ISSN 2964-4291
https://proceeding.unnes.ac.id/index.php/iset

Views of Global English by English and non-English Students in Indonesia

Ahmad Tauchid*, Mursid Saleh, Rudi Hartono, Januarius Mujiyanto

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author: ahmadtauchidmpd@gmail.com

Abstrak. This study focuses on English and non-English students' perspectives on their experiences with global English, along with their perceptions of the current status of English (CSE), varieties of English (VE), strategies for multilingual/multicultural communication (SMC), and English speakers' identities (ESI). There were a total of 75 participants in this survey. We used IBM SPSS Statistics 22 to perform an EFA on the collected data. Varimax rotations and principal components analysis (PCA) were used to extract data. We examined three factors: eigenvalues more than 1, factor loadings less than 0.5, and communality less than 0.5. Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability might be used to determine the sample's reliability with a value of 0.7. (CR). Cronbach's alpha values for each structure varied between 0.71 and 1.00, whereas CR values ranged between 0.79 and 0.99. Using the average variance extracted (AVE), we determined that the convergent validity varied from 0.57 to 0.97 with a 0.50 threshold. Each construct used 3 CSE items, 4 VE items, 4 SMC items, and 3 ESI items. The pooled mean and standard deviation were used to calculate descriptive statistics for the four constructs. We conducted a t-test on separate samples to see if English and non-English students' perspectives on global English varied substantially. The results suggested that neither group saw differences in their perception of the current status of English, varieties of English, strategies for multilingual/multicultural communication, and English speakers' identity. The implications of using worldwide English teaching materials and approaches are underlined.

Keywords: Global English, Students' Views, Indonesia

How to Cite: Tauchid, A., Saleh, M., Hartono, R., & Mujiyanto, J. (2022). Views of Global English by English and non-English Students in Indonesia. *ISET: International Conference on Science, Education and Technology* (2022), 576-589.

INTRODUCTION

Students studying English as a global Language have to possess many abilities due to English dominance as the world's primary language of communication. They must demonstrate English competency to work in various roles. To promote cross-cultural understanding among students, they must acquire competence in their field and general cultural knowledge (Richards, 2010). Literature on TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) professional identity has already been developed using the notions of language teaching as a starting point. According to Pennington (2014), a rising number of individuals are interested in learning whether or not the current professional profiles of English students meet specific general requirements and professional competencies. To meet those competencies, some tests are needed to differentiate those who are good at English and vice versa. However, not all students have favourable views of English tests. For example, Choi (2008) and Kim (2010) found that many individuals are against EFL exams because of their adverse effects on education. Moreover, Tsai and Tsou (2009) revealed that EFL tests, such as TOEFL and IELTS, are being forced on high school students, and college entrance exams are getting too much attention.

In recent years, a dramatic shift in the public perception of the English language has impacted individuals worldwide. Since its establishment as a world language in the twentieth century, English has evolved from being an ethnically homogeneous and standard language spoken by a small number of select countries to becoming a global language spoken by an increasingly diverse range of speakers throughout the world as a result of its global development (Galloway & Rose, 2017). It is necessary to develop a profession-wide response to the unexpected growing demands for, use of, and possession of English as a global language in today's world. This includes developing a response in English language learning, teaching, and teacher education in response to English as a global language. This reaction should involve assessment, policy, and evaluation of English as a global language. To ensure that all students have access to a high-quality education, it is necessary to develop an educational agenda that includes pedagogical strategies for teaching English under global English principles. This will ensure that all students have a high-quality education that meets their individual needs

(Matsuda, 2003).

Because of globalization, people all around the globe have become more reliant on the English language during the past several decades. In turn, the demographics of individuals who speak English across the world and the function of English as a global language have changed due to this. According to Crystal (2003), English is used as L1 (first language), L2 (second language), and L3 (foreign language) all around the world. However, around 75% of them are not native English speakers. Following Graddol (2003), the number of L1 speakers decreases while L2 and L3 speakers increases. Sharifian's (2013) data shows that English speakers have increased by roughly two billion from the first estimate a decade earlier, and it is dominated by L2 and L3 speakers other than L1 speakers. As a result, many non-native speakers currently communicate in multilingual and multicultural settings. This indicates that non-native English speakers tremendously influence today's English, even though they do not speak English very well.

The perspective of global English in non-native English-speaking environments has changed considerably in recent years (Ahn, 2015; Hundt et al., 2015; Bernaisch & Koch, 2016). Researchers are also looking at EFL students' attitudes across the cultural settings concerning global English (Jeon & Lim, 2013; Ke & Cahyani, 2014). Global English users who resided in the same geographic area or had the same first language (L1) linguistic background were the focus of these investigations (e.g. Ren et al., 2016). Therefore, an empirical study could not fully elucidate the cross-cultural views of global English users in its current form. A necessary explanation is that earlier research has focused chiefly on some regions of global English, such as phonetics and lexico-grammar, while disregarding any other aspects of linguistics (Ren et al., 2016).

More information regarding how students throughout the globe perceive global English from different viewpoints on culture is necessary to get a fuller view of the problem from an overall macro perspective, which is currently lacking. The current study addresses students' views of global English in various circumstances by concentrating on the perspectives of English and non-English students in Indonesia about their global English experiences. Therefore, this study proposes four research questions (RQs) in the following order:

How do Indonesian English and non-English students' views of the Current Status of English (CSE) vary?

How do Indonesian English and non-English students' views of Varieties of English (VE) vary?

How do Indonesian English and non-English students' views of Strategies for Multilingual/Multicultural Communication (SMC) vary?

