

Negotiating the Place of Spirituality in English Language Teaching: A Case Study in an
Indonesian EFL Teacher Education Program

by

Joseph Ernest Mambu

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved November 2014 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Paul Kei Matsuda, Chair
Patricia Friedrich
Matthew T. Prior

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

December 2014

ABSTRACT

This dissertation delves into EFL stakeholders' understanding of spiritual identities and power relations associated with these identities as performed in various ELT contexts in an undergraduate EFL teacher education program at a Christian university in Indonesia. This study is motivated by an ongoing debate over the place of spirituality, especially Christianity, in ELT. In this project, religions are considered to be windows through which one's spirituality is viewed and expressed. Spiritually associated relations of power indicate discrepancies due to positioning of one person committed to a spiritual view in relation to those having similar or different spiritual views.

The purpose of exploring spiritually associated identities and power relations is to provide empirical evidence which supports the following arguments. The integration of spirituality in ELT, or lack thereof, can be problematic. More importantly, however, spirituality can be enriching for some EFL teachers and students alike, and be presented together with critical ELT.

To explore the complexity of power relations associated with some EFL stakeholders' spiritual identities, I analyzed data from classroom observations, four focus group discussions from February to April 2014, and individual interviews with 23 teachers and students from February to September 2014. Findings showed that Christian and non-Christian English teachers had nuanced views regarding the place of prayer in ELT-related activities, professionalism in ELT, and ways of negotiating spiritually associated power relations in ELT contexts. Students participating in this study performed their spiritual identities in ways that can be perceived as problematic (e.g., by

being very dogmatic or evangelical) or self-reflexive. Classroom observations helped me to see more clearly how Christian English teachers interacted with their students from different religious backgrounds. In one class, a stimulating dialogue seemed to emerge when a teacher accommodated both critical and religious views to be discussed.

This project culminates in my theorization of the praxis of critical spiritual pedagogy in ELT. Central to this praxis are (a) raising the awareness of productive power and power relations associated with spiritual identities; (b) learning how to use defiant discourses in negotiating spiritually associated power relations; and (c) nurturing self-reflexivity critically and spiritually.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my wife, Ella Victoria, and my son, Joel Rafa Richelieu, who have accompanied me during my doctoral studies in the United States and in Indonesia.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to the Divine Being who has inspired me in this project and allowed me to learn from great people at Arizona State University (ASU). First and foremost, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to Professor Paul Kei Matsuda for his guidance since the first year of my doctoral studies, and especially for providing full support to me in completing this dissertation. I really appreciate his valuable and constructive feedback on a number of drafts of this dissertation. I am greatly privileged to have such a world-class mentor, teacher, and dissertation chair whose advice is very essential throughout my graduate studies at ASU and for the ongoing development of my professional career as an English language teacher educator in Indonesia.

I would like to thank my dissertation committee members, Professor Patricia Friedrich and Professor Matthew T. Prior for their encouragement and insightful comments on my dissertation project. I acknowledge Professor Friedrich's perspective on critical applied linguistics. I am also indebted to Professor Prior for sharing with me very useful works related to critical spiritual pedagogy in general education.

Special thanks to Professor Stephanie Vandrick at the University of San Francisco who read and provided very valuable feedback on an earlier draft of my first three chapters of this dissertation when I was still doing fieldwork in Indonesia.

It would have been impossible for me to complete this project without voluntary assistance from EFL teachers and students from Jawara Christian University (JCU). I thank the rector, the dean, and the head of department at JCU for securing my access to my research participants.

Financial aids from Fulbright and DIKTI (i.e., the Indonesian Directorate General of Higher Education) are worthy of mention. I really thank the U.S. and Indonesian governments for helping me to accomplish my dream to study in the United States of America.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to these close friends: fellow Indonesian Fulbrighters at ASU—Lusia Nurani, Made Eka, and Taufik Hidayah who have shared the same apartments with me and cheered me up during difficult nights and days, especially when I worked on my dissertation; my friends at Church on Mill—Todd and Amy Diehl, Harry and Elizabeth Hahne, Kent and LeeAnne Hardy, and Roxanne Beasley, who have prayed for me and helped me in many ways; my Graduate Christian Fellowship friends—Jean Duerbeck and Bill Gentrup who have provided ample spiritual nutrients in many Bible study sessions; and friends in ASU’s Department of English—Junghwa Kim and Karen Foltz who have been tremendously kind to me, and Sarah Elizabeth Snyder for very kindly helping me improve my dissertation. Any remaining errors are my own.

Last but not least, I am deeply grateful to my family. To my late father, especially, who, until several hours before he passed away last May 11, 2014, still asked me how I could be funded for my fourth year of my doctoral studies. My mother has also been great in remembering me in her prayers. Thank you, Mom. I am glad to have Ella Victoria as my wife who has oftentimes seen things I overlooked. Thank you, Dear. For Joel Rafa Richelieu, my son, thank you for behaving so cutely. You were greatly missed when I was in the United States, and you were in Indonesia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xv
 CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Unpacking Crucial Terms.....	7
Identity.....	7
Power and Power Relations.....	8
Agency.....	10
Spirituality and Religion.....	11
Problematization and Self-Reflexivity.....	17
Statement of Problem.....	20
2 INVESTIGATING SPIRITUAL IDENTITIES IN ELT THROUGH THE LENS OF CRITICAL SPIRITUAL PEDAGOGY.....	26
Early Discussions about Christianity and Foreign/English Language Education.....	26
A Longstanding Debate Over (Covert) Proselytization.....	28
“All Teachers Proselytize!” (Really?).....	29
Not All Christian English Teachers are Willing to Proselytize, but... Aren’t They?.....	30

CHAPTER	Page
The Conundrum of “Absolute Truths”	32
A Self-Reflexive Stance on Proselytizing.....	36
If Not about Proselytizing, then What?.....	38
Teaching Excellence and Professionalism.....	38
Toward Interactional Dialogue and Beyond.....	39
Personal Language Learning and Teaching Motivation.....	42
Entering a Christian-Based Educational Institution for One Reason or Another.....	43
Perpetuating “Colonial Legacy”	43
A Transitory Conclusion.....	44
Theoretical Framework.....	45
Critical Spiritual Pedagogy.....	45
Liberation Theology.....	49
Critical Applied Linguistics Insights into Critical Spiritual Pedagogy.....	51
Unpacking Power Relations even More.....	51
Some Degree of Skepticism.....	53
Problematizing Emancipatory Modernism.....	53
Delving into Critical Moments.....	56
Language Teacher and Student Identity.....	57
Social Identity Theory.....	58

CHAPTER	Page
Theory of Situated Learning.....	59
Identity as Image-Text (or Teacher Identity as Pedagogy).....	61
Synthesis.....	63
Conclusion.....	65
3 METHODS.....	67
Context.....	68
Indonesia.....	68
A Christian University in Indonesia.....	69
The Students in the EFL Teacher Education Program.....	69
The Instructors in the EFL Teacher Education Program..	70
My Role in the EFL Teacher Education Program.....	70
Gaining Access to the Field.....	72
Participants.....	75
Criteria for Selecting Participants.....	75
Recruitment Procedure.....	76
The Participants.....	78
Data Collection Methods.....	83
Observations.....	83
Focus Group Discussions.....	86
Semi-Structured Interviews.....	86

CHAPTER	Page
Collecting Relevant Documents.....	87
Data Analysis Procedure.....	92
Transcribing Data.....	92
Coding and Analyzing Themes.....	93
4 EFL TEACHERS’ UNDERSTANDING OF SPIRITUAL IDENTITIES IN ELT CONTEXTS.....	96
To Pray or Not to Pray in Public.....	96
Being Professional.....	100
Understanding Power Relations in ELT Contexts.....	103
Endorsing Character Education in ELT Contexts Non- Coercively.....	107
Endorsing Character Education in ELT Contexts by being Authoritative.....	116
Being Alert about Belonging to the Minority Groups: A Race- Faith Interface.....	118
Witnessing about the Gospel.....	119
Conclusion.....	128
5 EFL TEACHERS’ REFLECTIONS ON THE INCORPORATION OF SPIRITUALITY AND LIFE REALITIES INTO ELT CLASSROOMS.....	130
Mustika’s Experience of Teaching about Discrimination.....	130

CHAPTER	Page
Tim’s Experiences of Presenting Islam in Class.....	133
Angela’s Experiences of Being Reflexive about Evangelism.....	138
Toward Problematizing “Liberal Multiculturalism” in ELT Classrooms.....	144
Conclusion.....	150
6 EFL STUDENTS’ UNDERSTANDING OF SPIRITUALITY IN ELT SETTINGS.....	152
Defining and Performing Spirituality Dogmatically: Calantha’s Case.....	153
Defining and Performing Spirituality Evangelically: Monika’s Case.....	155
Performing Spirituality as Dialogue.....	166
An Additive Approach to Interfaith Dialogue: Karno’s Case.....	166
Being Less Fanatical: Ellie’s Case.....	171
Having an Interreligious Crush: Lucia’s Case.....	171
Reflecting on the Pronoun “him”: Lucia’s Case.....	173
Spirituality in ELT: A Source of Motivation or Otherwise.....	175
Spirituality as a Source of Motivation to Learn English: Ellie’s Case.....	175

CHAPTER	Page
Non-Shared of Spirituality as a Source of Bewilderment:	
Ellie’s Report.....	176
Conclusion.....	177
7 EFL TEACHERS AND STUDENTS NEGOTIATING	
SPIRITUALITY IN OBSERVED ELT CLASSROOMS OR	
BEYOND.....	179
Some Degree of Self-Reflexivity when Discussing Religion and	
Culture: Marty’s Case.....	181
Narrative Analysis #1: British and Indonesian Garbagemen..	181
Narrative Analysis #2: Marty’s Evangelical Discourse.....	186
Dealing with Life Realities and Religious Dogmas.....	203
Being Relatively Closeted about One’s Own Religion:	
Shinta’s Case.....	203
Initiating Intra- and Inter-faith Dialogue: Celeste’s Case.....	209
Teaching Students How to Read Logos Critically: Dika’s Case..	220
Conclusion.....	223
8 LOCALLY THEORIZING CRITICAL SPIRITUAL	
PEDAGOGY: THE CASE OF ELT IN JCU.....	225
Understanding the Local and the Indigenous in Theorizing	
Critical Spiritual Pedagogy.....	225

CHAPTER	Page
Three Components of Critical Spiritual Pedagogy being Locally Theorized.....	228
Understanding of Power and Power Relations Associated with Spirituality in ELT.....	229
Defiant Discourses Seen through Spiritual and Critical Lenses.....	231
Self-Reflexivity Nurtured Spiritually and Critically.....	237
Limitation of the Study.....	244
Concluding Remarks.....	244
REFERENCES.....	251
ENDNOTES.....	265
APPENDIX.....	268
A OBSERVATION PROTOCOL.....	268
B FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION PROTOCOL.....	273
C INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS.....	277
D LANGUAGE LEARNING (AND TEACHING) HISTORIES GUIDELINE.....	281
E COMPETENCIES RELATED TO CRITICAL AND SPIRITUAL VALUES.....	284
F IRB APPROVAL.....	286

APPENDIX	Page
G SHORT CONSENT TEMPLATE.....	289
H THE RECAPITULATION OF THE 23 OBSERVED CLASS SESSIONS.....	292
I A SAMPLE OF EMERGING THEMES: THE FIRST STAGE OF CODING.....	298
J A SAMPLE OF EMERGING THEMES: THE SECOND STAGE OF CODING.....	304
K MUSTIKA’S INTERPRETATION OF PHILLIS WHEATLEY’S POEM.....	308
L ANGELA’S NARRATIVE #1: CHRISTIANITY IN THE AMERICAN CULTURE AND LITERATURE CLASS.....	312
M ANGELA’S NARRATIVE #2: CHRISTIANITY IN THE INTERMEDIATE WRITING CLASS.....	317
N MUR’S COMMENTS ON MARTY’S TALK IN COMMUNICATION ACROSS CULTURES CLASS.....	320
O LUCIA’S POEM ENTITLED “SQUARES”.....	323
P KARNO’S LANGUAGE LEARNING HISTORY.....	326
Q ELLIE’S INTEREST IN SOCIAL (JUSTICE) ISSUES.....	330
R FIELD NOTES AND TRANSCRIBED DATA FROM DIKA’S INTERMEDIATE READING CLASS ON FEBRUARY 13, 2014....	332
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	336

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Focal Participants.....	80
2	Non-Focal Participants.....	82
3	Video-Recorded Classrooms.....	88
4	Focus Group Discussions with Students.....	89
5	Focus Group Discussions with Lecturers.....	89
6	Individual Interviews with Lecturers Who are Focal Participants.....	90
7	Individual Interviews with Lecturers Who are Not Focal Participants...	91
8	Individual Interviews with Students Who are Focal Participants.....	91
9	Interviews with Students Who are Not Focal Participants.....	92

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1 Some Prompts of “Your Worldview” that Marty would like his Students to Think Over.....	182
2 Marty’s PowerPoint Slide that Used Bahasa Indonesia.....	188

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The idea of integrating spirituality into English language teaching, especially that which is biased toward a Christian religion, has been a source of controversy. Some non-Christian (Edge, 1996, 2003; Pennycook & Makoni, 2005) and even Christian ELT scholars (Chamberlain, 2009; Ferris, 2009; Loptes, 2009) have problematized the practice of proselytization among many Western Christian English language educators in non-Western host countries. Responding to some non-Christian scholars' opposition to the idea of integrating Christianity into ELT, Johnston (2009), a non-Christian scholar, contend that "evangelical Christians" cannot be essentialized as those who always desire to proselytize non-Christians. However, he does not imply that proselytization is justifiable. For a Christian scholar like Baurain (2007), in contrast, it is reasonable for language teachers to witness about Jesus and his truth with love, respect, and humility as part of revealing Christian identity. Another controversy related to the issue of proselytizing zeal is that some Christian English language educators or missionaries are often unaware of their privilege as white Westerners or English native speakers (Snow, 2009; Vandrick, 2002, 2009; Wong, 2013).

In addition to the critique on Western Christian English teachers' positioning with non-Western students and (EFL) teachers and the debate on whether it is permissible for Christian English teachers to proselytize, there has also been a tricky question of whether Christian ELT scholars or teachers can also be critical pedagogues (CPs). Addressing this question, Canagarajah (2009) claims that he is an insider of both critical and Christian

ELT scholarship, which makes him a “different evangelical among CET [Christian English teachers] and a different critical theorist among CP.” This has made him acknowledge “tensions in [his] faith and politics” and challenge him to “conduct a dialogue within [him]self at times” (p. 12). The larger issue here is how Christian English language educators, like Canagarajah, make sense of their Christian (and critical) identities while also negotiating potential challenge or resistance from either camp (i.e., Christian and critical camps) which pulls or pushes them in either direction within relations of power between Christian English teachers and critical pedagogues. Though not explicitly addressing the tension between Christian and critical pedagogue ends of continuum, the scholarship on Christian English language teachers’ identity formation has begun to address the issue of power more seriously. With her research of Christian English teachers as missionaries in China as the backdrop of her reflection on future research trajectories, Wong (2013) calls for addressing the conundrum of religious (i.e., not only Christian) identity and power relations as follows: “Studies could be conducted to explore ways in which teacher educators could sensitize future teachers to issues of power and identity to minimize or mitigate power differentials” (p. 26). These studies should also “investigate the impact of other faith beliefs on identity formation of language teachers” (p. 27).

There is still a relative dearth of research into power relations associated with spiritual and/or religious identities in EFL contexts where ELT stakeholders (e.g., EFL [teacher] educators and students) embracing different religious faiths reside in religious educational institutions. Apart from Wong’s (2013) study, there is an attempt to balance

power in team teaching between Western Christian English teachers and non-Western co-educators of English in a host country, Taiwan (Wang-McGrath, 2013). In a recent study in my home country, Indonesia (see Lessard-Clouston, 2013), the issue of spiritually related power relations between EFL teachers and students or colleagues in a Christian university is not adequately discussed.

At least until today every Indonesian is required to state explicitly their religion—only one religion—in their identity card, with only seven official religions being acknowledged by the government: Islam, Christianity, Catholicism, Buddhism, Hindu, Confucian, or Baha'i. This suggests that in Indonesia religion is one very salient window through which one's spirituality is based upon and expressed, although some Indonesians may not conflate spirituality and religion (e.g., they make a distinction between religion and spirituality; they claim to be spiritual without being religious). Islam in Indonesia is the religion with the largest population in the world and it has become a major counter-hegemony of Christianity. Power relations due to spiritual values rooted in the two chief religions (i.e., Islam and Christianity) in Indonesia should then be paid more attention to, especially when EFL stakeholders interact in a religiously affiliated institution.

Insufficient attention to power relations among ELT stakeholders who have different religiously based spiritual identities is problematic. To illustrate, the ways English language educators' spiritual beliefs they hold are enacted might be unfavorable to students. In reflecting upon sharing her knowledge on the relationship between short-lived *suzumushi* ("bell-ringing crickets") and "the Zen Buddhist philosophy of living with no mind... or becoming free from all forms of clinging and bondage" in teaching

Japanese to a lot of American students, Kubota (2009) wondered “if [she] was providing cultural information or instilling religious belief.” The former is fine but the latter, according to her, might make some students feel “uncomfortable being exposed to a religious view different from theirs” (pp. 227-228). The question is to what extent English language educators demonstrate such self-reflexivity and discuss this with their students. Furthermore, lacking the awareness of religiously associated power relations overlooks the likelihood that religious values or interpretations can be either called into question or sources of inspiration for, as Smith and Osborn (2007) would argue, achieving social justice (e.g., by resisting inequality) via foreign language education like ELT.

This dissertation therefore will address this overarching research question: How can power relations inextricably linked to spiritual identities be identified, negotiated, and problematized? More specifically, the purpose of this dissertation is threefold. First, through a synthesis of the current literature on power and identity, it will shed more light on how relations of power through the embodiment, as well as performance, of spiritual identities operate and are subject to self-reflexivity. Second, it will demonstrate the ways ELT stakeholders (i.e., Christian and non-Christian English language teachers and students) in a Christian EFL teacher education program in Indonesia negotiate power relations associated with their spiritual identities. Third, a model of critical spiritual pedagogy will be theorized based on what transpire in the program in terms of the negotiation of power relations closely linked to the stakeholders’ spiritual identities.

To achieve this threefold purpose, the following questions will guide my inquiry:

1. What can be drawn from the literature on critical spiritual pedagogy and (language teacher) identity that will illuminate the process of identifying, negotiating, and problematizing spiritually associated power relations in ELT settings?
2. How do ELT stakeholders in a Christian EFL teacher education in Indonesia negotiate their spiritual identities and power differentials related to those identities? (a) What does it mean for an educator or a student to be spiritual in the context of ELT? (b) How do the stakeholders negotiate power relations due to the (possible) incorporation of spiritual (especially Christian) values into ELT?
3. How can the praxis of critical spiritual pedagogy be theorized locally in an ELT setting, without losing sight of its possible implications in a wider context?

The larger research objective that will be achieved by answering the above questions is to provide more empirical evidence which supports the following arguments. The integration of spirituality in ELT, or lack thereof, can be problematic. More importantly, however, spirituality can be enriching for teachers and students alike, and be presented together with critical ELT (i.e., ELT that is inspired by critical pedagogy; see e.g., Crookes, 2013).

The dissertation will consist of eight chapters. In this first chapter, I am establishing the need for further inquiry into how relations of power, which are associated with stakeholders' sense of spirituality, are negotiated in an ELT context. Some working definitions of important concepts (i.e., identity, power, power relations, agency, spiritual[ity], religion, Christian[ity], non-Christian[ity], and problematization) will be

provided. I will also present the statement of problem, in which I expand on the intricacy of negotiating religious identities and spiritually associated power relations in view of a real situation in Indonesia, especially in a Christian university in the country.

Chapter 2 will explore in further depth issues related to stakeholders' spiritual identities in ELT. Although one of the most salient issues is opposition to some Christian English teachers' proselytizing zeal (Pennycook & Coutand-Marin, 2003), it is not the only one. Spirituality can be a source of learning motivation (Lepp-Kaethler & Dörnyei, 2013). It can also inspire English teachers and learners alike to achieve social justice, thus the term critical spiritual pedagogy. My review of the concept of critical spiritual pedagogy (as introduced by Ryoo, Crawford, Moreno, & McLaren, 2009) will be informed by the Freirean critical pedagogy, liberation theology (Oldenski, 2002), and Pennycook's (2001) insights into power relations, agency, problematizing practices, and self-reflexivity. As part of my attempt to provide a theoretical framework to explore the sensitization of ELT stakeholders to issues of spiritual identities and power, the review of critical spiritual pedagogy will be complemented with some discussion about different theories of language teacher identity (Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, & Johnson, 2005), which is applicable to understanding language learner identity as well.

Chapter 3 will be the methods section in which the research context, participants, data collection methods, and data analysis procedure will be explained. In this case study, I used protocols for (a) observations in class or beyond (Appendix A); (b) focus group discussions (Appendix B); (c) interviews (Appendix C); and (d) eliciting written autobiographical narratives of language learning histories (Appendix D).

In chapter 4, EFL teachers' understanding of spiritual identities, as manifested in focus group discussions and individual interviews, will be discussed. I specifically looked into what it meant for a person to be an EFL teacher educator who has a religion or some sense of spirituality in a Christian university. Chapter 5 focuses on how English teacher educators in the university negotiated power relations concerning the incorporation of religiously based spiritual (especially Christian) values into discussions about real life issues (e.g., discrimination) in ELT classrooms. EFL students' understanding of spirituality and religion in ELT settings in the Christian university is the focus of chapter 6, with the main data set being analyzed coming from individual interviews and focus group discussions. In chapter 7, data from observed ELT classrooms were analyzed. The focus of attention is how spiritual identities were negotiated in the classrooms and/or in subsequent interviews with either lecturers or students involved in the classrooms that I observed as well as audio- and/or video-recorded. Finally in chapter 8, I will theorize the praxis of critical spiritual pedagogy in ELT. Central to this praxis are (a) raising the awareness of productive power and power relations associated with religious identities; (b) learning how to use "defiant speech" (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 310) in negotiating power relations; and (c) nurturing self-reflexivity.

Unpacking Crucial Terms

Identity

In general terms, identity means what a person is known for by the person her or himself, or by other people. The person is known through one or more labels attached by the person her or himself, or by other people with which the person may agree or

disagree, and through what the person performs, regardless of labels attached to her or him. The process of “acquiring and applying” someone’s identity is called identification (Buzzelli & Johnston, 2002, p. 106).

A person is capable of displaying multiple or conflicting identities. In poststructuralist traditions (e.g., critical multiculturalism [Kubota, 2004]; feminism [Pavlenko, 2004, and critical applied linguistics [Pennycook, 2004]), to which I subscribe here, essentializing or reducing a group of people into a single, monolithic entity (e.g., all American people, all Muslims, all women) is likely to be very inaccurate.

Essentialization of people does away with the very multiplicity of identity any individual, irrespective of labels assigned to her or him, has and is capable of performing. Also crucial in a poststructuralist view of identity is the likelihood that identities are formed through language, change over time, and “are discursively constructed, maintained, and negotiated” in relations of power (Buzzelli & Johnston, 2002, p. 106; see also Norton, 2013, p. 4). See chapter 2 for more detail on theorizing language teacher and student identity.

Power and Power Relations

Power refers to, according to Foucault (as cited in Pennycook, 2001, p. 90), the “multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate” (p. 92). In Foucault's view, what matters is not so much that power belongs to an individual or a group of people, but that power “operates throughout society” (Pennycook, 2001, p. 91). To illustrate, a teacher can exercise power, and so can a student, when both the teacher and the student interact.

The intricate interplay between one individual with another or with different groups of people is central to relations of power. In broader terms, the interplay indicates the difference between oneself and her or his Other which “often indexes a deeper power relation where the subject is at the center and the Other at the periphery (Spivak & Harasym, 1990)” (Ryoo et al., 2009, p. 138). The self at the center and the other at the periphery cannot be simplistic. Understanding the former as those “in power” or landowners—“the oppressors,” and the latter as “the oppressed” peasants, is oversimplistic. Furthermore, the common phrase of “people in power” (e.g., government officials, or the top 1% of the richest Americans) can be misleading in Foucauldian terms because all people can exert power, not only those “in power.” The pervasiveness of power in society renders it erroneous to “see power as an evil that needs to be combated” (Buzzelli & Johnston, 2002, p. 107). The so-called “those in power” can be repressive, but all people can use their agency to resist oppressive structures. Last but not least, power in Pennycook’s (2001) view, following Foucault, “is not merely repressive but is also productive” (p. 91). Thus, power relations are not simply about relations between “powerful oppressors” and “the powerless oppressed,” but are likely to be tied to people’s exercise of productive power to illuminate, to support each other, or to resist social injustice collectively by means of “symbolic and material resources.” The former refers to “such resources as language, education, and friendship,” as well as religious values in my case, and the latter includes things like “capital goods, real estate, and money” (Norton, 2013, p. 6).

Agency

Productive power is inextricably linked to the notion of agency. Agency has been theorized in sociology (e.g., Giddens, 1979; Sewell, 1992) and adapted in ELT. Kristjánsson (2013), for instance, has recently suggested a useful definition of agency along this sociological line: “a person's capacity to act within the possibilities afforded by the social structures in which he or she is situated” (p. 11). Agency is a crucial element in counter-hegemony.

In Gramsci's (1971) view, hegemony is characterized by:

... ‘spontaneous’ consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant... group; this consent is ‘historically’ caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production. (p. 12)

Affirmation and articulation of dominant views to which great masses give their consent are typically established by intellectuals. The notion of “spontaneous consent” is crucial in understanding hegemony. But even a singular hegemony should not presuppose that people give their full consent on it. As Holborow (2012) suggests: “Hegemony... is not the same as full-blown acceptance[; e]ven an apparently widely accepted ideology is never swallowed whole nor is it uniformly dominant: people may accept some aspects but reject others” (p. 41). Schugurensky (2011) argues in view of the Freirean critical pedagogy: Where education “is an arena where hegemonic values, ideals, standards, and practices are imposed by dominant groups,” education is “also a place where

counterhegemonic values and practices occur” (p. 204). In short, people utilize their agency in accepting or rejecting some aspects of hegemonic structures associated with certain ideologies or spiritual/religious values.

Spirituality and Religion

At least in the United States, the current fervor to return to “the Edenic situation of early American education, in which religious, spiritual, and moral concerns both animated and dominated the curriculum” of higher education (e.g., Astin, 2004; Palmer, 1998) has been seriously challenged (Gallagher, 2009, p. 73). Three major factors relevant here that have made Gallagher argues against current research into spirituality in the U.S. higher education are that the notion of spirituality is “so ill-defined as to be virtually useless,” that “everyone has a ‘spirituality,’” including atheists and agnostics, and that it enunciates a “fundamentally Protestant bias” (pp. 68-69).

The difficulty of defining “spirituality” is hard to deny. Spirit is, in Scott’s (2006) view, “fleeting”; it is like “wind, breath or fire. [F]ixing spirituality is a loss of engagement and possibility. Closure is not required. ... [T]he spirit(ual) is somehow elusive and powerful” (p. 89). It is also challenging to understand the relationship between spirituality, atheism, and agnosticism. Gallagher (2009) may be right when he indicates that atheists and agnostics do not have a sense of spirituality. As he puts it: “It must be asked... *why everyone* must be presumed to have a ‘spirituality’” (p. 83, italics in original). However, he seems to have overlooked the likelihood that atheists and agnostics can be spiritual eventually. After all, identities (like being atheistic or agnostic)

are not necessarily fixed (Varghese et al., 2005), though I believe some agnostics and atheists have chosen, choose, or will choose to be so for the rest of their lives.

Gallagher's (2009) argument that spirituality is a "fundamentally Protestant bias" (p. 68) is also problematic, when viewed from an international perspective. A Muslim scholar like Shahjahan (2004) raised his voice very vividly, then as a doctoral student in Canada, about his own spiritual epistemology that is profoundly grounded in his religion, Islam. Later as a new faculty in a Canadian university, Shahjahan (2010) reported his investigation into the spirituality of faculty of color, from assistant professors to full professors in various disciplines in Canadian universities. These faculty members come from a variety of ethnic backgrounds "with different spiritual traditions, including Islam, Baha'i, Black Christianity, Catholicism, Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, and Indigenous traditions. Some considered themselves as secular" (p. 484).

From Shahjahan's (2010) example, it becomes clear that spirituality is not restricted to embracing a religion like Islam or Christianity. Even scholars regarding themselves as "secular" can still have some sense of spirituality. So, what is spirituality in relation to religion? I will start from Tisdell's (2007) argument:

While religions do provide guidance on how to live a spiritual life from the perspective of that tradition, religions are also organized communities of faith, usually with an official belief system or written creed and codes of regulatory behavior. Spirituality, on the other hand, is more about how people make meaning through experience with wholeness, perceived higher power or higher purpose,

and does not usually focus on what a religious tradition's official creed is. (pp. 537-538)

Some overlap may be present between religion and spirituality. Van Brummelen, Koole, and Franklin (2004) suggest that “[t]he scope of spirituality is broader than that of religion” (p. 238), which may imply that religion can be, if not is, part of spirituality. In Van Brummelen et al's phrasing: “Religion does not encompass all of spirituality. It is possible to be spiritual without being religious” (p. 238), which indicates that someone can “perceive higher power or higher purpose” without having to adhere to “a religious tradition's official creed” (Tisdell, 2007, pp. 537-538).

When spirituality is perceived as broader than religion, its conceptualization has to be more encompassing than the ability or commitment to perceiving higher power or higher purpose. Spirituality may include the following. First, it is “a philosophy of becoming, in which the self can become Other to itself, and from that position either remain alienated or transcend itself” (Ryoo et al., 2009, p. 135). The favorable goal of spirituality in this sense is not being alienated, but rather transcending oneself through “an epistemological Othering and ‘doubling’ of the world—a sense of being beside oneself or outside of oneself in another epistemological, discourse, and political space than one typically would inhabit” (Luke, 2004, p. 26). By having the ability to be the Other(ed), a person can learn how to empathize with those in marginalized or oppressed position. This is one of the core components of critical spiritual pedagogy which I will revisit in chapter 2.

Second, spirituality is not only imagining the possibility of being the Other but connecting with others with love (Cutri, 2000; Dei, 2002; Freire, 1984; Palmer, 1993, 1998), especially that which is “not based on merit or value”—*agape* (Ryoo et al., 2009, p. 140). Being connected to others nurtures a sense of community (Astin, 2004). Such connectedness is central to indigenous (e.g., African) spirituality that “stresses mind, body, and soul interactions... through [individuals’] engagement [with] society, culture, and nature” (Dei, 2002, p. 125). Being committed to others also evokes a Christian metaphor of (God’s) word that has become flesh (e.g., Jesus Christ who is believed to be the word of God, and a God himself, and came down to earth with *agape* love as flesh to restore communion with human beings). For Christians, therefore, incarnating Jesus means reaching out to other people and desiring to have communion with them, although the idea of proselytizing others is not politically correct. Proselytization aside, commitment to being connected to others is highly relevant to achieve “justice, fairness,... mercy,... grace,... compassion, generosity, and humility” through a “spiritual morality” (Cutri, 2000, pp. 175-176), regardless of one's religious faith. Thus, spirituality in this second sense is closely tied to values that are not necessarily religious (e.g., morality which refers to “a person's beliefs which are evaluative in nature, that is, which concern matters of what is good and what is bad, what is right and what is wrong” [Johnston, 2003, p. 6] in relating to other people).

Third, I concur with Cutri (2000) whose one of her definitions of spirituality is “a quality of personal reflectivity and acknowledgment of a power higher than one’s self” (p. 168; see a similar conceptualization by Palmer & Zajonc [2010, p. 48] and White

[2010]). From my perspective as a Christian, this entails being humble to the Lord as I am a sinner who does a lot of wrongdoings. Without my Christian bias, I notice how Shahjahan (2004) was thrilled when he writes: *Bismillahir Rahmanir Rahim*, which means “In the Name of Allah Most Gracious and Most Merciful.” He further says: “as I utter and write these words my heart melts as I remember that I am a spiritual being that has a divine origin” (p. 294). Regardless of religious traditions or secularism that people hold, spirituality allows people to be self-reflexive also in the sense of asking “who [they] are and where [they] come from, [their] beliefs about why [they] are here—the meaning and purpose that [they] see in [their] work and [their] life...” (Astin, 2004, p. 34). Even for a person who has rejected a religious tradition, she or he “often spiral[s] back to that which they find the most important or life-affirming, and reclaim those [religious] images, symbols, or allegories” (Tisdell, 2007, p. 541). The following is an excerpt of Greta, an education professor who is a German immigrant and has long renounced the Catholicism for “political, sociocultural, and feminist reasons,” but still maintains her memory of the religion:

I just LOVED Easter. I think that has really profoundly affected me. That Easter, there’s always some resurrection. You go to hell, you die and you’re really at the bottom of mystery, but then you get resurrected. Often I think about when I am in bad shape—that [concept of] resurrection. (p. 542)

In sum, while it is true that defining spirituality can be challenging, it is possible to understand spirituality that encompasses those who have chosen not to observe a religious tradition and those who are not Christians. Based on the review of the literature

in general (and religious) education above, spirituality entails these interrelated aspects: one's attempt to look into oneself in relation to other people; one's commitment to being connected with other people and nature; and one's reverence to "a power higher than one's self" (Cutri, 2000, p. 168) including (but is not limited to) what religious traditions often refer to as God, the divine being, that allows the person to better understand their origin and life purpose. In indigenous spirituality, nature and ancestors are the very power higher than one's self.

Regarding why categories of Christian and non-Christian English language teachers and students are used in this study, I will suggest the following reasons. First, their identities (assigned here as "Christian" or "non-Christian") are strategically essentialized here. This is my appropriation of Gayatri Spivak's notion of "strategic essentialism" which she uses in her essays "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988) and 'Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography' [1985] (1995) to indicate a political and temporary use of essentialism for the subversive ends of creating or understanding a group self-consciousness." Moreover, Spivak argues that "strategic essentialism is not a 'search for lost origins' (1988: 295) that locates a static historical subject, but a critical, temporary method of locating self-consciousness for strategic ends" (Strategic Essentialism, 2007). By a similar token, I do not intend to locate "Christianity" or "non-Christianity" in a static manner. Christianity has been interpreted in different ways by Christians, or has even been ignored by those claiming to be Christian in terms of religion, as stated in their identity card (especially in Indonesia); and so has Islam, Hinduism, Catholicism, or any other religious traditions. Knowing one's religion is hence

a starting point for understanding how spiritual identities are (or are not) performed by ELT stakeholders, when they interact with me or with other fellow ELT stakeholders (especially [teacher] educators and students), and how their exercise of power in the interactions are identified, negotiated, and/or problematized.

Problematization and Self-Reflexivity

In the context of critical applied linguistics (Pennycook, 2001), a problematizing practice is a “critical practice” that is “always turning a skeptical eye toward assumptions, ideas, that have become ‘naturalized,’ notions that are no longer questioned” (p. 7). In responding to Pennycook’s (2001) work, Friedrich, Chauduri, Figueiredo, Fredricks, Hammill, Johnson, Duran, and Yun (2013) suggest that Pennycook “is loyal to his own stance on skepticism, and evidence of that is the very fact that no one is above criticism, not even [critical applied linguistics]” (p. 128). In my own reading of Pennycook (2001), I acknowledge Pennycook's own criticism on his earlier work. He is humble enough to submit to Canagarajah’s (1993) critique and is indirectly critical to Peirce’s work: “Canagarajah chides my ‘delineation of ideological domination through TESOL’ for being ‘overdetermined and pessimistic,’ while Peirce’s ‘characterization of the possibilities of pedagogical resistance’ is criticized for being ‘too volitionist and romantic’” (Pennycook, 2001, p. 118). Pennycook then concurs with Canagarajah’s (1993) position on relative autonomy in which structure can be (repressively) powerful but individual agency can challenge (oppressive) structure.

However, with a problematizing practice toward Pennycook's (2001) stance, Friedrich et al.'s (2013) position in regards to "skepticism" is worth quoting at length here:

We resent the view that looking critically means always looking skeptically; we certainly believe in keeping a questioning stance, a fact that should be self-evident by now, but we feel that the results of questioning and skepticism are quite different. To question is to contemplate the possibility of, at the end of the process, deeming things the way they are as acceptable. To be skeptical means to start from a cynical perspective in which *a priori* a decision is made that whatever is found is to be deemed faulty. That, we believe, is the position of impossibility that other researchers have called attention to (e.g., Fairclough). The obvious danger is that people refrain from proposing any new venues of action because, no matter what they propose, their plan will be considered not critical enough. (p. 131, italics in original)

And if Pennycook (2009) is committed to his own stance in favor of problematization, he will be open to call into question his too strong a contention that "the tendency to publish in little-known presses and journals (well known in Christian communities but little known outside)" is "part of anti-intellectualism..." (p. 62). It is true that a Christian scholar like Charles Malik (as cited in Noll, 1994) acknowledges the lack of rigor of Christian scholarship: "Who among the evangelicals can stand up to the great secular or naturalistic or atheistic scholars on their own terms of scholarship and research?" (p. 26). It also stands to reason that Christian ELT educators need to "stop

hiding” from mainstream ELT scholarship (Johnston, 2009, p. 37). However, Johnston is aware that “fear of ridicule and of not being taken seriously may partially motivate evangelicals’ unwillingness to show their face publicly to non-evangelicals” (p. 38). This is a more considerate view on the part of a scholar like Bill Johnston concerning Christian ELT educators. After all, it is still unclear whether fear led Christian foreign/English language educators like Smith and Carvill (2000) or Snow (2001) to publish their work in little-known presses. As a Christian, I find it much more helpful to start a scholarly endeavor with still small voices from fellow Christian educators whose views are published in little-known presses than nothing at all to begin with, especially when it becomes apparent that Christian views are downright rejected or marginalized at best by such a secular view as that of Pennycook (2009). Sadly, positioning mainstream TESOL presses and journals that are not religiously affiliated as *the* standard of intellectualism implies a message that secularism is more superior than spiritual epistemology—a shaky stance begging problematization in its own right! (Chamberlain, 2009). Furthermore, in a country where spiritual epistemology is a legal part (like in Indonesia), it is very condescending to say that the nation state is very likely to be anti-intellectual by its commitment to religious values in education (see a short discussion about the integration of religious values in the Indonesian Constitution 1945 in the statement of problem section below). Some interpretations of religious (including Christian) values can be problematic, but abandoning spiritual values through religious traditions or beyond does a disservice to spiritually inclined ELT educators who are also committed to rigorous scholarship.

Apart from critiques to Pennycook's standpoints, the notion of problematization is essential in this study because with constant questioning ELT stakeholders can hone their sensibilities to be self-reflexive when it comes to incorporating, or otherwise, spirituality into ELT. Inherent in self-reflexivity is a constant questioning stance that someone is intentionally ascribed to when s/he examines primarily her or his exercise of power (e.g., as a scholar in applied linguistics, a field which has, to borrow Heath, Street, & Mills's [2008] phrase, "colonial roots" [p. 123]; as a Christian scholar who is supposed to be "sustaining serious intellectual life" [Noll, 1994, p. 3] instead of being intellectually mediocre while zealously proselytizing; as a critical pedagogue holding certain theoretical assumptions in her or his study, etc.).

Statement of Problem

The main problem being investigated in this dissertation project is how the place of spirituality is negotiated by EFL stakeholders having various views of religion, particularly in a context like Indonesia where religions are expected to play an important role in education, especially ELT. English language educators or students may have different pedagogical and learning orientations that may or may not be related to their religious faiths. In the case where a pedagogical orientation (e.g., critical pedagogy) is closely tied to a person's (e.g., an educator's or a student's) religious faith (e.g., Christianity), there might be tensions not only in the person's mind, but also between the person and other people, fellow English language educators or students. An extreme case of the tension between a researcher with a critical pedagogical orientation and a "fundamentalist" Christian has been documented by Goodburn (1998), for instance, in

the context of L1 composition in the United States, which may be extrapolated to an L2 writing setting, too. Being self-reflexive, the instructor (Goodburn) acknowledged a blind spot in her critical pedagogy. That is, she intended her fundamentalist Christian student, Luke, to be open to re-interpretation of biblical texts (e.g., Kristine Beatty's poem "Lot's wife" [p. 337] which venerated the wife instead of biblically condemning the wife), and yet at the same time imposed critical pedagogy, which exhorts learners to call into question any truth claims, on Luke.

Although Goodburn's (1998) study took place in the United States, the likelihood that such a tension occurs in a non-Western setting like Indonesia is not slim. I may not be the first and only person in Indonesia who, like Canagarajah (2009), intends to blend critical pedagogy and spirituality in ELT. However, the extent to which the amalgamation of these two or more factors transpire in non-Western settings, especially by non-Western Christian educators in their own contexts where ELT plays a central role has yet to be sufficiently documented in the literature (Kubanyiova, 2013; Vandrick, 2009).

As teachers' or students' pedagogical orientation is not restricted to critical pedagogy, and their religious faith may not necessarily have some significant impact on their teaching or learning practices, it is also crucial to understand how teachers and students who claim to have some affiliation with a religious faith learn and/or teach English. A growing number of works addressing the relationship between ELT and Christianity has revolved around missionaries' attempts to integrate their Christian values into ELT covertly, unethically (e.g., Pennycook & Coutand-Marin, 2003) or self-reflexively (e.g., Wong, 2013). What is still not well represented in the literature,

surprisingly, is the likelihood that English teachers claim to hold a religious belief, including (though not limited to) Christianity, but seem reluctant or even staunchly resistant to the idea of integrating their religious values into ELT. Their voices (e.g., that which resonates some agnostic scholars' opposition to blending religion and ELT) might complicate the discussion about identities of teachers or students embracing different faiths—not only Christianity, which seems to dominate current ELT scholars' attention.

Moreover, interactions that occur between English language educators and their fellow colleagues, or between the educators and their students, or between the students themselves are potentially, if not inherently, embedded in intricate power relations, especially when they claim to have religions. How self-reflexive are these stakeholders in responding to different situations (e.g., when some need to integrate religious values and ELT and some others do not)? Does self-reflexivity matter at all to them, especially before they are aware that the notion of self-reflexivity exists? Besides, having a religion or spiritual values is not the only factor that affects relations of power. A person may be situated within relations of gender or race that will complicate analyses of power relations grounded in religious faiths.

As to why power relations associated with Western, as well as non-Western, Christian and non-Christian English language teachers' and students' identities need to be much further explored in non-Western settings (with Indonesia as a case), I have two main reasons. First, legal foundations and sociocultural factors differ between a Western country like the United States and a non-Western country like Indonesia. I understand that the notion of “non-Western” can be problematic. “Non-Western” people like myself

can be very Westernized. However, many of their embodied sociocultural practices since their childhood may still be distinguished from those living in the West (e.g., being deeply entrenched into religious practices of [indigenized] Islam, Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism, or Confucianism, especially in Indonesia). Second, in a non-Western setting like Indonesia, religious tensions (particularly between the majority of Muslims and the minority of Christians) have had a long history, which needs to be constantly problematized and resolved, whenever possible. Religious tensions may have permeated personal relationships between educators or students embracing different faiths and have spurred (academic) debates in mass media. The debates in mass media may potentially occur in ELT classrooms, so educators and students need to be better prepared how to have fruitful dialogues to ameliorate religious tensions among themselves and/or those outside of the class.

In terms of legal underpinnings, it is worth comparing North American contexts and Indonesia here. Mayes (2001) discusses legal debates in the USA concerning the place of spirituality in public schools. He asserts: “the First Amendment begins with the injunction that ‘Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof’” (p. 15). This epitomizes the separation of church and state in the United States. However, some statements from an organization like the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) or court rulings do not prescribe too strict separation between religion and education in public schools. “Students may be taught about religion, but public schools may not teach religion (ACLU, 1999),” which means that teachers’ and students’ spiritual opinions can be expressed as long as they are not

intended for proselytization (Mayes, 2001, p. 16). In *Lemon v. Kurtzman* (403 US 602 [1971]), Mayes sums up that “the state may neither advance *nor prohibit* religion” (pp. 16-17, italics in original). A similar case of separation between religion and education exists in Canada (Van Brummelen, Koole, & Franklin, 2004).

In Indonesia, where my case of non-Western setting is primarily situated, the latest amendment of *Undang-Undang Dasar 1945* (or The Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia of 1945 [2002]) stipulates: “The government advances science and technology along with holding religious values and national unity in high esteem with a view to promoting civilization as well as the well-being of humanity” (chapter 13 on Education, article 31, subsection 5). The tenor of “[up]holding religious values” in this constitutional mandate seems to have reverberated in the ELT curriculum, including that in Jawara Christian University, my research site (see Appendix E). Nonetheless, how religious values are incorporated into Indonesian ELT classrooms have yet to be sufficiently documented.

Socioculturally, religious tensions occur outside of ELT classroom contexts in Indonesia (e.g., Aritonang, 2013). While Christian values may be hegemonic inside of the program, Islamic values are hegemonic outside of it, though they may be oligarchically hegemonic inside of it (Phillipson, 2009). Christianity is dominant in the West, despite being under the guise of secularism (Shahjahan, 2010, p. 482—Christian privilege). The questions then become: Are such tensions in Indonesian society perceived to permeate ELT contexts? Will ELT stakeholders embracing various religious faiths be able to come

up with a “common good” (Goodburn, 1998, p. 350) or “universal values” as a basis for praxis?

In the next chapter, I will review issues pertaining to spiritual identities in ELT, mainly from the Christian faith, which have been explored in the literature. To address the complexity of power relations associated with EFL stakeholders’ diverse spiritual identities, I will suggest a theoretical framework that stems from the literature of critical spiritual pedagogy, with its related theories (i.e., the Freirean critical pedagogy, liberation theology, and Pennycook’s [2001] critical applied linguistics), and the literature of theorizing language teacher identity, especially that which is poststructurally oriented. The poststructuralist view of identity seems to me to be a sensitive theoretical lens to understand stakeholders’ tensions of whether to incorporate spirituality into ELT or not in the first place, or of amalgamating critical pedagogy and spirituality in ELT.

CHAPTER 2

INVESTIGATING SPIRITUAL IDENTITIES IN ELT THROUGH THE LENS OF CRITICAL SPIRITUAL PEDAGOGY

In this chapter, I will first provide a brief historical overview of attempts to integrate spiritual identities, which is predominantly explored by Christian scholars, into foreign language education, including ELT. I will then discuss how the potential notion of proselytization has been a source of heated debate in research into power relations associated with spiritual identities between Christian and non-Christian ELT (and general education) scholars alike. Beyond this debate is, in light of Wong's (2009) and Canagarajah's (2009) vision, how spiritual and secular (especially critical) dichotomy can be transcended, especially in non-Western, EFL contexts, without abandoning potential problems associated with proselytization rooted in Christian or other religious beliefs. In order to achieve this vision, a theoretical framework informed by the literature of critical spiritual pedagogy and language teacher identity will be delineated.

Early Discussions about Christianity and Foreign/English Language Education

Works on spiritual identities in foreign language education including ELT have on the whole begun to thrive more significantly in the turn of the century (e.g., Smith & Carvill, 2000 [foreign language education]; Snow, 2001 [ELT]), although still limited to a Christian audience in a Western (particularly U.S.) context. In the former, a brief historical overview of the relationship between Christianity and foreign language education is provided. According to them, the influence of Christianity in foreign language education has dated back primarily since Jesus's coming to the world and the

early church in the first century, with the zeal of mission and Bible translation. One important Christian figure who contributes to the formation of an ideal Christian teacher identity is Comenius who lived in the 16th century in Moravia, Europe. Not only did he revolutionize the way (language) materials were to be presented (i.e., pictures of objects and daily activities began to fill textbooks, whereas in earlier years, even centuries, materials typically contained classical authors' simplified texts), but Comenius was also concerned with teacher's role in class. He exhorts: "The educator's speech in class is not to consist merely of empty words; both a Christian view of the world and a Christian ethic of communication are to be modeled in the classroom" (Smith & Carvill, 2000, p. 47). Inspired by the history of Christianity in foreign language education and the Scriptures (e.g., Israelites under slavery in a foreign land, Egypt, centuries before Jesus's coming), Smith and Carvill state their philosophy: foreign language education *"prepare[s] students for two related callings: to be a blessing as strangers in a foreign land, and to be hospitable to strangers in their own homeland"* (pp. 57-58, italics in original). I will not discuss this philosophy further, but the point is that Smith and Carvill are among the first Christian scholars who philosophize foreign language pedagogy in an articulate manner and historically informed. Snow (2001), which is focused on ELT, is more pragmatic in that he discusses the function or role of Christian English teachers who should be involved in teaching English as "witness," "ministry," "Christian service," toward "peacemaking and intercultural understanding," and as "bridges between churches" (p. 7). Central to these two works in the beginning of the 21st century are attempts to philosophize Christian English teachers' identity that is to be apparent in

foreign language education like ELT. Christian philosophies (e.g., on being Jesus's witness), however, often clash with secular philosophies circulating in ELT.

A Longstanding Debate Over (Covert) Proselytization

Later publications that explore the relationship between Christianity and ELT have begun to debate over one major issue: Christian English teachers run the risk of proselytizing (e.g., Edge, 1996/1997; 2003). By proselytization here I mean one's (say A's) desire to convert another person (say B) to A's religious belief, overtly or covertly, with the degree of imposition being perceived by B (or other people) as non-existent, minimal, tolerable, or unbearable. Even a slight hint of becoming Jesus's witness by sharing one's belief in a Christian interpretation, for instance, may be regarded as proselytizing by non-Christian and Christian people having different interpretations of Jesus's teaching alike.¹ Desire to convert others is often linked to evangelical Christians' "prime beliefs," commonly perceived as the core of their idealized identity. Such beliefs consist of:

crucicentrism, that is, the centrality of Jesus Christ and his 'redeeming work' (Noll, p. 104) and of striving to live as Jesus Christ lived; Biblicism, the reliance on the Bible as the word of God; conversionism, the importance of the personal experience of being reborn or saved; and religious activism. (Varghese & Johnston, 2007, p. 7)

Mission work that is often closely linked to proselytization (and imperialism) has had a long history (see e.g., Varghese & Johnston [2007] for more detail; see also Snow [2013] in a Chinese context). Recently, proselytizing zeal has been strongly associated

with one of evangelical movements called “fundamentalist” Christian (or the “Christian right”) whose lobbying power has been so influential in the United States, especially since George W. Bush’s administration in the early 21st century (Johnston & Varghese, 2006, p. 196; see a similar observation by Stabler-Havener, 2009). Also, “market-driven approaches to ministry” that account for recruitments of (unqualified) Christian English teachers with covert evangelistic agenda have been observed and censured by Chamberlain (2009, p. 47), a Christian scholar.

“All Teachers Proselytize!” (Really?)

An interesting point of debate is raised by Baurain (2007) who states that “[a]ll teachers proselytize in the classroom” (p. 208) and a scholar like Pennycook also preaches the gospel of critical pedagogy zealously (p. 213) the way the Christian missionaries shares Jesus’s gospel. This has been responded to by Morgan (2009), a non-Christian ELT scholar. In Morgan’s view, many critical pedagogues in ELT do not think of critical pedagogy as intense in changing students as evangelistic zeal aiming at proselytizing (or converting non-Christians). Critical pedagogues, according to him, “are more willing to hedge their bets and negotiate how and what the outcome of change will look like” (p. 202). In other words, Morgan does not consider commitment to change to be an absolute for many critical pedagogues, but implies that conversion (to Christianity) is an absolute (see a similar argument by Varghese & Johnston, 2007).

I think Morgan will agree with me that Christian educators or critical pedagogues cannot be essentialized (Johnston, 2009), but from Morgan’s (2009) comparison between Christian educators and critical pedagogues in their commitment to teaching for a change,

one tension emerges. That is, a Christian (or any non-Christian, religious) educator devoted to addressing social justice, the main concern of critical pedagogy, has to reconcile the tension between believing in absolute religious truths (see more discussion on this below), especially those that s/he believes contribute to social justice (e.g., salvation through Jesus will rectify social problems) and moral relativism endorsed by secular critical pedagogues. Canagarajah (2009) has been immersed in this tension over the years. He claims to be an insider of both critical pedagogy and Christian scholarship in ELT, thus rejecting Pennycook and Coutand-Marin's (2003) rigid categories depicting evangelical Christian educators and critical pedagogues as mutually exclusive. Some other ELT scholars have also demonstrated this amalgamation of critical and spiritual pedagogy (see authors in Smith & Osborn's [2007] edited book; e.g., Watzke, Bierling, and Kristjánsson). Despite the possibility of blending critical and spiritual insights into ELT, it is always important that religious/spiritual ELT stakeholders are mindful of people's unfavorable perception of proselytization that may lurk beneath the guise of critical spiritual pedagogy, the theorization of which will be developed under the section of *Theoretical framework* below.

Not All Christian English Teachers are Willing to Proselytize, but... Aren't They?

Overt proselytization has been shunned, at least on paper, by a Christian scholar like Griffith (2004): "I routinely identify myself as a Christian to new classes, but I bend over backward not to proselytize through my teaching" (p. 714). Some Christian English teachers who happened to be U.S. missionaries in Varghese and Johnston's (2007, p. 8) study were also critical about the "corrupt past of missionary work outside of the United

States” which may include coercion in proselytizing. Commitment to adhering only to learning objectives prevented one Christian English teacher working as a missionary in China (Cynthia), as reported in Wong (2013), from including a discussion about Christmas in the classroom. She said: “Our finals ended before Christmas, and there was nothing that they needed to know about Christmas for the final so I didn’t try to fit it in” (p. 23).

But two dilemmas remain for both evangelical and non-evangelical Christians. First, when a Christian English teacher happens to be an “evangelical” that upholds the prime belief of converting non-Christians at all cost, is TESOL the right profession for her or him in the first place (Robison, 2009)? Second, even if a Christian English teacher does not directly proselytize, at least that is what may be claimed (e.g., by Griffith [2004]), to what extent is disclosure about the teacher’s faith perceived as (covert) proselytization or otherwise by fellow colleagues and students who are Christians and non-Christians alike?

Both questions need to be addressed empirically. In the current literature there is a normative sense that conversionist Christian English teachers should not be in the TESOL profession, or at least challenged (Varghese & Johnston, 2007). Still unclear is whether they negotiate this conversionism, and if yes, how they problematize that, as they (or in order for them to) stay in the profession. The boundary of whether something is regarded as proselytization or not is also not always very clear-cut. Purgason (2004) encourages all teachers, not only Christians, to be transparent “about their identities and purposes” (p. 711). However, Edge (2004) incisively figures out that while Purgason

(2004) calls for transparency, she does “not explicitly [condemn] covert evangelism” (Edge, 2004, p. 718). In another article Purgason (1994) states that “students will not hear what the teacher says as propaganda or proselytizing” as long as all ideas by students are “welcomed, encouraged, and appreciated” (p. 240). What is missing in this argument is power that Christian English teachers exercise when they are in class. Although Christian English teachers accommodate all ideas by their students, it is not always obvious whether these ideas are those that these teachers want to hear (Ferris, 2009), in order for the students to get good grades, for instance, or those that the students sincerely intend to say in view of their religious beliefs (Christianity and non-Christianity alike) or agnosticism. Just letting all ideas be expressed in class is not sufficient. In Kubota’s (2004) view, treating all students as equal, and by implication has the same opportunities to express their views, is a “liberal [multiculturalist]” stance that overlooks power relations between the teacher and the students, or between the students themselves, especially those embracing different religious faiths, or expressing different Christian interpretations.

The conundrum of “absolute truths.” Also controversial in Purgason’s (1994) view, though at the time expressed to a Christian audience, is her aphorism: “Offer the bait.” She explains: “As fishers of men, we can offer the bait in class and see which fish bite” (p. 240) and expect that sharing about Christian truths might be done outside class (Purgason, 1997). A Christian English teacher in Pasquale’s (2013) recent study, interestingly, also uses this “bait” metaphor: “English is the bait, I guess, and we are the fishermen, and God is the hook” (p. 148). This analogy of bait and fish may accentuate

power relations that position Christian English teachers as the giver of (Christian absolute) truth and the students as the receiver of truth.

