CREATIVELY NEGOTIATING THE PLACE OF SPIRITUALITY IN THE ELT CURRICULUM

Joseph Ernest Mambu
(joseph.mambu@staff.uksw.edu)

Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana, Salatiga
Jl. Diponegoro 52 – 60, Salatiga 50711, Indonesia

Abstract: This article aims to better understand constraints (e.g., hostility toward spirituality) and opportunities that may affect teacher-student and student-student relations as spiritually informed ELT curriculum is negotiated. Viewed more broadly, spirituality aims to foster the ability to see one's own religious positioning in relation to other people who have different faiths, and the commitment to being connected with other people, as well as nature, with love. In terms of pedagogical methodology, negotiating the place of spirituality in ELT means creatively keeping the balance of mainstreaming and decentering different senses of spirituality. It is in line with Kumaravadivelu's theoretical lens of postmethod pedagogy which sheds light on how a teacher theorized negotiating power relations associated with his spirituality; how a teacher exploited a religious issue unique to a specific context in Indonesia; and how the dialogue of religious issues can be extended beyond what already happened in class. Regarding spiritually informed materials development, this article focuses on teacher-student co-development of spiritually informed materials and adaptations of non-ELT materials. The article concludes with some pedagogical implications and major questions to be addressed in future research on spiritually informed ELT curriculum.

Keywords: creativity, dialogue, ELT curriculum spirituality, materials development, negotiation, postmethod pedagogy

Ideas and practices of creatively integrating spirituality in language teaching and learning (including ELT) are not new (see e.g., Lee, 2015; Pamplona, 2000; Smith & Osborn, 2007). However, spiritually informed ELT is not with-

out opposition, especially from Western critical (pedagogical) scholars who are secularly oriented (e.g., Pennycook & Coutand-Marin, 2003; Pennycook & Makoni, 2005; Pennycook, 2009). This resistance to spirituality, especially that which is religiously based, is quite understandable. Critical applied linguistics/ELT scholars I mentioned earlier think that there is a danger of coercing students to embrace their teacher's religious faith (especially Christianity).

The real picture in the ELT world is more complex, though, because secularism vs. religiosity is not solely based on where ELT scholars/practitioners reside in terms of the East-West divide. Crookes (2009) observes that non-Western philosophy is often rooted in religious beliefs, which is distinct from that of the secular Western philosophy. This does not mean nonetheless that non-Western English language teachers are always open to religious discussions in their classrooms. For example, an Indonesian Christian English language teacher educator, Houtman (a pseudonym), said to me personally about his objection to discussing issues of SARA (*suku* [tribe], *agama* [religion], *ras* [race], *antar golongan* [societal groups in terms of gender, class, ability, etc.]) in his *Intermediate Speaking* class, after a Catholic student delivered a presentation of her favorite pastor's biography (Classroom observation, February 10, 2014). In my field note, I commented that the presentation of Houtman's student was "very fundamentalist" (Mambu, 2014, p. 294). For instance, she said: "When he met God, when he met Jesus, everything was changed" (Audio-recorded classroom observation, February 10, 2014). If I had been the instructor, I would have at least commented briefly that a religious story should be more audience-friendly (because not all of the student's friends are Christian) and framed within the spirit of critical inquiry, not in a religious preaching and witnessing tone.

Not only is the exploration of religious issues through the English language essential in fostering the spirit of critical inquiry, but in Indonesia it also seems to be in line with The Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia of 1945 [2002] (a.k.a. UUD 1945) and other policies. The amended UUD 1945 clearly states: "The government advances science and technology along with holding religious values… to [promote] civilization as well as the well-being of humanity" (chapter 3, article 31, subsection 5). Elsewhere (in Mambu, 2015) I have examined how religious values are inextricably linked to character education in ELT, a buzz concept in the current Indonesian educational system—*Kurikulum 2013*. Furthermore, at the time of collecting data for my dissertation project, the EFL teacher education program I investigated had a curricular policy that

reads: *Mampu mencerminkan nilai-nilai Kristiani dalam mengajar* (i.e., being able to reflect Christian values in teaching; see Mambu, 2014, p. 75).

Against the backdrop of (1) the larger international debate of the place of spirituality in ELT; (2) religiously related policies surrounding ELT at the Indonesian state, institutional, and classroom levels; and (3) individual ELT stakeholders' sense of spirituality, in this article I argue that negotiating the place of spirituality in the ELT curriculum requires creativity on the part of English language teachers (or teacher educators), as well as students, who are deeply invested in spirituality. In view of Carter and Nunan (2001), the notion of ELT curriculum here entails "the aims, content, methodology and evaluation procedures of [ELT] in a particular institution or school system" (p. 221), especially that which is spiritually informed. In this article, the evaluation part is not covered (but see Mambu, 2015 for a fuller discussion on this).