How do Indonesian English and non-English students' views of English Speakers' Identity (ESI) vary?

English as a Global Language

Crystal (1997) observed that native and non-native English speakers participated in more than 80% of English talks, with the remaining 20% occurring between native English speakers. Crystal's initial finding has become more prevalent in today's globalized and networked world, which may be witnessed in various digital and non-digital contexts, including the internet. According to Aslam (2018), most Facebook users are from nations other than the United States of America. As a result, Inner Circle users from the US, UK, and Canada used to dominate the social networking site. Users from many countries outside the inner circle or expanding circle, including India, Indonesia and Brazil, have recently surpassed users from the United States to rank as the world's most populous countries on the social networking site (Malkin, 2007; Yung-Hui, 2012). Even though no data is provided to illustrate how popular English is on Facebook, according to the Internet Globe Stats 2018, English has surpassed all other languages to become the most often spoken worldwide. Consequently, among Facebook users, English seems to be the most often spoken language.

Due to this shift, approximately 40 million small enterprises today run their own Facebook platforms to accomplish jobs all around the globe (Ha, 2015). The number of international events and activities in person is increasing, creating more possibilities for individuals from all over the globe to connect and engage with each other. According to the Union of International Associations 2016, South Korea has surpassed the United States as the world's largest destination for international meetings, having hosted 206 such events in 2006. Due to these altering digital environments, people from non-native English-speaking countries have been exposed to and engaged with varied cultural and

linguistic identities, which has aided the organization's development (Kirkpatrick, 2010). As a result of this trend, the globalization of English and the need to improve cross-cultural communication skills in a wide variety of jobs are becoming more critical.

With a critical viewpoint, researchers in applied linguistics and teaching English as a second language (TESOL) have repeatedly underlined that the English language is transforming the sociolinguistic and sociocultural context (Galloway & Rose, 2015; Kachru, 1985; McKay, 2002; Pennycook, 2001; Seidlhofer, 2013). Numerous scholars have called into question traditional ELT practices, such as native speakers' models, the fallacy of native speakers, and ELT materials in the classroom. It is said that these methodologies do not even correctly depict the current situation of the English language and the people who speak it. The global English methodology should be used in ELT classrooms and teacher training programs (Matsuda, 2002, 2012, 2017). A multilingual, global situation in which each individual speaks the kind of English they are most comfortable with and employs a variety of communication tactics is considered a global language (Matsuda, 2017). It is possible to explore global English in a variety of methods; however, there is numerous terminology that has multiple meanings, such as "English as an international lingua franca" and "world Englishes" (Matsuda, 2017; Selvi, 2017). Pedagogically, Matsuda's conception of global English is well-suited for this study, primarily focusing on English-language students.

Global English Users' Views in Cross-Cultural Contexts

Several studies on the views of non-native English speakers of global English have been conducted during the past two decades, and the results have been published. The mainstream English spoken in the US and UK was preferred above the Sri Lankan, and Indian English spoken in the study, said Bernaisch (2012). Indians preferred British English over other versions of English in India (i.e. Sri Lankan English, Indian English, and American English). Students in Fijian universities spoke American and British English (Hundt et al., 2015). Tan and Tan (2008) and Kang (2015) have shown student preference for standard variations among ESL and EFL learners. Coskun (2011) discovered that many English instructors believed that NES accents were the norm and that the most excellent pedagogical strategy in the classroom when it came to teaching was the use of NES accents. Although respondents had varying opinions on the prestige of regional dialects of Standard English, such as Sri Lankan, Indian, Fijian, and Singaporean, this research revealed that Standard English was widely considered a prestigious language by the public. As a result, according to Yu (2010)'s study, Chinese university students are frequently familiar with multiple dialects of English and have a positive attitude toward their original language (i.e. Chinese English). Wang's (2015) attempts to establish Chinese English as a natural English language form in the classroom were impeded by the refusal of Chinese university students to adopt NES-like pronunciation in their tongue. After conducting many studies examining Taiwanese people's views toward various English, researchers identified a clear preference for American English regarding social standing and sense of belonging (Chien, 2014). When Ahn (2014, 2015) researched in Korea, she discovered that while Korean ELT teachers were more likely to accept Korean English in her 2014 study, they were less likely to accept other regional types like Chinese English, Singaporean English, Indian English, and Japanese English when she did research in the same country in 2015.

We have seen thus far that the great majority of studies on how people perceive global English have been done on a tiny group of global English users, which seems to be the case. Some recent research initiatives have investigated EFL students' cultural perspectives on global English to better comprehend this group's attitudes in general. For example, Ke and Suzuki (2011) found that participation in the internet-based platform for cultural exchange that included students from Japan assisted them in being well prepared to connect with other NNSs. Most EFL students in Taiwan who took part in the research believed that NNS was the most suitable design nine weeks after the intervention. L3 students from Taiwan's EFL universities participated in an eight-month cross-cultural online exchange program with students from Indonesia, where they learned to identify the importance of L3 in cross-cultural situations (Ke & Cahyani, 2014). Korean EFL students' cross-cultural and communication skills in elementary school increased through video conferencing when they were put together with people from different

cultures (Jeon & Lim, 2013). At the same time, it was shown that video conferencing could be used to establish an authentic global English environment at a private Japanese university (Lee et al., 2017). As a result of their encounters with Japanese students, many global English users from the three countries worldwide positively viewed the program.