In light of Morgan (2009), positioning students as receivers potentially converted may nurture “transactional” talk and not “interactional dialogue.” As he puts it: “Dialogue may purport to be *interactional*, whereby participants allow themselves to be re-formed as a consequence, but in effect remain stubbornly *transactional*, where predetermined values are guardedly exchanged without any intention of change” (p. 197, italics in original). Offering the bait of Christian truth seems to presuppose that the Christian English teachers’ truth claims are at best shared with, not necessarily exchanged in equal terms, or at worst guardedly imposed, however subtle, on the students. The latter is a “subtractive” approach to viewing religions (e.g., Christianity is the best and the most correct belief, ready to be bitten by non-Christian fish), which non-Christian scholars (Kubota, 2009; Mahboob, 2009) find off-putting when encountering their (former) conversionist Christian friends. Emphasizing religious absolute truths, in Ramanathan’s (2009) view, also displays religious arrogance. Rather than using the metaphor of offering the bait and which fish bite, I find Stevick’s argument (1996/1997), more acceptable as a starting point: sharing religious beliefs genuinely should not “force or pressure other people to accept” the beliefs but to “make [the beliefs] attractive and available in a free market” (p. 6). The next step is to identify how the “marketplace of ideas” (Robison, 2009, p. 263) from ESL/EFL teachers and students alike, regardless of religious faiths or agnosticism, is taken advantage of to re-form, if not trans-form, their initial beliefs as a consequence. Kubota (2009) goes further by arguing that in an additive

approach to religion one may maintain her or his religious faith “while affirming and critically understanding multiple views and practices that shape people’s social and cultural identities.” This, in her view, “transcends mere religious tolerance or sensitivity” (p. 233).

While Kubota’s (2009) and Mahboob’s (2009) argument for the additive approach to religion is laudable, it still does not address how religious (especially Christian) absolutes or certainties (e.g., Jesus is “the way and the truth and the life” [John 14:6, New International Version/NIV]; “You shall not murder” [Exodus 20:13]) are to be handled. Do “evangelical” Christians, for example, have to restrain as much as possible from sharing their certainties, as implied by Pennycook and Coutand Marin (2003), and Pennycook and Makoni (2005)? Liang’s (2009) answer must be no, as he argues that “teaching is not without a purpose; it is to lead students to the truth and to bring them in awe of the truth, so they can live out the truth in their lives” (p. 168). Different than Liang, Ferris (2009) is not very comfortable with the idea that teachers are agents of “moral, social, or political change” (p. 212), as suggested by Baurain (2007), Johnston (2003), or Pennycook and Coutand-Marín (2003), for instance. Ferris (2009) may not concur with Baurain’s (2007) contention that “[a]ll teachers proselytize in the classroom, that is, whether consciously or unconsciously, they try to persuade students by words and actions to accept their beliefs and values” (p. 208). Rather, Ferris (2009) is more focused on improving students’ mastery of content and skills, and not very much interested in “persuad[ing] [students] to adopt [her] worldview on *any* issue, whether it be care for the environment, equality for women or homosexuals, war, poverty, oppression, gun

control—or my [Christian] faith” (p. 212). She makes an exception in the context of Christian schools where explicit Christian goals and contents may exist. In the United States, her exception is fine.

In other contexts (e.g., Indonesia), however, Christian schools or universities enroll a lot of non-Christian students, the question remains as to whether Christian certainties or absolutes transpire in ELT classrooms. If yes, it is still worthwhile to inquire into why religious (not only Christian) absolutes are brought up by ELT stakeholders in non-Western settings. For Christian educators or students, is it because the “prime underlying purpose was to bring non-believers to Christ,” like what the evangelical Christian English teachers in Varghese and Johnston’s (2007) study all agree? And if this is the reason, do non-Western Christian English teachers or students also agree with some U.S.-based ESL Christian English teachers that “the right way was not attempt conversion of others outright, but rather to *plant seeds*” (p. 18 italics in original), which is akin to Purgason’s (1994, 1997) metaphor of offering the bait, inside or outside of classroom contexts? What about conversion to other religious beliefs: Do non-Christian English language teachers or students think of planting seeds, too? If no religious absolutes are raised, does it have anything to do with fear? Or reluctance? Or no attempt prioritize religious values in ELT? For non-Western Christian English teachers, in particular, do they feel that they can (or have the right to) teach or have taught English as a missionary language, to borrow Pennycook and Coutand-Marin’s (2003) phrase, just like Western missionaries did in the past or are probably still doing? Will these non-

Western Christian English teachers challenge the “*rightness* of [winning converts]” at all (Varghese & Johnston, 2007, p. 27, italics in original)? Why? Or why not?

A Self-Reflexive Stance on Proselytizing

Another possible line of inquiry is for ELT stakeholders embracing different faiths to reflect upon “a very fine line between open discussion of [controversial] issues or ideas and manipulation” (Ferris, 2009, p. 212) or proselytization, especially in classroom settings. Brown (2009) provides some “guidelines for dealing with controversial issues in the classroom.” Guidelines are not to be perceived as fixed rules and should be open to negotiation or problematization. In fact, a guideline can be very normative and hence problematic. For instance, “[e]vangelical ESL professionals must begin to write curriculum and influence curriculum design. Materials need to address issues of right and wrong... Materials need to be available that focus on absolutes, truth, and goodness” (McCarthy, 2000, p. 315). In broader terms, the question is how power relations are negotiated and reflected upon by these ELT stakeholders when controversial issues, including those that may touch upon religious absolutes, are discussed, if at all, in class or curriculum development. The negotiation or problematization may occur in oneself in the form of self-reflexivity.

Being more self-reflexive than her earlier work (1994) which I critiqued above, Purgason (2009) calls for Christian English teachers to “be like Jesus who relinquished power and who came to serve” (p. 188). She also illustrates her commitment to be humble:

When a student says something about what Muslims believe and I add a comment about what Christians believe, does it come across as respectful, interested, informative, and gentle? Or do I sound shrill, defensive, or pressuring? The impact of what I say may be very different on my students from what I perceive.
(p. 188)

This questioning also seems to be related to her earlier argument: “If you talk about Christian holidays, also talk about Muslim holidays” (Purgason, 1997, p. 62). In 1997, she implied that Christianity came first (Christian holidays), then another religion (Muslim holidays). In 2009, she asked herself if bringing up Christianity was problematic, even after something about another religion (Islam) was raised. Apart from Purgason, the issue of Christian holidays (e.g., Easter and Christmas) emerge again in Wang-McGrath’s (2013) study. One teacher in this study had “a difficult moment of inner conflict” because she thought that such holidays “could not be appropriately presented without a full picture of their religious significance” (p. 42). Carol, the teacher, seemed to be not interested in proselytizing. The larger dilemma, however, is whether Christian English teachers like Carol is being truthful about their Christian identity when they do not share the gospel:

To be a Christian is to believe that the greatest good achievable is to know God through Jesus Christ; and Christian teachers who are genuinely concerned for their students lack integrity if they do not desire that they also come to know God.
(p. 263)

The question then becomes how is it that some Christian English teachers reconcile the tension between evangelical conversionism, if they embrace this interpretation of the Bible, and the necessity of being self-reflexive about whatever beliefs they have?

The necessity of being aware of undesirable proselytizing, which has been raised in the literature reviewed thus far, cannot be understated. Nonetheless, restricting the discussion about integrating spirituality into ELT to the danger of proselytization may deprive ELT stakeholders of fruitful ways in which their spiritual identities enrich their own lives and their interaction with each other. Recall that in a Foucauldian view, power is not simply repressive but it may also be used in a productive way (Pennycook, 2001), e.g., to produce knowledge or to resist. Without failing to notice the issue of proselytizing and other negative impacts associated with religious traditions, it is worth asking how power (relations) between ELT stakeholders having spiritual values can be negotiated for achieving a common good, despite potential conflicts along the way.

If Not about Proselytizing, then What?

Teaching Excellence and Professionalism

Being Christian English teachers is not only about proselytizing. One defense that Christian scholars (e.g., Ferris, 2009; Pasquale, 2013; Purgason, 2009; Wong, 2009) express beyond the issue of proselytizing is for teachers to demonstrate (English language) teaching excellence or professionalism. It is hypothetically possible that proselytization is conflated by some Christian English teachers with teaching excellence, or that the former is subsumed within the latter, which is subject to problematization. However, being too suspicious that any attempt to be pedagogically excellent boils down

to proselytizing is unhealthy. Moreover, Byler (2009) argues, which I agree, that “other [i.e., ‘non-fundamentalist’] Christians oppose the views and actions of the pro-American religious right, focusing instead on building strong cross-cultural communication and partnerships” (p. 120). In an optimistic tone, she also suggests that “many [Christian English teachers] have a very different perspective, and how their religious faith can be a great asset [e.g., for promoting tolerance, reconciliation, and building meaningful relationships] rather than detriment” (pp. 122, 125; see also Smith & Carvill, 2000; Snow, 2001).

The Christian caucus in the U.S.-based TESOL organization might be established to accommodate professionalization of Christian English teachers, although it was then disestablished in 2008 by the TESOL board. One explanation for the termination of the caucus is associated with “‘legal concerns’ of discrimination and fears that people would think TESOL supported Christianity over other religions” (Wong, Dörnyei, & Kristjánsson, 2013, p. 4). This might not be the only explanation, especially because other caucuses, including the LGBT caucus, were dissolved at the same time.² The main question here is how professionalization of spiritually inspired (including Christian) English teachers is made sense of and implemented in ELT settings, regardless of the existence, or lack thereof, of a formal organization like the Christian caucus in TESOL.

Toward Interactional Dialogue and Beyond

Rather than being confrontational all the time (especially to the pro-American right Christians), I find “interactional dialogue” (Morgan, 2009) in “non-judgmental discourse” (Edge, 2009) between ELT stakeholders expressing different ways of being

spiritual more desirable. Similar to Morgan (2009), Johnston (2009) introduces the notion of “exploratory dialogue” to refer to “true dialogue [which] serves the dual function of giving participants voice and allowing exposure to the voices of others, leading to the mutual shaping of ideas and views” (p. 36). Johnston, as well as Pennycook (2009), has been pessimistic that such a dialogue can ever happen between (evangelical) Christian and secularly oriented critical English language educators. However, such a dialogue may come about between ELT stakeholders embracing different religious faiths.

In explicating the deconstruction or reconstruction of “missionary” English teacher identity, Wong (2009) projects a “hopeful” Christian English teacher identity who has the following characteristics:

global: to emphasize an understanding of and need for diverse perspectives

Christian: to mark my spiritual identity

professional: to stress the importance of being qualified, skilled, and knowledgeable

language: to convey [sic] sensitivity to English's domination and the importance of all languages and not just English

teacher: to note our role, responsibility, and vocation (pp. 98-99)

Envisaging the role of spirituality that is inclusive to Christianity or other religious traditions, Wong (2009) calls for more attention to “how... non-Western teachers avoid the spiritual/secular dualism found in the West and engage in a pedagogy that is holistic” (p. 94). Inherent in holistic pedagogy, in my opinion, are productive power relations in which ELT stakeholders build upon each other’s spiritual views through English

language teaching and learning inside or outside of classroom settings, without overlooking one's potentiality of undesirably proselytizing others. Although not in the context of ELT per se, the following anecdote by a U.S. missionary in China is a hopeful scenario ELT stakeholders may aim for:

... I had these feelings about Muslims and stuff like that, but these people were not like that. They were tender. They cared for me. Welcomed me and they knew we were Christians. And one day the uncle came up to me and said 'Christians and Muslims should be friends.' And he said to me, 'no matter what happens to you, keep and nurture your faith, keep your faith intact.' And I left there feeling exhorted, encouraged and blessed in a way that I had not in many churches.

(Wong, 2009, interview conducted with "Jacques" March 17, 2008, central China)

(Wong, 2009, p. 102)

Insights from L1 composition classrooms in the U.S. contexts with regard to religion and academic writing can be relevant to L2 teaching and learning (especially writing) contexts in my study. Lei and Kyburz (2005) in their edited volume on the whole argue that dialogue between secular educators and religious students, or between students having different religious faiths, should be nurtured. This requires reflexivity on students' and teachers' parts. The teachers, like Williams (2005), was reflexive of his "Western secular culture" that is incompatible with his Islamic student's values (p. 114). Secular teachers need to attend to their students' religious voices, too (Goodburn, 1998; Lei, 2005; Perkins, 2001; Rand, 2001), while at the same time teach, coach, or mentor students to inquire into their religious faiths self-reflexively (Anderson, 1989; Dively,

1993). The challenge is how religious students can be inquiring scholars without abandoning their affirmation of religious faiths (Downs, 2005). Other L1 composition scholars suggest that blending religious discourse and academic language is possible (e.g., “rhetorical arts” and “religious convictions” [Hansen, 2005, p. 32]; “using writing to engage students in critical thinking about their own and other students’ religious beliefs” [Montesano & Roen, 2005, p. 84]; using African-American Vernacular English with its “sermonic discourse” academically [Peters, 2005]). With specific regard to TESOL, applied linguists need to address how English language teachers and learners strategize discursive ways of composing English written and spoken discourse in which being spiritually self-reflexive is constructed non-verbally, if any, and verbally at lexical, syntactical, and discourse levels.

Personal Language Learning and Teaching Motivation

Recent work on the role of religious motivation in assisting foreign language acquisition (Lepp-Kaethler & Dörnyei, 2013; Ushioda, 2013) is also relevant to address the question of how to negotiate religious identities through ELT. The issue of power relations may come into play again, as a double-edged sword. On the one hand, the motivation of embedding sacred texts in assignments or class discussion needs to be negotiated and problematized, especially when ELT stakeholders use such texts for manipulating and proselytizing. On the other hand, when the motivation of embedding sacred texts are to enrich classroom discussion, to help others or themselves to acquire English, and to solidify, as well as to reshape, their spiritual identities in ways deemed desirable, then there is no reason to prevent them from being motivated as such.

The motivation of amalgamating spiritual and social justice in class (Mambu, 2010; Smith & Osborn, 2007) is also possible, and might even be endorsed by law (e.g., in Indonesia). But how this fusion is done in class, in particular, is nonetheless subject to constant scrutiny. Otherwise, coercing students into accepting truth claims in the name of critical pedagogy or spirituality may occur.

Entering a Christian-Based Educational Institution for One Reason or Another

Based on a documentation he had, Canagarajah (2004) brought to my attention the story of his own community in Sri Lanka during colonial times when “locals adopted a double-faced behavior of pretending to be Christians outwardly, but maintaining a vigorous life as Hindus within the local community in in-group circles” (pp. 121-122). These locals pretended to be Christians so they could be successful educationally and professionally.

There are many cases, based on my observation in Indonesia, that non-Christian (EFL) students or even educators enter Christian-based (EFL teacher education) institutions. Christian students or educators, however, on the whole do not enter similar institutions that are Islamic-based, in particular. Apart from questioning what the main reason for entering Christian institutions is, I find it important to know how the non-Christian English language students or educators negotiate their identities with Christian colleagues or friends.

Perpetuating “Colonial Legacy”

Reflecting upon her own autobiography, Vandrick (2013) analyzed 17 memoirs of fellow Western “missionary kids” (MK) who grew up in various parts of the world

outside North American contexts. Apart from proselytizing, “colonial legacy” takes the forms of 1) exoticizing non-Western people, animals, weather, or diseases and 2) showing off superiority toward a) local servants or b) local Christians. When EFL teacher educators are non-Western Christians, the question is to what extent they share missionaries or MK mentality, by perpetuating some forms of colonial legacy through ELT, and are critical about such colonial legacy.

A Transitory Conclusion

Based on the above review, the issue of proselytization is still not fully resolved, or will never be (at least in some contexts). For instance, negotiating one's identity as a Christian English language educator or student who is responsible for sharing the Gospel in any means, be it through overt proselytization or “offering the bait,” can be a source of struggle, even when one decides not to share it altogether. Apart from proselytizing, when a religious institution is inhabited by ELT stakeholders embracing different faiths, this question emerges: How do English teachers, Christian or otherwise, negotiate their professionalism and, as Kubanyiova (2013, p. 89) will also ask, their religious identities through dialogues in classrooms or with colleagues elsewhere? The questions on proselytizing and negotiating one's religious identities become even more prominent in a context where issues of religious values and/or social justice/transformation attract people's attention (e.g., an anecdote reported by Chan [2013, p. 215]) or should be part of (ELT) curriculum (e.g., Indonesia). Addressing these questions is timely, especially because recently the importance of, and call for reflecting on, teachers' beliefs, values, and philosophies in TESOL have been raised (Borg, 2006; Crookes, 2009; Johnston,

2003). In the following section I will develop a theoretical framework, with critical spiritual pedagogy as the starting point, because it is the most explicit theoretical lens that endorses the incorporation of spiritual values into (critical) pedagogy.

Theoretical Framework

In the literature of general (and religious) education (see chapter 1 for the brief review), the difficulty of defining and taking advantage of spirituality in education has been acknowledged. However, Shahjahan's (2004, 2010) study in Canada, among others, has offered a promising path for incorporating spirituality, not only Christianity, into education in general and, I would argue, ELT in non-Western settings potentially practiced by local teachers and students (who might interact with Western missionaries in some contexts). Springing from an assumption that (spiritual) identities are likely to change due to intrapersonal and interpersonal dialogues (Bakhtin, 1981), I will unpack a theoretical framework for the current study for making a case that spirituality is an important asset in ELT, under a condition that its interpretation and expression are subject to scrutiny by oneself and others. The framework is inspired by the literature on critical spiritual pedagogy, critical applied linguistics, and language teacher and student identity.

Critical Spiritual Pedagogy

The term critical spiritual pedagogy is borrowed from Ryoo et al. (2009) who consider humanity, power, and spirituality as three key concepts. Humanity refers to "the totality of one's experience of being human within varying socio-historical contexts and specific power relations." In view of critical pedagogy, experiences of being oppressed,

Othered, exploited, and “coerced into maintaining existing relations of power and privilege” (p. 133) are problems of humanity that need to be posed, challenged, and changed. Through problem-posing dialogues (see also Freire, 2000; Oldenski, 2002), Ryoo et al. (2009) believe teacher-student hierarchy can be eradicated and in unity students become agents of social change. Critical praxis or reflective thought and action is a crucial element in problem-posing dialogue (Freire, 2000). The praxis in critical pedagogy is devoted to examining students' socio-historical relations of power that account for societal inequality or injustice in terms of sexuality, gender, race, and class, and actively re-shaping history with their agency through (political) action.

Being careful as to not to base their theory on one religious tradition (particularly Christianity), Ryoo et al. (2009) discuss spirituality in broad terms. As already mentioned in chapter 1, spirituality depicts “a commitment to a philosophy of becoming” (p. 135), especially the process of becoming an Other in order for oneself to be able to empathize with the Other with *agape* (or sacrificial) love and to transcend oneself (e.g., from “fragmentation” to “integrity,” from “Othering” to “community,” from “exploitation” to “love” [pp. 137-142]). To illustrate, reliance on high-stakes testing only makes students fragmented because their emotional and spiritual identities are denied. Striking a balance between mind, body, and spirit in learning (and teaching) is a necessary attempt to achieve integration, thus eliminating fragmentation. An example of Othering is when non-mainstream students (e.g., black students in a predominantly white school) experience denigration of humanity due to their class, sexuality, gender, race, and language. To counter Othering, Ryoo et al. suggest that all students and teachers relate

interdependently as a community. “Such interdependence does not mean dependence *upon* one another, but rather connection *to* one another for the better of the community as a whole” (p. 138, italics in original). It is spirituality, according to Ryoo et al., that the dichotomy between self and other can be annihilated, praxis in education can be reinforced in an interdependent community, and “Othering experiences” (or experiences of being Othered) can be healed (p. 139).

Ryoo et al. (2009) acknowledge critiques leveled against critical pedagogy (e.g., predominantly theorized with Western epistemologies by white male scholars, and no discussion about spirituality). In Ryoo et al.’s view, however, these critiques only strengthened critical pedagogy. How indigenous epistemologies can enrich critical spiritual pedagogy is also discussed, by using Dei’s (2002) example in an African context. An important element of indigenous epistemology is the incorporation of students’ indigenous knowledge, spiritual traditions, and lived experiences of being oppressed or marginalized, which are grounded in daily practices in a community where they live, as learning materials at school. Following Love and Talbot, who are cited in Cuyjet, Ryoo et al. recommend that instructors need to:

- Reflect on their own spirituality
- Be open to the various notions of spirituality that students bring to campus
- Acknowledge that some students are deeply emotionally invested in their spiritual element of their lives
- Admit the need for training to equip them to deal with the spiritual development of the student. (p. 139)

These recommendations are relevant to Wong's (2009) call for a more holistic foreign/English language pedagogy that shatters the dichotomy between secular and spiritual in Western academia. I also have a similar stance to that of Wong in my earlier work (Mambu, 2010). In particular, I explore how critical and spiritual pedagogy is a viable approach to teaching a foreign language like English. Elsewhere (Mambu, 2011) I suggested using an Indonesian movie, with English subtitles, that integrates both critical and faith- (i.e., Islam-)based views. One of inspiring statements in the movie was uttered by Pak Harfan, a poor and yet idealist elementary school teacher in Belitong: "This school is where religious and moral lessons are not merely there to complete the curriculum. The students' intelligence here is not just measured by grades or numbers, but also by their hearts" (p. 153). Although this statement may have been fictitious, the gist reflects local Indonesian (especially Muslim) idealism about quality education. However, I have yet to address how the movie is considered usable at all by EFL students in class. Social justice and Christianity has also been spotlighted in Bierling's (2007) position article where religiously accented, touching stories told by Hispanic illegal immigrants in the United States can be used in a Spanish class in the United States. These works, however, are still limited to conceptualizing what is possible, or at the realm of "untested feasibility" (Freire, 2000, p. 102).

It does not mean there is no study in a setting other than ELT that has tackled this. Smith, Young, Uyaguari, and Avila (2007) used (auto)biographical narratives to be reflected upon by students in their foreign language (i.e., Spanish and German) classrooms in the United States. One of the narratives was used not only for the students

to learn its content, but also grammar (e.g., “[W]rite what you think Romero did in each situation based on your reading from last night in order to defend your response. Make sure your sentences are in the preterite or imperfect tense!!!” [p. 128]). In observing foreign language teaching textbooks he had used, Smith (2007) lamented:

... the visions of life ... conveyed by my teaching texts were extremely reductive. ... The characters who inhabited the textbooks shopped, ate, played, went on vacation..., but they never suffered, hoped, believed, doubted, prayed, wept, sacrificed for a cause or died... I could not equate images of shallow consumers with persons as images of God... [H]ow could I honor the humanity of my own students by framing their emerging discourses in the target language in such reductive terms? (p. 41)

None of these studies, however, has really touched upon how ELT stakeholders negotiate and problematize power relations that are closely linked to their religious identities.

Liberation theology. Overall, the works reviewed in the previous section might support “liberation theology” which “attempts to integrate both theory and praxis from the perspective of a faith community” (Oldenski, 2002, p. 145) and is committed to “the oppressed and the marginalized” (p. 148). Paulo Freire is a central figure in developing liberation theology and influenced (and was even influenced) by Catholic priests who devoted their lives to teaching the illiterates in Brazil around 1960s. During its growth in Latin America, liberation theology “rejects the dominating theological discourses of a pervasively Eurocentric cultural experience of religion, spirituality, and even church... .” It cherishes “everyday experiences as a source of power, theology, and spirituality” (p.

148). In translating Jesus into action, liberation theology promotes social justice, social transformation, and “values diversity” instead of “a monocultural religious practice and theological discourse” (p. 149). Christianity, however, has its own “liberation theology” (e.g., Maggay, 1996), which may not be as religiously inclusive as Oldenski’s (2002) vision of liberation theology and critical pedagogy.

Arguing that liberation theology and critical pedagogy are compatible, Oldenski (2002) suggests the following integrative model:

A. CRITICAL DISCOURSE describing my ‘present’ world and its problems

1. Something is wrong with my world.
2. I want to make it:
 - a. better;
 - b. different; and
 - c. more caring than it now is, thus more humane and just.

B. METHOD producing change

1. A methodology for changing ‘my current world’ to ‘my new world’ would:
 - a. develop an awareness of those conditions that spoil my current world and, therefore, require change; and
 - b. propose solutions that could transform my current world.
2. That methodology would also suggest implementation for creating my new world.

C. Both Liberation Theology and Critical Pedagogy offer these benefits. They:

1. begin with a concern for the poor and the oppressed;
2. encourage solidarity with the poor and oppressed in developing a humane and just community;
3. offer hope;
4. offer change in how I see myself and my world; and
5. perpetuate themselves even as they achieve change. (pp. 159-160)

Critical applied linguistics insights into critical spiritual pedagogy. Promising though it may seem, critical spiritual pedagogy (including liberation theology) is, in light of Pennycook's (2001) notion of critical applied linguistics, not free from problematization. Ryoo et al. (2009) may argue that critiques to critical pedagogy have not "weakened" it; critical pedagogy even "continues its path of amelioration" (p. 135). They, like Freire (2000), also presuppose that "problem-posing dialogue... dissolves the teacher/student hierarchy" (Ryoo et al., 2009, p. 134). However, before being too certain about the merit of critical spiritual pedagogy, it is vital to know its possible limitations.

Unpacking power relations even more. Quite long ago, and it is still relevant, Ellsworth (1989) objects to critical pedagogy, especially in terms of teacher-student relation and hierarchy. To begin with, the expectation of being "fully rational subjects" on the part of both teachers and students may be too unrealistic, and may put anyone not able to think rationally as an "exotic Others" (p. 301). Besides, it is often the critical pedagogue "who enforces the rules of reason" (i.e., rationality) in the classroom (p. 304). More provocatively, Ellsworth states:

Literary criticism, cultural studies, post-structuralism,... and media studies have by now amassed overwhelming evidence of the extent to which the myths of the ideal rational person and the ‘universality’ of propositions have been oppressive to those who are not European, White, male, middle class, Christian, able-bodied, thin, and heterosexual. (p. 304)

Put simply, students (especially if they are not European, White, Christian, and so forth) may feel oppressed by demands of being “the ideal rational person” in learning subject matters as cultural studies. I do not think Ellsworth intends to wipe out these subject matters. On the contrary, her point is that learners are situated in an imbalanced (rational) power relation with the subject matter that is often embodied and enforced by teachers, who will then “bring the student ‘up’ to the teacher’s level of understanding” (p. 306). While upgrading students’ level of understanding is not necessarily negative, the problem is when such upgrading is regarded as “student empowerment” only in terms of rationality. In critiquing Shor and Freire, Ellsworth questions the notion of “emancipatory theory” which presupposes that teachers knows the subject matter better than the students do. She does not know how it really is for black students to experience racism, says Ellsworth. Furthermore, a teacher (including a critical pedagogue) cannot always speak on behalf of the students. A white pedagogue, for instance, may even be “put at risk... by the demands and defiances of student voices,” especially when the students are black (p. 309). When critical scholars argue that sharing in dialogue is possible, it is not always that easy: “... women of color, men of color, White men against masculinist culture, fat people, gay men and lesbians... do not speak of the oppressive formations that condition

their lives in the spirit of ‘sharing’” (p. 310). In fact, imposing sharing on students so that they speak up and teachers can listen to the students’ voices fully may be perceived as “voyeuristic,” especially when the “voice of the pedagogue himself [or herself] goes unexamined” (p. 312). Another interpretation is that what students express is not necessarily their genuine response, but rather what they think will satisfy their teacher.

Some degree of skepticism. Apart from teacher-student relation, critical applied linguistics, in Pennycook's (2001) original thought, casts some skeptical light on grand project of critical pedagogy, or now the integrative model of liberation theology and critical pedagogy (Oldenski, 2002). In view of Friedrich et al. (2013) (see chapter 1), I will not go too far as being deterministically skeptical as Pennycook. Many teachers and students might be skeptical to subscribe to Oldenski’s model. To them, I do not find it fruitful to convert them to believe in what critical spiritual pedagogy proponents do. However, if few colleagues and students share some passion about “encourag[ing] solidarity with the poor and oppressed in developing a humane and just community” (Oldenski, 2002, p. 160), there is no reason to be too skeptical. Still, in my optimism with these few proponents of critical spiritual pedagogy, I may ask: who is/are the “poor and oppressed”? I am eager to reach out to those living in “absolute poverty” (e.g., homeless kids in Indonesia), but even before involving my students to get connected to those living in poverty and teach English, I need to ask if they are religiously or evangelically motivated. If yes, then the outreach project should be put under scrutiny.

Problematizing emancipatory modernism. The Oldenskiian critical spiritual pedagogy falls under the category of *emancipatory modernism*, in light of Pennycook

(2001, 2004). The strength lies in its overtly articulated social critique (e.g., “an awareness of those conditions that spoil my current world” [Oldenski, 2002, p. 159]) and commitment to change the spoiled world. The shortcomings, however, are its “static assumptions about social and political relations” and reliance on “rationalist emancipation” in an attempt to raise the awareness of inequality (Pennycook, 2004, p. 329). By “static assumptions,” Pennycook (2001) refers to “rather simple division between oppressed and oppressors, dominated and dominators,” and “capitalist accumulation as the primary source of power.” From Pennycook’s perspective, the emancipatory modernist project of critical (spiritual) pedagogy may also be regarded as “scientific” in its analysis, so it is problematic because “objectivity and truth” are maintained and not self-reflexively problematized (p. 38). Pennycook seems to be vigilant about teachers’ imposition of their agenda of change on their students.

The last, and yet relevant, criticism to emancipatory modernist projects is its lack of attention to “micro relations” (p. 39) as in conversations or interactions involving teachers and students. Promoting the notion of being critical as a form of “problematizing practice,” Pennycook (2004) insists on “casting far more doubt on the categories we employ to understand the social world and on assumptions about awareness, rationality, emancipation, and so forth” (p. 329). Pennycook was aware of the intricacy arising from such a problematizing practice. That is, the ground on which to position one’s political stance may be too shaky, due to its relativism. But in his opinion, this is also its strength:

As Foucault (1980) put it, ‘the problem is not so much one of defining a political ‘position’ (which is to choose from a pre-existing set of possibilities) but to imagine and to bring into being new schemas of politicisation’ (p. 190). (p. 330)

“A pre-existing set of possibilities” here may refer to simplistic categories like “the oppressed” vs. “oppressors.” “New schemas of politicization” push us to think beyond simplistic binaries or, in light of Pavlenko (2004), “[essentialized dichotomies]” including those of gender. In early feminist work on linguistics interaction, the schemas for analyzing gender-related language “cultural feminism” and “material feminism.” The former focuses on “gender differences in language learning and use,” and the latter on “male dominance in interaction” (p. 54). Both schemas are problematic because men and women (or boys and girls) are essentialized, such that the essentialization may imply that one’s gender determines the amount or kind of talk. Pavlenko’s new schema of politicization is her “critical feminism” (p. 55). Contrary to earlier work that indicates male dominance in interaction, for instance, in Willett’s study on four ESL children in a mainstream classroom (as cited in Pavlenko, 2004), it was found that a working class boy’s interaction was very limited compared to that of his friends, the three middle class girls. Although all four children scored the same on Bilingual Syntax Measure, it was the three girls who were allowed to exit the ESL program. It turned out that the boy’s limited interaction had something to do with his class, which is relatively more “underprivileged” (in this context) than his three female friends whose class backgrounds were relatively closer to the mainstream culture. Similar restriction to class interaction has also been found among immigrant school girls. The larger issue here, in sum, is the danger of

essentializing identities, an issue that will be revisited under the section of *Language teacher and student identity* below.

Delving into critical moments. Pennycook's (2004) determination to challenge the emancipatory modernist project culminates in what I consider to be his new schema of politicization: being "critical as in a critical moment, a point of significance, an instant when things change." His involvement in observing teaching practicum in the outskirts of Sydney, Australia, led him to find "critical moments when [he] seize[d] the chance to do something different, when [he] realize[d] that some new understanding is coming about" (p. 330). Out of four critical moments he reflected upon, I will choose one to discuss very briefly here. Pennycook was observing Bob, a reading teacher, who used an American text (in an Australian classroom!). The story in the text revolves around a happy ending of migration from China to the United States, a country which is described as an "accommodating place that will bend visa rules." This American story was given to Bob's students "around the same time a recent immigrant to Australia had burned himself to death" upon hearing that his family would be prevented from joining him (p. 336). Pennycook did not explain why Bob chose that text, but this is his punchline: "no text is ever innocent" (p. 337). Likewise, no presence of a Christian/critical/spiritual teacher in class is ever innocent; neither are students. They exercise power to resist each other, or to produce knowledge collaboratively. And when one's religious identity constitutes a nexus of other related identities assigned to her or himself or by others, how does the person negotiate these identities in one context (e.g., classroom) to another over time?

Wong's (2013) longitudinal study has explored some stability and evolution in U.S. Christian English teachers' identity formation as missionaries in China over the span of approximately ten years. Her theoretical framework is based on Lave and Wenger's notion of communities of practice, a theoretical lens that allows Wong to look into "participation that is first legitimately peripheral but that gradually increases in engagement and complexity" (p. 13). This framework, however, may not be as sensitive to power relations as critical applied linguistics. In fact, in concluding her study, Wong recommends that further studies will need to address power and identity in more depth. In the following section, I will discuss how language teacher (and student) identity has been theorized in the literature and suggest in what ways theorization of identity can complement critical applied linguistics in identifying ELT stakeholders' negotiation and problematization of power relations, which are aligned with spiritual identities, in class or elsewhere.

Language Teacher and Student Identity

In their work on language teacher identity, which I believe is relevant to tap into student identity as well, Varghese et al. (2005) provide an outline of three major and interrelated themes of how language teacher identity has been theorized in their (and others') works over the years:

1. Identity as multiple, shifting, and in conflict;
2. Identity as crucially related to social, cultural, and political context; and
3. Identity being constructed, maintained, and negotiated primarily through discourse. (p. 35)

These themes have been addressed, or neglected, in various degrees when researchers embark upon certain theoretical perspectives of identity. In their review, Varghese et al. (2005) discuss three strands of theorizing identity: “Tajfel’s (1978) social identity theory, Lave and Wenger’s (1991) theory of situated learning, and Simon’s (1995) concept of the image-text” (p. 21).

Social identity theory. To begin with, social identity theory is based on a premise that people’s identities can be socially categorized in terms of class, race, nationality, religion, etc. In any social category, there are relations of power and status. One may claim the power or status to be part of her or his identity. One may also be labeled or assigned with an identity by other people. Degrees of membership in one group (e.g., being nonnative English speaking teachers) may reflect one’s prominence or insignificance in claiming an identity. While the strength of this theory is on tapping into teachers’ (or students’) self-perceptions, it depends on “oppositional and static categories” (Varghese et al., 2005, p. 27). I mentioned earlier, in view of Pavlenko (2004), that men and women or boys and girls cannot be essentialized in terms of the amount of talk and their level of dominance in class. Besides, as Varghese et al. (2005) argue, social identity theory is not very sensitive in examining “the evolution of [one’s] identity and the moment-by-moment production of that identity” (p. 27). Put another way, one’s and an interlocutor’s co-construction of identities in a conversation (e.g., joint storytelling) may not be captured (see e.g., Prior, 2011; Talmy, 2011) by means of social identity theory. As Varghese et al. (2005) puts it, this theory “has a positivistic bent,” so

the postmodern approaches to examining “linguistic performativity,” as in co-constructed performance of storytelling, are not best handled by the theory (p. 27).

Some empirical studies on spiritually based identities seem to have been based on this theoretical assumption, though not necessarily mentioned. Such studies include the following: the links between missionary work, evangelical Christianity, and ELT (Varghese & Johnston, 2007); a survey of Christian English teachers in countries that restrict mission work (Loptes, 2009); pre-service and veteran English/foreign language teachers’ beliefs concerning the interrelationship between faith and foreign/English language teaching (Pasquale, 2013); volunteers’ perceptions on how they integrate their faith into a church-run ESOL ministry (Baurain, 2013); stories of four educators envisioning their professional and spiritual selves (Chan, 2013); and faculty members of color in Canada who expressed their experiences in using their spiritual values in class (Shahjahan, 2010). Although the starting point of identity being studied is “static” (i.e., spiritual identities), it has been found that Christian English teachers may not have the same opinion about the integration of faith into ELT (e.g., Loptes, 2009) or that spiritual identities are expressed in a variety of ways, depending on educators’ religious traditions they adhere to (e.g., Shahjahan, 2010). What remains unclear, nonetheless, is how ELT stakeholders’ spiritual/religious identities are negotiated in classroom contexts or elsewhere, and how those identities are inextricably linked to other identities in terms of gender, race, or class.

Theory of situated learning. The second theory of identity discussed by Varghese et al. (2005) is situated learning. It views “learning as an identification process”

in which learners evolve from only marginally participate in a community of practice to full-fledged members (p. 29). The focus of research is not on cognitive processes engaged in the community of practice, but on how members interact with each other and on what kinds of learning emerge as the members are socially involved, especially when novice can learn from more experienced members. The strong point of this theory is its basic assumption that identity is “constructed, not ready-formed” (p. 37), as often statically defined in social identity theory. Besides, in the construction/formation of identity, how one becomes or acquires what s/he wants to identify her or himself with is taken into account. However, the main problem with this theory in education (or even in business where Lave and Wenger’s work is originally situated) is that attention to power relations and different ways members of a community share or live out their ideologies is very limited. Analysis on an apprentice’s formation of identity that ideally is directed toward being a full member has yet to consider the influence of circulating ideologies at institutional, national, and global levels toward identity formation. Similar to the shortcoming of social identity theory, the theory of situated learning does not typically delve into co-construction of identity as performed by a person and her or his interlocutor.

One empirical study in the literature of faith and ELT that is inspired by the theory of situated learning is that of Wong (2013). In her study, Wong investigates the identity formation of U.S. missionaries in China who are also EFL teachers. As she has kept in touch with her research participants since the late 1990s, in 2008 Wong could see what remained the same, or differed from her earlier investigation, in terms of the

teachers' involvement in various communities of practice. There are four clusters of communities: emerging national/political communities (in the United States and in China), emerging professional communities (e.g., constellation of professional language educators, graduate students, local academic colleagues), emerging personal communities (e.g., community of Christian locals), and emerging missional communities (e.g., constellation of evangelicals, missionaries, teacher's mission agency, or financial supporters and church members) (p. 17). Wong also takes other factors impacting the Christian English teachers' pedagogy and professional identity formation into consideration: teaching experiences, cross-cultural experiences, learning experiences, goals/skills/gender/interests/religion of the teacher, the goals of sending organization/supporters, political events, reaction to media, natural disasters, social unrest, relationships with teammates, with Chinese colleagues, personal relationships, administration's goals, classes assigned, textbooks used, national exams, and students' interests, among others (p. 16). This is an excellent study that transcends, to a large extent, the limitation indicated by Varghese et al. (2005): "Issues of access, participation, and social engagement are always reflections of larger institutional, national, and global ideologies, which are not a focus of exploration in situated learning and communities of practice" (p. 31). Wong (2013) is thoughtful, however, to admit one limitation of her study: "An area of need brought out in this study is the lack of awareness in [Christian English] teachers [participating in the study] of issues of power" (p. 26).

Identity as image-text (or teacher identity as pedagogy). According to Varghese et al. (2005), this theory is poststructuralist in nature. To start with, texts are

regarded as “heteroglossic” (Bakhtin, 1981), because in them there are multiple voices that are both “complementary and contradictory” (Varghese et al., 2005, p. 32). By implication, teachers’ or students’ voices are always in a state of flux; their meanings are not fixed. Rather, they can be repeated, re-interpreted, or put into question intrapersonally or interpersonally over time. Identity is hence understood as open-ended performance of self that may have some degree of constancy and change, of which a person may not be aware. For instance, teachers may not be conscious of their inconsistencies, but students can, upon observing the teachers’ behaviors or attitudes. Teacher identity as pedagogy hence allows teachers to be self-reflexive by “being open to new accents, reinterpretation, and critical reading” (p. 35) of themselves, which in turn enables these teachers to avoid certain attitudes or decisions that may threaten or show disrespect to students.

Conformity and resistance to (oppressive) structure are also part of this theory. In performing their identities, students or teachers use their agency to learn how to conform to or resist certain expectations related to identities assigned (or labeled) to them. Also with agency students or teachers can, in Varghese et al.’s (2005) words, “open up identity options not previously imagined, or they can inspire, by example, social practices or forms of participatory citizenship not previously considered” (p. 34).

Varghese et al. (2005) are fair to suggest that typical of postmodern approaches emphasizing on “linguistic and discursive construction of reality” is the difficulty of applying concrete practices outside of language analysis. However, this shortcoming can be its great strength, too. As identities “emerge through and in language” (like in narratives), ELT stakeholders and researchers can better see teachers’ and students’

“multiple facets of identity” as situated in particular contexts. The identification of teachers’ and students’ multifaceted identities will facilitate researchers to see “transformational power (that is, the potential for agency inherent in identity)” (p. 37). In turn, the situated example of transformational power in one context can be used again by stakeholders in the same context, or elsewhere by other stakeholders having similar real-world problems (e.g., discursively analyzed racism in an ESL class; see Talmy, 2010), to learn how to maintain what is desirable and modify or subvert status quo.

To the best of my knowledge, empirical studies on the relationship between spirituality and ELT (or even in general education) reviewed thus far have yet to meet Varghese et al.’s (2005) criteria of researching identity as image-text. Most of these studies (except, to some degree, Wang-McGrath, 2013) are reliant on snippets of interviews in which discursive co-construction of meaning, especially between teachers and students or between teachers and their colleagues, is by and large absent.

Synthesis. Overall, Varghese et al. (2005) do not intend to argue that any of these three theories is more superior than the other two. Rather, they want to explore how these theories can complement each other, which I believe depends on the nature or purpose of one's research on identity.

Based on the three strands of theorizing identity, Varghese et al. (2005) also mention four “substantive areas of interest” in inquiring into language teacher identity: (a) marginalization; (b) the position of nonnative speaker teachers; (c) the status of language teaching as profession; and (d) the teacher-student relation (p. 35). These areas are relevant, in varying degrees, to the question of how ELT stakeholders, especially

nonnative-English-speaking teachers and students from different spiritual backgrounds, negotiate power relations in their milieu.

Some hypothetical scenarios to answer this question are as follows. First, when an interaction occurs between, say, a young Pentecostal lecturer and an older Pentecostal professor, and the context is the young lecturer wants to learn from her older colleague how Christianity is to be integrated into ELT curriculum, a theoretical lens that seems to be relevant is situated learning. Both of them can be seen as belonging to the same community of practice: a Pentecostal church. But the negotiation of power relations due to age difference might still be interesting to analyze. Second, I would like to know how Christian and non-Christian English language educators negotiate their identities and power relations. Though relying on static categories (e.g., Christian vs. non-Christian English teachers), they are but heuristic tools for further analysis. Recall as well the notion of strategic essentialism I brought in the chapter 1. Although Christian and non-Christian English language educators look like a simplistic binary at first glimpse, intricate power relations may be embedded within these two categories. Consider the following hypothetical situations: a young male Christian lecturer of Chinese descent attending a Pentecostal church is interacting with an older female Christian lecturer of half-Javanese half-Chinese descent attending a non-Pentecostal church; a female Christian lecturer of Chinese descent in her 50s is interacting with a male non-Christian full-professor of indigenous descent in his 60s. The cumulative effect of interactions with these configurations, or a myriad of other combinations, cannot be reduced to a simplistic binary power relation like Christian vs. non-Christian. Other markers of one's identities

besides, or even within, her or his claimed religious identity (e.g., racial, gender, professional, or church membership markers) may bear on one's exercise of power in an interaction, which may be modified when interacting with the same exact person or other people in later times. This is where the theory of identity as image-text comes into play: how multifaceted identity of a person is discursively negotiated intrapersonally or interpersonally in a span of hours, days, weeks, months, or even years.

Conclusion

Some agnostic or atheist ELT educators insist: "Don't proselytize!" Easier said than done. Some evangelical Christian teachers or scholars also argue that proselytization is unethical, but it is tricky to know how exactly they define "not proselytize." It is important, therefore, to inquire into how "proselytize" or "not proselytize" is discursively negotiated by Christian and non-Christian students and teachers of English alike, which is not yet sufficiently addressed in the reviewed literature, especially in a country (like Indonesia) where religious values are to be incorporated in curriculum but religious tensions are rampant.

Apart from proselytizing, how ELT stakeholders embracing different spiritual values negotiate the issue of power relations in (a) actualizing professional excellence; (b) interfaith dialogue(s); (c) expressing language learning and teaching motivation; (d) studying in a religious institution; and (e) problematizing "colonial legacy," especially by Christian English teachers, may also constitute promising lines of inquiry.

To address the pervasiveness of power relations due to the possibility of proselytization and other reasons, I synthesize some philosophical frameworks: critical

spiritual pedagogy, critical applied linguistics, and three strands of theorizing teacher (and student) identity. Critical applied linguistics attempts to be critical toward anything, including critical spiritual pedagogy. It is not my intention, however, that some degree of skepticism and self-reflexivity à la critical applied linguistics will obliterate critical spiritual pedagogy. Rather, with critical applied linguistics in mind, critical spiritual pedagogy will not be trapped into simplistic assumptions about power relations (e.g., the nebulous notions of “the oppressed” and “oppressors”), and another modus operandi of proselytizing, either in an “evangelical Christian” (or religious) way or in a rationally based “critical” manner. Theories of investigating teacher or student identities shed more light on nuanced ways identities can be assigned, claimed, negotiated, and problematized intrapersonally and interpersonally within a particular political, cultural, or social context. A fruitful line of inquiry will be on disclosing matches or disparities between an ELT stakeholder’s claimed spiritual identity and her or his performed identity in classroom interactions or elsewhere where ELT stakeholders are embedded within power differentials.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

The purpose of this study is to explore power relations when ELT stakeholders negotiated their religiously associated identities in a Christian EFL teacher education program in Indonesia. The Indonesian constitution (see chapter 1), unlike that in the United States, for example, encourages the incorporation of religious values in education. Consequently, related law or regulations at national and institutional levels, including ELT curriculum, should ideally be in line with the constitution. Religious tensions in Indonesia cannot be overlooked, however. Some Islamic fundamentalists in many parts of Indonesia have attempted really hard to marginalize non-Muslims, and their organized existence has been a source of contention (Bayuni, 2013). Christians in Indonesia, on the other hand, are not free from the label of embracing the religion of past colonialists or the Christian hegemony worldwide. Given this backdrop, this study aims to delve into how ELT stakeholders in the program negotiate their spiritual/religious identities in a context where power relations associated with the identities transpire in educator-educator, student-student, and educator-student interactions. To address the main research question, the following sub-questions will be addressed:

1. What does it mean for an English language educator or a student to embrace her or his spiritual identity, as particularly inspired by a religious faith, in the context of ELT in the Christian EFL teacher education program in Indonesia?
2. How do these stakeholders negotiate power relations due to the (possible) incorporation of spiritual (especially Christian) values into ELT, especially in

light of the country's constitution and related law or regulations and the program's curriculum?

Answers to these questions will be discussed in chapters 4 to 8. To address the questions, I am using a case study method, in which these “key recurring principles” prevail: “... in-depth study, multiple perspectives or triangulation, particularity, contextualization, and interpretation” (Duff, 2008, p. 23). I used protocols for guiding my observation field notes (Appendix A), focus group discussions (Appendix B), and interviews (Appendix C). Relevant documents (e.g., those elicited with a guideline for writing autobiographical narratives of language learning or teaching histories [Appendix D], and institution-mandated curriculum [Appendix E]) were also collected.

Context

Indonesia

This project took place in Indonesia, a country labeled as “the world's largest Muslim democracy” (Baswedan, 2004, p. 669). A country with this religious demographic characteristic is a fruitful site for investigating subtle and obvious tensions that may arise between Christians and non-Christians, especially in the context of ELT. According to the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the population of Indonesia was 253,609,643 by July 2014. This number ranks as the fourth largest population in the world (after China, India, and the United States), with the majority of its population being Muslims (86.1%). Protestants constitute 5.7% of the total population, followed by Roman Catholic 3%, Hindu 1.8%, and other or unspecified spiritual beliefs 3.4% (Indonesia, 2014). Intra-/inter-religious conflicts (especially between Muslims and

Christians), compounded by ethnic tensions, in Indonesia have been documented (e.g., Wilson, 2008), but intricacies of religious power relations in ELT classrooms and their immediate environment (e.g., in an EFL teacher education program) still need to be investigated.

A Christian University in Indonesia

There is a growing number of Christian and Catholic universities in Indonesia. For anonymity reasons, I will call this focal institution Jawara Christian University (JCU), located in Java. I am not the first person to investigate the role of Christianity in Indonesian ELT. Lessard-Clouston (2013) explored how faith, especially Christianity, was integrated in an American Christian University and an Indonesian Christian University (ICU). However, in his study nuanced power relations among stakeholders who have different spiritual views were not examined. Similar to ICU in Lessard-Clouston's study, JCU also has an undergraduate EFL teacher education program.

The students in the EFL teacher education program. JCU is hosting more than 10,000 students from different schools. The majority of the students are *Nasrani* (i.e., Christian and Roman Catholic), but there are also a lot of Muslim students, with few embracing Hindu, Buddhist, or Confucianism. Nasrani students come from different ethnic groups (e.g., Chinese, Javanese, Ambonese, Menadonese, and Papuans). Muslims are typically of Javanese descent, despite their hometowns inside or outside of Java. Balinese can be either Hindus or Christians. Buddhism and Confucianism are almost associated with ethnic Chinese.

The instructors in the EFL teacher education program. There are around 30 active (i.e., non-retired) instructors in the EFL teacher education program. Some are Muslims. Less than 10 are Roman Catholics, and the rest are Christians belonging to different church denominations (e.g., “mainstream” Protestant, and Pentecostal or charismatic churches). The EFL teacher education program at JCU has also had a long tradition of cooperation with a U.S.-based institution that sends its Christian missionaries to JCU as English teachers. There is also an English native speaker, and a Christian missionary, from an English speaking country other than the USA.

In such a milieu where instructors and students come from various religious backgrounds and Christian schools of thought, hegemonic or counter-hegemonic spoken or written discourses concerning one’s stance of the place of spirituality in ELT may circulate covertly or overtly between instructors and students, among students themselves, or among instructors themselves. Therefore, it is incumbent upon me to explain how I position or am situated in these discourses.

My role in the EFL teacher education program. I have had some close contacts with a number of teacher educators at the program (e.g., as friends with similar research interests, or as friends whose published work I read). For students participating in my study, except with Monika (see Table 1), I was almost a complete outsider; I knew almost none of them. With my relative outsider perspective, I could see the Christian students participating in my study perform their relatively genuine (spiritual) selves over the months. Their ideas were not in any way assessed by me through formal grading or classroom participation. With the non-Christian students, however, I realize that their

positive responses about Christianity might have been colored by my presence as a Christian English teacher. They might have wanted to save my positive face as a Christian, in other words. Having had close contacts with some teacher educators made it easier for me to get access to, and maintain prolonged contacts for follow-up interviews with, some of them and their colleagues. In turn, the complexity of their identities were better captured (e.g., that a person attending a “non-evangelical” church could be evangelical in her teaching approach, or vice versa). My insider status as a Christian allowed me to have a shared understanding of biblical texts that some of my Christian participants alluded to during data collection. When analyzing data, my Christian stance, which is more evangelically oriented, has been supported by one of the English native speakers, in particular. My knowledge of critical applied linguistics and some other Christian English teachers’ concern of Christianization, however, have made me more aware of real relations of power, which are associated with my faith, in ELT contexts.

Although I am relatively evangelical, my emic perspective as a Christian has been more complex over the years through the following factors. First, I am still a member of one of the non-Pentecostal Christian churches, as I stated my allegiance to it in 1994 when I was 16. I have also been *de facto* and *de jure* members in Indonesian Pentecostal/charismatic churches since 1997 in Indonesia and was a charismatic church member in Australia (2004-2005) while completing my M.A. Multiple membership to different churches with different doctrines allow me to know strengths and weaknesses of Pentecostal and non-Pentecostal churches alike. My parents’ “non-denominational” stance has also been very influential to me; they are officially members of a non-

Pentecostal church, but they often attended and invited me to go to services in Pentecostal churches. I am still professing my Christianity and am willing to share my spiritual understanding and experiences *only* when people ask me. In Mambu (2010) are some traces of my personal Christian understanding in foreign (especially English) language education.

My current understanding of being Jesus's witness, in particular, is partly informed by Baurain (2007). Concurring with his idea, I reject the notion that witnessing and converting can be conflated. When asked, I am willing to witness about my faith, but I do not want to coerce people to believe what I do and to convert them to be Christian. I also agree with Baurain's position when he quotes Peter, Jesus's disciple: “‘Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect, keeping a clear conscience’ (1 Peter 3:15-16)” (p. 217). Still, I have to be self-reflexive in my interactions with colleagues and students, because what I think is not coercive, might be perceived as such by others.

Gaining Access to the Field

After I obtained IRB approval (see Appendix F) and permission from JCU's rector, the dean and chair at the EFL teacher education program to conduct my study, I asked some teachers if they would allow me to observe their classes. Some of them let me observe their classes. More detail on this, see the *Recruitment Procedure* section below. With help from a faculty member I personally know, I could access to the list of courses offered at the program. I purposively selected “skill courses” (e.g., speaking, reading, and writing classes) and “content courses” on second language teaching (e.g.,

Sociolinguistics, Teaching English as a Foreign Language [TEFL] classes). I intentionally do not select listening courses because they are in a language laboratory where students focus on listening to a tape recorder using headphones. Names of courses can be identifiers of the institution, so I have slightly changed most of the names. Classes that I observed include:

1. Intermediate Speaking (for first-year students),
2. Advanced Speaking (for second-year students),
3. Basic Reading (for first-year students),
4. Intermediate Reading (for second-year students),
5. Basic Writing (for first-year students),
6. Intermediate Writing (for second-year students),
7. Advanced Writing (for second-year students),
8. Professional Writing (for third-year students),
9. L2 Teaching Approaches (for second-year students)
10. TEFL (for second-year students)
11. Psycholinguistics (for second-year students)
12. Sociolinguistics (for second-year students)
13. Communication Across Cultures (for second-year students)

The main reason for choosing these courses is that religious issues may occur as contents of classroom discussions or dialogue journals (e.g., reflections on Islam-Christian conflicts in Indonesia in skill courses like writing, reading, and speaking courses, or discussions about identities, including religiously based identities, in a content

course like Communication Across Cultures). From preliminary observations in the first few weeks of Spring 2014 semester, I got a better sense of which educators and students would be recruited as focal participants whose classes would be observed more closely in subsequent months.

In gaining access to EFL students who might be interested in religious issues, I did not depend on preliminary classroom observations. Rather, since early January 2014, I contacted the head of the students' body and showed him my recruitment script (see Appendix G). He would then suggest some possible names of his friends who might fit the profile that I desired to recruit. After that, he put me in touch with his friends, whom in turn I talked to in person and asked if they would be willing to participate in my study. I discussed and read the consent form with them, and highlighted my interest in understanding how they negotiated their spiritual identities with their friends (or fellow EFL students) and teachers. Most of them agreed to participate and signed the form. One of them has become my focal research participant (i.e., Lucia; see Table 1). In informal, unrecorded meetings, I could listen to their (especially Lucia's) stories of how religious issues emerged in class. I would then ask them to re-tell the story in recorded meetings. Other criteria than some interest in religious issues are discussed in the following *Participants* section.

I did not observe any literary classes (e.g., Prose, or Poetry) which were offered to students in the EFL teacher education program. However, conversations with students who are my focal participants (e.g., Lucia and Monika; see Table 1) led me to extend my research net to include instructors in the EFL teacher education program at JCU who

have a primary interest in teaching English literature and are spiritual (e.g., Mustika; see Table 1).

Participants

Criteria for Selecting Participants

Criterion sampling is used in this case study when recruiting my participants. The criteria are as follows. First, non-Protestant students and lecturers were prioritized, so as to fulfill the “maximum variation sampling” in terms of religious beliefs (Glesne, 2006, p. 35). In JCU, there were some Christian, Catholic, and non-Christian, especially Muslim, students and lecturers. Some agreed to be part of my study, including three foreign missionaries from English-speaking countries. Second, I paid more specific attention to students’ or lecturers’ overt performance of religiosity, especially Christianity, in class, when I observed them, or based on students and colleagues’ information that some fellow lecturers or students were interested in spiritual issues. Third, as opposed to the second criteria, I also involved those who attempted hard to avoid religious themes in class. However, they are only my supporting (or not focal) participants. Fourth, representatives of the former and the current management of the EFL teacher education program were recruited, because they know the Competency-Based Curriculum that contains one component that reads “Being able to reflect Christian values in teaching” (see Appendix E). Fifth, I tried to find any student or teacher who was actively involved in religious activities on campus and/or outside of the campus (e.g., church activists).