One major objective of this article is for ELT stakeholders (especially those in Indonesia) to better address constraints and opportunities that may affect teacher-student and student-student relations as the spiritually informed ELT curriculum is negotiated. To this end, I will first unpack the contents and aims of spirituality, which encompass, but are not limited to, religiosity. Second, I will explain the notion of dialogic spiritual negotiation as a pedagogical alternative to method(ology). Third, I will explore how ELT materials that contain religious issues have been creatively developed and/or negotiated by a number of Indonesian-based ELT stakeholders. The discussion leads to the implications of spiritual negotiations for English language classroom practices and an agenda of future research into the spiritually informed ELT curriculum.

SPIRITUAL CONTENTS AND AIMS IN THE ELT CURRICULUM

What is spirituality in relation to religion?[1] It is necessary to draw on the non-ELT literature, like those of general and religious education, to address this question. Van Brummelen, Koole, and Franklin (2004) imply that to some extent one's spirituality is indicated by his or her religious faith. However, the scope of religion is narrower than that of spirituality. In Van Brummelen et al.'s phrasing: "Religion does not encompass all of spirituality. It is possible to be spiritual without being religious" (p. 238), which indicates that someone can

---

[1] This section is taken, with some adaptation, from Mambu (2014, pp. 12-16).

"perceive higher power or higher purpose" without having to adhere to "a religious tradition's official creed" (Tisdell, 2007, pp. 537-538).

When spirituality is perceived as broader than religion, its conceptualization has to be more encompassing than the ability or commitment to perceiving higher power or higher purpose. In fact, spirituality includes the following aspects. First, it is "a philosophy of becoming, in which the self can become Other to itself, and from that position either remain alienated or transcend itself" (Ryoo, Crawford, Moreno, & McLaren, 2009, p. 135). The favorable goal of spirituality in this sense is not being alienated, but rather transcending oneself through "an epistemological Othering and 'doubling' of the world—a sense of being beside oneself or outside of oneself in another epistemological, discourse, and political space than one typically would inhabit" (Luke, 2004, p. 26). By having the ability to be the Other(ed), a person can learn how to empathize with those in marginalized or oppressed position. This is one of the core components of *critical spiritual pedagogy* (see Mambu, 2016 for more detail on this).

Second, spirituality is not only imagining the possibility of being the Other but connecting with others with love (Cutri, 2000; Dei, 2002; Palmer, 1998), especially that which is unconditional (Ryoo et al., 2009). Being connected to others fosters a sense of community (Astin, 2004). Such connectedness is central to indigenous (e.g., African) spirituality that "stresses mind, body, and soul interactions..." where individuals are engaged with "society, culture, and nature" (Dei, 2002, p. 125). Commitment to being connected to others is highly relevant to achieve "justice, fairness, ... mercy, ... grace, ... compassion, generosity, and humility" through a "spiritual morality" (Cutri, 2000, pp. 175-176), regardless of one's religious faith.

Third, I concur with Cutri (2000) who regards spirituality as one's recognition that there is power beyond him or herself as a human being. From my perspective as a Christian, this entails being humble to the Lord as I am a sinner who does a lot of wrongdoings. Christianity is not the only source of spirituality. Shahjahan (2004), a Muslim scholar, was thrilled when he writes: *Bismillahir Rahmanir Rahim*, which means "In the Name of Allah the Most Gracious and Most Merciful." He further says: "as I utter and write these words my heart melts as I remember that I am a spiritual being that has a divine origin" (p. 294). Regardless of religious traditions or secularism that people hold, spirituality allows people to be self-reflexive also in the sense of asking "who [they] are and where [they] come from, [their] beliefs about why [they] are

here—the meaning and purpose that [they] see in [their] work and [their] life..." (Astin, 2004, p. 34).

Based on the review of the literature in general (and religious) education above, spirituality includes these interrelated *contents* and their corresponding *aims*. First, spirituality is one's self-reflexive attempt to look into oneself (including his or her religion) in relation to other (or Othered) people. This content aims to foster *self-consciousness* or *self-reflexivity* (e.g., that one's own religious beliefs, attitudes, and practices [like proselytizing] can be used to offend and marginalize people embracing different religious faiths [see Mambu, 2016 for more detail on this]; that one's own religious language use can alienate a certain audience).

Second, spirituality entails one's commitment to being connected (or having communion) with other people and nature with love. The goal of this content is nurturing *a sense of humanity and community*, e.g., social justice, tolerance, "self-giving love," and "hospitality to the stranger," which run counter to the typical "appeal to profit, pleasure or power as motivators for learning based on self-interest" (Smith, 2007, p. 21).

Third, spirituality refers to one's reverence to "a power higher than one's self" (Cutri, 2000, p. 168) including (but is not limited to) what religious traditions often refer to as God, the Divine Being, that allows the person to better understand their origin and life purpose. In indigenous spirituality (including *kejawen* or the Javanese spirituality), nature and the spirits of deceased ancestors are regarded as the very power higher than one's self. Correspondingly, fostering *a sense of transcendence* (e.g., expressing hope, belief, suffering, and doubts to a Divine Being in English through a prayer, a poem, and [as documented by Mambu [2013] a personal narrative) is the aim of this spiritual content.