Even though they tried to look at global English users' points of view throughout other contexts within a culture, users of global English are the primary focus of the study, which is conducted in a single location. As a result, empirical research has not completely figured out the cross-cultural views of students who use global English. Ren et al. (2016) researched how Taiwanese and Chinese students thought about English used as a Lingua Franca. They saw massive discrepancies in how the two groups thought about ELF. Even though they lived in different areas, the students had the same Chinese language. In addition, Ren et al. (2016) only looked at the aspects of linguistics in global English, such as lexico-grammar or phonology, instead of other aspects of global English. Thereby, learning how students think about global English in different cross-cultural settings is crucial for us to know more about this subject matter worldwide. Because global English is necessary and there is not much research on how students think about it in different settings, this study will provide insight into how English and non-English students in Indonesia view global English by following the concept of global English proposed by Lei et al. (2017). According to Lei et al. (2017), there are four aspects of global English, namely, Current Status of English (CSE), Varieties of English (VE), Strategies for Multilingual/Multicultural Communication (SMC), and English Speakers' Identity (ESI). See appendix 1 for detailed global English indicators.

Global English Users' View in Indonesia

Some research about global English has been carried out in Indonesia. For example, Lee et al. (2019) found that EFL pre-service teachers have a positive attitude toward global English. It would seem that those preparing to teach English as a foreign language in Indonesia are more committed to including lessons on diversity and tolerance in their curricula. They have a more profound sense of ownership over their speech patterns, which include their regional accents. According to Ubaidillah (2018), English as a Foreign Language (EFL) pre-service teachers in East Java, Indonesia, share the belief that instructors who are native English speakers are superior. There is no doubt that they are entirely oblivious to the concept of English as either a global language or a global language. Using authentic materials from countries in the inner circle is their top choice when teaching and studying English as a foreign language (EFL). However, they are open to incorporating their mother tongue into EFL classes. Because of this, people have a low level of confidence in the local EFL books that they consult in order to improve their English language skills.

On the other hand, there are two schools of thought regarding incorporating cultures associated with the English language into EFL instruction. Some people believe that the materials used in the teaching should reflect their own local Indonesian culture. Dewi (2014) found that speaking English benefits a person's way of thinking, despite the widespread belief that the Western way of thinking is intrinsically linked to the English language. This belief is prevalent because of the prevalence of the Western style of thinking. Even among Muslim students, there has been a shift from associating English with their religion; instead, they see English as influencing their religious life. This shift has led to a significant decline in the significance of English as a foreign language (EFL) settings in Indonesia, where English has a positive effect on ethnic identities and where English has a positive effect on ethnic identities. According to Raja et al. (2022), EFL pre-service teachers in Indonesia feel that global English may be used for some purposes. When interacting with people from various cultural backgrounds, they can modify their behaviour and how they carry on conversations to adapt to the various pronunciation patterns and accents of English that they are exposed to. This demonstrates that they have a high proficiency in several languages and cultures. They have a strong sense of ownership over their unique variety of the English language, which they speak.

Supartini (2013) investigated the identities of two Western English teachers about their experiences as global English teachers in Indonesia. She discovered that global English instructors built their identities in three distinct ways. These techniques included self-positioning, being positioned, and negotiating between two cultures. In all cultures, self-

positioning shapes values and attitudes. They were non-natives who studied with great native speakers in western culture. In Indonesia, they employed languages. The teachers' identities were also shaped by their exposure to Western and Indonesian cultures. When they were exposed to western culture, they recognized they were foreigners. Both teachers were regarded as outsiders. In Indonesia, they were seen as a distinct "species" from the wider world, teachers who had studied and trained in the West and worked alongside "local" colleagues. When they returned to Indonesia with various new knowledge, they saw that their coworkers' views changed positively and negatively. Their exposure to two diverse cultures confused the teachers. Their identities were complex since they were a hybrid of Indonesian and Western culture and did not belong to either. Thus, various negotiations were conducted and communicated by integrating and readjusting Western and Indonesian experiences.

Even though global English perspectives are essential in EFL teaching, and there are more and more research papers on the subject, EFL students have not gotten as much attention, particularly in the Indonesian context. So, this study aimed to find out how EFL students in higher education institutions in Indonesia felt about the four aspects of global English. This was done to find more conclusive evidence about the topic studied in the Indonesian EFL contexts. These four parts are the current status of English, varieties of English, strategies for multilingual/ multicultural communication, and English speakers' identity among EFL students in higher education institutions in Indonesia.

METHODS

This study used the quantitative research method as Bryman (2012) suggested that Quantitative research is distinguished by its emphasis on using numerical measures in both the data gathering and interpretation stages. It is derived from a logical method in which the focus is put on testing theories, and it is moulded by empiricist and positivist philosophical systems of thought. To gather data on global English views, we implemented survey research as Shaughnessy et al. (2011) said that to collect information on people's perspectives, feelings, and opinions, survey research is widely used. The data were collected from an online questionnaire. Finally, we used IBM SPSS Statistics version 22 to analyze the data.

Participants and Contexts

Based on a convenient sampling technique, 220 students of English as a foreign language from Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Sunan Giri, Indonesia, took part in the research and successfully finished the questionnaire phase. They comprised 106 English students (65 females and 41 males) and 114 non-English students (74 females and 40 males). The students had varying amounts of previous learning (ranging from 5 to 8 years, with a mean of 6 years). The participants were divided into their respective groups (English and non-English students). They remained anonymous, and the confidentiality of the information they provided was preserved for the whole data collection procedure.

