Teaching English as a Glocalized Communication (TEGCOM): Some Empirical Examples

Ribut Wahyudi
ribut.wahyudi.uin.m2i.malang@gmail.com
Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University,
Malang, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to discuss my own auto ethnographical reflection of teaching experiences obtained during a 6 month Discourse Analysis course back in 2013. I will discuss my teaching experiences in relation to the TEGCOM and its related literatures. I then showcase what and how my teaching experience matches with the pedagogy. I use the following TEGCOM (Lin, Wang, Akamatsu & Riazi (2002; 2005) reference to contextualize the Western materials to students' cultural contexts. In this paper, I use auto-ethnography (Cauley, 2008; Ellis, Adam, Bochner, 2011) in elaborating my experience of teaching Discourse Analysis course, an empowering methodology which allows the personal story through the use of pronoun "I" (Dyson, 2007).

Keywords: TEGCOM. Localizing teaching materials. Auto-ethnography. Discourse Analysis

---

✉ RibutWahyudi
Email: ribut.wahyudi.uin.m2i.malang@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Teaching English in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context requires teachers to not simply take for granted the materials imported from Western countries such as the UK, US and Australia. This is because students may not be familiar with the themes or topics that carry Western cultural values. However, teachers can benefit from these imported materials by contextualising the materials to suit students' cultural contexts. This will help students to have access to the content of materials within a particular course. To do this, teachers are required to contextualize foreign language culture (English to students' own culture. Thus, teachers should be aware of pedagogical approaches which help them bridge insightful teaching and learning process as they both discuss foreign and local cultures contexts This is particularly relevant, in the Indonesian context where English is taught as a foreign language (EFL), the issue which I want to address in this paper.

Literature Review

Teaching English as Glocalized Communication (TEGCOM)

Inspired by *Pedagogy of Appropriation* (Canagarajah, 1999) and *Post-colonial performativity*, the idea that English teaching is implicated in hegemony, appropriation and resistance (Pennycook, 2000), Lin, Wang, Akamatsu and Riazi (2002; 2005) urged us to re-vision Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) to Teaching English as Glocalized Communication (TEGCOM). If TESOL is Western centric, on the contrary TEGCOM uses the following theoretical framework:

1. Sociocultural situatedness,

2. Post-colonial performativity and

3. Glocalization

While for research, TEGCOM is based on the following three tenets:

(a). Toward socially, culturally, historically and institutionally perspectives in doing research on ELT, curriculum development, and teacher education in a variety of contexts; foregrounding the social, cultural and historical situatedness of human communication and activities

(b). De-centering the production of the discipline's knowledge and discourse from Anglo-speaking countries to a diversity of sociocultural contexts in the worlds

(c). Drawing on anthropological research methods and interpretive sociological methods, including narrative analysis, discourse analysis, cultural studies, critical ethnography and autobiographic studies

(Lin, Wang, Akamatsu & Riazi, 2005, pp.17-18)

The idea of teaching English as global and local communication (TEGCOM) is a fruitful

concept. It also describes my teaching experience in translating the global cultural meaning from the western imported materials to local cultural meaning through appropriation by applying the concept of socio-cultural situatedness, institutional perspectives, de-centering the discourses from Anglo-speaking countries to local Indonesian discourse through auto-ethnographic study (Lin, Wang, Akamatsu & Riazi, 2005)

The appropriation of the discourses from Western imported materials to students' local discourses by providing the examples from local discourse community in student's daily activity (e.g. student activity unit, religious music group etc) enhanced student's engagement toward the materials. This might be because the western materials had been communicated through "culturally contexted practice" (Liddicoat, 2009, p.115) so that students were able to get more involved in the meaning-making process. Liddicoat explains that language is a "culturally constructed artefact which encodes perceptual understandings of the world" (p.115). Therefore, the communication between cultures "impose a problem of transferability…and necessitates a level of particularity for each actual instance of communication" (p.115). Similar to this, Pennycook (2008) argues that that as a global enterprise of English Language Teaching (ELT), "English needs to be seen in the context of other languages, as a language always in translation" (p.33), so that it opens "the possibility of bringing people into the global traffic of meaning" (p.33). The synthesis of the two notions ensures that the transferrability of the perceptual understanding of the world from English (embedded in western materials) is culturally contexted (Liddicoat, 2009) and translated (Pennycook, 2008).

Other scholars working in ELT areas however do not use the same term to describe a similar teaching approach or similar teaching and learning contexts.

Kumaravadilu (2006) for example proposed post-method pedagogy which promotes context sensitive pedagogy. This pedagogy enables teachers to theorize their own teaching practices and emphasizes the need to accommodate the local cultures. Furthermore, this pedagogy encourages the teacher about the sociopolitical aspect of English Language Teaching.

Another scholar, Kubota (2011) for example uses a glocal approach to teaching English in Japan. Accordingly glocal approach is inspired by "postcolonial resistance and hybridity" (p.116). Furthermore, this approach allows "a creative use of language and inventive cultural expressions" which are not bound to "fixed-preexisting norms" (p.116). Furthermore, this approach promotes border-crossing communication between cultures.

One among the scholars who proposed TEGCOM above Lin (2013) reported plurilingual-pedagogies in Hong Kong where the teaching of science is accompanied by the bilingual notes of Chinese and English. In this pedagogy, the students' "existing needs and abilities are understood and considered" (p.530) in the materials design.