DIALOGIC SPIRITUAL NEGOTIATION AS A CREATIVE PEDA-GOGICAL ALTERNATIVE

In this section, I discuss how ELT stakeholders, who are inclined to spirituality, negotiate spiritual contents and aims dialogically and creatively in ELT settings. To this end, I find it necessary to explain what is meant by *negotiation*, *dialogue*, and *creativity* first.

Negotiation

By "negotiation," Barkhuizen (2016), in his recent discussion of narrative inquiry in ELT-related studies, refers to attempts to address "inequality" between "people, groups, and institutions who have more power" and "those with less power" (p. 2). When the former (e.g., Christian English teachers in a Christian school) address inequality between themselves and the latter (e.g., non-Christian students in the school), they negotiate power relations through being self-conscious of their position of power and guard themselves against coercion to the latter (Mambu, 2014, 2016). Conversely, the latter (e.g., a nonnative English-speaking young female teacher) might attempt to confront the former (e.g., a sexist native English-speaking old male ESL coordinator; see Barkhuizen, 2016). In reality, it is not always easy to determine which one has more or less power. In addition to Barkhuizen's understanding of negotiation, sometimes it is also practical to be aware of the degree of hostility toward, or openness to, spirituality first. Those who are hostile toward spirituality do not necessarily have "more power," but they are powerful anyhow, so negotiating relations of power (and the place of spirituality within the constraints of power relations) is still essential.

Implied in the act of negotiating the place of spirituality in the ELT curriculum is the awareness of the following scenarios. First, spiritual contents (especially on religious beliefs in divinity and theology) are not always welcomed by some ELT stakeholders (e.g., Houtman, the instructor who had some reservations about religious presentations in his class; see the introduction section). Second, contents of divinity and theology might be welcomed by some ELT stakeholders (e.g., Christian teachers and students), but at the expense of some other stakeholders who do not share the same religious beliefs. Third, there are gaps between moralists or dogmatists, on the one hand, and agnostics and atheists, on the other hand.

In these scenarios, negotiating power relations is inevitable. To address the problem of the first scenario (i.e., dealing with an audience opposing to, or even hostile toward incorporating religious views in class), it is advisable for ELT stakeholders deeply invested in spirituality to *decenter* (to use Pennycook's [2010, p. 16.4] term) their personal religious dogmas and convictions in classroom discussions. Put simply, they need to restrain themselves from sharing unsolicited opinions on their personal religious faith(s) in class. In view of the spiritual contents and aims I discussed earlier in the previous section, stu-

dents need to decenter their sense of transcendence that is exclusively Christian, or Islam, or any other religions. Spirituality that can be *mainstreamed* (or put center stage) in a class where hostility toward expressing religiously based spirituality prevails is fostering a sense of humanity and community (e.g., nurturing tolerance and striving for social justice). From the perspective of Pennycook (2001), following Foucault, power "is not merely repressive but is also productive" (p. 91). Mainstreaming non-religious aspects of spirituality is one manifestation of, as it were, using productive spiritual power.

The second scenario (i.e., the likelihood that religiously based spirituality might exclude some ELT stakeholders) can be addressed as follows. Similar to that in the first scenario, a religiously inclined English language teacher or student needs to, on the one hand, decenter his or her own religious dogmas and convictions which may exclude students who do not share the same religious faith as the teacher or the student. For instance, in Mambu (2016), I mentioned a Muslim student who reported delivering a presentation on opposing the FPI (i.e., Islamic Defenders Front, an ultra-fundamentalist/dogmatic Islamic-based community organization in Indonesia). A teacher can facilitate (and mainstream) discussions about religious convictions from all religious perspectives available in the class only when all students having different religious faiths in a class are willing to discuss religiously based spirituality. Otherwise, non-religious sense of spirituality should be mainstreamed instead.

In the third scenario, religious moralists/dogmatists (e.g., those who explicitly state their rejection to LGBTQ people) can be in opposition to some non-religious dogmatists (e.g., those who are tolerant to LGBTQ people). If a (religious) English language teacher is comfortable with bringing controversial issues like LGBTQ and religion in class, he or she can intentionally mainstream the sense of humanity and community and decenter dogmatism (see Mambu, 2015 for more detail on this).

Overall, decentering and mainstreaming (speech) acts constitute what I call as *the pragmatics of spiritual negotiations*, especially in ELT settings.

Dialogue

The notion of "dialogue" here is derived from Bakhtin's (1981, 1984) theory of dialogism. One of the essential ingredients of dialogism is, in Frank's (2012) phrasing on a Bakhtinian dialogical narrative analysis, "… continuing possibilities of listening and of responding to what is heard" (p. 37). This re-

quires a listener (or a reader) to be an interlocutor who is capable of producing what Bakhtin (1984) mentions as "*rejoinder[s] in an unfinalized dialogue*" (p. 32, italics in original).

As a spiritually oriented English language teacher educator, I am committed to becoming rejoinders (or providing responses) to what I heard, read, and experienced, in order to keep spiritual dialogues going instead of finalizing them. I will illustrate this in the *Incorporating spirituality into the ELT curriculum as a postmethod pedagogy* sub-section below.