Instrument and Data Collection Procedure

A Google Docs-based online survey was used for this study. According to https://bit.ly/aaIY06, Google Docs users may collaborate on documents in real-time by altering and creating them in real-time. In order to keep track of all updates, each user maintains a revision history. Participants in the research were required to complete a questionnaire detailing their personal experiences. One goal in picking surveys was to get insight into students' points of view and interests and explain the significance of specific activities (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010). These were all goals that were met. As part of the survey, participants were questioned about their gender, central and the years they had studied English. As part of Lee and Hsieh's (2018) global English framework, students completed 14 statements on a Likert scale ranging from strongly disagreeing to strongly agreeing, based on Lee and Hsieh's (2018) work on the current state of English, English varieties, multilingual communication strategies, and the identity of English speakers.

IBM SPSS Statistics 22 was used to perform an EFA on the newly gathered data. We gleaned information from the raw data using principle components analysis (PCA) and variable maxima rotations. Eigenvalues more than 1.00, factor loadings less than 0.5, and communality less than 0.5 were all considered (Hair et al., 1998). We examined the data's validity and reliability to get more accurate findings. Cronbach's alpha (0.7) and composite reliability (CR) (0.7) may be used to evaluate the sample's reliability (Hair et al., 1998). For all constructions, Cronbach's alpha values varied

from 0.71 to 1.00, while CR values were between 0.79 and 0.99. We found that the convergent validity varied from 0.57 to 0.97, using a threshold of 0.50, using the average variance extracted (AVE) (Fornell & Larcker, 1981) (Table 1).

Table 1. Result of EFA, Validity, and Reliability

Item	Factor structure coefficient				Communality
	1	2	3	4	
CSE1	.003	.087	.714	-.113	.531
CSE2	.236	.065	.772	.050	.658
CSE3	-.254	-.033	.864	.030	.812
VE1	.053	.867	.189	.156	.815
VE2	.079	.845	.248	.156	.806
VE3	.050	.938	-.104	.063	.896
VE4	.174	.846	-.187	.316	.881
SMC1	.987	.092	.005	.102	.992
SMC2	.987	.092	.005	.102	.992
SMC3	.987	.092	.005	.102	.992
SMC4	.987	.092	.005	.102	.992
ESI1	-.070	.277	-.133	.865	.847
ESI2	.286	.528	.284	.629	.837
ESI3	.443	.135	-.024	.761	.794
Eigenvalues	4.340	3.481	2.094	1.933	
Explained variable (%)	30.998	24.862	14.956	13.806	
Cumulative variable (%)	30.998	55.860	70.816	84.621	
Cronbach's α (retained item)	1.000	0.916	0.716	0.805	
CR	0.993	0.929	0.828	0.799	
AVE	0.974	0.765	0.617	0.574	
Factor Name	SMC	VE	CSE	ESI	

Data Analysis

In each construct, there were 3 CSE items, 4 VE items, 4 SMC items, and 3 ESI items. After the study, descriptive statistics were produced for each of the four constructs by calculating their pooled mean and standard deviation (SD) (see Table 2). In the end, we used a t-test on independent samples to determine whether or not there were statistically significant differences between the groups on how English and non-English students in Indonesia perceived global English.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

As seen in Table 2, the global English survey respondents gave favourable replies to all concepts. CSE received the most responses, followed by ESI, VE, and SMC in that order. According to participant opinions, English is extensively utilized in business and culture, as well as in higher education and employment. When asked to assess how English speakers see themselves as a whole, participants' comments emphasized belonging to a particular group and mutual understanding of the English language rather than the goal of grammatically flawless or native-like usage. Participants in both groups agreed that teachers in the VE segment on diversity in attitudes toward English should use listening materials that included conversations between non-native English speakers. According to the results, individuals who used SMC approaches for multilingual/multicultural communication were better able to change their conversational styles and behaviours and transmit their cultural features and practices to other participants. This piqued their curiosity about learning about other cultures.

The two groups' average scores on all global English variables were contrasted using an independent-sample t-test to evaluate whether there were substantial variations between them. As can be seen in Table 3, there was not a significant disparity in CSE t (-1.46), VE t (-0.812), ESI t (-0.42), or SMC t (0.64), and the p-value for each of these constructs was more than 0.05.

Table 2. Descriptive data on the four constructs of global English

Constructs	No	Mean	SD
CSE	75	4.1733	0.6208
VE	75	3.5900	0.9368
SMC	75	3.4900	0.9780
ESI	75	3.7467	0.8833

RQ#1: CSE

We assessed the students' responses to the questionnaire items included in the CSE to provide an answer to RQ #1, which queried the degree to which English and non-English students in Indonesia differed in their CSE. Table 4 demonstrated, via the application of the CSE concept, that neither group had any indications of substantial differences.

After doing more in-depth research on the three survey questions, it was discovered that the CSE1 values were [M(4.68), SD(0.47)], and [M(4.71), SD(0.46)], [t(-0.32), p > 0.05] for English students and non-English students, respectively. Further analysis of the CSE2 data revealed that English students had mean scores of [M(3.27), SD(1.23)], whereas non-English students had mean scores of [M(3.71), SD(1.11)], with a t-value of [-1.61, p > 0.05]. Last but not least, the results of the CSE3 test were as follows: [M (4.32), SD (0.70)], [M (4.34), SD (0.58)], [t (0.11), p > 0.05] for English students and non-English students accordingly.

Table 3. Average responses from English and non-English students on the four global English constructs

Construct	Group	Mean	SD	t	Significance	Cohen's d
CSE	English students	4.0901	0.6603	-1.146	0.256	0.2650
	Non-English students	4.2544	0.5770			
VE	English students	3.5000	1.0017	-0.818	0.416	0.1890
	Non-English students	3.6776	0.8736			
SMC	English students	3.5700	0.8990	0.648	0.519	0.1530
	Non-English students	3.4200	1.0560			
ESI	English students	3.7027	1.0267	-0.421	0.675	0.0975
	Non-English students	3.7895	0.7287			

* represents significance level 5%

Table 4. The results of the construct of 'CSE.'