One of the current issues in ELT pedagogy is Teaching English as an International Language (EIL). This issue arises in the context of World Englishes. This pedagogy among others encourages global and local purposes of language learning, promotes linguistic awareness

and cultural differences (McKay and Brown, 2016, p.58). Among the existing TEGCOM and its related pedagogies, none is found in the Indonesian context. Therefore, my auto-ethnographic of teaching Discourse Analysis course aims to address this under discussed domain.

The Related Studies Incorporating the Locals into ELT Practices in Indonesian Context

I did not find specifically the references on ELT practices in Indonesian context informed by TEGCOM pedagogy. However here are some reliable studies found which aim to integrate the local culture into ELT practices; Alwasilah (2006) Sukarno (2012) Prastiwi (2015), Qoyimah (2016).

Conducting the study in West Java, Alwasilah (2006) incorporated the Sundanese literature into one semester long collaborative writing classes. He went through four modes (1) writing Indonesian responses to published Indonesian texts (2) writing poems in three languages: Sundanese, Indonesian and English and short stories in English. (3) writing comments in English (4) writing a reflexive essay. (pp: 15-16). Accordingly the students the students responded prositively to these collaborative writing classes.

Six years after later Sukarno (2012) provided an example of integrating local culture (especially Javanese culture) into an English classroom to build students' character. There are six steps that he suggested in the teaching process; (1) providing meaningful texts related to (Javanese culture) (2) discussing contents in general (3), exploring and elaborating culture for skill production (4) using appropriate English expressions related to the cultural messages (5) discussing cultural and moral aspect of contents (6) emphasizing moral values and local wisdoms for character development (p.202). The examples of the Javanese cultures discussed are; (1) "Pisang Raja Setandhan Sasuluhan" which is the methaporical example of bridgegroom and bride who would be King and Queen one day. Accordingly to emulate the King and Queen the students must have the following characters such as being responsible, loving, generous, faithful (p.207).

Exploring the kids' world Prastiwi (2015) in her dissertation examined the use of Western and Indonesian folktales to teach English in primary schools. The respondents of this study are two teachers and six students (twelve year old). The teachers were asked about their understanding and interpretations on Indonesian government policy in covering the local cultures into EFL classes as well as how these teachers implement the policy. As for the students, the researcher investigates how they folktale illustrations are used to develop the students' English language skills. The last concern that researcher investigates is the consequence of curriculum and pedagogy through the use of folktale to students' cultural knowledge and national identity (Prastiwi, 2015, p.11). The researcher found that teachers chose Indonesian folktales (translated to English) for the teaching which is accordingly to teach English and local cultures. It is also revealed that the students seem to be interested to read further the texts of the pair illustrations of folktales (Western and Indonesian). Furthermore, it is also reported that the students' willingness to study English and local culture raised (p.370).

In a current study Qoyimah (2016) examined how EFL teachers in Indonesia

implemented character education policy in the micro-pedagogic setting in Indonesian state schools. She found that the implementation of teachers' moral education was "dominated by their school communities [e.g. religious communities] and their preferred values of religiosity"(p.109).

None of the above studies discussed teacher's pedagogic practices in the classroom and discussed the pedagogic practices in relation to TEGCOM principles. Therefore, this article aims to enrich the above studies on the incorporation of local cultures into the teaching of English in Indonesian context, primarily Islamic university context. Secondly, this article aims to discuss TEGCOM informed discussion in this paper.

METHODOLOGY

For this study, auto-ethnography is written as a method (process) as well as a product. As *a method* (process), *auto-ethnography* unites the characteristics of autobiography and ethnography (Ellis, Adam & Bochner, 2011). When writing an auto-biography, the author "retroactively and selectively writes about past experiences" (p.4) and when doing ethnography, the researcher explores the real relationship between cultures, the shared values and beliefs and experiences to help insiders and outsiders better understand the culture (MASO, 2001 cited in Ellis, Adam & Bochner, 2011). As *a product*, the researcher should present an aesthetic, engage readers and use the convention of story-telling (Ellis & Ellingson, 2000 cited in Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011) by following chronological story progression (Didion, 2005; Frank 1995 cited in Ellis, Adams & Bochner, 2011). In this regard, I might use the first person to tell the personalized story through interaction and participation (Cauley, 2008). In ELT domain, auto-ethnography has been evidenced in the following literatures.

Clark & Gruba (2010) described the use of auto-ethnography in language learning especially social networking site in this case Livemocha. The result of this study indicates the flaws in site design so that it has an undesirable effect on pedagogy. Canagarajah (2012) uses auto ethnography to describe his negotiation in the different teaching practices and professional cultures between periphery and the center. In this in between spaces, he tries to construct 'a professional strategic identity' (p.258). Moreover, Canagarajah stresses the use of multiple identities in a critical way to establish voice "in the wider professional discourses and practices" (p.258).

Park (2014) reported the study of language teacher program in TESOL using auto-ethnographic method as a way to shift from reflective practices to reflexivity. The area being investigated is the teacher's biographical, cultural and historical factors shaping the teacher's profession. The result of the study indicates that the teacher herself shows "a deeper understanding about herself, students and TESOL context in Korea" (p.173).

Holland (2015) uses the same research approach to investigate teacher's first year teaching experience in Japan. The learned lesson in the research is "the importance of practicing cultural relativity" (p.iii). Despite being culturally relative, the researcher found herself to be

"America-centric" (p.157).