Recruitment Procedure

As a Christian, I believe that being ethical in recruiting potential participants is very important, although it is not without a challenge. Before conducting preliminary classroom observations in the first few weeks of my fieldwork, I said to some teachers whose classes were going to be observed that I was interested in understanding how they negotiated their identities, which might include but were not limited to religious identities, in class. An ethical dilemma that emerged was whether my specific focus on understanding spiritual identities had to be disclosed very early to some teachers. On the one hand, I was not pretty sure to what extent they enjoyed discussing spirituality in public. On the other hand, I did not want these teachers to perform “unnaturally” (e.g., being excessively or insincerely religious) in class after I told them what I was particularly interested in. My assumption was that those who performed their spirituality during my preliminary classroom observations, even without me having to emphasize that spirituality is part of one’s identity, would be desirable participants. This assumption turned out to be true in the cases of Yohanes and Celeste (see Tables 1 and 2): They performed, however subtle, their Christian identities in class.

To redress the superficial disclosure during the early stage (i.e., preliminary observations), later I gave these teachers, as well as some students (e.g., Calantha; see Table 1) in the observed classes, the options of signing the consent form (see Appendix G), if they were willing to be recruited as participants in my study, or of not signing it. In particular, after I came across an event in class where religious issues came to the fore and were negotiated in an observed class, I would say to its teacher, with the consent

form being made available to her or him, that the negotiated spiritual identities were things I was interested in understanding better from them or from their future classroom interactions with students. Some of them signed the consent form and participated in my study. They also allowed me to observe their subsequent classes. Even for those teachers who did not seem to display religious identities in class during my preliminary observations (e.g., Houtman; see Table 1), I told them that the scope of my study entails how their or their students' spiritual identities are negotiated, especially in class.

For some other teachers (i.e., Marty, Mustika, and Sara; see Table 1), I did not have to do preliminary classroom observations in their classes. Based on my unrecorded interactions with them, I had noticed that they enjoyed talking about spirituality with me. I then showed the consent form to them and shared my interest in how spiritual identities were understood and negotiated, particularly in ELT classrooms. They were interested in my study and signed the consent form in the first two weeks of February 2014.

Regarding some students who were to be recruited, I had explained about my study to them and gotten their signatures on the consent form before I observed them in class or before I involved them in focus group discussions and/or individual interviews. Apart from talking to the head of the students' body as the starting point for access to the students, (see *Gaining Access to the Field* section above), I also depended on the program's management (i.e., dean, deputy dean, and head of department), as well as some students, to inform me about potential students who might be enthusiastic about addressing religious issues in class or in their written work.

To all students and teachers who were about to sign the consent form, I emphasized that “discussing spiritual/religious issues in public may create discomfort” (see Appendix G), and so they could decide not to participate or to withdraw anytime. I also said that they had the right not to answer any question I might raise, and could ask me anything about my study.

The Participants

Because I anticipated some interesting data from classroom talks, I distributed the consent form to any class that I video-recorded (see the list of video-recorded classes under *Video-recorded classroom interactions* sub-section below) or a few of other classes that I observed. 132 students in eight classes (i.e., three speaking classes, one Intermediate Reading class, three Communication Across Cultures classes, one TEFL class) and those introduced to me by teachers or other students signed the consent form. 20 English teacher educators signed the consent form. The signatures of focal and non-focal participants, especially students, allowed me to analyze classroom talks that contain discussion about, or debate over, some issues that had some relevance to spirituality. By a focal participant here I mean anyone who eventually participated in at least one individual interview, and confirmed my transcribed data in which she or he was involved. These participants automatically become my focal participants: (a) They participated in focus group discussions, individual interviews, and classroom interactions that I audio- or video-recorded; (b) for students, they submitted Language Learning History essay and/or other artifacts; (c) they, lecturers and students alike, were involved in member checks at least in one round of checking my transcription; (d) they were relatively easy to contact

and work with; and (e) their ideas were insightful and highly relevant to the current dissertation project.³ Those who walked another mile by commenting on my emerging themes and on an excerpt of very evangelical talk in class are also my focal participants. Moreover, I remember discussing some findings of my study in an unrecorded conversation (e.g., on power relations between Christian and non-Christian EFL stakeholders) with Mur, one of my focal participants, on August 2, 2014. Having focal participants coming from a Pentecostal background (e.g., Celeste, Mira, and Monika, among others) is also a bonus. Though being Pentecostal does not necessarily mean the same way for those belonging to this church denomination, one major characteristic of Pentecostalism is its “rapid growth” typically associated with its “strong emphasis on mission and evangelism.” Pentecostal people are usually involved in “preaching of the ‘full gospel’ throughout the world” (Anderson, 2014, p. 198).

Those who are non-focal participants are those who were interviewed, but their collected data are limited in terms of one or some of the following factors: (a) the conversation was not audio recorded, upon the participant's (i.e., Tammy's) request (see Table 2), but the data was important in verifying what other participants had said; (b) the participants' responses were limited, or not very elaborate, in the interview but the participants were non-Christian (i.e., Tono and Fatma; see Table 2), so it is important anyhow to represent their views in one way or another; (c) the participant (i.e., Yohanes) joined a focus group discussion and an individual interview (see Table 2), but he did not check if my transcripts were accurate to the best of his knowledge; (d) the participant thought that spirituality is a private matter (e.g., Houtman; see Table 2). Finally, it was

unfortunate that one female Muslim and one male Muslim student who initially were eager to participate withdrew from my study. Another female Muslim student had participated in a focus group discussion and an individual interview, but she never replied to my email in which I asked her to confirm my transcripts. Therefore, I considered her to have withdrawn from my study. Eventually, the following are 17 focal and seven non-focal participants in this study (see Tables 1 and 2). Of the 17 focal participants, six are students, 11 are lecturers. Three students and three lecturers are the non-focal participants. Apart from that, I have “peripheral” student participants (e.g., Navra, Virgo, and Toby) and a teacher (e.g., Vira). They are mentioned once or twice because they are either marginally supportive of a theme under discussion or they are part of the transcribed talks that involve focal participants. All names are pseudonyms. Some students' pseudonyms were selected by the students themselves.

Table 1

Focal Participants

Students

No.	Pseudonyms	Current Religion	More descriptions
1	Lukas	Non-Christian	Male, non-Javanese.
2	Karno	Islam	Male, Javanese.
3	Lucia	Christian (Pentecostal)	Female, Javanese.
4	Calantha	Christian (non-Pentecostal)	Female, from out of Java.
5	Ellie	Christian	Female, from out of Java, a social activist.

6	Monika	(non-Pentecostal) Christian (Pentecostal)	Female, Javanese.
---	--------	---	-------------------

English language educators / lecturers

No.	Pseudonyms	Current Religion	More descriptions
1	Mur	Islam	Javanese, problematizing lack of openness about discussing conflicts associated with religions.
2	Sri	Islam	Non-Javanese.
3	Dika	Catholic	Female, non-Javanese.
4	Marty	Christian (non-Pentecostal)	Male, White, and a foreign missionary.
5	Tim	Christian (non-Pentecostal)	Male, White, and a missionary from the United States.
6	Angela	Christian (non-Pentecostal)	Female, White, and a missionary from the United States.
7	Shinta	Christian (non-Pentecostal)	Female, mixed races.
8	Celeste	Christian (Pentecostal)	Female, non-Javanese, a feminist, and an activist in a Pentecostal church.
9	Mustika	Christian (non-Pentecostal)	Female, Javanese, a feminist.
10	Sara	Christian (non-	Female, Javanese, and used to be a Muslim.

Pentecostal)

11	Mira	Christian (Pentecostal)	Female, non-Javanese, belonging to a Pentecostal church.
----	------	----------------------------	--

Table 2

Non-Focal Participants

Students

No.	Pseudonyms	Current Religion	More descriptions
1	Dale	Catholic	Male, thinking of himself as “agnostic theist,” and having a critical view against heteronormativity.
2	Tono	Islam	Male, Javanese.
3	Fatma	Islam	Female, Javanese.

English language educators / lecturers

No.	Pseudonyms	Current Religion	More descriptions
1	Yohanes	Catholic	Male, occasionally bringing up religiously associated talk in class when deemed appropriate.
2	Tammy	Christian (non-Pentecostal)	Female, performing an evangelical persona in an unrecorded conversation, being overt about her spiritual views in class, as reported by Karno and Lucia.
3	Houtman	Christian (non-Pentecostal)	Male, non-Javanese, a church activist.

Data Collection Methods

Observations

In observing classroom meetings or other encounters with Christian English lecturers and students, I attempted to identify moments where religious issues came to the fore, either when there was some tension between a Christian English teacher and one or more non-Christian English language students, or between an non-Christian English lecturer and one or more Christian English lecturer, or when religious themes were deliberately brought up by educators and/or students (e.g., in submitted assignments or classroom discussions). Even when there was no (significant) moment in which religious tensions or themes occur in the first month, I had a preliminary conjecture as to what it meant for the local ELT stakeholders to be Christian or non-Christian English language teachers and students in the EFL teacher education program: being Christian or non-Christian English language teachers or students might did not necessarily mean bringing up religious values overtly in teaching materials or classroom discussions. This could be verified or refuted through data triangulation elicited in subsequent months through classroom observations, focus group discussions, or interviews.

Moreover, as I observed (both at a preliminary stage and a subsequent stage after consent forms were signed by some participants), I would try to find if any of the issues brought up in my review of literature (e.g., on proselytizing, the conundrum of absolute truths, and learning or teaching motivation that is inspired or informed by spiritual values) emerged in classroom discussions or other ELT-related meetings. See Appendix A for more detail on questions of issues and a template for field observations. None of

the class I observed at this preliminary stage was audio- or video-recorded. Only after consent was granted by an individual teacher and/or student would I do the audio-recording and/or video recording.

I observed 60 class sessions, but I only included class sessions nos. 38 to 60 (early February to early April) for my data analysis (see Appendix H). When session nos. 38 to 60 were observed and/or video-recorded, the teachers had understood the purpose of my study and signed the consent form. In other words, class session nos. 1-37 are part of my preliminary observations in which I only attempted to determine which students or teachers would be recruited as potential focal participants. Of the remaining 23 observed class sessions, in five sessions religious issues were totally absent. The 37 preliminary classroom observations, which are removed from my data analysis, are my trade-offs. This is an ethical cost, so to speak, that I have to pay due to superficial disclosure concerning the main focus of my study at an earlier stage of my fieldwork. Over time, however, all of my recruited focal (and non-focal) participants, as well as teachers who did not end up participating in my study, were reasonably informed about my study.

I video-recorded seven classroom interactions in six Communication Across Cultures class sessions and one Intermediate Reading class session (see Appendix H):

1. On naming practices, in Celeste's Communication Across Cultures class on February 12, 2014.
2. On homosexuality, among others, based on an article from *The New York Times* entitled "What's in a Name: Family and More." It is in Shinta's Communication Across Cultures class on February 13, 2014.

3. On logos, including the JCU's logo, in Dika's Intermediate Reading class on February 13, 2014.
4. On "Eastern and "Western worldviews" in Marty's Communication Across Cultures class on February 20, 2014.
5. On "Religion and Culture" in Marty's Communication Across Cultures class on March 13, 2014.
6. On a drama script entitled "Kaleidoscope Eyes" in Shinta's Communication Across Cultures class on March 27, 2014. Themes of homosexuality, divorce, and contraceptive use were discussed.
7. On the "Kaleidoscope Eyes" material in Celeste's Communication Across Cultures class on April 2, 2014.

However, I did not analyze the first two video-recorded classrooms. Nos. 3 to 7 are much richer in terms of issue coverage and student-student, as well as teacher-student, interactions than the first two (see chapter 7).

Most of the students signing the consent form became peripheral participants in my study. That is, their talk in class might be transcribed, especially when they also signed that they agreed to be video-recorded. All the instructors of these Communication Across Cultures and Intermediate Reading are my focal participants, and so are Lukas (in Marty's Communication Across Cultures class), Ellie, and Calantha (in Celeste's Communication Across Cultures class).

Focus Group Discussions

Focus group discussions were used in this study because the dynamics of power relations (between students themselves, or between educators themselves, and me) were very likely to be better captured (than in individual interviews) and could be made more focused around the issue of spirituality in ELT settings. Besides that, focus group discussions allowed me to see how performances of identities were co-constructed through one's alignment with another's or others' positioning (e.g., through nodding, or expanding on others' views). Regular class sessions might not always include issues of spirituality. Of the four focus group discussions, three were video-recorded, because some lecturers did not want to be video-recorded. I was the moderator and was in charge of operating the video-recorder. Indonesian, Javanese, and English were used by participants in any focus group discussions. I developed my own focus group protocols (see Appendix B), based on principles and models of raising questions suggested by Litosseliti (2003).

Semi-Structured Interviews

For some participants, semi-structured interviews were conducted after focus group discussions. For some other participants, focus group discussions were not possible due to some time constraints and schedule clashes, so I only had individual interviews with them. Follow-up interviews were also conducted when I found out that (a) one interview session was not sufficient (e.g., a student or a lecturer had to enter a class soon); (b) I found something, when (re-)listening to a recording, worth probing into; or (c) member-checking was deemed necessary to ensure if my transcription or

interpretation of my ideas were accurate or needed some modifications. Other informal encounters with participants were recorded electronically (i.e., with an audio-recorder) or manually with my handwriting when I considered crucial and when permitted by them. Interviews are not limited to formal elicitation of data, but may also involve “participation in social practices” other than interview itself (Talmy, 2011, p. 27). Indonesian, Javanese, and English, or a mixture of the three languages even in a single utterance, could be used by participants. Email exchanges, Facebook chats, or Skype interactions with my participants were established during my stay in the field, and were extended, with few participants (e.g., with Karno and Marty), after I left the field and returned to the United States (see chapter 7). Semi-structured interview protocols (see Appendix C) have been adapted from Varghese and Johnston’s study (2007).

Based on recorded classroom observations, focus group discussions, and semi-structured interviews, I have over 35 hours of recorded data constituting over 1,000 pages of transcripts from 30 participants, which include focal, non-focal, and peripheral participants. The lengths of conversations with individual participants range from 5 minutes (e.g., in a follow-up interview) to 1 hour 45 minutes (of a full-fledged individual interview). Tables 3 to 9 show more detail on the recorded and transcribed data.

Collecting Relevant Documents

I accessed the current curriculum of the EFL teacher education program (Appendix E) and students’ language learning histories.⁴ While focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, and classroom observations were done in spoken form, language learning histories are in a written discourse (see Appendix D). I only asked the students to

write their language learning histories. Lecturers had too many responsibilities. Besides that, their interview data was considerably richer than that of the students and at times lecturers shared their spiritual journey without me having to probe too much. In this project, I only used Karno's language learning history, because I needed more insights from the only non-Christian (i.e., Muslim) student focal participant who submitted the language learning history.⁵

Table 3

Video-Recorded Classrooms

Classroom Session #	Class/Instructor/Date	Recording (in minutes/hours)	Transcript (in pages)
46	Communication Across Cultures (CAC)/Celeste/February 12, 2014	3 minutes	2
47	CAC/Shinta/February 13, 2014	8 minutes	3
48	Intermediate Reading/Dika/February 20, 2014	4 minutes	2
54	CAC/Marty/February 20, 2014	15 minutes	9
56	CAC/Marty/March 13, 2014	30 minutes	15
58	CAC/Shinta/March 27, 2014	45 minutes	25
59	CAC/Celeste/April 2, 2014	2 hours	50
Total		Approx. 3.75 hours	Approx. 106 pages

Note: The number of minutes, hours, or pages are in an approximate minimum.

Table 4

Focus Group Discussions with Students

Focus group discussion Session #	Participants / Date	Recording (in minutes/hours)	Transcript (in pages)
1	Wizard, Karno, Waluyoajati, Videa, Ellie, Velin, Thomas, and Ayunda*/February 26, 2014	1 hour 30 minutes	40
2	Monika, Tono, Calantha, and Lucia/March 4, 2014	1 hour	15
Total		Approx. 2 and a half hours	Approx. 55 pages

* Ayunda, a female Muslim student, withdrew from my study.

Table 5

Focus Group Discussions with Lecturers

Classroom Session #	Participants / Date	Recording (in minutes/hours)	Transcript (in pages)
3	Sri, Houtman, Dika, Sara, and Mira/March 11, 2014	1 hour 10 minutes	50
4	Mira, Mustika, Yohanes, Celeste, and Shinta/April 2, 2014	1 hour 5 minutes	45
Total		Approx. 2 hours 15 minutes	Approx. 95 pages

Table 6

Individual Interviews with Lecturers who are Focal Participants

No.	Lecturer/Date	Recording (in minutes/hours)	Transcript (in pages)
1	Mur / April 25, 2014	1 hour 45 minutes	50
	August 19, 2014	15 minutes	5
2	Sri / March 25, 2014	35 minutes	15
3	Dika / March 26, 2014	1 hour	30
	May 2, 2014	30 minutes	15
4	Marty / April 23, 2014	1 hour 15 minutes	45
5	Tim / June 5, 2014	45 minutes	26
6	Angela / April 29, 2014	1 hour 35 minutes	54
7	Shinta / April 16, 2014	1 hour	40
	June 11, 2014	5 minutes	5
8	Celeste / April 3, 2014	40 minutes	20
	April 14, 2014	1 hour 20 minutes	40
9	Mustika / May 6, 2014	1 hour	35
10	Sara / March 25, 2014	35 minutes	25
	April 1, 2014	1 hour 5 minutes	50
	April 2, 2014	10 minutes	10
11	Mira / March 21, 2014	1 hour	30
	Total	Approx. 12 hours	Approx. 450 pages

Table 7

Individual Interviews with Lecturers who are Not Focal Participants

No.	Lecturer/Date	Conversation (in minutes/hours)	Transcript (in pages)
1	Yohanes / April 28, 2014	1 hour (recorded)	30
2	Tammy / August 6, 2014	1 hour (unrecorded)	1
3	Houtman / March 28, 2014	40 minutes	20
		Approx. 2 hours	Approx. 50 pages

Table 8

Individual Interviews with Students who are Focal Participants

No.	Student/Date	Recording (in minutes/hours)	Transcript (in pages)
1	Lukas / March 25, 2014	1 hour	25
	August 7, 2014	30 minutes	15
2	Karno / March 10, 2014	1 hour	25
3	Lucia / February 21, 2014	15 minutes	5
	March 25, 2014	20 minutes	10
	March 27, 2014	20 minutes	10
4	Calantha / March 18, 2014	45 minutes	15
	April 3, 2014	45 minutes	15
5	Ellie / March 11, 2014	1 hour 5 minutes	25
6	Monika / March 19, 2014	40 minutes	15
	April 4, 2014	45 minutes	20

Total	Approx. 6 hours 15 minutes	Approx. 165 pages
-------	-------------------------------	-------------------

Table 9

Interviews with Students who are Not Focal Participants.

No.	Student/Date	Recording (in minutes/hours)	Transcript (in pages)
1	Tono / April 24, 2014	30 minutes	10
2	Dale / March 28, 2014	1 hour 30 minutes*	55
3	Fatma / March 28, 2014 May 2, 2014	20 minutes	10
		Approx. 2 hours 20 minutes	Approx. 75 pages

* I interviewed Dale and Fatma together on March 28, 2014.

Data Analysis Procedure

Transcribing Data

Almost all portions of focus group discussions, interviews, and video-recorded classroom interaction data were transcribed using relatively narrow (conversation analytic) transcription convention (see e.g., Prior, 2011), where interlocutors' speech overlaps, pauses, latches, stressed words, or laughter are taken into account (see Appendix I). The main reason for using such a convention is I do not simply want to look at emerging themes through the conversation (i.e., interview as "research instrument") but also how those themes emerge as they are framed in dialogues with me as an interviewer (i.e., interview as "social practice"; see Talmy, 2010).

In researching into interview as social practice, data are considered “socially constructed,” consist of “representations or accounts of truths, facts,... etc., co-constructed between interviewer and interviewee.” Voice is “situationally contingent and discursively co-constructed.” Data analysis “focuses not just on content, but on how meaning is negotiated...” and the interview is “locally accomplished.” The focus of analysis is on both “what” and “how” (process-oriented) (Talmy, 2011, p. 27). Although originally used in interview, the notion of “social practice” may be attached to focus group discussions and classroom interactions: focus group discussions as social practice, and classroom interaction as social practice. In presenting the data in my analysis, however, verbatim broad transcriptions were used, because religiously and critically related contents or themes are more at stake in this dissertation project. Co-constructions of meanings are indicated by broadly transcribed talks of participants, including myself at times, in focus group discussions, individual interviews, and observed classrooms.

Coding and Analyzing Themes

Emerging themes from data triangulated from (a) field notes during observations; (b) transcribed focus group discussions, interviews, and video-recorded classroom observations; (c) language learning history essays; or (d) other artifacts were coded in two major recursive stages. First, some portion of data might be coded as certain emerging themes (see Appendix I), usually in complete sentences, with my paraphrase or quoted words or phrases from a participant’s talk (see also Appendix H for the recapitulated observations in 60 class sessions, with some coding on the most right column).

At the second stage, I analyzed the extent to which the emerging themes gleaned from the raw data in the first stage might respond to issues or my questions that I raise in the literature review (see the list of possible questions in Appendix A) or emerge from the field (see Appendix J for a working categorization of data in this second stage). Being recursive, I might start from the first stage again to check if my coding is accurate when writing up my analysis in the fourth and subsequent chapters of my dissertation. Thus, to put it in Hayes's (2013, p. 71) phrasing, "[t]he main dimensions of categories arose partly from relevant literature" (see Appendix A), "... partly from the interview topic areas," especially those that are not yet sufficiently addressed in the literature (e.g., the theme of praying in class; see chapter 4), "and partly from the process of analysis itself."

The coding processes at the first stage involved myself and I shared my tentative coding to my research participants to verify that my transcription or analysis did not misrepresent their meanings. Other techniques to guard my study against the so-called validity threats involve "peer review and debriefing" (with dissertation committee members), "negative case analysis," "clarification of [my] bias," and "rich and thick description" (Glesne, 2006, pp. 37-38). In this study, negative case analysis entails "incorporating relevant negative instances in the data" (Talmy, 2013, p. 1487). With regard to my study, "negative instances," as well as "rich and thick description," might be explained as follows. I looked into educator-student interactions, student-student exchanges of ideas, and individual students' own attempts to negotiate their religious identities and power relations associated with these identities (or other identities in terms of race and gender, for instance) over time. As one meaning emerging in one interaction

might be reinforced, or modified, or even subverted by oneself and others in subsequent interactions, I not only included an ELT stakeholder's statement that was consistently expressed in subsequent interactions with various stakeholders including me, but also her or his utterances that might add more nuanced meanings, as I analyzed them, to her or his earlier statements. In other words, I would like to capture the very heteroglossic nature of any ELT stakeholder's statement (see e.g., Lukas's views of his evangelical instructor, Marty, in chapter 7). Recall my discussion about *Identity as image-text* in chapter 2 above (Bakhtin, 1981; Varghese et al., 2005; see also Frank, 2012).

Due to a relatively massive amount of data, I did not use all focal participants' data in a theme being focused on in my analysis. After all, not all focal participants addressed every single theme in some depth. To illustrate, participants A, B, or C might provide some weight to theme X, but participants D, E, and F do not. Furthermore, participants G, H, and I explained theme Y considerably, whereas participants A, C, and E do not. Besides, similar themes across participants will be analyzed under one category. After presenting data that exemplifies a theme, I analyzed it in light of relevant literature, and sometimes discuss its implications directly (e.g., how to better address students' religious dogmatism and evangelical discourse raised in class or elsewhere; see chapter 6). Besides, refraining from disclosing data that I sense might disrupt harmony among stakeholders participating in my study is preferable, but is not always possible. When a certain issue (e.g., colonial legacy) needs a participant's self-reflexivity, I included it in my analysis, especially when the participant expressed some eagerness to be self-reflexive him or herself.

CHAPTER 4

EFL TEACHERS' UNDERSTANDING OF SPIRITUAL IDENTITIES IN ELT CONTEXTS

One of my major research questions is this: How do ELT stakeholders in a Christian EFL teacher education in Indonesia negotiate their spiritual identities? In this chapter, I will discuss how English language educators at JCU made sense of their spiritual identities and negotiate power due to their spiritual identities within ELT settings, as reflected during focus group discussions and/or individual interviews.

Themes that emerge when I explored English language educators' understanding of spiritual identities are as follows: (a) praying in public; (b) being professional; and (c) understanding one's power in ELT contexts, including that in terms of endorsing character education, being aware of belonging to the minority groups, and witnessing about the gospel. These themes highlight some tensions due to one's faith in relation to her or his sense of professionalism, educational values, and racial identity.

To Pray or Not to Pray in Public

One of the most explicit ways of performing one's spirituality that is closely tied to her or his religion is praying out loud before class is started. It is customary for some Christian English language educators to start the first class on a day, usually that which starts at 7 a.m., with a prayer. Consider the following excerpts:

Jos: As far as you remember, in what ways did you express your belief in class?

Sara: Okay. Well it normally, like you know, in the morning class. It is the first class. I would start with a short prayer. A short Christian prayer. But only like, you know, in the morning. (Interview with Sara, March 25, 2014)

Jos: What part do your religious beliefs play in your daily life?

Yohanes: ... I have been practicing [this] for a long time. I know that this is only the first time the students attend the class, then I will start with prayer. Ya? Especially when I teach early in the morning at 7 o'clock. (Interview with Yohanes, April 28, 2014)

For the American Christian English teachers (i.e., Angela and Tim), however, they felt awkward if they had to start classes with a prayer. For example:

I sometimes look over those colleagues when they were praying in Christian way, in faculty meetings, wondering if this at all uncomfortable, or this just *sudah terbiasa* [they are already accustomed to praying]. But then I think about how in Indonesia and JCU you do sometimes pray, even though there are Moslem students and you welcome them to pray in whatever way they will, and so then I realize it's more my American issue that we don't oftentimes pray in public,... 'cause I never went to a Christian university or Christian school. We don't usually invite public prayer before a class or before an activity. (Interview, Angela, April 29, 2014)

One student asked me why I didn't open all of our classes with prayer. She [a Christian] said that she had had another teacher who always opened in prayer. And why I didn't do that. And that made me feel awkward... But it's not

something I'm used to like leading a public prayer in a classroom. Because I went to all secular schools in the U.S. (Interview, Tim, June 5, 2014)

An interesting observation was also expressed by Angela:

We are not just used to thinking about praying before a class or activity.

Jos: That's interesting.

Angela: it is interesting. ... I helped out with the drama, pronouncing and acting. And Fatma, the director, she's Moslem. But she would still say 'Okay. Let's pray.' [She] asked someone else to pray. They would pray in Christian faith. And they would do a prayer before the activity. She as a Moslem, invited a prayer that was Christian. I, as a Christian missionary, and Christian lecturer, never invited a prayer. It's just so bizarre. But I think it's okay. It's more okay in Indonesia. I mean you have a prayer in an airplane seat. (Interview, April 29, 2014)

There are two small stories in Angela's discourse. First, she told an event where even a Moslem student (Fatma) asked those involved in the preparation of annual English drama performance (e.g., in rehearsals) to start their activity with a prayer. Fatma would specifically asked someone else to pray in a Christian faith. This observation led her to express an irony, at which I laughed: "she, as a Moslem invited a prayer that was Christian. I, as a Christian missionary, and Christian lecturer, never invited a prayer. It's just so bizarre." Second, Angela put the religiosity of Indonesian people in a larger context. She said to me: "You have a prayer card in an airplane seat." Angela has made a familiar, taken-for-granted thing (i.e., prayer card in airplane seat) strange to me: The

praying culture seems to be nationwide, in Indonesia. For Angela, living in a secular world named the USA has made her “less religious” whereas occasions expected her (or Tim) to be “more religious” by praying in an Indonesian Christian university. This praying expectation was also expressed by Calantha, my focal student participant. She noted: “And I just realize why some teachers, in this [school], didn’t begin the class with pray” (March 4, 2014). Based on Fatma’s example in Angela’s narrative, I argue that religiously associated power relations are hence not simply about the “strong” party (e.g., Christians at JCU) imposing a religious ritual like prayer before class on the “weak” (e.g., Muslims at JCU). Rather, subtle power differentials can be formed through a perception of someone (like Calantha) that another person (like Angela) is “less religious” than she or he should be, regardless of the person’s religions, because the person does not pray in class. Put simply, the decision of not praying could be stigmatized.

But American Christians are not the only people who do not open their classes with a prayer. Celeste, a devout Indonesian Christian like Celeste, said: “Aku malah jarang i?” [I seldom pray], which was then responded similarly by another Christian teacher, Mira: “Aku ya ndak pernah isa dengan ‘mari kita berdoa,’ padahal kelas jam tujuh pagi” [I also could not say ‘let’s pray,’ although it is a 7 a.m. class]. Although Shinta recalled her past experience as a student at JCU: “Eh tapi dulu jamanku, gitu lho, jamanku masih [berdoa]” [You know what, in the past, when I was still a student, we still prayed in the first morning class] (Focus group discussion, April 2, 2014), it is not clear if she herself started a class with a Christian prayer. The remainder of lecturers who are my focal participants do not typically start with a prayer, either. Praying before class is

therefore not always viewed as a salient indicator of one's (especially a Christian English teachers' performance of spiritual identity, although for some students, including a Muslim student like Fatma in Angela's story, praying should be part of activities occurring in the context of EFL teacher education program at JCU.

Being Professional

For some Christian and non-Christian English language educators alike, spirituality is a source of motivation to work professionally as EFL teacher educators. In the context of responding to my question about Marty's view of the place of spirituality in ELT, Marty answered:

Is there a place for religion and spirituality? I would say there is. Should that define what is taught? I don't think it should define it. What should define what is taught, what is prepared in the curriculum, is... that people... can use English well. That's what should define the topics we teach. Okay. So it's not that we forbid the teaching of religiosity, or spirituality, but... teach topics that prepare good English language users. (Interview, April 23, 2014)

This answer sounds professional. Preoccupation with one's agenda to share the gospel should not drive or define what is taught, in other words. The goal of ELT is to "prepare good English language users" through any topics, which may include religious themes.

Much later in the interview with Marty, I asked him what he thought of the idea that one has a right or responsibility to let others know of her or his religious belief. One of his responses was: "Do I need to announce to my pronunciation class that I'm a Christian? It's pronunciation. I don't talk about the topic of religion very much in

pronunciation class” (Interview, April 23, 2014). And I think he should not, except if a pronunciation instructor wants to bring up a story of linguistic discrimination in which one’s life is determined by her or his pronunciation (e.g., the case of “shibboleth” in the book of Judges, chapter 12, verses 1-15; see also <http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~kemmer/Words/shibboleth>). This must not preoccupy all pronunciation class hours, though.

Spiritually associated professionalism is not restricted to topics to be raised in ELT classrooms. For Sri, it encompasses “teach[ing] something right, in a way that is in line with the principles and ideas in our profession” (Interview, March 25, 2014). Sri also talked about accountability (i.e., “your responsibility of what you have done, of what you are doing, and what you will be doing”) and about being resourceful to students (e.g., available for consultation, showing students how to use e-journal subscribed electronically by JCU's library).

For Shinta, professionalism in light of her sense of spirituality is more nuanced than Sri’s normative view that EFL teacher educators have to be accountable and resourceful. Shinta expected more overt attention to what spirituality can do to be a guideline for professionalism in an institution like JCU. She lamented: “I don’t think we discuss much about religion in collective context. I mean like even in staff meeting, religion is as much as praying, *renungan* [i.e., spiritual devotion]. That’s it” (Interview, April 16, 2014). She began to question how Christian English teachers should go beyond praying and devoting in staff meetings. This question might also be inspired by a Christian U.S.-based ELT scholar whom Shinta met personally and who asked her the

following, in Shinta's wording: "How does religion influence day-to-day activities?" (Interview, April 16, 2014). In Shinta's view, "what really make us [or individual teachers] different is by religion." Keeping abreast of the "current theory" in TESOL is part of standing out professionally and of "doing," rather than "saying" Christianity through verbal witnessing about Jesus (Interview, April 16, 2014).

In sum, for a teacher like Marty, professionalism may mean that verbal statements of religious faith should not always be foregrounded in class. For other teachers such as Sri and Shinta, "principles and ideas," as well as "current theory," in the ELT profession should determine one's spiritually inspired professionalism. In my current study, such understanding of professionalism in ELT is related to an individual teacher's awareness of the notion of power, and her or his position in power.

But before proceeding to the issue of power, I will argue that spiritually inspired professionalism problematizes Pennycook and Coutand-Marin's (2003) category of "secular humanist position." This position, according to them, is what Julian Edge would agree: "it is 'utterly repellent' to use [ELT] for any purpose other than the betterment of those students' lives as defined by those students themselves" (pp. 338-339). The problems with this "secular humanist" argument are as follows. First, recall that some JCU students demand their instructors pray (in English) before the first morning classes (see the previous section of this chapter). This implies that some students thought that spirituality should be part of ELT. Second, teacher educators like Shinta believed that "doing Christianity" entails being knowledgeable about the "current theory" in TESOL. I think she, and like-minded ESL/EFL teachers or teacher educators, will look forward to

learning about, or responding to, my current theorization of critical spiritual pedagogy in ELT (see chapter 8 for further detail). Moreover, for such teachers, being professional is not a matter of dichotomizing “secular” and “spiritual” realms. An instructor like Shinta has actually lived a life of doing holistic pedagogy that “... avoid[s] the spiritual/secular dualism found in the West...” (Wong, 2009, p. 94). Being spiritually professional ideally puts teachers like Shinta in a good position to better serve some of their (religiously interested) students. In practice, however, this may not always be easy, especially when an instructor decides to be “religionless” in class (see chapter 7 for more depth), due to an awareness of power differentials between him- or herself and his/her students.

Understanding Power Relations in ELT Contexts

Realizing that one is in a position of power, especially as Christian English teachers, is one way of showing self-reflexivity, which can be expressed in varying degrees: from avoidance to engagement. Houtman said: “For me, spirituality is my personal, private matter. So I will not include it in my teaching” (Focus group discussion, March 11, 2014). As such, he is the most closeted Christian in my study because he avoided any discussion about religious themes in ELT classrooms. Agreeing with Houtman, Sara said:

Like Pak Houtman said,... our students are not all Christian. So what I can share probably during my teaching is... only the values. Ya maybe the general or the universal value like you are not supposed to steal, you are not supposed to do plagiarism, something like that. (Focus group discussion, March 11, 2014)

Sara is different than Houtman, however, in that she still incorporated Christian values into ELT when interacting with her students (see the *Endorsing character education in ELT contexts* sub-section below). Houtman believed that spirituality is a private matter—end of discussion. In this dissertation, I acknowledge some degree of self-reflexivity on the part of those who prevent themselves from discussing spirituality in ELT contexts because not all EFL stakeholders are of the same religion (e.g., Houtman). However, I am much more interested in self-reflexivity that is demonstrated through engagement in bringing up spirituality, in many guises, in ELT contexts.

Self-reflexivity through engagement of discussing spirituality in class, to a degree, was more noticeably evident in my conversations with English language educators who had been familiar with the current TESOL literature on the debate over the place of spirituality, especially Christianity, in ELT. Only four Christian English language educators in my study were familiar with this literature: Shinta, Tim, Angela, and Marty. For them, spirituality *has* a place in ELT, but an English language educator needs to be aware of her or his power in class. In fact, only these four Christian teachers who brought up the notion of “power” in my conversations with them.

Committed to upgrading herself as a Christian English language educator in JCU, Angela said:

I had asked [Shinta] to send me some articles and to lend me some books about English language teaching, or TESOL, or World Englishes... because I was doing research on it, for a paper presentation at a conference (Interview, April 29, 2014)

To the best of my understanding, because Shinta forgot, Shinta then sent some articles, including that of Pennycook and Coutand-Marin (2003), to Angela. It was not clear who shared Pennycook and Coutand-Marin's work to Marty and Tim, but somehow these two missionary gentlemen read it, too. In this part I will focus on what Shinta, Angela, Tim, and Marty understood about their power as Christian English language educators in ELT contexts.

Responding to my question of what she thought of the idea that spirituality has a place in ELT, Shinta said:

So my question [is] how can I make my classroom, because I'm like the power in the classroom, as a space haven for people with different religion identities, so that we can talk and found a common ground... . (Focus group discussion, April 2, 2014)

By "I'm like the power in the classroom," she clarified that teacher is usually "positioned as the authoritarian figure" (Member Check, August 7, 2014) who "decides the syllabus,... assessment, and things like that" (Focus group discussion, April 2, 2014).

Understanding her position as a Christian, Shinta also said in an individual interview:

"When I teach, I try to be religionless in the classroom" (Interview, April 16, 2014).

Later she reiterated her point: "And I also don't shape my identity in the classroom as a Christian religious person." Her main reason for arguing so is that she wanted her classroom to be "more accepting to other religions." Besides that, Shinta did not feel comfortable "showcasing" her religion. She realized that she was "a person of authority." Showcasing a religion, in Shinta's view, "in a way" is like "giving student rules of a

certain way of performing religion.” I asked Shinta what she meant by “showcasing.” She explained that it may entail “judging student comments, saying to students that this is not what a religious person do.” Shinta would rather students, especially the non-Christian students who constitute around 60% of the student population, “to be... comfortable in being who they are.” Furthermore, by being “religionless,” Shinta believes that it could help her to become a “more open-minded Christian” (Interview, April 16, 2014).

Engagement in discussion about spirituality in ELT classrooms or elsewhere, while also being self-reflexive about his position of power as a Christian English language educator, is explained by Marty as follows, in response to my query as to what he thought of the idea that one has a right or a responsibility to let others know of his religious views:

I think it should be an expectation that teachers always are aware of the face of power that they have. They must be very careful never to manipulate students. I’m happy to present my belief. I’m happy to say I believe in it. I’m happy to say ‘If you wanna talk about this after class, come and speak to me... .’ I should never manipulate students. Now there's the obvious manipulation. ‘Well,... if you're to be Catholic, I’m sure you’ll get a higher mark.’ That's crazy. ... If I presented beliefs all the time in class, and didn’t give any avenue for disagreement, I think that would be a problem. (Interview, April 23, 2014)

A similar response was also put forward by Angela, although this time I framed the conversation in such a way that she responded to this question: “What do you think of the idea that spirituality and/or religion has a place in ELT?” Her main argument is that as a

Christian who is more “critical” than “conservative,” she believes that spirituality has a place in ELT. It should even “enrich the learning atmosphere.” However, she thinks that spirituality “shouldn’t be abrasive or pushy, or it shouldn’t be close-minded to only include one kind of spirituality... or religion” (Interview, April 29, 2014).

With the same question that I raised to Angela, Tim replied in more or less the same way. He believed spirituality does have a place in ELT, and it should motivate how he teaches. However, this is his concern:

But on the other hand I’m also scared about not bringing my religious perspective to be the one that dominates the classroom, because, you know, fear of power imbalance... My students who are Muslim, or Buddhist, [may] feel uncomfortable with me. Or will they feel comfortable with me? (Interview, June 5, 2014)

How power is claimed to have been negotiated by Marty, and other Christian English language teachers not very familiar with the TESOL literature on faith and ELT, are discussed in the following sub-sections.

Endorsing Character Education in ELT Contexts Non-Coercively

Insights into character education from three Christian English language educators (i.e., Marty, Sara, and Mira) are worth discussing in this sub-section. Although they did not explicitly frame their talk within the notion of power, these three Christian teachers were aware of their position as Christians in an institution that enrolls non-Christian students.

Responding to the Competency-Based Curriculum document, especially on point number 9 of the “main competencies” (i.e., “displaying self as an honest and noble

person, who can become a role model to students and society”; see Appendix E), Marty suggested that teachers could be good role models of being people with integrity and honesty. This could be shared in a course like Communication Across Cultures or Advanced Speaking. The main theme of Marty’s example is that women are not supposed to be objects of sex. This is also a lesson of not performing non-verbal language that sends a message of lust in Advanced Speaking. Here is Marty’s elucidation transcribed at length below:

[1] Part of what we do is train teachers... But is it our responsibility, to develop [honesty and nobility] within them, in this institution? It’s a difficult thing for me to answer. I can’t give you black and white answers. But when I teach my students, in all honesty, I’m not seeking to make them honest and noble people. My goal is to be honest and noble. That’s part of who I am. I want to express my life as a follower of Jesus, with integrity, with honesty before my students. I can be very vulnerable to my students. And talk about weaknesses, that I have. And I’m trying to make sure that they don’t affect my life. ... And I hope that that will influence them. But I don’t think I can assess them on it. ...

[2] In Advanced Speaking, so this is an example. ... I teach the young ladies that I teach, that they have to be careful of the clothing that they wear, when they give a speech. And I will say to them. ‘Do you want people to be looking at your eyes? Or looking at your chest? Or looking at your legs. There is no problem for a woman to wear attractive clothing, to wear a short dress, but if it distracts people from what they listen to, that’s a problem.’ So it’s an example

where I'm not telling people 'wear conservative clothing,' but I'm saying that what the clothes you wear say something about who you are and what you want to say. And I would talk to the guys. 'Guys, women can look exactly where your eyes are going. So when you're speaking to a group of women, make sure you look them in the eye, and you don't let your eyes wander.' And depending on the circumstances, [or] the environment, sometimes I can talk about how this is not easy for me. I work hard at doing that. Because I believe that when I focus on people's eyes, it honors her, and that honors my wife. I do not want to be a man who betrays the trust of my wife... I'm willing to be honest about my need to protect myself, because I'm a weak person. It's easy for me to let my eyes wander. I don't want to do that. So I can be honest. I hope they would learn it... When you're honest about your weaknesses, and you say 'I'm trying to change. I'm not trying to stay there,' it shows that you have an area of growth. When you stand up before people, and pretend that you have it altogether and 'I'm fine. I'm the perfect man. I have no weaknesses,' either people will think, 'you're lying,' or the students will think you are so perfect I could never learn anything from you. I could never be like you. And you put a great big distance between yourself and your students. (Interview, April 23, 2014)

Sharing a teacher's own vulnerability of dealing with the likelihood of being lustful, when it comes to looking at women, and exhorting students to follow his example of being honest about his vulnerability sound very Christian. This reminds me of Apostle Paul who urged his congregation in Corinth to follow him as he followed the example of

Christ (1 Corinth 1:1). Marty does not have to say the verse, but the message, as far as the transcribed talk above is concerned, is clear and not coercive.

Character education was also a salient issue for Sara. She thought that distinct “Christian color” should be expressed in class. The context of Sara’s opinion was shaped by my question “As far as you remember, in what ways did you express your belief in class?” (Interview, March 25, 2014). I raised that question after I was certain that for Sara spirituality has a place in ELT. In an earlier conversation in a focus group discussion, I asked my participants: “What do you think of the idea that spirituality, slash religion, has a place in ELT?” Sara’s response was: “I feel entitled to doing that” (Focus group discussion, March 11, 2014). “That” here refers to expressing her Christian values. Besides that, Sara thought that her faith and work are intricately woven, not compartmentalized. This accounts for the saliency of character education in Sara’s ELT practices.

So, the “Christian colors,” which characterized Sara’s commitment to character education through ELT, are as follows. When some students presented their work and the rest of the students were busy talking with each other, Sara would interrupt the presentation and said: “you need to treat others the way you want to be treated.” This is a biblical allusion: “So in everything,” said Jesus, “do to others what you would have them do to you, for this sums up the Law and the Prophets” (Matthew 7:12, NIV). However, Sara said: “I don’t really say like, you know, ‘Jesus,’ or something like that. No.” Although Sara did not say to students that her advice was inspired by a Christian value, she believed that it is part of “universal values” acceptable “across faiths” (Interview,

March 25, 2014). Sara's response was consistent with what she shared earlier during the focus group discussion:

I feel entitled to doing that.

Jos: What do you mean by doing that?

Sara: I mean like 'treat others the way you want to be treated.' The expression [is] kind of Christian. You can express it in different ways. I used that [i.e., the expression] because it's universal. But at the same time it's Christian. A Buddhist would have different expressions. For me, I'm entitled to doing that, because I am in a Christian university. And ya, because I do not compartmentilze my faith and my work.

By not compartmentalizing her faith and work, Sara viewed her role as a Christian English teacher (educator) in a holistic way, which supports Wong's (2009) perspective.

Dealing with students who cheated is also part of Sara's commitment to character education. Receiving a report from a student that two other students cheated, Sara invited them to talk to her. One of them was notorious for being a slow learner. But Sara gave some encouragement, saying that "no one is stupid." Later she said to the student: "Don't worry. I wouldn't define you by what you have done." Commenting on her statement to the student, Sara said to me: "Because I care about my students" (Interview, April 1, 2014). She resumed her "constructed dialogue," to borrow Tannen's (2007, p. 120) term, with the student again: "Not because I wanted to judge you, and then to punish you. No. 'Cause for me it would be just easier to just reduce your grade. Or just give a zero." It was a "dialogue," in Sara's opinion, which resulted in the students' being closer to her, such

that they could approach her freely. She then seemed to compare herself with other lecturers whose students were afraid to meet them: “many, many students who [are] slow learners, they do not feel very comfortable talking with their lecturers.” The students’ closeness with Sara made them change: “They [are] more disciplined.” One of them even got 94 for Research Methods, Sara recalled, or “the third highest.” Then I asked Sara if this non-punitive way of dealing with problematic students was also applied to non-Christian students. She replied:

I remember asking one student with hijab [i.e., a headscarf to be worn by devout Muslims] [accused of committing] plagiarism. But it was like not intended. We did some dialogue. For me dialogue is important. Not to judge people, [but] to give them like space to talk. And I think that's more effective in education. Well, maybe I got that from [Paulo] Freire. (Interview, April 1, 2014)

Due to time constraints, I did not ask her how she related Freire to a non-punitive way of dealing with students’ varying degrees of academic dishonesty. What I remember is that Sara lent me her *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* book almost 10 years ago. As I recall what Freire says in the book, I become certain that Sara might have also remembered important notions like “dialogue,” especially with “the oppressed,” and “love.” Love can mean different things for different people, and yet for Sara, she linked love to dialogue in a non-punitive way. Although Sara did not frame explicitly that her dialogue with cheating students, who may represent “the oppressed,” was a spiritual act, in my opinion it is. And this implies her understanding that she could not be too obvious in sharing her Christian teachings, to which I now turn.

In another occasion, Sara was known to have encouraged her students in a Research Methods class to be faithful to “smaller responsibility” including assignments (Interview, April 2, 2014). However, when she said “you need to be faithful to little things,” she “bahkan nggak pake Bahasa Indonesia” (i.e., “even didn’t use Indonesian”), “karena itu sangat Alkitab banget” (i.e., “because it is very biblical sounding”). She further explained that she attempted to limit biblical allusions so they are not too obvious. Then I asked her “What is the reason for limiting that.” Her response was interesting. She felt that quoting the Bible “put more responsibility on her part,” and she “did not want to be like, or be associated with, a preacher.” She only wanted to be an “ordinary teacher.”

A similar case of avoiding too obvious a biblical allusion was reported by Mira. I was asking Mira what she thought of “being able to reflect Christian values in teaching,” one component of the new Competency-Based Curriculum (see Appendix E). More specifically, I was interested in knowing more about the notion of “soft skills.” In an earlier conversation (i.e., in a focus group discussion on March 11, 2014), Houtman asked how the component of “being able to reflect Christian values...” can be assessed. Mira replied that it might be part of soft skills. In a follow-up interview with Mira (on March 21, 2014), I asked her “Lha kaitannya dengan nilai-nilai kristiani dalam mengajar, soft skillnya terus in what ways?” (i.e., “In what ways do Christian values in teaching have anything to do with soft skills?”). This was her response, in mixed Indonesian, Javanese, and English:

Mungkin ya memang lebih yang general, ya? [Maybe things that are more general, okay?...] Karena sebetulnya nilai-nilai kristiani pun juga cukup universal,

ya? [Because actually Christian values are quite universal, right?]. Like respect each other, love each other,... melakukan tugas sebaiknya seperti kamu melakukan untuk Tuhan [doing a task as well as you could as you do it for the Lord]. Yang kaya? gitu tho? [Something like that, right?].

With regard to character education, Mira's focus on hard work in completing a task was reiterated in a constructed dialogue after the quote above: "ini lho, kamu kalo? melakukan mengerjakan tugas ya harus sebaik-baiknya" [If you do your assignment, do it as well as you can]. Similar to Sara who did not want to disclose Christianity too much, however, Mira was hedging:

But maybe I will stop there. The remainder of the verse, 'like you do it to the Lord,' cannot be added. ... My perspective on how I do my task, I do it as I do it to the Lord. [Colossians 3:23: 'Whatever you do, work at it with all your heart, as working for the Lord, not for human masters' [NIV]]. I want to apply that verse. But when it comes to applying the verse to students, I will probably only stop at, 'do your task well.' But I can't use the rest of the verse. ... That's part of *soft skill*. So it's tricky, right? If Christian values are too obviously disclosed, the dilemma is *in that class, not all students are Christians. There are Muslims. There are maybe Buddhists, or Hindus. I'm afraid it will Christianize them.* (Interview, March 21, 2014, translated from Indonesian and Javanese to English, with sentences in italics originally in English)

The way a limit is defined as to how one's religious (especially Christian) belief can be expressed in class, if the limit is delineated at all, may be different across

lecturers. But if Christian values are to be incorporated into ELT in a non-coercive way, they need to be packaged in ways that do not disclose teachings of a particular religion too obviously. Marty did that through showing his moral values of appreciating women in Advanced Speaking class. Sara and Mira attempted to be aware of their non-Christian audience in class. Truncating a verse (e.g., by both Mira and Sara) or using an English version of a biblical verse (e.g., by Sara) are ways to negotiate Christian English teachers' performances of spiritual identities in ELT classrooms. They knew their power as Christian English educators who had the right to impart good values to their students, but to some extent they also were conscious of their power as Christians who work with non-Christian students.

In light of Megawangi, as cited in Inderawati (2013), a literary education scholar from Indonesia, there are "nine pillars of character" typifying "noble universal values":

- 1) love God and the universe and its contents,
- 2) responsibility, discipline, and self-reliance,
- 3) honesty,
- 4) respect and courtesy,
- 5) compassion, caring, and cooperation,
- 6) self-confident, creative, hard work, and never give up,
- 7) justice and leadership,
- 8) good and humble, and
- 9) tolerance, love of peace, and unity. (p. 16)

Although Inderawati's focus was on using literary works to promote character education, the notion of nine pillars of character seems to resonate in ELT settings at JCU where some teachers thought of spirituality as inextricably linked to character education. But how character education is packaged in class is still an intriguing question.

Endorsing Character Education in ELT Contexts by being Authoritative

Character education seems to have been integrated in Sri's teaching, too. In a focus group discussion on March 11, 2014, I asked whether spirituality concerned Sri. He said: "not very much in my daily life, unless if I come across problems which is very difficult to solve, I guess." Despite a lack of concern about spirituality, in a subsequent conversation, Sri remembered how he used the authority of a religious teaching to push his students to read. The noble character Sri would like his students to have was that they would be diligent, especially in reading assigned materials. The story in this excerpt is situated in Sri's attempt to address a question in my interview protocol. Sri held the protocol, so he understood that I expected him to elaborate on what he thought of his interactions with students in class having different spiritual and/or religious views. Although he did not exactly remember what class that was, when I asked him, he said that it might have been "Introduction to Research." He was apparently upset because only few students read the article he assigned. Then he switched to Indonesian "sudah anu, nggak punya hobi membaca lagi?" [you already have lost your reading hobby?]. Sri seemed to remember he used Indonesian to his students. It is quite common for myself that when a topic under discussion is hard, I switched to my first language when talking to students. I believe this is Sri's reason to switch to L1.

Sri could still remember his students' reaction: "almost everyone smiling." He said to his students, most probably still in Indonesian just as the phrasing he used before me: "Iho membaca kan perintah dari semua agama. Christianity juga memerintahkan umatnya untuk membaca. Menambah pengetahuan, kan? Islam juga memerintahkan

umatnya untuk membaca. Lalu? kalo itu tidak dijalankan, lalu gimana?” [To read is a command in every religion. Christianity also orders its people to read. It increases knowledge, right? Islam also commands its people to read. So? If it is not obeyed, then how?] (Interview, March 25, 2014).

I was curious how the students responded to that challenge. Sri said that they “kept smiling.” He resumed with his point that if the religious command is not obeyed, “melanggar aturan ya? Melanggar perintah” [trespassing the regulation, right? Disobeying the command]. His further comment is also interesting: “I didn’t say I was the one who told them to be ‘memerintahkan’ [I was not the one who gave the command to read]. Not me. But another authority” (Interview, March 25, 2014).

In Goffman’s (1981, p. 167) view, Sri *animated* the religious *authority*, ascribing the authority (e.g., God or a prophet) as the *principal* of the command that religious followers have to read. Sri disclaimed his own self (i.e., “Not me” as the principal, or the one who is responsible for declaring the authority. This is an irony intentionally crafted by Sri. If the students could not obey him, who is one of senior lecturers, who else would they obey to? This is the impression I perceive from Sri’s story.

In Christianity, reading avidly the Word of God might be the by-product of God’s command that his people contemplate about the divine teachings (e.g., Joshua 1:8). However, I do not think Christians are commanded to read (everything) as specifically as Muslims are. When I shared the story of religious authority used in ELT classrooms to Mur (unrecorded conversation, August 2, 2014), she brought the notion of *Iqra’* to my attention. *Iqra’* is a very important concept in Islam which means “read!” It was based on

the Prophet Muhammad SAW's story when he was "ordered to read by Angel Jibraeel (Gabriel)." Iqra' was also "the first word of the Quran that came upon the Prophet (SAW)" (Iqra, n.d.).

In light of Sri's story, one specific question emerges: How is the place of Islamic teaching in ELT, which is situated at an Indonesian Christian university and is initiated by a Muslim instructor, viewed by non-Muslim EFL stakeholders? That should be addressed in a follow-up project.

Being Alert about Belonging to the Minority Groups: A Race-Faith Interface

Moving to a Christian institution can be associated with feelings of racial and spiritual insecurity in another place. Dika moved to JCU because she felt discriminated when she worked in an English language learning institution, where the staff members are predominantly Muslims, in the Greater Jakarta. Besides that, there was a social riot there in 1998, which made her and her family terrified. As she said:

At that time I felt very insecure, because my neighbors who were mostly Moslems, then put the sign of 'Moslem belongings' on their door, so that they would be saved from the rioters. But then I could not do that. And I felt very insecure. (Interview, March 26, 2014).

This feeling of being discriminated against was not told to me and other lecturers during a focus group discussion on March 11, 2014, because there was Sri, a Muslim lecturer.

The experience of being discriminated against led her to have some idealism in the first few years working at JCU:

That's why when I was here, in my early years then I thought JCU should be strong because it's a Christian university. If JCU is strong, then I think it will also be good for Christian followers here. If JCU is not strong, it's a weak university, it will be easier for extreme fanatics of the majority religion in Indonesia then to dominate the non-Moslems. It is also possible that there will be kind of religious conflicts, which can start with ethnic conflicts or whatever, but then develop to be kind of anti-Christians... . (Interview, March 26, 2014)

Dika questioned herself if keeping this idealism was worth doing. However, having firsthand experience of being discriminated against and being aware of herself as part of the minority (as a Catholic and a Chinese) are invaluable assets for understanding societal power relations that oftentimes end up in religious or ethnic conflicts. Dika's initiative to bring up religiously related themes, like that which will be presented further in chapter 7, could be framed by her strong affection in creating a strong Christian/Catholic community.

Witnessing about the Gospel

One teacher, Tammy, seems overtly religious in class, but I could not identify how self-reflexive she was with regard to sharing the gospel. Tammy was dismayed because there is lack of Christian atmosphere in JCU. Therefore, she believed that she had the responsibility to show her Christian identity, including to students. She would explain religious backgrounds of certain literary works by Phillis Wheatley and Langston Hughes, among others. To her students, she expressed her discomfort in using a speaking

activity that included fortunetelling, because according to the Bible, it is not right to tell fortunes (My personal reflective journal, August 6, 2014).

In the remainder of this sub-section, I will focus on the cases of Celeste and Mustika who are not only open about their faith in class, but also critical (pedagogical). While Celeste is actively involved in a Pentecostal church, Mustika is a member of a non-Pentecostal church. Both Celeste and Mustika have been influenced by feminism. Let me start with Celeste.

Celeste's exposure to critical theories, especially in feminism, has made her quite critical towards the church she attends (e.g., that it does not really provide room for discussing homosexuality and other controversial issues). In chapter 7, I will point out how she negotiated her spiritual views so as to accommodate thorny issues like homosexuality and contraceptive use in a Communication Across Cultures class. Here I will concentrate on how her engagement in Christian mission work through her church accounts for a rather complex picture of her spiritual *identity formation*, to use Wong's (2013) term, as a person and as an EFL teacher educator at JCU.