Construct	Group	Mean	SD	t	Significance	Cohen's d
CSE1	English students	4.68	0.475	-0.323	0.748	0.0642
	Non-English students	4.71	0.460			
CSE2	English students	3.27	1.239	-1.617	0.110	0.3736
	Non-English students	3.71	1.113			
CSE3	English students	4.32	0.709	-0.118	0.906	0.0308
	Non-English students	4.34	0.582			

* represents significance level 0.05

RQ#2: VE

During the examination of the students' VE, which was incorporated into RQ#2, the four survey questions found no significant differences between English and non-English students. (See Table 5).

The VE1 values for English students were [M(3.54), SD(1.01)], whereas those for non-English students were [M(3.89), SD(0.76)], [t(-1.70), p > 0.05]. The VE2 values for English students were [M(3.32), SD(1.24)], while those for non-English students were [M(3.55), SD(1.05)], [t(-0.85), p > 0.05]. In the VE3 analysis, there were no significant differences between English students [M(3.70), SD(0.99)] and non-English students [M(3.84), SD(1.00), [t(-0.60), p >0.05]. Furthermore, the VE4 values of English students [M(3.43), SD(1.16)] and non-English students [M(3.42), SD(1.08)], [t(0.04), p > 0.05], were found to be equivalent.

RQ#3: SMC

After doing an exhaustive study to answer RQ#3, which centred on the participants' capacity for multilingual or multicultural

communication, the researchers found an intriguing similarity between the two groups. Table 6 shows no discernible differences between English and non-English students in SMC1, SMC2, SMC3, or SMC4.

Among English students, the SMC1 values were [M(3.57, SD(0.89)], whereas among non-English students the SMC1 values were [M(3.42), SD(1.05)], [t(0.64), p > 0.05]. Similar patterns emerged in SMC2, with English students scoring [M(3.57), SD(0.89)] and non-English students scoring [M(3.42), SD(1.05)], [t(0.64), p > 0.05]. For SMC3, the values of English students were [M(3.57, SD(0.89)], and the values of non-English students were [M(3.42), SD(1.05)], [t(0.64), p > 0.05]. Aside from that, the SMC4 values for English students were [M(3.57, SD(0.89)], and the values for non-English students were also [M(3.42), SD(1.05)], [t(0.64), p > 0.05], implying no significant difference between the two groups.

When comparing English and non-English students, the SMC1 values were [M (3.57, SD(0.89)] and [M (3.42, SD(1.05)] respectively, [t (0.64), p >0.05]. It was found that English students scored [M(3.57), SD(0.89)], and non-English students scored [M(3.42), SD(1.05)], with [t(0.64), p > 0.05] in SMC2. The scores for SMC3 were [M(3.57, SD(0.89)] for English students and [M(3.42, SD(1.05)], [t(0.64, p > 0.05]. Finally, the SMC4 values for English students were [M(3.57, SD(0.89)], and the values for non-English students were likewise [M(3.42, SD(1.05)], [t(0.64, p > 0.05], showing no significant difference between the two groups.

Table 5. The results of the construct of 'VE.'

Construct	Group	Mean	SD	t	Significance	Cohen's d
VE1	English students	3.54	1.016	-1.703	0.093	0.3894
	Non-English students	3.89	0.764			
VE2	English students	3.32	1.248	-0.855	0.395	0.1988
	Non-English students	3.55	1.058			
VE3	English students	3.70	0.996	-0.604	0.547	0.1402
	Non-English students	3.84	1.001			
VE4	English students	3.43	1.168	0.044	0.965	0.0089
	Non-English students	3.42	1.081			

* represents significance level 5%.

RQ#4: ESI

No statistically significant differences were found between the two groups in the three survey items evaluated in RQ #4, even though the participants in both groups were excited about identifying and comprehending English usage.

In the ESI1, English students had values of [M(3.84), SD(1.01)], whereas non-English students had values of [M(3.84), SD[0.88)], [t(-0.01), p > 0.05]. According to the ESI2, English students scored [M (3.59), SD (1.16)], whereas non-English students scored [M (3.66, SD (0.99)], [t(-0.25), p > 0.05]. At last, English students obtained [M(3.68), SD(1.22)] in the ESI3 values whereas non-English students received [M(3.87), SD(0.96)]; [t(-0.75), p > 0.05].

Table 6. The results of the construct of 'SMC'

Construct	Group	Mean	SD	T	Significance	Cohen's d
SMC1	English students	3.57	0.899	0.648	0.519	0.1530
	Non-English students	3.42	1.056			
SMC2	English students	3.57	0.899	0.648	0.519	0.1530
	Non-English students	3.42	1.056			
SMC3	English students	3.57	0.899	0.648	0.519	0.1530
	Non-English students	3.42	1.056			
SMC4	English students	3.57	0.899	0.648	0.519	0.1530
	Non-English students	3.42	1.056			

* represents significance level 5%

Table 7. The results of the construct of 'ESI'

Construct	Group	Mean	SD	T	Significance	Cohen's d
ESI1	English students	3.84	1.014	-0.019	0.985	0.0000
	Non-English students	3.84	0.886			
ESI2	English students	3.59	1.166	-0.253	0.801	0.0646
	Non-English students	3.66	0.994			
ESI3	English students	3.68	1.226	-0.758	0.451	0.1724
	Non-English students	3.87	0.963			

