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Abstract

Academic Coloniality in English Language Teaching in Higher Education in Algeria

This study investigates, through the lens of ‘Academic Coloniality’, the various ways in which colonial discourses and hegemonies resulting from the global spread of English and English Language Teaching (ELT) unfold in higher education in Algeria. Academic Coloniality refers to the practices and beliefs of people that contribute to the production, manifestation, and reproduction of certain power relations between the ‘native speakers’ of English and its learners (Daffri & Taibi 2023). By looking at the ELT beliefs and practices of teachers and learners in a context that was not directly affected by British or American colonialism, the study aims to explore how Academic Coloniality within ELT in Algerian universities contributes to asymmetries that continue to marginalise people.

The research was carried out using an exploratory sequential design comprising two phases. In the first phase, in order to explore and identify traces of Academic Coloniality in the context, qualitative data were collected from seventeen ELT students and teachers in one Algerian university using in-depth, semi-structured interviews. The data were analysed using critical discourse analysis. Following this, the second phase of the study, quantitative data were collected from 479 student and teacher participants by means of online surveys. In this way the researcher sought to verify and generalise the findings of the first phase across ten Algerian universities.

The findings suggest that Academic Coloniality manifests itself in participants’ continuous quest to achieve ‘native-like’ competence and adopt a ‘native-speaker’ variety of English language and culture. This results from a combination of the colonial history of the context, the imbalanced power interactions between participants, and the idealised representations of ‘native speakers’ often portrayed by the media. These factors, coupled with a resistance to change imposed by some English language teachers who act as gatekeepers, and the lack of open channels of communication between the different parties, contribute to the maintenance and continuity of Academic Coloniality. In that sense, the concept emerges as a useful heuristic tool for conceptualising and contextualising practices and beliefs within ELT which prevent its decolonisation, and which might impede the creation of a future of ELT beyond Academic Coloniality.

Moreover, the study presents significant pedagogical and social implications that call for diversifying the current content of the curriculum in Algerian universities, revisiting some of the dominant classroom approaches to teaching, and moving away from the mindsets that create hierarchies in the ELT educational system by giving advantages to certain teachers and marginalising others. Ultimately, it is hoped that this new approach will contribute to the professional formation of scholars who are able to critically engage with power inequalities and thereby change their social realities.
Chapter 1: Introducing Academic Coloniality

1.1 Situating the Study within the Field of ELT

My research falls within the field of ELT: a field that has been widely studied in terms of its links to colonialism and colonial ideologies (Phillipson 1992, 2017, Pennycook 1998, 2007, Canagarajah 1999, 2005, Holliday 2005). This is not only because the field is rooted in the colonial history of the British and American Empires, which resulted in on-going long-lasting effects of colonialism in the field, but also because the current domination of its theories and practices are tightly linked to (neo)colonial relations such as globalisation (Pennycook 2007). In that sense, the global spread of English and ELT means that these colonial effects extend beyond the previous colonies to include the whole world. ELT in this case becomes a field shaped by power imbalances, one that promotes hegemonic and hierarchical discourses and ideologies of English and its perceived cultures (R’boul 2022). Such hegemonic discourses consider Western and Anglophone cultures superior and give them privileges at the expense of the local ones (ibid, p. 9). This is particularly true because ELT is predominantly founded in Western (particularly British and American) epistemologies (Motha 2014), which is reflected in the ELT classroom through various practices and ideologies such as native-speakerism (Holliday 2006). As such, ELT becomes a means of subordination and subjectification, and a means of marginalisation (Kumaravadivelu 2012, 2016). This has ultimately led to many calls within the field to decolonise its pedagogies through the production of knowledges and methodologies that are anchored in the local (Kumaravadivelu 2016). This requires paying close attention to the local’s specificities and the voices of its inhabitants, which brings the need for this research to the fore.

It is under such conditions that this study aims at exploring the intricacies of ELT in Algeria and its links to colonial discourses in the light of the novel rapid spread of the language in the country. It particularly addresses features of Academic Coloniality in ELT in higher education in Algeria. Academic Coloniality can be defined as the practices and beliefs of people involved in ELT that contribute to the production,
manifestation, and reproduction of certain power patterns between the ‘native speakers’ of English and its learners that might have further impact on the learner’s sense of identity, confidence, and performance (Canagarajah 1999, Selvi 2014). To date, most ELT research that has taken place in higher education in Algeria does not go in-depth to explore colonial practices and beliefs embedded in the way English is taught (Jacob 2019). The current study targets this research gap. It aims to investigate Academic Coloniality in ELT in higher education in Algeria to raise awareness towards possible effects of its features. In order to meet those aims, the research employs an exploratory sequential design within a mixed methods approach. The findings of this research contribute to the literature of English language education by providing an understanding of possible aspects of Academic Coloniality in Algeria and their impact on learners and educators. It also provides insights that are crucial for the process of raising awareness towards those. This research also looks at coloniality in ELT from a different angle as Algeria has not been colonised by an English-speaking nation before but rather a French one. This, however, does not spare English from echoing the same colonial structures as French. This can be problematic given the current efforts to promote the language in the country. These are reflected in the various educational reforms with the most recent of them being the introduction of English as a subject at primary schools (BBC 2022). As such, Algeria can provide a rich and unique context where efforts towards ELT’s decolonisation can be advanced through offering new insights and perspectives into how Academic Coloniality is manifested and (re)produced, and how it can be overcome.

1.2 Aims and Research Questions

In the current research, I seek to investigate what, if any, features of Academic Coloniality are evident among educators, among learners and within the curriculum itself in ELT in higher education in Algeria. Specifically, I look at how the beliefs and reported practices of people involved in ELT might, consciously or not, contribute to the (re)production of power patterns that result in their own marginalisation (Kumaravadivelu 2016).
The study also aims to contribute to broader discussions on the global spread of English and the effects of colonialism on language education. It acknowledges that the spread of English and ELT have brought about various benefits and opened many opportunities to fulfil the needs for people around the world (Crystal 1997), such as facilitating communication and promoting international trade and cooperation. However, it also acknowledges that these are not unproblematic. As such, it is important to recognise the potential negative impacts of this spread, particularly on marginalised communities and their languages and cultures. I believe that, by exploring the presence and (re)production of Academic Coloniality in the context of ELT in Algeria, this study can contribute to a better understanding of the broader implications of English language education and the need for critical language pedagogy.

In order to make the best out of the global spread of English, consciousness towards its surrounding conditions needs to be attained. By exploring those in higher education in Algeria, this study could identify ways to raise awareness of Algerian teachers and learners of English towards the possible effects of features of Academic Coloniality, which opens opportunities to act upon them and reach possible solutions. To do so, the study aims first at identifying possible aspects of Academic Coloniality and highlighting evidence of it before investigating what factors might contribute to its (re)production in this context. To meet these aims, the research seeks to answer two main questions:

RQ1: What, if any, evidence is there of Academic Coloniality within English language teaching in higher education in Algeria?

RQ2: How is Academic Coloniality (re)produced in this context?

The first research question (RQ1) seeks to identify whether any evidence of Academic Coloniality is present in ELT in higher education in Algeria. By exploring this question, the study aims to highlight any possible features of Academic Coloniality that might be present in this context. This is important because identifying these features is the first step towards understanding how they may impact the experiences
of teachers and learners, and how they might contribute to the (re)production of power relations that can result in their marginalisation.

The second research question (RQ2) seeks to investigate how Academic Coloniality is (re)produced in this context. By exploring this question, the study aims to identify the factors that contribute to the (re)production of Academic Coloniality in this specific context. This is valuable because it helps to inform the development of interventions that could be implemented to address the identified issues.

By addressing these research questions and exploring the beliefs and practices of educators and learners and the curriculum itself, the study aims to identify the features and factors contributing to Academic Coloniality and to inform policies and practices that promote more inclusive and equitable language education practices. The research can therefore contribute to a better understanding of the broader implications of English language education and the need for critical language pedagogy, both within Algeria and beyond.

1.3 Rationale and Personal Reflections

One of the incentives that pushed me to undertake this study was my personal experience as an Algerian student of English. For five years, from my first year at university up until I obtained my master’s degree, I was strictly instructed in various aspects of the English language: oral and written production, grammar, phonetics, linguistics, culture, and civilisation. During that period, I was encouraged to imitate the received pronunciation (RP) of the British ‘native speaker’, I learned that British English was the standard variety and that exposure to the British culture was necessary for me to learn the language. There is no denying that the education I received during those years has provided me with the necessary skills and qualifications to be a proficient English speaker, but I also had the mindset that the more I approximate the ‘native speaker’ proficiency, the more advantage I have in the field. I was convinced and protective of the ideology of one standard correct variety of English.
When I obtained my Masters, I had the chance to meet Prof Adrian Holliday, one the most influential figures in the field of ELT, Dr Diana Freeman and Prof Shane Blackman in a workshop in Algeria. Part of the workshop was a video of a mock viva of an American PhD student with Prof Holliday and Prof Blackman as examiners. Everyone in the room was impressed by how well the student did until Prof Holliday asked the present students the following question: “do you think that the PhD student did well because he is a native speaker?”. Everyone in the room, including myself, replied with “yes”. What troubled my mind at that point was why Prof Holliday, a ‘native speaker’, would ask that question? At the time, I did not realise that the intention from that question was to direct the attendees’ attention to some of the normalised beliefs we held about the ‘native speaker’. While a logical response to the question should have been “why would the fact that the student is a ‘native speaker’ be relevant to the quality of their work or their knowledge about their research?”, our response instead was an unquestionable “yes”. To me, being a ‘native speaker’ was enough to justify the student’s performance in his mock viva. In fact, I doubted the question itself before our answer. After the workshop, I did some research on Prof Holliday’s contributions, and how he problematised several aspects that were normalised to me in my studies including native-speakerism, Othering and several essentialist views about speakers of English and culture that I took for granted. After I moved to the UK, I was even more surprised by how different matters were between what I was taught, the actual use of English, and the unrealistic ideas I had about the ‘native speaker’. I became more interested in global English education, and I began to question several aspects of my beliefs and practices that I constructed about “good” English, how easily I identified right or wrong English, and how protective I was towards ‘native’ varieties. I started wondering about the extent to which ELT in Algeria is shaped by colonial beliefs and practices. Hence, this sprang my interest in carrying out this project upon which I report in this thesis.

In order to be able to raise awareness towards these and other similar concepts, it is crucial to achieve a deep understanding of the conditions, attitudes and circumstances in which English is being taught in
different contexts. Uncovering ideologies, if any, underpinning ELT in higher education in Algeria is necessary to introduce a more aware ELT system, especially given the field’s rootedness in colonial hegemonies. Researchers into ELT and its different paradigms (e.g., Seidlhofer 2001, 2011, Dewey 2012, Jenkins 2014, 2015, Saraceni 2015) emphasise the demand to investigate the implications of the international spread of the language in various contexts, which needs sometimes to go beyond countries where the spread of English and ELT is not a result of a direct Anglo-American imperialism (R’boul 2022). In fact, Canagarajah (1999), Swan, Aboshiha & Holliday (2015) call for research into those issues to be conducted from an ‘insider’ perspective in order to provide a deep understanding of the specific aspects of ELT within those contexts, which might not be accessible and noticeable to ‘outsiders.’ In other words, they encourage the investigation to be carried out by researchers from within the context itself. Accordingly, as a previous ELT student in an Algerian higher education institution who had first-hand experience of and interaction with problematic practices within ELT and was for a long time influenced by some of its colonial ideologies, I meet the criteria to provide an ‘insider’ perspective on the issues of the study. This research therefore seeks to thoroughly investigate features of Academic Coloniality within ELT in higher education in Algeria which would raise awareness towards any effects of these. This could contribute to the international English language education literature, as well as identifying ways in which the awareness of learners and teachers of English can be raised regarding the long-lasting effects of colonialism and (neo)colonialism in the field.

1.4 Outline of the Thesis

Nine chapters constitute this thesis. After the introductory Chapter 1, which aims at setting the scene to researching Academic Coloniality, introducing the aims and research questions, and exploring the rationale for conducting the study, Chapter 2: delves into the body of literature that shaped the study at hand. It starts by exploring the field of ELT. It specifically explores aspects of the field that are relevant to the study, namely, its (colonial) history, its different paradigms, and the different (colonial) ideologies that
are entrenched in it. The chapter then moves to presenting the context of the study followed by an introduction to its theoretical framework. It discusses the concept of Academic Coloniality and its usefulness in the field of ELT, particularly when combined with a Critical Discourse Analysis framework. **Chapter 3:** turns attention to the methodological design of the study. It situates the study within a research paradigm. It traces how the two phases of the study evolved and highlights the procedures of how data was collected and analysed. Furthermore, it deals with aspects of rigour and ethics. **Chapter 4:** and **Chapter 5:** present the findings of the first phase of the study. Chapter 4 engages with the manifestations and production of Academic Coloniality in higher education in Algeria. It traces back the factors that caused it to exist in the first place and how it is manifested in the beliefs and reported practices of the participants. Chapter 5, on the other hand, looks at the reasons behind the persistence of Academic Coloniality and its reproduction in ELT in the country. **Chapter 6:** of the thesis discusses the findings presented in chapters four and five. It looks at the findings from a macro level to offer a holistic understanding of how the three processes of production, manifestation, and reproduction come together rooting for Academic Coloniality. **Chapter 7:** presents the results of the quantitative phase of the study. It explores the generalisability of the beliefs and reported practices associated with Academic Coloniality on the various Algerian universities. **Chapter 8:** then discusses phase two’s findings and compares them to the findings of phase one, and then draws conclusions on their applicability to the wider context of the study. Finally, **Chapter 9:** summarises the findings and answers the research questions. It states the study’s contribution to knowledge, its pedagogical and social implications as well as its limitations and recommendations for further research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review: Problematising Dominant Approaches to ELT

2.1 Introduction

The English language has “touched the lives of so many people, in so many cultures and continents, in so many functional roles, and with so much prestige”

(Kachru 1990, p.5).

Such a status of the English language, however, does not come without a cost. The unprecedented spread of English has undeniable implications for how the language is taught and learnt. It further raises many concerns surrounding the imperial and oppressive history of the language. In this chapter, I engage with the most current literature and debates relevant to the current study and present its theoretical framework. In doing so, I also introduce a plethora of theoretical constructs including English as foreign language, English as a lingua franca, World Englishes, native-speakerism, and the (de)coloniality framework. The first section of the chapter provides historical glimpses at the field of ELT. It relates the emergence of the latter to the current state of English as the global language of international relations and moves on to explore the different paradigms within the field. The second section introduces the socio-historical background of Algeria as the context of the study and the development of ELT within higher education in the country. It describes the historical and linguistic situation in Algeria and focuses on the specificities of its higher educational system in relation to ELT. The final section of the chapter places the study within its broader theoretical frameworks. It introduces the concept of Academic Coloniality and attempts to define it within the context of higher education in Algeria and in relation to previous literature on colonialism and decolonisation. It discusses the usefulness of the concept in addressing current issues of (de)coloniality. The chapter concludes by exploring the potential for combining Academic Coloniality and Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough 2010) frameworks for a wholistic understanding of issues within ELT.
2.2 ELT: a Brief History

The study at hand falls within the field of ELT. The term was first introduced and adopted in 1946 in the UK by the British Council for their new journal, which is now known as ELT Journal (Howatt and Widdowson 2004, p. xvii). Since then, ELT has emerged as a recognisable field of study that focuses on issues surrounding the teaching and learning of the English language (Smith 2021). The emergence of ELT as a distinguishable and recognisable field of study in the twentieth century, especially following WWII, was prompted by several factors including the increased mobility of people around the world, the internationalisation of education, and the rise of multinational corporation and late capitalism (Hall 2016, p.2). More recently, the factors also included processes of globalisation and the development of digital communication technologies (ibid). The emergence of the field, however, has also strong ties with the continuous spread of the English language around the globe. Assuch, in order to provide a comprehensive account of the history of ELT, in what follows, I discuss the spread of the English language in relation to its colonial history. I further explain how the spread of English, hence the emergence of ELT, is also marked by the globalisation phase. I then turn to how these factors shaped and continue to shape previous and current understandings and approaches within ELT.

2.2.1 English Around the World

The spread of English around the world today can be traced back to its colonial and imperial history (Leith et al 2020). During the nineteenth century, English began to expand following the expansion of the British Empire until it became the language “on which the sun never sets” (Crystal 2003, p.10). According to Leith et al (2020), there are three types of English colonialism: 1) Displacement, which refers to the full displacement of the indigenous population by the English language speakers' settlers such as in North America, 2) Subjection, which is when the colonial settlers kept the indigenous population in subjection while allowing some of them access to learning English, and finally 3) Replacement, which entailed replacing the indigenous population by new labour from elsewhere through slave trade, resulting in them
abandoning their local languages. Besides spreading English around the world, colonialism has also resulted in the creation of many new varieties of English in many parts of the colonised world. As a result of the spread of English through colonialism, it is believed that there exist strong connections between ELT and colonial ideologies (Phillipson 1992; Pennycook 1994, 1998; Canagarajah 1999, 2005; Holliday, 2005). In fact, Pennycook (2001, p.19) goes further to regard ELT itself “a product of the Empire”. To describe the effects of colonialism on English and ELT, Kachru (1985) developed a three circles model in which he makes the distinction between, 1) inner circle which includes countries where English is spoken as a ‘native language’ (e.g., UK, US and Australia), 2) outer circle where it is a product of colonial history and is used as an additional language (e.g., previous UK and US colonies), and 3) expanding circle which comprises the rest of the world where English has no governmental role (e.g., Algeria). These distinctions are based on how the language is taught and used in the country as well as on its colonial history. Today, English continues to expand in a globalising world.

In contemporary discourse, globalisation has come to be used as a ‘fashionable’ catchword (Block & Cameron 2002, p.2), which needs to be handled with caution, particularly because the term may mean different things to different people (Kumaravadivelu 2006a p.1). As a phenomenon, globalisation is not new. Its scale and scope, however, have intensified (Coupland 2011, p.26). Giddens (1990, p.64) refers to the current phase of globalisation as “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice-versa.” Multinational corporations, international trade, and new communication technologies have all been facilitated by globalisation (O'Regan, 2021), leading to an increased demand for a common language of communication. In this context, English has become the primary language of global commerce, technology, and education, its use has become essential for individuals and organizations to participate in the global economy.
However, O'Regan (2021) argues that this trend has also reinforced the power imbalance between English-speaking countries and the rest of the world, resulting in the marginalisation of other languages and cultures. This is because the hegemonic effects of globalisation can present threats to the heterogeneity of local ways of life (Kumaravadivelu 2012). Fairclough (2006) cautions against the misuse of the word ‘globalisation’, as this may lead to the misrepresentation of what it is. This is particularly important because globalisation can be used to mask the continuation of a (neo)colonialist Western domination over the world (Kumaravadivelu 2006a) especially because the West is its driving force. According to Coupland (2011 p.23), globalisation can be seen as a process of Westernisation, Americanisation, and McDonaldisation that aims at maintaining control over previous colonies. Guttal (2007) points out that, while it is rooted in European colonialism, contemporary globalisation is a marker of capitalist expansion driven by a neoliberal policy to explore and exploit new markets. Given such conditions and given the (post/neo)colonial legacy, it comes as no surprise that English is the language of the globalised world (Gray 2012).