In the current study, Wahyudi (2016) uses auto-ethnographical reflection to propose intercultural competence concept which has multi-dynamic, intersubjective, critical and interdisciplinary approaches. He argues that this proposed type of intercultural competence is the answer for the current context and needs.

From the above auto-ethnographic studies, its use in teaching discourse analysis in an Islamic university is absent. Therefore, my article aims to address this uncharted area.

Participant Information

As it is the reflection of my experience of teaching *Discourse Analysis* course, the participants were myself and the students in the 6th semester (the second semester of the third year of enrolment), February to June 2013. There were two classes in the course with 40-45 students in each class.

Data Collection

My stories in this article were taken from the Power Point (PPT) slides I was using while teaching the Discourse Analysis class traceable through the Facebook group created by students. In addition, I also followed the sequence of the topics presented in the Discourse Analysis (Paltridge, 2006), I used in the classroom. However, it is worth noting that due to the limited space given in this journal, I will only discuss the first three chapters. I used the book because it was used in one of my courses during my master's degree in an English speaking country. Therefore, I had experienced how this book was used in the Western context. Furthermore, I asked two of my students to review their notes when joining the course. I asked them to remind me on some of the points I missed discussing.

DISCUSSION

The followings are the way in which I contextualized the first three chapters of Discourse Analysis (Paltridge, 2006)

Introduction to Discourse Analysis (DA)

In this introductory meeting, I introduced firstly the broad definition of DA. I elaborated the concept of DA which according to Paltridge (2006) falls into two broad categories: textually oriented discourse and socially oriented discourse. Then I provided an example where the textually oriented discourse could be done through the analysis of a piece of text such as how a text (written text) is composed from several paragraphs where each paragraph consists of sentences. Together, the text conveys an overall (broad) meaning constructed by different layers of discourses from each paragraph and sentence. In exploring this, I made an example of a hypothetical text saying that "Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University, Malang, Indonesia" is the best State Islamic University in Indonesia, then this is the overall meaning (the

macro – discourse). This overall discourse can be constructed by different layers of discourses. I asked students to identify the possible layers of discourses which may form the overall discursive formation. In doing this, I gave the chance for students to provide different answers.

After all students voiced out their answers and no more response was given, then I listed the possible construction of discursive formations such as: (1) the fact that the university's entrance exam is highly competitive so that the selected students are those having good potentials (2) the university has qualified lecturers with Masters and PhD degrees from both overseas and local universities. (3) the university has clear and balanced (theoretical and practical) curricula, (4) the university has excellent facilities such as language laboratory, library, plethora of books etc, (5) the university has been nationally accredited A, (6) both the lecturers and students have produced good academic works (7) the Indonesian government has trusted the university as the host university for international students sponsored by Indonesian government scholarship. . Other possible discourses could still be drawn out. By doing this, I crossed the boundary from the culture presented in the book with students' own daily life example. This is one of the ways of appropriating the discourse presented in the book. While for socially oriented discourses, I exemplified the various discourses in our daily lives such as religious discourses, political discourses, economic discourses etc are socially situated in nature. This is in line with the ideas of localisation of materials which capture student's real life situations (Tomlinson, 1998 cited in Bao, 2003) and still attached to institutional attributes (Canagarajah, 1999; Lin, Wang, Akamatsu & Riazi, 2005).

In this meeting I discussed the relationship between language and context. An example given in Paltridge (2006) book was "the runway is full at the moment" (p.3), which was said by the pilot. The statement is explained to have two possibilities of meaning. The first meaning is the impossibility to land the plane while the second meaning is the explanation why the plane is late taking off. This example was understood by students in my classroom. To further explain this, I discussed the differences between Semantics and Pragmatics where the first deals with the literal meaning and the latter refers to meaning in context. To get students involved in the topics, I asked the students to provide their own examples from daily lives. This was possible as the object of discussion is of mundane issues. After that I also provided an example myself such as when Javanese people (local tribe in Indonesia) are offered food "Monggodipundhahar? (Please have the food?), they might not directly take the food in the first offer (especially those who have just known each other) as it is considered impolite. They might just reply "nggih" means "yes" but might be still reluctant to have the food. After the third offer, the guest finally takes the food. In this case, the context of culture plays an important role in understanding the meaning of language. In the above case, I made an example of local speech event in student's own culture in order to better understand the concept of Pragmatics, as the form of contextualization in the local socio-cultural context (Lin, Wang, Akamatsu & Riazi, 2005) and encourages pride in student's cultural tradition (Canagarajah, 1999).

The next topic that we discussed was the influence of culture on speaking and writing especially the language use by particular cultural groups (Hymes, 1964). Accordingly the *speech events* such as *who is speaking to whom, about what, for what purpose, where and when, and*

how will have impacts on how something is said and is done in particular cultures. One of the examples given in the Discourse Analysis book (Paltridge, 2006) is that how the word "thank you" is usually used in the daily life. I told students my own story when studying in Australia. e. g. when an Australian bought a travel ten bus ticket, he/she usually sais "thank you" to the shop keeper. This also is common after someone gets off the bus, he/she says "thank you" to the driver. Thus saying "thank you" is part of daily rituals for an Australians at least from what I experienced (Wahyudi, 2016). Then I compared this to the Indonesian context where saying "thank you" is less common after buying something and after getting off from the bus. Further research could be done to investigate why these differences occur. In this instance, I got student's attention to the concept of "thank you" in an Australian setting compared to the expression of "thank you" in Indonesian context.