* represents significance level 5%

DISCUSSION

The findings of this research may be primarily classified into the following three groups: To begin, the majority of the students in Indonesia, both those who spoke English and those who did not, provided favourable replies to all four characteristics of global English. This was consistent across all four aspects of the language. Students of English as a Foreign Language generally had a positive perspective on the fundamentals of global English. According to the findings of preliminary research, exposing students to a more significant number and diversity of global English users and resources might be beneficial for improving the student's overall knowledge, understanding, and attitudes about global English in general (Jeon & Lim, 2013; Lee et al., 2017). Previous research indicated that students' knowledge of global English rose due to an educational intervention incorporating global English. However, the present study used an online survey to investigate students' attitudes about global English. The advantage of this is that English language students may have a higher chance of comprehending the current state of the phenomena at hand in the matter. The level of CSE possessed by young students of English as a foreign language has increased as a result of the proliferation of digital tools and resources, such as cellphones and social media, which make it possible for these students to be exposed to global issues and content that is cross-cultural (Lee, 2017). More research is required to determine how digital technology can benefit English as a Foreign Language students with their CSE. In the years to come, other discoveries will likely be made. Compared to VE, it was shown that the use of global English in EFL settings was much lower. This is most likely because there are not as many chances or resources for exposure to and applying global English in EFL contexts.

The second data set discovered that English and non-English students in Indonesia had a similar perspective on ESI [$t = -0.42$, $p > 0.05$]. According to these statistics, both groups seem to have an equal level of control over their regional dialects of English, which in this case refers to Indonesian English. In addition, the results of Ahn (2014) seem to be supported by the ESI2, which suggests that Korean EFL students are unlikely to possess Korean English. Data reveal that English students M(3.59) and non-English students M(3.66), indicating that they strongly support this item. A comparable scale that measures the same notion may also be applied in a subsequent inquiry to substantiate this thesis. The outcomes of CSE [$t(-1.14)$, $p > 0.05$], VE [$t(-0.81)$, $p > 0.05$], and SMC [$t(0.64)$, $p > 0.05$] demonstrated that English students fared similarly to non-English students in all three categories; however, these results were not statistically significant. It was discovered that there were no significant variations between the two groups regarding the use of English in business, culture, and education, attitudes about English-related diversity, and practices for multilingual and multicultural communication.

Surprisingly, neither the VE levels nor the SMC levels of the group altered. There is a possibility that high-stakes English examinations or instructional practices had a washback impact on English students' and non-English students' levels of ability on the VE and SMC assessments (Choi, 2008; Kim, 2010). Many high school students in Indonesia interested in continuing their education beyond high school choose to take the TOEFL as their college admissions exam. Because the majority of questions on the TOEFL listening section are spoken with a British English accent, many students, both native English speakers and those who do not speak the language as their first language spend their secondary school years working to improve their English listening skills by imitating the British English accent. English-speaking students whose first language is not English seem to gain academically from a curriculum and teaching method that emphasizes the

TOEFL (such as reading comprehension and grammar). According to Tsai and Tsou (2009), sociopolitical factors were present in Indonesian high school students. One example of this was the use of worldwide standardized English examinations as education requirements, such as the TOEFL.

Last but not least, the VE4 approach yielded no statistically significant difference between the two groups [(t(0.04), p >0.05)]. Non-native and native speakers of English favoured English listening materials and interactions with non-native speakers of English in this research. Ahn's (2014) claim that American and British accents are more highly valued than local accents is at odds with the results of this study (for example, Korean English). Accordingly, it is possible that this kind of high-stakes test severely impacted students' verbal abilities since they were forced to focus on Standard English. Consequently, non-native speakers of English may not have had as much formal and informal exposure to an American or British English standard variety accent as they would have had in their home country via traditional and non-traditional teaching methods (Kang, 2015).

Based on previous research, this study might substantially impact L2 professionals. Using technology with pedagogical benefits, such as real-time online collaboration via SMC, may help students study English more successfully worldwide. Students may utilize the internet to communicate with English speakers throughout the globe regardless of where they are located (Jeon & Lim, 2013; Ke & Cahyani, 2014). When linked to the internet at any time or location, SMC offers a natural, engaging environment where native and non-native speakers alike may participate in the discussion (Lee et al., 2017). As shown by Yu (2010), SMC is a collaborative learning strategy that benefits students from various countries and cultures (Jeon & Lim, 2013; Ke & Cahyani, 2014). There may be the formation of some kind of online community for EFL students to interact and learn from native English speakers as a result of this online cooperation (Kirkpatrick, 2010).

Giving students as many linguistic inputs as possible via online resources, such as interactions between non-native and native speakers, is essential. Exposure to dialects other than those spoken in the United States and Great Britain aids EFL students in improving their English proficiency (Matsuda, 2017). Teaching pupils to speak English in a global context may be done using technology and internet resources. Students will better understand the CSE and broader perspectives on English and cross-cultural communication.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Most English speakers are non-natives who have picked up the language to converse with people of all linguistic backgrounds (Larsen-Freeman, 2019; Seidlhofer & Widdowson, 2020). As part of this research, we evaluate how EFL students from two distinct educational backgrounds (the English department and the non-English department) see English as a global language in CSE, VE, SMC, and ESI. Students from English and non-English department backgrounds had similar perceptions of CSE. Regarding English and non-English students, English is regarded as a worldwide language used by both native and non-native speakers. In business, society, and education, it is a common language. It seems that English and non-English students have similar views about VE. This helps them see other varieties of English besides the one they are used to (American English and British English). Thus, Hong Kong English, Indian, Indonesian and Japanese English are all now acceptable. It is possible that these English speakers, despite their varied regional accents, may be employed in a classroom setting for instruction. Third, both groups' perspectives on SMC were similar. No matter their nationality or language, English and non-English students can communicate effectively in the English language. Non-English students in Indonesia, on the other hand, have similar views on the importance of ESI. As long as their English is comprehensible, they think they do not need to talk like native speakers since their accents are a part of who they are.