Under the conditions of globalisation, English has not only reached an unprecedented spread around the world but was also promoted as a necessary skill to meet the expectations of success in a globalised world. In the neoliberal belief, which promotes “liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterised by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade” (Harvey 2005, p.2), individuals are better valued if they acquire certain skills which are highly valued in the market. English, as the pre-eminent global language, is the language of success in such market (Gray et al. 2018, p.474; Block & Gray, 2018). Ferguson (2013), for instance, notes how the lack of English skills disadvantage certain individuals and interferes with their professional progress and equal opportunities for a better life. This was met by an increasing recognition for the importance of English in the global market which motivated countries to make learning the language a first concern (Jenkins 2015). This has resulted in the expansion of English at the expense of other languages and varieties (Ushioda 2017) while
pushing the boundaries of traditional economic and political imperialism to include language (Phillipson 1992, 2009). Phillipson (1992 p.47) uses the term English “Linguistic Imperialism” to refer to how the “dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural (material properties) and cultural (ideological properties) inequalities between English and other languages.” Linguistic imperialism calls into question the status of English in the world and examines its relation to other local varieties. It highlights the inequalities that are embedded within the hegemonic discourses around English which often attempt to depict it as “universal” and “global”. Such discourses, Phillipson (2009, p.29) argues, serve certain agendas of the powerful and seek to legitimise the hierarchical linguistic order. In that sense, English is loaded with ideological and political orientations that perpetuate the social and the hierarchical inequalities, which are reflected in ELT practices and policies.

2.2.2 Competing Paradigms of ELT

The global spread of English has ultimately marked the rise of ELT in the world. However, because the status of English today is deeply associated with historical colonialist and (neo)colonialist inequalities, ELT might well be (re)producing colonial ideologies. Such ideologies downgrading ‘local’ knowledge, specifically that which is not in English. They promote and strengthen the link between the English language and the ‘Western Culture’ and advocate it on the account of the local one (Kumaravadivelu 2006b). They engage in the ‘Othering’ of non-white learners, regarding them as inferior, and marginalising their local knowledge (Hsu 2017). At the present time, the effects of these ideologies are still manifested in certain practices within ELT (Phillipson 1992, Pennycook 1998, Canagarajah 1999, 2005, Holliday 2005, 2015). These practices continue to influence speakers of English as a second language, especially those from the ‘expanding circle’ (Kachru 1985, Jenkins 2014). In these contexts, English was taught in a similar way to what it had been in colonial contexts with little to no updates, thus, expanding circle countries have implemented English as a foreign language (EFL).
2.2.2.1 English as a Foreign Language (EFL)

Within the EFL paradigm, the main purpose of learning English is to be able to function and communicate with the ‘native speaker’ (Jenkins, 2014). This paradigm is often associated with Kachru’s model, which has been widely criticised by scholars for perpetuating inequality in the field of English language teaching. Jenkins (2006) argues that Kachru’s model reinforces the problematic distinction between ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ speakers, leading to discrimination and marginalisation of ‘non-native’ speakers. Similarly, Galloway and Rose (2013) argue that Kachru’s model is Eurocentric and fails to account for the global spread of English and the diversity of English language varieties. Crystal (2003) and Graddol (1997) also question the relevance of the ‘native speaker’ concept, as English is spoken as a lingua franca by millions of ‘non-native’ speakers. Rampton (1990) and Davies (2003) also argue that it is increasingly difficult to define what it means to be a ‘native speaker’ in a world where English is a global language with diverse and changing forms, and that the focus should be on effective communication in a global context rather than on adhering to a specific model of English. Graddol (1998) further argues that the future of English is likely to be characterised by increasing diversity and decentralisation, with the emergence of new varieties and forms of English that reflect the cultural, social, and linguistic contexts in which they are used.

Closely related to Kachru’s model, in the EFL paradigm, the ‘native speaker’ becomes the learning target, and learners and teachers tend to “idealise” the ‘native speaker’ (Rudolph et al. 2019), which gives rise to discrimination against ‘non-native’ speakers. Such idealisation is reinforced by how the ‘native speaker’ is represented in the media, which often portray stereotypical representations and unrealistic images of the latter (Dobrow & Gidney 1998, Mastro, Behm & Morawitz 2005, Lippi-Green 2012, Gluszek & Hansen 2013) and often exclusively reflects ‘native speaker’ varieties, such as Received Pronunciation (RP) as a standardised form of British English (Sonnesyn 2011, Dragojevic, Mastro, Giles & Sink 2016). In addition, the EFL paradigm emphasises the link between the English language and ‘Western Culture’ which justifies
the advantage given to the ‘native speaker’ teacher as they have the suitable cultural and methodological background (Holliday 2005). In what follows, I discuss these aspects in ELT in detail.

2.2.2.1 Native-Speakerism

The ideology of “native-speakerism” refers to “an established belief that ‘native speaker’ teachers represent a ‘Western culture’ from which spring the ideals both of English language and of English language teaching methodology” (Holliday 2005, p.6). Such belief is entangled with discourses of Othering and of ‘us’, i.e., ‘native speakers’ versus ‘them’ i.e., ‘non-native’ speakers. In fact, the terms ‘native’ versus ‘non-native’ are far from neutral; rather, they are intrinsically hierarchical and ideological (Holliday 2013, p. 25), and native-speakerism is closely associated with Whiteness (Kubota & Fujimoto 2013, p. 197). This is because the label ‘native speaker’ in native-speakerism typically refers to White Western-looking individuals from inner circle countries regardless of language proficiency (Aboshiha 2015). As such, the discrimination arising from this ideology affects both ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ speakers from inner, outer, and expanding circles. Because those teachers do not convey the typical socially constructed image of the ‘native speaker’, they can be underestimated regardless of their linguistic skills and contributions to the field of ELT. This view of ‘native speaker’ superiority is underpinned by the notion of essentialism, which defines human beings as cultural subjects who are located within a particular bounded world and are defined and differentiated by their culture, territory, or nationality (Grillo 2003, p.158). Essentialism assumes a "universal essence, homogeneity and unity in a particular culture" (Holliday et al. 2010: 1), which attributes fixed, rigid, and unchanging characteristics to speakers inherited at birth and impossible to escape. This belief system reinforces stereotypes and prejudices based on assumed inherent differences between individuals and groups, disregarding the complexity and diversity of human experience.

Nevertheless, the current role of English as the global language results in the inaccuracy, or at least ambiguity (Holliday 2009), of the notion of a ‘native’ and a ‘non-native’ speaker of English. Due to the
constant criticism of the notion and its inappropriateness (Widdowson 1994; Holliday 2009), the demand for an adequate definition resulted in several attempts, the most common of which is that being a ‘native speaker’ depends on whether one learns English as their first language (Cook 1999). This definition does not only fail to represent those who learn more than one language as their first ones, but it also entails the assumption that the linguistic competence of all ‘native speakers’ is the same. In this respect, this distinction is not a purely linguistic one; for example, some educators of English were labelled ‘native or non-native’ speakers based on their appearance (Holliday 2005; Sharifian 2009). Holliday (2005) also argues that the “non-” in ‘non-native’ speaker of English implies a sense of deficiency. To avoid this, Jenkins (2015) suggests different less connotative terminology that does not include the use of ‘native’. Jenkins’s suggestion reduces the implications of the previous distinction, especially that there seems to be an association of ‘nativeness’ with ‘standardisation’ (Seidlhofer 2011) (see Section 2.2.2.1.2). However, the most effective way to address such issues is addressing the beliefs of individuals and the ideologies surrounding ELT. While doing so, in this study, I follow Holliday’s (2013) recommendation to use the terms ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ with inverted commas. This is to emphasise their socially constructed, subjective, and ideological nature. The use of these two terms often goes in hand with the use of other hierarchical binaries such as ‘Western’ vs ‘non-Western’. Given that such labels are deeply embedded in the field of ELT and widely accepted and used in people’s everyday lives, it might not be feasible to avoid using them altogether. Instead, such labels can be signalled through using the inverted commas in order to avoid them being taken for granted as objective and value-free. Similarly, expressions like ‘Algerian Culture’ and ‘Western Culture’ can also reflect such essentialist views and lock individuals in pre-defined, simplistic, and static categories. In this case, using these terms with inverted commas reflects awareness of their ideological underpinnings while still acknowledging their roles in people’s lives, particularly because some speakers might still identify with such labels but resist the biases and stereotypes that come along with them (Doan 2016).
The tendency to single out the excellence and suitability of the ‘native speaker’ results in the well-established preference of and bias towards the ‘native speaker’ teacher whether in terms of employment in international settings or reputation in the workplace (Holliday 2005; Sharifian 2009). This is usually accompanied with a preference for the authentic, standard, and more desirable inner circle English varieties, especially for curriculum design and teaching methodologies (Matsuda, 2006; Jenkins, 2014). As a result, discrimination against ‘non-native’ speakers who tend to marginalise their local knowledge, culture, and varieties might occur. In a comparative study between students who were taught in English in an EFL environment and students who were taught in English in an inner circle context, Griffiths and Soruç (2019) report that EFL students were more in favour of ‘native speaker’ norms and less tolerant towards ‘non-native’ varieties. Besides the fact that these opinions could have been the result of the EFL paradigm, the study concluded that the students’ unrealistic views of the ‘native speaker’ and the struggle of the ‘non-native speaker’ to use English everyday also contribute to these attitudes (ibid.). These beliefs, coupled with the monolithic view of separate cultures to which people belong, lead to the demotion of the English language user that belongs to a ‘non-Western Culture’. In this sense, the ‘non-native’ speaker of English becomes a “problematic generalized Other to the unproblematic Self of the ‘native speaker’” (Holliday 2006, p.386) (see Section 2.2.2.1.4).

In the same context, contributions to academia produced within inner circle countries were also treated with the same prestige (Kumaravadivelu 2012). The varieties, methodologies, and approaches of English promoted within the EFL paradigm are dominated by those from the inner circle (dominantly Britain, Australasia, and North America (BANA), which represent “authentic” and “proper” standards, models, and norms of English (Lowe 2020, p. 23). This is due to the belief that ‘native speakers’ of English are ‘owners’ of the language, thus producers of such norms and standards (Matsuda 2003, Pillai 2008, Saraceni 2010, Akkakoson 2019). They are then implemented in the ELT classroom, reflecting a monolithic view of language, and any different forms of English, even those produced in outer or expanding circles are sub-
standard or just erroneous (Sifakis & Sougari 2005, Ranta 2010, Galloway 2013, Ke & Cahyani 2014, Jenkins 2014, Soruç 2015, Chen & Lin 2016, León 2018, Norton & Pavlenko 2019). In addition to these, there is also a tendency and persistence to favour the inner circle cultural aspects in teaching EFL contexts under the claim of the *authenticity, nativeness, and standardisation.*

### 2.2.2.1.2 The ‘Standard English’ Ideology

Closely related to the native-speakerism ideology is the ideology of ‘Standard English’ (Lowe & Pinner 2016). ‘Standard English’ is part of the broader ‘standard language’ ideology, which Lippi-Green (2012, p. 166) argues is “a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogeneous spoken language which is imposed from above, and which takes as its model the written language”. In ELT, “Standard English” refers to inner circle ‘native varieties’, particularly the varieties known as General American (GA) and Received Pronunciation (RP) spoken in North America and Britain (Jenkins 2019). This association between ‘Standard English’ and native-speakerism is rooted in the colonial history of the language and is perpetuated today by processes of globalisation (Tupas 2022). The belief in a single unitary and superior form of English that is spoken by ‘educated native speakers’ and which can be used to identify them (Jenkins 2019, p. 10) goes hand in hand with the belief in a ‘non-standard’ English, which comprises the ‘non-native’ English varieties spoken in outer and expanding circles. The latter is considered ‘deficit’ and ‘incorrect’ (Saraceni 2015) or in Quirk’s (1990, p. 9) words, ‘half-baked bakery’, therefore, not worthy of teaching and learning. ‘Standard English’ is given a prestigious and powerful status over ‘non-standard’ varieties and is considered the goal of learning English as a foreign language. Buckingham (2014), who investigated the attitudes of 350 Omani students towards teachers’ ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ status, found that students favoured ‘native-speaker’ teachers whose pronunciation reflected a standard UK and/or US English.

Despite its prevalence in ELT (Kiczkowiak 2018, p. 34), the belief in a monolithic homogeneous ‘Standard English’ which is the only correct model for teaching English has been closely scrutinised (e.g., Jindapitak
et al. 2018, Fang 2018, Seidlhofer 2018, Jenkins 2019). Seidlhofer (2018, p. 89) argues that ‘Standard English’ is an “ideological construct” that functions under the false assumption that this model constitutes the entire English language and that ‘native speakers’ know and own the language in its entirety (Seidlhofer 2011), which is far from true. This is because such a limited and simplistic belief only represents “a tiny portion” of English language speakers (Seidlhofer 2018, p. 89). It does not only exclude ‘non-native’ speakers from inner, outer, and expanding circles, but goes further to exclude ‘native speakers’ from inner circle who do not speak ‘typical Standard English’. In addition to that, such belief does not do justice to the English language use as it does not reflect its diversity and plurality even among ‘native speakers’ (Jindapitak et al. 2018, Jenkins 2019). Inherent to ‘Standard English’ therefore is a power imbalance hierarchisation of English varieties and its users. This hierarchy marginalises and discriminates against ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ speakers who represent the vast majority (Jenkins 2019). Despite this, ‘Standard English’ continues to be the dominant teaching model in ELT (Kiczkowiak 2018, p. 34), which does not only privilege certain Western English varieties over others but extends to ‘Western Culture’ as is explored below.

2.2.2.1.3 The Language-Culture Nexus in ELT

Language and culture are closely intertwined concepts, with language being shaped by the society in which it is spoken, while culture is expressed through the range of behaviours, beliefs, values, and customs communicated through language (Atamna 2008). As Thompson (2007) notes, “to learn a language is to be nurtured or apprenticed into the life-world of individual host people and groups” (p. 1, cited in Atamna, 2008). Given this connection, it is crucial to understand the relationship between language and culture in the context of language teaching and learning as it can have significant implications for ELT. This is particularly important because certain conventional models in ELT, such as 'native-speakerism' (see section 2.2.2.1.1 above), highlight how cultural biases and hierarchies based on race and nationality can reinforce the idea that only certain cultures or individuals are deemed "correct" or "superior" in their use.
of the English language, rendering the language-culture relationship in ELT problematic. Consequently, some scholars propose a critical intercultural approach, which interrogates the conventional notion of culture as a set of fixed identities linked to a specific group or nation, and instead views it as a verb, shaping and being shaped by language and communication practices (e.g., Kramsch & Hua, 2016; Piller, 2017). This approach highlights the significance of raising learners' awareness of the nuances of language use by individuals from diverse social affiliations and identities, and teaches them to comprehend the power dynamics behind intercultural exchanges. More recently, efforts are being made to understand the complex relationship between culture and language in the contemporary world and to address cultural biases and hierarchies in ELT practices, as discussed below.

Many studies investigated the beliefs, perceptions, and practices regarding teaching and learning Western and local cultures within the ELT classroom (e.g., Gray 2012, Monfared et al. 2016, Li & Liu 2019, Tajeddin & Pakzadian 2020). Findings of these studies have varied. For instance, Monfared et al. (2016), who looked at the attitude of teachers from inner (40 American, 36 British), Outer (44 Indian, 40 Malaysian) and Expanding (44 Iranian and 40 Turkish) circles towards cultural content of ELT books, concluded that most teachers supported a blending of cultures, both local and international, in their teaching materials. In their study, however, 13% of the teachers were more inclined towards native-speakerism and teaching English with a focus on ‘Western culture’. Bias towards ‘native speaker’ varieties and cultures within ELT practices was also evident in other studies. In their large-scale study, Li & Liu (2019) investigated how native-speakerism is reproduced, enacted and legitimised in ELT practices in China, which implement English as a foreign language (EFL) paradigm in English language education. Drawing on a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework, they used both qualitative (interviews) and quantitative (surveys) methods with teachers, students, and administrators to explore their cultural orientations in teaching English, their attitudes and perceptions towards the different English varieties, as well as approaches and methodologies to teaching English. Their findings revealed that there was a clear bias towards ‘native-
speaker’ varieties and culture, which were assigned a more prestigious status and considered a point of reference in learning English. Similarly, Tajeddin & Pakzadian (2020) evaluated the content of ELT textbooks against the representation of inner, outer, and expanding circle cultures and varieties. The study reports that the content was dominated by inner-circle varieties and cultures and teachers generally favoured them in teaching English.

Such focus on the ‘native’ speaker variety and culture in the EFL paradigm, however, fails to meet the demands of the global status that English has in the world. Seidlhofer (2005) notes that the majority of interactions in English do not involve a ‘native speaker’. In fact, this renders the assumption that the only purpose of learning English is to communicate with the ‘native speaker’ invalid. Subsequently, the aim of learning should no longer be the idealised ‘native speaker’, nor should the learner need to abide by their norms. Regarding EFL’s view towards culture, Holliday (2005, p.18) problematises determining and limiting people’s actions and knowledge based on what culture they grew up within because that takes the agency away from the person and attaches it to the culture. In this case, we pre-decide a person’s attitude, knowledge, and actions based on the stereotypes specific to their assumed cultures. Moreover, Baker (2009) argues that, although language can never be culture neutral, the relationship between language and culture is not fixed. That is, when using English, the speaker creates a new link between their individual cultural background and the language, and since cultures are not unmoving monolithic blocks, this relationship is not static. In this sense, the association of the English language to the ‘Western Culture’ that gives the ‘native speaker’ teacher advantage within ELT should also be as invalid. In the same vein, the situation of English as an international language demands that the persistence within the EFL paradigm on the advantage of the ‘inner circle culture’ should also be abandoned.

2.2.2.1.4 The ideology of ‘Self’ and ‘Other’

The dichotomous positioning of a dominant, global western ‘Self’ as opposed to a dominated, local non-western ‘Other’ is one of the manifestations of the power imbalances rooted in ELT’s colonial ideologies.
Within this dichotomy, the Self’s perspectives, varieties, and cultures are more valued as opposed to the Other’s perceptions. This is because the construction of the underdeveloped problematic Other is completely dependent on the image one has about the developed unproblematic Self (Pennycook 1998, Holliday 2005). Such image, which depicts the Other as inferior to a superior Self and shapes individuals’ beliefs and ideas about their knowledge, culture, and language, is perpetuated through tools such as education and media (Gramsci 1972; Çelik et al. 2017). This is evident in ELT within the EFL paradigm in the division ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ within TESOL, and in the TE/SOL cut of ‘Teaching English’ to ‘Speakers of Other Languages’ itself (Pennycook 2001) which reflects essentialist colonial constructions that portray a superior Self and an inferior Other (Shin 2006, p. 147). In fact, Holliday (2018, p. 9) reports that one might go further to distort the reality about themselves just to meet the Other’s expectations and achieve acceptance through ‘self-Othering’ or ‘selective essentialism’. An example of that is a study conducted by R’boul (2022a) in which he investigated the language ontologies of undergraduate and master students as well as university professors in Morocco, using focus groups and in-depth interviews. Students were willing to embrace a US or UK culture on the account of their own local culture. This is to associate themselves with an American or British lifestyle, which are thought to be more modern and attractive. Such belief is reinforced by their own ‘non-native’ teachers in the ELT classroom. The outcome of these practices and beliefs does not only ensure the continuity of the social inequalities, but also contributes to the stereotypes about Western culture and reinforces native-speakerism normativity (Kumaravadivelu 2003, Holliday 2005).