Furthermore to illustrate the local example of speech events (e.g. who is speaking to whom, about what, for what purposes, where and when, and how) discussed by Dell Hyme (1964) above, I told students that when I talk to the Dean at the faculty and the Rector at the University I often switch from Indonesian language to polite Javanese language as I respect the Dean and the Rector who are older than me and institutionally have higher social status. The shuttling activities between Indonesian language to Javanese language is understood in the context where Indonesian language has more democratic status (speaker and hearer may have equal positions though they still have politeness features) than Javanese language which clearly shows hierarchical structures. In Javanese culture, the sub-ordinate usually uses very polite language which includes the particular choices of diction and syntactic structure while usually those in higher social position use ordinary language. Additionally, I told the students that this does not apply to the Australian context where the languages used by the Vice chancellor, Dean and ordinary lecturers are the same. Therefore I emphasized to students that who speaks to whom, in what context, the relationship between the interlocutors are really bound by cultural norms. After giving examples, then to engage students, I asked students to provide their own examples to stimulate their own awareness of socio-cultural and institutional context (Lin, Wang, Akamatsu & Riazi, 2005) in their foreign language learning trajectory.

Following the structure of the chapter in Paltridge (2006), I then discussed the idea of discursive competence (Bhatia, 2004). The discursive competence comprises of *textual competence, generic competence and social competence* (Bhatia, 2004). As competence can be roughly understood as "ability", then discursive competence might be equalized to the ability to produce appropriate discourse. Thus *textual competence* is the ability to produce and understand text messaging such as ASAP (as soon as possible), gtg (got to go) (Paltridge, 2006) in the online or short text message setting. *Generic competence* is the ability to use language within a particular genre such as being able to write an appropriate job application letter, argumentative essay and others which have their own patterns. *Social competence* is the ability to use language which is socially appropriate to project our own identities in different situations e.g. how someone acts as a lecturer in the university, a son of his parent, a father of his own son and daughter and a friend of his colleagues. In discussing this, I mentioned some socially inappropriate examples of short message services (sms) that lecturers received from students where for example students use "anda" (you) and "kesinio" (come here) to the lecturers. I

showed the students that the appropriate words should be *"panjenengan" (you)* and *"monggodipunaturi" (come here)* in Javanese terms as both of the lecturers are Javanese. Raising student's cultural awareness was the essence of my explanation to students to improve their social competence.

Discourse and Society

In the second meeting, I presented some concepts of Discourse and Society such as Discourse communities, Speech communities and Communities of practices. *Discourse community* is defined as "a group of people who share some kind of activity" (Paltridge, 2006, p.24), e.g. associations who have regular activities, groups of students who go to classes at the same university. To enhance students' understanding, I associate these examples to the students organization at our university and other student activity units e.g. sports, religious music, and other student's organization under Islamic names. These examples are friendly topics to students as those are the pictures of their own real life. Paltridge (2006) defined *speech community* as the people who speak the same language and might also cover social, geographical, cultural, political, (and) ethnic factors. Speech communities may accordingly also share a particular norms and behaviour. In our university context, there may be at least two speech communities e.g. Madurese and Javanese speech communities. However, these might not be a clear cut category as the students might be from a society where there is a mix between the Javanese and Madurese. As the concept *Community of practice* refers to discourse community in one particular place interacting with other discourse communities in another city (Paltridge, 2006). e.g. the possible explanation of this would be the participants of English debate clubs at our university who interact with other participants of English club from other neighbouring universities such as: University of Brawijaya, State University of Malang. Localizing the concept of discourse community, speech community and community of practice in those ways mean that de-centering the examples in Discourse Analysis from Anglo-Saxon countries to students' own local discourses (Lin, Wang, Akamatsu & Riazi, 2005) so that the local examples match "not only with learners potential relevance and utility in real life situations but also their personality and preferences so as to achieve personal contact" (Tomlinson, 1998, cited in Bao, 2003, p.171).

In the second meeting, I explored discourse in its relation to *language choice*. Similar to the idea that language is bound to cultural context, language is also determined by different settings such as family, religious, educational and employment settings. Discussing this, I explained an example of the discourse of *UlulAlbab* (see the different meaning of *UlulAlbab* in Hassan (2010)), which should be the goal of students of our Islamic university (the institutional values). It is a real example where Maulana Malik Ibrahim as the State Islamic university has its own distinctive values different from other universities on which the education system is based. Lin, Wang, Akamatsu & Riazi (2005) urged us that the teaching of English should be "tied" to institutional values). I also discussed DA in relation to social class and social networks. Social class may include occupation, income, housing, and its location (Labov, 2006). The examples such as doctors, businessman are quite noticeable for students representing social classes, whereas for housing and location, I made an example of an elite real estate area such as ARAYA in Malang (our city) where rich people can also have houses in the ARAYA. Mentioning our local real estate area such as ARAYA is a form of *translingual practice,* "the ability to use

diverse codes (housing, location, social class etc) across language varieties and settings which are contextually appropriate" (Pennycook 2008 cited in Jain, 2014, p.493).