Creativity

Inherent in many teachers' creative attempts are the understanding and applications of what are possible within certain limits, constraints, or boundaries, which are either imposed by authorities (e.g., government-mandated curriculum and textbooks) on the teachers, or are deliberately constructed by individual teachers themselves (e.g., providing a limited number of words for students to make as many sentences as possible with the words; see Maley, 2015). Extrapolating Maley's (2015) idea, here I refer to creativity as English language teachers' capacity to negotiate spiritual contents and aims within some institutional constraints (e.g., opposition from colleagues who disagree with the idea of discussing spirituality in the ELT curriculum—recall Houtman's stance I mentioned earlier in the introduction) and sociocultural constraints (e.g., the fact that not all students have the same religion and interest in discussing spiritual issues as those of the teachers). Creativity also denotes one's (especially teachers') agency/capacity to create few (or limited) questions that can spark lively dialogues. Examples of such questions will be provided in the next section.

INCORPORATING SPIRITUALITY INTO ELT AS A POSTMETHOD PEDAGOGY

It is my contention that creatively and dialogically negotiating spiritual contents and aims in the ELT curriculum is an extension of the *postmethod pedagogy* that Kumaravadivelu (2003) popularized more than a decade ago. To begin with, negotiating spirituality does not aim to establish yet another language learning and teaching method, which is "conceptualized and constructed by experts" (Kumaravadivelu, 2003, p. 24) of spirituality, to be mandated and

consumed by English language teachers in all contexts in a one-size-fits-all manner. One alternative to method that Kumaravadivelu suggests is what he calls as postmethod pedagogy, which has three *parameters*: *practicality, particularity,* and *possibility* (p. 37).

Practicality

The first parameter in Kumaravidevelu's (2003) postmethod pedagogy is practicality. This parameter allows teachers to "theorize from their practice and to practice what they theorize" (p. 37). Theorizing from their own practices, teachers are not mere robots who swallow theories imposed by experts on them. Instead, they have dialogues with themselves by posing questions to their past practices. In my own case, being more informed about relations of power between English language teachers and their students who have different religious faiths from that of the teachers (e.g., Kubota, 2009; Purgason, 2009; Wong, 2013) enables me to theorize my idealized classroom practice based on what I did in my own class a couple of years ago. My own working theory is as follows: central to negotiating power relations associated with different religious faiths between English language teachers and students is the teachers' own vigilant attitude toward any possibility that their religious language use might widen power differentials between themselves and their students. In the case where religious language use is (or has already been) used, care should be taken to ensure that no imposition of a teacher's religious beliefs on the students happen. If necessary, decentering religiosity is a very good option; and only when possible (or desired by all students), mainstreaming all religious perspectives is a very good option, too.

One illustration happened on January 18, 2008, in the first audio-recorded meeting of the *Critical Pedagogies and Literacy* elective course which I offered to some undergraduate students at the undergraduate English language education program in Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana, Indonesia. I was introducing Paulo Freire's book, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, and discussing "oppression" when a male student asked me: "Is oppression always bad?" I replied:

> No! I have to say no… Even though I do not want to be oppressive to others, but oppression can be good to me. Well. This is based on my Christian belief. …

[Pause around 30 seconds; I opened a Bible software on my laptop which was connected to an LCD projector]

Okay. This is an example. Now. This is my belief. Can you read this? *Bahwa aku tertindas* [oppressed]*, itu baik bagiku. Supaya aku belajar ketetapan-ketetapan-Mu, ya Tuhan* [It was good for me to be afflicted so that I might learn your decrees—Psalms 119:71, New International Version]. This is my stance as a Christian. Perhaps from you guys, from Islam, or from other beliefs, perhaps oppression can be good for you. But your religion will not teach you to be oppressive to others. Perhaps.

At the time of teaching, I was still totally unaware of the heated debate over the place of spirituality in ELT. I only had a strong conviction that both critical pedagogy and my Christian faith could be compatible when it comes to standing up for social justice. In retrospect, I have become more conscious of my power distance with my students, especially that which is accentuated by my religious belief. I could have addressed the student's question on whether oppression is always bad with a non-religious example. I am feeling relieved that at least I used some sort of hedging: "Perhaps from you guys, from Islam, or from other beliefs, perhaps oppression can be good for you" (January 18, 2008). Unfortunately, I did not really open up an opportunity for my students to respond to my witnessing about my Christian faith. After the hedged expression, I did not provide a pause that allowed students to respond to my opinion. Therefore, I am curious about what the students, especially the non-Christian, had in mind. Now, this is my commitment to practicing what I theorize: if my students raise (difficult!) questions that (may) relate to religious issues, I will not jump to commenting from my Christian perspective. Or if I do, I will make sure that non-Christian perspectives are brought on the table.