An explanation to why teaching English within the EFL paradigm persists despite all these issues reported above and despite the constant criticism and contributions of many scholars (e.g., Phillipson 1992; Jenkins 2014, 2015, Holliday 1999, 2005, 2015; Pennycook 1994, 1998, 2001; Seidlhofer 2001, 2011; Sharifian 2009) might be what is referred to as Reification (Berger and Luckmann 1979; Gergen 2001, Holliday 2005, 2020), i.e., the “think-as-usual professional routine” (Holliday 2015, p. 20), or Naturalisation (Fairclough
Reification to the letter means to turn something into a reality or make it real, and it takes place when something “exists over and above human behaviour” (Holliday 2005, P. 22). That is, the reified object gets normalised in people’s minds, and it no longer becomes a topic for debate (ibid.). In Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (see Section 2.4.3), ideologies can be reproduced through language use when they become “naturalised” or “commonsensical” as a result of their dissociation from the purposes they were created for; they then become commonly accepted within societies (Fairclough 2010, p. 37). In the same sense, the EFL paradigm assumptions discussed above get reified among speakers of English that they are no longer questioned. What this leads to is the lack of awareness towards those issues as they are taken as timeless rules that operate beyond discussion (Holliday 2005). This lack of awareness towards those unquestionable aspects might explain the persistence of the EFL paradigm in global English education. Another reason for that could be the fact that the alternative paradigms for ELT are not yet as practical.

2.2.2.2 English as a Lingua Franca and World Englishes

ELT researchers (e.g., Kachru 1986, 2006; Crystal 2006; Seidlhofer 2001, 2011; Saraceni 2015) are increasingly recognising the need for an alternative paradigm due to the failure of EFL paradigm to meet the demands for a globalised English. In this respect, McKay (2002, p. 1) states that “the teaching and learning of an international language must be based on an entirely different set of assumptions than the teaching and learning of any other second and foreign language”. This is because an international language’s ownership does not belong to a specific group of users, the ownership moves to whoever is speaking the language (Holliday 2005; Sharifian 2009). For this reason, it is important that English is taught with recognition to its international spread. In that respect, researchers are divided between two approaches towards English as an international language: English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) and World Englishes (WE). While both approaches have the same view towards the failure of the EFL paradigm (Jenkins 2014; Graddol 2006), they are still different in the way they explore the current state of English.
The origin of ELF is based on the idea that Englishes outside the inner circle should be allowed to develop away from any ‘native speaker’ interference, and corpora of such varieties are generated when otherwise ‘wrong’ linguistic forms occur frequently enough (Kuo 2006). One of the important recognitions made by advocates of ELF is that those creative linguistic forms are too recurrent to be dismissed (Mauranen 2012). That is, ELF focuses on exploring and describing how English is used in international settings between speakers of different backgrounds (Seidlhofer 2011; Galloway & Rose 2015). What also sets ELF apart from WE is that it recognizes all varieties of English throughout the inner, outer and expanding circles placing communication and not nativeness in its core (Seidlhofer 20011; Jenkins 2014). Even though ELF opposes the ‘native speaker’ language ownership, allows a certain level of inaccuracy, is about real-world interaction, and entails international multicultural communication (Galloway & Rose 2015), it still has its limitations. As a result of the unpredictability, fluidity, and broadness of how ELF corpus is generated, several concerns of codification and teachability arise (Kuo 2006; Matsuda & Friedrich 2012; Galloway & Rose 2015). These are some of the causes for one of the main struggles to incorporate ELF within classrooms: the lack of ELF practical teaching material (Galloway & Rose 2017). Matsuda (2012) also expresses this issue where educators, even if they wish to incorporate an international approach to ELT, often do not have the choice due to the lack of teaching material. In this context, Galloway & Rose (2015) explain that even though ELF is closely related to ELT, its main aim is not to provide ELT material, but to explore and describe how English is used in international settings.

The emergence of WE was based on the description of the status and use of English varieties in contexts with Anglo-American colonial history. WE scholarship aims to contribute to the codification and establishment of these varieties as official Englishes abiding by the norms of the respective contexts they are in rather than those of the ‘native speaker’ (Kachru 2006). In other words, for WE, the nativized varieties that emerge in these contexts are not failed attempts to imitate the ‘native speaker’ varieties; instead, they are an expression of these people’s sense of identity and detachment from the ‘native
speaker’ (Jenkins 2014). Because people’s identities are often linked to their sense of nationality, WE scholarship acknowledges boundaries of the nation-state in its approach to English as a global language. That is to say, this approach has nationalism at its heart, and the exploration of the varieties of English takes place within the boundaries of that (Pennycook 2009; Jenkins 2014). Seidlhofer (2009) points out that because of these, WE does not extend enough to include English varieties from inner and expanding circles. The other debate within WE approach is whether there exists only one World English with its different varieties or are those varieties independent enough to be regarded as separate World Englishes (Kachru et al. 2006). In this research, the tendency is to use World Englishes because claiming one World English from which spring the other varieties fails to represent the creative side of the formation of those Englishes and could cause a similar effect of the variety chosen as the ‘standard’ (ibid.).

It seems that neither the ELF nor the WE approaches provide a paradigm that fully represents the global spread of English and can be adopted for ELT classroom practices at the same time. Perhaps it is best to bring together the strengths of both approaches to provide a degree of both representativeness and practicality. In this sense, ELF’s aim of exploring and describing the global use of English in relation to Kachru’s (1985) circles of Englishes would help represent the current situation of the language in all contexts, which helps overcome WE’s shortage as it only focuses on English varieties in post-colonial territories (Seidlhofer 2009). Additionally, the way WE approach separates varieties of English based on national boundaries and seeks to officialise them in their contexts helps with EFL’s shortage in providing practical ELT material. That is, within a specific variety, it is acceptable to state what is correct and incorrect; this does not only provide criteria for evaluation for teachers and a codified variety to teach that is suitable for the local context, but it also presents local learning targets for students on the long run (Harmer 2010). ELF’s focus on communication in English would also be vital for the codified varieties not to unintelligibly develop apart.
It would also be important that one of the main focuses of such paradigm should be exposure and appreciation of the plurality of Englishes around the world (Jenkins 2014). Classroom activities can be one way of ensuring that. For example, Rose & Galloway’s (2017) study about increasing world Englishes awareness revealed that classroom activities that encourage language learners to engage with World Englishes succeeded in raising their awareness towards the topic and being critical towards those varieties. Highlighting to the students the fact that abiding by ‘native speaker’ norms is not essential for communication and the inaccuracy of representation of the ELF paradigm, the study concluded that exposure to the current spread and plurality of Englishes around the world allows learners to make more critical and informed choices about which varieties to adopt (Canagarajah 2011; Rose & Galloway 2017).

2.3 ELT in the Algerian Context

Algeria is a north-African country with a large population that can be divided into two ethnic and linguistic groups, Arabs and Berbers. Throughout its history, the country had been subject to many occupations and colonisations. This ultimately shaped the sociolinguistic landscape of the country and affected language education including English. Before closely examining ELT’s policies, approaches, and methodologies within higher education in Algeria, it is crucial to provide a socio-historical background of the country in order to understand the context in which English emerged as a sociolinguistic reality, its relation to other languages and varieties in the region, and how it was introduced to the educational sphere in Algeria.

2.3.1 Algeria: A Socio-Historical Background

Due to its rich and complex history, Algeria is linguistically a diverse and plurilingual country with two official languages, Berber and Arabic, which are not mutually intelligible, and a semi-official French language, which is spoken by the majority as a lingua franca. The original occupiers of the land are Berbers who, throughout history, have not been successful controlling their land (Benrabah 2014). Many Berbers’ traditions and languages survived within the region through about 23 centuries of colonisation by
Romans, Vandals, Byzantines, Arabs, Turks and finally the French by isolating themselves through these periods, but multilingualism was the norm for many other areas (Djité 1992). In the second half of the seventh century and early half of the eighth, Arabic reached North Africa with the Muslim Arabs successfully spreading Islam among the majority of Berbers; it was for this that the relationship between Islam and Arabic was strong (Gellner 1973; Benrabah 2014). Bentahila (1983) too puts this acceptance down to the “link between Arabic and religion, and maybe also because of the respect they felt for the written forms which their own language did not possess” (p. 2). That same association to Islam also preserved the standard form of Arabic (Classical Arabic), while a lower regional variety of it developed because of the contact with Berber (Benrabah 2014).

Between July 5th, 1830, and July 5th, 1962, Algeria was subject to the French colonisation. During that period, the French Colonial policies to ‘civilise’ and ‘cultivate’ the Algerian ‘Other’ included deculturization and Frenchification of what was seen as uncivilised culture and inappropriate languages to them (Benrabah 2014). Messaoudi (2012) argues that because of that, both Berber and Arabic were expected to fade away. In fact, the number of speakers of both languages exponentially decreased in the first 50 years of colonisation when more than a million Algerian people were killed (Kateb 2012). By the end of colonisation, French was the everyday-speech language or at least part of it as both local languages were affected by it, the number of Berber speakers decreased to half and those of Arabic by a third, and Algeria was the second largest French speaking country after France (Rezig 2011; Benrabah 2014). This was evident in the country’s continued dependency on the French language. In fact, due to the colonial policies, which aimed at restricting Algerians’ access to education, this dependency on the legacies of the French colonialism went as far as adopting the French colonial university system after independence (Abid-Houcine 2007, Belmihoub 2018). The postcolonial legacy of French is still evident in Algeria today through the country’s linguistic dependency on foreign languages, specifically French, in the various
domains of everyday life, in addition to holding the language in a higher status and giving it more power over the local varieties (Benrabah 2013) continuing a coloniality of French language beyond colonialism.

After the independence, the most significant act of decolonisation (see Chapter 2, 2.4.2) that took place in the country was the adoption of Arabic and its implementation in most domains between 1962 and 1976, i.e., Arabization (Benrabah 2007). The local varieties of Arabic and Berber, both affected by their contact with French, were sought to be replaced by Classical Arabic. The latter was declared as the official language of the country, which was heavily criticised for neglecting Berber that only joined Arabic as an official language in 2002 (Benrabah 2014). In education, it was difficult to implement this policy because “[t]he illiteracy rate stood at around 90% with only 5.5% (around 300,000) of the population literate in Literary Arabic only” which meant a deficiency in teachers, curriculums, and curriculum designers (Benrabah 2004; Benrabah 2014, p. 46). To meet the need, about a third of the instructors employed were not Algerians; most were Egyptians and Syrians (Rezig 2011). In turn, this was problematic, because although they were more qualified than the local instructors, they did not share the same belief in the purpose of Arabization (ibid.).

After Arabization, ELT was only introduced after the second reform in the mid-70s. During that period, English was taught as a compulsory class in the 8th grade to 13 years old learners (Rezig 2011). English competed with French for the foreign language status in the country, and in 1993 both languages were available for pupils and their parents to choose to be taught at 4th grade (Benrabah 2007). Despite the association of French with the painful memories of French colonisation, it was, surprisingly, chosen over English by the majority of parents. Benrabah (2014) explains that the policies followed by authorities to implement English in primary schools were similar to those of the French colonisers, and they “did not take into account Berber and dialectal Arabic as the people’s first languages” (p. 51). Ignoring the diversity of the people’s linguistic backgrounds led them to resist the authorities’ suggestions to implement English (ibid.). Despite resistance in the past, efforts to introduce English in primary schools finally succeeded
when in August 2022, the Algerian president announced that 3rd year primary school pupils are to be taught the English language stressing that "it is a reality that English is the international language." (BBC 2022). In higher education, foreign languages in general, and English specifically were not given much importance during Arabization; in fact, it was only after the failure of the Arabicized higher education system that English and French received more attention (Entellis 1981). After that, the Algerian higher education became a more open multilingual system with the implementation of the LMD system (Licence, Master, Doctorat) in 2004/2005 (Mami 2013).

One of the important points to note about the educational reforms in Algeria in general and ELT specifically is the effect of colonialism on the decisions made after independence. In this regard, Benrabah (2014) states that the “influence was so deep that Algerian society was never the same again” (p. 46). The majority of people who formed the independence government were schooled and trained by the colonisers (Benrabah 2007). As a result, the majority of ‘intellectuals’ had radically essentialist views regarding culture and language teaching and learning. This would explain some of the decisions made during Arabization, neglecting Berber as the first language, implementation of English, and even adopting EFL paradigm to teach English due to the possible persistence of these ideologies. In recent years, English in Algeria is increasingly gaining more momentum. This is evident in the increase of interest of students in the English language especially by the younger generations (Benrabah 2014; Belmihoub 2018; Bouhmama & Dendane 2018). It is also evident in the changing political and social discourses around English in the country, and the increasing efforts to promote it (for instance, in August 2022, the Higher Council for Youth drafted its statement in English for the first time in its history). Although English is presented as a ‘neutral’ language in Algeria, the language is highly politicised (Jacob 2019). It is presented as a decolonial alternative and a political attempt to reduce French’s value and replace it (Troudi 2022, p. 138). For instance, in August 2019, the minister of higher education, Tayb Bouzid, urged Algerian universities and higher education institutions to prioritise the task of improving English over French saying
that, “French does not get us anywhere” (British Council 2021, p.35). However, aspirations for breaking free from the linguistic dependency on French by switching to English can be hindered by the French language coloniality. Algeria has for long been a battleground where local and foreign languages existed in constant competition and power imbalances. This can be perpetuated by English. Both English and French are thought to be the languages of modernity, openness to the world, and of prestige by Algerians as opposed to Arabic and Berber which are regarded as local and representing traditions and heritage, despite their official status (Benrabah 2013). Besides globalisation, the media have also been shaping these beliefs about English (Soares 2017) and growing interest in it by the younger generation due to their extensive exposure to American culture through films and music, which portray an idealised Western lifestyle that students want to associate with (Belmihoub 2018).

This historical background qualifies Algeria as an expanding circle country (Kachru 1985). That is, English in the country has neither an official status nor a colonial history. These characteristics of the Algerian context are essential for this study. As argued above, despite the status of English in Algeria, this does not mean that ELT was not affected by colonial ideologies. ELT in higher education in Algeria adopts the EFL paradigm, which is discussed above to have failed to meet the global status of English and might be the reason for the persistence of other ideologies (Sharifian 2009, Jenkins 2014). In fact, the scarcity of research about the ideological effects of the EFL paradigm in higher education in Algeria is alarming, and it could be because those assumptions got reified among teachers and learners of English that they no longer become a topic of debate and are being constantly reproduced through everyday practices (Fairclough 2010; Holliday 2005). In the same vein, Canagarajah (1999) and Holliday (2015) emphasise the need for research into those issues to be from within those contexts themselves as the sense of identity may prevent ‘outsiders’ to effectively contribute. For this reason, awareness needs to be raised towards the effects of the EFL paradigm within this context that most of which are thought to be colonial. More detail on ELT in higher education in Algeria is provided in the next section.
2.3.2 ELT in Higher Education in Algeria

In 2004, Algeria introduced the LMD system as an educational reform as part of its aspirations to internationalise Algerian universities and to open up to the (Western) world (Mami 2013). LMD (Licence - 3 years, Master - 2 years, PhD - 3 years) is a francophone educational structure that uses the European Credits Transfer System (ECTS). The reform included profound structural and pedagogical changes to the Algerian universities. As opposed to the previous “classical” system, LMD reduced the number of the Licence degree years to three instead of four, changed the nature of the master’s degree, previously known as “Magister” and granted access to postgraduate studies with relative ease. The reform also changed the nature of assessment by placing emphasis on formative assessment throughout the academic year instead of a reliance on one summative exam at the end of the year (see Meriem & Bouyakoub (2020) for an overview of the changes brought about by the LMD system). Furthermore, it gave more freedom to teachers to develop their own courses (Azzi 2012). The development of the courses, however, is expected to go in line with the Canevas. The Canevas is an official policy document issued by the Algerian Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (MHE) that serves as general guidelines on the courses’ content and classroom practices. It is issued/revised on a regular basis after a series of meetings with senior teachers across state universities. This places the power of change in classroom practices and courses content in the hands of senior teachers and excludes junior teachers, which accentuates an age division between educators within higher education in Algeria. One of the main changes brought about by the LMD system is the shift from a teacher-centred approach towards a learner-centred teaching approach with a focus on a ‘competency-based’ pedagogical approach. A competency-based approach aims at developing employable, competent, and autonomous learners (Messekher & Miliani 2017). It gives students more agency to contribute to their own learning and take more control inside the classrooms while teachers act as guides and facilitators of the learning process. English plays a great role in the implementation of these changes to the educational system in Algerian universities as it is regarded
as the language of internationalisation. As such, in 2010, the MHE in Algeria made English courses compulsory to all disciplines across higher education, being it learning English for academic purposes or for specific purposes. This took place with an increasing number of students and teachers enrolling in English departments in the same academic year (Benrabah 2013, p. 124).

The efforts made to improve the quality of education in Algerian universities touch upon ELT. ELT in this context heavily draws from the EFL paradigm (British Council 2021) and involves the teaching of the linguistic aspects of the language such as the four skills, reading, speaking, listening, and writing, besides modules on English literature, history, and culture. Based on the changes mentioned above and the implementation of the competency-based approach, the focus on language was replaced by a focus on communication and the aim was to enable students to communicate in the target language across different contexts. Nevertheless, the steps taken to promote English and the emphasis on switching from traditional structure towards a focus on communication in ELT is not reflected in reality as the absence of systemised teacher training has prevented such switch and resulted in a clash of pedagogies (Milliani 2012). As the LMD reform was introduced, teachers were put under the pressure of aligning their “folk pedagogies” with the “Western LMD model” without appropriate training (ibid). Zourez (2017, p. 206) summarises the situation of ELT within the LMD reform as “new teaching approach, new textbooks, and little training”. Consequently, the teacher-centred approach and its implications continued under the LMD system. For instance, English in higher education in Algeria today is still ‘taught to the test’ (Benmoussat & Benmoussat 2018) which does not reflect true progress (Schweisfurth 2011).

Benmoussat & Benmoussat (2018, p.4) argue that “EFL teachers at university level will find themselves facing students who only excel in reproducing faithfully exact forms of knowledge in exam seats rather than having considerable skills in dealing with the language communicatively.” The authors argue that this is because the content and form of ELT in student’s 3rd year secondary education were designed to serve the Baccalauréat (BAC) exam thus developing students’ single-minded focus on passing the exam that
continues to higher education. Students become passive receivers of the knowledge that their teachers provide with the sole purpose of reproducing it during their tests in order to pass. This can reinforce a power imbalanced teacher-centred classroom interactions, where the teacher is held as the “all knowing” producer of knowledge who shapes and moulds learners’ views without being challenged (Burgess & Etherington 2002; Nishino 2012, Xu 2012, Bagheri & East 2021). This can also be because the use of English in Algeria is restricted to the confines of the English departments and/or the media (Jacob 2019). As such, classroom practices that disadvantage students and obscure their voices can continue in the absence of forms of open dialogue, such as the collection of formative feedback from students about classroom practices (Lerang, Ertesvåg, & Havik 2018, Vattøy & Smith 2019). The exclusion of students from decision-making processes does not only marginalise their voices but can also have far-reaching consequences on their learning experience (Bailey & Garner 2010, Ajjawi & Boud 2018). This, coupled with factors like class size, lack of equipment and resources, lack of training, the implementation of teacher-centred methods, and the poor implementation of the LMD system (Bouazid & Le Roux 2014; Boukhari 2019; Rezig 2011; Benleulmi & Hadiby-Ghoul 2015) contribute to the lack of language skills of students and their criticality.