Another important issue in the second and third meetings of the course was the language, identity and social construction. Cameron & Kulick (2003) highlighted that the use of language is an act of identity and a social construction. As a result, everyone's language uses represent the constructed identities. In a more practical sense, the construction of particular identities can be recognised from the daily vocabularies people used. For examples the use of *Alay vocabularies* and *Korean drama* terms in Indonesian context might be considered as "gaul" (get connected and updated) and "modern" (Smith-Hefner, 2008) for Indonesian teenagers and also the uses of Arabic words are to project the Islamic identities among some Moslem's groups. In a similar vein to Cameron & Kulick (2003), Hall 2005 (as cited in Rassokha 2010) stated that language use is concurrently identity construction and representation.

Language and gender is also an important concept in Discourse Analysis. Language was formerly associated with a biological category which is now adapted to a social category (Paltridge, 2006). I usually gave an anecdotal example that languages used by Doni (male) in the daylight life are dissimilar to the languages used by Dona (female) in the night. What I meant was Doni and Dona are actually the same person who acts in two different ways through the uses of different languages and costumes and gestures. The naming is also special in that the two names are only distinctive in one vocal. While the names are pseudo-names, there are in fact cases where the local people in our city (Malang) have met transgender in the local train station at night Some students also provided the same testimonies on the phenomenon. This example justifies the notion that language is a gendered category and at the same time is a social practice (Eckert & McConell-Ginet, 2003). Thus discussing language in relation to gender, is more about how the gender is performed (Buttler, 1990; Pennycook, 2009). While in some context of Western culture, the issue of transgender might be considered normal but in Indonesian context, it is mostly considered *the Other*.

Further discussion in relation to language and gender is the issue of a woman's and a man's language features (Paltridge, 2006). Lakoff (1975) explained that woman's language denotes: overly polite form, the use of question tags, the occurrence of the rising intonation in declaratives, the greater use of euphemisms, the use of more hedges and mitigating devices, more indirectness and the use of particular lexical items such as adorable, charming, sweet etc. As this hypothesis was rooted in the US context, I asked students to discuss the features of a woman's language in Indonesian context especially which students encounter in the daily life. While some features are similar those such as: indirectness and the use of particular lexical items such as adorable, charming and sweet, other categories are not clear. One of the students in the Discourse Analysis course who submitted an essay on this topic told me that the girls (university students) while chatting with other girls will not use indirect language and polite forms. Their languages especially seemed to characterize more *gossip* and *gaul language* (Smith-Hefner, 2008) such as the discussions on lecturer's classroom teaching, fashion, and boyfriends. Despite the fact that there is an underexplored issue of woman's language in Indonesia, students' own testimony on girls' language in their daily life provide insightful evidence that Lakoff's study on

woman's language only works in some contexts. This indicates that the theory rooted from one culture is not directly applicable to another culture.

I also discussed Discourse and Identity in the course. As discussed previously that one person may have different identities (Paltridge, 2006). I provided an example of how student in our university act as a student while in the university site, may act as a senior activist in the student's organisation, and as a son or daughter in his/her family and as a friend for his/her own classmates. Paltridge (2006) noted that identity is constructed, reconstructed and involves two way constructions (see also Dervin, 2011). This construction, reconstruction and two-way construction are played out when someone interacts with others. In the case of construction and reconstruction, someone may project different identities in different time periods. For this, I discussed a case where in the past a person could be an artist, and then later he/she could become a religious preacher. In this context his/her constructed status as an artist is later re-constructed as a religious preacher. While two way construction is understood in the sense that what a person acts will raise a response from other people. Other people may accept or reject this sort of construction. This makes discourse and Identity as something complex and yet interesting. To foreground this concept, I discussed my own published paper (Wahyudi, 2012) on the discourse and identity involved in the matchmaking discourse. In this paper, I told the students that religious affiliation, income and culture serve as the determinant of success in matchmaking where the context is young Javanese from Islamic background and from rural family in East Java, Indonesia. While again this is not something generalisable but it is common encounters for students usually from the same background.

Identity can also be reflected through casual conversation. Eggin & Slade (1997 cited in Paltridge 2006) explained that casual conversation is not just to waste time but also to negotiate social identities and interpersonal relations. This skill is very important especially to those working in public relations, business and other jobs. Moreover, I discussed that students' future success is not only determined by how smart they were but how more importantly how students manage interpersonal relationships and how students have wider networks. In this context, teaching Discourse Analysis was not only about teaching content per se but also raising student's awareness for their future investment (Pierce, 1995) and the relevance of social context (Kumaravadivelu, 2006).

Furthermore, I also explored identity in relation to written academic discourse. Hyland (2002) explained that when we write something, it portrays about the author and the sort of relationship with readers. For example, in some contexts, uses of the pronoun "I" as an expert academic writer and makes the essay more personal. I also highlighted that the way the Western writer composed essay in a straightforward way reflect their cultural identity as a straightforward person. While in an Indonesian context, especially in Javanese culture, the indirect way of composing essay is the portrayal of local culture that tends to discuss secondary or tertiary matters before the primary piece. Both of them are examples of cultural thought pattern (Kaplan, 1966). From this discussion, I informed the students that these cultural differences inspired the research in contrastive rhetoric (Connor, 2002).

The last variable discussed in the meeting was the relationship between the discourse and ideology. This relationship can be revealed in a piece of text. I further explained to students that ideology in this context does not only refer to religion per see but it can mean a variety of things for example I discussed whenever students visit the mall or shopping centres; they unconsciously might be exposed to consumerism as an ideology or capitalist ideology in that they are seduced to always buy the new gadget or new fashion products. Dijk (2006) defined ideology as 'system of ideas' or 'shared representation of social group' (p.115).