Particularity

The parameter of particularity expands on pedagogy that is "context-sensitive" and "location-specific," and is "based on a true understanding of local linguistic, sociocultural, and political particularities" (Kumaravadivelu, 2003, p. 37). Figure 1 exhibits an Indonesian-based English language teacher's

Facebook posting that explicitly reveals spiritual contents.[2] The posting demonstrates a dialogue between Ms. Marliani, who posed an open-ended question, and her students, who responded to the question from different perspectives. Viewed through the lens of spiritual aim #2 (i.e., fostering a sense of humanity and community), the students appeared to be given a chance to negotiate power relations associated with their religious faiths. The question raised by Ms. Marliani is location-specific: SMAN 1 Tangerang Selatan (Tangsel), Banten province, Indonesia. Her question is also context-sensitive in that it is made relevant to her students' real lives as Indonesian people who must have religions and interact with fellow Indonesians. Presupposed in the question is that each student in her class has a religion, which is a political fact (and particularity) in Indonesia. The question will not be contextually appropriate in countries where agnosticism and atheism prevail. Furthermore, the students' responses reflect real sociocultural facts (and particularities). For example, there are tensions between the religious majority and minority groups (see responses #1, 2, and #4). Linguistically, the word *hijab* represents the religious majority group in Indonesia—Islam.

Lilis Marliani
January 22 at 10:52pm ·

Last week my 11 graders at SMAN 1 Tangsel studied vocab related to Spirituality taken from 400 academic word textbook. And for speaking practice I asked them this question:
Q: What concerns you most regarding your religion and the community where you live in? Here are some responses from my students
1. I fear that I will be attacked by people of diiferent religion/ faith.
2. I think the minority is trying to gain their existence by being loud recently.
3. I think that today'syoung generation lack of moral value, for example you can easily see girls wearing miniskirts at malls.
4. I feel safe wearing hijab in this country but what would happen if I am traveling to western countries with Islamic phobia?
5 My biggest concern is why people are defined by their religion not based on who they really are.
6. Why do people set norms based on their own standards. If I dont do what they do, they call me abnormal. What is 'normal' really?

👍 Like   💬 Comment   ➡ Share

You and 15 others like this.

Figure 1. Spiritual Contents Negotiated in Ms. Marliani's Speaking Class

[2] I am really grateful to Ms. Lilis Marliani for allowing me to use her Facebook posting in this article.

Possibility

Kumaravadivelu's (2003) third parameter of postmethod pedagogy is possibility. Inspired by critical pedagogy, Kumaravadivelu puts it succinctly that this parameter "seeks to tap the sociopolitical consciousness that participants bring with them to the classroom so that it can also function as a catalyst for a continual quest for identity formation and social transformation" (p. 37). There are three key phrases in this parameter: sociopolitical consciousness, identity formation, and social transformation. To unpack these important concepts, I will use Ms. Marliani's Facebook posting (see Figure 1) again. Ms. Marliani's question allowed her students to negotiate a salient spiritual issue of interreligious relationship in their community dialogically. Being asked what concerned them most regarding their religion and the community where they lived in, students raised different voices. The ability to identify possible sources of these voices is indicative of being aware of sociopolitical stances. The first response (i.e., "I fear that I will be attacked by people of different religion/faith") was likely to be raised by a person who belonged to a religious minority group (i.e., a non-Muslim in Banten); the second might be expressed by a person belonging to the religious majority group (i.e., Muslims in Java); the third was probably stated by a moralist, regardless of his or her religious affiliations; the fourth was likely to be expressed by a Muslim who imagined being a member of a religious minority group as a tourist in Western countries; the fifth and the sixth responses were possibly raised by either agnostics or non-dogmatic religious students.

Although Ms. Marliani did not discuss the extended conversations between her and her students, I imagine possibilities of making small baby steps, so to speak, by positioning myself as the students' interlocutor who is committed to keeping the spiritually oriented dialogue going through raising critical questions to the students' responses. For example, to responses #2 and #4 I will ask *What would you feel if you were part of the religious minority group(s)? What have you done to help your classmates who belong to the religious minority group(s)? What have you not done to help them?* These questions are based on the "philosophy of becoming, in which the self can become Other to itself" (Ryoo et al., 2009. p. 135). A learner's ability of becoming the Other(ed) is pivotal in his or her spiritual identity formation; that is, the learner not only learns how he or she forms her own religious identity, but also fosters empathy with those having another (or the Othered) religious faith. My question to re-

sponse #3 is framed as such: *You said that the "young generation lack of moral value," and you used "girls wearing miniskirts at malls" as your example. What about boys? What would you say about the boys' morality?* These questions will, with hope, lead to social transformation, particularly in the sense that a sense of humanity (e.g., challenging sexism) is strengthened (recall spiritual aim #2).

On the whole, Kumaravadivelu's (2003) notion of postmethod pedagogy has shed light on (1) how a teacher (e.g., I) theorizes negotiating power relations associated with the teacher's (i.e., my) own religiously based spirituality—the parameter of practicality; (2) how a teacher (e.g., Ms. Marliani) can exploit the religious issue in a specific context (e.g., an English classroom in Indonesia)—the parameter of particularity; and (3) how the dialogue of religious issue can be extended beyond what already happened in class (e.g., in Ms. Marliani's class) to foster sociopolitical awareness of power relations linked to students' religious faiths, better understand their religious identity formation, and envision social transformation—the parameter of possibility. In the next section, I will devote more attention to the parameter of possibility in spiritually informed materials development.