Furthermore, Celeste has been exposed to insights into evangelism recently learned at church. But the way she performed evangelism was not coercive. The context of the following conversation was I asked Celeste about her involvement in church. She told me then she was once asked by the church leader to interpret, from English to Indonesian, a mission team that conducted a workshop on mission. As she further explained:

So there was a mission team brought by the pastor's son. Then they conducted a workshop. Several techniques were presented when we want to share the gospel. And this is the real gospel, you know. Using biblical verses.

Jos: Who was the audience?

Celeste: The audience were members of [cell groups]. And what do they aim? What is church's aim? It is supposed to mobilize as many people as possible. *I'm interested in the word 'mobilize.'*

Jos: Could you please say more about it?

Celeste: Mobilizing as many youths as possible to partake in mission activities. So in the workshop there were many young people... . One of the techniques was how to guide people to salvation, and to accept the Lord Jesus as their savior... . *There's no other way. To help you to fulfill your deepest desire to encounter God. Ya it is indeed the deepest desire of every creature. Finding the creator, ya? And they said, there's no other way. Unless you come and kneeling down on the cross. Accepting Jesus Christ's sacrifice. Accepting him yes, he is the savior. And then Andrea, the speaker, said: 'It is better to share about Jesus to those we already know. Or those we meet on daily basis [like] colleagues or university students. Or people at home.'* (Celeste, Interview, April 16, 2014; translated from Indonesian, with sentences in italics originally in English)

The teaching from the mission team was heavily evangelical, and I speculated that as an interpreter Celeste must have agreed with the message being conveyed to the audience. I also began thinking if the evangelistic teaching had some influence on her

profession as an EFL teacher educator. I asked him: “Does any of the teaching [by the mission team] have an impact on your position as an English language teacher?” Her response was quite nuanced, in that she understood the challenge of implementing what was taught on the pulpit. If I were Celeste, I would probably have said: “Easier said than done.” Her response below is in English:

I started to think of ‘Do I have to start at least think of this possibility or not?’
When student come and talk to me, and it’s not counseling. It’s just sharing. And at the end of the sharing usually if they want me to pray, ya I would pray with them. If they don’t want to, then it’s okay. But I usually will ask: ‘Do you think that you want me to pray with you?’ If they say ‘yes,’ ya. But not specifically talking about salvation. (Celeste, Interview, April 16, 2014)

It is not clear if she had started thinking of the possibility of sharing the gospel before or after she interpreted the mission team at church. But the thinking itself had been ongoing and she recalled an event where she interacted with her student in person. Praying with a student privately, not praying in public, had been a strategy for Celeste to reach out to her students. Unlike Andrea the speaker of the mission team who frontally suggested that there should be a mention of “Jesus as savior” to prospective converts, Celeste said that she did not specifically talk about salvation to her student.

It was not clear either whether the student was Christian or not. So I asked Celeste: “So do you mean the students who are not Christian [to whom you didn’t specifically talk about salvation]?” Her reply was quite shocking: “or even Christian” (Interview, April 16, 2014). In other words, even to fellow Christians, who happened to

be her student, Celeste would not talk about salvation. Whether Celeste has had any private encounter with non-Christian student in a similar situation is not clear. And by saying “or even Christian” is probably Celeste’s strategy to conceal any private encounter with non-Christian students.

Commenting on the act of praying, Celeste explained further: “I just try to respect their decision as a person” (Interview, April 16, 2014). The students’ agency to decide whether to pray together with her is taken into account by Celeste, in other words. Her next step in a rather reserved manner is, whether the students wanted to pray with her or not: “but if you have problems, from what I know, the Bible offers this [solution]. *But I never mentioned any Bible verse*” (translated from Indonesian, with the sentence in italics originally in English). At other times, Celeste only acted as a listener to her students’ stories. Only later sometimes Celeste offered the students that there is “satu solusi yang kekal, yang sebenarnya” [one eternal and real solution].

Afterwards, I shifted the conversation to a classroom context. I asked her: “As far as you remember, what about in class?” To this, Celeste answered: “Never.” Her main reason was this:

In my opinion, if they know salvation by themselves, *they start to encounter God by themselves. Then they move from being dependent to me, and being dependent to God.* That’s more important, I think. (Interview, April 16, 2014, translated from Indonesian, with the sentences in italics originally in English).

Besides that, Celeste was aware of a negative stereotype toward the charismatic movement:

I realize, like sharing gospel, and even leading people come to salvation or accepting Jesus as their savior, is stereotyped as charismatic movement. I just sense that this university management, they do not favor so much the charismatic movement. So I'm thinking of political factor, right? (Interview, April 16, 2014, originally in English)

Politically, Celeste knows that JCU is not very sympathetic with evangelization, even to fellow Christians. Celeste has also understood that Indonesia is a multi-religious country, with Christianity being the minority compared to Islam. Therefore, her approach to sharing her life with students, with only occasional mentions of the importance of the Bible, is more appropriate than aggressive evangelism endorsed by the mission team from out of Indonesia. And sharing life is only possible when, as Celeste has exemplified, a teacher thinks of their students as part of their spiritual calling. As Celeste put it:

The question [is] whether they simply be my students, or are they part of my calling? Like if they are simply my students, it's like they are just my clients. Like we are in business kinds of relationship. But if they are part of my calling, then it requires different kind of relation. (Interview, April 16, 2014)

Relating to students as part of spiritual calling is consistent with Celeste's holistic view that "spiritual" and "non-spiritual" things are not supposed to be dichotomized. Wong (2009) envisions a holistic pedagogy, especially by non-Western teachers who "avoid the spiritual/secular dualism found in the West." For Celeste, in particular, the spirituality functions as the "driving force" that "governs the way [she talks], the way [she relates], the way [she works], the way [she perceives] things" (Focus group

discussion, April 2, 2014). Listing with the phrase of “the way...” is, in Schiffrin’s (1994) perspective, Celeste’s strategy to make a point that “to [her] everything is spiritual.” This point is also reinforced by a strategy other than listing. That is, she used a deductive approach to arguing. As she put it: “I do not intend to draw strict limit between what seems to be spiritual, and what means to be not spiritual like.” Celeste also used the word “strict” in “draw[ing] strict limit.” This intensifies her stance in making herself distinct from a mainstream thinking that the “spiritual” is different from the “non- or less spiritual.” One common indicator of dichotomizing the spiritual and the non- or less spiritual is that the former “is mainly when I relate with God,” and the latter is “when I relate to people around me.” Arguing that everything is spiritual, Celeste extended the case of “everything” in terms of teaching (i.e., “when I teach, it’s my spiritual act” [Focus group discussion, April 2, 2014]) and relating to her students (Interview, April 16, 2014).

On relating to her students, furthermore, Celeste explained how she viewed them as individuals already embedded in processes of social constructions which she could not simply overlook:

The one that I face with that day is the result of the one who relates [to] something else and someone else outside the classroom. So the experience outside the classroom would influence who they are in my classroom. So I cannot just neglect it. So of course I cannot approach the whole students in the class that day. ... But in every semester I will see one or two students, [who] require special approach. (Interview, April 16, 2014)

Celeste's feminism seemed to be at work when she noticed a girl with a bruised arm. The script of physical abuse appeared to have activated Celeste's understanding of the social construction that women are inferior to men. This became a strong reason for her to get connected with her student. She told me a story as follows:

I once spotted a girl. She usually sat almost at the corner of the class. And many times she cannot concentrate on the learning, or my explanation, or whatever. Lost. Out of the track many times. One day, she came earlier than the others. And I spotted like uh bluish *kaya? memar, biru, menghitam* [like bruise, blue, blackened]. Yes, bruise on her arms. And I started to question. Okay, then at the end of the class, I asked her to help me to bring the attendance list back to me in my room. So she came and I said 'Do you have class after this?'

'No, Ma'am.'

'Okay. I would like to have a breakfast. Would you have breakfast together with me?'

'Okay.'

We sat for a breakfast, and after several talking, I started to ask about- not her life, but just how that she feel, things like that. And then the story behind the bruise came out. And I know that her boyfriend beat her last night. And then from that point I just started to share about her *cinta monyet* [i.e., puppy love] experience, so I think by doing that way I can help to deal with her learning problem in the class. (Interview, April 16, 2014, originally in English, with some Indonesian expressions)

At other times, Celeste dealt with students who are “too open, and just come without any invitation from [her].” And she was relatively fine with that. Celeste reiterated her point: “If I only see them like client, ya ‘office hour is finished. Sorry, I cannot talk to you anymore.’” I asked her if any of these students to whom she reached out or who approached her were non-Christian. Celeste answered: “One or two of them are Muslims” (Interview, April 16, 2014).

The whole point of Celeste’s case in this sub-section is this: the gospel is not necessarily conveyed in a verbal and aggressive way. Reaching out to students, especially those requiring more special attention, and being open to students who approached her has been part of Celeste’s spiritual calling. Bonding with students will later determine Celeste’s move as to whether the students would like to pray with her, or whether she would encourage her students to look into the Bible by themselves.

Now I turn to Mustika. Although Mustika is a member of a non-Pentecostal church, her standpoint of sharing the gospel is distinct from Houtman: not only is Houtman a member of a non-Pentecostal church, but he also avoids himself from sharing his faith in class. I asked Mustika what she thought of the idea that a person has a responsibility to let others know of her religious belief. Her response sounded bolder than Celeste, Sara, or Mira with regard to professing her faith in class:

It is my responsibility to tell what I believe. Because the Holy Book that I believe has the mandate or tells about the mandate to share or tell other people the story of what you believe. Even though from my perspective, when I tell about my belief, it does not have to be openly say that ‘well, I’m a Christian... This is what

Christianity is.’ But in any occasion or any opportunity to tell about what Christian belief is my responsibility as a Christian. So like the simplest information that I shared with the student, when I define the word ‘savior,’ when we discussed the poem [see chapter 5 and Appendix K], I think that was part of doing my responsibility. (Interview, May 6, 2014)

However, it does not mean Mustika is not self-reflexive about how her faith is often understood and practiced by less reflexive Christians. She might not be cognizant about the current TESOL literature on faith and ELT, but her interest in critical theories through English literary studies have helped her to be self-reflexive, too. In the next chapter, I will discuss self-reflexivity on the part of Mustika, as well as two U.S. missionaries, Angela and Tim, when they brought up several themes depicting life realities in ELT classrooms.

Conclusion

Christian and non-Christian English language teachers’ spiritual identities have been understood in different ways: praying in public, being professional, being aware of one’s power, due to her or his religion, and witnessing about the Christian gospel. With few exceptions (e.g., Houtman’s avoidance from discussing spirituality in class and Sri’s use of religious authority), self-reflexivity when engaging in discussions about spiritual views is the main thread that runs through the English language educators’ understanding of spiritual identities in class, as far as their comments or narratives are concerned.

For English language teachers who decided to engage in conversations about their spiritual identities, these nuanced ideas of power relations came to the fore. First, power relations associated with spirituality are not simply about interreligious tensions.

Expected prayers in public (e.g., before the first morning class starts) have seemed to create two castes among Christians themselves: Those teachers who pray fit in the “cultural models” (Gee, 2012, p. 94) of being ideal Christians; those who don’t are the other way around. Second, the gap of power differentials can be narrowed, in a way, when teachers share their weaknesses or vulnerability with students. Recall how Marty acknowledged his susceptibility to sexual immorality through lustful eyes, when he talked about how in a speaking class female students should dress properly, and how male students should respect women’s bodily parts. Third, being aware of one’s position of power in class, power differentials due to one’s dominant faith in an institution like JCU can be narrowed by not alluding to biblical texts too explicitly (see Sara’s and Mira’s cases). Lastly, racial identity (e.g., being of Chinese descent) is closely linked to one’s spirituality, especially in Indonesia, where Chinese and Christian people are by and large positioned as second-class citizens by “indigenous” (especially Javanese) Muslims. Working at JCU has therefore been for Dika to create a strong atmosphere of Christianity. In chapter 7, I will discuss in more detail how Dika was more concerned about showing her (and the Christian students’) existence as Christians than about proselytizing. In the next chapter, I will examine how English language educators at JCU reflected on how spiritual and/or religious issues were incorporated into discussing themes of life realities (e.g., discrimination, the 9/11 incident in the United States) in ELT classrooms.

CHAPTER 5

EFL TEACHERS' REFLECTIONS ON THE INCORPORATION OF SPIRITUALITY AND LIFE REALITIES INTO ELT CLASSROOMS

In this chapter, narratives from three Christian English language educators (i.e., Mustika, Tim, and Angela) and an observation from one non-Christian English teacher (i.e., Mur) are analyzed. They talked about how spirituality, which may include religious issues, was either raised in class when discussing themes of life realities (e.g., in Mustika's, Tim's, and Angela's classes) or could have been better addressed in ELT classrooms (see Mur's suggestion). In discussing Mur's suggestion, I compare her opinion to that of Shinta first because I think Mur's opinion is closer to what I have in mind regarding critical spiritual pedagogy. The main difference between this chapter and the previous chapter is that spirituality in the current chapter was part of major class discussions about themes of life realities, not as addenda, like character education addressed in passing, of an ongoing lesson. The following themes of life realities have been considered salient by some English teachers and/or students: discriminations (e.g., slavery in the United States, Islamophobia after then 9/11 incident, and interreligious love relationships). Themes of life realities that are spiritually salient are those that are much more meaningfully engaged by EFL stakeholders in ELT classrooms at JCU.

Mustika's Experience of Teaching about Discrimination

Being discriminated (e.g., as a slave in the pre-nineteenth century United States) is a life reality. Although slavery impacting the life of many African-Americans happened in quite a distant past, the theme of discrimination is still relevant until today.

Using the case of Phillis Wheatley's poem entitled *On Being Brought from Africa to America*,⁶ Mustika initiated a discussion about nuanced spiritual identity formation of Phillis Wheatley, a slave who was taught literacy and Christianity by her mistress. Whether Mustika's opinion of Phillis Wheatley's poem is plausible according to the standard of literary studies or not is less of an issue here. More at stake is Mustika's take on what the main purpose of discussing the poem with her students of EFL teacher education program at JCU who took the Prose course. In Mustika's view, "this poem is kind of auto-critique to the believers. To the Christian believers" (see paragraph 4 of Mustika's talk in Appendix K; from Interview, May 6, 2014). Broader than auto-criticism toward Christianity, Mustika also had this agenda in class: "That is why I then try to generalize the issue of auto-criticism toward someone's belief," not necessarily Christianity (paragraph 8; see also paragraph 5). She even challenged her Muslim students to be reflexive, if not also auto-critical, to their practices: "why [do] you put on head scarf? Were you ready with the questions, or with the people's look toward you, especially when you were studying here in Christian university, and you put head scarf?" (paragraph 13).

From my understanding of Mustika's interpretation, Phillis Wheatley exercised personal agency within the White structure of Christianity. Her agency is demonstrated through her decision to write the poem in which she was thankful for having been introduced to Jesus as her savior (see Appendix K, paragraph 2). More importantly, Phillis had some meta-awareness of discrimination through learning her life as a slave and as a Christian. In Gee's (2012, p. 169) view, a person like Phillis Wheatley has

learned the Discourse of Christianity well enough to be able to have some “meta-knowledge,” and provide some “meta-talk” through the poem, of the irony of discrimination (see Appendix K, paragraph 3). Phillis Wheatley’s meta-knowledge of discrimination, as reflected in her poem, was a result of years of learning. She learned literacy and Christianity, through the lens of, to use Gee’s explanation on the notion of learning, “life-experiences that trigger conscious reflection” (Gee, 2012, p. 167). The most salient life-experience Phillis had was the embodiment of slavery as day-to-day status and practices.

I did not observe Mustika’s Poetry class, so I was curious about how her students responded to her auto-critical stance. Mustika reported that the students did answer her question, but “they smiled” and she believed they started thinking. It is difficult to measure starting to think, but in Mustika’s opinion, this is more important than knowing what their answers were in the class (see Appendix K, paragraph 6). And thinking in silence might be more favorable, in my opinion, than answering a question so as to please what a teacher believes (see Angela’s conundrum below when she discussed critical thinking in relation to spirituality).

Despite Phillis Wheatley’s agency, the straitjacket of White supremacy was very powerful. Mustika explained that a literate slave like Phillis was subject to being put on display in road shows by their masters (or mistress). Having skilled slaves might boost slave owners’ sense of pride (see Appendix K, paragraph 10). Phillis might get “the spotlight as a poet, but people would always ask the question ‘who made her such poet? Because she was just a slave’” (paragraph 12).

Overall, Mustika's thorough discussion about the poem demonstrated a Christian English teacher's attempt to be self-reflexive. Mustika might feel that it is part of her responsibility to share the gospel (e.g., by explaining the concept of "salvation" to her students; see the *Witnessing about the gospel* sub-section in chapter 4 above). However, she dared to challenge injustice practiced by fellow Christians like the White slave owners. Mustika's case lends some support to the idea that a Christian English language educator does not have to be closeted (or "religionless," as Shinta puts it, like Houtman) about her or his faith in class. Instead, it is of utmost importance that the Christian English teacher can exhibit self-reflexivity concerning her or his faith by keeping some distance from inhuman practices that is contrary to a sense of humanity in general and her or his own spiritual beliefs as a Christian.

Tim's Experiences of Presenting Islam in Class

Interreligious conflicts have been a salient theme of life reality in Indonesia which was addressed by Tim. What is interesting from my talk with Tim is his critical insight into developing materials for reading courses that include such a theme. The following excerpt contains Tim's response to my question if there were any incidents in his classes where he had to deal with the tension between his spirituality and power imbalance with students, an issue that he brought up earlier during the conversation (see chapter 4):

[1] Ya. So I think early on, specially when I was not using my own materials, I notice some of the books, like in Intermediate Reading class, some of the readings might have a critical view of certain issues in Indonesia, that were predominantly within the Muslim community. So like issues of polygamy, or issues of tolerance

[to] Ahmadiyah. So there's a group that was critical of how majority Islam is treating Ahmadiyah, the minority, persecuted group that's considered like a deviant branch. They're considered heretical from mainstream. So the articles are about that.

[2] And I felt like it was tense and inappropriate because my Muslim students are in the majority Christian campus. And me as a Christian teacher. And ya. That's a view that might be critical of their religion and faith. And I think it's different when it comes from within your community than outside community. And so those readings made me feel a little bit uncomfortable. And I, you know, couldn't tell if my students were uncomfortable, because it related to religion at all, or what the dynamic was. Where if I was, you know, imposing my own view. And coming from the U.S., where you know, I went to public schools, and we didn't talk about issues of religion very much in the classroom. It's pretty negative sometimes.

[3] So then later, I felt like I tried to bring in readings that were maybe, if there were on that topic, would be written by a Muslim writer, talking about their own community. I would tell the students, 'it's a perspective from within the community. And I'm interested in your thoughts and views. And here are my thoughts and views. But they're not the only thoughts.' So I tried to make it much more clear, that I was interested in their views. So that was the time when I was tense. (Interview, June 5, 2014)

By “not using my own materials” (paragraph 1), Tim implied that at least one person other than himself developed the reading materials. It is very likely that at least an Indonesian EFL lecturer developed the material. I even suspect that the material developer was also a Christian or a Catholic. Some of the readings were critical to some issues like polygamy and the marginalization of Ahmadiyah,⁷ a sect banned by the mainstream Islam in Indonesia. Even when the material developer was a Muslim, which was very unlikely because no Muslim EFL lecturer had taught the reading course, I understood when Tim said: “I felt like it was tense and inappropriate because my Muslim students are in the majority Christian campus. And me as a Christian teacher.” Yes, Tim was uncomfortable (paragraph 2). This is a critical, aha moment. As Pennycook (2004) views it, a critical moment entails “a point of significance” when “some new understanding is coming about” (p. 330). Had Tim not shared his apprehension of using the material that criticized some religious practices associated with Islam, I (and my fellow Indonesian EFL lecturers at JCU or elsewhere) would have taken this for granted. It is very easy to exert one's power, especially as a Christian English teacher, in being critical toward those embracing different faiths. Not that Muslim students could not be critical toward some practices tied to their religion, but the issue here is how selection of ELT materials could be very religiously insensitive.

Tim offered a viable solution: “I think it’s different when it comes from within your [Muslim] community than outside community” (paragraph 2). In the third paragraph, Tim tried to use readings on Islamic topics that were authored by a Muslim writer. And instead of jumping to express his own view, he cushioned the sensitive topic

by first presenting the perspective from within the (Muslim) community (as represented by the Muslim writer), and then asked the (Muslim) students what their thoughts or viewpoints on the Muslim writer's perspective. Only after that would Tim share his ideas. But he did not stop there, hedging that "they're not the only thoughts" (paragraph 3).

But Tim also had another strategy. Instead of focusing on the negative view of Islam (like on polygamy or intolerance to Ahmadiyah), Tim brought in materials that attempt to mitigate post-9/11 Islamophobia. Tim shared stories of some Muslim-American writers who "try to build awareness that happen in the U.S." after the 9/11 tragedy (see paragraph 1 below). He even told the students about his visit to some mosques in the U.S. and how *Imams* (i.e., Islamic leaders) shared with him stories of religious intolerance towards Muslim-Americans (paragraph 2):

[1] So then there was also I taught American Culture and Literature class. And so one of the units was on Post 9/11 literature and culture in America. And we worked at some of the Islamophobia that happened. But then also, you know, the positive look at Arab-American, or Muslim-American writers who wrote about their experiences and some of the outreach, and to try to build awareness that happen in the U.S. And that was hard. Ya because I know [it] was a sensitive topic. But my students seem appreciative to know more just what people were feeling at that time.

[2] Because it was, you know, for my generation such a big impactful moment. Ya. Even just using the words 9/11, everyone understands with them coming out of a U.S. context, you know. And especially for these folks who were,

you know, maybe like ten at the time, now that they're much younger, it didn't have that same impact. And so watching like the video footage of it happening, reading some of the editorials or comments afterwards, but then also going into some of the more rough things like the discrimination against people. And I showed some experiences of mosques that I visited that had been attacked at different points, like someone shooting at the building or calling a bomb threat, so things like that. [I shared with my students how Imams at the Mosques I visited in the U.S. shared with me about how the Mosques had occasionally been fired at or been vandalized].

[3] But we did other things as well. So looking at other religious aspects in the U.S. and covering Christianity as well as some more French-Christian groups in the U.S., and Islam in the U.S., looked at some British writings from the U.S., things like that. So it wasn't just associating religion with one negative thing. But also like some Black Muslim Americans in the U.S. used Islam during Civil Rights Movement. So it's also relating in positive ways. Not just negative, which I felt was important. (Interview, June 5, 2014)

Broader than the context of 9/11 tragedy, Tim acknowledged the positive contribution of Islam in the U.S. history (e.g., Black Muslim Americans' involvement during the Civil Rights Movement; see paragraph 3). By allowing himself to learn the positive role of Islam, Tim not only has internalized "interactional" dialogue within himself through the literature he read, but also he shared his new understanding of Islam with his students embracing different faiths. "Dialogue may purport to be *interactional*,"

Morgan (2009) contends, “whereby participants allow themselves to be re-formed as a consequence, but in effect remain stubbornly *transactional*, where predetermined values are guardedly exchanged without any intention of change” (p. 197). In view of Morgan, Tim has been reshaped as a more open-minded Christian through his serious study of Islam. He did not transactionally imposed acceptance to criticisms about Islam on his students, either.

Tim’s and Angela’s experiences of teaching the American Culture and Literature course, among others, at JCU are complementary. While Tim shed more light on how Islam should be viewed in a positive way, Angela focused on reflexivity concerning some Christians’ evangelical agenda after the 9/11 tragedy.

Angela’s Experiences of Being Reflexive about Evangelism

Angela provided two insightful narratives of her classroom interactions with her students when the issue of Christianity was raised in class. The narratives accentuate two major life realities: the 9/11 tragedy and the likelihood that students would express a view that their teacher would like to hear.

In the first narrative, Angela told me how the 9/11 incident and its aftermath had inspired her to discuss issues of culture, which includes Christianity and Islam (e.g., American Islamophobia; see Appendix L, narrative #1 paragraph 1; from Interview, April 29, 2014). As an American, she wanted to learn more about Islam, and by “provid[ing] a safe space” for the students and her to talk about religion in the class, she hoped to “build better interfaith relationship with... students” (paragraph 1).

Angela was aware, though, the her attempt to dig out more about religious views from Indonesian EFL students was some sort of “pushing the envelope.” Angela had observed that Indonesians talked more openly about religion than those in the United States, but “to a point” that did not disrupt harmony (see Appendix L, paragraph 2, from an interview on April 29, 2014). Therefore, she tried not to be too pushy by saying “And if you want to compare it with your own culture, and see if this has similarities or differences, and apply this critique to your own culture, *silahkan* [please]. But they don’t feel *terpaksa* [obliged]” (paragraph 3).

Angela’s lessons were enhanced by media (e.g., songs, television shows, and movies) that better depicted American cultures (see Appendix L, paragraph 4, from an interview on April 29, 2014). A variety of media produced by “right” and “left” wingers were used so as to show the students many U.S. people’s purposes or motives in presenting their views of the 9/11 incident through the media (paragraph 5). A complication arose when one song with highly Christian overtone was played in class. Angela actually wanted to tell her students that the song was used as an evangelical tool:

It’s a song, but it’s almost like a narration of God. And it’s told from the perspective of God. And he is saying, ‘I was there, in the building. I was there in the planes. I was there. People wanted to know where I was. But I was there.’... At the end it’s like God asked the question, ‘But if you were in that situation, at that moment, would you've turned to me?’ And it’s used just like this evangelical tool. Like ‘Think about your life. Think about your death. If you were a victim of 9/11, would you have been calling out to me?’ (paragraph 6)

Angela even expressed a caution and a meta-commentary of the media she brought in class: “I’m not trying to evangelize you, guys. I want you to see how people use this tragedy for their own purposes.” However, this was not sufficient for some Christian students and Muslims alike. Some Christian students had misunderstood her, saying that Angela was brave to be God’s witness and evangelize in class: “I admire you because even in the class, ... there's a way to like witness or evangelize.” Some other students thought Angela “was trying to convert the Muslims” (paragraph 7).

Learning from this, Angela was determined to repeat her intention of bringing some Christian media a lot of times in different ways in order that the students would not miss her entire point: “I was trying to... show [students] how people were using this for their own religious agenda. And how people got terrified at Islamaphobia. I was trying to use it as a critical moment” (see Appendix L, paragraph 8 from an interview on April 29, 2014; a similar view was repeated in paragraphs 10, 13, and 14). Besides that, Angela had not felt comfortable with being evangelical herself. As a non-Pentecostal person, she put more emphasis on “witnessing through love and relationship and service.” She believed that without actions, people would not be sincerely converted through words only (paragraph 11). After all, conversion to Christianity was not the focus of her lesson at all.

Angela’s reflection also disclosed two possible problems that accounted for some students’ misunderstanding. First, the students were learning English as a foreign language (see Appendix L, paragraph 14 from an interview on April 29, 2014). Second, some (Muslim) students who misunderstood her were the weak students whose English

language proficiency and “critical thinking abilities were not very developed” (paragraph 9). To address the first problem, repeating her intention over and over again so as to avoid misunderstanding could potentially work. However, developing critical thinking is not without issues. That Angela, or Christian English teachers in general, have self-reflexivity is commendable. However, it is not easy for self-reflexive teachers, who are committed to keeping some distance from their cherished beliefs, to develop students’ critical thinking that is sincere. The following narrative reveals the intricacy of nurturing critical thinking in class.

In an individual interview with Angela, I explored how Christian spirituality was once utilized by Angela as a theme for the writing class. Having tried to use a text with Christian overtone in the writing course reader once, Angela expressed her concern. Compared to that in the (American) culture and literature classes, she thought that it was harder for her to discuss religious issues in a writing class (see Appendix M, paragraph 1, from an interview on April 29, 2014). Angela’s main intention of bringing up a short narrative about Langston Hughes’s being forced to be saved (paragraph 2) was to give an example of writer's purpose. As she said: “Is it clear why he [the writer] told the story? How did he structure the story? Those kinds of things” (paragraph 4).

Angela’s meta-commentaries of the students’ agreement with her is worth analyzing here. Angela thought that the students seemed to know how to please her by performing a “critical” persona rather than a “spiritual” persona. The students sounded critical, just like how Angela framed the story of Langston Hughes, of fake conversion (see Appendix M, paragraph 3, from an interview on April 29, 2014). Affirming a

teacher's critical opinion in class might be due to sedimented practices of "trying to give [a] teacher what they want" since a young age and the teacher's "leading questions" which may make students "feel like 'I should answer it this way, rather than this way'" (paragraph 5). If the teacher were spiritually inclined, some students would have been either silent or bogusly support the teacher's stance. Angela was critically inclined, which also led some students to support her, though she was not sure if this was sincere.

Through reflecting on her inclusion of Langston Hughes's narrative, Angela seems to have problematized a simplistic view that when students can be critical toward religion in class, it is un-problematically good. It *is* good to keep some distance from how religious beliefs are practiced. But to critique for critiquing's sake runs the risk of glorifying critical bandwagonism. It is desirable that students are critical, but if they simply jump into the bandwagon of criticality, they might not have a strong basis why they are being critical, apart from parroting the teacher in performing, if not "mushfaking" (to use Gee's term [2012, p. 178]), criticality.

Janks (2010) has noted that "desire and identification" at times "work against reason" (p. 213). Janks notices that a female student could be very feminist in their outlook, especially in class, but she could have a stronger desire to be identified with slim models on advertisements. In my current study, Angela suspected that students could use reason and be critical toward religion so as to identify themselves with the teacher and build good rapport with the teacher. In my view, identifying themselves with a "critical" teacher may imply the students' desire simply to get good grades from the teacher, rather than developing critical thinking abilities further.

Angela also thought of the dichotomy of being “critical” and being “spiritual” as problematic. As she said, commenting on the inclusion of Langston Hughes’s narrative: “But it was very compartmentalized almost. Like here is religion and spirituality, here’s critical thinking. Never the twin shall meet. Never the two shall meet. That’s how I felt at that time” (see Appendix M, paragraph 3, from an interview on April 29, 2014). Reading this is like discovering another critical, or an aha moment for me, although Angela thought she did not have much time to discuss it further with her students. The idea of critical spiritual pedagogy; see chapter 2) is not new. Some novelty here is my understanding that identification and desire complicate an optimistic hope that critical thinking and spirituality can be honestly blended and negotiated in ELT classrooms. Desire is not only “situated,... co-constructed,... [or] intersubjectively constituted and shaped” (Motha & Lin, 2014, p. 331), but also contested, especially between students and fellow students, or between students and their instructor. In other words, a student’s decision to identify her or himself with a teacher’s or fellow students’ (critical) persona with certain desires (e.g., questioning sexual straightness) is intricately woven in relations of power. First, with power at their disposal, teachers can either subtly impose criticality or some sort of spirituality on students, or use the power effectively to nurture dialogues that do not sacrifice critical thinking and one’s sense of spirituality. An attempt to achieve the latter has been initiated in JCU, although the instructor might not have seen it the way I see it (see Celeste’s case in chapter 7). Second, it is worth asking if someone’s desire to be identified with certain spirituality is compatible with “critical” schools of thought.

What is ideally believed in one's spirituality (or religion) may contradict one's desire (e.g., to be identified as a lesbian).

The role of English language (teacher) educators is hence to be more aware of power differentials due to the discrepancy between religious ideals and one's desire to be identified with certain personae that may be incongruent with religious ideals, but are justifiable in a higher plane (i.e., spirituality, which teaches "non-judgmental love," regardless of religions). Some empirical evidence that can address this will be provided by Celeste and her student, Ellie (see chapter 7).

Toward Problematizing "Liberal Multiculturalism" in ELT Classrooms

In this section, I will first compare Shinta's opinion about the notions of "spirituality" and "religion." After that, I will explain how Shinta's view can be a source for further reflections. With regard to relationship building, Shinta thought that spirituality unites, religions divide. Shinta actually started her definition of spirituality by saying that:

It is a quest to fill in the void that we have in human. Many people fill in with religion, other people fill in with other different thing. I think spirituality is how we can know our quest to know what is actually our purpose in this world, and why we are built a certain way, so that we can serve the greater good. ... When I start to learn about this, I learn that... we are similar than we are different. For whatever reason I feel like religion is like dividing us, so that we focus more on differences. But spirituality,... there are many things actually in common, among humankind. (Focus group discussion, April 2, 2014)

By saying that to “fill in the void that we have in human” with “religion” or “other different thing,” Shinta was implying that spirituality is larger in scope than religion. More importantly, spirituality drives people to find the very purpose of their life so as to “serve the greater good.” Religion does not seem to go well with the endeavor of serving the greater good because it is “like dividing us” and makes people “focus more on differences.” This is her working definition. She further argues:

So I don't know. And for me that is not like a full stop, but I think that is thinking in process, about spirituality, because it's very complex. And, what is it? Very fluid. So that's my definition today. (Focus group discussion, April 2, 2014)

I am glad that Shinta is open to future revisits of her own definition.

Understanding similarities across religions has at least one advantage: It may encourage people to see positive contributions that religions have in common to “serve the greater good.” An alternative interpretation is that focusing solely on similarities across religions may imply fear that concentrating more on differences can lead to conflicts. This interpretation highlights the likelihood that glossing over (religious) differences may lead to blindness of power differentials.

In Kubota's (2004) view, merely looking at people as having the same opportunity in society regardless of cultures can be part of “liberal multiculturalis[t]” mentality. This mentality obscures, or even obliterates the capability of seeing, power relations that are pervasive in society. Kubota endorses what she calls as “critical multiculturalism” when power relations are more paid attention to. Likewise, in this dissertation project, an awareness of power relations that are associated with religions or

spiritual views is in line with Kubota's critical multiculturalist stance. To illustrate briefly about this stance, arguing that Islam and Christianity similarly teach love is hard to rebut. Implying that Christian (English) teachers know better in teaching love for the rest of the people in the world (e.g., see Pasquale [2013, p. 60]) is highly problematic, though. Feeling more powerful in exerting love is susceptible to criticism. In chapter 7, I will address in further depth self-reflexivity and how power relations can be overlooked when only commonalities (e.g., of religious views) are emphasized.

Here I present Mur's view that problematizes emphasis on harmony, which can mystify power relations associated with religions. From my understanding, Mur cast some doubt on glossing over religious differences. Not that looking at similarities is entirely unfavorable. Far from it. My argument is that we have to look at similarities across religions, without overlooking power differentials due to religious divides.

In a recorded conversation with Mur on August 19, 2014, I was curious about her view of an excerpt of Marty's talk in a Communication Across Cultures class that contains an unhealthy interfaith debate, followed by Marty's statement of his strong faith in Christianity. So in Marty's view, rather than being involved in an unfruitful interreligious debate, he would rather say that he believes in Jesus (see chapter 7 for more detail). To Mur, I did not disclose that Marty was the speaker. I was fortunate because Mur did not only talk about the excerpt (see Appendix N, paragraph 1, from an interview on August 19, 2014), but she extended the conversation to include how religious issues have not been adequately addressed in Indonesian classrooms due to some fear of

proselytization (paragraphs 2 and 3). Then I asked her how her observation of the Indonesian classrooms can be specifically tackled in ELT classrooms (paragraphs 4-6).

On being not detailed about one's faith, Mur constructed an imaginary dialogue, followed by a meta-commentary:

'So we live happily ever after, this is a little bit part of [my belief], but I'm not going to talk in details, because if we start talking in details, the potential of conflicts will be more.' See my point? It's kind of like sweeping the dust under the carpet. You know? (Interview, August 19, 2014; Appendix N, paragraph 1)

In the next two paragraphs, Mur talked about the possibility of using "studium generale" (i.e., general studies) of religions, which had actually been implemented at JCU, in other contexts like public senior high schools, but not in elementary school. This is to compensate the "mono-religious" teaching at Indonesian schools. But Mur was conscious about fear on teachers' and parents' parts that such general studies will end up in evangelization. Mur mentioned:

Some school actually celebrate certain religious holidays, even though the students consist of different religions. Just to give a taste like, 'okay, this is how the holiday is celebrated,' which is actually great, but I don't think that will be a practice that is popular among the majority of Indonesians. Do you see my point? It's like sweep the dust under the rug. It looks beautiful and nice. Now let's not talk about it. Everybody's happy. (Interview, August 19, 2014, paragraph 3)

From Kubota's (2004) perspective, giving a taste of how different religious holidays are celebrated is a liberal approach to multiculturalism. However, in Indonesia it

seems like it is a good start for further understanding of power differentials associated with religious faiths. Mur's expression of "sweep the dust under the rug" encapsulates many Indonesian people's reluctance of understanding religious differences and how these people having different religious backgrounds interact with each other. Curious about how she addressed reluctance of understanding religious differences, I asked Mur a probing question: "Any concrete suggestions as to how to ameliorate the problems of sweeping the dust under the rug?" She answered:

Having a controversial debate. I know it's going to be tense and full of debates and heated argument, and things like that. But you cannot really learn anything, if you do it the nice way all the time. You know what I mean? And because this is the context of class, I assume that the students will know each other for quite some time, to consider other as friends. This is not a total strangers, you know? This is not total strangers. And usually discussion about differences is easier to accept when you actually know whom you're talking to. Like if your friend, you're not just seeing this person as a person with background. You'll see that this is a friend, that you empathize with, that they're just human beings; we both eat rice; they're friends, rather than total strangers which I don't care. You know?

(Interview, August 19, 2014)

I began to be more curious about what topics of "a controversial debate" would be appropriate for the students. I asked Mur: "Any topics that you can think, off the top of your head?" She replied:

Interreligious marriage is always interesting. And also that because, see? They're in college. They're like... hang out every day. Love. It's still a very interesting topic for them. Because they are like young adults. And I'm sure that there'll be crushes. Interreligious crushes. And that is something that actually students are so interested to know how to deal with that. Because you cannot really control how you feel. You cannot control when you fall in love. But I don't think they're quite sure of how to handle that in terms of differences. You know what I mean?

(Interview, August 19, 2014)

In chapter 6, I will discuss how “interreligious crushes” has been a real issue for students, especially Lucia, who wrote a poem of her personal interreligious love experience. As to how interreligious crushes are embedded in relations of power, I have the following views. First, followers of three big religions in Indonesia (i.e., Islam, Christianity, and Catholicism), including my Christian parents and to some extent myself, have held a deeply rooted belief in the incompatibility of interreligious marriages. These intra-religiously marital purists, so to speak, often deride those who decide to be involved in interreligious love relationships. Second, legal certainties of interreligious marriage in Indonesia are highly influenced by Indonesian Muslim leaders who stipulated that all Muslims in Indonesia be not to marry those from religions other than Islam. With Islam being the most powerful religion in Indonesia, non-Islamic religious leaders sometimes have become reluctant to marry Muslims and those who are not Muslims. It was reported that some Protestant church leaders did not want to authorize interreligious marriage because they did not want to be censured by Muslim leaders, not necessarily on the

grounds that the church banned it (Cammack, 2009). But which church is it that allows interreligious marriage to occur in the first place? I remember my own church that requires those who want to be united in a holy matrimony have to be active members of the church for at least a certain period of time, which implies that interreligious marriage will not be performed at the church.

What is crucial for EFL stakeholders is not for them to simplistically advocate for interreligious marriage. They can. But it is much wiser if EFL teacher educators scaffold students' abilities in reflecting upon their own positions of the issue and exploring debates over this controversy in English. In so doing, students will have more options to make informed decisions regarding their love lives.

Conclusion

Three Christian English language teachers whose teaching practices are analyzed in this chapter have attempted to construct themselves as being reflexive upon their spiritual and/or religious roots when discussing life realities like discrimination in the form of slavery or religious discriminations in Indonesia or elsewhere. One pedagogical solution has been offered by Tim when he thought that material development could have been more religiously sensitive in the context of a religious institution like JCU. The conundrum of acting spiritually (or religiously) or critically in class, as far as Angela's perception is concerned, has been brought to the fore and warrants further inquiry. Celeste's case (see chapter 7 below) will partly address this conundrum. Last, Mur, the Muslim English language educator, explored potential dialogue in class when a

controversial, yet real, issue of interreligious crushes (which might end up in marriages) is discussed in an English class like speaking.

Whereas in chapters 4 and 5 thus far I have discussed how EFL teachers at JCU understood spirituality and shared their experiences of integrating spirituality in their ELT classrooms, in the following chapter I will focus on how EFL students in JCU make sense of and perform spirituality in ELT contexts.

CHAPTER 6

EFL STUDENTS' UNDERSTANDING OF SPIRITUALITY IN ELT SETTINGS

In this chapter, I will present students' understanding, including definitions, of spirituality and religiosity that are closely related to their decisions to study at the EFL teacher education program at JCU and how spirituality is performed in ELT contexts. The way spirituality was defined by the students might shape their performances of identity in focus group discussions and individual interviews, which will be discussed in this chapter, as well as classroom interactions (see chapter 7). Based on the data, spirituality has been made sense of, and performed, by some students dogmatically, or evangelically, or as dialogue. Another important issue worth analyzing in this chapter is how the inclusion of spirituality can be perceived as a source of motivation, especially in learning English, or otherwise.

I understand that by labeling students as being dogmatic or evangelical, I may sound condescending to them. However, I have a reason for this "strategic essentialism" (see chapter 1 for more detail on this term). Performing dogmatism or blatant evangelism are fleeting points of reference for EFL stakeholders, including myself, to reflect on their practices. By "fleeting" I mean the likelihood that dogmatism, for instance, is subject to change, although it depends on the person whether she or he wants to change at all. Regarding dogmatism, in particular, it is tempting to say that being less, or not, religiously dogmatic is better than being rigidly dogmatic. Now I personally prefer the former than the latter when it comes to interacting with people, who profess different religious beliefs, in public. However, people reserve the right to be religiously dogmatic

in their private lives. One may ask, then, if keeping double lives of being less dogmatic in public and being rigidly dogmatic in their private lives is an indicator of being hypocrite. It is beyond the scope of my study here to look into hypocrisy, but I have one view as an applied linguist and an English language teacher nonetheless. The pragmatics of interacting with people means that someone keeps the positive face of their interlocutors, especially if they embrace different religious faiths than hers or his. The breach of this will lead to bringing more heat than light in an inter-religious conversation. Therefore, those who are still unaware of this pragmatics will perpetuate the perceptibly hostile personae beyond ELT contexts, which might harm themselves.

Concerning blatant evangelism, it is not that the evangelist is hostile towards non-Christians, but she or he might sound too pushy when sharing about the gospel is not done judiciously. Making use of a Christian context like JCU as a site for blatant (and excessive) evangelism may also run the risk of widening power differentials between Christians and non-Christians.

Defining and Performing Spirituality Dogmatically: Calantha's Case

In this section, the case of Calantha, a female Christian student who appeared dogmatic during focus group discussions, will be analyzed. Right from the beginning Calantha had a dogmatic view of spirituality, after I asked her “What does spirituality mean to... you?” This is her response: “It’s something that holy. Holy and there is right and wrong. You have to do this, and you don’t have to [i.e., must not] do this” (Focus group discussion, March 4, 2014).

In another thread of conversation, I was asking students in the focus group discussion to comment on a curriculum document that has some Christian bias. Lucia responded first by relating the issue under discussion to her experience of being part of the minority (i.e., being Christian in a public high school dominated by Muslims). Tono expressed his feeling as part of the minority in JCU. Tono is already a member of the students' body, but as a Muslim, he cannot be promoted to general or commission chairpersonship. Then he asked: "What if a Muslim or Hindu, or other that's not Christian is more capable to be a leader, right?" But Tono recalled what Calantha said earlier that the Muslims reside in a Christian university. Calantha raised her right hand, ready to take the floor, but Tono still managed to continue on his comment:

Like [what] Calantha said that we have to realize that we live in Christian university. You can't change the rule that they created. So we have to adapt not they adapt to us. (Focus group discussion, March 4, 2014)

Calantha's dogmatism was accentuated in full sway afterwards. She not only stressed the word "rules," but she also repeated it a couple of times in these utterances: "Because we have to look the rules. ... The university was born or was made in Christian rules." Furthermore, the constructed dialogue "What is tritunggal?" [i.e., What is Holy Trinity?] only divided Calantha and Tono even wider. Tono was, in other words, othered or categorized as "them," whereas those knowing and believing in the Holy Trinity as "us." Tono, who had never known Calantha before, was positioned as a complete outsider here (Focus group discussion, March 4, 2014). The same stance on not allowing non-Christian to be leaders at structural positions in JCU was even maintained in a follow-up

interview I had with Calantha on March 18, 2014. Calantha's dogmatism was also performed in a Communication Across Cultures class (see chapter 7).

Dogma is not necessarily unfavorable. Memorized biblical verses can be sources of character education that Calantha envisioned if she becomes an English teacher one day:

Another example when I teach my students, I'm not only teaching about grammatical patterns, about structure, reading skills, writing skills, but I think about how life go on, like in Galatia said, Galatia, if I don't mistake Galatia five ayat [verse] twenty two until twenty three. The fruit of spirit.⁸ (Interview, March 18, 2014, originally in English)

But the issues of understanding one's power and performing self-reflexivity remain: How can a prospective ELT educator like Calantha could problematize her dogmatism in incorporating a religious teaching like the Fruit of the Spirit into ELT?

Defining and Performing Spirituality Evangelically: Monika's Case

The most representative student participant in my study that illustrates an evangelical performance of identity is Monika. Even in defining the term spirituality, Monika in a focus group discussion inhabited a very evangelistic persona, with Tono, the Muslim student, being present:

In my perspective, God never create religion. In the beginning he only create heaven and earth, humans, but never create religion... . But humans, like in the Genesis, it's mentioned there that religion start when people try to help themself, to recover their relationship with God. Renew their relationship with God. So

what I mean is that people, they create religion, but spiritually, it's always connected with our relationship between human being, mankind with the creator itself. (Focus group discussion, March 4, 2014)

I am used to hearing evangelistic preachers, including my own parents, who recite the story of the Fall (see the book of Genesis chapter 3 in the Christian Bible). In a nutshell, Adam and Eve fell into temptation and committed sin, so their relationship with God had to be restored, and Jesus was believed to have fulfilled God's requirement to redeem people's sin on the cross. As I sense that my motivation to enter JCU as an undergraduate student in an EFL teacher education program is quite similar to that of Monika, I probed into what influenced her decision to be educated at the EFL teacher education program at JCU. Listening to her in subsequent interviews, I became more convinced that both Monika and I were exposed to foreign missionaries. I also visited her Pentecostal church several times and I can tell it is a missionary-sending church. More specifically, when I asked focus group discussion participants including Monika why they chose JCU, Monika told me that it started in 2008 and 2009 when she went to Kalimantan (Focus group discussion, March 4, 2014). In a follow-up interview, Monika said that she lived in Kalimantan with a missionary family who came from a European country. But living with a missionary per se did not sound to be the main factor that shaped Monika's evangelical persona:

Before I decided to continue in this university, I was planning to join in actually mission school. I came to my pastor, and discuss this a little bit with him. But... I didn't really have a peace to continue on going in a mission school because my

pastor was mentioning that if [I] want to continue in mission school, I have to continue in a different place, not in Kalimantan. Because our church *belum punya ada koneksi dengan mereka, gitu* [has not yet established a connection with a mission site in Kalimantan]. But we have connection with other church, not in Kalimantan. But at that time I had really big passion on serving, on education. So after I talked to many friends and people, they suggest me to join in psychology faculty, or in [the English Department] at JCU. So I decided to be [here], 'cause that time, the government program still concerning my mind, that maybe one day I can be one of those teachers that can be sent on those villages [in Kalimantan where she once lived with the missionary family]. (Interview, March 19, 2014)

Exposure to missionary life and the mission literature has formed Monika's spiritual identity, such that she aspired to be an English teacher in villages in Kalimantan, an island that is much less developed than Java.

When responding to my query about what Monika thought of the idea that there is a place of spirituality in ELT, her statements also sound evangelical:

[1] I think to answer this question I want to ask myself with three different question. First, is where are we from actually... . The second is what are we doing in this earth. And the third question is where will we go, after we die. From these three concept I think it will lead us or lead me to see what is the most important thing in my life to be reached, not just for now, but in the future.

[2] So religion has a place in ELT. It's very important. What I mean is that English is international language. So I expect that if I travel in many different

places, people could understand me. I speak English. And because I have already found what is important for me, which is actually the important thing of the faith itself, so I can use English to share the big or the most valuable that people should actually know. I will not just keep it for myself, but I can like a virus maybe. I can spread it out, by using English... . English give me wider opportunity to tell the same message that I have received, to people out there. Even though maybe people will reject me, but at least I have an opportunity, a wider opportunity, than other people who doesn't know English.

[3] Jos: Are you saying that this is in the context of English language teaching?]

Monika: I think can be also. Like for example, I have a group, Bible group that we are discussing about creations. (Focus group discussion, March 4, 2014)

By asking the three questions, Monika framed ELT within her Christian spirituality. Although there might not be a logical link between the three questions and the sentence “So religion has a place in ELT,” by looking into the entirety of Monika’s discourse I could sense that the questions are like a template ready to be retrieved whenever she talks to people, especially in English.⁹ The answers of her questions, if I read between the lines as a fellow Christian, are the following: we are from God, or were created by God; we are here in this earth to glorify God; and we will go to heaven if we believe in Jesus, and to hell if we don’t. Besides, the questions tie past, present, and future, all of which are centered to God—the Christian God. When Monika said that she had “already found what is important for [her],” it refers to that God, or “the most valuable that people

should actually know.” Spreading out the “Good News” (i.e., Gospel) about God through English is hence a logical move that a devout Christian like Monika would do, despite potential rejections from non-Christian people (paragraph 2). In another conversation, when I followed up on her three questions, Monika even mentioned that her mandate from God is to “give impact to the world,” which was inspired by the Great Commission: “Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you” (Matthew 28:19-20 [NIV]; Monika, Interview, April 4, 2014).

In a follow-up interview, I asked who were involved in the Bible group discussing creations. They turned out to be six junior high school students who are already Christian (Interview, April 4, 2014). This suggests that sharing the gospel is directed to fellow Christians as well, on the grounds that, as far as my insider’s perspective as a Christian concerned, not all Christians have understood the real gospel. But Monika’s evangelical persona was quite consistently performed nonetheless. After all, she was fully aware of Tono’s, the male Muslim student’s, presence in a focus group discussion on March 4, 2014.

In addition to sharing the gospel (indirectly) to Tono in the focus group discussion, Monika also told me how she shared the gospel to a Catholic, who, in Monika's opinion, is not a Christian:

[1] When I was in drama class, we need to make an assignment, based on a film that has been played in the class. So we need to make a summary, and take symbols that is shown in the video. And we need to analyze it by ourself. It’s free

analysis... . Because [at that time] I was reading about the first sacrifice [based on a Christian book], that the Bible mentions in Genesis first, chapter, no. Genesis two. I forgot. That time I was studying about the first sacrifice. In the movie that was played in the class, the symbol that I saw was blood, which is actually the same [as] the first blood, or sacrifice, that happened from the girl in the movie. So I make it connected. So I tried to share what I have, what I know about what I have read, even though it's only maybe a small piece. But maybe the small piece can be a big thing for others who didn't know. So I try to combine the knowledge I have known from the Bible, and make a connection with the movie. Because my analysis was the sacrifice that is exist until now is based on the first sacrifice that happen in the human history. 'Cause before that, there was no sacrifice before. Only God who did the first sacrifice. And up until now, there [are] many kind of sacrifice. All have to be back on the first, who create the knowledge itself, which is God.

[2] So even though maybe I could only share my knowledge by writing on the summary, or on the assignments, I think it's a good chance for me to share to others. 'Cause after that, after I finish the paper, I give it to the lecturer. Ibu X. And we can share our opinion, our paper, with other students. So I think it's a good opportunity for me to share my idea. And even though there was only one girl who respond on my paper, but she was quite surprised. Because she never heard it before.

Jos: Is she a Christian?

Monika: uh no. She's a Catholic.

Jos: What was her response?

Monika: She was, 'huh? Really? How did you know?' ...

'Well, it's all said there in the Bible,' I said.

'Really?'

'Ya. The book is really helping me.'

[3] And I mean like, to share or to give a testimony, doesn't have to wait until I graduate. I can do it now. But maybe in a different way.

Jos: What do you mean by 'a different way'?

Monika: I mean like my goal after I graduate from this university is to be a teacher, as a Christian teacher, in a certain place, like in a certain village. So it means that I want to be a teacher, but also I want to share the love of God by giving the same opportunity for those children who have not a good education yet. But now, like I'm not a teacher yet. So I can use my time sharing what I have know or I have read, by writing it on my assignments, or sharing in a group discussion, even though maybe people will not all one hundred percent agree with my ideas. But at least I have the chance to share. (Interview, March 19, 2014)

From the excerpt above, it is not clear how the lecturer (or Ibu X; see paragraph 2) addressed students' work, like that of Monika, which is heavily Christian. Writing to a U.S. audience specializing in L1 composition, Lei (2005) argues that "when we seize opportunities to teach students about the potential for religious faith to inspire and nurture effective rhetorical practice, we might help them become more engaged students and

more effective citizens” (p. 3). That Monika was engaged in doing the course assignment is undeniable. But how is it, in an L2 writing setting like Indonesia, that Monika is equipped with “effective rhetorical practice” in order for her to be a “more effective citizen” interacting with people embracing different faiths or sense of spirituality? As a (critical) applied linguist working in a TESOL setting, a broader question can be raised: Is it wrong then to be an English teacher who has a missionary calling? I would have instantly leapt in joy to welcome her to an evangelical Christian English teacher club that I would have established, had I not been aware of very critical literature in TESOL on English as a missionary language (especially Pennycook & Coutand-Marin, 2003).

Therefore, as a critical Christian insider, I begin questioning what my specific role in EFL teacher education that attempts to accommodate the desire of some students like Monika who have an evangelical leaning in their pedagogical orientation. Mustika (see chapter 5), an L2 speaker and writer of English herself, has given the model of being self-reflexive (recall her notion of auto-criticism) about how her faith in Christianity, the religious structure of which has a long, and not necessarily pleasant, history (e.g., the practice of slavery and discrimination committed by those claiming to be Christians). But Angela (also in chapter 5) reminded us of the dichotomy of “spirituality” and “critical thinking” that at times can be problematic, especially when students use one component to please their teacher who is perceived as more inclined to one, say “critical thinking,” than the other. The challenge for “effective rhetorical practice” is therefore for L2 writers and speakers to negotiate the so-called critical thinking and their sense of spirituality in ways that the former does not wipe out the latter, or vice versa. Some

excerpts in the next *Performing spirituality as dialogue* section might illustrate relatively effective rhetorical practices from nascent to developed forms of intra- and inter-personal dialogue.

When evangelization is practiced outside classroom boundaries, but still in the context of English language learning (see paragraph 2 of an excerpt below), it is important to start thinking how TESOL practitioners should address this. When I re-listened to the recording, the word “break” (i.e., recess) in which students waited for another lecturer to come to class reminded me of Canagarajah’s (2004) notion of *pedagogical safe houses*. Piggybacking Canagarajah, I think Monika’s case is not only a form of pedagogical but also evangelical safe houses:

[1] Well maybe one of the example is by sharing knowledge that I have known. I mean like even though I'm learning English, but I can talk about Christianity using English... . If I met some of friend that I know that they are not believer, I try to make some discussion with them. Well not a big discussion but just small talk. Because they love to practice their English. I think it's a good chance for me to hook them. To share their ideas using English... . So I try to ask them question in English, so they can answer using English, explaining their opinions related of my questions. For example, 'Do you know where will you go after you die?'... And some of them they say, 'well, I hope that I will go to heaven.' So from this point, I try to get more discussion with them... .

[2] Jos: In what circumstances do you usually talk about this issue?

Monika: Not in a particular class, actually, but in like break. Break or just waiting for lecturers.

[3] Jos: What was their response when they were engaged in conversation with you when you discussed such things?

Monika: First time, they actually get irritated... . They are not very comfortable talking about religion actually. I didn't do it only once. So I keep trying to share or to make a discussion again and again. Because I know that she was a Christian. But she wasn't a Christian anymore. So I think she already have some thoughts about Christian belief. That's what I expected. So when I try to discuss with her, first time she wasn't really comfortable to talk about it. But I try to get closer with her. And after maybe two semester, she was a little bit open with me. Because she know me well. It went quite smooth, I think. Even though, up until now, she's not believer. I mean she's not Christian. She's still Muslim.

[4] But at least she has heard the message. The decision is always in her hand. I mean like she knew it already. But she keep to decide not to believe. It's up to her. But my job is to tell her. That's all. ...