With this lack of criticality and the implementation of the EFL approach and its colonial inclinations, people involved in ELT in higher education can, knowingly or otherwise, contribute to their own marginalisation, especially because some voices are cast aside and left unheard as a result of factors such as the age division mentioned above (see also Nias 2002, Angelides 2004). This inevitably continues a power imbalanced relationship between people involved in ELT and maintains colonial practices within it. In fact, many studies have shown that senior and more experienced teachers are more likely to be resistant to change (Angelides 2004, Hargreaves 2005, Zimmerman 2006, Ibrahim & Zaatari, 2013, Avidov-Ungar & Magen-Nagar 2014, Snyder 2017; Tariq, Dilawar & Muhammad 2019, Hamlaoui 2021). Therefore, they can be more adherent to some of the problematic practices within ELT. This can be alarming to the whole educational system in Algeria given the rising popularity of English in the country and that the majority of
English university graduates become teachers in middle, secondary, and very recently primary schools as well as teachers of English for specific and academic purposes in higher education (British Council 2021, p.21).

2.4 Academic Coloniality in ELT: Theoretical Frameworks

In this section, I introduce the theoretical framework of the study by combining the theoretical assumptions of (de)coloniality and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). In what follows, I present an overview of both frameworks and their assumptions in relation to the issues discussed above and in relation to ELT. I also lay the foundation for the concept of Academic Coloniality, which shapes the study at hand. I situate the concept within the body of literature relevant to it, and explore in-depth how it adds to it, and how, when combined with a CDA framework, it can contribute to the wider field of ELT.

2.4.1 From Colonialism to Coloniality

“We breathe coloniality all the time and everyday”

(Maldonado-Torres 2010, p. 97).

A key concept in this research is Academic Coloniality, but in order to properly define it, it is important to understand what colonialism and coloniality denote. Maldonado-Torres (2007) defines colonialism as “a political and economic relation in which the sovereignty of a nation or a people rests on the power of another nation” (p. 243). In the same context, Williams (1983) states that a definition of colonialism that does not specify the nature of the control of the dominant nation is ambiguous to whether the control is merely political; thus, colonialism ends with the political independence, or more than that (economic, cultural, and ideological), where political independence does not much affect the state of the colonised nation (cited in Pennycook 1998). Colonialism, Osterhammel (1997, as cited in Sommer 2011, p. 189) argues, implies that: 1) one society takes control over another society’s autonomous developments (2) such control is legitimised by ideological conditioning, and (3) these ideologies create “cultural gaps” that
separate between coloniser and colonised. Colonialism therefore entails a cultural process through which discriminatory and hierarchical ideologies are imposed on the colonised to legitimise domination and oppression. The ideologies establish the superiority of the coloniser and their knowledge, values, and cultures, and the inferiority of the colonised and allows colonialism to persist and reproduce (Fandiño-Parra 2021). Understanding it as such means that the end of the political presence, settlement, and control of one nation in the territory of another, i.e., colonialism, does not end its effects. In fact, Pennycook (1998) states that colonialism has a permanent effect that stretches to the present day, that is coloniality.

Coloniality refers to the “long-standing patterns of power that emerged as a result of colonialism” (Maldonado-Torres 2007, p. 243). In this sense, in the contemporary world, the Western colonial mindset persists beyond the end of colonialism and its effect can reach both cultural and educational patterns in a way that is further than that of colonialism (ibid.). This persisting aftermath of the colonial experience is reproduced through the colonial matrix of power that can be observed in the coloniality of economy and authority (the long-standing patterns of colonialism and its effects on modern forms of exploitation, labour, and domination), the coloniality of knowledge (manifested in the long-standing patterns of colonialism and its effects on knowledge production and education), and the coloniality of being (the long-standing patterns of colonialism and its effects on the lived experience of individuals and on language) (Quijano 2000; Maldonado-Torres 2007, p.242). It is embodied in the hegemonic practices, discourses, knowledges, ideologies, languages, and in the structures of social realities (race, class, gender, linguistic imperialism, etc.) and the political ones (Western over non-Western, North over South, centre over periphery, etc.) (Figueroa & Lindgren 2016, p.443). Through coloniality, the myth of a “post-colonial” world has been revoked as the end of “global colonialism” marking the beginning of a new era of “global coloniality” (Grosfoguel 2007; Dastile & Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013).
The relationship between colonialism and coloniality can therefore be understood as one of cause and effect. Colonialism is the historical process by which one group takes control of another, while coloniality refers to the ongoing effects of that process. Coloniality is the enduring legacy of colonialism, and it is maintained by the same power relations that were established during the colonial era. The power dynamics of colonialism laid the foundation for the ongoing domination of colonisers over the colonised, and the legacy of colonialism can be seen in the structures and institutions of contemporary societies. In his influential book *Black skin, white masks*, Fanon (1967) argued that colonialism was not just a political and economic system, but also a social and psychological one. According to Fanon (2001), colonialism sets the stage for the captive mind, i.e., a state of mind that results from colonialism and is characterised by a psychological dependence on the coloniser, by displacing the local and disconnecting them from their cultural roots (Alatas 2019). This is accomplished through what Fanon (1967, 2001) refers to as "cultural violence," whereby the coloniser imposes their own culture and language on the colonised while suppressing the local culture and language. As a result, the local becomes alienated from their own culture and internalises the values and beliefs of the coloniser, leading the colonised to experience a psychological dependence on the coloniser (Fanon 1967). Fanon (2001) also argues that the captive mind is a direct consequence of the colonial situation, in which the local intellectual is separated from their people and culture, rendering them unable to contribute to social and political change. The local intellectual often becomes a pawn of the coloniser and perpetuates the status quo rather than challenging it, as they have been educated in the language and culture of the coloniser and have internalised their values. Therefore, coloniality is not only the afterlife of colonialism but a constitutive element of modernity and a persistent condition that reproduces inequality and oppression. Coloniality is sustained by discursive and material practices that configure the world in a certain way, with the only way to overcome it is through revolution (Fanon 2001). This provoked the emergence of a “decolonial turn” to resist the hegemonic power produced and maintained by the ongoing power domination of colonialism (Maldonado-Torres 2006).
Central to the “decolonial turn” is the concept of decolonisation or decoloniality. It is defined “as a project that aspires to create a world with symbols, relations of power, forms of being, and ways of knowing beyond modernity/coloniality” (Maldonado-Torres 2018, p. 112). In the field of ELT, decoloniality involves the revisiting of methods, approaches, and theories that are the result of the hegemonic and colonial discourses (Guerrero-Nieto & Polo 2022, p. 137). Although for more than two decades now, coloniality within ELT has been extensively explored and studied in the field, Kumaravadivelu (2016, p. 82) points out that its aspects persist and continue to shape ELT practices. Tupas (2022, p. 148) argues that ELT is a continuing colonial project and remains a nexus of coloniality. The author draws attention towards the potentially misleading postcolonial discourse which celebrates the agentive nature of ‘Global Englishes’ within the field which in turn might render enduring inequalities invisible. For example, Fang et al., (2022) notice that despite the solid scholarship on World Englishes and ELF, the native-speakerism ideology and practices, which privilege inner-circle norms, persist in the educational settings. This stubborn persistence of native-speakerism (Houghton & Bouchard 2020; Matsuda 2021) denotes the continuation of colonial legacies in ELT. This prompts a pressing need in the field to explore more nuanced methodologies and knowledges beyond those that are currently available for any meaningful attempt to decolonise it (R’boul 2022b, p. 117). To do so, I propose the concept of Academic Coloniality.

2.4.2 Academic Coloniality within ELT

In the quest for a meaningful and functional theorisation of decoloniality, it is crucial not to fall into the “structuralist trap” of theorising colonial hegemonic power as totalised formations out of reach (Gibson-Graham 1996; Mösching 2019), i.e., theorising it as monolithic, ubiquitous, and all-encompassing might paradoxically contribute to its continued hegemony. The risk is that, by not accounting for the differences across the contexts and even across the fields and domains that are potentially affected by coloniality, some voices might continue to be marginalised. Taking this into consideration, I suggest the term “Academic Coloniality” as a more apt term to explore traces of coloniality that are specific to ELT contexts.
This can be particularly useful given that the coloniality framework can be broad and encompassing of wider economic, political, and social domains. Furthermore, I investigate forms of Academic Coloniality within ELT in a context that was not directly affected by Anglo-American colonialism, which may enrich current approaches within the field that emerged and were developed drawing on the colonial history of English (R’boul 2022b, p. 116). This is further explained below.

Academic Coloniality in ELT can be defined as “the practices and beliefs of people involved in ELT that contribute to the production, manifestation, and reproduction of certain power patterns between ‘native speakers’ of English and its learners” (Daffri & Taibi 2023). Through the lens of Quajino’s (2000) and Maldonado-Torres’s (2007) coloniality framework, the concept aims to scrutinise embedded coloniality in ELT pedagogy at both the macro (i.e., beliefs and ideologies) and micro (i.e., reported classroom practices) levels. It looks at the contemporary manifestations of coloniality in ELT and how practitioners, educators, and learners contribute to its (re)production. In its core, Academic Coloniality entails a conceptualisation of the educational policies and practices within ELT that are related to “the coloniality of language” (Verneolli 2015, 2016; R’boul 2022b). The “coloniality of language” is a process through which the coloniser dehumanises and racializes the colonised through language (Verneolli 2015, p.119). Vernonelli (2015, p. 118) explains that European colonialism systemically worked towards depicting indigenous language practices as animal-like forms of language that can only convey simple forms of expressions that he called “simple communication”, contrary to European languages which can express complex worldviews. This created a hierarchy of superior languages of the coloniser and inferior forms of “simple communication” of the colonised. Language as such plays a central role in producing and sustaining colonial hegemonic systems of power and serve in the continuous linguistic othering of ‘non-native’ speakers (R’boul 2022b, p. 22). The perceived superiority of the ‘native speaker’, their culture, knowledge, and norms as explored in the “coloniality of language” framework are entangled with histories of
colonialism and are reflected in ELT practices such as the emphasis on inner-circle varieties and cultures (see Section 2.2.2.3.1 above).

The coloniality of language results in the subalternity of local varieties and when extended to ELT as Academic Coloniality, it further affects local cultures and knowledges. Language and language teaching in this case become a means of domination and of privileging or marginalising certain voices. This is particularly true when such practices are reified and naturalised (see Section 2.2.2.3.1 above) and become self-inflicted. Kumaravadivelu (2012, p.22) introduces the concept of “self-marginalization” within ELT to refer to “the ways in which the periphery surrenders its voice and vision to the centre.” It is a process through which teachers and learners contribute to their own marginalisation and legitimise colonial ideologies that view them as inferior. They do so through the unreflective and uncritical conformity to the norms in language use and language teaching (Lankiewicz & Wąsikiewicz-Firlej 2016, p.150).

Consequently, marginalisation is sustained internally because officials and teachers “are buying into what was offered by the dominant stakeholders, dismissing their own expertise and indigenous knowledge, engaging in the practice of self-marginalisation” (Widin 2010, p. 60 as cited in Kumaravadivelu 2012, p. 23). In that sense, unravelling self-marginalisation requires more than just changing the conditions surrounding the marginalised, it requires changing their whole mindset and consciousness (Freire 1972, p. 47). This can only be achieved through a deep understanding of the beliefs, views, and ideologies that lead to self-marginalisation within people involved in ELT. Academic Coloniality therefore builds on the concept of self-marginalisation to further explore the reasons behind it in ELT. In addition to that, it takes the concept a step further through looking at other external factors that contribute to coloniality within ELT in a context that was not directly affected by previous Anglo-American colonialism, but which arguably might carry traces of it.

Although it is characterised by colonial features, Academic Coloniality in ELT in higher education in Algeria is not the result of previous Anglo-American colonialism. The almost unique history of Algeria makes it a
perfect context to investigate Academic Coloniality in ELT because, even though it has never been colonised by an English-speaking country, it is a post-colonial one, and it adopts an EFL paradigm that arguably contributes to several colonial ideologies. Taking into consideration the recent and rapid spread of English in the country and the advocacy for it as a neutral alternative decolonial language to break free from the colonial legacy of French (see Section 2.3.1 above), this can mean that practices and ideologies within ELT can continue oppressive power-imbalanced dynamics between English and local varieties in the Algerian society and between the ‘native speaker’ and learners of English. This can be further aggravated by the lack of research on aspects of coloniality within ELT in Algeria as most of the current research focuses on the discourse about an “empowering” and “developmental” English that needs to be embraced and taught (Jacob 2019, p.47). This can be attributed to the lack of awareness about the issue, especially because English is presented as a “neutral” language with no colonial history in the country (see Section 2.3.1). As a result, this study aims to fill what I identified as a gap in the literature about ELT in higher education in Algeria through looking at aspects of Academic Coloniality in this context.

### 2.4.3 Academic Coloniality and Critical Discourse Analysis

The current study adopts Fairclough’s (1989, 1992) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) theoretical approach to try to highlight some of the attitudes, practices, and policies within ELT in higher education in Algeria to explain them in terms of power relations with the ‘native speaker’ and seek to raise awareness towards their possible effects. Capone and Mey (2016) describe CDA as a problem-based movement of research between “a loosely networked group of scholars that began in the 1980s in Great Britain and Western Europe and has since burgeoned into an international set of approaches that explores the connections/relationships between language use, its producers and consumers, and the social and political contexts, structures, and practices in which it occurs” (p.72). According to Fairclough (2010), there are three main characteristics for CDA: “it is relational, it is dialectical, and it is transdisciplinary” (p. 3). CDA is considered relational because it focuses on the social relations rather than discourse itself (ibid).
That is, instead of looking at language itself (English), CDA looks at the social issues related to it (Titscher et al., 2000 p. 146), such as Academic Coloniality, which is the key concept in the current study. The transdisciplinary nature of CDA allows it to explore the ideologies surrounding language, language teaching, policies governing that, attitudes, and practices (Fairclough 2010, Capone & Mey 2016). It allows it to make connection between detailed studies of texts and different types of larger social and ideological issues that have to do with methods or groups and individuals (ibid). CDA relates to this study in two dimensions. First, it focuses “on the effect of power relations and inequalities in producing social wrongs [...] and their effects on other relations within the social process and their elements.” (Fairclough 2010, p.8). Second, “it focuses on what is wrong with a society (an institution, an organisation etc.), and how ‘wrongs’ might be ‘righted’ or mitigated” (ibid P.7). Accordingly, I explain in this section how the focus of the present study meets these two conceptions.

From a CDA viewpoint, in the real world, there exists a natural world and a, socially constructed, social world that differs from the former (Fairclough 2010). Language use, as a form of spoken/written discourse, is therefore a social process (Fairclough, 1989, 2003, 2010; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997) that can affect and be affected by “dialectical relations between discourse and other objects” (Fairclough 2010, p.4). Discourse, in this sense, affects the social world and is affected by it at the same time (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). CDA’s claim is that this relationship is dependent on the interplay between discourse, ideology, and power. Fairclough (2010) suggests that ideologies can become “naturalised” and “commonsensical” when they are no longer associated with the purposes and benefits they were created to serve at the beginning; the result of this is a general agreement that these ideas and methods should just be accepted within the society (ibid, p. 37). He argues that these ideologies are presupposed during language use. In this case, discourse, as the social act of language use, reproduces the presupposed ideologies (ibid). At the same time, the discourse that has the most significance in the social world is that of the more powerful (Van Dijk, 2008). He (ibid.) further explains that members of
these groups have a better chance to promote their views and ideologies because of the authority and access they have over the expanding range of different discourses. These groups’ ideologies can achieve the less powerful groups’ acceptance and become naturalised as “group ideologies” (Wallis 1998, p. 23), which, in turn, leads to the maintenance and recreation of these within these groups, thus, the maintenance of power of the powerful groups takes place even without them promoting it anymore.

It is true that discourse allows more powerful groups to achieve dominance over resources and spread their ideologies; however, Schaffner & Wenden (1995) argue that it also allows the same amount of access to the rest or the opposing groups. This makes discourse a site of power and ideological struggles. The less powerful groups are not simply passive buyers of what the dominant groups are selling; they can use language to protest and even overthrow power (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). In this sense, discourse allows opposition groups to affect the immediate and the longstanding power patterns (ibid). CDA, in this case, seeks to expose the dominated groups’ reaction, whether they are pushing against or accepting the more powerful groups’ ideologies (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001). One of the main assertions of CDA is that it focuses on values of a “good society” in the social world (Fairclough 2010, P. 7) from which springs its social objective. That is, it is not sufficient for CDA to identify and describe ideologies, it additionally seeks “to produce and convey critical knowledge that enables human beings to emancipate themselves from forms of domination through self-reflection” (Wodak & Meyer 2009, P. 7). The critical knowledge, or “interpretations and explanations” (Fairclough 2010, p. 8), clarify and demonstrate the subtly normalised social wrongs that are the product of the dominant groups’ ideologies (Fairclough 1989, 2010). Conveying these interpretations to the dominated groups could not only “(in the right conditions) contribute to righting or mitigating” (Fairclough 2010, P. 8) social wrongs, but it also helps empower and announce the dominated groups and surface and resist aspects of social inequalities (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000).

The present study corresponds with CDA in terms of its claims about the role of discourse in the production and reproductions of powerful groups’ ideologies and about the power struggle of discourse.
As argued above, certain aspects of Academic Coloniality in ELT in Algeria, if any, might be due to certain colonial ideologies. These result in features of Academic Coloniality to become naturalised within ELT in higher education in the country, which, in turn, leads to its reproduction through everyday practices and interactions of those involved in language teaching in this context. This research examines what teachers of English at one university in Algeria think about their everyday practices, what documents the MHE in Algeria issues to the university might convey, and the attitude and experience of learners towards the issue in order to understand the possible colonial ideologies. Based on several works that resist aspects of Academic Coloniality through promoting for an international view of English in ELT and calling for creating alternative relatable local knowledges (e.g., Pennycook 1998, Holliday 2005, 2009, 2015, Baker 2009, Hoff & Hickling-Hudson 2011, Jenkins 2007, 2014, 2015, Mbah 2018, R’boul 2022b, Tupas 2022), I believe that framing this study within a critical discourse analysis theory will help unveil possible signs and sources of production of a reified Academic Coloniality within ELT in higher education in Algeria, its ways of reproduction and whether there is any knowledge about the phenomenon. This will identify possible aspects of Academic Coloniality in ELT in Algeria and expose potential ideological background behind everyday practices that might signify the power relation of ‘native Vs non-native’ within higher education in the country. It will further enrich the decolonising approach taken to investigate Academic Coloniality within ELT in this context.

A decolonial approach to ELT can benefit from the theoretical premises of CDA. Drawing on the theoretical framework of (de)coloniality and CDA helps this study to highlight some of the practices and policies surrounding ELT in higher education in Algeria and explain them in terms of power relations with the ‘native speaker’. Initially, the context of the current study, as a post-colonial country, could be met by (de)coloniality theory’s interest in the persistence of colonial traits after the end of colonialism. Additionally, the association of certain ELT practices to colonial ideologies is also relevant to the study and will help investigate and explain any possible features of Academic Coloniality. Its interest in discourse,
ideology, and power makes both theories relevant to the study. Fairclough’s (1992) theoretical approach to language use, or discourse, as a social process and its effect on the social world contribute to explain certain aspects of this study as well. Moreover, the three-dimensional conception of discourse will contribute to the study’s analysis. CDA therefore can provide a methodological tool within the overarching (de)colonial framework of this study to investigate Academic Coloniality. This can be particularly useful because both CDA and (de)coloniality theories are interested in hegemony, power relations, and social inequalities. In that case, while CDA is used to uncover the hegemonic discourses that circulate within ELT context in Algeria, the (de)colonial approach is used to further explore how these discourses are linked to the practices and ideologies of coloniality.

