of their usage of English

The final category was to determine if the participants agreed that NNSs' usage of English was legitimate. Of the six statements in this category, S13, which asked participants to rate their agreement with the assertion that teachers should assist students in communicating successfully, had the highest mean score from the teachers (M = 4.40). This reflects a widespread opinion that instructors should put more emphasis on helping students in communicating successfully than on achieving native-like fluency. Remarkably, 30% of the teachers moderately and 60% strongly agreed with this statement.

On the other hand, S14, with a mean of 2.32 (SD = 0.95), indicates a considerable difference among the teachers on the requirement that pupils should not follow the native English speakers' model to the letter. Significantly, Two-third of participants (66%) expressed (strong) disagreement with this concept. Similarly, S15, which has a mean of 2.72 (SD = 0.96), indicates that most teachers (64%) do not feel that it is important for children to learn about the customs and culture of native English speakers.

Table 4: Attitudes toward the authenticity of their usage of English

| Statements | In-service teachers (N=50) | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|----|----|-----|----|----|
| | SD= strongly disagree; D= Disagree; SmA= Somewhat Agree; MA=Moderately Agree; SA= Strongly Agree | | | | | | |
| | Mean (SD) | | SD | D | SmA | MA | SA |
| S13. I think teachers should help students communicate effectively rather than achieve a native-like proficiency. | 4.40 (.92) | Frequency | 0 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 30 |
| | | Percentage | 0 | 10 | 0 | 30 | 60 |
| S14. I think it is unnecessary for many students to learn English according to the native English speakers' model. | 2.32 (.95) | Frequency | 9 | 24 | 9 | 8 | 0 |
| | | Percentage | 18 | 48 | 18 | 16 | 0 |
| S15. I think it is unnecessary for many students to become familiar with the culture and traditions of native English speakers. | 2.72 (.96) | Frequency | 0 | 32 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| | | Percentage | 0 | 64 | 0 | 36 | 0 |
| S16. I don't think it is necessary for Non-native English speakers to sound like NSs of English to communicate successfully in English. | 3.58 (1.29) | Frequency | 4 | 9 | 5 | 18 | 14 |
| | | Percentage | 8 | 18 | 10 | 36 | 28 |
| S17. I think NNSs of English can be a role model for Pakistani students. | 3.88 (.84) | Frequency | 0 | 5 | 5 | 31 | 9 |
| | | Percentage | 0 | 10 | 10 | 62 | 18 |
| | 3.96 (.87) | Frequency | 0 | 5 | 5 | 27 | 13 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|---|----|----|----|----|
| S18. I think it is important to introduce students to many different English accents (both native and Non-native accents). | | Percentage | 0 | 10 | 10 | 54 | 26 |
|---|--|-------------------|---|----|----|----|----|

Positive views are also shown regarding the notion that Non-native English speakers can communicate successfully without sounding like NSs (S16: $M = 3.58$; $SD = 1.29$), with 64% of teachers moderately or strongly agreeing. Additionally, a significant majority of teachers (80%) strongly support NNSs as role models (S17: $M = 3.88$; $SD = 0.84$). Similarly, every four out of five of instructors (80%) moderately or strongly agree that it is important to expose kids to a variety of English dialects (S18: $M = 3.96$; $SD = 0.87$).

Discussion

After the examination of the quantitative data compiled through the survey, there appears to be discrepancies among teachers not only related to different statements but also their understanding of EIL paradigm. The responses given by participants to the first three variables are consistent with almost all of the teachers rooting for EIL norms indicated by the relatively high mean scores of statements S1 to S11 except S6 (see Table 1, 3, & 4). The low mean score for S6 indicates an internal desire of NNS teachers to be recognized by everyone as NNS rather than NS. This belief aligns with the belief of the EIL paradigm as emphasized by Cook (1999) and Kirkpatrick (2007). All the five statements of the first variable related to the acceptability and intelligibility of their own accent are also in adherence with EIL ideology that lays special emphasis on mutual intelligibility of the core of EIL as described by Seidlhofer (2005). The positive attitudes of teachers towards S6 stand in contrast to what Rahatlou et al., (2018) found in their large-scale study conducted in Iran. They employed a mixed-method design and used questionnaires and interviews as their measurement tools and found contradictory results from both instruments. The results from the in-depth interviews implied that Iranian teachers did not like being identified as Persian through their English accents. They reasoned that the NS English accent is considerably more advantageous and helps them out in upward mobility. But the quantitative data speaks otherwise in which the majority of the teachers liked being identified as Persian. They validated this notion with the help of Sung's (2015) assumption that there lies a complicated and intricately interwoven connection between EIL and identity (p.326).

Moreover, it appeared that the participants of the current study are not fully cognizant of the state of affairs regarding English ownership at the moment. A great number of participants, or 54%, disagreed that English is owned by NS, supporting the ambivalent attitude they retained towards the recognition of NNSs' power to claim proprietorship of the language. This was supported by the quantitative data. S10 and S11 exhibit a significant disparity in the responses from the participants, indicating that while NNSs are free to own English, they are unable to adapt or change it to suit their local needs. This finding supports the previous hypothesis that the participants lack sufficient literacy regarding ownership-related EIL issues.