[5] And I think it is our responsibility to tell people the truth. Me as a Christian, the truth that I believe is Jesus is the only savior. *Kita masih punya tugas, gitu lho. Kesempatan untuk memberitahu. Kalo mereka bertanya.* [We still have the task, you know. The opportunity to let them know. If they ask.] If not, I can still tell them. But maybe not too push them. Or not too... *mengaruhi mengharuskan mereka untuk mengikuti.* [influencing, obliging them to follow].

To tell and to ask is different. *Maksudnya, memberitahu aja sama mengharuskan orang itu kan beda. Yang penting message nya kena.* [I mean, letting them know and requiring them to be different, right? The important thing is that they get the message.] (Interview, April 4, 2014)

I think it would be too far, if not useless, for an EFL teacher education program to police students during recess and to stipulate that evangelization in any sort be prohibited. Students (or teachers) reserve the right to share or discuss what they believe, especially outside the classroom context (i.e., their evangelical safe houses), in English (paragraph 1) or any other languages. After all, if these English-speaking evangelists got rejected and in some contexts persecuted mentally or physically, it is social punishment or risk or “the cross to bear daily” anyway, on the evangelists’ part. Furthermore, for Monika, forcing conversion to Christianity is not the goal. What matters to Monika is for her to tell, and for non-Christians to hear and decide on their own whether to believe in what an evangelist like Monika shares (paragraph 5). As a non-Western Christian English language student, although Western evangelical influences have had some impact on her Christianity, Monika has a view that is similar to some U.S. teachers of English who thought that “the right way was not attempt conversion of others outright, but rather to *plant seeds*” (Varghese & Johnston, 2007, p. 18, italics in original). But this question remains: How is it that planting seeds are not done in too pushy a way that the evangelical Christian English students like Monika will have to be socially punished by non-Christians and bear a heavier cross than is necessary? My Christian spiritual answer would be this: I would pray so that the Lord will send people who want to hear the gospel

to me without me having to be showing off my biblical knowledge pre-emptively (without being asked), indiscriminately, and unethically. My critical applied linguistic answer would be this: I will keep being constantly aware of my position in power especially in the context where I am the English teacher in a Christian institution. These are possible answers that students like Monika need to learn more.

Performing Spirituality as Dialogue

In this section, I will analyze Christian and non-Christian EFL students' implied interfaith dialogues that may redress the paranoia of incorporating Christianity, as one form of spirituality, into ELT. On the non-Christian student's part, Karno's case suggests that being exposed to Christian English literary work has not done any spiritual harm on him. For some Christian EFL students, interfaith dialogues require less fanaticism (e.g., for Ellie), or entail personal struggles over interreligious crushes or romantic love relationship expressed through an English poem, and reflecting on a critical moment in class (e.g., for Lucia).

An Additive Approach to Interfaith Dialogue: Karno's Case

Here I will make a case against a presupposition that non-Christian students exposed to missionaries or missionary work are so weak that they are subject to evangelical expansion that may damage their faith. The background of such a presupposition is as follows. From the literature, I have gotten the impression that a critical scholar like Pennycook (2009) has been too worried about the incompatibility of Christianity in ELT. The "incompatibility" argument here is often associated with the missionaries from English-speaking countries who work as English teachers in host

countries like Indonesia. These missionaries are also often demonized: “Christian missionary work typically preys on the weak, using English to gain access to vulnerable non-Christians” (Pennycook & Coutand-Marin, 2003, p. 348). In a similar work, Christian missionaries are depicted as those who are complicit with “past and current forms of colonialism and neocolonialism, not only in attacking and destroying other ways of being, but also in terms of the language effects their projects have engendered” (Pennycook & Makoni, 2005, p. 137). While I do not deny the existence of colonial roots in presenting a material to EFL students (see chapter 7), I take issue with Pennycook and Makoni’s too strong a contention that foreign missionaries “attack and destroy other ways of being.” Another assertion worth counter-arguing is this: “The use of English language teaching as a means to convert the unsuspecting English language learner raise profound and political questions about what is going on in English classrooms around the world” (p. 137). I have shown in chapters 4 and 5 how foreign missionaries like Tim, Angela, and Marty went to great lengths to ensure that they did not impose their Christian beliefs on the students. Besides that, by saying that foreign missionaries and their missionary work “prey on the weak,” Pennycook and Coutand-Marin (2003) have subtly, if not also bluntly, stripped non-Christian people in host countries like Indonesia off their sense of agency to downright reject or negotiate Christian values in their lives. I will focus on the latter here: how Christianity is negotiated by a Muslim student, Karno.

Karno has an American writing tutor, Donald. Upon knowing Karno’s interest in culture, Donald invited Karno to come over to his house, because he has many books on that field. Karno then borrowed Donald’s book entitled *The Pilgrim’s Progress* by John

Bunyan. Because before puberty I also read the abridged comics of the book which has been translated to Indonesian, I found Karno's exposure to the book intriguing, especially because he read the English version.¹⁰ Extensive Reading is a course offered in the EFL teacher education program at JCU, but it is unusual for a student (and also a Muslim!) to remember what he read as part of his personal avid extensive reading project, especially when the reading is conspicuously of a different religious faith than his own. I became curious about how the book was at all relevant to his faith. This is his response:

I like the idea of Pilgrim Progress. The main character is Christian. The man named Christian. Actually the idea is almost same with the Muslim. When Muslim has difficulty, they have to make a pilgrim to make theirself better and get like *pencerahan* [enlightenment] in the worship... [I read the book] for many times because I like the idea. The value of Christianity is almost same with Muslim, from the book. The thing I know is when you have difficulty or burden, the book says about burden, you have to make a progress. I mean pilgrims.

Ziarah.

Jos: And you said that it's quite related to Muslim?

Karno: uh-hm.

Jos: Can you say more about that?

Karno: In Muslim we have a *ziarah* [pilgrimage] or or *hajji*. *Hajji* is uh we have like go to Mecca. But before, there's a story about Mohammed. Mohammed go to *gua* [cave of] Hira. In *Gua Hira*, they pray to Allah to get a *pencerahan* [enlightenment].

Jos: Enlightenment.

Karno: Enlightenment. And the idea of this Christianity in the book of Pilgrim Progress is also said that Christian make progress to get enlightenment...

(Interview, March 10, 2014)

A Christian purist may say: “But that's not the whole point of *The Pilgrim's Progress*! Jesus redeemed our, and Christian's sin, and that's why the Christian's burden was released when he accepted Jesus!” I will say: “That's how Karno made sense of it and that solidifies, instead of destroying, his own faith in Islam.” Karno might also be diplomatic when expressing his view of the book to me. But pragmatically, Karno respects the positive face of Christianity, and he did not challenge a potentially negative face of Christian people as represented in the book (e.g., “Christianity is a piece of crap!”) or those who subscribe to Christianity. He strategically negotiated his identity as a Muslim who had some tolerance to a Christian lecturer like myself and who could find similarities or the “common good” between Christianity and Islam (e.g., life is a spiritual journey; people have a spiritual journey to seek for *pencerahan* [enlightenment]).

To find similarities across religions, a stance that would be endorsed by a Christian English language educator like Shinta (see chapter 4), one has to perform the ability to have a personal dialogue first. But then, in light of Morgan (2009) who distinguishes *interactional* dialogue from *transactional* exchanges of religious ideas, I wonder if Karno's take on *The Pilgrim's Progress* is the former, or the latter, or something else. To qualify as an interactional dialogue, one has to be “re-formed as a consequence” and not simply exchanging “predetermined values... without any intention

of change” (p. 197). Interacting with the book, Karno with his agency guarded his Islamic faith, and at the same time he did not challenge Christianity or accentuate the superiority of Islam, at least in my presence. Rather, he was open to better understand Christianity through *The Pilgrim’s Progress*. He was not, in a very strict sense, “re-formed as a consequence” (e.g., converting to Christianity), but he enriched his repertoire of intrapersonal dialogue through delving into a book written from a perspective of a different faith. In Kubota’s (2009) view, Karno has employed an additive approach, instead of a subtractive approach, to religion in that he was “... affirming and critically understanding multiple views and practices,” including those of Christianity, “that shape people’s social and cultural identities,” when reading John Bunyan’s book. This additive approach on Karno’s part “transcends mere tolerance or sensitivity” (Kubota, 2009, 233). It is much easier to pay lip service on being tolerant and religiously sensitive, especially when someone does not have a ground (like reading *The Pilgrim’s Progress*) on which to argue for her or his appreciation of people embracing faiths other than her or his own. Being “re-formed as a consequence” through true interactional dialogues, which Morgan (2009) might have in mind when conceptualizing the term, is that people involved in such dialogues become less dogmatic and are open to discourses challenging religious dogmatism. This is not a specific quality that Karno demonstrated. Regardless, he showed an additive approach to doing intrapersonal interfaith dialogue when reading John Bunyan’s book.

Being Less Fanatical: Ellie's Case

As a Christian from an evangelical background, I was quite shocked when Ellie said “Do not think that my religion is the best” in a Focus group discussion (February 26, 2014). In a subsequent individual interview, I asked Ellie to say more about that. Her response was:

Ya. Ya I said that... . It is true that we have to believe in our religion, in our God. But we must not think that we are the best, and other religions are not. Because if we think in that way, it means that we cannot accept their belief. I mean when we face differences between us and theirs, it can create the gap. We can be like fanatics. (Interview, March 11, 2014)

Objectively speaking, this attitude is the main ingredient for performing interactional dialogue that Morgan (2009) envisions, not only to people of different religions, but also to those who oftentimes are marginalized because of religious dogmas. Not thinking of one’s religious views as the best paves the way for being realistic and humanistic about current issues like homosexuality. In chapter 7, I will present how Ellie, just like Celeste, could articulate the tension of “religious belief” and “personal belief,” particularly when the latter is likely to run counter to the former.

Having an Interreligious Crush: Lucia’s Case

Writing a poem is an art that embodies desire in a trans-rational manner. It brings in some sort of rationality (e.g., in structuring thoughts and feelings), and yet is not bound by strict rationality. Rather, it transcends rationality of mind. Debating over controversial issues like interreligious marriage, as suggested by Mur (see chapter 5) only hones

cognitive prowess. And when desire (e.g., attached emotion to someone of a different religion) is expressed in a foreign language like English, it sometimes convey things inexpressible in one's own first acquired language. Put simply, writing a poem is, in light of “current affective-turn theorists,” an attempt to connect “mind and body, thinking and feeling, reason and passion” (Benesch, 2012, p. 38). And when the poem is written in English, its author is not simply experimenting with linguistic structures of a foreign language being learned, but she is also emotionally engaged in meaning making and transgressing societal boundaries, especially those intricately tied to power relations associated with religious beliefs in Indonesia (e.g., the relations between church doctrines, state laws or regulations, and unsolicited parental advice on marriage, on the one hand, and youth’s desire of romantic intimacy or aspiration for a long-term commitment, on the other hand). The latter is particularly pertinent to affectively oriented critical applied linguistics that Benesch envisages. The current finding might also be a fitting response to Benesch’s question for further inquiry: “How might teachers investigate what else might be going on in students’ lives from the perspective of other emotional discourses: curiosity, love, political awareness?” (p. 135). Critical spiritual pedagogy that I envision is compatible with Benesch’s commitment to bridging mind and body: “Acknowledge that some students are deeply emotionally invested in their spiritual element of their lives” (Love & Talbot, as cited in Ryoo et al. 2009, p. 139).

Lucia’s emotional investment in an interreligious crush with her beloved person culminated in a poem. The decision of Lucia’s instructor in a Poetry class, to assign students to write their own poems was relevant to Lucia’s need of emotional outlet. In

fact, she told me “I myself, when I wrote this poem, I also cried” (Interview, March 27, 2014). Her poem is entitled *Squares* (see Appendix O). As I listened, re-listened, wrote, read, and re-read Lucia's poem, I was thrilled. I even clapped my hands and said “That’s deep!” after listening to her reading of the poem. It is much more powerful than knowing with my rational mind that there is an issue of interreligious love relationship.

In Lucia’s view, her instructor, Tammy, agreed with her: “Lucia is right. Because it is not God who creates the squares. It is us who make the squares. God never creates religion... .” So did her friends: “ya. We feel the same way. Why can’t we love others from different religion or even ethnicity?” (Interview, March 27, 2014). Romantic love relationship, especially that Lucia experienced, necessitates interfaith dialogue be nurtured between two parties. From Morgan’s (2009) perspective, such interfaith dialogue is potentially interactional rather than transactional, especially when two parties, regardless of sex and sexual orientations, transgress religious boundaries to be re-shaped in a mutually fulfilling relationship. This dialogue might stop anytime whenever one party, at least, succumbs to religious dogmas.

Reflecting on the Pronoun “him”: Lucia’s Case

An apparently small event in class (i.e., noticing some Muslims’ restlessness when “him” was used to refer to God) can be a critical moment for a student. No sooner had Miss Y referred to God with “him” or “Jesus,” than her Muslim friends saw each other and commented: “Oh. We actually have to call God, not him.” I was actually curious about whether the Muslim students expressed their concern to the instructor, but I had not said “to the instructor” when Lucia re-constructed what happened in class: “They

look at each other and then ‘is it Him?’” I was still probing into whether Lucia’s friends eventually told Miss Y about their concern, but Lucia said “no.” They only talked to each other, and Lucia could overhear it because they sat in front of her in a Micro Teaching class she attended earlier that day (Interview, February 21, 2014).

Then I asked Lucia in what context the word “him” was brought up by Miss Y. Lucia explained that at that time Miss Y asked the students how to cope with nervousness. Then one of Lucia's friends suggested: “Ya we can face our nervous feeling by praying.” Miss Y agreed and said: “Ya, it’s actually right to pray before we do our micro teaching. Because we know that someone will help us. Someone that we cannot see. We cannot see him, right?” (Interview, February 21, 2014).

As a Christian, I have never really paid attention to the fact that (some) Muslims do not call God as “him” (see e.g., Who is Allah [n.d.]). By “some” I mean some other Muslims I know (e.g., Mur, Fatma, and Karno in this study) used “him” to refer to God. However, Miss Y co-constructed Christian hegemony in class when she agreed with Lucia’s friend to discuss the role of God, which was also addressed by “him,” in overcoming teaching nervousness.

Self-reflexivity is a main ingredient in an interfaith dialogue. Lucia did not directly have a conversation with the Muslims, but noticing interactions between the Muslim students had made her aware that something was not right. Calling God as “him” has been an embodied experience for Christians like myself, Lucia, her friend, and Miss Y. It is virtually impossible to do away with “him” when Christians pray to God. However, it is likely to be much more sensitive when interacting with Muslims who may

regard calling God as “him” as blasphemous, especially in a predominantly Christian setting like JCU.

Spirituality in ELT: A Source of Motivation or Otherwise

Spirituality as a Source of Motivation to Learn English: Ellie's Case

Religious English teachers made Ellie (or her like-minded friends) more enthusiastic about learning English:

I myself feel more enthusiastic if my lecturer give more motivation than only give the materials. I can remember Pak Yohanes, Miss Joy Liem, *karena cara mereka mengajar dengan alkitabiah, maksudnya dengan kata-kata Alkitab. Jadi itu lebih tertempel di benak saya. Dan lebih mengena, gitu.* [because they teach biblically. I mean they use biblical words. With that, [lessons and/or the biblical verses] are more easily remembered. That approach is also appropriate to me]... So I think the motivation from the lecturers, especially related to religion is really important to help the students' learning process. I have experienced it. My friends more enthusiastic in class, if the lecturer can give motivation, the words of God, rather than only force their students to do their responsibility. (Interview, 11 March 2014; context: What Ellie thought of her fruitful interactions with teachers, especially fellow Christians)

Ellie is a Christian, and her being spiritually motivated in class because of the presence of some religious teachers is very understandable. Although there is no evidence that Ellie remembered lessons better, Ellie's case might support earlier studies on the positive role of spirituality in foreign language acquisition (e.g., Lepp-Kaethler &

Dörnyei, 2013; Ushioda, 2013), especially in ELT classrooms. However, Ellie's opinion in an individual interview, presented in the next section, sheds more light on how Christian texts can be alienating for non-Christian students.

Non-Shared Sense of Spirituality as a Source of Bewilderment: Ellie's Report

What is spiritually motivating for one person can be a source of bewilderment for another. In an individual interview, I probed into what Ellie meant by "mister titik-titik" [Mr. bla bla bla] that she brought up in an earlier conversation (in a focus group discussion on February 26, 2014). Ellie said that it refers to Pak Yohanes. The biblical text mentioned by Yohanes, as far as Ellie's story is concerned, was "jika seseorang menampar pipi kananmu, kamu harus memberikan pipi kiri [If anyone slaps you on the right cheek, turn to them the other cheek also [Matthew 5:39 NIV]] Karena itu yang telah ada di Alkitab" [because it is written in the Bible]. The problem is she could not remember what the material being taught was. I asked her if there were any other examples of biblical texts embedded in Yohanes's class. Ellie could not recall specifically. She only said that "he usually connect[ed] the story from the Bible to our class discussion," which "help[ed] us, to understand his teaching." My responses were sort of confirmation check: "So that's your response," followed by Ellie's affirmative answer "ya." I also said: "You took it positively," followed by another confirmation "yes" by Ellie, then my backchanneling "uh-hm." And Ellie seemed to understand quickly that my "you took it positively" is an implied request for further explanation on her part. Latching onto my "uh-hm," she said that her non-Christian friends were

“confused,... they didn't know what Pak Yohanes is talking about.” (Interview, March 11, 2014).

In retrospect, I view this conversation as co-constructed self-reflexivity. My question of how religious texts which are embedded by a Christian English teacher in an ELT classroom are viewed by non-Christian students has been addressed by Ellie. I never know what really happened in Yohanes's course that Ellie took. I did not observe the class, either. But hearing an implied criticism towards a teacher (e.g., Yohanes) embracing the same sense of spirituality as the student (e.g., Ellie) is sometimes more illuminating than a non-Christian student (like Karno) who has kept saying positively about Christian English language teachers at JCU. In a subsequent project, either a non-Christian research assistant or co-researcher, or an independent researcher who is not Christian, should address, through interviews or classroom observations in which I am not involved, how non-Christian students view their Christian English language teachers in a Christian institution like JCU.

Conclusion

More understanding about Christian English language students who are very dogmatic (e.g., Calantha) or very evangelistic seems to call for more EFL teacher educators' effort into managing interfaith dialogue and nurturing self-reflexivity in class. Students who have been exemplary in their additive approach to viewing religions (e.g., Karno) and showing self-reflexivity (e.g., Lucia and Ellie) can be good role models for students and EFL teacher educators alike, especially those who are very dogmatic, or

evangelistic, or too unconscious about the effect of bringing in religious texts in ELT classrooms.

Desirable as it may sound, expected progression or shift from religious “dogmatism” or “evangelism” to “self-reflexivity” is subject to further scrutiny, too, however. The pendulum of (my) TESOL approach has swung in critical applied linguistics’s favor. To those who consciously were self-reflexive about their positions in power as Christian students at JCU (e.g., Lucia and Ellie), I may not need to nudge them to my current preferred orientation—critical applied linguistics. The challenge is how I (or other English teachers or teacher educators) can introduce self-reflexivity without being too dogmatic about it. It is important that religious dogmatism is not challenged in a condescending manner by being dogmatic about the necessity of having and showing self-reflexivity. In chapter 7, I will show Celeste’s case that exhibits a balance between challenging religious dogmatism and respecting a student’s (i.e., Calantha’s) expression of religious beliefs in class.

Departing from reliance on data elicited through focus group discussions and/or individual interviews, in the following chapter I present my understanding of what really happened in classrooms that I observed. I also followed up on a conversation about Christian evangelism, based on one observed classroom taught by Marty, with three people (i.e., Marty and his non-Christian students) in several email exchanges.

CHAPTER 7

EFL TEACHERS AND STUDENTS NEGOTIATING SPIRITUALITY IN OBSERVED ELT CLASSROOMS OR BEYOND

This chapter presents what I observed from ELT classrooms when I sought for evidence of whether spirituality came to the fore at all, and if yes, how. First, I will provide a broad brush stroke of the observed class sessions where religious issues emerged (see Appendix H for more detail). Second, I will focus on four exemplary cases where religious issues were embedded or intentionally discussed by teachers as well as students.

Occasionally there were interesting activities designed by a lecturer (e.g., Vira in sessions 38 and 44; see Appendix H) in which spiritual themes (e.g., witches, magic and supernatural fantasy, and moral lessons [session 38]; traditional rituals [session 44]) were used as part of the activities. However, more philosophical reflections on the activities were not part of the instructor's focus. I only wish that the discussion about the “good” and “evil” characters (see session 38) could have been extended to discussions about complex (spiritual) identities that depict every day reality, in addition to fantasy. In some Communication Across Cultures classes (e.g., session 41), there were interesting discussions on the history of students' names. Some of their names are spiritually motivated. Due to a lot of difficulty in making pseudonyms for such spiritually inspired names, I have decided not to analyze them. In some other classes, religious issues were touched upon in passing (e.g., sessions 40 and 51), or were initiated by students in the form of presentations (e.g., sessions 39, 42, 43, and 46), but with little instructors'

feedback on religiously related matters (e.g., a Christian pastor's biography [session 42]).

Houtman said to me that he personally avoided SARA topics in ELT classrooms (Observation fieldnote, February 10, 2014; see session 42 in Appendix H). By SARA, Indonesian people mean *Suku, Agama, Ras, dan Antar Golongan* (i.e., Tribe, Religion, Race, and Inter-Groups or Factions commonly divided by isms or political views).

Houtman's view is similar to typical ELT coursebook writers:

[m]ost publishers advise ELT coursebook writers to follow a set of guidelines to make sure that controversial topics are kept out of their books. One such set of guidelines is summarized as PARSNIP... Politics, Alcohol, Religion, Sex, Narcotics, Isms, and Pornography. (Gray, as cited in Akbari, 2008, p. 281)

It will be misleading to suggest that all teachers have to include issues of SARA or PARSNIP in any ELT-related class. However, in an ever-pluralizing society of our time in this 21st century, it is crucial that English language teachers or teacher educators are better equipped with the ability to engage with, and reflect upon, such issues, especially spirituality and/or religion, in class.

In the remainder of this chapter, cases from four observed classrooms taught by four EFL teacher educators (i.e., three Christians and one Catholic) will be examined in depth because these lecturers negotiated the place of spirituality and religion in ELT classrooms and beyond with their students (e.g., in a series of follow-up interviews to reflect on the classes being observed). These are the lecturers: Marty (teaching Communication Across Cultures class, with the main topic being Religion and Culture [see session 56 in Appendix H]), Shinta and Celeste (teaching Communication Across

Cultures class, with the main theme *Kaleidoscope Eyes* [sessions 58-59]), and Dika (teaching Intermediate Reading, with the main discussion logo reading [session 48]).

Some Degree of Self-Reflexivity when Discussing Religion and Culture: Marty's Case

In this section, I will analyze two narratives of Marty's attempts to incorporate Christian spirituality into his Communication Across Cultures class. The narratives are chronologically ordered: The first narrative is based on a class session on February 20, 2014; the second on March 13, 2014. The narratives are not long stories of what entirely happened in Marty's two class sessions. Rather, I highlighted classroom events where I found some critical moments (recall Pennycook, 2004) for further reflections by Marty himself, some students, and me. In so doing, I am engaged in a Bakhtinian Dialogical Narrative Analysis. This analysis is, from Frank's (2012) perspective, committed to recognizing that "any individual voice is actually a dialogue between voices" (p. 34), 2) "remain[ing] suspicious to... monologue" (p. 35), and "open[ing] continuing possibilities of listening and of responding to what is heard" (p. 37).

Narrative Analysis #1: British and Indonesian Garbagemen

On February 20, 2014, Marty discussed Eastern vs. Western worldviews in a Communication Across Cultures class session. Marty also used some questions as prompts for students' reflections (see Figure 1). He indicated that a dichotomy of worldviews can be problematic. At the beginning of the class, for example, Marty mentioned:

How do you see your religion as influencing your view of the world? Some of you wrote ‘yeah I think I’m an Eastern person, but I believe in just one God.’ And that’s more of a Western idea. What does that mean? (Communication Across Cultures class, February 20, 2014)

Figure 1.

Some Prompts of “Your Worldview” that Marty would like his Students to Think Over

YOUR WORLDVIEW
Describe the worldview of your culture. Discuss these questions to help:
Does your culture believe that there is a Supreme Being (God)?
How much control do you have over your own destiny?
Do the members of your culture try to dominate nature or control it, or do they try to blend harmoniously with it or subordinate themselves to it? Are people equal to nature or superior?
Do the members of your culture place their personal needs above those of other people, or do the members of your culture subordinate individual needs to those of the group?
Does your culture believe in supernatural beings (souls, spirits, ghosts)? Give examples.

About half an hour later, Marty gave an instruction to his students before a video was played:

What I would like you to do is watch this [video]. I want you think about the very different worldview of a man from England who came to Jakarta, and the worldview of the people in Jakarta that he is mixing with. And how does this influence him? And do they influence him? ... Again, try to think about his worldview shaped the way he does things. And how does the Indonesian worldview shapes the way Indonesians [do things].

The video depicts an African British dustman, Wilbur Ramirez, who decided to live in Jakarta for 10 days to have a first-hand experience of being a binman in the metropolitan area. Entitled *The Toughest Place to be a Binman*, the video started with the typical life of a British binman, represented by Wilbur who drove a large, air-conditioned garbage truck. Wearing specific clothing and a helmet, he picked up garbage from every house in several areas assigned to him. Wilbur explained that in London there is a law requiring its citizens to tie up a garbage plastic bag in one bundle before pickup. If this is not done, a binman like Wilbur can report this to the city council and the garbage of a household that violates this law will not be picked up. Plus, a fine will be charged. In Jakarta, however, being a binman is very tough, and Wilbur witnessed himself how difficult it has been for a binman, Imam Syaffi, to live and toil in a slum area surrounded by skyscrapers in Jakarta. Unlike London, the laws prohibiting people to dump rubbish indiscriminately are not at all obeyed in Jakarta (Walsh, 2012).

As I listened (and re-listened) to the video, which I audio-recorded, I was quite fixated on the notion of fatalism that seems to be highlighted by the video concerning Imam's worldview. In an edited conversation between Wilbur and Imam, Wilbur asked Imam concerning his future. Imam replied in Bahasa Indonesia, with an English subtitle on the video, that he had no idea, but only God did. Wilbur asked about the well-being of Imam's children. Imam responded that what matters was as far as he was healthy, he would work as hard as he could. The narrator of the video then mentioned Imam's fatalistic view of his future life. This worried Imam's wife. Marty even picked up on this,

saying: "... at the very end, Wilbur is saying 'I hope he's moved onto the other things.' The hope is that Imam has control, or he does his own choices."

At the end of the class, I asked Marty why he was particularly interested in including this video in the Communication Across Cultures class. His response was this:

I want to include it because the way you hear in my talk about, you know, well 'hanya Tuhan yang tau' [only God who knows]. His fatalism does touch a lot on Eastern and Western worldviews. Issues of corruption... . And I choose [this video] because many students here at JCU, well there are some of the people who come here, most of the time they got enough money to pay for the university. So I use it also to challenge some of the students to think about the way they treat *tukang sampah* [binmen] in Indonesia. (Communication Across Cultures class, February 20, 2014)

In my view, the prompts (see Figure 1) allowed students to use "meta-talk" (Gee, 2012, p. 169) to share their knowledge of religion and culture in which they are part. Besides, by asking "Does your culture believe that there is a Supreme Being (God)?" Marty is open to the possibility that a (spiritual) worldview might not include God. Put another way, Marty does not presuppose that God always exists in a worldview. This was a way for suppressing a Christian bias in the class. I also observed Marty's concern about social justice issues in Indonesia. In the video, for example, I remember watching a conversation between Wilbur and a rich, English-speaking Chinese woman who was also the head of neighborhood unit. Wilbur called for more financial attention to garbage men like Imam. Imam lived in the same neighborhood unit chaired by the woman, but his life

is totally different from her in terms of social and economic standing. This scene fits nicely with Marty's purpose of using the video to "challenge some of the students to think about the way they treat *tukang sampah* [binmen] in Indonesia."

As I was reflecting on the notion of fatalism, I remembered this sentence: "No text is ever innocent" (Pennycook, 2004, p. 337). I do not totally agree with fatalism myself, and yet it is not atypical for Muslims that I know in Indonesia to have the same fatalism as Imam, the garbage man from Jakarta. If Marty and I had been a Muslim, we would have been in a much better position to comment on fatalism. Otherwise, Marty and I are likely to compromise our commitment to always being aware of position in power—as lecturers, more competent English speakers (and for Marty as a native speaker of English), and as Christians. Besides, the selected video might have implied some British colonial sense of pride. As an Indonesian, I could feel, and in fact have felt, that the British involved in the video production might be condescending toward Indonesians, including to Imam, the very garbageman they seem to help! I am not sure if Marty was aware of this possible interpretation. Objectively speaking, he provided plenty opportunities for students to speak (e.g., about fatalism). However, at times many students in his classes that I observed were very quiet when Marty asked them if they had any question or comments. His role as an English teacher who has an English-native-speaker status and a White, male, and Christian identity also has probably, in my view, complicated the teacher-student relationship.

Apart from silence, there is no evidence to support a presupposition that Muslim students in Marty's class felt uncomfortable when the issue of fatalism was raised.

However, self-reflexivity has pushed me to think beyond empirical evidence: I do not want to feel too secure about presenting a worldview like fatalism, especially because I am a Christian. In this case, I concur with Tim's religiously and culturally sensitive approach (see the *Tim's experiences of presenting Islam in class* section in chapter 5):

... bring in readings [or videos] that were maybe, if there were on that topic [including fatalism], would be written by a Muslim writer, talking about their own community. I would tell the students, 'it's a perspective from within the community. And I'm interested in your thoughts and views. And here are my thoughts and views. But they're not the only thoughts.' So I tried to make it much more clear, that I was interested in their views. (Tim, Interview, June 5, 2014, with few modifications from me)

In particular, Marty and other Christian English language teachers including myself need to discuss the likelihood that some degree of the so-called "fatalism" can be indigenously better than total control of everything. After all, being submissive to God's sovereignty, when things do not seem to fall into place, is also part of a Christian value, in my humble opinion. And maybe there are more narratives of being "rather fatalistic" which will spark more spiritual insights into life than highlighting that the "Western" ways of being committed to Christianity, or spirituality in general, or to social justice is better than local wisdoms.

Narrative analysis #2: Marty's Evangelical Discourse

In a Communication Across Cultures class session on Religion & Culture (March 13, 2014),¹¹ Marty seemed to be critical toward "God-against-culture" doctrine of early

missionaries in Java who were afraid of syncretism. This doctrine, encapsulated in “The New Ten Commandments,” suggested that Javanese traditional cultures (e.g., listening to gamelan music, attending a wayang [or puppet] performance, being circumcised, reading Javanese verse, and decorating cemeteries with flowers) were to be abolished at all cost once someone from Java decided to be Christian. However, this missionary approach was not only ethnocentric, but also “the result was a ludicrous breed of Christian community that was the laughing stock of Muslim Indonesians.”¹² Being reflexive to this, Marty said to his students:

Now my concern for this is, *kalo orang mau menolak pikiran seperti ini, apakah mereka menolak Tuhan Yesus? Atau mereka menolak budaya Eropa? Dan saya sedih, karena saya benar-benar percaya kepada Tuhan Yesus. Tapi ketika saya cakap-cakap dengan dia, ‘saya tidak mau orang menjadi orang barat.’ Tapi, maaf ini pribadi, saya benar-benar mengasihi Tuhan Yesus, dan saya mau orang lain mengasihi dia. Saya tidak mau mereka menolak Tuhan Yesus hanya karena mereka pikir ‘[doktrin] itu aneh sekali. Saya tidak mau menjadi seperti orang Kristen, kalau betul.’* [Now my concern for this is, if people want to reject such a thought or doctrine, does it mean they reject the Lord Jesus, or they repudiate the European culture? And I am sad, because I really believe in the Lord Jesus. But if I talk to someone, ‘I don’t want to be like a Westerner.’ But, sorry this is personal, I really love the Lord Jesus, and I want other people to love him. I do not want them to reject the Lord Jesus because only because they think ‘What a weird

doctrine. I don't want to be like a Christian, if it is right there is such a doctrine.]

(Marty, in Communication Across Cultures class, March 13, 2014)

Marty was assertive about his Christian belief. However, *maaf ini pribadi* (i.e., sorry this is personal) was quite effectively used as a means of hedging. He was aware of the fact that his audience consisted of students embracing different religious faiths, including Lukas, the non-Christian student, and yet it appeared that he did not want his strong belief in Jesus to go unnoticed by his students. As a speaker of Indonesian as a second language, Marty seemed to use the language to convey his evangelical calling more understandably to his students than if he used English. That was my opinion. But then I also noticed that almost at the end of the class on that day, Marty used Bahasa Indonesia again, when he read a note from a PowerPoint slide aloud to his students, for what I perceive as his evangelical purpose (see Figure 2).

Figure 2

Marty's PowerPoint Slide that Used Bahasa Indonesia



I found this Indonesian use intriguing, as I was analyzing his discourse. This is how it reads in English:

I am a person who follows God's way and obeys Isa al Massih's (i.e., Jesus's) law. I read holy books: Moses's Law, Psalms, other prophets, and the Gospel. I read these books in order for me to know not only God's Law but also Him.

Then I asked him these through an email:

1. What made you decide to use this slide in the Communication Across Cultures class you taught?
2. What influenced your decision to switch to Bahasa Indonesia in the second part of the slide? (August 10, 2014)

These are his responses:

This slide was in the context of talking about the 'New Ten Commandments' and so I was trying to help the students to see how such thinking still influences people today and to make it personal for the students. So, because people in the past have presented what I believe to be a distortion of Christianity I don't want to be associated with such a perspective.

The use of Indonesian was also to try and give the slide more impact and make it more personal for the students. I also used the Indonesian as it gives the students who might agree with what I'm saying an 'exact' phrase which they can learn and use with others. (Marty, August 10, 2014)

I have some comments regarding Marty's responses. To begin with, if "to give the slide more impact and make it personal for the students" is the goal, I would probably

think so, were I his student. I am not sure, though, if students who subscribe to evangelism (i.e., those “who might agree with what [Marty’s] saying”) would use the “‘exact’ phrase which they can learn and use with others”). Regardless, this is a very strategic approach to imparting the spirit of evangelism to Christian students. In other words, he was in a way preaching to the choir. At the same time, he attempted to avoid his information from being misunderstood by Muslim and other non-Christian students—and Indonesian use is undeniably like a shortcut for better understanding on the students’ part. Nevertheless, his use of Indonesian is still open to questions. He could have used English, especially because later in an individual interview, as I have discussed in chapter 4 under the *Being professional* section, Marty wanted to be committed to “teach[ing] topics that prepare good English language users” (April 23, 2014). Marty’s faith is a topic that may prepare good English users. Marty did have some investment in evangelism. However, as far as my observation is concerned, many students, including Karno and Lukas, have enjoyed Marty’s class. I will not overlook his expressed commitment (i.e., preparing good English users) and observable attempts to teach English well, either (e.g., through scaffolding his students to reflect on their cultures and religions; see Appendix N). Besides, when he read aloud the slide, at the end he also used English to comment on the second part of it. And very importantly, Marty performed his self-reflexivity in class when he challenged bad mission work in the past. Recall my discussion about Marty’s take on “The New Ten Commandments” above.

An individual’s self-reflexivity might have some limitations, though. Luke (2004) has suggested: “... for the critical to happen, there must be some actual dissociation from

one's available explanatory texts and discourses—a denaturalization and discomfort and 'making the familiar strange,' the classic ethnographic axiom suggests" (pp. 26-27).

Marty and I, as Christians, are familiar with our own Christian, evangelistic discourse. So the question is whether this evangelistic discourse was perceived as proselytizing by non-Christian students. To address this question, I asked two non-Christian students, Karno and Lukas, to comment on the text. From Luke's (2004, p. 26) perspective, my attempt to understand the non-Christian students' views aims at finding "some actual dissociation from one's" (i.e., my and Marty's) "available explanatory texts and discourses" of evangelism, in particular.

I used the transcript of Marty's talk below, when I asked Karno and Lukas what they thought of it:

When I'm having a conversation with a Muslim, okay? I don't have a problem talking about real differences. But for many Muslims, Christians are those people who believe in three gods. And many times it's God the Father, Mary, and Jesus. They believe that God has sex with Mary, so this is a wrong thinking, but some of them hold to it. And that we've changed our own books. Sometimes it's not worth going through some of these arguments. Okay? I just don't wanna deal with those arguments sometimes. So this is one of the phrases that I say when I meet the people.

Saya orang yang mengikuti jalan Allah, dan mematuhi sharia Isa Almasih. Saya membaca kitab-kitab suci: Tawrah, Zabur atau Mazmur, dan Injil, dan nabil lain. Saya membaca kitab-kitab ini, tidak supaya saya hanya tahu hukum Allah,

sharia Allah, tetapi supaya saya mengenal Dia. Okay? That's my goal in reading the Tawrah, the Zabur, and Injil. [And... knowing God, not simply knowing God's law, is the goal]. (Marty, Communication Across Cultures class, March 13, 2014)

Then I raised the following questions to Karno and Lukas: (a) In what specific context do you think this talk appeared? (b) What do you think of the content? (c) What do you think of how the speaker constructed her or his argument?

This is Karno's response to my question on the same day I sent him my question:

[1] I have this similar talk in Pak Marty's class. The talk commonly appears when teacher is having small talk especially in religion or culture. I remember Pak Marty was telling us the similar talk; it was about his experience when he met an Indonesian Moslem, but unfortunately I didn't remember exactly when he talked that matter.

[2] The content is acceptable since it is also written in the Koran; I have read the same argument in one of the verses in the Koran. And the verses is intended to overcome the problem when we have debate with a person who has different belief.

[3] I think the speaker constructed the argument very well, from the argument we will know that the speaker is not going to make debate but he or she wanted to share her/his idea to overcome the gap in religion. What I mean by the gap here is a misunderstanding of religion.

[4] I hope the answer will help you Pak Jos. If you have more question please send me a message. God Bless You. (Karno, quoted verbatim from an email reply, August 1, 2014)

His responses indicated that Karno attended Marty's Communication Across Cultures class in a previous semester. When reading Karno's response more thoroughly, especially paragraph 2, I came up with this question: *Verses yang di Al-Quran itu apa saja, dari kitab apa, dan bunyinya apa?* [What are the verses from the Koran, from which book[s], and how do they read?] (Tempe, September 5, 2014). He responded to my question as follows:

Good Morning Pak Joseph. Here the answers of what you asked several days ago. This verses is taken from Surah Albaqarah verses 62th. From the Surah we, Moslem, believe that someone who follows their God, although they are Christian, Jew, or Sabeans, they are saved. Indeed, those who believed and those who were Jews or Christians or Sabeans [before Prophet Muhammad]—those [among them] who believed in Allah and the Last Day and did righteousness—will have their reward with their Lord, and no fear will there be concerning them, nor will they grieve. (Surah Al-Baqarah [2:62]) (Karno, September 10, 2014)

The point of Karno's response is that he did not view Marty in a negative light at all. Consistent with his language learning history document (see Appendix P) and how he enjoyed learning English through reading Christian literature (e.g., *The Pilgrim's Progress*; see chapter 6), Karno did not find an evangelical discourse in class like that of Marty problematic. My concern about the extent to which Marty's evangelical discourse

was regarded as Christian proselytizing does not seem to hold true for Karno. As I have mentioned elsewhere, though, Karno knows I am not a Muslim like him. The power relations between him and me in terms of religious views and social status are real. His strategic approach to dealing with these power relations is that he has refrained from creating conflicts as much as possible with me and Marty. He might be sincere in being of the same wave length, so to speak, with me (cf. Shinta's emphasis on spirituality as finding similarities, rather than differences, across religions). Still, I am rather unsatisfied with Karno's seemingly accommodating, instead of confrontational, approach to me.

I raised the same three questions to Lukas. And this is his response, which is different than Karno but is similar to what I expected from a non-Christian who might have some resistance to Marty's text. Interestingly, what Lukas took issue with was some degree of Marty's one-sidedness, not with his evangelical discourse on the Christian God and teachings. The following quote responses are based on my three questions I mentioned above:

1. I think the context of this conversation is classroom context, like a cross cultural understanding course in our faculty. Specifically, they're talking (maybe) about how or what is the participants' point of view in terms of God such as who is God or do they believe in a single God or not, based on their religion or belief.

2. Hmm. I can't say much actually, because I don't know the whole conversation, but if it has or the participant gives richer information, it might be interesting to be studied. I'm actually questioning about what he/she meant by changing scriptures and books, is it okay to do that and why would he/she or

maybe the religion do that? Is it merely to cover/fix misunderstanding about God and Mary relationship or the relation between Muslim and Christian?

3. In my opinion, at first it seemed that the person in that conversation knew about Muslim and Christian quite well, especially about God. However, after that, he/she didn't want to argue about that and he/she closed the conversation quickly by saying that he/she only wants to learn, know and be closer with God. Well, what I try to say here is that he/she started as an open-minded person (maybe), but actually he/she spoke, only based on his/her belief, without the effort to talk more about the difference in Muslim and Christian, especially about God. (Lukas, quoted verbatim from an email reply, August 3, 2014)

After that, I raised some follow-up questions to Lukas in the same thread of email exchanges on Marty's discourse. Again, I did not disclose Marty's identity to Lukas at this stage. This is what I wrote to Lukas:

My larger question is this: What do you think of having a talk like the one that I transcribed and shared with you above, in an English Language Teaching (ELT) classroom? You may also address this larger question by elaborating on (a) the hedging word 'maybe' (after the clause 'he/she started as an open-minded person' [see your response in no. 3]); (b) your somewhat critical tone to the speaker; and (c) what you mean by being an 'open-minded person.' (August 3, 2014)

Lukas responded to my follow-up questions on the following day:

[1] Okay, so in my opinion, having this kind of talk in ELT is actually good, especially if the course is about Communication Across Cultures.

Why? Nowadays, we live in a global era where there is less barrier, so most people can connect each other even though they live apart. By sharing opinion or idea, I think we can learn about another culture, another religion and of course their perspective on some things that are similar, which I think is one of the best way to be an open-minded person. Being an open-minded person can be very useful, we can exchange information, start from good culture that we can adapt until the exchange of technology such as in medical to overcome diseases like cancer. If we keep on being a stereotype person, I don't think we can survive later on in our life. Moreover, it will be useful later when the students live in the real world. I bet they can blend well in the society, especially in Indonesia, because from what I see until now, Indonesian people tend to warmly welcome people who know their culture well.

[2] For me, an open-minded person is a person who is ready to talk, listen to others who have different background with him/her and ready to receive any comments/criticism with a cool head. Instead of insisting that he/she is the best, he/she will listen first, then clarify things based on what he/she knows.

[3] Regarding to the word 'maybe' I used before, I said maybe because at first, it seemed like he/she is an open-minded person, ready to talk differences [referring to Marty's first utterances in the excerpt]..., it's obvious that he/she said that he/she doesn't have problem talking differences), so it's possible that he/she

is an open-minded person.

[4] However, in that conversation, next thing that came up was that he/she resisted to talk more about the differences between Christian and Muslim way of thinking. He/she insisted that he only wants to know and be closer with God, in his/her own religion, full stop. He/she even said that in order to avoid arguments about God in Christian and how some people misunderstood the relationship of God and Holy Mary, he used a specific phrase like in the transcribe. Well, in my opinion, this kind of person is (sorry), a hypocrite, 'fake' open-minded person, because at the end, he/she didn't show any attraction to talk, listen to and clarify about some arguments. After all, it's still one-side point of view. (August 4, 2014)

Having read his critical comments, in an email I eventually let Lukas know that the speaker was Marty, and the excerpt was transcribed from a Communication Across Cultures class that he (and I attended) on March 13, 2014. Then I told him that Marty's talk was situated at the end of his teaching, so he might not have had sufficient time to talk more about the Islam-Christian debate. In the email, I also asked him if he was interested in seeing me in person to talk more about Marty's talk. I have another reason for inviting him for another conversation. I notice that in an earlier conversation with Lukas, on the whole he commented positively on Marty's approach to bringing up religious issues in class:

So like what I learned in [Communication Across Cultures class] is that, even though I'm [non-Christian], and most of my friend is Christian..., but when we discuss about religion, although our religion is different, we never like clash. But

rather we try to understand. So like in the Communication Across Cultures class, my lecturer, Mr. Marty Gate, he always try to see that ‘This is from my point, from my religion. But maybe from your religion is different.’ So he... never mean to offend other religions. So this is what he got in his religion. And he try to invite us from other religion to express our opinion, about the same thing. So I think this is very interesting and this is very helpful. (Interview, March 25, 2014)

When Lukas and I met in my office on August 7, 2014, I told him this:

Waktu individual interview yang dulu kan, kesannya dengan kelas Pak Marty, okay. Itu kan secara garis besarnya. Cuma discourse analysis tu, zoom yang kecil-kecil. [During an individual interview with you, I had the impression that Pak Marty’s class was fine. It was the big picture. But discourse analysis zooms on little things.] [And] I happen to come across this data. ‘Hey. This is interesting. I wonder what non-Christians think about it.’

In this follow-up conversation, Lukas agreed with me that Marty might not have had enough time. Besides, Lukas did not think it was wrong for Marty to express his belief. He expected, though, that Marty could elaborate more on the Islam-Christian debate:

So ya kalo memang hanya yang saya membaca ini bla bla untuk mengenal dia, ya saya juga tidak akan melarang. Itu memang kepercayaan dia seperti itu. Namun jika melihat yang short conversation yang di atasnya, dia kan ada menyebut seperti Muslim. Menurut saya kenapa tidak akhirnya menjelaskan saja, kalo memang Anda tau yang sebenarnya. Saya lebih suka untuk kita sharing antar

agama. Jadi kita sama-sama mengklarifikasi lah. [If it is only about ‘I read bla bla to know God,’ I won’t forbid Marty to say that in class. It is his belief. But if I look at the short conversation prior to Marty’s Christian belief, he mentioned something on Islam, right? In my opinion, why didn’t he just explain it, if he really knows it. I’d rather have an inter-religious sharing. So we can clarify our beliefs together.]

What I criticize is only that argument about changing scripture, changing books, and Muslim, and [the fact] that [Marty] didn’t want to argue too much about that. But what I think is that, if you really read everything, you know a lot, you know your God, ya I think it is best to not only skip that argument but we sit, and we talk. (Interview, August 7, 2014)

To be fair, I need to include Marty’s own view of his talk. Interestingly, Karno used my question about the verses in the Holy Koran as an opportunity for him to use my previous three questions, which I raised much earlier to him, to be addressed by Marty.

Karno copied Marty’s response to him:

1. The talk was in the context of Communication Across Cultures class which addressed how religion and culture [are] connected.

2. ... [T]he basic content is about a person avoiding the name ‘Christian’ because the word of ‘Christian’ means a lot of things to different people (political, historical, social, theological, etc.) and so rather than deal with people attitudes towards ‘Christians,’ I instead want people to understand about my relationship with God and what it means for me to be a follower of Isa Al Masih.

3. The structure could have been made clearer on this particular occasion (the one which is transcribed) but it makes sense to me to get people to focus on what's really important rather than be distracted by what people have already been trained to expect. (September 10, 2014)

In an extended conversation through email, I asked Marty two questions: “When you said ‘... distracted by what people have already been trained to expect,’ 1) what does the ‘people’ refer to? [and] 2) what have these people been trained to expect?”

(September 22, 2014)

Marty's response is as follows:

[t]he focus of my comment is more targeted towards Muslims because of some of the things they have been trained/taught to think about Christians. What they have been taught to think includes:

- Western nations are Christian nations (do I really want Muslims to think that films coming out of the West are Christian films?!)
- Christianity wants political power in countries (many churches do want political power and this is one of the issues in our history but that to me is not even close to the heart of Christianity).
- Christians eat pork and so are unclean (I'm free to eat pork, that's true, but I don't want people to avoid speaking to me because of that topic, so avoid people immediately thinking about that by avoiding the word, 'Christian.')
- Christians believe in three Gods, God the Father had sex with Mary, and Jesus didn't die (according to the Bible, none of these are true, but wouldn't it be

more effective for people to discover these truths for themselves by reading the Holy Books [I use versions which look similar to a Quran] rather than me just telling them or getting into a fight about it?) (September 22, 2014)

Overall, as a fellow Christian, I agree with Marty. Regarding his last point, however, when he said that “wouldn't it be more effective for people to discover these truths for themselves...,” I remember Lukas’s comment that if a person like Marty knows a lot about what she or he believes, it is better for the person to share the “truths.” I am also aware, though, that some people who are trained to be religious debaters and do not intend to have a sincere interactional interfaith dialogue would only want to transactionally impose defeat on an evangelist like Marty. In this case, Marty’s stance, which may also remind of me the story of Jesus who kept silent when persecuted before being crucified, is reasonable. But when the audience is someone like Lukas who is eager to get better understanding of debates over religious teachings nonetheless, I do not see any reason why a Christian like Marty should be hesitant in practicing apologetics with humility and openness to objections instead of being defensive such as saying something like “This is my belief. Full stop.” Lukas, in an individual interview on March 25, 2014 thought that overall it was totally acceptable for Marty to share his belief in Christianity:

So like in Communication Across Cultures class, my lecturer, Mr. Marty Gate, he always try to see that ‘This is from my point, from my religion. But maybe from your religion is different.’ So he... never mean to offend other religions.

Lukas was more concerned if people force him to convert to another religion. The following opinion was a response to some of Marty’s prompts (i.e., “Have you ever heard

someone of a different religion explain their faith? When has this been good? When has this been bad?”), which were assigned to his Communication Across Cultures students on March 14, 2014:

For me, interaction with people with different faiths is not that difficult. ... In my personal opinion, people with different faiths can live in harmony as long as they are open minded and has high tolerance to others. Sometimes I hear someone explain their faith to me or my family. My family and I actually don't have problem with this as we like to exchange opinions. However, this kind of act will be annoying when the person tries to force us to change our faith. We have different faiths, so why bother to force others to change? It's better if we respect and help each other because I believe that every person found their belief from their private experience. (Lukas's response shared with me on July 10, 2014)

And he is also concerned with, in light of Morgan (2009), transactional approach to talking about religions. Lukas critiqued the perceived identity of Marty as “a hypocrite, ‘fake’ open-minded person, because at the end, he/she didn't show any attraction to talk, listen to and clarify about some arguments” (Email communication, August 4, 2014).

On the whole, Marty's approach to presenting the slide on “Avoiding the name ‘Christian’” seems more transactional than interactional. He was in a way self-reflexive (e.g., critiquing bad conducts of past missionaries imposing The New Ten Commandments local Javanese people). However, there is certainly room for improvement if he, or other like-minded, evangelical Christian English language teachers is really committed to being professional, being upfront, when situations (e.g., legal

status in a host country) permit, about their faith, being self-critical towards his pedagogical practices, and being more interactional in interfaith dialogues. The last is very important, especially because some evangelical Christians that I know tend to transactionally offer their absolute truths rather than accepting and internalizing, to any degree, what non-Christians had to say on various issues that may run counter to Christian truths (e.g., homosexuality, the likelihood that some historical assumptions on Jesus were dubious, etc.).

Dealing with Life Realities and Religious Dogmas

In this section, I will discuss two Communication Across Cultures class sessions in which the same drama script (from *Kaleidoscope Eyes*) written by a Singaporean female author, Theresa Tan (1998), was used for classroom discussions. *Kaleidoscope Eyes*, briefly speaking, contains a fiction of a Catholic wife of Chinese descent (Clare) who was restless about her husband's being a homosexual, which she knew only after they got married.

Being Relatively Closeted about One's Own Religion: Shinta's Case

As discussed previously in chapter 4 (under the *Understanding one's power in ELT contexts*), Shinta attempted to be "religionless," or Christian-less, in class. This was quite consistent with how she performed herself in a Communication Across Cultures class session (on March 27, 2014) in which *Kaleidoscope Eyes* was examined. She did not explain in much depth how she viewed some controversial issues like homosexuality, contraceptive use, or divorce from the perspective of her religion. The students who led the workshop on the drama script did explain their religious views, but Shinta did not add

anything substantial in light of her Christian belief. The only candid comment was this: “But changing belief is hard.” It was expressed after one of the presenters who led the workshop said that for Catholics to get divorced, they might consider becoming Christians first.

In the class, Shinta performed a persona of critical academic, detached from her own religious views. She did not ask students from different religious faiths to comment on these controversial issues, which is understandable because she once said “I don’t profile students by religion” (Focus group discussion, April 2, 2014). Shinta did not even follow up on a statement by Virgo, one of the presenters, that in Catholicism, homosexuality is wrong, but “religion teach us about love, and the logic of thinking is that, you know, accepting something different, as showing love to others can be good things” (Communication Across Cultures class, March 27, 2014).

On the whole, Shinta seemed more keen on expanding ideas of non-mainstream sexual orientations (i.e., lesbianism and homosexuality), especially in Indonesia, than on religious views that may either support or oppose such orientations. Shinta did provide some opportunities for students to question homosexuality (see e.g., Navra’s question below). However, she did not ask students, especially the Muslims, to express their views, as far as my observation is concerned. Even some Christian students who had usually been more engaged in classroom discussions were also quiet in this class session, except Navra. Consider the following between Navra and Shinta:

Navra: I just have a question. What makes Ben decided to change his [sexual] orientation?

Shinta: That's a really hard question. This is really interesting. I'm just going to follow it up. Because you say Ben decided to change his orientation. Right? You were thinking it is in his power to change his orientation.

Navra: Yes?

Shinta: Because for me, is it really in my power to change orientation?

(Communication Across Cultures class, March 27, 2014)

In *Kaleidoscope Eyes*, Ben is Clare's husband who came out as a gay after he married Clare. By questioning Navra's query "is it really in my power to change [sexual] orientation?" Shinta implied that one's sexual orientation was fixed. A heterosexual could not be a homosexual, and vice versa. But then in an ensuing discussion about homosexuality, Shinta brought up some debate on whether sexual orientation is permanent or fluid. This was initiated by Toby's question:

But why did he married to Clare? So not tell the truth first that he is actually gay.

And then he just married Clare, and then he broke his promise to God to marry

Clare, to live with her. And if he is gay after marriage, so what makes Ben

become a gay? (Communication Across Cultures class, March 27, 2014)

Navra, who asked a similar question, nodded. After that, Shinta brought up a debate over sexual identity: whether it is "fluid" or "permanent." She seems to address to Toby who might have assumed the permanence of sexual identity: "You say that sexual identity is something permanent." Interestingly, it was Fatma who chimed in with a "no." "Or is it fluid?" Shinta queried. Dale and Fatma replied "fluid" in unison.

Before continuing on the discussion about sexual orientation, I find it important to explain a little bit about Dale and Fatma. Dale has begun to question his Catholicism. He also said in an interview: “I think my religion is agnostic theist. I mean I do believe there is a god, but I don't quite go with a religion. I go with a lot of religions” (Interview, March 28, 2014). Fatma is a Muslim, but her view does not sound conservative.

On sexual orientations, Fatma contributed her understanding of the Queer Theory. It was Dale, though, who mentioned the word “Queer.” I later found out (in an interview to both Dale and Fatma on March 28, 2014), that they took Angela’s Literary Theory and Practice course offered to second-year students of EFL teacher education program at JCU. In Angela’s class, they were introduced to the Queer Theory. In making sense of the theory, Fatma said: “We don’t know how normal we are actually,” followed by some students’ laughter in the Communication Across Cultures class (March 27, 2014). Dale seemed to have some reservation about the word “normal,” thus altering it to “straight.” Fatma yielded to Dale: “or how straight we are.” Fatma had not finished her utterance when Dale overlapped with “it’s biased,” meaning that he really disliked the notion of normality. Fatma then, in a manner of a lecturer, explicated the continuum of sexual orientations. Holding a piece of paper, she said: “So if this is the line, and then, okay. This is the marker, for example, if you are normal, you’re standing here.” But when Fatma said “If you are normal, you’re standing here,” Dale protested again: “straight.” Fatma even said sorry to Dale, and reiterated Dale’s point regarding the bias of the word “normal.” Shinta agreed, saying that normality is “a [social] construction.” In subsequent

utterances, Fatma used the Queer Theory to shed light on Ben's story in *Kaleidoscope*

Eyes:

That mean someone like Ben, for example. When he is homosexual and bisexual at the same time,... I think Ben himself don't know his position whether he is eighty percent homosexual, [or] twenty percent bisexuals.

Dale co-constructed Fatma's understanding of Queer Theory in the following excerpt:

Dale: [You don't know] how straight you are, and how gay you are. No. We never know.

Fatma: Like maybe Wanti, you can have a crush with Virgo, for example.