2.5 Conclusion to the Chapter

In this chapter, I critically reviewed some of the key literature related to the global spread of English, its colonial legacy, and the issues that these conditions raise regarding the way English is currently being taught in post-colonial contexts. I also included the theoretical framework of the study and how the coloniality framework and Critical Discourse Analysis theories will contribute to the current research. As reviewed above, there are strong views towards the currently adopted by many EFL paradigm in teaching English. I tried to adopt some of those that are relevant to the context of the study, and the conclusions drawn are that the global spread of the English language places it in a unique position as the international language, or lingua franca of international relations, technology, tourism, science, and other fields. This unique position produces an increasing amount of criticism towards several of the traditionally given characteristics of the English language and the way English has been taught. Language ownership by the ‘native speaker’, for example, has been challenged as most users and the majority of interactions in English take place between ‘non-native’ speakers. The spread of English is also neither neutral nor unproblematic. That is to say, even decades after the end of colonialism, traces of it still prevail through many practices and beliefs within ELT, specifically the EFL paradigm. Many colonial ideologies are being
produced and reproduced within ELT due to the lack of awareness that could be the result of reification and naturalisation of these ideologies. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate and raise awareness towards the ideologies that accompany ELT. The historical and linguistic background of Algeria makes it a suitable context to investigate Academic Coloniality which critically examines the issues raised above. As stated earlier, most research in the context of higher education in Algeria fails to address the ideological implication of practices within ELT. Through investigating Academic Coloniality in ELT in higher education in Algeria, this research addresses that research gap.
Chapter 3: Methodology: Setting up the Methodological Design for Researching Academic Coloniality

3.1 Introduction

As previously stated, the aim of this study is to explore traces of Academic Coloniality, if any, in ELT in higher education in Algeria. To this end, I conducted a mixed methods exploratory sequential research. In the first part of this chapter, I start with a discussion of the rationale behind the research’s strategy. I explore the philosophical and methodological beliefs that underpin the exploratory sequential design, and how it is situated within the mixed methods research paradigm. After that, I provide a description of the research context. This includes the sites across which the research took place and its overall context as well as the research participants, sampling procedures, participants’ recruitment process, and demographic information about them. I then move to presenting the data collection methods, its procedures, and analysis. In addition to that, I report on the pilot study. Finally, I delve into exploring issues related to my research such as issues of quality criteria, ethics, and researcher positionality. Since this research adopts a two-phase exploratory sequential design, throughout this chapter, whenever possible I discuss the development and implementation of each phase separately as they occurred. This is to provide in-depth and detailed information about the different stages of the study.

3.2 Research Strategy

Besides the study’s questions and aims (Ellis and Levy 2009, p. 325), a research methodology is also guided by the philosophical assumptions of the researcher (Creswell and Creswell 2018, p.3). In this study, the primary aim is to explore aspects of Academic Coloniality within ELT in a context where it was not previously explored, i.e., higher education in Algeria. After gaining a deep understanding of these aspects, the study also aims at further exploring the magnitude of them across Algerian universities. In that sense, this study is exploratory in nature, with the purpose of first developing an understanding of the ways Academic Coloniality is (re)produced and manifested followed by developing measurement instruments.
that can further explore these aspects with a larger sample. This means that to meet the aims of this research, different methods, both qualitative and quantitative, needed to be used. As such, this study falls within a mixed methods methodological approach. This approach is defined as a “class of research where the researcher mixes or combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques, methods, approaches, concepts or language into a single study or set of related studies” (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie 2004, p. 17). By bringing both qualitative and quantitative research methods together, a mixed methods methodology allows for combining different and complementary data instruments which in turn allows for a more holistic and comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon being studied (Murphy et al 2014, Plano Clark & Ivankova 2016).

As explained above, this study starts with a qualitative exploration of the concept of Academic Coloniality on a small sample to identify its aspects to then quantitatively test if these findings can be generalised on a larger scale. Prioritising the qualitative phase qualifies this study as exploratory sequential research (Creswell 2014, Creswell & Plano Clark 2018). Exploratory sequential research is mixed methods research where “two-phase sequential design that can be recognized because the researcher starts by qualitatively exploring a topic before building to a second, quantitative phase” (Creswell & Plano Clark 2018, p. 86). It is qualitatively driven and aims at deepening and expanding the findings of the research. Choosing an exploratory sequential design is also to follow Creswell’s (2012) recommendation that when the researcher chooses to do mixed methods research, they need to decide on the dominating approach, i.e., if they lean towards qualitative or quantitative approach or whether they are both equally considered. Such decision is usually a reflection of a researcher’s more deeply held ontological, epistemological, and methodological beliefs. For my study, leaning towards qualitative approach reflects my philosophical beliefs which are grounded in social constructivism and feed into my relativist ontology and subjectivist epistemology, that is, the belief that reality is not independent from the researcher and knowledge is constructed through individual’s lived experiences and their interactions with others. This makes reality
multiple and knowledge subjective (Merriam 1998, Cunliffe 2011, Denzin & Lincoln 2013). This is reflected in the exploratory nature of the research and aligns with my views and its aim at unravelling the complex concept of Academic Coloniality, which is entangled with both the subjective experiences of people involved in ELT in higher education, and the unique contexts in which the research takes place.

### 3.3 Research Design

As explained previously, in order to expose the ideological background of ELT in higher education in Algeria in relation to Academic Coloniality, this study seeks to explore the attitudes of teachers and learners towards ELT from several angles. Therefore, it adopts an exploratory sequential design within the mixed methods approach that complies with CDA’s “endeavour to work interdisciplinarily, multimethodically and on the basis of a variety of different empirical data as well as background information” (Reisig & Wodak 2001 p. 35). Data collection and analysis for this research took place in two phases. First, a qualitative study for which participants were interviewed online. They were all from one university in Algeria that will not be mentioned for anonymity reasons. Documents that are relevant to the content being taught at the target university were also collected for analysis during this phase. Second, a quantitative study was designed based on the qualitative phase’s findings with a larger number of participants from several other Algerian universities. In that sense, the findings from the qualitative phase formed the foundation of the quantitative study. The two phases, however, complemented each other to serve the purpose of the present project. In the third stage of the research, the qualitative and quantitative findings were integrated to provide a holistic understanding of Academic Coloniality in Algeria. More details on the research design are provided in what follows.

For the purpose of getting an in depth understanding of the participants’ opinions towards issues related to Academic Coloniality, semi-structured online interviews were selected as a method of data collection. Semi-structured interviews do not limit participants to pre-made responses and allows for any further developments in the expression of their ideas (Brinkmann & Kvale 2015). This method is specifically
appropriate in this context as it follows the tradition of using semi-structured interviews to explore the beliefs of the English language learners and educators (Borg 2012, 2015). In fact, Mangubhai et al. (2004) explain that interviews allow “teachers the opportunities and time to detail fully and freely the bases for their approaches to teaching, without the constraints of a set schedule of invariant questions” (p. 294). Interviews are also popular in this context because the views they uncover cannot always be observable (Kagan 1992). They are only problematised in a context where they are used by themselves (Merriam 2009), which is not the case in the current study, as already explained. This method has also been problematised due to time constrains as interviewees may not always be free for long interview sessions, and for the fact that what participants say may not always be what they would do in the actual context or is only what they think the researcher wants to hear (Borg 2015). Undertaking online interviews helps minimise these shortcomings as it allows more flexible hours and location for the participants to choose to undertake the interviews. Additionally, Barton & Lee (2013) state that online interviews encourage participants to express ideas that they would not have been comfortable sharing in a different context as the absence of physical presence helps create a more relaxed atmosphere. Even though the change from in person to online interviews was imposed by COVID-19, online interviews seem to be the most suitable method for this phase of the study. Nevertheless, conducting online interviews can also be problematised for lack of non-verbal cues, technical issues caused by dips in internet connection, and the fact that not all participants can be open to the use of ICT in some contexts (Salmons 2014). In the following sections, I explain how I attempted to minimise the effects of these on the data collection.

A review of the documents relevant to the EFL programme taught at the target university was also conducted during the first phase of this study. For Bowen (2009), document analysis is “a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents – both printed and electronic (computer-based and Internet-transmitted) material” (p. 27). This research method is often used alongside semi-structured interviews (Dornyei 2007) and is the third most used data collection method in qualitative research.
according to Merriam (2009). In this study, document analysis was not carried out in order to investigate teachers’ or students’ beliefs but instead in order to validate data collected from the semi-structured interviews, to assess to what extent participants’ attitudes and beliefs correspond to those, and to explore any patterns within these documents that indicate the presence of any potential signs of Academic Coloniality. This was particularly relevant to this study’s context as COVID-19 restrictions prevented me from observing classroom practices and analysing policy documents helped validate several claims from participants’ reported practices.

This study took into consideration several advantages and disadvantages of document analysis that were highlighted by scholars in the literature (e.g., Bowen 2009, Merriam & Tisdell 2015, Morgan 2022). The fact that documents are usually stable makes them reliable and replicable subjects for analysis (Merriam 2009). On the other hand, e-documents are often open access and can be edited by the public or the publishing institution during data collection. In this study, the documents considered, mainly the Canevas issued by the MHE, do not change for at least one year from the date they are issued. As will be explained further in this section, these do not necessarily change during the yearly national meetings held between university representatives and the MHE. Documents also provide an accurate and detailed source of information that is neutral because they usually are issued for other purposes than those of the study being carried out. This is also the case for the current research. In this sense, unlike observations and interviews, documents analysis is immune against the effect of the presence of the researcher (Merriam 2009). At the same time, because of this property, the documents collected may not provide relevant enough data requiring additional data collection (Bowen 2009).

In qualitative research, different research questions tend to dictate the different types and the focus of the documents being analysed (Bowen 2009). In this study, two main types of documents were found useful: The Canevas (see Appendix 1) and the programme curriculum (see Appendix 2) provided by the interviewee teachers. The Canevas are the documents issued by the MHE on a yearly basis during the
meetings with Conférences Régionales des Universités (CRU) representatives of the three regions of the country. According to the official website of the MHE in Algeria (www.mesrs.dz), a regional division of universities (CRU) is maintained for ease of communication between it and universities. CRU East, Centre or West usually include heads of the institutions and senior staff at universities within that region of the country. The Canevas include information concerning the universities’ resources, semester organisations and programmes details each unit the universities provide. However, because the details in the Canevas did not provide data that was rich enough for the sought after aims, the decision was to also collect programme curriculum from the interviewee teachers themselves for a more thorough analysis of the relevant data. These included instructions, the titles of weekly sessions, and the specific teaching material for those sessions. In order to get access to these documents, I had to get permission from the Head of the Department of English at the target university. I accessed the documents after getting in touch with the Head of the Department via email and sending him an information sheet and consent form (see Appendix 6 and Appendix 8). The Canevas were open access and could be downloaded from the MHE official website, but the detailed programme curriculum and sessions’ titles had to be obtained from the teachers who generously agreed to provide them after getting the Head of the Department’s permission.

For the second quantitative phase of the study design, online survey questionnaires were developed based on the findings of the first phase. The main themes emerging from the qualitative study were turned into factors from which sprang the questionnaire items. The main aim of the second phase of the study was to test the generalisability of the findings on a larger sample. For that reason, online questionnaires were used as they were not only proven to save time and cost (Stockemer 2019), but they were also easy to administer, and data could be obtained from a large and geographically dispersed sample (Sue & Ritter 2012, p. 10). Moreover, they were useful in measuring attitudes, establishing opinions, and learning about individuals’ experiences (Newcomer & Triplett 2004, p. 257). Online questionnaires therefore were ideal in this context to verify the attitudes and beliefs of the targeted sample on potential issues of Academic
Coloniality arising from the first phase of the study. Nevertheless, online surveys require participants to have the adequate access to technology and to be digitally literate (Oliveri et al. 2021). To mitigate this, the questionnaire was designed in a simple and accessible format with clear and simple questions and instructions (ibid). This was particularly important as I could not be present in person to clarify any potential confusion or misunderstandings. To keep the questions simple and clear, I also stayed as close as possible to the words and expressions used by the participants of the first phase, who potentially used common expressions that circulate among ELT students and teachers at Algerian universities. Because of this, the questionnaires developed in this phase of the study were particularly appropriate for this context. Despite the limitations, online questionnaires proved to be a valuable data collection instrument especially with the emergence of the global pandemic COVID-19 which impeded me from collecting the data in person.

Figure 1 below summarises the research design and how each of the two phases’ aims are addressed by the data collection methods, research settings, and selection of the participants:
Figure 1: Summary of the research design, aims, and context
3.4 Research Context

3.4.1 Research Settings

3.4.1.1 Phase 1

The first data collection phase of this study was conducted at the faculty of Arts and Foreign Languages, Department of English at one university in the east region in Algeria. In order to plan and improve teaching programmes, units, and content; a series of meetings is held periodically at the level of departments, CRU of the region, and a national meeting at the MHE. At the target university, for example, meetings with teachers of each unit would be organised and led by the unit responsible (responsable du module); these would then be followed by a meeting with other senior staff members from other CRU East universities. After these, a national meeting is held at the MHE with representatives from the three regions where final and generally unified programmes are agreed upon. For several years, within the department of English at the target university, English as a Foreign Language programme provided a three-year EFL course (Licence) corresponding to the LMD reform (Licence, Master, Doctorate), and a two-year Master’s course in which students can choose to specialise in Applied Languages (Languages Appliqués), Literature and Civilisation (Literature et Civilisation), or Language Sciences (Science du Languages – equivalent of Teaching English as a Foreign Language – TEFL).

At most universities in Algeria, including the target university, in order to be granted a Licence degree (equivalent of a Bachelor’s), a student must collect 180 credits in 6 semesters through L1, L2 and L3 years. Each semester lasts about 15 weeks, with about 22h30 of course work per week. During these, all students are taught the same classes regardless of their future speciality in their master’s. After getting a Licence degree, and depending on the speciality of choice, a student needs to collect 120 credits in 4 semesters through M1 and M2 to get their Master’s. Three of these semesters last about 13 weeks each, with 25 hours course work per week. During the fourth semester, students are expected to write, present, and defend their MA dissertations. At the end of each semester, except the M2’s second one, students sit for
exams in every unit to evaluate their performances. Each unit has a specific coefficient depending on its importance in that specialty or degree (www.mesrs.dz n.d.). Almost all state universities in Algeria manage their students this way, the differences are generally that some universities have less or different specialties in master’s.

The document analysis was also undertaken within the same university. Each year, the MHE issues a ‘Canevas’, a document that contains what the curriculum should include for that year. The content of the Canevas does not necessarily change every year they are issued. Before issuing the Canevas, the MHE hold meetings with one representative (of each faculty) from every university in the region. For example, at the target university, there is one representative of the faculty of Arts and foreign languages. The faculty includes three departments, department of English, French, and of Translation. The purpose of these meetings is to listen to the university staff’s suggestions as to what should be included in the Canevas. The representative of the faculty gets suggestions from responsible teachers of each module in the department before attending the meeting at the MHE. It is the responsibility of those to put forward a fully detailed curriculum starting from the Canevas provided by the MHE. Their role is to issue those during meetings with teachers of the different modules at the department.

The target university was selected for this phase of the study for reasons of accessibility, impact on higher education in Algeria, and the ELT programmes it offers MA students. Firstly, out of the possible universities to get in touch with, the gatekeeper at this university was cooperative and offered to get in touch in person with some of the potential participants to talk to them about the study. This has eased several aspects of the data collection especially under the conditions imposed by COVID-19. Secondly, several staff members of this institution worked or are still working closely with the Algerian MHE through their CRU cooperation programmes, as well as the university’s reputation as one of the most highly regarded in the country. Finally, this university offers the choice between the three most common MA programmes state universities throughout the country offer: Applied languages, Civilisation and Literature, and TEFL.
This way the target university allowed me access to participants from the three programmes as most other universities only offered one or two of those. Nine Students and eight educators agreed to participate in this phase of the study. More details about the participants of the first phase will be presented in the following section of this chapter.

### 3.4.1.2 Phase 2

The second phase of the study took place at 10 state universities across the three regions of Algeria (as per the MHE’s division), the selection of which took place through purposeful and snowball sampling (see Figure 2, Section 3.4.2.2). Four of the universities were from the East of the country, three from the centre, and three from the West. The Eastern region of Algeria includes a higher total number of universities than the other two regions, and so four were sampled from there. All the selected universities had departments of English that abided by the guidelines of the MHE explained above and offered similarly structured undergraduate courses as well as MA programmes to the target university in phase 1 of this study (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.1.1). The reason these ten institutions were selected in this manner is to make sure to meet the purposes of the second phase of the current study. Selecting a larger number of universities, and so participants, helped ensure the verification of the qualitative findings of the first phase among them using a different research method. Additionally, by purposefully selecting universities from the three regions of the country, the findings of this phase provided grounds for the generalisation of the results.

### 3.4.2 Participants and Sampling

#### 3.4.2.1 Phase 1

In this phase of the study, 17 student participants and teachers from one university voluntarily participated. This included nine students of English, one from each school year for undergraduates and three from each master programmes provided by the target university for MA students, and 8 teachers of several units. Because each educator can be responsible for a number of units across several school years, the sample included at least one unit responsible teacher from each year, two non-responsible
teachers, and two senior lecturers. These were purposefully sampled in order to fully represent the several levels and variation of the participants (Maxwell 2013). In order to reach target student participants, I also adopted snowball sampling strategies with them (Bryman 2012). That is to say, the participants’ selection for this phase of the study was a mixture of purposive and snowball sampling strategies which served to triangulate in participants and sources of data (see Table 1 and Table 2, Section 3.4.2.1). All participants were Algerians who speak Daridja (Algerian Arabic) as their day-to-day language.

As stated earlier, the nine students interviewed were distributed across the three undergraduate school years and two masters’ (postgraduate) years they have to go through to be granted a masters’ degree by the target university. Participant masters’ students were also selected depending on their specialty: Applied Linguistics (AL), Civilisation and Literature (CL) or Language Sciences (SL) (equivalent of Teaching English as a Foreign Language – TEFL). In this sense, one student from each academic year and each specialty was interviewed. In terms of gender, three student participants were males and six were females, which is natural in language studies in Algeria as there are more female than male students (Hanifi 2019). Their ages ranged between 19-30. Table 1 below is a representation of the selected interviewee students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Postgraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because each interviewee teacher could be responsible for more than one unit in several academic years, I first tried to contact the more involved teachers with units, with the regional and national committees (CRU), and responsible for the teaching content selection. Initial contact was made through emails and
other social media platforms (Facebook and WhatsApp) as I did not always get replies via email. Facebook was the platform from which I got most replies as it is largely popular in Algeria. This was through sending private message requests on Facebook to the selected participants. The participant selection was possible thanks to a list provided by the Head of the Department at the target university (see Appendix 4). The document contained names, contact details, and units of all responsible teachers at the department. More importantly, this document contained names of teachers that the Head of the Department thought were technology friendly because not all teachers engaged with ICT and social media. This was so I could conveniently select participants who were possible to interview online. Consequently, most of my interviewee teachers (six out of eight) tended to be ones who were more open towards the use of ICT. They mostly chose to have the interviews through Facebook Messenger calls with which they were familiar. Those teachers were generally younger and less experienced than other senior staff. To rectify that, the two other interviewees were contacted through email, phone calls, and eventually agreed to take the audio-recorded interviews via Skype to phone calls.