Similar discrepancies are found in the statements of the fourth category or variable related to the legitimacy and authority of NNS English use. However, their responses indicate a favorable attitude towards communicating effectively rather than achieving native-like competence and emphasizing that teachers' utmost priority should be enabling students to communicate effectively in S13 by 90% of the teachers agreeing to it but S14 indicates an unfavorable response of teachers towards the assertion that learners should not learn English according to NSs model. S13 and S16 focus on the significance of efficacious communication with a huge number of teachers showing positive attitudes toward it but when it comes to students' learning, teachers advocate for the importance of teaching the NSs model as evidenced by the responses in S14 and S15. And their responses are further confusing related to S17 and S18 where the majority of the participants support the idea of NSs being role models for NNS and at the same moment endorse the idea of exposing to variety of English accents. Since all of these statements deal with the usage of English inside the classroom, only one reason could justify this mixed response from the participants: the participants in this study agreed to effective communication above native-like ability when they discussed the practical usage of English outside of the classroom, showing no inclination toward the NS standard; however, for the most part, they were engrained with the NS standards. Their exposure to NS standards in an educational setting may have resulted from

their instruction in English at Peshawar's private language schools, where the norms of NSs—especially British and American—dominate in the curriculum.

Additionally, some scholars assert that there is a big difference between how English is used outside of the classroom and how it is taught in the classroom (Galloway & Rose, 2018; Sung, 2018). Rahatlou et al., (2018) in response to similar mixed responses justify it by citing Kumaravadivelu (2012). According to Kumaravadivelu (2012), the ability to break Western stereotypes is impeded by internal and external challenges. External challenges refer to the English language's coloniality that is used to uphold the center's dominance over the periphery. Internal challenges refer to the manner in which the peripheral resigns and forfeits the center of its voice and vision. These reasons are believed to pertain to the current wavering responses of the participants.

Conclusion

The intricate interactions between several elements firmly ingrained in the historical, cultural, and educational settings can be responsible for the multifaceted views displayed by the in-service English instructors in Peshawar. The persistent influence of colonial legacies on ideas of language ownership and authority is one important aspect. Even while there is a yearning for linguistic autonomy, the historical dominance of English-speaking colonial powers may have contributed to a subconscious respect to local speaker standards. The literature's discussion of both internal and external challenges—especially as put out by Kumaravadivelu (2012)—provides insight into the ambivalence of instructors. The coloniality of the English language and other external obstacles might foster a situation in which the linguistic center's domination over the periphery is maintained. It is possible that some of these historical power dynamics were internalized by the participants based on their replies.

According to Kumaravadivelu (2012), internal difficulties show how the peripheral cedes its voice and vision to the center. The participants' erratic views in this situation may be the result of an internal struggle between the desire to reject Western preconceptions and the enduring effect of other conventions. There may be conflicting reactions to the fight for linguistic autonomy and acceptance, such as pride in one's Non-native identity and residual effects of native-speaker standards. The environment of the classroom is also very important in determining the attitudes of the teachers. The significance of institutional norms is suggested by the difference between their preferences for good communication outside of the classroom and their support for NS role models within educational settings. The curriculum and instructional materials that prioritize NS requirements may have an impact on teachers' observed dualistic views and the external challenge as exemplified by Kumaravadivelu (2012) could be a determinant factor in this regard. When considered together, the study's findings resonate with the body of research showing that pre-service and in-service teachers have mixed perspectives (Jenkins, 2007; Pan and Block, 2011; Ellis, 2016; Deniz et al., 2016; Sifakis and Sougari, 2005; Rahatlou et al., 2018).

References

- Alfadda, H., Fatima, M., Ghaffar, A., & Afzaal, M. (2020). Critical thinking perspective in ESL new English textbooks: a case study of Pakistan. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 9(2), 24. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.9n.2p.24>
- Alsagoff, L., McKay, S. L., Hu, G., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2012). *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language*. Routledge.
- Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language*. Multilingual Matters.
- Barzegar Rahatlou, M., Fazilatfar, A. M., & Allami, H. (2018). English as a lingua franca in Iran: An attitudinal investigation into the in-service teachers. *Cogent Education*, 5(1), 149-165.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). *World English: A study of its development*. Multilingual Matters.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (Ed.). (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006). Changing communicative needs, revised assessment objectives: Testing English as an international language. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 3(3), 229–242.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the NS in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185–209.