Discourse and Pragmatics

In this lesson, I discussed Discourse in relation to Pragmatics. As elaborated earlier that Pragmatics is meaning in context. Therefore language, context and discourse are integral part of the discussion. The context itself is usually discussed as the context of situation and the context of culture. Furthermore, there are a number of key aspects which interweave each other among them such as: *situational context, background knowledge context, co-textual context* and *discourse community*. I asked the students to provide the definition of situational context. One of the examples came up was when a person is saying *one, two* and *three*, this might mean different things for different people. The context situation does determine the meaning of *one, two* and *three* (as verbal action) (see Firth cited in Halliday and Hasan, 1985). The counting *one, two* and *three* might mean a mother teaches the kids how to count. It might also mean that it is the signal to start the marathon. What made the difference between the use of counting *one, two and three* is the context of use. For background knowledge context, I explained that our former understanding about a particular thing might have an impact on our current understanding. e.g. in Javanese context, receiving the first offer of food may be considered impolite.

Furthermore, I exemplified in the word *bank* which all students consider as the institution where people withdraw and deposit money. The second meaning of the *bank* is the edge of the river. It is noted that previously the former understanding of the word *bank* which means the edge of the river might confuse students with the word *bank* as a monetary institution as the words are homonym, that is words that have the same forms and sounds but different meanings (Yule, 2010). The second example was the word *sampean* (you) which might mean slightly two different things for Javanese and Madurese people. Madurese students understand that the word *sampean* has indicated polite marker even though not the most polite form. There was a misunderstanding when Madurese students address his/her lecturer (Javanese) using the word *sampean* (you) as the word *sampean* in Madurese are considered polite. This of course for the lecturer (Javanese) has not been considered polite yet. The lecturer from Javanese background may expect the word *panjenengan* (the most polite form of you in Javanese). The Madurese student should know this difference in order to avoid *misunderstanding* in the social interaction. The use of sampean (you) in Madurese and Javanese is thus governed by different tribal rules, the example shows that politeness is not always universal (Brown & Levinson, 1999). The different conception of sampean (you) in different tribes (Javanese and Madurese) also proves that "another language has another soul" (Wilson, 2013, p. 298), two languages have different standards of showing politeness.

Another key concept I discussed was speech act. The speech act concept was derived from Searle (1969 cited in Paltridge, 2006) and how to do things with words Austin (1962). Austin and Searle explain that language is used to do 'things' other than just true and false statements. By uttering the statement, we accordingly do not only perform the physical acts but also perform acts by using the language. Performing acts in this case refers to give orders, to make requests, to give warning or advice. Therefore to do "things" goes beyond the literal meaning. There are three well-known concepts here such as: *locutionary*, *perlocutionary* and *illocutionary acts*. A locutionary act means utterance itself, illocutionary act is the function of an utterance and perlocutionary act is the effect of an utterance (Austin, 1962). In addition to this, there are felicity conditions, the required conditions for *speech acts* to work. Therefore, Austin (1962) explained that the felicity conditions must be carried out correctly and completely for speech act to function.

The famous example of speech act is the declaration of marriage by the religious scholars. Thus when religious scholars were assigned by the local government to marry X and Y, then both of them are formally married. The declaration which usually says "it is my pleasure to pronounce them husband and wife" (source: https://www.officianteric.com/pronouncement-of-marriage/) in the western context, is from the Christian tradition while in Indonesian Moslem context usually the rituals is done by reciting "syahadah – asyhadu-an-la-ilaha-illallah-wa-wa-asyhadu-anna-muhammadar-rasulullah" (I bear witness that there is no God to worship except Allah and I bear witness that Muhammad is the prophet of Allah). Then the Islamic preacher will utter "sayanikahkan X dengan Y binti Z dengan mas kawin C" (I will marry X to Y the daughter of Z with the dowry C). Then the bridegroom will say "saya terima nikahnya Y binti Z dengan mas kawin C dibayar tunai" [I accept the marriage of Y the daughter of Z with the dowry of C by cash]. Then the Islamic preacher …asks the witness "*sah* (legitimate)?" Then the witness says "sah" (legitimate). Under these felicity conditions, the X and Y are legally married. By discussing this, students could not only understand the speech act concept by Austin (1962) but also the cross cultural differences in the concept of marriage, learning through boundary crossing (Tsui& Law, 2007) where I as the cultural mediator (Eick & Valli, 2010). In explaining this, I made an anecdotal example where I mentioned the two names of students in the classroom say A and B. I deliberately chose the two male students whose personalities were unique among their friends. Even though performing the speech act completely and accurately, in the case where A (as an illegitimate person) declares B marries to X, it will have no effect as one felicity condition is ignored, the fact that A is not an authority. I provided an anecdotal example to students with the hope that students could learn the concept speech act concept in a fresh way/humorous way (Bell, 2009). Teaching through this way, the speech act material was socio-culturally grounded (Canagarajah, 1999; Lin, Wang, Akamatsu, Riazi, 2005 and Kumaravadivelu, 2006).