SPIRITUALLY INFORMED MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT

According to Tomlinson (2012), materials development "refers to all the processes made use of by practitioners who produce and/or use materials for language learning, including materials evaluation, their adaptation, design, production, exploitation and research" (pp. 143-144). I find it impossible to cover all of these processes here. Therefore, I will only focus on the processes of (co) production, adaptation and exploitation, on the grounds that these aspects have been specifically addressed in class and/or in the nascent literature on spirituality in ELT, especially in Indonesia. Furthermore, it seems to me that spiritually informed materials are predominantly "eliciting" in nature; that is, to use Tomlinson's (2012) definition, they "encourage[e] the learner to use the language" (p. 143) when discussing spirituality (e.g., students' elicited answers based on Ms. Marliani's religiously framed question). However, I will explore the possibility of using the elicitation-oriented spiritually informed materials to raise students' awareness of the English language system (a.k.a. "grammar") as well, in addition to increasing students' sociopolitical awareness, fostering their spiritual identity formation, and envisioning social transformation together with

the teacher. To enable me to explore this possibility, two modes of materials development will be discussed below: (1) teachers and students co-developing materials together and (2) adapting non-ELT materials.

English Language Teacher-Student Co-Developing Spiritually Related Materials

Ms. Marliani's question and her students' responses (see Figure 1 again) can be regarded as an ELT material co-produced by a teacher and students. This material, supplemented (if not co-produced) by my responses I put forward earlier (under the parameter of possibility sub-section), is potentially exploited by other English language teachers in other contexts. Apart from Ms. Marliani's example, I have another piece of evidence where a Muslim male student (Tono), with his Muslim female instructor's assistance, developed a material for his presentation in a speaking class at an undergraduate EFL teacher education program in an Indonesian-based Christian university. In an informal unrecorded meeting, Tono mentioned his presentation on FPI [Islamic Defenders Front] in a speaking class. To probe into this, in a recorded interview I asked him: "Can you share about your experience of presenting the topic of FPI in one of your classes?"

His verbatim response is as follows:

> It was on the Public Speaking class. Argumentative speech. So the lecturer, Miss Sani, helped me to choose the topic. I said to Miss Sani, 'How if I chose FPI to be my topics?' Because she give an example in the front of the class,… the topic is FPI. It made me illuminated. They are *ormas* [community organization]… FPI should be banned…

> Even my uncle, that works on the government, say the bad side of the FPI. So I used them to strengthen my arguments. There may be another reason that I choose the topic. Because every time I saw FPI on the TV news, everything in there is bad. I mean they try to do something good, but they do in the bad way. For example, in Malang. [They want] to relocate the prostitution area. There was two victims in the event. One pregnant mothers died. This could be my strongest argument.

> Jos: What was the response from your friends?

> Tono: Some of them nodding. And when I finished my speech, some [Muslims and non-Muslims] say that 'Yes! We don't need FPI.' (Mambu, 2016, p. 173)

The argumentative speech assignment allowed Ms. Sani to elicit Tono's ideas on FPI. By lambasting the FPI, both Ms. Sani and Tono co-constructed a significantly moderate Muslim identity that cherishes a sense of humanity over religious dogmatism. More broadly, this suggests that spiritually informed teacher-student materials co-development is inextricably linked to not only ELT stakeholders' commitment to English language learning, but also their deep investment in spiritual identity that is locally grounded, organically emerging, and oriented toward communality instead of interreligious disharmony.

Adapting Non-ELT Materials

Based on a personal communication with the Oxford University Press in 2000, Gray (2010) comments: "Topics which coursebook writers are advised to avoid are generally referred to within ELT publishing by the acronym PARSNIP (politics, alcohol, religion, sex, narcotics, isms, and pork)" (p. 119). It is difficult, therefore, to rely on ELT coursebooks published by Western publishers when spiritually oriented ELT stakeholders are eager to incorporate spiritual discussions into their classroom. Tomlinson (2015) has recently suggested that

> "… the use of coursebooks could become more creative by replacing or modifying closed activities [i.e., which require all the learners to give the same correct answer] with open activities which encourage personal response to meaning[,] language discovery by the learners[,] authentic communication[,] the taking of risks[,] affective engagement[,] cognitive engagement[, and] being different[.]" (pp. 24-25)

However, if there is no religious issue presented in the ELT coursebook to begin with, what closed activities are to be opened?