- Crismore, A., Yeok-Hwa Ngeow, K., & Keng-Soon, S. (1996). Attitudes towards English in Malaysia. *World Englishes*, 15(3), 319–335. doi:10.1111/j.1467- 971X.1996.tb00118.x
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2006). English worldwide. In R. Hogg & D. Denison (Eds.). *A history of the English language* (pp.420–39). Cambridge University Press.
- Curran, J. E., & Chern, C.-L. (2017). Pre-service English teachers’ attitudes towards English as a lingua franca. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, 137– 146. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.04.007
- Deniz, E. B., Özkan, Y., & Bayyurt, Y. (2016). English as a lingua franca: Reflections on ELF-related issues by pre-service English language teachers in Turkey. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 16 (2), 144–161.
- Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2018). Incorporating global Englishes into the ELT classroom. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 3–14.
- Gu, M. (2008). Identity construction and investment transformation: College students from Nurban areas in China. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 18(1), 49–70.
- Haidar, S. (2018). The role of english in developing countries. *English Today*, 35(3), 42-48. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266078418000469>
- Ishikawa, T., & Jenkins, J. (2019). What is ELF? Introductory questions and answers for ELT professionals. *Center for English as a Lingua Franca Journal*, 5, 1–10.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1983). Regional norms for English. *Studies in Language Learning*, 4,54–76.
- Kachru, B. B. (1990). World Englishes and applied linguistics. *World Englishes*, 9(1), 3-20.
- Khatib, M., & Monfared, A. (2017). Exploring teachers’ attitudes towards pronunciation issues and varieties of English in three circles of World Englishes. *Applied Research on English Language*, 6(2), 213–236.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). Individual identity, cultural globalization, and teaching English as an international language: The case for an epistemic break. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, H. Guangwei, & W. A. Renanyda (eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 9–27). New York: Francis and Taylor.
- Litzenberg, J. (2016). Pre-service teacher perspectives towards pedagogical uses of Non-native and native speech samples. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 26(2), 168–189.
- Marlina, R. (2014). The pedagogy of English as an international language (EIL): More reflections and dialogues. In R. Marlina & R. A. Giri (eds.) (2012), *The pedagogy of English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers, and students* (pp. 1–22). Springer International Publishing.
- McKay, S. L. (2012). Principles of teaching English as an international language. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 28–46). New York: Routledge.
- Monfared, A. (2019). Ownership of English in the Outer and Expanding Circles: teachers’ attitudes toward pronunciation in ESL/EFL teaching contexts. *Asian Englishes*, 21(2), 207-222.
- Pan, L., & Block, D. (2011). English as a “global language” in China: An investigation into learners’ and teachers’ language beliefs. *System*, 39, 391–402. doi:10.1016/j. system.2011.07.011
- Philipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Rajagopalan, K. (2004). The concept of “World English” and its implications for ELT. *ELT Journal*, 58(2), 111–117.
- Rashid, A., Khan, Y., & Khudai, U. (2022). Investigating the impact of formative feedback on writing skills of English language learners at undergraduate level in south Punjab, Pakistan. *Sir Syed Journal of Education & Social Research (SJESR)*, 5(4), 125-132. [https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol5-iss4-2022\(125-132\)](https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol5-iss4-2022(125-132))
- Ren, W., Chen, Y.-S., & Lin, C.-Y. (2016). University students’ perceptions of ELF in mainland China and Taiwan. *System*, 56,13–27. doi:10.1016/j. system.2015.11.004
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT journal*, 59(4), 339-341.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford University Press.

- Shahid, C., Ong, E., Wong, K., & Perveen, A. (2020). Expectations and reality of learner autonomy and communicative competence in Pakistani higher education institutions: A review. *International Journal of Education Psychology and Counseling*, 5(34), 91-101. <https://doi.org/10.35631/ijepc.534007>
- Sharma, L., Jha, S., Koirala, R., Aryal, U., & Bhattarai, T. (2023). Navigating the research landscape: a guide to the selection of the right research design. *International Research Journal of MMC*, 4(1), 64-78. <https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v4i1.51863>
- Sifakis, N. C., & Sougari, A.-M. (2005). Pronunciation issues and EIL pedagogy in the periphery: A survey of Greek state school teachers' beliefs. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 467–488. doi:10.2307/3588490
- Silalahi, R. M. P., Santoso, W., & Hutauruk, B. S. (2023). English as a Lingua Franca in an Indonesian Multilingual Setting: Pre-Service English Teachers' Perceptions. *Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, 5(2), 144-160.
- Smith, L. (1976). English as an international auxiliary language. *RELC Journal*, 7(2), 38–43.
- Soomro, M. A., Memon, N., & Memon, S. A. (2016). Concept of best practices in English language teaching to pakistani ELT fraternity. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(4), 119-123.
- Sowden, C. (2012). ELF on a mushroom: the overnight growth in English as a Lingua Franca. *ELT Journal*, 66 (1), 89–96. doi:10.1093/elt/ccr024
- Sung, C. C. M. (2015). Exploring second language speakers' linguistic identities in ELF communication: A Hong Kong study. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(2), 309–332. doi:10.1515/jelf-2015-0022
- Sung, C. C. M. (2018). Out-of-class communication and awareness of English as a Lingua Franca. *ELT Journal*, 72(1), 15–25.
- Sung, Mathews, M. M., (2015). Exploring second language speakers' linguistic identities in ELF communication: A Hong Kong study. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 4(2), 309–332. doi:10.1515/jelf-2015-0022
- Walker, W. (2005). The strengths and weaknesses of research designs involving quantitative measures. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 10(5), 571-582. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136140960501000505>



@ 2023 by the author. Licensee University of Chitral, Journal of Linguistics & Literature, Pakistan. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).