The more involved teachers, as indicated in the list provided by the Head of the Department, were contacted first, and if unavailable, I contacted others. Eventually, at least one teacher from each school year and each specialty was interviewed. In terms of gender, five teacher participants were females and three were males. Their ages ranged between 35 to over 50, with various teaching experiences (2 years, 3 years, 5 years, 7 years, 8 years, 12 years, 29 years, 32 years). For a clearer representation, Table 2 shows the distribution of the participants:
### Table 2: Teacher interviewees’ distribution: school year, gender, and units taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>L1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of English language</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral expression</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written expression</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Linguistics</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL (TEFL)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Ethics and Copyright</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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3.4.2.2 Phase 2

The target population of this study was all Algerian state university students and teachers of English. The teacher participants were those who have working experience at an Algerian university teaching English for at least one semester. The student participants were those studying English (all levels and all specialties) at an Algerian state university. For this phase of the study, I used a multistage sampling technique that is defined as the case where “sampling is done sequentially across two or more hierarchical levels” (Battaglia 2008). In this type of sampling, the sample is picked over several levels depending on the makeup of the population being studied. This type of sampling is often employed when the research is done over a large geographical area (Daniel 2012). For the current study, the sampling was undertaken over three stages. First, I used a purposive sampling technique where I divided Algeria into three major regions in accordance with the division of MHE in the country: East (25 universities), Centre (20 universities) and West (19 universities). Here, I made sure to include universities from each of the regions. In the second stage, within each region, after excluding universities without English departments (22 universities), I randomly selected four universities from the Eastern region, three from the Centre, and three from the West. In the third stage, I used snowball sampling technique to get access to as many student and teacher participants as possible at the universities sampled in stage 2. Using a multistage technique, I ensured a fair level of representation of the population from the three main regions of the country. Figure 2 illustrates a visual representation of the sampling design:
The total number of participants was 479 (376 students and 103 teachers). The 376 students (17.4% males and 82.6% females) were distributed as follows: 119 students from Western universities, 113 students from central universities, and 144 students from Eastern universities. In terms of school year, 20.5% were 1st year undergraduate, 14.6% 2nd year undergraduate, 14.6% 3rd year undergraduate, 30.6% 1st year postgraduate, and 19.7% 2nd year postgraduate while their ages ranged from 18 to 50 years old. On the other hand, the 103 teachers (29.1% males and 70.9% females) who took part in the study were dispersed among universities as follows: 60 teachers from Eastern universities, 24 from Western universities, and 19 from Central universities. Their teaching experience ranged from 3 years to 40 years.

3.5 Methods of Data Collection

The study made use of three methods for data collection. First, I used two versions of online interviews aimed at establishing a deep understanding of teachers’ and students’ opinions at one university towards Academic Coloniality in Algeria and any signs of the phenomenon from their points of view. Second, I used document analysis to verify some of the participants’ claims in official documents issued during teachers’
meetings to decide on content for units. After analysing results of these two, the findings emerging from the analysis were used to build the third data collection method in order to test the phenomenon among a larger sample of participants. This was to ensure the validity and generalisability of the results (Teddlie & Tashakkori 2008, Onwuegbuzie, Bustamante, & Nelson 2010, Creswell & Plano Clark 2011).

3.5.1 Phase 1

3.5.1.1 Semi-Structured Online Interviews

Two versions of interviews were designed: one for students and the second for teachers at the target university in order to attain a thorough understanding of aspects of Academic Coloniality in the opinions of participants, their awareness of the phenomenon, and their arguments to back up their views. Both versions of the interviews consisted of 10 items divided into three main sections of three items each: English varieties awareness, language-culture association, and production and maintenance of Academic Coloniality. The last item was intended for participants to express any further relevant ideas or suggestions.
### Table 3: Academic Coloniality: broad themes and interview items and studies that informed them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Coloniality</th>
<th>Manifestations</th>
<th>Culture-language association</th>
<th>(Re)Production</th>
<th>Further suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Item 2               | - Bias towards ‘native speaker’ English varieties (Jenkins 2014, Li & Liu 2019, Tajeddin & Pakzadian 2020)  
- Copying the ‘native speaker’ is essential for communication (Belmihoub 2018, Sadeghpour & Sharifian 2019) |
| Item 3               | - Learning English to communicate with the ‘native speaker’ (Spolsky 1989, Seidlhofer 2010, Jenkins 2015) |
| Item 4               | - Monolithic View of Culture (Baker 2009)  
- Association of English language with the ‘Western Culture’ (Holliday 2006) |
| Item 5               | - Ideology of Self and Other (Holliday 2005)  
- Unrealistic views about the ‘native speaker’ (Lippi-Green 2012, Gluszek & Hansen 2013, Griffiths and Soruç 2019) |
| Item 6               | - Native-Speakerism and advantage given to the ‘native speaker’ because of their knowledge of ‘Western Culture’ (Kumaravadivelu 2003, Holliday 2005, 2006) |
| Item 7               | - Freedom to Include/exclude content |
| Item 8               | - Participants’ thoughts of the document sent by the ministry (Canevas) |
| Item 9               | - How do they respond to the Canevas and how/whether their responses were received by the ministry |
| Item 10              | - Question 10 is to see what kind of changes (if any) participants would suggest if given the opportunity. |
Interview items were initially drafted based on the review of several studies in the previous chapter and interview questions from other studies (see Table 3, Section 3.5.1.1). In order to test the suitability of the items drafted, I considered suggestions from two Algerian PhD students at different stages of their research, who were familiar with the linguistic and cultural context of the country, and I conducted a pilot study. In March 2020, I piloted the online interviews with four participants (two educators and two students). The initial number of participants in the pilot study was eight. However, due to the limitations in the internet service and travel restrictions caused by COVID-19, it was not possible to undertake the interviews with all the potential participants. In order to avoid any exposure of the main study’s potential participants, the interviewees for the pilot study were selected from a different university in the same region as the university where the main data collection was undertaken. The two student participants, one male and one female, were a master student and a second-year undergraduate student respectively. The two teacher participants, one male and one female, both had an MA degree in applied linguistics from Algerian universities. One of them was a graduate from the main study’s target university. The semi-structured interviews were conducted online using Skype V 8.55 and were audio-recorded after obtaining written and oral consent from the participants. All interviews lasted between 45 minutes to one hour. The participants had been made aware that they could stop at any point, and they were reminded that they could choose not to answer any of the questions. In addition to this, I also made sure to abide by the ethical standards set by the University of Bath and recommendations for undertaking an interview, creating a friendly atmosphere for the participants, minimising any imbalance in the power relations during these, and being attentive to any possible assertion of my own perspective. More on reflexivity and researcher positionality and ethics are in Section 3.8 and Section 3.10 respectively.

In analysing the data collected from the pilot study interviews, I tried to move from the text to its range of properties “discourse” (Fairclough 1989) then back to the text again. For example, one participant’s response on item three was:
I think we should go for British English (...) because our curriculum basically relies on British English not the American one, when I go to Britain, I must use the English that they use in Britain, even informally (...) I think we should take the standard British English (...) we should never teach a variety in Algeria because a variety creates a problem. (SP1/Pilot-Interview. 05/03/2020)

In the above excerpt, there are signs of the idea of learning English to communicate with the ‘native speaker’ within the participant’s argument. Here, the participant placed value on the ‘native speaker’ English variety, particularly “standard British English” and expressed intolerance towards any ‘non-native’ English variety, equating the latter with the word “problem”. As such, this excerpt clearly carries traces of native-speakerism and was coded as such. To validate this analysis, I contacted the participants again after the initial interpretation of the interviews to see if their ideas were adequately represented i.e., respondent validation (Bryman 2016). The pilot study did not only serve in familiarising me with the interviewing process, but also in refining the interview questions and deciding on the type of questions to include. After the pilot study, the main interview items were finalised, and the interview guides were drafted (see Appendix 10 and Appendix 11).

3.5.1.2 Document Analysis

For this step of the study, the initial plan was to collect and analyse the Canevas issued by the MHE and sent to the target university. However, these documents did not seem to contain information that is detailed enough for CDA. The Canevas are divided into 3 sections: Fiche d’identité du Master/licence, fiche d’organisation semestrielle des enseignements, and programme détaillé par matière. The first of these sections contains information about the university locations, offered course description, and objectives and material/human resources available. The second section introduces how many teaching hours each unit requires, coefficient, credit, and evaluation modes. It also indicates how many teaching staff are needed for the units. The third section, entitled “The Programme detailed in units”, includes general description of each of the units in the programme the university offers. It provides information like:
teaching targets, general content titles, evaluation mode and a few references for teachers to go back to. Ordinarily, this was the section this study would be interested in analysing. However, there did not seem to be enough information and data would still be poor for the lack of details in this section specifically, and the Canevas generally. After obtaining permission from the Head of the Department, interviewee teachers were asked to provide more detailed course documents they used for teaching. These were the primary material they presented during their sessions. They included all materials they planned to use every week: texts to explore with students, courses to present, lecture contents and all kinds of rich data that were of benefit to this study.

3.5.2 Phase 2

3.5.2.1 Online Questionnaire

This phase of the study emerged from the findings of the previous phase with regards to students’ and teachers’ attitudes towards their English language learning and teaching experience. The results of the first phase of the study provided a comprehensive understanding of Academic Coloniality in terms of its production, manifestation, and maintenance within ELT at the target university. In the second phase, the main aim was to investigate these dimensions on a bigger population. These were the main sections of the questionnaires that included the major points of interest from the findings of the previous phase.

Based on these, I operationalised the findings into items that formed the questionnaires administered to the participants. The process of operationalising these started from the main findings (production, manifestation, and maintenance) to more detailed components (which are also based on phase 1) that became the factors or constructs, which in turn were operationalised into the questionnaire items. When formulating the questionnaires’ items, I tried to stay as faithful as possible to the data from phase 1. That was done by taking phrases from the interviews of the first phase and editing them into items to include some negative statements as well as positive ones in order to minimise response bias and increase validity (Sonderen, Sandermen & Coyne 2013). Faithfulness to the data from the first phase helped ensure that
the quantitative phase complimented the qualitative one. That is to say, while the data collected in the first phase provided deeper understanding of the participants views qualitatively by developing and validating the scales extracted (see Table 4 below), the purpose of the second phase was to seek to quantitatively verify these factors with a larger population from different institutions (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.2.2). A similar approach was followed in Yeoman et al. (2016) who developed a measurement instrument on research attitudes and research integration that was directed to secondary school students. The measuring instrument was successfully adopted and verified by Eryilmaz (2021) across seven schools in the UK. By using phrases from the interviews in the first phase, the voices and perspectives of the participants are centred in the research process. This is because the phrases used in the questionnaire items were derived directly from the participants' own words and experiences, rather than being imposed or drawn from pre-existing scales or categories. This approach is in line with a decolonial methodology, which seeks to centre the voices and perspectives of marginalised groups in knowledge production (Smith 2021). By incorporating the participants' own words and perspectives into the research process, the value and validity of their experiences and insights are acknowledged, and it is a way to creating space for their voices to be heard and recognised. One potential limitation of using this approach is that it may not capture the full range of perspectives or experiences within the participant population. By relying heavily on phrases and expressions used by participants in the first phase, the questionnaire items may inadvertently exclude other perspectives or experiences that were not captured during the initial interviews. Additionally, the questionnaires in this phase relied mostly on five-point Likert scale items for participants to easily understand and relate to those. Such items were problematised for limiting the possible responses a pre-selected set of choices (Chimi & Russel 2009). However, this effect was minimised since these items were generated by phase one's students and educators in a similar context.
Because some of the findings from phase 1 applied only to teachers or to students, two draft questionnaires were developed: one for teachers (see Appendix 13) and one for students (see Appendix 12). Table 4 below demonstrates how phase 1 findings relate to the factors that were operationalised into items in the case of students:

**Table 4:** How the findings of Phase 1 were operationalised into students’ questionnaire items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The findings of Phase 1</th>
<th>factors</th>
<th>items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production of Academic Coloniality</td>
<td>Effects of Media</td>
<td>• I became interested in English because my favourite TV shows/ Series/ films/ Social Media platforms/ Video Games / Podcasts… etc are in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exposure/interest in native speaker varieties</td>
<td>• I think students are more interested in English more than French because of media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stereotypes/Idealising the native speaker</td>
<td>• American culture is more influential in our society because of TV shows/ Series/ films Social Media platforms/ Video Games / Podcasts… etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students interact more with the American society, not the British one, because of media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• I am affected more by American English because of movies and TV series I watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Most of what I know about the native speaker of English comes from films, TV, series, podcasts, social media platforms… etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Films, TV shows, series, podcasts, social media platforms… etc are the only contact I have with English outside the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• I think that British and/or American lifestyles are attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Coloniality</td>
<td>• I learned a lot about the American and British lifestyles from media.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Compared to Algerian Culture, Western culture is cooler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In my opinion, learning English in Britain or America is better than learning it in Algeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I think that learning English from the native speaker is the ideal situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I believe that British and/ or American universities are better than Algerian ones.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some of my teachers do not accept any suggestions from students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some teachers correct students in a rude way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I avoid making suggestions in the classroom because of my teachers’ reactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It upsets me when my teachers do not speak native speaker English in class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I would prefer it if my teachers spoke either British or American English in class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In my opinion, teachers should not waste time talking about non-native varieties of English (other than American and British English)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teach to the test approach | • I think my teachers focus more on preparing us for tests and exams and less on exploring new concepts.  
• I follow my teachers’ instruction because I have to get the required mark to pass.  
• I feel that my learning is not about education, but about getting the mark.  
• I feel that if I wanted to get good grades, I should learn everything my teachers tell me.  
• I only work hard during exams. |
|---|---|
| Teachers imposing biased views on students | • My teachers encourage me to speak British English  
• My teachers prefer British English over American English  
• My teachers expect me to speak British English |
| Language Ownership | • The English language belongs to the English culture  
• English language belongs to the native speaker  
• When speaking English, I am borrowing the native speaker’s language. |
| Language-Culture Association | • English cannot be separated from its culture.  
• I can only speak English 100% correctly if I am aware of its cultural aspects |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Resulting arguments</strong></th>
<th><strong>Native speaker English as a learning target</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Every country has its own culture, so when you adopt the language, you get the culture with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- It is necessary to learn the culture of English to be able to speak it correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The culture of the native speaker of English is completely different than that of the Algerian speaker of English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Native speakers of English are completely different than Algerian speakers of English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In Britain and America, they have many interesting cultural aspects that we do not have.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I think students should try to speak as near native speaker accent as possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Native speaker English should be the target variety for learning English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In my opinion, learners of English should choose to speak either British English or American English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If you want to speak English, it’s better to speak British or American rather than go and use another accent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I think teachers should correct students based on either British or American English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learning English brings me closer to my dream of living in America or Britain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I am learning English because I want to travel/work in America or Britain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Continuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actively Gatekeeping Academic Coloniality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Calling for Change/Out-of-Date Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning English teaches me about the people am I going to face when I go to Britain or America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The content of the curriculum currently being taught should be changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am happy with the content of my classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think that we are being taught very old theories that do not matter anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think we are studying too much past events, not actual culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think the content of the courses I am learning is out-of-date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passively Gatekeeping Academic Coloniality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatched Views on Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In our classes, I think that teachers present information and students just passively receive knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our teachers allow us to be leaders and decision-makers in our own learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My teachers follow a teacher-centred approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overlooked Feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My teachers regularly collect feedback from us about our learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My university/department systematically collect feedback from students about our learning experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I often provide feedback to my teachers about my learning whenever they ask me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My teachers rarely asked me to provide written feedback about my studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 demonstrates how Phase 1’s findings laid the foundation for the second phase’s constructs. I followed the same steps making a similar table to design the teachers’ questionnaires. Once an initial draft was designed, I reviewed it with two Algerian PhD students at different stages of their research, as they were familiar with the context of the study; and my lead supervisor for feedback. After that, I did a pilot study with 113 students and 12 teachers at one university in the east of Algeria to review the items constructed. To further improve the items, I also did a ‘think out loud’ activity (Willis 2005) where I asked some of the pilot study participants (nine students and four teachers) to loudly say what they were thinking as they were answering the questionnaires. This took place over Facebook Messenger audio calls while they were responding to the questionnaires online. I also made sure to be attentive and inquired about the length they took to respond to some items and asked about any ambiguity (Kamp et al 2018). At the end of the piloting stage, I reviewed all the items and produced a final draft of the questionnaires for the main data collection of the second phase of this study.

3.6 Procedures of Data Collection

Data for this study was collected in two phases. In July 2020, the interviews were undertaken with teacher participants and students. Teacher participants were also asked to provide teaching material to be analysed in the first phase of the study at the end of the interviews. As already explained, most interviews were undertaken in English conforming to participants’ choice. Following the first phase of the interviews,
between April and May 2022, online survey questionnaires were also administered to 479 student and teacher participants. This section explores the procedures of interview and questionnaire data collection processes.

3.6.1 Phase 1

The online interviews were conducted online with nine students and eight teachers at the Department of English at the target university. All participants were informed that they could take the interviews in English or Arabic; most of them opted for the interviews to be conducted in English. However, there were instances during some interviews where participants code-switched to French or Algerian Arabic for some words and phrases which were translated by me. Only one student felt less confident to speak English and accepted the suggestion of expressing themselves in Arabic instead. This latter interview was not used in the research. Reasons for that are explained in Section 3.8 of this chapter.

First, the Head of the Department of English at the target university was approached. After explaining details of my plan to contact potential student and teacher participants, he helpfully offered to provide a list of names of teachers, their contact details, and units they were responsible for (see Appendix 4). The offer came when we discussed the fact that the use of online platforms at university, especially by senior educators, was not common in Algeria, which would make conducting online interviews complicated. The response rate for the initial contact with potential teacher participants made via email was lower than what was required. Alternatively, I started contacting them on social media platforms, specifically Facebook. As Facebook is the most popular social media platform used in Algeria in the last five years (Statista 2020), I successfully managed to contact and get the interest of several teaching staff. Consent was obtained from them before interviews were agreed to be undertaken on Facebook Messenger calls as they were more familiar with the platform. I audio-recorded those with their consent using the integrated voice recording app on Windows 10. I also conducted interviews with two senior educators using Skype to Phone calls because they were not on social media and were not open to the use of ICT.
Contact with those was established via email, then phone calls to go through their involvement (consent form and participant information sheet), and after that we agreed on interview dates and times at their convenience.

Concerning the document analysis, the initial plan was to collect the documents sent to the university by the MHE which govern the content of the teaching material, i.e., the Canevas. However, after looking at the Canevas, they seemed to contain only general information about the curriculum and did not provide rich data for analysis. As a substitute, at the end of the interviews with teachers, I asked them if it was possible for them to provide the teaching material they based their lectures on for document analysis (see Appendix 3). Before I could collect those, I had to obtain permission from the Head of the Department. Teacher participants explained that they were only provided with headings and sections to cover, and it was up to them to explore and develop their teaching content. The decision was then to consider both the Canevas issued by the ministry, which I had access to online, but the Head of the Department also provided to me via email; and the material provided by the teachers for the document analysis, which they sent to me via Facebook as it was the main platform of contact between me and them.

Similarly to teachers, contact with student participants was made on Facebook. Students were identified and approached through mutual acquaintances in the target university who contacted potential participants. Students who accepted to take part in the study were then sent private message requests on Facebook. After explaining the study to them, informed consent was obtained before agreeing to take the interviews. The interviews were also audio-recorded with participants’ consent the same way as teacher’s interviews.