This study has implications for worldwide English teaching materials and methods. First, avoid relying on the native speaker paradigm to improve communication skills. Instead of a monolingual approach, contemporary educational approaches should be bilingual. ESL/EFL instructors should teach students strategic communication skills to use native and non-native linguistic and practical norms in global English interactions. English teaching materials must include a diversity of English to represent global English's broad dissemination. Researchers agree on properly equipping teachers and administrators in non-English-speaking countries and throughout the globe to

enhance their understanding of the variety of English and its variants and promote fairness for non-native and/or "standard" English speakers. Non-native English learners should be taught these ideas to help them rethink English ownership and validity. English teachers must reassess their assumptions about native speakerism and embrace a more global English-aware pedagogy to reappraise teaching strategies in expanding circle situations from a global English perspective. English instructors should also educate students to negotiate meanings and build negotiation skills for international interactions. Kachru and Smith (2008) say that the multiplicity of global Englishes hinders cross-cultural communication.

LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The limitations of the research may limit its generalizability. For follow-up research to be effective, data must be collected from a more significant, diverse sample of individuals with various experiences. We need results from different disciplines. Thus, this research may pave the way for future comparative studies on the effect of language and sociocultural conditions on the perspectives of international English users (Ren et al., 2016). Second, the teacher's in-class approaches may have influenced the participants' perceptions of global English, which is not investigated in this study. Teachers significantly impact their students' perspectives on global English; hence, future research may integrate their ideas and teaching methods. Third, consideration may be necessary when analyzing self-reported survey results. Students could fail to report their worldwide English experiences. Additionally, some replies may demonstrate varying levels of comprehension or interpretation of a topic. Future studies should include more data, such as interviews and observations, to have a thorough grasp of the issue.

REFERENCES

Ahn, H. 2014. Teachers' attitudes towards Korean English in South Korea. *World Englishes*, *33*(2), 195–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12081

Ahn, H. 2015. Awareness of and attitudes to Asian Englishes: A study of English teachers in South Korea. *Asian Englishes*, *17*(2), 132–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2015.1036602

Aslam, S. (2018). *Facebook by the numbers: stats, demographics and fun facts*. https://www.omnicoreagency.com/facebook-statistics/

Bergisch, T. 2012. Attitudes towards Englishes in Sri Lanka. *World Englishes*, *31*(3), 279–291. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2012.01753.x

Bernaisch, T. (2012). *Attitudes towards Englishes in Sri Lanka*, *31*(3), 279–291. World Englishes. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2012.01753.x

Bernaisch, T., & Koch, C. 2016. Attitudes towards Englishes in India. *World Englishes*, *35*(1), 118–132. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12174

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods (4th ed.)*. Oxford University Press. https://bit.ly/3bMn5op

Chien, S. C. 2014. Varieties of English: Taiwanese attitudes and perceptions. *Newcastle and Northumbria Working Papers in Linguistics*, *20*, 1–16. https://bit.ly/3ueazo3

Choi, I. C. 2008. The impact of EFL testing on EFL education in Korea. *Language Testing*, *25*(1), 39–62. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0265532207083744

Coskun, A. 2011. Future English teachers' attitudes towards EIL pronunciation. *Journal of English as an International Language*, *6*(2), 46–68. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED527146

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press. https://bit.ly/3bOvJCW

Dewi, A. 2014. Perception of English in relation to communication and identity. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *24*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1075/japc.24.1.01dew

Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research: construction, administration, and processing (2nd ed.)* Rutledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203864739

Find what's changed in a file. Support.google.com. https://bit.ly/3aaIY06

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. 1981. Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*(3), 382–388. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022243781018

00313

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). *Introducing global Englishes.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315734347

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. 2017. Incorporating global Englishes into the ELT classroom. *ELT Journal, 72*(1), 3-14. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx010

Graddol, D. (2003). *The decline of the native speakers*. In Anderman, G. & Rogers, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Translation today: Trends and perspectives (pp. 152–167).* Multilingual Matters.

Ha, Antony. (2015, April 29). *Facebook says there are now 40M active small business pages*. Oath Tech Network. https://techcrunch.com/2015/04/29/facebook-40-million/

Hair, J. F., Tatham, R. L., Anderson, R. E., & Black, W. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis (5th ed*.). Prentice-Hall International.