Dale: Like girl crush... . Like some of guys here have their own favorite soccer players, like 'oh I adore him so much.' That's called boy crush. And that's a boy. Isn't it some kind of homosexuality? (Communication Across Cultures class, March 27, 2014)

To say that having a favorite soccer player is some kind of homosexuality, Dale might suggest that people were not supposed to be over-judgmental to homosexuals. Adoring favorite soccer players can be regarded as a homosexual act, too, if I imply from Dale's discourse.

In addition to what Fatma and Dale had said, Shinta stated:

[1] But I want to add. That's from literature. Okay?... . There is a story why I choose this article actually. [To] accommodate Queer Theory. Like in Japan, people can be homosexual in English, but they cannot be homosexual in Japanese.

There are many cases like that, because the language doesn't really accommodate Queer identities. That's from language theory.

[2] From psychology now. The recent thing is that sexual identity is a matter of experimenting. So you don't know. You know? You can't figure it out. But it's about experimenting. And what I've learned from my friend, because we have a discussion is about his dissertation, men sexual identity is more either on this side, or either on this side. Woman is more fluid. And I wonder, when I talked to him, how does culture affect that? I mean like contribute to that. Because perhaps women in America is very different from Javanese women. Do you know what I mean? ...

[3] And another thing, this is vocabulary that I also learned. Ben, perhaps the right word is, he is closeted. Do you know what closeted mean?

Wanti: No.

Shinta: People who live in a closet... . So we don't say like normal, because normal is a social construction, we say he's closeted. (Communication Across Cultures class, March 27, 2014)

It is important to know a lot of information from applied linguistics, critical theory (e.g., Queer Theory), and psychology regarding sexual orientations. After all, I am interested in how critical pedagogy can be fleshed out in classroom discussions. However, from my observation, only the four presenters who led the workshop, and some students on the audience side (Navra, Toby, Fatma, and Dale) were actively involved. The rest of the class (i.e., Muslim students other than Fatma and other Christian or

Catholic students, including those who had usually been very active in previous class sessions) were, on the whole, silent. I understand that religious (especially Christian) dogmatism has crept into many classrooms (including composition courses; see e.g., Rand, 2001; Smart, 2005, and Celeste's Communication Across Cultures class to be discussed in more depth below). But when students appear to be hesitant to express their faiths, they might not have the opportunity to learn how to negotiate their religious faiths in ways that do not offend or marginalize those espousing values, including spiritual beliefs and "secular" critical pedagogy, other than theirs. How an EFL teacher educator facilitated classroom discussions that accommodated critical and religious views is presented in the next section.

Initiating Intra- and Inter-Faith Dialogue: Celeste's Case

In Celeste's Communication Across Cultures class, religious dogmatism and its counter-argument were manifest in teacher-student and student-student classroom interactions. This is how the story of Celeste's class session unfolds. Calantha was initiating a next group activity for her friends, with the topic being homosexuality. She asked her friends whether they agreed with it. Celeste chimed in to distinguish between "religious belief" and "personal belief": "... we can believe on the basis of church dogma, but as a person we probably have different belief or opinion" (Communication Across Cultures class, April 2, 2014). This seems to call for students' inquiry into this issue quite effectively. Calantha remained dogmatic, which was supported by her classmate, Franz, but at least two other students (i.e., Patricia and Ellie) disagreed with dogmatism. I will only present Ellie's comments here:

As my belief, my religion, [homosexuality] is forbidden. But as a person, I think I'm agree. It's like I don't want to discriminate people because who they love to. I mean you can't discriminate like this homosexual, so he is bad. I myself can't judge people, when I don't walk in their path... . In our religion, homosexual is forbidden, but only God can judge he's sinner or not. So as a human being, we could have choose build relationship with them. We don't have right to discriminate their love. To disgrace their love. And who can stop [or] control their heart? Even we ourself can't control our feeling, right? (Communication Across Cultures class, April 2, 2014)

Calantha strongly protested: "But how about if the Bible said that God just create woman and man in this world!?" Ellie resumed her talk:

Ya. Like I said before, from my religious perspective, I agree that homosexuality is forbidden. But as myself, I very open to them. I mean I have a lesbian friend... . My experience is more open-minded. Because, if you make relationship with them, you will know their reason. So sometimes their situation change their identity. So we can't judge them. (Communication Across Cultures class, April 2, 2014)

Celeste then asked a question: "If we have, let's say, maybe a gay or lesbi in this classroom, will you interact with her?" Franz and other students said "yes." Celeste continued: "Okay. And when you interact with this group of people, what will you use as your basis? Your religious affiliation?... or your personal?" Again Franz and some students said "yes." Calantha remained quiet. The next question raised by Celeste went

meta. That is, Celeste employed meta-talk (see Gee, 2012) to discuss identity: “Where do you find your personal belief? Where does it come from? How do you form your personal belief?” Some students responded: “From ourself.” Celeste did some more probing: “Can you form your own personal belief? From what sources can you form your personal belief?” Now Calantha answered: “from the Bible?” Celeste agreed, “Okay, from our religious belief. What else?... Society. Anything else?” A male student said “social media.” “Anything else?” Celeste kept probing. Some students say “family” and “culture.” This time Celeste used a closed question: “Do you think that educational institution also contribute to the formation of your personal belief?” Some students said “yes.” Celeste then explained:

So as a person, you comprise your personal belief from different sources. Right? And one of them is religion. But I think this is interesting this morning to find out that you share different ideas. Yes. Like on the basis of your religious affiliation or belief, you say you disagree with homosexuality. But as a person you maybe not on the level of agree or disagree, but at least you provide room for this issue. Am I right? Maybe in order to say I agree or disagree is too big. Ya? Unless you spend closer time with the person, like Ellie say, you can understand the reason. Then you can say you agree or disagree. (Communication Across Cultures class, April 2, 2014)

Calantha remained noncompliant to tolerance for the homosexuals. She asked Celeste: “Ma’am. I just [have a] question. How about if we give them time, or give them space to live,... it will increase their homosexual?” Celeste clarified Calantha’s question:

“She thinks that accept the fact of homosexuality will facilitate the growth of homosexuality. What do you think of this?” Franz, an opponent of homosexuality, had the following remark:

I’m agree with Calantha that we can increase the homosexual if we have the room for [them]. Because in the Bible, as I Christian, God have told me, told us that we cannot accept the homosexual. Because it’s straight that God want. It’s man and woman. It’s not like Sodom and Gomorrah. So I cannot accept that about homosexual and lesbian living. (Communication Across Cultures class, April 2, 2014)

Celeste asked her question again: “including providing room for them?” Franz was resolute: “Ya. Including providing room... .” Ellie joined the conversation again: “I think only God can judge.” Calantha picked up on Franz’s idea: “It will related to the Bible that God only creates man and woman... . Can you say that after they pass away they can go to the heaven?” The remaining heated debate between Calantha and Ellie was eventually interrupted by Celeste.

In a follow-up interview on the following day, I played the video recording and asked Celeste why she decided to interrupt Calantha. She explained: “the main reason is I sense... *resistensi, gitu. Yang satu resisten sana, aku resisten ini. Na kalo dilanjutkan, nanti kan akan menjadi kurang dialogis lagi* [resistance. One was unwavering about her opinion, the other was adamant with her own opinion. If it had been continued, it would have been less dialogic.]” Besides, Celeste would like other students to participate (Interview, April 3, 2014).

In fact, Celeste asked her non-Christian students: “Does your religion provide the room for homosexuality?... Those who come from different religion than Christianity, could you raise your hand?... Then I can identify. Okay. We have five. Are you Moslem?” (Communication Across Cultures class, April 2, 2014). Basically the Muslims think that homosexuality is wrong in their religion. Celeste did not stop there. She asked again: “Okay. Have you ever happened to know any Muslim friends who are gay and lesbian?” Students only murmured. This is a highly sensitive question, and the students might not seem ready to respond to it lucidly. However, the larger picture is that if religious differences are to be delved into, so that teachers and students do not “sweep the dust under the rug” like Mur once suggested (see chapter 5), I find Celeste’s teaching approach to using meta-talk illuminating.

Time constraints did not allow Celeste and I to have further discussions about issues like homosexuality, divorce, and patriarchal values in the Communication Across Cultures class. However, Celeste’s closing remark in the class potentially paved the way for further reflections or personal dialogues on students’ part:

Maybe after this class, then you are in the process of having another Kaleidoscope Eyes. Could be. Ya? Because each of us will experience [the] so-called constantly changing in terms of anything: identity, point of view, perspective, religious belief. Maybe you find yourself a little bit fixed and rigid on certain identity, let’s say maybe sexual orientation, after you leave this classroom. Then probably you will experience a little bit changing. Who knows? Okay?... (Communication Across Cultures class, April 2, 2014)

The notion of “constantly changing identity” is nicely tied with the notion of post-structuralism. Celeste expected Calantha and her friend to include the notion of post-structuralism in their presentation. Celeste hoped that the broad view of post-structuralism could be applied in analyzing the *Kaleidoscope Eyes*. Introducing post-structuralism for undergraduate students is not without a foreseeable reason. In a follow-up interview on the following day (i.e., on April 3, 2014) after the Communication Across Cultures class on *Kaleidoscope Eyes*, Celeste stated:

... Yesterday was our last meeting, and I would like them to at least come to a point that intercultural encounter is not simply meeting different people coming from different cultures [having] different point of view. But something indeed happen. And that matters a lot. And that will make us constantly changed. And I would to make sure that they can see the constantly changing idea within Clare [i.e., the main character who eventually figured out that her Catholic husband was a gay]. And finally I hope that it happens within them also.

And Celeste really highlighted the notion of “providing room.” She argued that these students, even though they had not graduated, were members of community. If in class they did not want to provide room for difference, “*repot sekali nanti* [they would be in trouble].” In Lei's (2005, p. 3) view, Celeste attempted to equip her students with “effective rhetorical practice” through dialogue to prepare them to be “more effective,” if not also reflective, “citizens.”

Furthermore, in the follow-up interview with Celeste, I managed to have more in-depth understanding of factors that have shaped Celeste's own identity as a Christian, a

scholar, and a student activist. This identity formation accounts for Celeste's pedagogical decision in probing into controversial issues with her students. Let me start with Celeste's formation and performance of reflective-Christian-scholar identity. Reflecting on the previous day's Communication Across Cultures class, and on the fact that Calantha discussed mixed feelings after the Communication Across Cultures class with her right before meeting with me, Celeste said:

[1] ... on certain point at least, I provide room for them to communicate what they have, really inside them. And I think, church does not provide this opportunity. Maybe Bible club also will not allow you to talk about this. Maybe in other classes also. Maybe they have to talk about this, but not too deep. ...I think this is a kind of high-level dialogue, ya. And as an undergraduate student myself, years back, I was not given that space to talk about such issues. And even if the lecturer provide that room, I might not react the same way as they did yesterday.

[2] [What I did in class] is part of *apa ya? Langkah cukup beradablah yang bisa dilakukan oleh pendidikan. Dan kalo kita pendidikan Kristen, institusi Kristen, menurut saya [diskusi di kelas Communication Across Cultures] menyumbang cukup berarti untuk membentuk umat yang tidak mudah untuk menerima segala sesuatu. Kita kan tipe konsumen sebenarnya, kan, umat kita itu? Cuma datang untuk seminggu, denger, pulang, gitu. Konsumen, sih menurut saya. Tapi kurang ada dialog pribadi dengan semacam issue. Menurut saya kalo kita bisa menyediakan ruang untuk itu, kita ikut berperan sih menciptakan umat yang apa ya? Mau dibilang kritis ya boleh, cerdas ya boleh.* [What is it? a

civilized step that can be done by education. And as we are part of Christian education, Christian institution, such a discussion in the Communication Across Cultures class contributed quite significantly in making churchgoers critical in that they do not easily accept everything. We churchgoers are sort of consumers, right? They come every week, listen to sermons, and go home. Very consumer type of churchgoers, in my opinion. But they lack in personal dialogue on controversial issues. In my opinion, if we could provide room for that, we take part in creating Christian people who may be regarded as critical or smart.]

[3] *Saya tadi pagi sih ingat ada satu bagian di Kisah Para Rasul, ya, waktu Paulus dimintai pertanggungjawaban tentang apa yang dilakukan, waktu dia dipanggil oleh penguasa-penguasa kota. Dan dia harus mempertanggungjawabkan tindakan penginjilan dia waktu itu. Dan dia mampu menyampaikan dalam tanda kutip pembelaannya dia itu tu kan cara yang sangat akademis ada di situ, politis juga ada di situ. Ekonomi juga ada di situ. Menurut saya, kita juga bisa seperti itu. Maksudnya menciptakan umat yang seperti itu. Kalo ditanya 'kenapa kamu nggak setuju sama homoseksualitas?' Kita nggak cuman mau berhenti sampe 'saya nggak setuju.'* [This morning I was reminded of one part of the book of Acts, when Paul was asked by city authorities to account for what he had done. He had to be accountable for his evangelization at that time. And he could deliver his defense in a, quote unquote, very academic way. He was also knowledgeable about politics and economy at the time. In my opinion, we can be like that too. I mean creating Christians who are well-rounded is possible.

When asked ‘Why do you disagree with homosexuality,’ we will not stop at ‘I don’t agree.’] ‘Why? Let's talk about it.’ (Interview, April 3, 2014)

Celeste’s critical view of Christianity were expressed in the second and third paragraphs of the excerpt above. Dissatisfied with simply attending church and consuming whatever teaching was offered at church, Celeste called for more dialogue at personal and congregational levels to discuss issues that have been part of life realities like homosexuality. Celeste even referred to the Apostle Paul in the Bible who provided a role model for Christians to be holistic in their apologetics or defending their faith at church or elsewhere (like her Communication Across Cultures class, for example).

Feminist movement has also shaped Celeste’s identity since she was an undergraduate student. The following response, which was framed by my question of how she made sense of her own constantly changing spiritual and/or religious identities, depicts Celeste more fully:

[1] Ya, I experience many things. But I think the major one is the one related to women’s role. Like I used to be part of feminist movement. Ya. 2000 or 1998. Since I was still in university, I took part of several feminist movement. And then I work also as part time in one of the NGO, especially for women and children. So I was exposed too much with so many feminist movement. And again, there was perspective, ideas, belief behind each of them.

[2] I remember when I attended church, and when the pastor mentioned about okay. ‘*Istri-istri harus tunduk pada suami.*’ Okay. ‘Whatever you say.’ But

I started to have own preaching in my heart: 'No, shouldn't be like that, it should be like this, this this this, and this.' That's what I believed at that time.

[3] But then after I started to read more books, about Christianity and women's role, and then I think I read one book which is highly influential in change my view about women's role. *Why Not Women*. The title of the book is *Why Not Women*, and it was written not by the one who actively in ministry, but by a scholar. A Christian scholar. So I think it is one of the reference that help me to not only finally accept, but put myself into a dialogue. The book start from the history of why woman suffer from so many oppression and so on and so forth, and then how it infiltrate to church as an institution. Ya. Many chapters. But then shaped the way I think. So okay, my God is not patriarchal God. If church end up as patriarchal institution, then that's the institution choice. Not my God's choice. So I can decide to be part of my God, who is not patriarchal side, or whose church as an institution with patriarchal side.

[4] Then I started to be able to accept some of the hard topic to me, like, you still remember the analogy that husband is the head of the wife? I started to be able to accept it. But, without separating another knowledge like Christ, and the church. His people. So okay, I will submit myself under my husband, if he has settled characteristics or qualities on the rise. I mean that's liberating for me. I think after so long. At least this is one of my changing part, I think, both spirituality and religious view. (Interview, April 3, 2014)

The main point of bringing in Celeste's identity formation as a critical Christian scholar is as follows. A Christian English teacher educator like Celeste has the potential to become a good role model for English language students who can utilize their spiritual sense, which may be grounded in their religious faiths, conscience, and critical thinking to problematize religious dogmas that oftentimes stand against people's sense of humanity. Furthermore, Celeste has exemplified ways to delve into and problematize religious dogmas from her ever-evolving sense of spirituality that, for the time being, is centered on Jesus Christ. Recalling Angela's story (see chapter 5), I sense that Celeste did not dichotomize "critical thinking" and "spirituality." Though still limited in transactional exchanges of understanding from different religious backgrounds regarding divorce, for example, Celeste has stepped into doing interactional dialogue by being open to homosexuality, in particular. Her experience of interacting with homosexual people and the literature on that issue has allowed her to be "re-formed as consequence" (Morgan, 2009, p. 197); that is, she has become more open-minded in understanding the issue at hand, and guided her students to learn this process. Eventually, as a Christian English teacher (CET), Celeste has, to some extent, responded to Pennycook (2009):

If CET wish to join me in battles against bigotry, homophobia, heteronormativity, racism, sexism, and more, and if they are happy to acknowledge the equality of languages, cultures, peoples, and beliefs that have to be part of such struggles, they are very welcome. But on the evidence here, I doubt that this can happen.

Celeste's case has rebutted Pennycook's too strong pessimism that Christian English teachers are incapable of joining him in struggles against isms he opposed. In

hindsight, I might also say that Celeste is not the only Christian English teacher in JCU who is devoted to critical pedagogy. Recall Tim, Angela, and Mustika, whom I discussed in chapter 5. Even a student like Ellie has problematized her religious dogmatism in the matter of viewing and interacting with homosexuals. See also Appendix Q to see that a student like Ellie is interested in social justice issues, and so with her Christian spirituality, it is possible for her to implement critical spiritual pedagogy that I envision (see chapter 2) and theorize (see chapter 8).

Teaching Students How to Read Logos Critically: Dika's Case

In a class session of the Intermediate Reading course (on February 13, 2014), Dika introduced the notion of logo on the grounds that verbal words are not the only channel of communication that people read. For a more detailed version of my field notes and transcribed data, see Appendix R.

After explaining different logos in business and political fields, Dika showed the JCU's logo and said:

That is why in the beginning, before we started, then I asked you to write what you think of the university. ... And now look at the logo. Now, do you think you have the meaning of the logo there? In your handout, you can read the meaning of the logo...

The students were then assigned to work in groups of three and answer Dika's questions:

- Do you think the logo is the face of JCU today? Or, do you think it represents JCU today?
- Do you think the logo fits your idea about JCU or JCU today as you know it?

Dika said that students were not to be afraid of being dropped out if they are honest about any unpleasant thing about the university. She reminded the students of the necessity of reading a text like, including the JCU's logo, critically; that is, students are not simply "to accept what is stated, but to assess it, or examine it." A follow-up question was raised:

If you think that the logo and your idea about the university as you know is different, then please discuss with your friends whether there are things that need to be changed in the logo, or whether there are things that the university should change, so that the logo will represent the face of JCU today. ... If you think that there is a match between the logo and the university as you know JCU today, then give reasons. If you think both don't match, then which ones should be changed.

... If there is something needs to be changed, in what ways should it be changed?

Dika's justification of why the JCU's logo is to be examined is as follows: "Because you are all here. You are members of the big family. You must know JCU very well. [JCU is] something you live in, something you partly depend your future on."

Students' responses vary. The students either did not want to change the logo because it is already "good," or they wanted to change it (e.g., "If the symbols use a picture of book more interesting"). One response is quite critical: "We think the reality in the college itself is not showing God to be first priority."

In an interview with Dika, I asked her what influenced her decision to use the JCU logo, apart from introducing students to a genre other than verbal texts. She said:

I bring JCU logo because I'm thinking of whether JCU is still like a Christian university or not. And so to make the students be aware of that JCU should be a

Christian university. Something like that. And I think, not introduction but preliminary activity, when I asked them to write about what they think of JCU,... many or most of them do not consider it as a Christian university, but then more as a green university, or an Indonesian mini. (Interview, March 26, 2014)

What I think is potentially illuminating from Dika's activity is her instruction in the class:

“If you think that the logo and your idea about the university you know is different, then please discuss with your friends whether there are things that need to be changed in the logo.” When I heard this, I remember Janks's (2010) notion of *design*. In her view, design “encompasses the idea of productive power—the ability to harness the multiplicity of semiotic systems across diverse cultural locations to challenge and change existing discourses” (p. 25). Changing JCU logo might not be an issue at all for the university management or many stakeholders at JCU, although I personally would like to change the wording of *mampu mencerminkan nilai-nilai kristiani dalam mengajar* (being able to reflect Christian values in teaching) in its curriculum document (see Appendix E).¹⁴

However, the practice of reflecting on one's (spiritual) identity in relation to the JCU logo can be a good starting point for honing some L2 writing skills. For instance, students are directed to practice how to write with a purpose to an audience that is not restricted to a teacher who will grade their work. This is something Dika can explore if this activity is to be repeated in other semesters. And if I were the instructor, I would not go to Dika's direction that “JCU should be a Christian university” (Interview, March 26, 2014). Rather, I would use the JCU logo as a tool, and not the only tool, for students, regardless of religions, to design compositions that are supposed to attract potential

students, especially those who are not Christian, for instance. Some guiding questions can be raised to be fleshed out with arguments and supporting evidence by the students (e.g., What influenced your decision to study at the EFL teacher education program at JCU? How do you see yourself as a Christian/Muslim/Hindu, etc. in this university? How do you see the JCU logo as something that is relevant to you? Or if it is not relevant, what would you think should be part of the logo that represent[s] you better? What do you think, regardless of the JCU logo, is/are rewarding from your study at JCU—academically and/or non-academically?). In another composition, students can be guided to write some criticisms concerning interreligious interactions in class through the advocacy unit of a students' body. Even a small incident of referring to God as "him" (see Lucia's reflection on this in chapter 6) can be brought up to Christian students' and lecturers' attention. Islamic views are definitely part of the "multiplicity of semiotic systems" that can challenge existing Christian discourses at JCU that are not religiously sensitive to non-Christians.

Conclusion

Classroom observations have provided richer understanding of how spirituality is negotiated in ELT classrooms. First, explicit evangelical discourse may not necessarily be the main concern for two non-Christian students participating in this study, as long as it is conveyed in a respectful manner and is not used to force students to be converted to Christianity. Second, interactional dialogue, instead of transactional approach to sharing interreligious debates, should have been done more adequately in class where non-Christian students like Lukas are present. Third, Christian English teachers are capable

of envisioning future possibilities that are humanistically friendly (e.g., not homophobic, not discriminating against religions, etc.) through classroom activities that incorporate spirituality and critical approaches to ELT in a relatively balanced way (e.g., Celeste's approach to having more dialogue with her students in the Communication Across Cultures class; Dika's use of JCU logo to be reflected upon by students). Celeste's case is in particular resonant with my, and I believe other Christian English teachers', struggles in negotiating critical pedagogy and evangelical teachings at church, at a Christian institution hostile to charismatic (and evangelical) movement, and ELT classrooms. Celeste has helped me, in particular, to see more clearly how critical pedagogy, especially her understanding of feminism, and her Christian faith can be complementary, rather than mutually exclusive, in her EFL pedagogy.

After looking into rich detail of what EFL Christian and non-Christian students and teachers at JCU thought of spirituality and how it manifested in class or other ELT-related settings, based on my observations and data elicited in focus group discussions and interviews, I will theorize critical spiritual pedagogy, which is locally grounded in JCU, in the final chapter.

CHAPTER 8

LOCALLY THEORIZING CRITICAL SPIRITUAL PEDAGOGY: THE CASE OF ELT IN JCU

In this final chapter, the praxis of critical spiritual pedagogy is locally theorized, and some implications from the current findings are suggested.

Understanding the Local and the Indigenous in Theorizing Critical Spiritual Pedagogy

By locally theorizing critical spiritual pedagogy I mean I use my reflections on the literature in light of the current findings at the local context of the undergraduate EFL teacher education program at JCU. Most importantly, this locally informed theorization entails my articulation of my “best understanding of what is actually going on”: “These are the data of my experience,” of interacting with EFL stakeholders at JCU in Indonesia, “and this is my best shot at accounting for them” (Edge, 2011, p. 80). Besides, the process of theorizing is also partly indigenously done, because it involves Indonesian nationals, not in a monolithic, homogenous sense. Furthermore, the term “local” suggests that “non-indigenous” teachers (i.e., the three missionaries from English-speaking countries) are part of this local theorizing of critical spiritual pedagogy.

Regarding indigenous perspective, I find Li’s (2000) argument, inspired by Stuart Hall when Li researched into two Indonesian communities outside of Java, relevant to the current local theorizing of critical spiritual pedagogy:

My argument is that a group’s self-identification as tribal or indigenous is not natural or inevitable, but neither is it simply invented, adopted, or imposed. It is,

rather, a *positioning* which draws upon historically sedimented practices, landscapes, and repertoires of meaning, and emerges through particular patterns of engagement and struggle. (p. 151, italics in original)

The “indigenous” Indonesian Christian and non-Christian English language teachers and students who happen to work, study, and interact to each other in a Christian university named JCU have positioned themselves as those inhabiting multiple and shifting identities in terms of religions (e.g., Celeste’s being a member of an evangelistic church who needed to tone down evangelistic zeal in ELT classrooms; see chapter 7), social status (e.g., Sri’s being a senior lecturer; see chapter 4), race (e.g., Dika’s being of a Chinese descent), or sexual orientations (e.g., Fatma’s and Dale’s views against heteronormativity; see chapter 7). And when spirituality, which is inspired by religious views for most participants in this study, is the nexus of other related identities (e.g., sexual, ethnic, or social identities), spiritual positioning is intricately tied to one’s desire to be accepted by at least a community in an imagined locality or to be subversive in a struggle against some sort of injustice. With her or his spiritual positioning, a person wants to be either accepted in her or his imagined locality by shared sedimented practices or repertoires of meaning (e.g., Mira’s reluctance to be regarded as a fanatic Christian who is interested in proselytizing; Mustika’s view that she felt the responsibility as a Christian to spread the gospel [see chapter 4]) or being subversive to a dominant view (e.g., Ellie’s critique toward heteronormativity; see chapter 7).

Locality is usually imagined, when someone is positioning her or his spirituality. The sense of locality can be one’s strong adherence to one realm in a particular place

(e.g., Christianity as it is practiced in the United States, or Islam as it is performed in Saudi Arabia) that she or he thinks should be part of “normal” everyday life. A person’s immediate locality can be in Indonesia—his or her physical body is in Indonesia, but the landscape of Christian evangelistic worldview as circulating in the West may be internalized locally in Indonesia. Monika, one of the Indonesian Christian English language students, has this sense of locality, and has attempted to be verbally evangelical in class or outside the class, irrespective of potential rejections from people around her (see chapter 6). Celeste seems more selective in internalizing the very Western evangelical discourse introduced in her church. While she has kept the evangelical spirit, especially through relating to students more personally, she has not swallowed the evangelical discourse without critical discernment. She is aware of power relations between herself and JCU, as well as between herself and the large Muslim population in Indonesia, which inhibit her from being too frontal about sharing the gospel. In other words, Celeste has been conscious of at least two localities: the Western countries as imaginary places associated with ways of doing evangelism, though those places might be much more secularized now than ever, and Indonesia (including JCU) which is by and large hostile to evangelical Christian mission works. An indigenous view of spiritual positioning is therefore manifest in how local people (e.g., Indonesian nationals) negotiate their spiritual identities, in relation to other fleeting signifiers of identity (e.g., sexuality, race, social status), on the backdrop of their sense of localities.

Three Components of Critical Spiritual Pedagogy being Locally Theorized

The main components of critical spiritual pedagogy that I am theorizing locally here are (a) understanding power and power relations associated with spiritual and/or religious identities; (b) using “defiant speech” (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 310) or discourse with respect and humility in negotiating power relations; and (c) nurturing self-reflexivity. These components are interrelated, are likely to be relevant in other contexts similar to that of JCU, and can be made sense of in some ways. The following is one way (i.e., my way) of grasping the interrelatedness of the three components.

Understanding power means that it is not only that which is unfavorably perceived (e.g., an old aphorism “power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely”). Power, especially that which is tied to spirituality, can be used in productive ways to edify those attached with some sense of transcendence through relation with a god, or gods, fellow human beings, and the nature. The “power” of encouraging words or “knowledge is power” might be relevant to this sense of power which is productive in nature, or simply put, productive power. Understanding power relations associated with one’s religious identities or sense of spirituality is a good start for nurturing self-reflexivity. This is based on the assumption that self-reflexivity is not simply about knowing one’s power, but also how to keep being aware of ways in which dimensions of power other than religion (e.g., being an English native speaker and a White man) may coalesce with a person’s religion and may work together to widen power differentials. Being self-reflexive, furthermore, does not mean a person has no right to use defiant speech that challenge *undesirable stuff*, if you like, which may include such labels as

“oppression,” “discrimination,” “sexism,” “racism,” “homophobia,” and the like. Without self-reflexivity, however, challenging undesirable stuff may be part of the undesirable stuff itself. For example, critiquing that “Christianity is the root of all evils in ELT” is undesirable stuff. It denies one’s adherence to spirituality, including Christianity, which is believed by its followers to ameliorate problems in real-world contexts. Believing that Christianity is a panacea for all problems in the world is also undesirable stuff, though. Nurturing self-reflexivity will assist someone, especially English language educators and students, to keep the balance between challenging any undesirable stuff outside of him or her and undesirable stuff inside of him or her. By “challenging undesirable stuff outside... and inside...,” I do not restrict it to “critiquing” with cognitive prowess only, but how it should also entail using emotions (e.g., of being “oppressed,” intimidated, bullied, etc., by religious dogmatism and academic/intellectual arrogance alike; see also Lucia’s poem [chapter 7; Appendix O]).

Understanding of Power and Power Relations Associated with Spirituality in ELT

It is essential to make Christian EFL lecturers and students more aware of power which is ascribed to them, especially their construction of religious/spiritual identities. To illustrate, the spiritual power of love might supersede religious boundaries, in Shinta’s view: spirituality unites, religions often divide (see chapter 5). This is the productive power of spirituality that English teachers and students can exercise: Finding similar or the same common ground to interact inter-religiously. When this kind of power is actually exercised by a person, this is when her or his agency is coming to play. Karno commented on some similarities between Islam and Christianity when explaining his

experience of reading *The Pilgrim's Progress* (see chapter 6). This is an example of agency being at work: Karno employed his Islamic knowledge to view the Christian book. In addition to perceiving spirituality as one's power to avoid interreligious conflicts, spirituality may also function as a "driving force," to borrow Celeste's phrasing, for teachers to be professional, to endorse character education non-coercively, and to share the gospel through relating to students outside class and in a way that is not pushy, let alone Bible-thumping (see chapter 4). For students, the productive power of spirituality is not by being dogmatic or indiscriminately evangelical, but by being open to interreligious dialogue and relationships, and being self-reflexive of one's position in power (especially as a Christian), in relation to friends embracing different religious faiths (see chapter 6). The productive power of knowledge of discourses other than (evangelical) Christianity has allowed some Christian English teachers at JCU to be aware of power relations between themselves and non-Christian colleagues or students (see chapter 5).

The fact that someone is not only Christian but also evangelical, white, male, and an English native speaker (e.g., Marty; see chapter 7), might widen power differentials if she or he is not careful about positioning him or herself in class. Positioning other people's cultures as objects of criticisms might not be directly related to spirituality. However, it may intensify a longstanding colonialist mentality or "legacy" (Vandrick, 2013) attached to Western Christians, when it is a non-indigenous, Western person who spotlights what indigenous people should or should not do if they wish to improve themselves. Not that the message by a Western messenger is inherently wrong or totally

inappropriate, but the way it is presented, especially when it is something related to spirituality (e.g., fatalism), may be perceived as condescending by some.

Defiant Discourses Seen through Spiritual and Critical Lenses

Providing more space for English language teachers and students to discuss their identities, including spiritual and/or religious identities, in class is paramount. On the one hand, “talking back” to religious dogmatism seems relevant for students in the context of JCU (e.g., Ellie’s stance against her fellow Christian friend, Calantha [see chapter 7]; Lucia’s emotionally charged poem that puts tabooing interreligious love relationship into question [see chapter 6]). On the other hand, a defiant discourse can be articulated against an excessive suspicion on foreign missionaries working as English teachers in a host country like Indonesia and on local (Indonesian) Christian English language educators who have a strong conviction to be evangelical.

Defiant discourse against academics hostile to (evangelical) Christian English teachers were in fact also existent in my research site. Compartmentalizing English teachers into five different and mutually exclusive categories (i.e., evangelical, service, liberal agnostic, secular humanist, and critical pedagogical positions; Pennycook & Coutand-Marin, 2003, p. 338-339) can be subject to criticism, especially because a Christian English language teacher like Angela did not view herself as fitting nicely into one single category. Angela, the U.S. missionary working as an English lecturer at JCU, stated:

[Pennycook] broke us down into categories as missionaries. One of them is evangelical. One of them is service-oriented. One of them was more like a

political or social justice mindedness, I think. And then I there is another one, and I forget what that was... Well anyway. What bothered me about his classification, his categorizing of us, was that I just personally fundamentally disagree with it. Because as a [non-Pentecostal] Christian worker, what we stand for cannot be separated often to these categories. He was compartmentalizing us. And I didn't think that it was, A, possible, and B, he offered it as this is conclusive of the whole picture of what missionaries are or can be. And I really took issue with it. Because I don't serve with an organization that fits neatly into any one of those categories. (Interview, April 29, 2014)

Her narratives (see chapter 5) of her service as a critical (and self-reflexive) English teacher supports her argument that she could not be compartmentalized as one of the categories delineated by Pennycook and Coutand-Marin (2003).

A more complex picture of identity is shown by such Indonesian Christian English teachers as Celeste and Mustika, who are to some extent evangelical, but they are also, like Canagarajah (2009), critical pedagogical. Even Pennycook and Coutand-Marin (2003) in their conclusion acknowledge that “it is possible to engage in Christian (or other religion-based) pedagogies that... deal with such concerns [as ‘disparity, difference, and desire,’ and] Paulo Freire’s mixture of Marxism, humanism and Christianity is an obvious example.” What Pennycook and Coutand-Marin disagree is when “the mission becomes to spread Christianity itself, and particularly when that message becomes conflated with right-wing politics” (p. 351). I have some reservations about this argument, though. I have to concur with Angela that every educator, including her former

Early American Literature professor who was a “combative atheist,” has “ulterior motives.” For the professor, his motive was to un-Christianize his students, at least in academe. In other words, the professor’s mission is to spread anti-Christianity. For Angela, this is not healthy, which led her and her friends to be “closeted Christians” in class: “we never would admit to having faith in the class, 'cause we were too scared of Dr. X” (Interview, April 29, 2014). I am afraid that the tone of Pennycook and Coutand-Marin (2003), as well as Pennycook (2009), are similar to Angela’s combative atheistic professor. They acknowledge Freire’s mixture of Christianity and humanism, but they, especially Pennycook, have doubted that (many) Christian educators other than Freire are capable of mixing religious-based spirituality and critical pedagogy. This is Pennycook’s over-pessimism. Besides, I do not think Angela, Tim, and Marty conflated their position as missionaries who teach English in JCU with right-wing politics. I know Tim and Angela, in particular, as non-Pentecostal missionaries who put emphasis on social justice and are, on the whole, more in favor of the Democrats than conservative Republicans.

Furthermore, one defiant speech expressed by Marty concerns with Pennycook and Coutand-Marin’s (2003) notion of disclosure. They say “if the sole or central purpose of one’s pedagogy is concealed, and one is only teaching in order to gain access to students, there is surely a major ethical concern of trust” (p. 350). Opposing this, or talking back to Pennycook and Coutand-Marin, Marty argued:

What if someone received a job teaching English at a boys school in a country (say Afghanistan when the Taliban was in power) which denies education to girls and treats them in derogatory ways[?] This teacher will teach the boys to the best

of his/her abilities but will seek to challenge their thinking in culturally sensitive ways to challenge their attitudes towards women and will also use his/her spare time to teach girls. Should this teacher be required to be completely upfront about their agenda and so risk being kicked out of a country and never be able to teach there and thus never challenge the thinking about the position of women, or, by being completely upfront they may well endanger the lives of the women they seek to teach in their spare time[?]

Most Western educators would understand the agenda that such a teacher has and would understand the need for secrecy / being careful as to what is disclosed. It is a shame when those Western educators require of 'missionaries' something beyond what they do for their own agenda... this is hypocrisy.

(September 22, 2014)

After all, Marty is known as a missionary from a foreign English-speaking country—no concealment on that part. He has also been open about his faith in class, to which his non-Christian students like Lukas and Karno did not seem to object. Marty is also committed to being cautious about his position in power as an evangelical Christian English teacher. I notice that a Christian English language teacher like Marty might still need to improve the ways ELT materials are selected (see chapter 7 above). However, it is too far, and inaccurate, to argue that Marty induced a “right-wing” political agenda. Rather, it is a constructive comment on my part in order for Marty, and other missionaries, are more self-reflexive (e.g., on presenting an issue of fatalism in ELT classrooms; see chapter 7).

Apart from defiant discourses against religious dogmatism as well as against academic hostile position (e.g., Pennycook & Coutand-Marin, 2003) that positions Christianity as a culprit in ELT, it is crucial to see how defiant discourses circulate in Christian-Christian and Christian-non-Christian relationships. Dominant groups (e.g., Christians in JCU) may instill some hegemonic values (e.g., Christianity). However, it does not mean that the dominant group is monolithically uniform (Holborow, 2012). Even a Christian student like Ellie make use of his freedom of speech in class to offer a counterhegemonic (or defiant) discourse when she expressed her openness to homosexuality. Furthermore, whereas “hegemony” is typically perceived as negative, an individual can use her or his agency to tolerate, accept, or reject it. Lukas and Karno could tolerate the hegemony of evangelical discourse in ELT classrooms (see chapter 7), but it does not mean they accepted it fully or rejected it altogether. To further illustrate, when the understanding of spiritual journey to seek for enlightenment in *The Pilgrim’s Progress* was fully accepted by Karno, it does not suggest that Karno accepted the concept of salvation that Christianity offers (see chapter 7). The broader argument is that I defy totalizing Christianity and especially its (evangelical) followers as one rigid hegemonic power that invades and obliterates non-Christian values in ELT classrooms. Being “re-shaped as a consequence” in interactional dialogue with Christians (Wong, 2009) does not always suggest that one will be fully converted to another side and abandon a previous belief, be it “Christian” or “critical.”

Being re-shaped as a consequence is more on showing respect, as well as tolerance, and giving space, at least for discussions about real-life issues that oftentimes

are seen too one-sidedly by religious or secularly critical lenses alike. Johnston (2009) introduces the notion of “exploratory dialogue” to refer to “true dialogue [which] serves the dual function of giving participants voice and allowing exposure to the voices of others, leading to the mutual shaping of ideas and views” (p. 36). Karno’s interpretation of *The Pilgrim’s Progress* has exemplified such mutual shaping of Christian and Muslim views. The issue is hence not who hegemonizes who, or who is being hegemonized by whom. Rather, mutual shaping of religious views highlights similarities, instead of differences, across religions. Karno may implicitly express a defiant discourse of silence regarding the Christian concept of salvation in Jesus Christ, but it was used strategically by him to maintain peace in an interreligious encounter with me.

Defiant discourses are also vital in showing one’s spiritual existence. In the Indonesian context, Islam is a hegemonic spiritual window through which many Indonesians (including Christians like myself) are to see the world. I remember being educated in an Indonesian public senior high school. On Monday flag ceremonies, many students from different religious backgrounds took praying in a Muslim way for granted. This is something I find as disturbing as when I self-reflexively think of asking non-Christian students to pray in a Christian way. Dika (see chapters 4 and 7), who also shares a similar emotion with me in terms of being Christian and Chinese, found a way to incorporate counter-hegemonic (or defiant) discourse into an ELT classroom (i.e., a Intermediate Reading course). Although at first I only thought, in view of Janks (2010), that the JCU logo might be re-designed so as to be more religiously inclusive (see chapter 7), in an ensuing interview with her she made me aware of her hidden motivation: “to

make the students be aware of that JCU should be a Christian university” (Interview, March 26, 2014; see chapter 7). I am personally still cautious about the likelihood that Christian English language educators proselytize in a coercive way. However, integrating a classroom activity that may reinforce the feeling of attachment to the Christian faith without forcing non-Christians to be converted to Christianity can be a justifiable counterhegemonic discourse to the dominant Islamic views in Indonesia. The issue is hence not so much of proselytizing but of exhibiting the existence of Christianity in a predominantly Muslim society.

One caution about expressing defiant discourses is in order. While being critical toward other people’s views can be part of everyday life, it is necessary to avoid oneself from constant anger that may cloud one’s vision of alternative views. Paraphrasing the view of Nhat Hanh (a Buddhist scholar), Bradley (2005) wrote: “When one does not cling stubbornly to one’s views, . . . one is less likely to act out of anger” (p. 35) and, I may add, arrogance. Guarding oneself from constant anger that originates from a fixation upon one’s own views requires humility and self-reflexivity.

Self-Reflexivity Nurtured Spiritually and Critically

To be included in the process of being self-reflexive is reflecting upon (a) how one defines spirituality (e.g., Calantha’s dogmatic view of spirituality [see chapter 6]); (b) one’s motivation in working or studying in an institution like JCU (e.g., Dika’s avoidance from Muslim-Christian tensions in the Greater Jakarta [see chapter 4]); (c) how teachers interact with their students (e.g., Sara’s outreach to her student accused of committing plagiarism [see chapter 4]); (d) how students view their relationship with their peers (e.g.,

Lucia's observation that “him” might not be appropriate to refer to God in Islam; see chapter 6); and (e) how ELT materials are developed (e.g., Tim’s concern about some reading materials that might be developed in a somewhat religiously insensitive way [see chapter 5]).

Furthermore, self-reflexivity is not static or once for all time. It is not “always turning a skeptical eye” (Pennycook, 2001, p. 7) toward anything, either—I agree with Friedrich et al. (2013). Being self-reflexive is a process through which one’s blind spots should always be identified through (a) humble reflections; (b) interactional or exploratory (rather than transactional) dialogues that allow one’s spiritual or critical views to be mutually shaped (Johnston, 2009; Morgan, 2009); and (c) updated knowledge from relevant literature. It is one thing to express criticism against bad conducts of past missionaries who were strongly associated with past colonialism. It is another thing to keep walking the talk or practicing what is preached in being self-critical about one’s position in power. Recall that even a self-critical English teacher could overlook the possibility that a teaching material, even that which has nothing to do with evangelization, could perpetuate colonial legacy, although it was shown to students with the intention of attaining social justice in mind (see e.g., Marty’s case in chapter 7). Christian English language teachers, missionaries and local nationals alike, might not directly talk about Jesus or religions in class. However, their self-reflexivity needs to be extended to being aware of colonial legacy, particularly in terms of epistemology (e.g., “critical thinking” as the best way of knowing and understanding), that is oftentimes inextricably linked to Christianity as the dominant worldview in Western, colonialist

countries, although people in the Western world have been much more secularized. I am not saying that “critical thinking” is inherently appalling. I believe people need critical thinking in one way or another. What I found potentially problematic is the likelihood that spotlighting a person from the West (e.g., the British garbage man) as a savior who thought critically and acted heroically could be perceived as condescending by indigenous Indonesian people, including myself. The same concern has to be directed to me: Do I sound “shrill” or “pressuring,” to partly use Purgasson’s (2009, p. 188) wording, when I preach the gospel of Jesus Christ, or of social justice, or of critical thinking to fellow Indonesians, especially to those who are not Christian?

It is not yet known how a person like Calantha problematizes her definition of spirituality that is very dogmatic. Also unclear is how a student like Monika revisits her evangelical calling through becoming an English teacher. However, data elicited from these students can be used in a course like Second Language Teaching or TEFL to be reflected upon by other students and teachers alike. This data may also become a starting point for exploring the debates over the place of Christianity in ELT in the TESOL and applied linguistics literature—or beyond.

Most importantly, self-reflexivity is likely to be nurtured spiritually and critically. First, spirituality and critical approaches to ELT are not necessarily incompatible, given that humanist concerns are focused on, not religious dogmas. Christian spirituality, for instance, would encourage Christian English teachers to ask: “What would Jesus do if some people, including homosexuals, are bullied?” A critical (applied linguistics) approach to ELT will drive Christian English teachers to ask: “How should my selected

ELT materials, which address homosexuality, be presented in ways that respect those who are religious and those deeply invested in LGBT issues? How should I position myself so as not to sound condescending when talking about critical pedagogy, social justice, and my religion?”

Second, self-reflexivity may guide English language teachers and students to explore their identities as “multiple, shifting,... in conflict,... constructed, maintained, and negotiated primarily through discourse” (Varghese et al., 2005, p. 35). Recall that Celeste may be simplistically labeled as an “evangelical Christian,” from the perspective of social identity theory (see chapter 2), due to her belonging to an evangelical church. But this is not always the way she constructed and negotiated her identity with me and/or before her students. Having been exposed to feminism, she once questioned a man-woman relationship, an issue not typically addressed in a critical way in evangelical churches I know of. Her adherence to the Christian God, however, has made her willing to submit to a husband (see chapter 7). In the church she belongs to, she might be a novice in evangelism. But the extent to which she would like to be a full-fledged evangelical person, like how the theory of situated learning (see chapter 2) would view Celeste, is still highly questionable. To her students in JCU, she might not negotiate her Christian identity in a frontal and Bible-thumping way as what her church might want a person to act out in order to qualify being an evangelical Christian. Celeste’s main concern was not to have full membership in an imaginary evangelical circle, nor in a feminist camp. She attempted to juggle between identities, negotiating them in ways that have displayed her as having a critical pedagogical flavor (e.g., in gender and homosexual issues) without

losing her evangelical Christian taste. The Christian spirituality might be her driving force or the center for other things, but it is not too emphasized at the expense of her concerns in social justice, especially concerning how homosexuality should be addressed in ELT classrooms or elsewhere (see chapter 7).

More broadly viewed, therefore, identity formations of English language teachers who are spiritually and critically inclined are not a matter of conforming to simplistically assigned labels (e.g., “evangelical Christians” or “critical teachers”), nor are they a single one-dimensional path to achieve full membership in one domain (e.g., being an evangelical Christian English teacher) or even two or more domains (e.g., being “fully evangelical,” and “entirely critical,” and “completely feminist”), which may be elusively idealized or delineated by the church, critical pedagogues, and feminist scholars alike. Rather, individual English language teachers have their own sense of what it means to perform their best attempt to calibrate being evangelical, or critical pedagogical, or both. Besides, in forming or shaping their identities, spiritually inclined critical English language educators, like Celeste, might take into account their productive power (e.g., as a resource person in class) and the existence of power relations constituted in societal constellations (e.g., between evangelical and non-evangelical Christians, between non-Christians and Christians) that may be hostile or welcoming to them. Self-reflexivity might help teachers (including myself) and students, especially those who are spiritual *and* critical, to better understand their productive power of thoughts, emotions, or passion, and relations of power that may complicate passionate attempts to achieve desirable stuff (e.g., social justice) and eliminate undesirable stuff (e.g., social injustice).

Personally speaking, self-reflexivity has, throughout this current project, transformed my ways of looking at myself. As I learned from at least a class that I observed (i.e., Celeste's Communication Across Cultures class where the issue of homosexuality became a point of debate; see chapter 7), I was very much amazed at Celeste's pedagogical insights into managing classroom discussions in which meta-talks were utilized. Not only did Celeste perform classroom practices in which spirituality and critical pedagogy were nicely synthesized, but also she has surpassed my own teaching repertoire that was, in hindsight, more transactional (e.g., "This is critical pedagogy that I, and hence you need/have to, believe") than interactional through meta-talks. Apart from Celeste's case, I think of a student like Calantha as a mirror on which I look at my past life as a religiously dogmatic person myself in the context of my interactions with non-Christians and fellow Christians alike. In other words, I could label Calantha as "dogmatic," because I probably used to be, and might still potentially be, like her, too.

The current study has also shaped me into a person who might be accused of being "double-minded" (James 1:8) and "serv[ing] two masters" (Matthew 6:24). The question then becomes whether I serve Master Critical Pedagogy or Master Christianity? Likewise, am I being syncretic by blending critical pedagogy and spirituality? It goes without saying that certain religious dogmas (e.g., that Jesus is the only way and truth [John 14:6]; that homosexuality is a sin [1 Corinthians 6:9]) are totally incompatible with postmodernist critical pedagogy. However, as an English language teacher and teacher educator, I have begun thinking of myself as an "agnostic Christian," for lack of a better term, which sounds similar to the notion of "agnostic theist" expressed by a student

participant, Dale (see chapter 7). I still maintain my willingness to express about my faith, when asked (see chapter 3). Nonetheless, as I am becoming more aware of my academic audience, especially fellow applied linguists, TESOL practitioners, and students, my goals are not to convince non-Christian colleagues and students that Jesus exists, or is a Savior, or died on the Cross to redeem my sin, and that homosexuality is a sin. I am even bold enough to say that, with general academic audience in mind, even if (hypothetically) the so-called God does not exist, what I believe exists is textual evidence like the Holy Bible that becomes one of my major sources of inspirations for my spirituality and critical pedagogy. For instance, the story of Jesus having a dialogue with a Samaritan prostitute, a woman who was marginalized due to her profession and being not a “pure” Jewish (see the gospel according to John chapter 4) resonates with my critical pedagogical view of advocating for anyone positioned in marginalized positions. Those who can be marginalized include evangelical Christians who are oftentimes too unfairly discredited by many of the so-called “secular” academicians. I have also begun to realize more presence of LGBT-supporting discourse from English language students in Indonesia, with the specific case being in JCU. As an “agnostic Christian,” I find this phenomenon rewarding for nurturing my sensitivity in interacting with LGBT proponents and performers. Thus, it is a lot better for me to be an “agnostic Christian” than being a person who claims to be a devout Christian, but is double-minded by hating and marginalizing people who are homosexual, disabled, of different religions, races or ethnicities, and gender.

Limitation of the Study

First, participation of non-Christian EFL stakeholders have been restricted. There were only three non-Christian (i.e., Muslim) English teachers in JCU, one of whom decided not to participate in the study. Three Muslim students who initially signed the consent form eventually withdrew from the study for unknown reasons. With only two Muslim English teachers, two Muslim students, and one other non-Christian student participating in my study, it is difficult to say that their views are generalizable to other non-Christian EFL stakeholders in the same institution or in similar contexts (i.e., Indonesian Christian universities accommodating non-Christian English teachers and enrolling non-Christian students).

Second, I am a male Christian person who was also a doctoral student in an American university. This may have widened a gap between me and female, non-Christian students. This may have accounted for the withdrawal of two female Muslim students who initially wanted to participate in my study. In addition, being a Christian might have refrained non-Christian participants from revealing more fully and sincerely what they felt in a Christian insitution like JCU.

Concluding Remarks

Theorizing critical spiritual pedagogy locally entails inquiries into the dynamics of spiritually associated power relations among (EFL) stakeholders in a literal locality (e.g., being physically present in JCU) who have their means of expressing defiant discourses, and degrees of understanding of self-reflexivity in making sense of localities, desires, ways of identifying themselves with a race (e.g., being “indigenous” or

otherwise), or sexual orientations, among other markers of identity. The nature of power-relational dynamics suggests that power is not exercised unidirectionally by one party at the expense of another (e.g., that evangelical Christianity will destroy the well-being of non-Christian English language learners). Rather, it can be productively managed in a context like an ELT classroom where students and teachers have a space to explore their spiritual and critical views concurrently through interactional or exploratory dialogues in a foreign language like English. In such dialogues, English language students and teachers can learn to be nimble to identify “critical moments” in which “some new understanding is coming about” (Pennycook, 2004, p. 330). Circulating defiant discourses in a classroom space or elsewhere (e.g., to academia) may hurt or mute one another, although they are meant to challenge undesirable stuff (e.g., the status quo where social injustice or marginalization of evangelical Christian English teachers prevails). However, commitment to self-reflexivity might push individuals to produce more light (e.g., balanced views of bad conducts of past missionary work and a present-day responsibility to be more aware of one’s position in power) than heat (e.g., crude criticisms toward evangelical Christians by critical pedagogues or toward critical pedagogues by staunchly evangelical Christians).

Concurrent with the theorization of critical spiritual pedagogy which is grounded in evidence from JCU, the current study has generated some pivotal findings and pedagogical implications. First, the incorporation of spirituality into ELT can be problematic. For example, some students were perceived by Ellie as being puzzled when biblical texts were brought up in class by an instructor (see chapter 6). A local institution

(including JCU) can be hostile toward charismatic movement that is typically evangelical, according to Celeste (see chapter 4). Moreover, a student who performed what I perceived as “religious dogmatism” in class or elsewhere might widen power differentials between herself and non-Christian students, or between herself and those who are more critically oriented (e.g., Ellie who showed more acceptance to homosexuals; see chapters 6 and 7). These findings highlight the importance of attending to spiritually associated power relations, the first component of locally theorized critical spiritual pedagogy. Pedagogically speaking, it is crucial that power relations due to one’s spiritual identities and self-reflexivity are brought to the fore through meta-talks in EFL classrooms, especially in ELT-related courses.

Second, lack of attention to spirituality in ELT can be put into question. Recall that some students expected a missionary like Tim to pray in class (see chapter 4). Besides, Shinta’s decision to be religionless in class might not have been without a price. She did not take into account perspectives from students embracing a variety of religious faiths when discussing controversial issues like homosexuality (see chapter 7). Consequently, English teachers or teacher educators need to be mindful about negotiating, rather than simply rejecting, possibilities of discussing spiritual issues in class and being honest about which spiritual perspective s/he comes from.

Third, integrating spirituality in ELT contexts can be enriching for teachers and/or students. Celeste’s decision to interact with students more closely than in a business-like relationship appears to have been appreciated by her students (see chapter 4). Tim, an American Christian missionary, was devoted to showing Islam in positive light to his

students in the American Culture and Literature class (see chapter 5). Thus, bringing in spirituality in ELT classrooms is not always about proselytizing that non-Christian critical TESOL academics like Pennycook have been wary about. Furthermore, John Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress* was positively received by Karno (see chapter 6) who likes to read English texts extensively for his personal (spiritual) enrichment. Even when the gospel was explicitly presented in a Communication Across Cultures, non-Christian students like Karno and Lukas were still firm with their own faiths and did not feel that they were spiritually marginalized (see chapter 7). These findings are supportive of the productive power of spirituality, which is still the first part of my locally theorized critical spiritual pedagogy: Understanding power associated with spirituality in ELT. Besides, by defying academics hostile to evangelical Christians (see the defiant discourses, the second component of critical spiritual pedagogy being locally theorized here) and hence integrating faith explicitly in ELT (see chapter 7), Marty seems to have been more content as a Christian. He is not spiritually suppressed or closeted; on the contrary, he might feel some joy when revealing his faith in class and intellectually satisfied when he could be self-reflexive about bad conducts of past missionary work in Indonesia. EFL teachers or teacher educators should therefore think of highlighting views that are likely to be shared, or be acceptable, across religions.

Fourth, spirituality can be presented together with critical ELT. Not that critical pedagogy and spirituality in ELT are always compatible, but there have been serious attempts by some teachers to explore these in their classes through self-reflexivity (i.e., the third component of my locally theorized critical spiritual pedagogy). Mustika was

teaching about religious auto-criticism when she interpreted Phillis Wheatley's poem (see chapter 5). In one of her classes, Angela attempted to be self-reflexive about some evangelical agenda through media produced by fellow Christians in the United States after the 9/11 incident (see chapter 5). Discussing religious views and controversial issues (e.g., homosexuality) could generate some reflective moments for students. At least that was what an English teacher like Celeste had in mind (see chapter 7). In view of Edge (2009), rather than displacing their own faith altogether, these teachers augmented critical pedagogical insights into their spiritual understanding and becoming. Negotiating spirituality and critical approaches to TESOL seems to be more rewarding than the displacive, anti-religious discourse of Pennycook (2009):

... no[t] that I do not welcome discussion of spirituality, belief, philosophy, and ethics. But to have to engage with ancient organized religions in their new incarnations, with claims to the existence of an almighty being still,... seems a desperate regression. (p. 60)

At least for some EFL teacher educators in some settings at JCU, Indonesia, Pennycook's over-pessimistic stance regarding the role of faith in ELT appears untenable. Besides, is it always possible to talk about spirituality without any reference to god or "the existence of an almighty being"? My answer is a clear "no!" With a sense of spirituality, one, me included, can still believe in God, be affiliated in "organized religions," and yet be critical toward them whose practices are not sensitive to "social justice," in its broadest sense of the phrase (Mambu, 2011).

In contexts other than Indonesia where religious values are not regarded as salient (e.g., for some, if not many, instructors of first-year composition [FYC] classes in the United States serving international students), the findings of the current study are still relevant. When international students, including those from Indonesia, are personally invested in spirituality, FYC instructors and L2 writing specialists in the United States need to think of ways in which issues of spirituality can be negotiated through meta-talk rather than simply dismissing and deeming them totally irrelevant to academic life (and writing).