### 3.6.2 Phase 2

After analysing the data from the interviews and documents collected in the first phase of the study, questionnaire surveys were constructed and finalised for the second phase’s data collection. Contact with
the sampled institutions was made through current Algerian PhD students in the UK who were on the same scholarship programme as me. I first contacted a number of current or recent PhD graduates from UK universities via email, who then referred me to more potential graduates who helped with distributing the questionnaire (see Appendix 9). These students did their undergraduate and masters’ degrees in different Algerian universities before qualifying to the UK PhD scholarship programme. In most cases, they offered to forward the questionnaires’ links to teacher and students from their institution and encouraged them to share them with their colleagues. The others provided me with contact details (emails, Facebook accounts, and WhatsApp numbers) of teachers and students – with their permission – and it was my responsibility to establish contact, send them links, and encourage them to share them with their colleagues. This took place over April and May 2022 as the response rate fluctuated over the exams and corrections periods. In the questionnaires, I made sure to include a consent statement for participants to tick before moving to the questions page. Once the required participant numbers were achieved, I closed the questionnaires and started the data analysis.

3.7 Methods of Data Analysis

In an exploratory sequential design, data analysis is ideally undertaken over three levels: after the first qualitative stage, after the second quantitative stage, and at the final stage when integrating the two study results together extending the results of the first qualitative study (Creswell & Plano Clark 2011). This allows for a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of the data. In the following, I explain in detail the procedures for data analysis at these three levels.

3.7.1 Phase 1

The qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews was fully transcribed in a denaturalising method i.e., taking certain speech features like laughter, tone, and gestures out (Davidson 2009). Elliot (2005, p. 25) refers to this as “clean transcripts” which “makes the material easy to read”. Throughout the findings’
With regards to the interview undertaken in Arabic, the interview was not used in the data analysis for two reasons. First, the approach used for data analysis is Critical Discourse Analysis. One of the main dimensions at which data is analysed following this approach is a linguistic one through which the specific linguistic properties of the text are scrutinised, including the words and phrases that participants used. As such, for validity reasons, the analysis needs to accurately account for the exact words that participants used, which can be affected by translation (Van Nes et al. 2010). Second, given the number of details and contextualisation provided by the other eight participants who conducted the interviews in English, the
data collected from them was enough to provide a comprehensive understanding of their ELT beliefs and reported practices. Having transcribed the interviews, I then started analysing them.

The analysis of the interviews was conducted in reference to RQ1 and RQ2. I first divided the extracts into broad thematic groups, then I categorised those in more specific smaller sub-groups. While doing this, I continuously looked for arguments, comments, or expressions that can be taken as evidence for or against Academic Coloniality in the context. When analysing the qualitative data from the online interviews, I mainly followed the three-dimensional guideline for analysing linguistic units, meaning, and structures within CDA (Van Dijk 1984, Fairclough 1993, Reisigl & Wodak 2009, Wodak & Fairclough 2010). The analysis moved through the three dimensions as follows:

1- Contents (topics): identifying to what of the macro topics does the text belong to. These are mostly informed by the literature (deductive), but also by the topic of the text being analysed; that is, the broad thematic groups of the text, which gives room for emerging topics and themes (inductive).

2- Discursive strategies: pointing out and evaluating the corresponding intentional plans for the discursive practices employed in discourse. According to Wodak (2005) and Reisigl & Wodak (2009, p. 93-94), these strategies include 1) Argumentation strategies, i.e., the arguments and justifications used in the text, 2) Predication strategies, i.e., the qualities attributed to people, 3) Nomination strategies, i.e., the words and expressions used to refer others, 4) Perspectivation strategies, i.e., the perspectives from which the other attributed, nominations, and arguments are expressed, and 5) Intensification, i.e., refers to whether the text produced was intensified or mitigated.

3- Linguistic means and forms: analysing the nature of the linguistic means and forms employed in discourse, i.e., the words and expressions used to realise the above strategies.

These three dimensions can be seen in operation in the analysis of the excerpt below:
I also think each individual has each own accent, each one is trying to perfect their English accent in order to attain that level of near native speaker accent, whether it’s American English or British English. We call it academic English (SP4/Interview.06/07/2020).

On the first dimension, the broad topic under which this exchange can be coded is Awareness and Views of Varieties of English. This can be observed though the participant’s perception of the linguistic and sociolinguistic status of these varieties and their speakers.

On the second dimension, the respondent argued that learning English for them was to attempt to imitate the ‘native speaker’. However, learners could never reach their level of proficiency, as the best they could do was to get “near native speaker accent”. This is clear evidence that the target for learning for the participant is ‘nativeness’ rather than communication. On top of that, this also indicates that the participant viewed themselves as always inferior to the ‘native speaker’ regardless of how proficient they were or could become using the language. This is also a further indication of the power relation between the learner and the ‘native speaker’ that such beliefs resulted in. Additionally, the participant appeared to recognise that English accents vary individually for learners of English. However, they still assumed that there was only one ‘native speaker accent’ that they viewed as the target for learning. This also indicates the participants’ lack of awareness about ‘native speaker’ English.

On the third dimension, another point to highlight from the extract is that the student seemed to believe that learners of English used imperfect language and were trying to “perfect” it by imitating the ‘native speaker’.

The teaching materials and the information from the Canevas were also used at this stage to back up the data from the interviews. After carefully reviewing the documents, they were used to supplement the data (Bowen 2009, p. 30). This was when teachers made some claims about the content of their courses, the documents then were presented to provide more evidence about these claims. They provided more
insights and information about teachers’ practices in the classroom; hence, they were used alongside the
data gained from the interviews in the first phase’s findings chapter (see Chapter 5, Section 5.2.2.1).

3.7.2 Phase 2

The analysis of the second phase’s quantitative data was undertaken in three stages: Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), internal consistency test of the Likert scale items (by reporting Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients), and finally descriptive statistics (including percentages and the means for each of the scales).

As defined by Hoyle (2000): “confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is a statistical strategy specifically designed to identify and explore hypothetical constructs as manifest in fallible indicators.” (p. 465). In other words, CFA is an equation model that deals with the relationship between the constructs (factors) and the relevant indicators (questionnaire items). CFA can serve several purposes, but one of its crucial roles is “construct validation” (Brown & Moore 2012, p.3). That is to say, CFA helps to determine how and whether a set of indicators represent the specific constructed factors under which they are listed. “CFA verifies the number of underlying dimensions of the instrument (factors) and the pattern of item-factor relationships (factor loadings).” (ibid.). According to Kline (2016, p. 207), carrying out CFA also has certain requirements that include knowing “the number of factors” and “the correspondence between factors and indicators”. These specifications are met in the current study. As already explained (see Chapter 3, Section 3.3) the number of factors is known since they are based on – and so supported by the theory that is – the findings of the first phase of the study. Additionally, the items under each of these factors are known here (see Table 4 for examples). In this sense, this phase of the study seems to suite and meet the requirements for CFA.

In addition to these, there were two more reasons I elected to employ CFA in my analytical strategy. When developing questionnaires from the data of the first phase of the study, I established 15 factors for students’ and teachers’ questionnaires (see Table 4). Since the factors were directly taken from phase
one’s findings, I did not need to explore the data for possible constructs; as they were already qualitatively established, I aimed to validate these factors quantitatively in this phase. Consequently, CFA was the most suitable approach since I needed to confirm whether the items in fact represent the factors under which they were included. In addition, preserving the same constructs as phase one also served the aim of the second phase of the study through facilitating the process of validating and the generalising the initial findings. The second reason to use CFA was how it complemented the internal consistency test through Cronbach’s alpha that I also used in this phase as part of the analytical strategy (Taber 2017). This will be addressed in more details in this section.

To verify the 15 factors, I estimated CFA model fit for each factor on both data sets. As per the recommendations in Kline (2016), under normal theory Maximum Likelihood (ML), I evaluated the CFA model fit for each factor through Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and the Standardised Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMSR). Hu & Bentler (1999) suggest that a CFI that is greater or equal to 0.90 indicate a generally good fit, while a RMSEA & SRMSR equal to or lower than 0.08 are an indication of an acceptable one. These cut offs are generally accepted and adopted by the majority of researchers (Hooper et al. 2008, Xia & Yang 2018).

To run the analysis, I used RStudio (Version 2022.07.0 - Build 548 - for Windows) using lavaan and semPlot packages (Rosseel 2012; Epskamp 2015). The results of these are reported in Table 5 and Table 6 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferior Local Knowledge and Superior Western</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure/Interest in native speaker varieties</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes/Idealising the native speaker</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unequal classroom power relations</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>SRMSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ intolerance of the use of non-native varieties by teachers</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach to the test approach</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers imposing biased views on students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Ownership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language-Culture Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othering</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native speaker English as a learning target</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English to communicate with the Native speaker</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Calling for Change/ out-of-date content</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatched views on practice</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlooked Feedback</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After removing some problematic items, the results of the CFA model fit in Table 5 demonstrate that the 15 factors were confirmed. That is to say, the CFI for each factor is just about or well above 0.90 (acceptable range). At the same time, the RMSEA and SRMSR were equal to or less than 0.08; these, as recommended by Hu & Bentler (1999), are within the acceptable range. In this sense, the CFA results show that the model fit indices for each of the factors for students are generally acceptable. The same process was followed for teachers’ questionnaires. The results for the confirmatory factor analysis are shown in Table 6 below:

**Table 6: CFA model fit (CFI, RMSEA, and SRMSR values for each factor for teachers’ questionnaires)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferior Local Knowledge and Superior Western</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure/Interest in native speaker varieties</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes/Idealising the native speaker</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unequal power relations (older/younger teachers)</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ intolerance of the use of non-native varieties by teachers</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach to the test approach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers imposing biased views on students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Ownership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language-Culture Association</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othering</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native speaker English as a learning target</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling for Change/ out-of-date content</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatched views on practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlooked Feedback</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to students’ questionnaires, I also removed the problematic items to get the above CFA model fit results. These results indicate that the 14 factors were confirmed. The CFI for each of the constructs is over 0.90. This is within the acceptable range according to Hu & Bentler (1999). Similarly, the RMSEA and SRMSR were within the acceptable range (equal to or under 0.08). Therefore, it can be said that the model fit indices of the confirmatory factor analysis for the factors above are generally acceptable.

In addition to the confirmatory factor analysis, I also conducted an internal consistency test on the Likert scale items using SPSS (Version: 28.0.0.0 – 190). Cronbach’s alpha is perhaps the most common statistic to which authors refer to show that their item sets are closely related and reliable. Although the general rule of thumb for an ‘acceptable’ Cronbach’s alpha value is over 0.60 ~ 0.70 (Griethuijsen et al., 2014), values as low as 0.45 were considered “acceptable” and “sufficient” by several studies Taber (2017, p. 1278). In fact, Taber (ibid.) explains: “[this] suggests that there is no clear consensus on the most appropriate labels to use to describe the values obtained when calculating alpha.” (p. 1278). In this study,
most Cronbach’s alpha values were just about or over the rule of thumb (0.60) in the case of teachers (see Table 7). However, in the case of students, only eight factors (out of 15) made the recommended value 0.60 (see Table 8). Despite the relatively common agreement on certain values as the rule of thumb, lower values did not necessarily mean unreliable questionnaires all the time (Plummer & Tanis Ozcelik 2015; Taber 2017). Griethuijsen et al. (2014), for example, justified lower values as due to the small number of items in their scales. Other researchers (e.g., Pell & Jarvis 2001; Lamb, Akmal & Petrie 2015) explained theirs with participant’s difference in abilities as well as their association with the scales. Taking these into account, while several factors in this phase of the study were only represented by three items which may have affected their Cronbach’s Alpha values, I refrained from deleting items for other factors to improve reliability on the account of validity. In this sense, it can be said that Cronbach’s alpha can be taken as more of a measure of its “application to a particular sample of respondents” more than that of the factors or questionnaires themselves (Taber 2017). This also explains the variance in the values of similar scales between the student and teacher respondents.

The Cronbach’s Alphas value for the Likert scale items together for teachers’ questionnaire reached 0.88 (67 items), and 0.82 (62 items) for students. The tables below represent more details about the alpha value for each factor:

**Table 7: Cronbach’s alpha values for each factor in teachers’ questionnaires**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferior Local Knowledge and Superior Western</td>
<td>0.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure/Interest in native speaker varieties</td>
<td>0.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes/Idealising the native speaker</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unequal power relations (older/younger teachers)</td>
<td>0.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ intolerance of the use of non-native varieties by teachers</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After inverting some negative items then calculating the Cronbach’s Alphas value for the relevant Likert scale items, the results of the factors reported in Table 7 above are mostly acceptable. In the case of most of these factors, the value of Cronbach’s Alpha is over the generally ‘acceptable’ value (Griethuijsen et al., 2014). Factors with lower value than the generally used ‘rule of thumb’ of Cronbach’s Alpha are still acceptable in this study as they were still justifiable and yielded relevant results (see Chapter 7:). I followed the same process with student participants’ questionnaire results:

### Table 8: Cronbach’s alpha values for each factor in students’ questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferior Local Knowledge and Superior Western</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure/Interest in native speaker varieties</td>
<td>0.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes/Idealising the native speaker</td>
<td>0.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unequal classroom power relations</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerance to the use of non-native varieties in the classroom</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach to the test approach</td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers imposing biased views on students</td>
<td>0.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language ownership</td>
<td>0.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language-Culture Association</td>
<td>0.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othering</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native speaker English as a learning target</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning English to communicate with the Native speaker</td>
<td>0.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Calling for Change/ out-of-date content</td>
<td>0.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatched views on practice</td>
<td>0.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlooked Feedback</td>
<td>0.524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the negative items were reversed, and Cronbach’s Alpha was run, the results for most of the Likert scale items of each of the factors in Table 8 were over 0.50. These can be described as sufficient because the analysis of each of these factors still yield interpretable results (Taber 2017). Each of these factors are analysed in Chapter 7: where justifications were provided for some of the discrepancies in the responses of the student participants.

### 3.8 Researcher Reflexivity

Berger (2015) defines reflexivity as:

> A researcher’s conscious and deliberate effort to be attuned to one’s own reactions to respondents and to the way in which the research account is constructed, it helps identify and explicate potential or actual effect of personal, contextual, and circumstantial aspects on the process and findings of the study and maintain their awareness of themselves as part of the world they study. (p. 221)
In other words, reflexivity is the process through which the researcher is consciously aware of how their lived experiences, aspects of the Self, their role, and their educational and social backgrounds shape and influence the way they conduct research (Brown & Moore 2012). It is a process of recognising the ‘humanness’ while doing research (Dean 2017, p. 1). In conducting this study, I was aware of how my past experiences, my educational background, and my views and beliefs would interfere with the research. Before starting my PhD, I was a student of English as a foreign language in an Algerian university, as explained in the introduction chapter of this thesis (see Chapter 1, Section 1.3). I was myself part of the same educational system which this study aims at exploring. Throughout my university years as a student, I was taught English with an emphasis on native-speakerism, the ‘Standard English’ ideology, the language-culture association and other colonial and unequal power infused ideologies. I was not aware of the effects of these on how I perceived myself and others until I was put in a situation where all what I took for granted for years as ‘true’, ‘normal’, and part of ELT was questioned (see Chapter 1, Section 1.3). It is these factors that resulted in me floating between insider and outsider positions in this research (Merriam et al. 2001). The insider positionality might have been most evident in how I approached the research questions and the type of questions I chose to ask my participants. This is mainly because in doing so, I was influenced by my own past experiences. The insider position therefore allowed me to understand and relate to the experiences of my participants. It enabled rapport building with them and it enriched the qualitative phase’s explorations. However, I was also an outsider who has been made ‘slightly’ different because of my educational trajectory and knowledge on the subject I am researching. This floating of positionalities was most clear in how my understanding of Academic Coloniality progressively changed as I learnt more about it from previous research as well as my own (see Chapter 6, Section 6.3).

For the reasons explored above, when I started my data collection and analysis, it was crucial to explore how my different positionings in relation to my participants would influence the process and outcomes
It was particularly important to explore relations of power and reciprocity. That is to say, the impression my participants would have on me as the expert who is doing research on ELT in a UK university, who is asking questions, might have influence the power imbalances during fieldwork. This is evident in how my participants constantly sought reassurance on some of the answers they were giving such as, “is this relevant?”, and “was that helpful?”. To balance the power relations, I aimed at reminding participants of my keen interests in listening to all of what they have to say and that their experiences are all relevant to my study. Besides that, in some instances, I shared with them my own experiences of being a student in Algeria to remind them that just like them, at times my experiences resembled theirs. My commitment to listening to their stories and my quest to making their voices heard was also a way to reciprocate the time my participants invested in taking part in my study (Seidman 2006). Rather than neglecting their effects, by acknowledging my switching positionalities, my subjectivities, and predispositions, my aim was to understand how they affected and shaped the research process. This includes both phases of it, particularly because the second quantitative phase was based on the findings of the first one.

3.9 Quality Criteria

3.9.1 Trustworthiness (Criteria of Judgement - Phase 1)

The qualitative nature of the research in the first phase of the study dictates evaluation criteria relevant to the qualitative research approach as opposed to the quantitative one. Lincoln & Guba (1985) developed a set of criteria for evaluating research under this paradigm that consist of: Credibility, Transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Qualitative research often relies on these criteria whilst quantitative research often uses ‘validity’ and ‘reliability’ as criteria to evaluate research (ibid.).

In order to ensure credibility of the study, I followed a number of techniques that many scholars recommended to ensure trustworthiness (e.g., Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Creswell & Miller, 2000; Maxwell,
These techniques included member checking, data collection and researcher triangulation, and audit inquiry (Lincoln & Guba 1985, Creswell & Miller 2000, Nowell et al 2017). Throughout this phase, including the pilot study, I made sure to go back to the participants (on a voluntary basis) after the initial interpretation to make sure their ideas were well-represented. Additionally, As already explained in this chapter, I triangulated my data collection methods and my sources of data to minimise shortcomings of the online semi-structured interviews. I have also kept constant contact with my supervisory team whose reflections were essential for the direction this work went and kept record of these.

In this phase of the study, the intention was not to generalise attitudes and beliefs of teachers and students of English, but it was to provide a deep understanding of the ideological context under which ELT is taking place at the target university. This, therefore, aligns with the criterion of transferability in qualitative research which does not seek to generalise the findings, but only transfer them to ‘similar contexts’ (Lincoln & Guba 1985). Since I was unable to know the possible contexts to which findings may be transferred, I made sure to provide ‘thick descriptions’, i.e., detailed descriptions of the context, methods used, data collection and analysis (Creswell & Miller 2000). In this way, it is the responsibility of the reader to make the judgement if the findings can be transferred to their own context (Nowell et al. 2017).

Ensuring the dependability of the findings refers to the researcher’s clear, logical, and traceable process in doing the research. For this phase of the study, decisions made throughout the data collection were mentioned in several sections in this chapter. I made sure to provide detailed descriptions and rationale behind these decisions throughout the research, in the research design, sampling and data collection sections to ensure meeting the dependability of the study’s findings. I also added a section on researcher reflexivity (Miles & Huberman 1994).
Confirmability is the equivalent of the evaluation criterion of objectivity in the positivist view. It is “concerned with establishing that the researcher’s interpretations and findings are clearly derived from the data, requiring the researcher to demonstrate how conclusions and interpretations have been reached” (Nowell et al 2017, p. 3). To establish the confirmability criterion in this phase of the study, I employed several techniques to ensure that my findings are shaped by the data collected and not myself as the researcher; this included triangulating my data collection methods and sources, and constantly referring to the text and data during the analysis.