Hundt, M., Zipp, L., & Huber, A. 2015. Attitudes in Fiji towards varieties of English. *World Englishes, 34*(4), 688–707. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12160

Internet World Stats. (2019). *Internet world users by language*: *Top 10 languages*. https://www.internetworldstats.com/stats7.htm

Jeon, H. Y., & Lim, H. W. 2013. The effects of Korean-Taiwanese students' telecollaboration on Korean students' intercultural competence and English speaking ability. *English Language Teaching, 25*(3), 365–386. https://doi.org/10.17936/pkelt.2013.25.3.018

Kachru, B. B. (1985). *Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle.* In Quirk, R. and Widdowson, H. G. *English in the world: teaching and learning the language and literatures (pp.11–30).* Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, Y., & Smith, L. E. (2008). *Cultures, contexts, and world Englishes.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203891346

Kang, O. 2015. Learners' perceptions toward pronunciation instruction in three circles of world Englishes. *TESOL Journal*, *6*(1), 59–80. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.146

Ke, I. C., & Cahyani, H. 2014. Learning to become users of English as a lingua franca (ELF): How ELF online communication affects Taiwanese learners' beliefs of English. *System, 46,* 28–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07.008

Ke, I. C., & Suzuki, T. 2011. Teaching global English with NNS-NNS online communication. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, *8*(2), 169–188. https://bit.ly/3OtJLs7

Kim, T. Y. 2010. Socio-political influences on EFL motivation and attitudes: Comparative surveys of Korean high school students. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 11,* 211–222. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-010-9071-7

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model.* Hong Kong University Press. https://bit.ly/3bY6m1K

Larsen-Freeman, D. 2019. On language learner agency: A complex dynamic systems theory perspective. *The Modern Language Journal, 103*(1), 61–79. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12536

Lee, J. S., & Hsieh, J. C. 2018. University students' perceptions of English as an International Language (EIL) in Taiwan and South Korea. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *39*(9), 1-14. https://doi: 10.1080/01434632.2018.1438448

Lee, J. S., Lee, K., & Drajati, A. N. 2019. Pre-service English teachers' perceptions of English as an international language in Indonesia and Korea. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *40*(3), 230–243, https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1503669

Lee, J. S., Nakamura, Y., & Sadler, R. 2017. Effects of videoconference-embedded classrooms (VEC) on learners' perceptions toward English as an international language (EIL). *ReCALL*, *30*(3), 319-336. https://doi:10.1017/S095834401700026X

Malkin, B. (2007, September 24). *Facebook is UK's biggest networking site*. The Telegraph. https://bit.ly/3OKUZZx

Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Multilingual Matters. https://bit.ly/3bVu52c

Matsuda, A. (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language*. Multilingual Matters. https://bit.ly/3bVOlRD

Matsuda, A. 2002. International understanding through teaching world Englishes. *World Englishes*, *21*(3), 436–440. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ659399

Matsuda, A. 2003. The ownership of English in Japanese secondary schools. *World Englishes*, *22*(2), 483–496. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2003.00314.x

McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches.* Oxford University Press.

Pennington, M. C. (2014). *Teacher identity in TESOL: A-frames perspective*. In Cheung, Y. L., Said, S. B., & Park, K. (Eds.), *Advances and current trends in language teacher identity research (pp. 16–30).* Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: a critical introduction.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410600790

Raja, P., Flora, Putrawan, G. E., & Razali, A. B. 2022. English as an international language: Perceptions of EFL pre-service teachers in higher education institutions in Indonesia. *Education Research International*, *2022*, 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/3234983

Ren, W., Chen, Y. S., & Lin, C. Y. 2016. University students' perceptions of ELF in Mainland China and Taiwan. *System, 56*, 13–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.11.004

Richards, J. C. 2010. Competence and performance in language teaching. *RELC Journal*, *41*(2), 101–122. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688210372953

Seidlhofer, B. (2013). *Understanding English as a lingua franca.* Oxford University Press. https://bit.ly/3usbZeZ

Seidlhofer, B., & Widdowson, H. (2020). *What do we really mean by ELF-informed pedagogy? An enquiry into converging themes.* In Konakahara, M. & Tsuchiya, K. *English as a lingua franca in Japan (pp. 323–331).* Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33288-4_16

Selvi, A. F. (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language: Reflections from Northern cyprus*." In Matsuda, A. *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language* (pp. *114–124*). Multilingual Matters.

Sharifian, F. 2013. Globalization and developing metacultural competence in learning English as an international language. *Multilingual Education*, *3*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1186/2191-5059-3-7

Shaughnessy, J. J., Zechmeister, E. B, & Jeanne, Z. (2011). *Research methods in psychology (9th ed.).* McGraw Hill.

Supartini. 2013. Becoming English teachers in English as an international language (EIL) context in Indonesia. *Universitas Pendidian Indonesia.* https://bit.ly/3yKCT4f

Tan, P. K. W., & Tan, D. K. H. 2008. Attitudes towards non-standard English in Singapore. *World Englishes*, *27*(3-4), 465–479. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2008.00578.x

Tsai, Y., & Tsou, C. H. 2009. A standardized English language proficiency test as the graduation benchmark: Student perspectives on its application in higher education. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *16*(3), 319–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/09695940903319711

Ubaidillah, M. F. 2018. The pedagogy of English as an international language: Indonesian pre-service teachers' beliefs. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *15*(4), 1186–1194. https://doi:10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.4.23.1186

Union of International Associations. (2016). *International meetings statistics report.* http://www.uia.org/publications/meetings-stats

Vinagre, M. (2016). *Promoting intercultural competence in culture and language studies: Outcomes of an international collaborative project.* In Martín-Monje, E., Elorza, I., & Riaza, B. G. *Technological advances in specialized linguistic domains: practical applications and mobility (pp. 23–35).* Routledge.

Wang, W. 2015. Teaching English as an international language in China: Investigating university teachers' and students' attitudes towards China English. *SYSTEM*, *53*, 60–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.06.008

Yu, Y. 2010. Attitudes of learners toward English: a case of Chinese college students. *The Ohio State University*. http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1283303545

Yung-Hui, L. (2012, February 2). *India is now Facebook nation no. 2, behind the US.* Forbes. https://bit.ly/3ONbAfb