In my dissertation project (Mambu, 2014), I documented the adaptation of a non-ELT material in a culture-oriented course at an undergraduate EFL teacher education program. By "non-ELT material" here I refer to a text that is

not specifically designed to ELT stakeholders, but can be adapted for ELT purposes anyway. The text in the course is entitled *Kaleidoscope Eyes* (Tan, 1998), a drama script that tells about a married Singaporean Catholic couple who were on the verge of divorce because the husband came out as a homosexual. The text is not "closed" by comprehension questions to be answered by the students, so it is basically open to subjective interpretations and meaningful responses on the part of teachers and students alike. The issue is not solely on homosexuality, but also on divorce, contraception, and a cultural expectation of having at least a child in a legal marriage. This open text, so to speak, made it possible to elicit students' responses in English (Mambu, 2014). For instance, Ellie commented:

> As my belief, my religion, [homosexuality] is forbidden. But as a person, I think I'm agree . . . I myself can't judge people, when I don't walk in their path . . . In our religion, homosexual is forbidden, but only God can judge he's sinner or not. So as a human being, we could have choose build relationship with them. We don't have right to discriminate their love [nor] to disgrace their love. (Communication Across Cultures class, April 2, 2014) (Mambu, 2016, p. 173)

The *Kaleidoscope Eyes* text allowed Ellie to explore a global issue of LGBTQ that is socio-politically controversial. Responding to the text also provided her space to express her current form of religious identity and her sense of humanity that transcends a religious dogma. Sense of humanity is certainly an essential ingredient for social transformation, at least in problematizing homophobia.

Other examples of adapting materials not specifically designed for language learning include using sacred texts in a foreign language (including English), either for highly motivated self-taught learners (Lepp-Kaethler & Dörnyei, 2013) or for a group of learners who are deeply invested in Christianity in an ESP program (Pamplona, 2000). Decentering discussions about religious traditions and beliefs, spiritually inspired teachers can still mainstream or foreground a sense of humanity in their spiritually informed ELT materials. For example, as Papalazarou (2015) puts it,

> "events [portrayed in a work of art, a photograph, a story the class has read, a video] [that have] to do with issues of social justice and fairness (racism, bullying,

a historical event, slavery) can evoke an emotional response and lead to more creative understanding." (p. 39)

In my earlier study (Mambu, 2009), I used four photographs (of McDonald's burger advertisement, a beauty pageant, a slum area, and a beggar in front of a religious shrine) to elicit my undergraduate EFL students' responses. Their comments range from mere (or literal) descriptions of the pictures to social critiques that expose injustices in society.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Spirituality has been growingly addressed in the ELT literature, and in Indonesia religiously based spirituality in education is even endorsed by the constitution. These suggest that there are more opportunities for ELT stakeholders who have deep investment in their spiritual identities to incorporate spirituality into the ELT curriculum. Despite these opportunities, however, constraints in (or resistance to) integrating spirituality in ELT have also been documented in the literature (e.g., simply avoiding sensitive issues in class; fear of proselytization). By understanding spirituality as a concept that encompasses, but is not limited to, religiosity, teachers aiming at incorporating spirituality into their ELT curriculum should be in a much better position to negotiate their spiritual identity with fellow teachers and/or students using the pragmatics of spiritual negotiations in their teaching approaches (or pedagogy). That is, they can creatively decenter religious beliefs and mainstream a sense of self-reflexivity, humanity, and community, when deemed appropriate (e.g., when some ELT stakeholders' resistance to spirituality escalates).

Besides the pragmatics of spiritual negotiations, it is essential for spiritually inspired English language teachers to (1) ground their (postmethod) pedagogy in local concerns or problems that are related to interreligious relations; (2) theorize what works or is problematic when discussing spirituality in class; and (3) practice or envision practicing what they theorize with regard to integrating spirituality in ELT settings. In the interplay of theorizing and practicing the incorporation of spirituality into the ELT curriculum, teachers should think of possibilities for English language learners to raise sociopolitical awareness, explore their own spiritual identity formation, and envision social transformation dialogically. Concerning spiritually informed materials development, ELT teachers deeply invested in spirituality cannot rely on many existing

coursebooks in the market, so they are encouraged to develop spiritually related materials themselves together with their students, or to adapt non-ELT materials.

Based on my review of the spiritually informed ELT curriculum that has been practiced and/or documented in the literature, follow-up studies are in order. Some major questions that should be addressed in future research are as follows: How do English language teachers practice the pragmatics of spiritual negotiations when they attempt to integrate spiritual contents and aims in the curriculum?; In what ways do spiritually oriented ELT stakeholders execute their postmethod pedagogy in class?; What strategies are used by spiritually oriented teachers (especially those who are not Christian) in developing spiritually related ELT materials?; What are the roles of computer and mobile technology (e.g., digital storytelling, Facebook posting/chat, and the use of online learning management system like Schoology) in facilitating spiritually informed ELT pedagogy and materials development?

REFERENCES

Astin, A. W. (2004). Why spirituality deserves a central place in liberal education. *Liberal Education, 90*(2), 34-41.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* (C. Emerson, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Barkhuizen, G. (2016). Narrative approaches to exploring language, identity and power in language teacher education. *RELC Journal, 47*(1), 25-42.

Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (Eds.). (2001). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Crookes, G. V. (2009). *Values, philosophies, and beliefs in TESOL: Making a statement.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cutri, R. M. (2000). Exploring the spiritual moral dimensions of teachers' classroom language policies. In J. K. Hall, & W. G. Eggington (Eds.), *The*

sociopolitics of English language teaching (pp. 165-177). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Dei, G. J. S. (2002). Spiritual knowing and transformative learning. In E. O'Sullivan, A. Morrell, & M. A. O'Connor (Eds.), *Expanding the boundaries of transformative learning: Essays on theory and praxis* (pp. 121-133). New York, NY: Palgrave.