Conversation is one of the main topics of discourse research. When doing an analysis of conversation, Discourse Analyst may focus on implicature, the implied message. e.g. "There is nothing on at the movies" (Paltridge, 2006, p.70). This sentence means according to Paltridge that there is no something special at the movies worth watching but it does not mean that there are no movies. Paltridge (2006) mentioned that there are three kinds of implicatures. The first is conventional implicature such *as anyway, but, on the other hand, yet* and the second is

conventional conversational implicature such as in the following example: (A): you're out of coffee (B): don't worry there's shop on the corner. The third is scalar implicature: expressions of scale of values such as e.g. all, most, something and nothing. Even though this is a new term for the students; in daily life, they may have similar concepts particularly in the local languages conversation contexts. e.g. if A is indicating to borrow some money to B in indirect way for example by telling that A has just lost a wallet, and informing that A's parents will send him money in a couple of weeks. B might have caught the "real" message but B may reject the proposal by telling B's hard situation. In this regard both A and B imply their real intentions but they have understood each other's messages due to, perhaps, the same cultural background. Both A and B are able to "read" each other's intentions pragmatically.

Another interesting topic in Discourse is gift giving rituals. Paltridge (2006) explains that *gift giving rituals* is a politeness strategy or involvement strategy in English while Japanese indirectness is a sign of intimacy. In the Indonesian context, there is no concept of gift giving rituals but I explained a similar involvement strategy such as those which are done by the smokers. A smoker may offer a cigarette to the person he has just known then he starts discussing mundane topics. In this context offering a cigarette is a form of involvement strategy. Similar to the concept indirectness as a sign of intimacy in Japanese context, the similar phenomenon applies to girls having relationship with boys in Indonesian contexts. Usually girls may just encode signals for their boy-friends to guess. Being able to guess the indirect messages from the girls mean that the boys are sensitive enough in decoding their girl friends' messages as the sign of a close relationship. This is one way of involving students' desire in language learning which according to Motha and Lin (2013) is very important as it will motivate them. Providing the equal comparison from the Western concept of gift-giving ritual and Japanese indirectness to local contexts did help students better understand about gift giving rituals. Through cross cultural comparisons in discourse and pragmatics, students could broaden their understanding about the system of values across nationals and global borders, the value which is a context specific and culturally bound. Through this understanding, I told the students to be aware that the social phenomena are the rich sources of discourse research. Thus learning and researching discourse means learning and researching real life situations.

CONCLUSIONS

In the above reflections, I have presented different ways of contextualizing the Western materials to local contexts. In that regard, I position the Western particular concepts of discourses to the relevant discourses in our sociocultural contexts. In Kubota's (2011) term I performed "border crossing communication" (p.117). My historical learning trajectory of using the same book Paltridge (2006) has helped me to be the broker of students' meaning making process in the classroom. The students will not only learn the Western discourses represented in the book but their own cultural discourses. The core principle of teaching English as TEGCOM is that the teacher should be able to translate English materials into local discourses accessible for students. It is important that the local examples teacher bring should touch students' emotional engagement as I did above such as humor, love, marriage, politeness and other potentially engaging topics. My auto-ethnographical reflections have contributed to the current discussion

of the global and local communication in teaching English especially in Indonesian context.

Pedagogical Recommendations

Based on the above empirical teaching experience, I would recommend the following points for EFL teachers especially in teaching content courses:

• Contextualising materials from Western context to students' own culture.

• Associate the topics in the western materials to students' interests

While I am fully aware that each teacher may have his/her own unique and innovative experience, the mentioned points above are worth considering especially those whose pedagogy are expected to be motivating and empowering.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Alwasilah, A. C. (2006). From local to global: Reinventing literature through writing English classes. *TEFLIN Journal*, 17(1), 11-27.

Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words.In A. Jaworksi& N. Coupland (Eds).*The discourse reader* (pp.63-75). London/New York: Routledge.

Bao, D. (2003). Localising ELT materials in Vietnam: A case study. In W. A. Renandya (ed). *Methodology and materials design in language teaching: Current perceptions and practices and their implications*.(pp.170-191). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Bell, N. D. (2009). Learning about and through humor in the second language classroom.*Language Teaching Research*, 13(3), 241-258.

Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *World of written discourse: A genre based view*. London: Continuum.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1999). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. In A. Jaworksi& N. Coupland (Eds).*The Discourse reader* (pp.321-345). London/New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender troubles: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York/London: Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2012). Teacher development in a global profession: An autoetnography. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(2), 258- 279.

Cameron, D. &Kulick, D. (2003).*Language and sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Caulley, D. N. (2008).Making qualitative research reports less boring: The techniques of writing creative nonfiction.*Qualitative Inquiry*, 14(3), 424-449.

Clark, C. &Gruba, P. (2010) *The use of social networking sites for foreign language learning: An autoetnographic study of Livemocha*. Proceeding ascilite Sydney.Accessed from http://www.ascilite.org/conferences/sydhttp://www.ascilite.org/conferences/sydney10/procs/Cclark-full.pdfney10/procs/Cclark-full.pdf on 9 Septermber 2016.

Connor, U. (2002).New direction in contrastive rhetoric.*TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 493-530.

Dervin, F. (2011). A plea for change in research on intercultural discourses: A 'liquid' approach to the study of acculturation of Chinese students. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 6(1), 37-52.

Dijk, T. V. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis.*Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11(2), 115-140.

Dyson, M. (2007). My story in a profession stories: Auto ethnography—an empowering methodology for educators. *AustralianJournal of Teacher Education*, 32(1), 36-48.

Eckert, P. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and gender*. Cambridge University Press

Ellis, C., &Bochner, A. P. (2000).Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 733-768). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ellis, C., Adam, T. E. &Bochner, A. P. (2011).Autoethnography: An Overview, *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1), 10.