In view of the findings of the current study, more questions emerge and warrant further inquiries. At a theoretical level, there should be more attention to how the notions of “values,” “morality,” and “ethics” are conceptualized so as to better understand critical spiritual pedagogy.¹⁵ At an empirical level, it is still unclear how “small” or “large” a space for discussion should be provided, such that one’s sense of spiritual integrity is not compromised by her or his commitment to critical pedagogy, or vice versa, when Christian English teachers, in particular, negotiate their critical and spiritual identities in ELT contexts. What hedging and meta-talk strategies are utilized when one negotiates issues not typically endorsed by her or his religious beliefs? Furthermore, a more complex picture of spiritually associated relations of power might be captured when a non-Christian researcher delves into non-Christian EFL stakeholders in a Christian institution like JCU. It is also crucial to figure out ways to keep track of students who are religiously “dogmatic” (e.g., Calantha) and deeply evangelical (e.g., Monika) in longitudinal studies. The question for such students is how their current stances evolve,

or remain the same, or become much more nuanced, when they get more exposure to critical pedagogy literature or interactions with non-Christian teachers and fellow students. How L2 writing instructors guide and assess students to address an audience coming from a variety of religious backgrounds, or lack thereof, is particularly important to address. Also interesting to explore is how English teacher educators negotiate their spiritually associated identities and power relations with their students outside an EFL teacher education program, like in a community service emphasizing ELT, which is facilitated by a local church.

REFERENCES

- Akbari, R. (2008). Transforming lives: Introducing critical pedagogy into ELT classrooms. *ELT Journal*, 62(3), 276-283. doi:10.1093/elt/ccn025
- Anderson, A. H. (2014). *An introduction to Pentecostalism: Global charismatic Christianity (2nd)*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, C. (1989). The description of an embarrassment: When students write about religion. *ADE Bulletin*, 94, 12-15.
- Aritonang, M. S. (2013, April 2). Minister: Christians bring discrimination on themselves. *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2013/04/02/minister-christians-bring-discrimination-themselves.html>.
- Astin, A. W. (2004). Why spirituality deserves a central place in liberal education. *Liberal Education*, 90(2), 34-41.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Baswedan, A. R. (2004). Political Islam in Indonesia: Present and future trajectory. *Asian Survey*, 44(5), 669-690. doi: 10.1525/as.2004.44.5.669
- Baurain, B. (2007). Christian witness and respect for persons. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 6(3), 201-219. doi: 10.1080/15348450701454221
- Baurain, B. (2013). Putting beliefs into practice in a church-run adult ESOL ministry. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjánsson, Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 136-153). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bayuni, E. M. (2013, July 24). Commentary: The state, not the FPI, is the real problem. *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2013/07/24/commentary-the-state-not-fpi-real-problem.html>.
- Benesch, S. (2012). *Considering emotions in critical English language teaching: Theories and praxis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bierling, M. R. (2007). Legal and illegal immigration: Complex ethical issues for the language classroom. In D. I. Smith, & T. A. Osborn (Eds.), *Spirituality, social*

- justice, and language learning* (pp. 89-105). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Bradley, C. A. (2005). Spirituality and L2 pedagogy: Toward a research agenda. *Journal of Engaged Pedagogy*, 4(1), 26-38.
- Buzzelli, C. A., & Johnston, B. (2002). *The moral dimensions of teaching: Language, power, and culture in classroom interaction*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Byler, M. (2009). Confronting the empire: Language teachers as charitable guests. In M. S. Wong, & S. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 120-130). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cammack, M. (2009). Legal aspects of Muslim-non-Muslim marriage in Indonesia. In G. W. Jones, H. L. Chee, & M. Mohamad (Eds.), *Muslim-non-Muslim marriage: Political and cultural contestations in Southeast Asia* (pp. 102-134). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1993). Critical ethnography of a Sri Lankan classroom: Ambiguities in student opposition to reproduction through ESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), 601-626. doi: 10.2307/3587398
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2004). Subversive identities, pedagogical safe houses, and critical learning. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 116-137). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2009). Introduction: New possibilities for the spiritual and the critical in pedagogy. In M. S. Wong, & S. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 1-18). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Chamberlain, M. (2009). First, the log in our own eye: Missionaries and their critics. In M. S. Wong, & S. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 46-52). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Chan, L. (2013). Christian language professionals (CLPs) and integrated vision: The stories of four educators. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjánsson, Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 206-222). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Crookes, G. V. (2009). *Values, philosophies, and beliefs in TESOL: Making a statement*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Crookes, G. V. (2013). *Critical ELT in action: Foundations, promises, praxis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cutri, R. M. (2000). Exploring the spiritual moral dimensions of teachers' classroom language policies. In J. K. Hall, & W. G. Eggington (Eds.), *The sociopolitics of English language teaching* (pp. 165-177). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dei, G. J. S. (2002). Spiritual knowing and transformative learning. In E. O'Sullivan, A. Morrell, & M. A. O'Connor (Eds.), *Expanding the boundaries of transformative learning: Essays on theory and praxis* (pp. 121-133). New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Dively, R. L. (1993). Religious discourse in the academy: Creating a space by means of poststructuralist theories of subjectivity. *Composition Studies. Freshman English news*, 21(2), 91-101.
- Downs, D. (2005). True believers, real scholars, and real true believing scholars: Discourses of inquiry and affirmation in the composition classroom. In E. V. Lei, & b. I. kyburz (Eds.), *Negotiating religious faith in the composition classroom* (pp. 39-55). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Duff, P. A. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics*. New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- Edge, J. (1996). Keeping the faith. *TESOL Matters*, 6(4), 1.
- Edge, J. (1996/1997). Letters: Julian Edge responds. *TESOL Matters*, 6(6), 6.
- Edge, J. (2003). Imperial troopers and servants of the Lord: A vision of TESOL for the 21st century. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 701-709. doi: 10.2307/3588218
- Edge, J. (2004). The author replies: Of displace and augmentative discourse, new enemies, and old doubts. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4), 717-721. doi: 10.2307/3588289
- Edge, J. (2009). Non-judgmental steps on a road to understanding. In M. S. Wong, & S. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 21-34). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Edge, J. (2011). *The reflexive teacher educator in TESOL: Roots and wings*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), 297-324.
- Ferris, D. R. (2009). Power and change in ELT: Thoughts from a fellow traveler. In M. S. Wong, & S. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 205-214). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Frank, A. W. (2012). Practicing dialogical narrative analysis. In J. A. Holstein, & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Varieties of narrative analysis* (pp. 33-52). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Freire, P. (1984). Education, liberation and the church. *Religious Education*, 79(4), 524-545.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.) (30th anniversary edition). New York, NY: Continuum Books. (Original work published 1968).
- Friedrich, P., Chaudhuri, A., Figueiredo, E. D. d, Fredricks, D., Hammill, M., Johnson, E., Duran, C. S., Yun, M-J. (2013). Reading Pennycook critically 10 years later: A group's reflections on and questions about critical applied linguistics. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 7, 119-137. doi: 10.1080/19313152.2012.664989
- Gallagher, E. V. (2009). "Spirituality in higher education?" Caveat emptor. *Religion & Education*, 36(2), 68-87. doi: 10.1080/15507394.2009.10012444
- Gee, J. P. (2012). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in Discourses* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contradiction in social analysis*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodburn, A. (1998). It's a question of faith: Discourses of fundamentalism and critical pedagogy in the writing classroom. *JAC: A Journal of Composition Theory*, 18(2), 333-353.

- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, Trans.). New York, NY: International Publishers.
- Griffith, T. (2004). Unless a grain of wheat... . *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4), 714-716. doi: 10.2307/3588288
- Hansen, K. (2005). Religious freedom in the public square and the composition classroom. In E. V. Lei, & b. l. kyburz (Eds.), *Negotiating religious faith in the composition classroom* (pp. 24-38). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Hayes, D. (2013). Narratives of experience: Teaching English in Sri Lanka and Thailand. In G. Barkhuizen (Ed.), *Narrative research in applied linguistics* (pp. 62-82). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, S. B., Street, B. V., & Mills, M. (2008). *Ethnography: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Holborow, M. (2012). Neoliberal keywords and the contradictions of an ideology. In D. Block, J. Gray, & M. Holborow (Eds.), *Neoliberalism and applied linguistics* (pp. 33-55). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Inderawati, R. (2013). The application of literature for all and literature across curriculum concept by responding literary works to the enlightenment of character education in Indonesia context. *Journal of Teaching and Education*, 2(1), 13-24.
- Indonesia. (2014). In *Central Intelligence Agency*. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/id.html>
- Iqra (n.d.). In *Islamic-Dictionary*. Retrieved from <http://www.islamic-dictionary.com/index.php?word=iqra>
- Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and power*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Johnston, B. (2003). *Values in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Johnston, B. (2009). Is dialogue possible? Challenges to evangelicals and nonevangelicals in English language teaching. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in*

- dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 35-45). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Johnston, B., & Varghese, M. M. (2006). Neo-imperialism, evangelism, and ELT: Modernist missions and a postmodern profession. In J. Edge (Ed.), *(Re-)locating TESOL in an age of empire* (pp. 195-207). London, UK: Palgrave.
- Kristjánsson, C. (2013). Inside, between, and beyond: Agency and identity in language learning. In J. Arnold, & T. Murphey (Eds.), *Meaningful action: Earl Stevick's influence on language teaching* (pp. 5-22). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Kubanyiova, M. (2013). Towards understanding the role of faith in the development of language teachers' identities: A modest proposal for extending the research agenda. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjánsson, Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 85-92). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kubota, R. (2004). Critical multiculturalism and second language education. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 30-52). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kubota, R. (2009). Spiritual dimensions in language teaching: A personal reflection. In M. S. Wong, & S. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 225-234). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lei, E. V. (2005). Coming to terms with religious faith in the composition classroom: *Introductory comments*. In E. V. Lei, & b. I. kyburz (Eds.), *Negotiating religious faith in the composition classroom* (pp. 3-10). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Lei, E. V., & kyburz, b. I. (2005). (Eds.). *Negotiating religious faith in the composition classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Lepp-Kaethler, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2013). The role of sacred texts in enhancing motivation and living the vision in second language acquisition. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjánsson, Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 171-188). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lessard-Clouston, M. (2013). Faith and learning integration in ESL/EFL instruction: A preliminary study in America and Indonesia. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjánsson, Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning:*

- Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 115-135). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Li, T.M. (2000). Articulating indigenous identity in Indonesia: Resource politics and the tribal slot. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 42(1), 149-179.
- Liang, J. (2009). The courage to teach as a nonnative English teacher: The confession of a Christian teacher. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 163-172). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Litosseliti, L. (2003). *Using focus groups in research*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Loptes, K. A. (2009). A preliminary survey of Christian English language teachers in countries that restrict missionary activity. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 53-58). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Luke, A (2004). Two takes on the critical. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 21-29). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Maggay, M. P. (1996). *Transforming society*. Quezon City, Philippines: The Institute for Studies in Asian Church and Culture.
- Mahboob, A. (2009). Additive perspective on religion or growing hearts with wisdom. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 272-279). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mambu, J. E. (2010). *Personalizing critical pedagogies in foreign language education*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Mambu, J. E. (2011). English for Advocacy Purposes: Critical pedagogy's contribution to Indonesia. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 8(4), 135-173.
- Mayes, C. (2001). Cultivating spiritual reflectivity in teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 28(2), 5-22.
- McCarthy, T. (2000). A call to arms: Forming a Christian worldview of teaching English as a second language. *Evangelical Missions Quarterly*, 36(3), 310-316.

- Montesano, M., & Roen, D. (2005). Religious faith, learning, and writing: Challenges in the classroom. In E. V. Lei, & b. I. kyburz (Eds.), *Negotiating religious faith in the composition classroom* (pp. 84-98). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Morgan, B. (2009). The pedagogical dilemmas of faith in ELT: A dialogic response. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 193-204). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Motha, S., & Lin, A. (2014). "Non-coercive rearrangements": Theorizing desire in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(2), 331-359. doi: 10.1002/tesq.126
- Murphey, T., Chen, J., & Chen, L. (2005). Learners' constructions of identities and imagined communities. In P. Benson & D. Nunan (eds.), *Learners' stories: Difference and diversity in language learning* (pp. 83-100). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Noll, M. A. (1994). *The scandal of the evangelical mind*. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Oldenski, T. (2002). The critical discourses of liberation theology and critical pedagogy. In T. Oldenski & D. Carlson (Eds.), *Educational yearning* (pp. 133-162). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Palmer, P. J. (1993). *To know as we are known: Education as a spiritual journey*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Palmer, P. J., & Zajonc, A. (2010). *The heart of higher education: A call to renewal. Transforming the academy through collegial conversations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pasquale, M. (2013). Folk linguistics, content-oriented discourse analysis, and language teacher beliefs. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjánsson, Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 47-63). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pavlenko, A. (2004). Gender and sexuality in foreign and second language education: Critical and feminist approaches. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical*

- pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 53-71). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (2001) *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pennycook, A. (2004). Critical moments in a TESOL praxicum. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 327-345). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (2009). Is dialogue possible? Anti-intellectualism, relativism, politics, and linguistic ideologies. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 60-65). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A., & Coutand-Marin, S. (2003). Teaching English as a missionary language. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 24(3), 337-353. doi: 10.1080/0159630032000172524
- Pennycook, A., & Makoni, S. (2005). The modern mission: The language effects of Christianity. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 4(2), 137-155. doi: 10.1207/s15327701jlie0402_5
- Perkins, P. (2001). "A radical conversion of the mind": Fundamentalism, hermeneutics, and the metanoic classroom. *College English*, 63(5), 585-611. doi: 10.2307/379046
- Peters, B. (2005). African American students of faith in the writing center: Facilitating a rhetoric of conscience. In E. V. Lei, & b. I. kyburz (Eds.), *Negotiating religious faith in the composition classroom* (pp. 121-134). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Phillipson, R. (2009). Dialogue and discourse. In M. S. Wong, & S. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 66-71). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Prior, M. T. (2011). Self-presentation in L2 interview talk: Narrative versions, accountability, and emotionality. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 60-76. doi:10.1093/applin/amq033
- Purgason, K. B. (1994). How to communicate values and truth in the context of teaching English as a second or foreign language. *Evangelical Missions Quarterly*, 30, 238-243.

- Purgason, K. B. (1997). Christianity in the classroom: Principles and resources for teaching English. In *Teaching more than English: Using TESL/TEFL on the mission field at home and abroad* (pp. 59-66). Evanston, IL: Berry.
- Purgason, K. B. (2004). Readers respond to Julian Edge's "Imperial troopers and servants of the Lord:" "A clearer picture of the servants of the Lord." *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 711-713. doi: 10.2307/3588287
- Purgason, K. B. (2009). Classroom guidelines for teachers with convictions. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 185-192). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ramanathan, V. (2009). Questioning religious "ideals" and intentionalities: Staving off religious arrogance and bigotry in ELT. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 72-74). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Rand, L. A. (2001). Enacting faith: Evangelical discourse and the discipline of composition studies. *College Composition and Communication*, 52(3), 349-367. doi: 10.2307/358623
- Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Robison, R. E. (2009). Truth in teaching English. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 255-264). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ryoo, J. J., Crawford, J., Moreno, D., & McLaren, P. (2009). Critical Spiritual Pedagogy: reclaiming humanity through a pedagogy of integrity, community, and love. *Power and Education*, 1(1), 132-146.
- Scott, D. G. (2006). Wrestling with the spirit(ual): Grappling with theory, practice and pedagogy. *International Journal of Children's Spirituality*, 11(1), 87-97. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13644360500503431>
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Schugurensky, D. (2011). *Paulo Freire*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Sewell, Jr., W. H. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(1), 1-29.

- Shahjahan, R. A. (2004). Centering spirituality in the academy: Toward a transformative way of teaching and learning. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 2(4), 294-312. doi: 10.1177/1541344604268330
- Shahjahan, R. A. (2010). Toward a spiritual praxis: The role of spirituality among faculty of color teaching for social justice. *The Review of Higher Education*, 33(4), 473-512. doi: 10.1353/rhe.0.0166
- Smart, J. M. (2005). "Frankenstein or Jesus Christ?" When the voice of faith creates a monster for the composition teacher. In E. V. Lei, & b. I. kyburz (Eds.), *Negotiating religious faith in the composition classroom* (pp. 11-23). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Smith, D. I. (2007). Moral agency, spirituality, and the language classroom. In D. I. Smith, & T. A. Osborn (Eds.), *Spirituality, social justice, and language learning* (pp. 33-50). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Smith, D. I., & Carvill, B. (2000). *The gift of the stranger: Faith, hospitality, and foreign language teaching*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Smith, D. I., & Osborn, T. A. (2007). (Eds.). *Spirituality, social justice, and language learning*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Smith, D. I., Young, S. L. D., Uyaguari, A., & Avila, K. J. (2007). Of log cabins, fallen bishops, and tenacious parents: (Auto)biographical narrative and the spirituality of language learning. In D. I. Smith, & T. A. Osborn (Eds.), *Spirituality, social justice, and language learning* (pp. 107-129). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Snow, D. (2001). *English teaching as Christian mission: An applied theology*. Scottsdale, PA: Harold Press.
- Snow, D. (2009). English teachers, language learning, and the issue of power. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 173-184). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Snow, D. (2013). The globalization of English and China's Christian colleges. In In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjánsson, Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 99-114). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Stabler-Havener, J. (2009). Christian English teachers' presence: Reflecting Constantine or Christ? In M. S. Wong, & S. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 131-140). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Stevick, E. (1996/1997). Letters: Keeping the faith. *TESOL Matters*, 6(6), 6.
- Strategic Essentialism. (2007). In *Feminist Philosophies A-Z*. Retrieved from https://login.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/login?url=http://literati.credreference.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/content/entry/edinburghfem/strategic_essentialism/0
- Talmy, S. (2010). Qualitative interviews in applied linguistics: From research instrument to social practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 128-148. doi:10.1017/S0267190510000085
- Talmy, S. (2011). The interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity, and ideology in a speech event. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 25-42. doi:10.1093/applin/amq027
- Talmy, S. (2013). Critical ethnography. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1483-1487). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse* (2nd ed). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- The Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia of 1945. (2002). In *Asian Human Rights Commission*. Retrieved from http://www.humanrights.asia/countries/indonesia/laws/uud1945_en
- Tisdell, E. J. (2007). In the millennium: The role of spirituality and the cultural imagination in dealing with diversity and equity in the higher education classroom. *Teachers College Record*, 109(3), 531-560.
- Ushioda, E. (2013). Christian faith, motivation, and L2 learning: Personal, social, and research perspectives. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjánsson, Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 223-229). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Van Brummelen, H., Koole, R., & Franklin, K. (2004). Transcending the commonplace: Spirituality in the curriculum. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 38(3), 237-254.
- Vandrick, S. (2002). ESL and the colonial legacy: A teacher faces her "missionary kid" past. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Enriching ESOL pedagogy* (pp. 411-422). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Vandrick, S. (2009). A former “missionary kid” responds. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 141-149). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Vandrick, S. (2013). ‘The colonial legacy’ and ‘missionary kids’ memoirs. In G. Barkhuizen (Ed.), *Narrative research in applied linguistics* (pp. 19-40). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Varghese, M. M., & Johnston, B. (2007). Evangelical Christians and English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(1), 5-31. doi: 10.2307/40264329
- Varghese, M. M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., Johnson, K. A. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity, & Education*, 4(1), 21-44.
- Walsh, E. (2012). The toughest place to be a binman. *BBC News Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-16722186>.
- Wang-McGrath, S-C. (2013). The role of faith in the power balance between Christian native speakers and Taiwanese teachers who team teach. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjánsson, Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 31-46). New York, NY: Routledge.
- White, K. (2010). Asking sacred questions: Understanding religion’s impact on teacher belief and action. *Religion & Education*, 37, 40-59. doi: 10.1080/15507390903559103
- Williams, B. T. (2005). The book and the truth: Faith, rhetoric, and cross-cultural communication. In E. V. Lei, & b. I. kyburz (Eds.), *Negotiating religious faith in the composition classroom* (pp. 105-120). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Wilson, C. (2008). *Ethno-religious violence in Indonesia: From soil to God*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wong, M. S. (2009). Deconstructing/reconstructing the missionary English teacher identity. In M. S. Wong, & S. A. Canagarajah (Eds.), *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas* (pp. 91-105). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wong, M. S. (2013). Called to teach: The impact of faith on professional identity formation of three Western English teachers in China. In M. S. Wong, C.

Kristjánsson, & Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 11-30). New York, NY: Routledge.

Wong, M.S., Dörnyei, Z., & Kristjánsson, C. (2013). Introduction. The faithful fence. In M. S. Wong, C. Kristjánsson, & Z. Dörnyei (Eds.), *Christian faith and English language teaching and learning: Research on the interrelationship of religion and ELT* (pp. 1-7). New York, NY: Routledge.

ENDNOTES

¹ The latter is based on my personal observation and experience. See also Byler (2009).

² I thank Stephanie Vandrick for bringing this up to my attention. As she further put it: “Some of [the caucuses] petitioned for, and gained, interest section status later. I’m not necessarily saying the decision was correct, but it may have been a more complex situation than we know” (personal communication, February 1, 2014).

³ This last criteria excludes seven other participants whom I interviewed. But their ideas might be followed up in other research projects.

⁴ Initially I intend to collect language learning and teaching histories, but the students who submitted their essay had no substantial teaching experience to be shared.

⁵ Students who submitted their language learning histories are Karno, Lucia, Fidea, Thomas, and Velin. Velin, however, only responded to the prompts I provided without relating them to spiritual or religious themes at all.

⁶ Monika told me that Mustika was teaching about the poem (Interview, March 19, 2014). This led me to include Mustika in my study.

⁷ See: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/10189/Ahmadiyyah>.

⁸ “²² But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, forbearance, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, ²³ gentleness and self-control. Against such things there is no law” (Galatia 5:22-23, NIV).

⁹ A similar view, though in a much less elaborated way than that of Monika, was also put forward by Fidea (Focus group discussion, February 26, 2014).

¹⁰ He reported also having read the English version of *Narnia* (C.S. Lewis), which is very Christian in nature.

¹¹ I did not obtain signed consent forms from the majority of the students when I observed this session, so I decided to look into what Marty actually said in class, not students' responses.

¹² Marty's reference is this, which I quoted verbatim from his PowerPoint slide: Hank Dewaard, “Transforming Supernaturalism in a Javanese Worldview” (paper presented to Charles H. Kraft, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1979), p. 5.

¹³ From the excerpt, I can sense that Fatma tried hard to respect Dale's preferred term “straight.” Dale's interest in issues of straightness, or its opposite, or somewhere in the

sexual-orientation continuum has probably accounted for the way he shaped a counter-hegemonic discourse against “normality.” Another possible explanation is that: “From an interactional perspective, it could also be that [Dale] and [Fatma] were engaged in a bit of a struggle over epistemic superiority (e.g., who is right; who is more knowledgeable; who is a better student of the lessons)” (Matthew T. Prior, personal communication, November 8, 2014).

¹⁴ My own suggested version is this: Mencerminkan nilai-nilai spiritual dalam mengajar, bagi mereka yang memilih spiritualitas sebagai pedoman dalam pemikiran, keputusan, dan tindakan pedagogisnya [Reflecting spiritual values in teaching, for those who choose spirituality as the guideline of their pedagogical thoughts, decisions, and actions].

¹⁵ I am grateful to Stephanie Vandrick who suggested that I provided clearer definitions of these concepts (personal communication, February 1, 2014). I have yet to explore these three terms adequately in this current project, but one of my research participants’ ideas may function as a heuristic tool for understanding these. Marty said: “Ethics is predominantly determined by about what we believe is right or wrong. Values [have something] to do with what we like or dislike. . . . And I believe that the spiritual and religion dimension of life is vital for good ethics. The reason I believe that, is that without a spiritual or religious foundation to our ethics, we are essentially left up to our own devices. We’re left up to defining what I believe is right. So just last year I remember reading the blog entry by a man who said he had a crisis, and he had to work out what was right or wrong in a situation. And he said that as long as he could look himself in the mirror, as long as he believed that he was a good man who was doing a right thing, then it was acceptable. And most people in the world, especially in the Western world, of which I am part, they say, ‘Yes, he was true to himself.’ But what did this man choose to do? Well, he chose to leave his wife. He chose to run off with the 15-year-old student, that was in his care, and he left England to go to France. But he [was] genuine with his own integrity. He did it because he believed it was right. It was acceptable. He could look himself in the mirror. So if you remove the religious foundation for ethics, you’re essentially left with your own choices. Your own devices. And I think people can be pretty selfish at times. I know I can be. . . . Religion is very important for ethics. Now we may disagree with what certain religions allow. But at least the religion creates a series of absolutes, normally. . . . In my religion, I believe in having absolutes. There are certain absolutes that I should not cross. . . . [Jos: And what about morality? Where does morality fit into ethics, or values?] [Marty:] I could be mistaken, I could be wrong, but morality to me is very closely tied to ethics. So a moral person is an ethical person. Morality, in my understanding, and I could be mistaken, is a little broader, though. So ethics may tell that I shouldn’t kick a dog. Morality might tell me that I should care for animals. So [morality is] a little bit broader. . . . If you take a different definition of ethics, such as as long as nobody gets hurt, you’re fine to do what you like. So a person says, ‘okay, as long as nobody gets hurts, so that means I could sleep with this woman, and I could sleep with this man.’ . . . Now if your ethics is as long as nobody

gets hurt, and if all those people agreed, and they're all fine with it, then you have been ethically okay. For me, [it] would've been morally terrible. But that's my values. So that's my moral values. And my moral values are shaped by my religion. The same as my ethics are shaped by my religion" (Interview, April 23, 2014).

APPENDIX A
OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

Observer: Joseph Ernest Mambu Location/Scene: _____

Date: _____ Participants: _____

Activity: _____ Language(s): _____

Other Contextual Notes: _____

Visual Map:

Running Record:

Time	Observation	Observer Comments
<i>(Use additional pages as necessary.)</i>		

Reminders:

Things to observe include (a) setting (i.e., space and objects); (b) people (i.e., actors, relationships, interactions, feelings); (c) systems (e.g., formal or informal); (d) behavior (i.e., times, routines, processes, events) (Richards, 2003, pp. 130-133). One of the behaviors I hope will emerge and I want to focus on is the extent to which Christian and non-Christian English language teachers and students embed sacred texts or religious themes in classroom talks.

Specific moments and issues that may emerge during observations in the first month or few weeks, based on personal hunches and the review of literature

The following moments or issues might also emerge as I become a participant observer for several months and when I conduct focus group discussions and individual interviews.

- Finding moments where spiritual/religious issues are discussed in class, staff meetings, course coordination meetings, informal chats with colleagues, students' written assignments
- Coming across current news related to religious issues which I may talk about occasionally with colleagues and/or students

- Proselytizing, converting, or witnessing

Two dilemmas remain for both evangelical and non-evangelical Christians.

First, when a Christian English teacher happens to be an “evangelical” that upholds the prime belief of converting non-Christians at all cost, is TESOL the right profession for her or him in the first place?

Second, even if a Christian English teacher does not directly proselytize, at least that is what may be claimed (e.g., by Griffith [2004]), to what extent is disclosure about the CET’s faith perceived as (covert) proselytization or otherwise by fellow colleagues and students who are Christians and non-Christians alike?

Still unclear is whether Christian or non-Christian English teachers negotiate proselytizing, and if yes, how they problematize that, as they (or in order for them to) stay in the profession. The boundary of whether something is regarded as proselytization or not is also not always very clear-cut.

Do teachers or students seem to believe that “all teachers (or students) proselytize”?

- Absolute truths in a religious tradition

Does a metaphor like “offering the bait” or “planting seeds” occur?

The question remains as to whether Christian certainties or absolutes transpire in ELT classrooms. If yes, it is still worthwhile to inquire into why religious (not only Christian) absolutes are brought up by ELT stakeholders in non-Western settings.

For Christian educators or students, is it because the “prime underlying purpose was to bring non-believers to Christ,” like what the evangelical CETs in Varghese and Johnston’s (2007) study all agree?

And if this is the reason, do non-Western Christian English teachers or students also agree with some U.S.-based ESL Christian English teachers that “the right way was not attempt conversion of others outright, but rather to *plant seeds*” (p. 18), which is akin to Purgason’s (1996, 2004) metaphor of offering the bait, inside or outside of classroom contexts?

What about conversion to other religious beliefs: Do non-Christian English teachers or students think of planting seeds, too?

If no religious absolutes are raised, does it have anything to do with fear? Or reluctance? Or no attempt prioritize religious values in ELT?

For non-Western Christian English language teachers, in particular, do they feel that they can (or have the right to) teach or have taught English as a

missionary language, to borrow Pennycook and Coutand-Marin's (2003) phrase, just like Western missionaries did in the past or are probably still doing?

Will these non-Western Christian English teachers challenge the "*rightness* of [winning converts]" at all (Varghese & Johnston, 2007, p. 27, italics in original)? Why? Or why not?

- Is there any self-reflexivity on proselytizing?
- It is worth asking how power (relations) between ELT stakeholders having spiritual values can be negotiated for achieving a common good, despite potential conflicts along the way.
- Does religion have anything to do with teaching excellence and professionalism? When a religious institution (which I may not mention due to an ethical reason) bars a faculty member embracing a faith different than the institution from a strategic position in an English department of the institution, isn't this discrimination?
- Toward interactional inter-faith dialogue. Wong (2009) calls for more attention to "how... non-Western teachers avoid the spiritual/secular dualism found in the West and engage in a pedagogy that is holistic" (p. 94). Does EFL teacher education program in JCU avoid the spiritual/secular dualism?
- Motivation. When the motivation of embedding sacred texts are to enrich classroom discussion, to help others or themselves to acquire English, and to solidify, as well as to reshape, their spiritual identities in ways deemed desirable, then there is no reason to prevent them from being motivated as such. But does such motivation exist at all?

The motivation of amalgamating spiritual and social justice in class (Mambu, 2010; Smith & Osborn, 2007) is also possible, and might even be endorsed by law (e.g., in Indonesia). But how this fusion is done in class, in particular, is nonetheless subject to constant scrutiny. Otherwise, coercing students into accepting truth claims in the name of critical pedagogy or spirituality may occur.
- Reasons for entering a religious institution. There are many cases, based on my observation in Indonesia, that non-Christian (EFL) students or even educators enter Christian-based (EFL teacher education) institutions. Christian students or educators, however, on the whole do not enter similar institutions that are Islamic-based, in particular. Apart from questioning what the main reason for entering Christian institutions is, I find it important to know how the non-Christian English language students or educators negotiate their identities with Christian colleagues or friends.

- No text is ever innocent. No presence of a Christian/critical/spiritual/... teacher in class is ever innocent; neither are students. They exercise power to resist each other, or to produce knowledge collaboratively. And when one's religious identity constitutes a nexus of other related identities assigned to her or himself or by others, how does the person negotiate these identities in one context (e.g., classroom) to another over time?

What remains unclear, nonetheless, is how ELT stakeholders' spiritual/religious identities are negotiated in classroom contexts or elsewhere, and how those identities are inextricably linked to other identities in terms of gender, race, or class.

- A fruitful line of inquiry will be on disclosing matches or disparities between an ELT stakeholder's claimed spiritual identity and her or his performed identity in classroom interactions or elsewhere where ELT stakeholders are embedded within power differentials.

APPENDIX B
FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION PROTOCOL

This protocol will be used for two kinds of focus group discussions: (1) Focus group discussions for lecturers only, and (2) focus group discussions for students only. In each focus group discussion, I expect to have participants who embrace different religious faiths.

A focus group introduction

Welcome and thank you for taking the time to attend our focus group.

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss your ideas, opinions, and experiences on the topic of spirituality and ELT. What you discuss here today will be very helpful for my individual research project in this area, and after today's session you are welcome to ask me questions about the research and about our discussion.

You have all been invited because you have some things in common (for example, you seem to be interested in spiritual/religious issues), based on my observation in class or elsewhere, and because you are likely to have a variety of important views and experiences to share about this topic. You have also been invited because you represent different religious faiths.

The idea of the group discussion is to allow you to share your views in a relaxed and informal environment. There are no right or wrong answers, but rather different points of view. All points of view, and both positive and negative comments, are important. Of course, what to say, how to say it, and how much to say is up to you. You should not worry about what you are expected to say, whether you are on the right track, or whether you should reach consensus. But please make sure that you allow others to speak, you do not talk at the same time, and do not interrupt others.

So that I do not miss any of your comments, I would like to record our discussion. I have asked for your permission to do this, as it will make my research work much easier. I should point out that your contributions will be anonymous and confidential, and that any published research will contain changed names.

Our discussion will last about one hour and a half. During that time, I would like to explore a number of issues on this topic and hear everyone's responses. It would be better to keep your questions about this research project until the end, but please feel free to ask questions relating to the topic throughout the discussion.

Quoted and adapted from Litosseliti (2003, pp. 71-72).

For lecturers

Unpacking the concepts of spirituality, religious beliefs, and other related terms (e.g., morality, values, ethics, etc.).

- What does spirituality mean to you?
- Does it concern you?
- Is there a difference between “spirituality,” “religiosity”/“religious belief(s),” and “morality”? What is the difference between those concepts?

Exploring the arguments of whether spirituality/religious beliefs should be incorporated into ELT.

- What do you think of the idea that spirituality/religion has a place in ELT?

- What influenced your decision to work in the English department at a Christian university?

Examining curricular or related documents that contain the integration of Christianity into teaching and learning, especially into ELT.

- What is your response to these documents?
- What would it feel like for someone who is not Christian?

Investigating how religious identities are negotiated.

- What happens when you interact with students or colleagues who hold a different religious belief, especially in class or other activities in which English language learning or teaching occurs (e.g., in debating practices)?

Ending questions.

- Is this an adequate summary? _____
- Of all the issues of the incorporation of Christianity, or religious beliefs, into ELT that were discussed, which one is more important to you?
- Have we missed anything?
- Would you like to add one last thing?

Quoted and adapted from Litosseliti (2003, pp. 57, 61-63, 65, 73, 80)

Thank you once again for your presence, time, and ideas ☺

For students:

I would like to start by asking you to introduce yourselves to everyone, by telling us your name, where you come from, what year you are in, and what religious belief you hold.

Asking participants to introduce themselves: their name/where they come from/what year they are in/how long they have taught in the department, and what religious beliefs they hold.

- ‘I would like you to introduce yourselves by telling me your name, where you come from, what year you are in and what religious belief you hold.’
- ‘I would like to briefly go around and have each of you say something about how you feel about being here today.’

Unpacking the concepts of spirituality, religious beliefs, and other related terms (e.g., morality, values, ethics, etc.).

- What does spirituality mean to you?
- Does it concern you?
- Is there a difference between “spirituality,” “religiosity”/“religious belief(s),” and “morality”? What is the difference between those concepts?

Exploring the arguments of whether spirituality/religious beliefs should be incorporated into ELT.

- What do you think of the idea that spirituality/religion has a place in ELT?
- What influenced your decision to study in the English department at a Christian university?
- How do you feel about studying in the English department at a Christian university?

Examining curricular or related documents that contain the integration of Christianity into teaching and learning, especially into ELT.

- What is your response to these documents?
- What would it feel like for someone who is not Christian?

Investigating how religious identities are negotiated.

- How do you feel about being a Christian/a Muslim/a Catholic, etc.?
- What do you like best about being a Christian/a Muslim/a Catholic, etc.?
- What happens when you interact with friends or lecturers who hold a different religious belief, especially in class or other activities in which English language learning or teaching occurs (e.g., in debating practices)?

Ending questions.

- Is this an adequate summary? _____
- Of all the issues of the incorporation of Christianity, or religious beliefs, into ELT that were discussed, which one is more important to you?
- Have we missed anything?
- Would you like to add one last thing?

Quoted and adapted from Litosseliti (2003, pp. 57, 61-63, 65, 73, 80)

Thank you once again for your presence, time, and ideas ☺

APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

(For lecturers in the undergraduate EFL teacher education program at a Christian university)

Follow-up questions after a focus group discussion (FGD):

- How did you think the discussion went?
- What did you think of the other people in the group?
- What was it like for you to be in the focus group?
- Was there anything in the discussion that made you feel uneasy or stopped you from saying something?
- What would you change about that focus group?
- What did you think about the _____ comment made by _____ in the FGD?

Quoted and adapted from Litosseliti (2003, p. 82).

- What made you decide to work here as a teaching staff member in the undergraduate EFL teacher education program in a Christian university?
- Would you mind telling me your experience when a) applying for a job here or b) when interviewed by the university's board of trustees?
- What do you think of the idea that spirituality and/or religious values can be incorporated into ELT? How would you view it?
- What do you think of the idea that a person has the right or the responsibility to let others (especially those in ELT contexts) know of his or her religious beliefs?
- What do you think of your interaction(s) with your students who have different spiritual and/or religious views than yours in English language learning and teaching contexts?
 - (a) Have you ever experienced opposition or even hostility to your spiritual views or religious beliefs, especially when you interact with your students in ELT contexts (e.g., in class, in teaching practicum, in individual consultation with you, etc.)?
 - (b) Within the context of ELT, have you ever had positive or fruitful interactions with your students who have different spiritual and/or religious views?
- What do you think of your interaction(s) with your colleagues (i.e., fellow lecturers) who have different spiritual and/or religious views than yours in English language learning and teaching contexts?
 - (a) Have you ever experienced opposition or even hostility to your spiritual views or religious beliefs, especially when you interact with your colleagues in ELT contexts (e.g., in course-coordination meetings, in staff meetings, in management meetings, etc.)?
 - (b) Within the context of ELT, have you ever had positive or fruitful interactions with your colleagues who have different spiritual and/or religious views?

(Note: Some questions [i.e., 10, 11a, and 12a] are taken and adapted from Varghese & Johnston, 2007, p. 31)

Interview Protocol

(For students in the undergraduate EFL teacher education program at a Christian university)

Follow-up questions after a focus group discussion (FGD):

- How did you think the discussion went?
- What did you think of the other people in the group?
- What was it like for you to be in the focus group?
- Was there anything in the discussion that made you feel uneasy or stopped you from saying something?
- What would you change about that focus group?
- What did you think about the _____ comment made by _____ in the FGD?

Quoted and adapted from Litosseliti (2003, p. 82).

- What made you decide to study here, in the undergraduate EFL teacher education program in this university?
- What do you think of the idea that spirituality and/or religious values can be incorporated into ELT? How would you view it?
- What do you think of the idea that a person has the right or the responsibility to let others (especially those in ELT contexts) know of his or her religious beliefs?
- What do you think of your interaction(s) with your friends who have different spiritual and/or religious views than yours in English language learning and teaching contexts?
 - (a) Have you ever experienced opposition or even hostility to your spiritual views or religious beliefs, especially when you interact with your friends in ELT contexts (e.g., in class, in teaching practicum, in debating practices, etc.)?
 - (b) Within the context of ELT, have you ever had positive or fruitful interactions with your friends who have different spiritual and/or religious views?
- What do you think of your interaction(s) with your English teachers or lecturers who have different spiritual and/or religious views than yours in English language learning and teaching contexts?
 - (a) Have you ever experienced opposition or even hostility to your spiritual views or religious beliefs, especially when you interact with your teachers or lecturers in ELT contexts (e.g., in class, in individual consultation with teacher, etc.)?
 - (b) Within the context of ELT, have you ever had positive or fruitful interactions with your teachers or lecturers who have different spiritual and/or religious views?

(Note: Some questions [i.e., 9, 10a, and 11a] are taken and adapted from Varghese & Johnston, 2007, p. 31)

A Supplementary Interview Protocol
(For Christian and Catholic lecturers in the EFL teacher education program at a Christian university)

1. How did you get involved in teaching?
2. How did you choose or become involved in the field of EFL?
3. What about your background, in particular, led you into English language teaching?
 - a) What do you believe is the purpose of teaching English?
 - b) What ESL/EFL teaching have you been involved with and where?
4. What part do your religious beliefs play in your daily life?
5. Which church do you belong to? What is the nature of your involvement in that church?
6. Which religious (e.g., parachurch) organization(s) do you belong to? What is the nature of your involvement in the organization(s)?

(Cited and adapted from Varghese & Johnston, 2007, p. 31)

A Supplementary Interview Protocol
(For Christian and Catholic students in the EFL teacher education program at a Christian university)

1. What part do your religious beliefs play in your daily life?
2. Which church do you belong to? What is the nature of your involvement in that church?
3. Which religious (e.g., parachurch) organization(s) do you belong to? What is the nature of your involvement in the organization(s)?

(Cited and adapted from Varghese & Johnston, 2007, p. 31)

A Supplementary Interview Protocol
(For non-Christian or non-Catholic lecturers and students in the EFL teacher education program at a Christian university)

1. What part do your religious beliefs play in your daily life?
2. Which religious organization(s) do you belong to? What is the nature of your involvement in the organization(s)?

(Cited and adapted from Varghese & Johnston, 2007, p. 31)

APPENDIX D

LANGUAGE LEARNING (AND TEACHING) HISTORIES GUIDELINE

Instruction:

Read an excerpt of Shahjahan's (2004) story. Although it is not in the context of ELT (English language teaching), you may relate the story to what happens/happened in your language learning and/or teaching history. Write an autobiography of your language learning and/or teaching history from when you began learning English to the present. Include anything that you think is/are relevant to the incorporation of your religious belief into your experience(s) in learning and/or teaching English. This means you may have two or more stories embedded in the autobiography. You may also include your vision about ELT in the future, based on your past and present experiences. Length: about 2,000 words in English and/or Indonesian, but the more the better. Please send it via email to joseph.mambu@asu.edu or hand it in personally to me.

... in one of the tutorials I was facilitating on racism toward aboriginal people in Canada, I took to my class of 23 a sacred stone and sweet grass. I rearranged the classroom into a circle and asked the students to sit on the floor rather than on chairs. I first went through a meditation exercise. While they were going through this meditation exercise, I asked the students to imagine a positive moment in their lives that brings a smile to their face. After a few minutes, I then passed around the rock and sweet grass. I wanted them to connect to the world beyond the classroom we were in. I asked them to feel the stone and smell the sweet grass and reconnect to the world beyond the classroom in terms of the land, air, rocks, oceans, and people who are not in the academy. I asked them then to think or imagine aboriginal people. What kind of images came to their mind? Were they being objectified? I then asked them a series of questions regarding the brutal legacy of colonization of aboriginal people in Canada. I told them that the land they were sitting on, which is covered by concrete now, belongs to the aboriginal people in Canada and is called Turtle Island. European White settlers have renamed it. I tried my best to give them images of aboriginal people and their living conditions in Canada. I believe students engaged with our reading material much better that day because they were no longer dealing solely with words, but rather, they could feel, smell, and touch what they were theorizing. I asked them to pass the stone around, and the person who had the stone had the floor to speak, and everyone had to be patient and listen. I asked them to speak not only from their minds but from their hearts. Those who didn't wish to speak could pass on the stone. The sharing I had that day was very profound as I saw a different side to my students. To me, that is how centering spirituality can help students engage with the classroom better. After that tutorial, I received a very profound email from one of my students. She pointed out that she couldn't stop the tears coming from her eyes in the classroom. She added that the classroom environment created a very sacred learning moment where she could engage with the reading material at a deeper level. She thanked me for that. I found her message and the risk I took to be empowering. (Shahjahan, 2004, pp. 301-302)

Some questions you should answer in your story:

1. How did you learn English in elementary school, junior high school, and senior high school?

2. If you had the chance to learn English in private courses other than formal schooling, please tell me the experience(s) you had there.
3. What memorable experiences did you have (especially from teachers)?
4. What negative experiences did you have (especially from teachers)?
5. What did you learn from them?
6. What were you expecting before you came to the university where you majored in English language education/literature?
7. What were you surprised about in your university classes?
8. What is your ideal English language education that you envision?

The following questions only apply to lecturers and those who are doing or have done teaching practicum.

9. What experiences did you have as a language teacher (either during teaching practicum or elsewhere)?
10. What were you expecting before you decided to become a language teacher or before you did teaching practicum?
11. What were you surprised about in your teaching profession (or practicum)?
12. What memorable experiences have you had so far as a language teacher?
13. What negative experiences have you had so far as a language teacher?

(Modified from Murphey, Chen, & Chen, 2005, p. 86)

Your response to this last question can be embedded in any part of your LLTH:
Do you think your religious faith have any impact on your LLTH? If yes, please explain.

APPENDIX E

COMPETENCIES RELATED TO CRITICAL AND SPIRITUAL VALUES

Part 1. Two components of the “main competencies” that contain attention to spiritual values and morality. (Note: English translation is mine)

9	Menampilkan diri sebagai pribadi yang jujur, berakhlak mulia, dan teladan bagi peserta didik dan masyarakat. [Displaying self as an honest and noble person who can become a role model to students and society.]
10	Menjunjung tinggi norma, tata nilai, moral, agama, etika, dan tanggung jawab profesional. [Revering norms, values, morality, religion, ethics, and professional responsibilities.]

Part 2. One component of the “supporting competency” that contains attention to social issues.

6	Memiliki kemampuan untuk menanggapi masalah-masalah sosial yang terkait dengan pembelajaran dan pengajaran bahasa Inggris. [Demonstrating ability in responding to social issues relevant to English language teaching and learning.]
---	--

Part 3. Two components of “other competencies” that contain attention to spiritual values and social transformation.

1	Mampu mencerminkan nilai-nilai kristiani dalam mengajar. [Able to reflect Christian values in teaching.]
2	Memiliki daya cipta untuk pembangunan & pembaharuan masyarakat. [Demonstrating innovativeness in developing and transforming society.]

Note: This is an excerpt from a competency-based curriculum draft I obtained from an EFL teacher education program's administrative staff at Jawara Christian University on April 25, 2013. This document remained the same as I did my fieldwork in the university in Spring 2014

APPENDIX F
IRB APPROVAL

EXEMPTION GRANTED

Paul Matsuda
English
480/965-6356
pmatsuda@asu.edu

Dear Paul Matsuda:

On 11/1/2013 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	Negotiating the place of spirituality in English language teaching: A case study in an Indonesian EFL teacher education program
Investigator:	Paul Matsuda
IRB ID:	STUDY00000228
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HRP-502c - TEMPLATE CONSENT DOCUMENT -SHORT FORM.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • APPENDIX D - Language learning (and teaching) histories guideline.docx, Category: IRB Protocol; • APPENDIX E - Competencies related to critical and spiritual values.docx, Category: IRB Protocol; • 2011 Mambu Human Research Curriculum Completion Report.pdf, Category: IRB Protocol; • 2013 Matsuda CITI Completion Report.pdf, Category: IRB Protocol; • HRP-503a - TEMPLATE PROTOCOLSOCIAL BEHAVIORAL.docx, Category: IRB Protocol; • APPENDIX A - Observation field notes.docx, Category: IRB Protocol; • APPENDIX B - Focus group discussion protocol.docx, Category: IRB Protocol; • APPENDIX C - Interview protocol.docx, Category: IRB Protocol;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Letter to .pdf, Category: Other (to reflect anything not captured above);• Joseph Mambu -- Questions or responses.msg, Category: Other (to reflect anything not captured above);• Recruitment script.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials;
--	--

The IRB determined that the protocol is considered exempt pursuant to Federal Regulations 45CFR46 (2) Tests, surveys, interviews, or observation on 11/1/2013.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc: Joseph Mambu

APPENDIX G
SHORT CONSENT TEMPLATE

STUDY TITLE: Negotiating the place of spirituality in English language teaching: A case study in an Indonesian EFL teacher education program

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Paul Kei Matsuda in the Department of English at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to investigate the relationship between spiritual/religious identities and English language teaching (ELT).

I am inviting your participation, which will involve 1) writing language learning (and teaching) histories and 2) audio- or video-recorded a) focus group discussions, b) individual interviews, and c) other formal or informal meetings (e.g., classroom sessions and informal chats). Other relevant documents (e.g., written assignments or syllabi) might also be collected from you. The process of collecting data will take approximately 8 months. However, I might also want to follow up on you until I finish writing up my dissertation (by mid 2015 or around 12-16 months after you sign this consent) through email or Skype. There will be two stages of focus group discussions and each will last approximately one hour and a half. Individual interviews will last about one hour and a half in two or more sessions. You have the right not to answer any question, and to stop participation at any time.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. For students: Your decision not to participate will not affect your grade. You must also be 18 or older to participate in the study.

Discussing spiritual/religious issues in public may create discomfort for some people, which may include you. We cannot promise any direct benefits to you or others from your taking part in this research. However, a possible benefit includes increased awareness of advantages and challenges of integrating spiritual values into ELT. For some, such increased awareness will be spiritually fulfilling.

The data will be retained for five years after the study for future research, stored in my own password-protected PC and external hard-disk drive. My dissertation committee members and I will have access to the data. Your responses will be anonymous. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your name will not be used. Due to the nature of focus groups, complete confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

I would like to audio record and/or video record the focus group discussions (FGDs), individual interviews, and some classroom sessions. Audio recorded data is crucial in discourse analysis; as a discourse analyst, I will not depend on my memory to re-construct past conversations with my own words. Video-recorded data will help me 1) to identify more accurately who is speaking in FGDs and observed classroom sessions and 2) to analyze non-verbal cues that accompany verbal words. Some classroom sessions will be audio- and video-recorded with a class teacher's permission. However, if you are a student in the class, you have the right to ask me not to be video-recorded. Even when the majority of the class do not want to be video-recorded, one or more classroom sessions will still be video-recorded to accommodate those who are willing to be video-recorded. However, I will not video-record you if you do not want to; nor will I include you in my data analysis, although your voice might still be recorded. The class will be arranged in such a way that those who disagree to be video-recorded will not be video-recorded. You can change your mind after the focus group discussions, individual interviews, and classroom interactions start; just let me know.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact the research team at pmatsuda@asu.edu and joseph.mambu@asu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at +1 (480) 965-6788. Please let me know if you wish to be part of the study.

By signing below you are agreeing to be part of the study.

Name:

Signature:

Date:

By signing below you are agreeing to be video-recorded.

Name:

Signature:

Date:

RECRUITMENT SCRIPT

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Paul Kei Matsuda in the Department of English at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to investigate the relationship between spiritual/religious identities and English language teaching (ELT).

I am recruiting individuals to be involved in 1) writing language learning (and teaching) histories and 2) audio- or video-recorded a) focus group discussions, b) individual interviews, and c) other formal or informal meetings (e.g., classroom sessions and informal chats). Other relevant documents (e.g., written assignments or syllabi) might also be collected from you. The process of collecting data will take approximately 8 months. However, I might also want to follow up on you until I finish writing up my dissertation (by mid 2015 or around 12-16 months after you sign this consent) through email or Skype. The recorded data will be kept strictly confidential in password-protected PCs for five years.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you have any questions concerning the research study, please reach me at joseph.mambu@asu.edu.

APPENDIX H

THE RECAPITULATION OF THE 23 OBSERVED CLASS SESSIONS

No	Course	Teacher/Faith	Date	Fieldnotes	Emerging Themes
38	TEFL	Vira/Cath	3-Feb-14	In modeling the teaching of writing to the students, Vira used four types of narratives: fairy tales, fables, legends, and myths. The teaching model in the TEFL class is to be used for senior high school students. Some elements of narratives under discussion where spiritual things emerge include characters (e.g., witches), fantasy (e.g., magic, supernatural), and lesson (e.g., moral). On magic, Vira introduced magical characters, magical settings, and magic or enchantment. The main task being scaffolded was write a fairy tale, in which the "good" and the "evil" guy are distinctive.	Using spiritual themes for classroom activities Scaffolding writing that delves into the binary thinking of "good" and "evil" Identity displayed in a structuralist manner
39	Advanced Speaking	Eka/Chr	4-Feb-14	Nina (F, Jv) talked about her hometown, Kudus, and explained about its history. The city was built by Suran Kudus, one of the nine Wali Songo, who "share about Islamic" [sic]. The traditional food of Kudus is jenang. Jenang has its own history, too. One day a boy was possessed. People gave up in casting out the demon. Syeh Janglung said that the boy was not dead. He ordered the mother to make jenang gampong, with gampong being limestone. The jenang was fed to the boy and he was cured.	Display of knowledge about one's history of her hometown. The history has some spiritual overtones
40	Sociolinguistics	Mur/Isi	4-Feb-14	Adit (M, Jv) talked about reog. Main audience imagined: culture lovers. Reog is famous in Ponorogo, a city in East Java. It is often performed during suro/Muharam (i.e., an Islamic festivity).	Academic categories of religious expressions across cultures
41	Communication Across Cultures	Shinta/Chr	6-Feb-14	In church/mosque, the language tends to be formal. [It seems that Christian [including Catholic] students dominated classroom talk] In naming their children, Indonesian parents seem to use spirituality as a salient source of inspiration. Students' own names being discussed in class that have some spiritual tone are inspired by their own religion (e.g., that whose meaning is a boy "who follow Jesus") or a spiritual figure not necessarily related to their own religion (e.g., "ganesha," a god of wisdom).	History of one's own names -- understanding one's or their family's spiritual and/or religious identities
42	Intermediate Speaking	Houtman/Chr	10-Feb-14	Susi's presentation was on Choky Sitohang. Why she liked him: Choky is very spiritual. The word "God" was mentioned twice.	Student-initiated talk on idealized religious identities

43	Intermediate Speaking	Houtman/Chr	10-Feb-14	<p>Wizard's presentation was on the biography of her favorite pastor, who was once a gangster member but was then converted to Christianity. This is a very fundamentalist presentation. She even sobbed at the end of the presentation. I actually did not want his students to bring up SARA (tribe/clan, religion, race, and ism) issues in the presentation.</p> <p>Sunu presented Janson [?] who appears in "Supernatural Series" on TV. He likes him because the actor is a "religious" person.</p> <p>Nontik presented Audrey Hepburn. I thought that Audrey's "loving, sharing, and giving" as well as being a "feminist" could be her embodiment of spirituality and criticality in a broad sense.</p>	Student-initiated talk on idealized religious identities
44	TEFL	Vira/Catn	10-Feb-14	<p>Vira used the [Javaneese] culture of "selamatan" (i.e., commemoration with a spiritual intent) for someone who was dead 1,000 days before as an example of designing an invitation. Context: Vira wanted her students to be creative. She jokingly said that an invitation of "suratan" (circumcision) is possible. Tono chimed in "undangan layat" (an invitation to attend a funeral), leading Vira to discuss "selamatan 1,000 hari" (i.e., the 1,000th day commemoration). [listen to the audio-recording, minute 3:5 second 30's onwards, for further detail -- very funny, entertaining, and most importantly, indigenous]</p>	Indigenous traditions that have some spiritual overtones regardless of one's religion (e.g., selamatan, though commonly practiced by Muslim Javaneese, may also be practiced by non-Muslims)
45	Sociolinguistics	Yohanes/Cath	11-Feb-14	none	
46	Communication Across Cultures	Celeste/Chr	12-Feb-14	<p>Calantha: A reason for not changing her name: "I am special... God has sent us to this world with a beautiful purpose... to be bless to others." Patty: changing a name to "agape." Down syndrome symptom gone. Gay marriage is not followed up by Celeste in this session.</p>	History of one's own names -- understanding one's or their family's spiritual and/or religious identities
47	Communication Across Cultures	Shinta/Chr	13-Feb-14	<p>Being asked a probing question, a student explained how his Catholic identity accounted for why he thought that heterosexuality and chastity in marriage is the norm. This is challenged by the article's discussion about same-sex marriage.</p>	No text is ever innocent
48	Critical Reading	Dika/Cat	13-Feb-14	<p>T initiated a discussion about the logo of JCU. She also presented the visions and missions of the university, which are very Christian-oriented.</p>	No text is ever innocent

49	Intermediate Speaking	Human Ctr	17-Feb-14	One student (Tom) asked his friend, who presented the short biography of Slash (from Guit's n' Roses), whether it was right that Slash used to worship demons.	A religious absolute: No demonic worship
50	Intermediate Speaking	Human Ctr	17-Feb-14	None	
51	TEFL	Vira/Csft	17-Feb-14	T mentioned very briefly that praying can be part of pre-teaching. It is not the focus of lesson plan to be designed by students. T even asked students not to include praying in their lesson plan.	Praying being marginalized in lesson plans
52	Advanced Speaking	Eka Ctr	18-Feb-14	One F student (Jati) with headscarf presented about Prambanan temple. She told the story/legend of Roro Jonggrang. She displayed Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva statues. Another F student (Riri), also with headscarf, presented about Borobudur temple which is one of the centers of Buddhism. Anto gave some tips of backpack traveling. On the top of his list of what to prepare, he mentioned: "God's bless" Eka commented on Olivia's presentation. He asked who the audience was. Jati said: foreign tourists, but Eka thought that students of anthropology might be the better audience.	Displaying knowledge of others' religions is part of one's sense of religiosity Displaying one's religious identity through prioritizing god in his traveling plan
53	Communication Across Cultures	Celeste Ctr	19-Feb-14	None	
54	Communication Across Cultures	Marty/Chr	20-Feb-14	Worldviews, religion. Marty did most of the talking on his views of religions. See transcribed data for more detail.	power differentials subtly accentuated by T's selected text
55	Advanced Speaking	Eka Ctr	25-Feb-14	Immorality mentioned in passing when students presented about a park in Javara city.	
56	Communication Across Cultures	Marty/Chr	13-Mar-14	Theme of the day: Religion & Culture	Self-reflexivity on Marty's part, no text is ever innocent
57	Communication Across Cultures	Celeste Ctr	26-Mar-14	Stereotype based on religion. Check audio recording and reflective journal.	Nuanced spiritual identities
58	Communication Across Cultures	Shinta/Chr	27-Mar-14	Kaleidoscope Eyes	problematising dogmas

59	Communication Across Cultures	Celastie/Chr	2-Apr-14	Kaleidoscope Eyes; Calantha vs. Ellie
60	Research Methods	Sara Chr	2-Apr-14	None

Notes:

T = Teacher

S = Student

M = Male

F = Female

Chr = Christian

Cath = Catholic

Isl = Islam

Names of T or S are all pseudonyms. Some decided to withdraw and/or did not want to participate in my study.