Frank, A. W. (2012). Practicing dialogical narrative analysis. In J. A. Holstein, & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Varieties of narrative analysis* (pp. 33-52). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Gray, J. (2010). The construction of English: Culture, consumerism and promotion in the ELT global coursebook. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kubota, R. (2009). Spiritual dimensions in language teaching: A personal reflection. In M. S. Wong, & S. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 225-234). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lee, I. (2015). Living out the Christian faith in the writing classroom. *International Journal of Christianity and English Language Teaching, 2,* 7-20.

Lepp-Kaethler, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2013). The role of sacred texts in enhancing motivation and living the vision in second language acquisition. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjánnson, & Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 171-188). New York, NY: Routledge.

Luke, A (2004). Two takes on the critical. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 21-29). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Maley, A. (2015). Less is more: The power of constraints. *Humanising Language Teaching, 17*(2). Retrieved from http://www.hltmag.co.uk/apr15/mart01.htm

Mambu, J. E. (2009). Thematic investigations with Indonesian EFL teachers: From descriptions to social critiques and beyond. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, *5*(1), 57-80.

Mambu, J.E. (2013). Narrative structures across tellings of the same "good" teaching experience. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL), 2*(2), 199-215

Mambu, J.E. (2014). *Negotiating the place of spirituality in English language teaching: A case study in an Indonesian EFL teacher education program* (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, United States of America). Retrieved from https://repository.asu.edu/attachment/143405/content/Mambu_asu_0010E_14422_updated_11Jan2015.pdf.

Mambu, J.E. (2015). Challenges in assessing character education in ELT: Implications from a case study in a Christian university. *TEFLIN Journal, 26*(2), 183-208.

Mambu, J.E. (2016). Investigating students' negotiation of religious faiths in ELT contexts: A critical spiritual pedagogy perspective. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 13*(3), 157-182.

Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Pamplona, D. (2000). The Bible as an effective source of teaching materials. *Humanising Language Teaching, 2*(1). Retrieved from http://www.hltmag.co.uk/jan00/mart2.htm

Papalazarou, C. (2015). Making thinking visible in the English classroom: Nurturing a creative mind-set. In A Maley, & N. Peachey (Eds.), *Creativity in the English language classroom* (pp. 37-43). London, UK: British Council.

Pennycook, A. (2001) *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pennycook, A. (2009). Is dialogue possible? Anti-intellectualism, relativism, politics, and linguistic ideologies. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue:*

Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas (pp. 60-65). New York, NY: Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2010). Critical and alternative directions in applied linguistics. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 33*(2), 16.1-16.16.

Pennycook, A., & Coutand-Marin, S. (2003). Teaching English as a missionary language. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 24*(3), 337-353.

Pennycook, A., & Makoni, S. (2005). The modern mission: The language effects of Christianity. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 4*(2), 137-155.

Purgason, K. B. (2009). Classroom guidelines for teachers with convictions. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 185-192). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ryoo, J. J., Crawford, J., Moreno, D., & McLaren, P. (2009). Critical spiritual pedagogy: reclaiming humanity through a pedagogy of integrity, community, and love. *Power and Education, 1*(1), 132-146.

Shahjahan, R. A. (2004). Centering spirituality in the academy: Toward a transformative way of teaching and learning. *Journal of Transformative Education, 2*(4), 294-312.

Smith, D. I. (2007). Spirituality and language pedagogy: A survey of recent developments. In D. I. Smith, & T. A. Osborn (Eds.), *Spirituality, social justice, and language pedagogy* (pp. 13-29). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Smith, D. I., & Osborn, T. A. (2007). (Eds.). *Spirituality, social justice, and language learning.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Tan, T. (1998). Kaleidoscope Eyes. In L. L. Geok (Ed.), *More than half the sky: Creative writings* (pp. 202-212). Singapore: Times Books International.

The Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia of 1945. (2002). In *Asian Human Rights Commission.* Retrieved from http://www.humanrights. asia/countries/indonesia/laws/uud1945_en

Tisdell, E. J. (2007). In the millennium: The role of spirituality and the cultural imagination in dealing with diversity and equity in the higher education classroom. *Teachers College Record, 109*(3), 531-560.

Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching, 45*(2), 143-179.

Tomlinson, B. (2015). Challenging teachers to use their coursebook creatively. In A Maley, & N. Peachey (Eds.), *Creativity in the English language classroom* (pp. 24-28). London, UK: British Council.

Van Brummelen, H., Koole, R., & Franklin, K. (2004). Transcending the commonplace: Spirituality in the curriculum. *Journal of Educational Thought, 38*(3), 237-254.

Wong, M. S. (2013). Called to teach: The impact of faith on professional identity formation of three Western English teachers in China. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjánnson, & Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 11-30). New York, NY: Routledge.