Eick, C. &Valli, L. (2010). Teachers as cultural mediators: A comparison of accountability era to assimilation era. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 7(1), 54-77.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1985).*Language, context and text: Aspects of language in a social semiotic perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Hassan, M. K. (2010). A return to the Qur'anic paradigm of development and integrated knowledge: The Ulu al-Albab model, *INTELLECTUAL DISCOURSE*, 18, 2, 183-210.

Holland, D. (2015). *"Don't wake me, my desk is far too comfortable": An autoethnography of a novice ESL teacher's first year of teaching experience in Japan*. Eastern Washington University.Unpublished thesis.

Hyland, K. (2002). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing, *Journal of Pragmatic*, 34, 1091-1112.

Hymes, D. (1964). The ethnography of communication.*American Anthropologist*, 66, 1-34.

Jain, R. (2014). Global Englishes, translinguistic identities, and translingual practices in a community college ESL classroom: A practitioner research report. *TESOL Journal*, 5(3), 490 – 522.

Kaplan, R. (1966). Cultural thought pattern in Inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, (1-2), 11-25

Kubota, R. (2011). Immigration, diversity and language education in Japan: Toward a glocal approach to teaching English. P. Sergeant (Ed). *English in Japan in the Era of Globalization* (pp:101-121). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From methods to Postmethod*. London/New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Labov, W. (2006).*The social stratification of New York city*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press.

Lakoff, R. T. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper & Row.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2009). Communication as culturally contexted practice: A view from intercultural communication, *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 29(1), 115-133.

Lin, A. (2013). Toward paradigmatic change in TESOL Methodologies: Building plurilingual pedagogies from the ground up. TESOL *Quarterly*, 47(3), 521-545.

Lin, A, Wang, W, Akamatsu, N &Riazi, A. M. (2002). Appropriating English, expanding identities, and re-visioning the field: From TESOL to Teaching English for Glocalized Communication (TEGCOM). *Journal of Language Identity and Education*, 1 (4) 295-316.

Lin, A., Wang, W., Akamatsu, N. Riazi, M. (2005).Transnational TESOL professionals and teaching English for glocalized communication (TEGCOM).In Canagarajah, AS. (Ed). *Reclaiming the locals in language policy and practice*. (pp.197-222). New Jersey: Routledge.

McKay, S. L. & Brown, J. D. (2016).*Teaching and assessing EIL in local contexts around the world*. New York/London: Routledge

Motha, S. & Lin, A. (2013). "Non-coercive Rearrangements": Theorizing desire in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(2), 331-359.

Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.

Park, L. E. (2014). Shifting from reflexive practices to reflexivity: An autoetnography of an L2 teacher educator.*English Teaching*, 69(1), 173-198.

Pennycook, A. (2000). English, politics and ideology: From colonial celebration to post-colonial performativity. In T. Ricento (Ed*) Ideologies, politics and language policies: Focus on English* (pp.107-119). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Pennycook, A. (2008). English as a language always in translation.*European Journal of English Studies*, 12(1), 33-47.

Pennycook, A. (2009). Performativity and language studies.*Critical inquiry in Language Studies*, 1(1), 1-19.

Pierce, B. N. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning.*TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9-31.

Prastiwi, Y. (2015). *Folktales as a medium of teaching English: Two primary schools in Solo,Indonesia.*Deakin University.Unpublished dissertation.

Qoyyimah, U. (2016). Inculcating character education through EFL teaching in Indonesian state schools.*Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 11(2), 109-126.

Rassokha, M. (2010). Language identity: Issues of theory and practice. *Asian Englishes*, 13(1), 20-33.

Smith-Hefner, N. J. (2008). Youth language, gaul sociability and the new Indonesian middle class, *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 17(2), 184-203.

Sukarno (2012).Integrating local cultures into teaching English as a foreign language for character building.*JurnalPendidikanKarakter*, II(2), 202-212.

Tsui, A. B. M. & Law, D. Y. K. (2007).Learning as boundary crossing in school-university partnership, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 1289-1301.

Wahyudi, R. (2012). Language and Identity: A case study of matchmaking discourse (Javanese and Islamic Perspectives). *Language Discourse and Society*, 1(2)107-117.

Wahyudi, R. (2016). Intercultural competences: Multi-dynamic, inter-subjective, interdisciplinary and critical approaches. In F. Dervin& Z. Gross. (Eds) *Intercultural competence: Alternative approaches in today's education*. (pp: 143-165). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wilson, R. (2013). Another language is another soul. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 13(3), 298-309.

Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language* (4th ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://www.officianteric.com/pronouncement-of-marriage/a

About the Author

RibutWahyudi is a lecturer at State Islamic University Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia and is now PhD candidate at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. He has published his articles in *Language Discourse and Society, 2012, Journal of Global Literacies, Technologies and Emerging Pedagogies 2014, English for Specific Purposes World 2014, Journal of Research, Policy& Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education 2015, Journal of the IATEFL ESP SIG 2016, TEFLIN Journal 2016* and a book chapter with Palgrave (2016, in press). He also has published articles as co-author with his undergraduate students in the following journals: *Issues in Language Studies 2014 (with Qadafi), Journal of Language and Communication 2015 (with Mukti), International Journal of Indonesian Studies (with Djayanti, 2015), Language Discourse and Society 2015 (with Chusna) etc*. All his works can be accessed here: https://scholar.google.co.nz/citations?user=UP1v26EAAAAJ&hl=en&oi=ao