Some reasons I could not observe all classes that I had planned to attend:

1. I had to choose which class of parallel classes I consider important to observe. Decisions were made based on my hunches which were to be informed by a) students' report (e.g., Yohanes liked to bring up spiritual issues), b) whether in a previous week/meeting I identified that one or few spiritual issues was brought up in class (e.g., I re-observed Vira's TEFL class after she discussed spirituality in Curriculum 2013 in the 1st week meeting), c) my assumption that one teacher (e.g., Celeste) could be observed in one of the courses she teaches. In Celeste's case, I selected Communication Across Cultures instead of Psycholinguistics.
2. For a course (e.g., Communication Across Cultures) taught by some instructors at the same time slot, Indonesian instructors (e.g., Shinta) were prioritized than an English native speaker (e.g., Marty), although later I felt the urge to observe Marty's Communication Across Cultures class. The literature has been replete with analysis on how Christian English native speakers who teach English address ELT. More perspectives from Christian non-native English speakers who teach English were then sought.
3. I found out later there were make-up classes (especially those held on Saturdays).

APPENDIX I

A SAMPLE OF EMERGING THEMES: THE FIRST STAGE OF CODING

Data Analysis - Interview - Lucia a (February 21, 2014)

Length: around 15+ minutes; around 5+ pages of transcript.

Starting date of analysis: July 26, 2014

Confirmation received: June 27, 2014

Church affiliations: A Protestant (non-Pentecostal) church and a Pentecostal church.

<p>Themes (which are informed by the literature as reviewed in Chapter 2, or expand those in the literature)</p>	<p>Data Samples (e.g., participants' excerpts of definitions of “spirituality” and “religion”; “small” stories; excerpts from classroom observation fieldnotes or transcripts)</p> <p>Note: In each data sample, pseudonyms of participants and how the data is generated will be mentioned.</p>	<p>Comments (i.e., some brief analyses on the samples of certain themes)</p>
[...]	[...]	[...]
<p>Reflective of religiously related power relations in an ELT classroom: The case of “him” to refer to God.</p>	<p>Jos: And then (.) based on your observation as an English Department student- PBI student Do you:- have you found (.) any occurrences in class (.) where (.) spiritual issues (.) are brought up By either the students (.) or the instructors? (2.0)</p> <p>Lucia: No it's actually a: [small thing but I (.) really pay attention</p> <p>Jos: [uh-hm</p> <p>Lucia: Of this issue when (.) Miss Y (1.5) u:h Call (.) God with (.) <u>him</u></p> <p>Jos: Uh-hm</p> <p>Lucia: Or Jesus= Jos: =uh-hm</p> <p>Lucia: Many: of my friends who are Muslim (.) they (.) see each other And then (.) think like “O::w We (.) actually have to call <u>God</u>, not <u>him</u> or .hh (1.5)</p> <p>Jos: Uh did the Muslims students express (.)</p> <p>Lucia Ya= Jos: =their concern</p> <p>Lucia: They look at each oth- each other and then “is it Him?” ((acts as if she were talking to someone beside her)) Like questioning</p> <p>Jos: Did they talk to Bu [Y about it</p>	<p>[...]</p> <p>For those who grew up as a Muslim, “him” may not be appropriate to refer to God.</p> <p>What I like about Lucia’s comments is that she observed religiously related theme not only in content courses in which spiritual/religious issues are more easily brought up (e.g., literary courses), but also in a Micro Teaching course!</p>

	<p>Lucia: [no Jos: Or they [talked to each other= Lucia: [talked to =ya Jos: But you could (.) a- overhear= Lucia: =yeah (laughs) .hh [because they .hh Jos: [u:h Lucia: s- sat in front of ((laughing)) my chair Jos: Oh I see Okay, what class is that? Lucia: Mini teaching. Jos: In micro [teaching class? Lucia: [mi- micro teaching °yeah micro teaching° Jos: In one of the meetings (.) in this semester? Lucia: Yeah. Today ((laughing)) Jos: Today? In what context did Bu Y (.) uh bring up the name of (.) <u>him</u>. Or (1.0) call (0.5) God as <u>him</u>? Lucia: Whe::n (.) Miss Y- uh Miss Y asked the: difficulty (.) to face our (0.5) nervous (.) being nervous When ((laughing)) teaching And .hh one of my friend .hh s- say that “Ya: we can (.) face our (.) nervous feeling by praying And then Miss Y= Jos: =uh Lucia: And Miss Y u:h agree, agree and (.) say “<u>Ya</u>, it's actually right to pray before .hh We: do our micro teaching Because we know that (1.0) someone will .hh help us Someone that we cannot see. We cannot see <u>him</u>, right?” Then ((laughing)) [when Jos: [uh-hm Lucia: She said "<u>him</u>" (0.5) many o- two of my friends Jos: That's very interesting and then Who suggested the idea of praying to overcome nervos- nervousness? Lucia: It's actually Danu and me ((laughing)) But .hh Miss Y u::h point Danu Danu and (.) me, we discuss (.)= Jos: =oh= Lucia: =and Danu. Jos: Is Danu a Christian? Lucia: <u>Yup</u></p>	
--	---	--

	<p>He and I .hh are both want to be a priest later ((laughing)) So we .hh >discuss many thing about Christianity.< Jos: Oh you mean (.) outside the class?= Lucia: =yeah, outside the class. (2.0) Jos: Very interesting. >any other occurrences in any other classes?< Lucia: U::hm <u>no</u> ((laughing)) Jos: No</p>	
[...]	[...]	[...]
<p>Spirituality/religion and ELT:</p> <p>1. prayer before class</p> <p>2. Lucia's constructing Sara's statement in Research Methods course, when students did not do their homework: And how can God (.) give (0.5) bigger responsible to you if (.) You cannot handle (.) the simple or the: smaller (.) responsibility. I think (.) he- he- uh she (.) said (.) <u>he</u> (.) will not give you like bigger (.) responsibility If you (.) cannot handle the smaller- (.) smaller responsibili[ty.</p>	<p>Jos: Do you think (.) spirituality has a place in English language teaching? (3.5) Lucia: Yah Spirituality eh it's- it's actually more .hh on (.) morality I think. °Not in spirituality° probably. Jos: What do you mean by that? (2.5) Lucia: Because many: lecturers i:n this faculty always .hh Say that (2.0) we (.) u:h do not only (.) teach (.) uh How to learn English but .hh We also teach (.) how to be a good person Or .hh how to (.) be good uh >how to have a good personality< like that It's more like .hh morality rather than spirituality. Jos: Is it based on your observation?= Lucia: =£yah£ (indecipherable) Jos: What do you think (3.5) u::h (3.0) There is a place for spirituality (.) in (.) English language teaching? Lucia: Yeah (2.0) Jos: Can you explain that further? (3.0) Lucia: It's a simple thing. Maybe before- before we: (1.0) start (.) the: lesson we can pray together, It's like (.) Pak {Yohanes} always (.) does £in the class£ [.hh Jos: [=o:h Lucia: He leads [to praying Jos: [yeah [...]</p>	<p>The way Lucia constructed Sara's biblical allusion seems different than what Sara claimed to have said.</p> <p>See Prior (2011?) -- different rhetorical purposes, but by two different speakers in at least three different events: The classroom (to which I had no access), Lucia's conversation with me, and Sara's talk with me. I will only focus on the last two chats. With me, Sara wanted to show a point: That she limited her biblical allusion in class so that the students do not think of her as evangelizing them overtly. With me, Lucia constructed Sara's identity as someone who is religious. And what counts to her is the whole two clauses from the Bible: "whoever can be trusted with little" and "can be trusted with much."</p>

	<p>Jos: Okay. Where were we? U:hm so Pak {Yohanes}.</p> <p>Lucia: And also Bu {Sara}.</p> <p>Jos: Bu Sara.</p> <p>Lucia:: It's actually (1.0) implicit ((chuckling)) message from .hh Bu Sara. When (.) we (.) didn't do our (.) home-homework, Bu Sara said .hh how can you: (.) do that?</p> <p>Jos: [uh-hm</p> <p>Lucia: [How can you (.) not being (.) responsible (.) i:n the small thing? And how can God (.) give (0.5) bigger responsible to you if (.) You cannot handle (.) the simple or the: smaller (.) responsibility. I think (.) he- he- uh she (.) said (.) <u>he</u> (.) will not give you like bigger (.) responsibility If you (.) cannot handle the smaller- (.) smaller responsibili[ty.</p> <p>Jos: [In what context did he- did she talk about it?</p> <p>Lucia: Homework ((chuckling))</p> <p>Jos: Homework=</p> <p>Lucia: =Homework. ((chuckling))</p> <p>Jos: Research methods=</p> <p>Lucia: =ya.((chuckles))</p> <p>Jos: Okay.</p>	<p>This is not really a matter of which one is correct in presenting the biblical allusion in two clauses or otherwise, but instead of the purpose of constructing one's own or another person's spiritual/religious identity in two separate speaking events.</p>
--	---	--

Transcription conventions:

=	: A latching symbol.
[[: Two people begin at the same time.
[: Denoting someone's speech that overlaps his/her interlocutor.
(.)	: A very short pause.
(1.5)	: A pause of measurable length.
.hh	: An in-breath.
((smiling))	: A non-verbal cue (e.g., smiling).
lo:ng	: The colon indicates a prolonged sound.
(indecipherable)	: An indecipherable syllable, word, or expression.
↑Lenny, shut ↓up	: The arrows signal a rising and a falling intonation respectively.
<u>Shut up!</u>	: The underlined word is stressed.
° utterance °	: A quiet utterance.

- >faster speech<
 - {pseudonym}
 - £smiley£
- : An utterance between inverted angle brackets speeds up.
 - : Between the parentheses is a pseudonym or a changed phrase to conceal an identity.
 - : A “smile” voice.

(Adapted from Jefferson, 2004).

APPENDIX J

A SAMPLE OF EMERGING THEMES: THE SECOND STAGE OF CODING

Themes	Marty	Mira
What does it mean for an EFL stakeholder in an Indonesian Christian university to be "spiritual"?		
1	Defining spirituality and religiosity	<p>Spirituality: relationship with god, reflected in interactions with other people and teaching relation with colleagues not always easy.</p> <p>One's definition of sp. shapes the rest of focus group discussion</p> <p>Closeness with god determines one's relation with others.</p> <p>Spirituality as motivation to work hard.</p>
2	Spirituality and/or religiosity in relation to teaching (or learning) excellence and professionalism	<p>ELT has nothing to do with religion, but then I reminded her of the plan to include discussion about ghosts in Ext Read respect each other's belief.</p> <p>in a Christian environment is different to share what she had learned in JCU being "tooradikal" = "lebay"</p> <p>acknowledging her responsibility to show that she's god's child, family upbringing accounts for her not being "radikal" > < Jos</p> <p>no overt witnessing, afraid of proselytizing; imparting work ethos to her students; simple daily prayers work hard - motivated by god</p> <p>No praying in class</p> <p>Spirituality as motivation to work hard.</p>
3	Motivation (in learning or teaching English)	<p>Spirituality: god(s); for him: a spiritual Ctr, relationship</p> <p>Religion: structured, out of tradition on the surface</p> <p>More discussion on Ethics & Morality</p> <p>Prepare students to use English well</p> <p>He wants to be blessing</p> <p>Being a missionary.</p> <p>Being a role model in class</p> <p>Agreeing with & critiquing Pennycook and Couland-Martin (2008)</p>
4	Reasons for entering a religiously affiliated institution	
5	Claimed vs performed spiritual and/or religious identities	
6	Christian-based character education through ELT	Being a role model in class

Power relations due to, or associated with, one's spirituality and/or religiosity

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | Proselytizing, converting, or witnessing | Telling a story - planting seeds | there is limit in witnessing -- not all stud are Christian.
Universal values okay. |
| 2 | Absolute truths in a religious tradition | Jesus is the way, the truth, and the life.
Personally against syncretism, but being critical toward god-against- culture, pure Calvinistic gospel
Aware of his position of power as a Christian and English native speaker.
Against ethnocentrism. | |
| 3 | Self-reflexivity (on proselytizing etc.) | Acknowledging his colonial baggage | |
| 4 | How power (relations) between ELT stakeholders having spiritual values was were/ could be negotiated for achieving a common good, despite potential conflicts along the way | *the Curriculum is fine as long as no proselytizing

* "Missionary work, preys on the weak"? Marty critiques it.

* Cultural baggage in one's religion.
* Selective about which story to tell.
* Hedging - "this is my perspective."
* Not talking about religion when the topic does not permit.

* condemning coercion & manipulation.
* Giving some avenue to disagreement
* Respectful of other beliefs;
* Asking question related to belief outside class

* Using examples from Anglo- phone worlds can be problematic, esp. when compared to Indonesia. | Sri's presence prevented Mira from talking about something, which she forgot. |

5	Inter-faith dialogue: Transactional or Interactional?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lukas & Marty's apologetics * Marty's take on homosexuality * Eastern vs. Western worldviews and the problem of strict binary thinking * Not presupposing god's existence * More on in-ethnography project (religion & local beliefs; religious freedom; "assalamualaikum") 	<p>Concerns on CBC doc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * How to evaluate students * The danger of forcing students to agree with teachers' values * In ELT, should people be honest and noble? 	<p>Commenting on Marty's discourse: basically okay, but she thought "this is not gonna be easy" if she were the instructor.</p> <p>On vision and mission: too conceptual</p>
6	No text is ever innocent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Marty's apologetics in Cross-Cultural Understanding class: A covert evangelization? 	<p>On CBC draft</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * too difficult to understand * not that universal * as soft skill - integrated. * ask me to check with Shirinta. * the discussion made Mira self-reflexive. <p>In a subsequent focus group discussion where Shirinta was present, Mira played devil's advocate, by pretending to be a very critical assessor of an accreditation team.</p>	

APPENDIX K

MUSTIKA'S INTERPRETATION OF PHILLIS WHEATLEY'S POEM

Mustika:

[1] Usually when [students] talked about African-American, they would directly think about [racial] discrimination, and all African-American writers would be against slavery. But this one, surprisingly sounds in favor with slavery. Even she felt ↑thank↓ful for being brought from Africa. Even though she moved from Africa, which probably provided her with better position in her homeland, but she felt thankful, ‘twas mercy brought me from my Pagan land from Africa. She was brought from Africa literally [...] to America and she was taken as a slave by her mistress whose name was then given to her. Wheatley, the Wheatleys family was her master’s family. She [was] taught reading and writing by her mistress, and she also was taught about Christianity. And Bible was the first book that was introduced to her as a part of her reading lessons. (Interview, May 6, 2014, originally in English)

[2] Jos: So that goes back to my previous question. So do you think Phillis Wheatley genuinely became a Christian, and became thankful to the mistress? Is that what you think?

Mustika:

I felt. I felt, from her choice of words, she felt thankful. Because when she was brought from Africa to America, she came to know God. And Africa, in my opinion, Pagan land did not only refer to her old life, but also her old home land, which was pagan, which did not know Christ. And it was mercy that she was taken from that bad situation, to America, where she could be introduced to the hope, and life, through Christianity. [...] She did not mention about being a slave. She was more thankful because she was able to move to America. And she was introduced to Christianity. She was introduced to the savior, to Jesus Christ.

[3] But interestingly, at the end, even though she did not say that slavery was unpleasant, she reminded people, ‘Remember, Christians, Negroes, black as Cain, May be refin’d, And join, th’angelic train.’ From my perspective, these last two lines, can be one of the reminders for all Christians to see colors as something that should not hinder people from salvation. Something which sounds contradictory with her first line [i.e., ‘Twas mercy brought me from my *Pagan* land], when the word pagan was viewed as hierarchical. But the last two lines, does not [sound] hierarchical. Or she sounds against the hierarchy, because she also mentions Negroes. Black as Cain. May be refin’d and join the’angelic train. So that’s what makes me want my students to see how a believer can be that paradoxical. At the first place she probably looked at her position as hierarchical, but at the end, she’s kind of in contradiction with what she said earlier. [...] eh [the reference is] ‘Some view our sable race with scornful eye, Their colour is a diabolic die.’ This is kind of admission, ya? That there is discrimination. This is more criticism to Christianity itself.

[4] Because learning from this, she was thankful that she was introduced to the savior. So she converted to Christianity, she became a Christian. Unfortunately, these Christian people- [...] I got the idea that ‘Some view our sable race with scornful eye.’ Referring to her color. Different color. Because she was introduced to Christ by her mistress, which was white. Ironically, ‘some view our sable race with scornful eye.’ But

then she remind those people, ‘Remember, Christians, Negroes, black as Cain. Maybe refin’d and join th’angelic train.’ So I also introduced to the students that this poem is kind of auto-critique to the believers. To the Christian believers.

[5] And then after that- That’s why, I then pointed to the religious symbols. ‘What about you in real life? Will you be able to accept criticism toward you own religion? Or you would be angry when people criticize your religion?’ Or, ‘can you criticize your own religion, in order that you learn more about what you believe.’ So that was usually what I asked, when it came to the issues like this poem.

[6] Jos: Any responses of the students that you still remember, in relation to your questions to them?

Mustika: They did not answer my question. But they smiled, and I ↑could see their expressions that they started to think. Because they start to look at the ceiling and smile. So when they only look at the ceiling, maybe ‘who cares!’ But they smile, and start to look at the ceiling, or look outside, thinking. So it is not important to know what their answers were, but it is interesting for me to see, and it is more important for me to see them to start thinking. So for me, it is more important, rather than listening to their answers. When they start thinking, even though it is difficult to measure how much they think, for me it is more important.

[7] Jos: And you said this poem was selected by Angela. Did you talk with her about this poem, before you taught the class?

Mustika: [...] when Angela was the coordinator [of the Poetry course], we discuss this poem. This is from our discussion with Angela.

[8] Jos: I was wondering what about those who are not Christians.

Mustika: That is why I then try to generalize the issue of auto-criticism toward someone’s belief. The specific story is about this poet’s experience. But the principle here is the ability to look at someone’s belief more objectively. So to criticize practices of the believers’ attempt to follow the teachings, and to look at, or to compare the misconduct or mistreatment done by the believers. And to separate the believers from the belief. Because that is what commonly happens in our society: ‘Because you believe in Christianity, so you are Christian. When you are doing bad, so Christianity is bad.’ That is what people usually think. And that’s what I wanted my students to see. To widen their perspectives in seeing problems. [...]

[9] Because I only had seventeen students in class, so it was not a big [class]. Students had more chance to share their ideas. And they gave comments on this. And well, I could learn that they were surprised that religion could be such hierarchical. [...] And I also introduced the issue that it ↑may also be politicized. Because she was taught by the mistress, the mistress probably has exposed the idea that because you’re from a land where people could not read and write, when you were able to read and write here,

these people here were higher. Better than you were. More civilized than your people there.

[10] So political voice may be not clearly traced here, but I personally suspect the political manipulation here. So the white politics of Christianizing people maybe. But unfortunately in our discussion, I only discuss that part very slightly. But I also introduced this may be politics. Because in the historical context of this poem, the Whites still believe that slaves were their possession. The other political idea that we can find here, also in relation with the history of the writer, the mistress, then brought this particular writer to road shows, showing that ‘here. This is our slave, but we did not treat her as slave like the other people were doing.’ So what political action was that I told the students that probably, they would feel that they were superior slave owners, in comparison with other slave owners.

[11] Jos: Road show?

Mustika: Road show. So to different places for her to read her poem. A very rare opportunity for slave. Well the students said, ‘Wow. She was a lucky slave.’

Jos: But still it is within the frame of white superiority.

Mustika: exactly.

Jos: white supremacy.

Mustika: exactly.

[12] And that’s what the students did not realize. And then I asked them. My next question for them was that ‘Who got the most benefit from the road show?’ And the students start to think [...] ‘Who got the most ↑benefit from the road show? Did Phillis Wheatley get all the praise? Was there anyone else who also got the praise from the people? What do you think?’ [...] She probably got the spotlight as a poet, but people would always ask the question ‘who made her such poet? because she was just a slave.’

[13] And after that I talk about ‘why [do] you put on head scarf? Were you ready with the questions, or with the people's look toward you, especially when you were studying here in Christian university, and you put head scarf?’ Ya. Unfortunately the students did not answer my question. But she just smiled. But I almost certain that she’s probably start thinking, at least at that time. But that may be a wrong assumption. Because she did not give me any answer. (Interview, May 6, 2014)

APPENDIX L

ANGELA'S NARRATIVE #1: CHRISTIANITY IN THE AMERICAN CULTURE
AND LITERATURE CLASS

[1] [Context: What Angela thought of her interactions with students embracing various faiths.]

Angela: I enjoyed them. Because I enjoy learning about the different faiths and their different religious viewpoints. Especially coming from an American context where admittedly I don't know very much about like the Islam faith. And post 9/11, America became very very Islamophobic. So I enjoy my interactions, when I can ↑get students to talk about their faith, especially Islam faith or Buddhist faith, or whatever, that I can learn more about it. Because A, it's interesting to me. And B, I think it helps build better interfaith relationship with my students. When I show that I can love and respect them even though we have different faiths. And I think that I want to provide a safe space [so that] we can talk about religion in the context of the classroom where it's not so sensitive or so taboo, because I think very dangerous in that.

[2] As an American, this is interesting. [...] People talk about religion here more openly than they do in the U.S. But to a point. And then it's like people kind of back away. Then it becomes like almost taboo, or sensitive. People are afraid of offending or to stepping on toes. Or creating conflict [...]. We don't go ↑too ↓far into discussing religion. Because then it might kind of disrupt the harmony. And so that's been interesting to me to observe. ... And someone who's not familiar with this culture, to kind of tiptoe around in the classroom. And I've ↑done ↓that. a ↑few ↓times. Pushing the envelope as we say. Do you know that expression? [...] Wanting to get into something, but being maybe a little bit more pushy about it than I should. We call it pushing the envelope. Pushing my own agenda.

[3] Because I approached it like for example in my American Culture and Literature class, talking about the Islam faith, and talking about Islamophobia, from my context in the American cultures. So I tried to say, 'okay. We're gonna ↑talk ↓about this. Because I think it's important that we talk about religion in the classroom [...]. But we're gonna talk about it with my context. We can critique American culture. America post 9/11. Because I realize it's a delicate issue here. And I might make people feel a little bit *kurang enak* [awkward]. And if you want to compare it with your own culture, and see if this has similarities or differences, and apply this critique to your own culture, *silahkan* [please]. But they don't feel *terpaksa* [obliged]. They don't feel forced to try to build critical thinking. But not make it too uncomfortable. Cause this is really pushing the envelope, especially in Indonesian context.
[...]

[4] Oh there is one other thing I wanted to say. You asked me about spirituality. When I do the unit in American Culture and Literature about Islamophobia, I tried to bring in media to make it more interesting 'cause it's culture. Not just use literature, but to use songs, and to use television shows and movies, too in American Culture and Literature.

[5] So post-9/11, people use 9/11 for whatever agenda they had, like to push their agenda in whatever way. So one of the things that I did in this class was we played a few songs. And they came from very different- like this one was very very right wing. It was very patriot. 'Let's go to war. Let's get them. Beat their a-' un in fact the lyrics of the song is 'we'll put a boot of your ass.' It's the American way. And it's ↑terri↓fying. That song.

And it's terrifying how ↑po↓pular it has been over the years. And then there were the other side which was like, you know, 'Bush has led us into this war, filled with lies, and what are we doing?' So very rightist, very leftist [...]. So I tried to show them how people used this occasion for their own purposes, their own motives.

[6] And then from there, I also had shown them [...] Allen Jackson [who] wrote 'Where were you when the World Stop Turning?' And [...] there was a reference to Bible quote that said 'But these three things remain. Faith, hope, and love. And the greatest one is ↑love.' So that one was a little bit more vague about spirituality. But it does mention God. So that one was a little more safe, I thought, like to play in class [...]. I think the title of it is 'I was there.' [...] It's a ↑so↓ng, but it's almost like a narration of God. And it's told from the perspective of God. And he is saying, 'I was there, in the building. I was there in the planes. I was there. People wanted to know where I was. But I was there.' [...] At the end it's like God asked the question, 'But if you were in that situation, at that moment, would you've turned to me?' And it's used just like this evangelical ↑to↓ol. Like 'Think about your life. Think about your death. If you were a victim of 9/11, would you have been calling out to me?'

[7] And the most interesting about this was I specifically said when I played it for the class: 'I'm not trying to evangelize you, guys. I want you to see how people use this ↑tra↓gedy for their own ↑pur↓poses. But even still, after that class, I heard through students, other students, that some people thought that I was trying to con↑ve↓rt the ↑Mus↓lims. And even when my ↑Chris↓tian students said, it's like 'I- I admire you because even in the class, you were using- and there's a way to like witness or evangelize.' And I remember thinking, °but I wasn't.° Like they have completely either had misunderstood me, had not listened to me. What I meant like 'let's look at the purposes behind why these things were made.' But some of the students could not separate the idea that this was religious themed. And therefore the very fact that the teacher is playing it means that she is trying to evangelize us. Even though, while I was ↑pla↓ying it, I was also leaning very critical eye, saying the danger of what happens post-9/11 is that people get scared, and they get desperate, and they get mad. And they ↑used this occasion to push their own agenda: Whether it's politically, whether it's religiously, whether it's humanitarian treat each other nicely. I was just trying to show the differences. And they didn't take issue with the po↑liti↓cal ones. Especially 'cause at the beginning I was like 'I just wanna show you what was the pop culture responds post-9/11.' Because it ↑did determine our culture, in terms of media, in so many ↑wa↓ys. And that's all I was trying to show. And even though I explained that before and after, that's what came back to me.

[8] So the next class I had to say. 'Guy- Guys guys guys. I'm not trying to evangelize. I wanna show you. Because this is a Christian nation [...].' I was trying to also show them how people were using this for their own religious agenda. And how people got terrified at Islamaphobia. I was trying to use it as a critical moment. But it was kf::yu ((using a sound to indicate that students did not get it; if I were to reconstruct this, I would use a swinging hand past my head)).

[9] Jos: Do you have any idea who thought that you were evangelizing the students?

Angela: I don't know for sure. But I have a feeling, it was honestly some of the older students who were Moslem, whose English and whose perhaps critical thinking abilities were not very developed. I say that because I had other Moslem students that understood that I was using this moment for us to think critically about people's motives. And they got something from the teaching. And I say that because at the end of the class, they wrote that in their evaluations, you know? But these students [...] might not have had a previous relationship with me. So they might not have known that I have, can we say, interfaith respect and interfaith tolerance. But it just seemed to me that they were the weaker students, who maybe the less bright students? That might have either misunderstood me, or not then capable of understanding the lesson. I was trying to teach them critical thinking [...]. This was the first time I had these [older and weaker] students in class. Before then, I might've had these other students who are Moslem. But they knew me inside and outside of class. They didn't get the same perception. These other students did. It was almost like they were [...] protecting their faith, their religion, not wanting to be witnessed to or evangelized to, even though that was not my intention at all.

[10] Jos: So after that incident, I should say, if you were to teach a similar class that involves different activities, including displaying movies or films that include religiously associated themes, like the post-9/11 incidents, how would you do that?

Angela: Well, I learned from this experience. Because this is something I've always taught. I taught [American Culture and Literature] class several times. So this was the first time I taught it. And after that, I got even more insistent, and clear about saying 'I am showing this to you, because this is a part of American culture. It is not because I'm trying- And I would say it more, I would repeat myself. I would say more adamantly.

[11] And part of that is because I'm not comfortable with being evangelical myself. It's just not who I am. It's a {non-Pentecostal organization}. I believe in witnessing through love and relationship and service. I don't believe that my words without actions can convert people anyway. At least not that heartfelt conversion that you want people to have if they want to accept Christ. That's my personal belief.

[12] But it's also because I wanna create a safe atmosphere at my classroom. And I believe that if those students think that I am partial to Christians, or I'm trying to evangelize, or witness to them, and not to focus on the material of the class, which was spirituality or religion post-9/11, then that makes me feel sad as a teacher too. Because it wasn't really the focus of the lesson, or the focus of class activity. [...]

[13] It was very interesting to me. [It] is like 'really? Seriously?' So I repeated and repeated, and I repeated some more, and repeated some more, in my classes. And not just about the Christian aspect, but when I talked about Islam. And I talked about how so many Americans are now Islamophobic because of what happened in 9/11. And because many Americans don't know about Islam, and so their representations of it are extremist, fanatics, terrorists, bad examples they see from the media. And so over and over again, as I'm saying this to the students. I repeat and repeat and repeat. 'I do not agree with this. I do not agree with this. I don't think it's good. And just trying to make you understand what ↑hap↓pended in America, so that you understand where these Americans are coming from. I want us to be critical towards them. And understand them so that we can learn

from this.' Rather than being like 'Yeah. I understand why Americans are scared of, you know, Muslims' or you know, or whatever.

[14] And I think the languages should become a factor there. You know? Like I say it. For five six times because it's a foreign language. I'm teaching in their foreign language also. And I don't want them to miss what I'm saying. Because that's really important what I'm saying. I'm teaching language. But I'm teaching culture. But I'm teaching critical thinking too. And the medium of communication is their foreign language. So I repeat it and repeat it and repeat it in different ways, so that it doesn't get lost on them. Because there's danger if it gets lost on them, as I learned from the first time I taught this. (Interview, April 29, 2014)

APPENDIX M

ANGELA'S NARRATIVE #2: CHRISTIANITY IN THE INTERMEDIATE WRITING

CLASS

[1] Jos: I might not have been able to observe more classes, and I do not want to haunt people by my presence all the time anyway. But based on my observations, you didn't seem to bring up religious or spiritual issues in Intermediate Writing class. But I'm not sure.

Angela: Probably not. I probably find it easier to talk about spiritual or religious issues when it's involving culture or religion. Or [in] literature classes. With writing I don't think I do as much. It's harder. [...]

[2] One time though, I remember I used Langston Hughes. He's an African-American Renaissance poet. But he wrote short narrative about being forced to be saved. Like feeling this extreme pressure in this church to stand up and admit that you're sinner, and accept Jesus as your savior. And it was in narrative. And I think it was last year, or two years ago. I put that one into the [course] Reader, because I was the coordinator. And that one involved the issues of faith and spirituality. But we turned a critical eye toward it like 'was this a genuine example or was this pretty much this example of how you can feel pressure to conform, without being genuine about your faith?' So it's more important that he get up and profess his salvation, rather than actually feel conviction in his heart to do that genuinely himself. That's what the narrative story was about. So we adapt a little bit about that.

[3] Jos: And the response from the students, when it came to reading that particular essay?

Angela: They were pretty critical about it. And agree that it wasn't genuine because he felt forced to confess a faith. That he wasn't feeling, but because of this situation. ... I was interested... if this were to happen in Indonesian context, would they be okay with it? Or do they have a similar story that it's more okay, because this is real life, and this is just a story. At that time I was interested, 'what did they really think about it?' But because of the time constraints, I couldn't get dig deeper. And I also think it's also possible that they were giving me the answers that they thought I wanted to hear, which was not in terms of the spiritual aspect, but in terms of they knew I wanted them to be critical about what was happening in this piece. And therefore they said, 'o:h ya. It's not genuine because he felt forced.' Or something like that. But it was very compartmentalized ↓almost. Like here is religion and spirituality, here's critical thinking. Never the twin shall meet ((chuckling)). Never the two shall meet. That's how I felt at that time [...]. But because of time, I couldn't get deeper. And it wasn't really about writing. So I felt they had to kind of move on.

[4] Jos: So they didn't really respond to that essay in their own writing.

Angela: No. We used it more as an example to talk about purpose. 'Is it clear why he told the story? How did he structure the story?' Those kinds of things.

[5] Jos: And sorry. What made think that they have to follow you? I mean their response was something that you would like to hear? If I'm not mistaken.

Angela: No. You are clear. I'm not entirely sure. I don't know how they answer that, other than I can say that I felt it. And I think that students are smart. They learn from a young age to try to give this teacher what they want. And I probably ask certain leading questions, or questions in such a way that maybe made them feel like 'I should answer it this way, rather than this way.' Yeah. It was more a sense of what I got. And ya. Maybe

because some of these students [who] had had me before knew that I might ask them to be a little bit more critical. A little bit less dogmatic or prescriptive in the way that I'm like [in favor of] spirituality.

'Religion.'

'Good.'

'Jesus.'

'Good.' you know?

'Everything else bad.'

So that I was asking them to think more about the process of what was happening during the narrative.

[...]

As far as I remember, both Christians and Moslems had had this similar response that being forced was not a positive or helpful thing for this young boy in the context of this narrative story. (Interview, April 29, 2014)

APPENDIX N

MUR'S COMMENTS ON MARTY'S TALK IN COMMUNICATION ACROSS

CULTURES CLASS

[1] There is a tendency if we're talking about general Indonesian public. *Biasanya tu tergantung siapa yang ngomong sih. Tapi sering-seringnya adalah, nggak akan mau berbicara detil.* [It depends on who speaks. But generally people not want to talk in detail about their faith]. Like when you interviewed me, I can explain like very detail on certain part of my religion to support my answer. But in this context [i.e., Marty's talk], I don't think he would go there, because – ↑maybe, maybe, I cannot speak for him, or her – maybe it will be interpreted by the audience as forcing one's belief into the audience. Maybe. It really depends on the person. But I get that feeling that in order to be harmonious, instead of talking about it openly, it's like 'let's not talk about it.' You know? [Or] 'let's talk about it, but not in details.' [Or] okay, 'we live happily ever after, let's not talk about it.' Or okay, 'so we live happily ever after, this is a little bit part of [my belief], but I'm not going to talk in details, because if we start talking in details, the potential of conflicts will be more.' See my point? It's kind of like sweeping the dust under the carpet. You know? ... It looks nice now. Everybody is happy now in the house.

[2] That is also reflected in how our education system, in term of religious teachings in practice in schools. It's always mono-religious teaching, rather than multi-religious teaching. Remember when you're in public senior high school, if you're Protestant, you guys have a class on your own. And if you're Muslim, you're going to class on your own. Rather than okay, 'let's have a studium generale,' or whatever it is. And then 'Okay. This is Islam. This is Protestant. This is Catholic. This is Buddhism. This is Hinduism.' At least, there are certain openness to talk about the details of the religion, in terms of giving information. But that will be misunderstood by many parents, and students, and teachers, because once you go to multi-religious teaching, usually it would be perceived as 'O:h. you're doing evangelism.' [Or] 'you're trying to force the students to adopt certain religion.'

[3] I only know [...] JCU, for example. There are certain lecturers who actually have that kind of curriculum. Multi-religious curriculum. They will invite people from different religion to give information about their religion, but I don't think that will work in senior high school level, or even elementary school. I saw one or two initiatives to do that, from private school, like to invite people from other religious groups to explain about their religion, but not in public school. Certainly not. Certainly not in elementary school. Some school actually celebrate certain religious holidays, even though the students consist of different religions. Just to give a taste like, 'okay, this is how the holiday is celebrated,' which is actually great, but I don't think that will be a practice that is popular among the majority of Indonesians. Do you see my point? It's like sweep the ↑dust under the rug. It looks beautiful and nice. Now let's not talk about it. Everybody's happy.

[4] Jos: So in general, what do you think of having such a talk [i.e., Marty's talk] in ELT classrooms?

Mur: It's actually good because I realize that we are educating teachers. And as teachers later on they may go into public schools. And we need to give them preparation of how to deal with students with diverse backgrounds. But if this is how they conduct in class, I don't think [it is a good idea that] the students will just carry on the tradition of sweeping everything under the dust. Everything is happy. Everybody is happy, you know?

Everything is okay and beautiful—rather than treating their future students with more understanding.

[5] Jos: Any concrete suggestions as to how to ameliorate the problems of sweeping the dust under the rug?

Mur: Having a controversial debate. I know it's going to be tense and full of debates and heated argument, and things like that. But you cannot really learn anything, if you do it the nice way all the time. You know what I mean? And because this is the context of class, I assume that the students will know each other for quite some time, to consider other as friends. This is not a total strangers, you know? This is not total strangers. And usually discussion about differences is easier to accept when you actually know whom you're talking to. Like if your friend, you're not just seeing this person as a person with background. You'll see that this is a friend, that you empathize with, that they're just human beings; we both eat rice; they're friends, rather than total strangers which I don't care. You know?

[6] Jos: Any topics that you can think, off the top of your head?

Mur: Interreligious marriage is always interesting. And also that because ((clicking sound)) see? They're in college. They're like... hang out every day. Lo:ve. It's still a very interesting topic for them. Because they are like young adults. And I'm sure that there'll be crushes. Interreligious crushes. And that is something that actually students are so interested to know how to deal with that. Because you cannot really control how you feel. You cannot control when you fall in love. But I don't think they're quite sure of how to handle that in terms of differences. You know what I mean? (Interview, August 19, 2014)

APPENDIX O

LUCIA'S POEM ENTITLED "SQUARES"

Squares

You asked me once,
“What do you want if you see a falling star?”
I said, “nothing.”
We once were holding each other hands,
Laying together on the backyard of your home,
Looking at the blue sky,
Hoping that what we had would last forever.

The clouds that we saw, moved bit by bit.
The black clouds covered the bright smiling sun.
The clouds started to cry.

You tried to embrace me.
Swaying me, that it was okay.
I ran as far as I could.
Leaving you is pain.

Throwing away the book that we write together,
Just because I was too afraid,
To face the storm in front of us.
You came, I hid.
You cried, I tried to smile.

For me, it was the time for the logic.
To take the victory from feeling.
Now, I'm looking at the sky.
I wish I can see a falling star.

I wish that I can be with you once again one day.
In the right place, and in the right time.
But is it possible?
For two people, with two different dogmas?
To be unified in this world now?

You pray by raising your hands, facing your face,
But I, folding my hands.
Friday is your day,
But Sunday is my day.
You read your Qur'an,
I learn about Holy Bible.

We live in the same world,

But believe in the different creed.
Will it be more beautiful,
To change the word “but,” into “and”?

You pray by raising your hands, facing your face,
And I folding my hands.
Friday is your day,
And Sunday is my day.
You read your Qur’an,
And I learn about Holy Bible.

We live in the same world,
And believe in the different creed.
What's wrong with that?
Is it God, who created the squares for us?
Or is it man-made squares, that separate us?

Were we created by the same God?
Will we meet in the same place called heaven,
When we are created by the death

If the answers are yes,
Why can’t we hold each other hands right here and right now?

(Interview, March 27, 2014)

APPENDIX P

KARNO'S LANGUAGE LEARNING HISTORY

[...]

Beruntung pada saat itu ada orang asing dari Kanada, Ibu Y namanya, menawarkan untuk belajar bahasa Inggris padanya. Ibu Y adalah [misionaris] yang tinggal di Salatiga dan telah enam tahun tinggal di kampungku. Dan dia sangat senang sekali mengajari bahasa Inggris pada anak-anak didesa tempatku tinggal. Dan pada saat itu ada enam anak termasuk aku yang belajar pada Ibu Y.

Belajar pada Ibu Y berbeda sekali dengan Miss X. sebelum memulai materi ibu Y menyuruh ku untuk berdoa terlebih dahulu agar dalam pembelajarannya Tuhan membantuku. Dan meski ibu Y adalah orang Kanada dia selalu mencoba menggunakan bahasa Indonesia seperti yang dilakukan oleh Miss __. Dan cara pengajaran ibu Y sangat menarik sekali. Dia tidak hanya memberikan daftar kata-kata tetapi juga object kata tersebut melalui gambar. Dia juga sering sekali membuat kelompok kecil dan selalu mengandalkan kerja sama dan mengajariku cara bersaing yang sehat. Dan satu hal yang aku suka dari ibu Y adalah dia mengajariku bahwa dalam belajar yang terpenting adalah proses dan keinginan untuk tahu, dan sejak aku belajar dengan Ibu Y, bahasa Inggrisku meningkat dari teman-temanku yang lain walau aku hanya belajar enam bulan bersama Ibu Y karena di tahun 2006 dia harus pindah ke pulau Bali. Dan bekal dari ibu Y inilah yang aku gunakan sebagai filosofi belajarku dan bekal ku di sekolah menengah pertama.

[...]

Menjelang ujian sekolah aku mendapatkan satu guru lagi yang berpengaruh dalam hidupku. Beliau adalah Mister B. seperti Mister A beliau juga adalah salah satu guru senior di sekolah menengah pertamaku. Namun beliau berbeda sekali dengan mister A karena beliau seringkali mengajarkan nilai-nilai spiritual kepada murid-muridnya. Dia selalu berkata kepada muridnya tentang nilai hidup dan ketuhanan sepanjang kelas dan hanya mengajar bahasa Inggris jika murid siap untuk belajar bahasa Inggris. Salah satu ajaran yang aku dapatkan dari beliau adalah bahwa pendekatan kepada Tuhan itu sangatlah penting dan apabila kita belajar tanpa mengenal Tuhan, hidup kita menjadi sia-sia dan manusia adalah akan menjadi lilin tanpa api jika tidak mengenal Tuhannya. Dan sosok Mister B tidak pernah aku jumpai di sekolah menengah atas.

[...]

Aku beruntung selesai tamat sma, atau tiga bulan setelah lulus sma, ada orang asing yang mau mengajariku bahasa Inggris lagi. Beliau berasal dari Amerika dan namanya adalah pak Donald. Aku tidak ingat bagaimana aku mengenal beliau untuk pertama kali. Yang pasti waktu itu, pada hari lebaran, beliau dan istrinya datang berkunjung kerumahku dan beliau menawarkan untuk belajar bahasa Inggris dengannya. Akupun senang sekali karena aku mempunyai kesempatan belajar bahasa Inggris bersama orang Amerika dan di sisi lain Pak Donald adalah guru bahasa Inggris di sekolah internasional.

Pertama kali aku belajar bahasa Inggris dengan Pak Donald, itu membuat pemahamanku terhadap bahasa Inggris berbeda lagi. Pak Donald mengajarku bahwa belajar bahasa sama saja dengan belajar budaya. Dan tanpa mengenal budaya bahasa, bahasa yang diucapkan akan terdengar bookish. Dan Pak Donald pun memberiku banyak sekali buku tentang budaya dan tentang bagaimana berbicara bahasa Inggris dengan alami. Beliau sering kali mengajakku untuk berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris tentang lintas budaya. Dan sejak saat itulah aku tertarik ingin menjadi guru seperti Pak Donald. Karena beliau mengajarku bahwa menjadi seorang guru adalah hal yang paling mulia. Selain dapat memberi ilmu pengetahuan, seorang guru juga membentuk kepribadian seorang murid.

Dan ketika aku masuk ke universitas, aku banyak sekali menjumpai guru-guru bahasa Inggris yang mampu membuatku termotivasi untuk terus belajar bahasa Inggris dan menjadi seorang guru. Dan tidak hanya sebatas itu. Guru-guru itu juga mampu meningkatkan nilai spiritualku dan membuatku sadar untuk apa aku terlahir dan belajar di dunia ini. Dan Guru-guru itu adalah Mister Sony, Mr. Marty Gate, dan Miss Mustika.

Mister Sony adalah guruku disemester pertama. Dia adalah guru yang paling aku kagumi. Beliau sangat berbeda sekali dengan guru-guru disemester pertama. Dalam mengajar beliau jarang sekali membahas semua materi yang ada dibuku. Dan hanya menjelaskan materi-materi yang sulit bagi murid-muridnya dengan cara yang sangat sederhana dan singkat. Dan untuk menghabiskan sisa waktu belajar, beliau akan duduk diatas meja dan bercerita tentang kisah hidupnya. Beliau bercerita bagaimana dia sewaktu menjadi mahasiswa dan juga bercerita kehidupannya pada waktu dia tinggal di _____. Kadang-kadang beliau juga bercerita tentang hidupnya sekarang ini. Dan aku ingat ketika menjelang tes pertama, beliau berkata kepada murid-muridnya bahwa “God is not a servant that will always give his mercy, you have to struggle with yourself if you want to get the best”. Dan dari diajari oleh Mister Sony aku sadar bahwa menjadi guru yang baik bukan selalu memberi materi tetapi juga dapat menjadi sahabat bercerita.

Dan di dua semester berikutnya aku mendapatkan dua guru yang tak akan pernah aku lupakan dalam hidupku, mereka berdua adalah Mr. Marty Gate dan Miss Mustika. Marty adalah seorang guru dari [negara berbahasa Inggris]. Beliau adalah guru yang sangat tegas. Satu hal yang aku sangat kagumi dari beliau adalah beliau sangat terbuka sekali terhadap muridnya dan mempunyai standar yang tinggi. Beliau akan memberitahu nilai murid secara langsung dan memberitahu kesalahan dan keunggulan murid tersebut. Jarang sekali aku diajari oleh guru seperti Marty Gate. Dan satu hal lagi yang membuatku sangat terkesan dengan beliau adalah beliau sangat senang apabila muridnya datang untuk berkonsultasi dan membantu menyelesaikan masalah yang dijumpai oleh muridnya sewaktu mengerjakan tugas.

Dan yang terakhir adalah Miss Mustika. Teman-temanku bilang, dan juga kakak angkatanku, Miss Mustika adalah seorang guru yang kejam. Dia tak pernah memberikan nilai yang bagus kepada murid-muridnya. Namun sewaktu aku diajari beliau, pandangan itu salah besar. Miss Mustika adalah guru yang sangat hebat, beliau mampu melihat

sesuatu yang tidak dilihat oleh orang lain dan beliau juga suka sekali dengan pendapat-pendapat yang tidak biasa.

Aku tahu mengapa beliau jarang memberi nilai bagus kepada muridnya, karena beliau adalah seorang perfeksionis yang ingin segalanya terlihat sempurna. Namun di sisi lain beliau juga seorang feminis dan arena diajar beliau itulah aku menjadi paham tentang arti feminis dan bagaimana melihat dengan sisi yang berbeda. Beliau juga memotivasiku untuk terus membaca dan membaca karena manusia harus menggunakan akal budinya untuk menentukan mana yang baik dan mana yang buruk.

Dan aku bermimpi agar bisa menjadi guru seperti Miss Mustika yang bias melihat sisi yang berbeda. Dan aku juga ingin menjadi guru seperti Marty Gate yang terbuka terhadap muridnya, seperti Mister Sony yang menjadi sahabat cerita pada muridnya dan Pak Donald yang selalu mengajak berbicara tentang hal-hal berbeda mengenai budaya.

[Note: I have edited some sentences and changed all people's real names to pseudonyms].

APPENDIX Q

ELLIE'S INTEREST IN SOCIAL (JUSTICE) ISSUES

During a focus group discussion, Ellie was the only student who explicitly made a connection between social issues and religion. The following excerpt was taken from the ending part of the focus group discussion when Ellie referred back to the Competency-Based Curriculum document that I distributed to the participating students earlier.

Kompetensi pendukung [Supporting competency] point 6. Sorry I'm back to the competence, *Memiliki kemampuan untuk menanggapi masalah-masalah sosial yang terkait dengan pembelajaran dan pengajaran bahasa Inggris.* [Being able to address social issues that are related to teaching and learning English.] So I think this is the connection. We learn other religion, we learn the issue, social issues about religion through English. So that's why I think the idea of put[ting] spiritual and religious identity in our teaching and learning English process is important. (Focus group discussion, February 26, 2014)

In an individual interview, I asked Ellie what influenced her decision to study at the EFL teacher education program at JCU. She initially wanted to be admitted in the International Relations program, but it was too late for her to enroll there. She eventually entered the English Department, and this is her justification, which is also informed by her interest in social justice.

[1] I think I have to learn English, because I want to write articles, journals, that can *mengajak orang lain untuk memiliki kepedulian terhadap* [encourage other people to have more attention to] children and women. And because I usually work with international organization like UNICEF..., so it force me to speak in English.

[2] If I can [be an] English teacher, I don't want to be English teacher in a big city. I want to go to small village. I want to teach children. Poor unlucky children. I mean poor children, and women. I don't like to teach in the big city, because for me it's not challenging. I want to be a good teacher for those who really need me. For those who don't have good teacher. I want to teach the people which is not be part of government's focus. Because in my province, there are so many children and women. I think they are smart, and they are potential, but sadly, the government don't really focus on their potentiality. So I myself want to build my country, ↑my province, especially for women and children. That's why I want to learn English. (Interview, March 11, 2014)

APPENDIX R

FIELD NOTES AND TRANSCRIBED DATA FROM DIKA'S INTERMEDIATE

READING CLASS ON FEBRUARY 13, 2014

Context: The class session was a transition from reading news critically to reading another genre, logo, in a critical manner. It is a 100-minute class session, which started at 2 p.m. Around 25 students attended the class, some of whom are Muslims. Dika was inspired by her work in which she wrote something on Critical Media Literacy, and she then decided to partly apply this in the current class. After introducing what reading logos entails in the first half of the class, Dika assigned students to express their ideas of the Jawara Christian University's (JCU's) logo. She wanted to use the students' written responses for her research into issues of gender and violence. In the class she hoped that the students would feel free to share their views on JCU because she thought it would be beneficial for the improvement of JCU. The purpose of this exercise is not for humiliating people but to channel the students' "voices" for the betterment of the institution, in particular. Dika had planned the use of the JCU's logo as a topic of presentation and a prompt for students to generate (critical) responses long before I disclosed to her the purpose of my study.'

The following is a detailed account of Dika's teaching session. Direct speech is indicated between quotation marks or verbatim narrow(er) transcription of Dika's (and students') speech.

Having displayed several logos (e.g., Mercedes Benz, Apple, etc.), Dika proceeded with the history of a certain logo like Pepsi in the United States. Specific attention was paid to the color. It was first red but then in 1950 it was changed to red, white, and blue. Dika asked, "What does 1950 remind us of?" [23:27].¹ She then asked the students what actually happened several years before 1950. Some students replied: "World War." "Yes, World War II (WW II)." Dika examined the WW II in further depth by asking the students historical questions of 1) which countries were involved in it, and 2) who won the war. The winner was the United States and its allies. Dika also asked: "How do people feel after a war, especially if they think they win the war?" [26:00]. Students were still silent.

Using yet another intertextual strategy, Dika associated the war with the current event in which students from one cohort competed against other cohorts. A similar question was raised: "What would you feel if your cohort wins the competition?" [26:30]. "Happy" and "proud" were the answers. "Did you feel closer to each other [in one cohort]?" Dika asked, to which the students replied in unison: "Yes!" [26:52]. Similarly, the United States and its allies felt proud of their nation [27:02].

The flag of the United States was then displayed on a PowerPoint slide by Dika. As such, the students then could see the relationship between the three-colored U.S. flag and Pepsi [28:00]. Another interpretation: Pepsi is to be perceived as a U.S. product [28:40]. I heard Tono (i.e., the student who is one of my non-focal participants) say that the colors are to

¹ After watching a certain segment of the video-recorded data, I specify the hour, minute, or second in which a theme or sub-theme in the segment (e.g., what the winner of the second World War felt) occurred.

“respect the hero of the war” [28:54]. Dika intertextually linked the U.S. national pride to Indonesian government officials who promote themselves politically by emphasizing a slogan like buy our own national products (e.g., Dahlan Iskan who said that he wore Indonesian-made shoes) [29:45] to show patriotism [30:06]. Likewise, those who love America might want to buy Pepsi [30:33].

Change of logo is not only in business world, but also in politics [31:40]. The main sample being discussed is the United Development Party (a.k.a. PPP or Partai Persatuan Pembangunan). Dika explained that during the New Order Regime under Soeharto’s presidency, in many general elections only three parties were involved: Golkar, PDI, and PPP. And it was Golkar who had always become the ruling party, as it was engineered by Soeharto.

Showing the logo of PPP on a PowerPoint slide, Dika asked what the students understood about the party. It became apparent to the students that the party is Islamic because of its green color and there is a picture of Ka’bah shrine in Mecca, Saudi Arabia [32:56]. Tono confirmed it boldly.

PPP always came second after Golkar [33:12]. Dika: “In 1977 and 1982 general elections, PPP got more than 25% of total vote.” Established in 1973, PPP was “a fusion of other Islamic parties” [33:53]. 1984 was a year when two political decisions were made by the former President Soeharto. First, the “*Azas Tunggal Pancasila*” (i.e., Pancasila [or the nation’s Five Principles] as *the* only and highest law or ideology in Indonesia). All adult citizens have to attend a kind of training in order for them to be Pancasila-ist [35:07]. One implication of this *azas* is that the PPP’s logo has to be changed—Islamic views must be submissive to Pancasila. PPP decided to use the picture of star as its logo. Because of this change of logo, in 1987 general election PPP only got around 16% of total vote [36:05]. One possible reason for this significant decline is that the former sympathizers of PPP did not think of the party as Islamic (enough) any longer, especially because the logo did not seem to remind people of Mecca, “a place which may unite Muslims all over the world” [37:17]. After the fall of the New Order Regime in 1999, the picture of Ka’bah shrine in Mecca was reinstated as PPP’s logo. Dika asked why, and Tono said: “Tono gain their followers” [38:18]. With the change of logo, they managed to gain around 22% of total vote in the 1999 general election [40:55]. But as there were other Islamic parties, PPP votes have declined again since then.

The class discussion continued to the logo of JCU [43:05]—not disclosed here for securing confidentiality. The history of the university was then presented. After that, discussion about the university’s visions and missions constituted a large portion of the second half of the class. [Some talk on a catchphrase associated with the university is deliberately omitted here, for a confidential purpose]. Based on the catchphrase, Dika suggests that the university’s members have to be “critical to assess what is happening [and] what is available” [49:37].

[...]

Dika showed the JCU's logo [59:02] and said:

That is why in the beginning, before we started, then I asked you to write what you think of the university. ... And now look at the logo. Now, do you think you have the meaning of the logo there? [A student was heard to have said: "No."] In your handout, you can read the meaning of the logo... [Students laughed]. ... [59:46].

The students were then assigned to work in groups of three and answer Dika's questions:

- Do you think the logo is the face of JCU today? Or, do you think it represents JCU today? [01:00:15]
- Do you think the logo fits your idea about JCU or JCU today as you know it? [01:00:33]

Dika said that students were not to be afraid of being dropped out if they are honest about any unpleasant thing about the university [01:01:11]. Dika reminded the students of the necessity of reading a text like, including the JCU's logo, critically; that is, students are not simply "to accept what is stated, but to assess it, or examine it" [01:01:28]. A follow-up question:

If you think that the logo and your idea about the university as you know is different, then please discuss with your friends whether there are things that need to be changed in the logo, or whether there are things that the university should change, so that the logo will represent the face of JCU today [01:02:00]. ... If you think that there is a match between the logo and the university as you know JCU today, then give reasons. If you think both don't match, then which ones should be changed. [...] If there is something needs to be changed, in what ways should it be changed? [01:03:52]

Dika's justification of why the JCU's logo is to be examined:

Because you are all here. You are members of the big family. You must know JCU very well. [JCU is] something you live in, something you partly depend your future on. [01:03:06]

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Joseph Ernest Mambu earned his Ph.D. degree in Applied Linguistics from Arizona State University (ASU) in December 2014. He specializes in critical applied linguistics with a focus on critical spiritual pedagogy in English language teaching and learning. During his doctoral studies at ASU, he was primarily funded by Fulbright and DIKTI (i.e., the Indonesian Directorate General of Higher Education) scholarships. He has published in *The Journal of Asia TEFL* and *The Asian EFL Journal*, among others.