3.9.2 Validity and Reliability (Criteria of Judgement - Phase 2)

In order for the online survey questionnaire to meet the quality criteria of the quantitative research, i.e., validity and reliability, several techniques were employed. Validity refers to the level at which a research method, in this case, the questionnaire, measures what it was designed to measure (Mohajan 2017, p.70). Reliability, on the other hand, refers to the extent to which the research findings are consistent, accurate, and replicable (Kvale & Brinkmann 2009, p.245). There are many reasons which might potentially result in validity and reliability to be compromised in research. These can include, as Sue & Ritter (2012, p. 55) suggest; 1) Social desirability, i.e., respondents’ feeling pressure to conform to social norms and giving the ‘right’ answer rather than the valid one, 2) Inaccurate estimation, i.e., respondents’ inability to accurately estimate the information requested from them, and finally 3) the wording of the survey questions. To elicit valid and reliable responses and ensure a rigorous data analysis, I opted for minimising the effects of these factors in several ways. First, I reassured participants of their anonymity and reduced the collection of any identifiable information about them as part of the data such as their names. This is to reduce social desirability bias. I also made sure to ask questions that are specific, that students can easily relate to, and that are easy to recall from their daily classroom interactions, particularly, through administering the questionnaires during term period while students were still frequenting university.
Furthermore, designing a valid questionnaire also requires keeping in mind the purpose for which the questionnaire was designed when formulating the questions. In the case of this research, the survey questionnaire aimed at testing and generalising the findings of the first phase of the study; therefore, questions were developed in reference to them. In addition to that, questions were developed using everyday simple language (Oliveri et al. 2021), which was inspired by the language used by the participants of the first phase. Questions were also closed-ended to provide reliable measurements and because “respondents are turned off by the difficulty of recalling and articulating information and will usually skip open-ended items when they can” (Sure & Ritter 2012, p. 56). Further steps that were taken to ensure the reliability and replicability of the findings included thoroughly describing the target population and sample as well as sampling methods and procedures, discussing the processes through which the questionnaires were distributed, and providing a detailed description of the data collection instrument including the provision of a copy of the questionnaire (Creswell 2002, p. 405).

3.10 Ethical issues

In order to abide by ethical research regulations, all interview participants were provided with a consent form (see Appendix 5) and a participant information sheet (see Appendix 7) prior to conducting the interviews. These contained information about the purpose of the study, reasons for selecting them as participants, what participation involved and other details about privacy and contact details in case they had questions. Both documents were designed with reference to Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research by British Educational Research Association (BERA) and the guide to conducting confidential research online by the University of Bath and granted ethical approval on January 2020. All interview participants were reminded of their right to withdraw at any point during the interviews without having to provide explanation and with no consequences even after giving consent to participate.

Beyond this logistical procedure, I also had to pay close attention to a number of issues related to conducting ethical research online. These issues were specifically related to how data was stored in the
online applications where the interviews took place. The interviews took place on Facebook Messenger and Skype V 8.55. I therefore had to check how these websites process and retain data. While all Skype-to-Skype calls are encrypted (Skype 2022), which means that data is not shared with any third party, Facebook Messenger uses a number of built-in tools, such as limiting access of third parties, to manage data in a secure way (Messenger Privacy and Safety 2022).

Similarly, participants in the survey were also required to tick a box to indicate their consent to participate in the survey before moving to the next page. This was done after setting up an information sheet in the first page of the online survey to ensure that they were fully informed about the research process and what it entailed and their right to withdrawal (Mahon 2013, Roberts & Allen 2015).

In order to adhere to the ethical guidelines set by the university of Bath and BERA, confidentiality measures were taken to ensure anonymity of the participants. All real names of institutions and the participants were not mentioned anywhere in the study, and the anonymised data was saved on my password-protected computer and backed up on the University of Bath X drive. Only I and my supervisors had access to the anonymised data. Dornyei (2007) and Merriam (2009) argue that some participants might still be identifiable even after data is anonymised, and it is the researcher’s responsibility to maintain anonymity in these cases. This was also taken into consideration throughout the whole study. Therefore, any traceable and identifiable information, such as individuals’ names and locations, were removed from the quotes. Survey participants, on the other hand, were not required to provide their names. This was to minimise any risks of traceability. For purposes of validity, however, names of their institutions were collected. For ethical reasons, these were not shared in the research and were handled only through the University’s secured software.
3.11 Summary of the Chapter

This chapter described and detailed the methodological design of this study. It started by exploring its rootedness in the social constructivism paradigm where I made clear my philosophical stances which ultimately shaped the study at hand. Furthermore, it explained how the study uses a mixed methods exploratory sequential design suited for the aims of this study to first explore and identify traces of Academic Coloniality in ELT in higher education in Algeria, to then test whether these traces are generalisable to a larger population. This chapter also provides detailed descriptions of the study’s context where I provided description of its settings then moved to sampling procedures, participants’ recruitment processes, data collection methods and procedures, as well as data analysis. Throughout, I ensured to provide in-depth and thick descriptions, including a section on researcher reflexivity, on both phases of the research process. This is not only for matters of validity, reliability, and trustworthiness, but also to ensure transparency. The chapter concluded by a note on ethical issues arising from the research and how these were handled to ensure the conduct of an ethical research.
Chapter 4: Findings: Production and Manifestation

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I present the qualitative findings on how aspects of Academic Coloniality are manifested within the people involved in ELT at the target university and how these aspects are produced. The data presented here were collected through the first and second sections of the interviews (items 1 to 6) with teacher participants and students at the target university. This chapter aims to address RQ1 and RQ2 and specifically to highlight the production and manifestation of Academic Coloniality in the attitudes and reported practices of participants at one university. That is to say, the results presented here show the points of view of the two participant groups that reflect their a) awareness and views of varieties of English, b) the relevance of those to their teaching and learning, and c) their attitudes towards the association of English to specific culture/s. Finally, I conclude this chapter with a summary of the findings about each of these aspects and how they relate to each other.

4.2 Awareness and Views of Varieties of English

The opinions of the teacher and student participants about the different varieties of English can be observed through their perceptions of the linguistic and sociolinguistic status of these varieties and their speakers. Qualitative data about this were gathered through the discussion of items 1, 2 and 3 of the interview questions (for both students and teachers). The data analysis indicated that both participant groups showed bias towards ‘native speaker’ English varieties by claiming these to be more academic, the origin of the language, and more desirable.

4.2.1 Because ‘Native English’ is More Formal (Academic English)

4.2.1.1 Students on Perceived Formality of ‘Native English’

An emerging sub-theme from the students’ responses to the interviews to justify their bias towards ‘native speaker’ varieties is claiming that these varieties were more academic. Responding to interview items 1
to 3, students showed signs that their learning target was ‘nativeness’ and not communication since ‘native speaker’ English was “more academic”. This was expressed in several participants’ responses:

I also think each individual has each own accent, each one is trying to perfect their English accent in order to attain that level of near native speaker accent, whether it’s American English or British English. We call it academic English (SP4/Interview.06/07/2020)

There are several points to call attention to in this extract. To begin with, the respondent here argued that learning English for them was to attempt to imitate the ‘native speaker’. However, learners would never reach their level of proficiency as the best they could do was to get “near native speaker accent”. This is clear evidence that the target for learning for the participant was ‘nativeness’ rather than communication. On top of that, this also indicates that the participant viewed themselves as always inferior to the ‘native speaker’ regardless of how proficient they were or could become using the language. This is also a further indication of the power relation between the learner and the ‘native speaker’ that such beliefs result in. Additionally, the participant appeared to recognise that English accents varied individually for learners of English. However, they still assumed that there was only one ‘native speaker accent’ that they viewed as the target for learning. This also indicates the participants’ lack of awareness about ‘native speaker’ English. Another point to highlight from the extract is that the student seemed to believe that learners of English used imperfect language and were trying to “perfect” it by imitating the ‘native speaker’. In fact, another participant viewed that those who spoke academic English were a commodity that should be cherished:

I think we should focus more on the RP, received pronunciation is fading away, trust me.

The few teachers that use the British accent, you can count them on the fingers of one hand. (SP2/Interview.10/07/2020)
The participant in this extract expressed the necessity to focus on RP as fewer and fewer teachers at the university were using it. They also stressed that there were only a few teachers left who “use the British accent”. This is evidence that participants did not tolerate the use of ‘non-native’ forms not only by their peers, but also from their teachers. In addition to this, the linguistic forms the participant used to refer to their teachers who spoke ‘native speaker’ English “you can count them on the fingers of one hand” indicate that they saw those teachers of higher status because they spoke “British English”. This further supports the student participant’s bias towards ‘native speaker’ varieties. Furthermore, besides the point that ‘non-native’ varieties were considered incorrect, student participants emphasised the idea that ‘native speaker’ English varieties were the only correct ones, since they were “academic”:

I think the students should go deep into the language, speaking correctly, pronouncing correctly with a lot of aspects concerning academic native English.

(SP3/Interview.13/07/2020)

Here, the participant seemed to believe that the “correct” variety of English that they should be learning was the “academic native English”. Besides the clear bias towards ‘native speaker’ English considering it the correct one, it is interesting to note that the linguistic forms the participant used here appeared to hold that the only academic variety of English was that of the ‘native speaker’. The participant’s discursive strategy to justify ‘nativeness’ as the learning target was that ‘native speaker English’ was not just the only correct variety, but also the only academic one.

4.2.1.2 Teachers on Perceived Formality of ‘Native English’

Findings here show that most teacher participants held similar views and discursive strategies to their students in terms of bias towards ‘native speaker’ varieties. Some teacher participants appeared to hold strong views on what English varieties their students should be learning and why they should do so. The following exchange provides several illustrations of the participants’ views:
Exchange 1:

I: What if they [students] choose something else different that is not American or British English or maybe even not Australian?

TP1: I don’t know any other—for example, we can’t allow them to speak French English or Algerian English or whatever English; so it’s either or—it’s either they choose to speak British English, I mean the correct one, or the American English which is correct, the other ones I don’t think—so far, let me say from an academic point of view, of course; when you talk university, it’s like this. In the streets it’s a different story of course.

I: Yeah, we’re talking about it in academic contexts, specifically at university.

TP1: yes, absolutely; we have two basic pronunciations: it’s either British or American.

I: Why not, as you said, a French version of it isn’t accepted?

TP1: well, of course, look! When somebody speaks French English; it’s understood, he makes people understand him, but that is not the correct English. I mean “I think” - when a person says “I think that is very important” [participant speaks in a French accent]. We understand them, but it’s not the correct English to speak. Academically speaking, of course. It’s not a matter of communication because you’re not in a stance where we communicate only. I mean, when you understand me it’s okay, in this way I can speak to you very broken English, and then we say “okay we accept it.” If I say for example, “he spoke” instead of saying “he speaks” you know, I can break the rules as I want and I say do you understand me, you say okay. No, it’s not that. From an academic point of view, we have to follow the rules, of course.

I: “following the rules” here, does it mean following the British or American?
TP1: yes. (TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)

There are several points to focus on in this exchange in addition to the ones previously raised by students (see Section 4.2.1.1). The participant stated that they would not “allow” their students to learn a ‘non-native’ variety including a hypothetical Algerian English. In addition to this being the same point indicated by their students, ‘native speaker’ varieties as the target for learning, the participant’s linguistic units show clear evidence for the imbalanced power relations they had with their learners. That is to say, the use of the verb “allow” in this context shows that the teacher believed they had the power to decide what English variety their students should learn. The participant in the extract also used exclusive language referring to any ‘non-native’ English variety, limiting the target for learning to “either British or American” English. They also used similar discursive strategies to their students’ claiming that ‘native speaker’ varieties were the only “correct” ones “from an academic point of view” to justify them as learning targets.

Exchange 1 also provides more findings about the teacher participants’ views. When they were asked about the reasons for which they did not allow their students to learn about ‘non-native’ English varieties, the participant clarified that those were not the “the correct English to speak”. This is further evidence for the association of correctness to ‘native speaker’ varieties. More interestingly, the participant claimed that “Academically speaking, [...] It’s not a matter of communication”. Instead, for them, it was that of correctness. That is to say, even if the learner could successfully communicate in a ‘non-native’ accent without any linguistic or grammatical errors, it was still unacceptable. Instead, because ‘native’ varieties were more academic, they should be the target. This also supports previous findings (see Section 4.2.1.1) of how intolerant participant were of the ‘non-native’ varieties. Justifying this point, the teacher stated that the fluidity that the use of ‘non-native’ forms brings could be problematic. The participant then appeared to circle back to the point that in academic contexts, the purpose for learning the language was not just to communicate. Otherwise, ‘non-native’ forms would be acceptable. Instead, they insisted that in academic contexts, learners “have to follow the rules” of “British or American” English. This signifies
that only ‘native speaker’ English varieties were considered academic by the participant, and so acceptable. At the same time, any other variety was not academically acceptable, and so was not tolerated in their classes.

Findings from students regarding these points were very similar and were even expressed in comparable linguistic forms. This could indicate that such views originated from the teachers and were transferred to the students through teacher-student classroom interaction. In fact, a teacher participant explicitly stated that from their experience:

In our department, I always remember my teachers saying that the English we are using is British English focusing on RP. (TP2/Interview.3/07/2020)

In this extract the teacher participant reported that, when they were students, their teachers (at the department where they are currently working) asserted that they favoured British English “with a focus on RP” as the learning target. Besides the idea that the focus of learning was on ‘native speaker’ varieties, this illustrates how these views and biases were transferred from teachers to their students through their interactions. In this case, the former student became the teacher and was now having the same effect on their current students going a full circle. In fact, the same participant stated that they noticed how intolerant their students were to their use of ‘non-native’ English varieties:

I have been to different places in the world and what I noticed is that wherever I am and I speak English, people do not really care about my accent. What is important for them is the medium of communication, which is English. However, if you are at university talking to students, let’s say, who specialise in ELT, the students really care about the accent, and they do make a different between the British and Americans and other accents (TP2/Interview.3/07/2020)
The participant here reflected on their experience with other speakers of English around the world. They reported that, when they were outside the country, people did not pay attention to the variety they used as long as they were able to communicate successfully. On the other hand, they did not seem to enjoy the same tolerance from their students. This is consistent with the previous findings about students’ intolerance of ‘non-native’ English forms (see Section 4.2.1.1). Under these circumstances, it appears that student’s intolerance of the ‘non-native’ English varieties also affected teachers who felt pressured to abide by ‘native speaker’ norms. At the same time, this does not necessarily mean that these teachers were willing to include ‘non-native’ varieties in their practice. When asked about the relevance of those to their teaching, they responded:

If you want to speak English, it’s better to speak British or American rather than go and use another accent[]. I don’t think that either students or teachers would prefer other accents to American or British. (TP2/Interview.3/07/2020)

Here, the participant argued that speaking British or American English was superior to speaking other varieties. Their discursive strategy was that this was also the preference of both students and teachers. This is clear evidence that these teachers held nativeness as the target for learning instead of communication. Interestingly, they backed up their argument by claiming that other teachers and students preferred ‘native English’ varieties. While this will be discussed in more details in Section 4.2.2, it is important to link this to earlier findings. In other words, the participant’s claim here can be the result of them facing the intolerance from other teachers and students towards ‘non-native’ varieties. In a way, this circle of intolerance normalised these views among the participants.

Findings of this section showed that the views of the two participant groups reflected several aspects of Academic Coloniality. Both students and teachers displayed bias towards ‘native speaker’ English varieties considering those to be the learning target. In fact, the findings highlighted that the purpose for learning English for some of the participants was not communication, but nativeness. Both groups also expressed
intolerance towards the use of ‘non-native’ varieties highlighting issues of codification and teachability. It was also found in this section that these similarities in views and how they were expressed was an indication of the effects of teachers on the views of their students. This was backed up by findings about the power relations between them, in addition to the evidence of these views going full circle from teachers to students who became teachers. These findings also showed that the intolerance of the participants creates an echo chamber effect that ensures the persistence of the same views.

4.2.2 Because ‘Native English’ Is the Origin

4.2.2.1 Students on Perceived ‘Native English’ as the Origin

The second sub-theme of this section springs from students’ discursive strategy to justify holding ‘native speaker’ English (often British English) as the learning target by claiming that it was the origin of the language. The belief in the ideal ‘native speaker’ English was explicitly expressed in several instances throughout the exchanges in the first section of the interviews. While some of the participants used this belief to justify their biases towards ‘native speaker’ English, others expressed it while explaining different arguments. For example, when asked about a particular variety they thought should be the point of reference in ELT in Algeria, SP4 responded:

That’s a good question! Honestly, I cannot actually have a strict answer to that because I’m torn between a big YES! Which is a British accent, which is the academic English, UK English, because historically it is the origin and old English; at the same time, another side of me is a saying a big NO, you know, when learning a language there is no real reference, especially when these languages have many varieties, so it’s all about personal choice.

(SP4/Interview.06/07/2020)

The student participant here was indecisive about the issue of specifying a variety of English to teach in higher education in Algeria. They expressed that it could be a specific ‘native variety’ or could be left to
the learners to choose. More relevant to this section are the arguments the participant provided for both possibilities. They stated that they would choose British English because it was academic, and because it was the origin. In addition to supporting findings from Section 4.2.1, this also highlights the participants’ belief in ‘native speaker’ English as the origin. On the other hand, the student also argued that since English had many varieties, the choice should be left to the learner. While this could be taken as a sign of awareness of English varieties, the participant did not refer to any other choices than ‘native speaker’ British and American varieties throughout their interview. Additionally, this demonstrated a level of tolerance towards learners’ use of language despite their unrealistic claim that “there is no real reference” in learning a second language. The students’ indecisiveness towards the issue could be an indication of a lack of thorough consideration of it, or that they had not internalised either of the positions. Nonetheless, other students seemed to argue differently:

Here in Algeria, I think we can easily speak the original native language, I think, the American. It’s really popular in our country because of movies and all those things. I think the community tend to speak American. (SP3/Interview.13/07/2020)

This extract provides an example for the participants’ use of the claim that ‘native speaker’ English was the origin in other arguments. The linguistic forms and the structure of the participant’s discursive strategy here indicate that they took the idea of “original native English” for granted since they based their argument on it. That is to say, the participant started from the assertion that American English as an “original native” variety to then explain how movies and media offered constant exposure to it. This latter point will be discussed in more details in Section 4.3. As for the former, starting from the idea that American English is the “original native” variety to make their argument can be taken as evidence for its normalisation. In turn, this contributes to reproducing the discourse of ‘native speaker’ English as beneficial/neutral. As shown in Section 4.2.1, such views can result from interaction with teachers:
SP4: You know in writing, I’m speaking about myself to avoid generalising, I think that I have been, let’s say (...) I wouldn’t say brainwashed, because it’s a big word; let’s say we’ve been really used to the fact that if you ever going to write an English essay or even a paragraph, you better use the British way because it’s the academic way.

I: By whom?

SP4: Teachers of course! Because as far and as long as I remember teachers always used to always say that the correct way or the formal way to write whatever piece of writing in English is the British one, which is also referred to as Academic English. But they have never gave us a reason.

I: How do you feel about that?

SP4: I honestly do not know, growing up, I used to follow the rules, you know the Algerian way, you have to have the mark, because it’s not actually about education it’s about marking. So, I always followed the rules (SP4/Interview.06/07/2020)

This exchange contains several points that are worth exploring in further details. Initially, the manner that the participant described the intense instructions to follow ‘native speaker’ English norm is noteworthy. They specifically stated that they were “really used to” that to the extent that they were almost “brainwashed” to follow those norms since they were academic. These linguistic forms are clear evidence of how students were inscribed with particular discourses that they became normalised among them. When asked, the participant stated that their teachers instructed them to abide by those norms claiming that they were “correct”, “formal” and “academic”. This illustrates how teachers normalised these discourses among their students.

The participant also added that those teachers did not provide explanations for pushing such discourses. Here, instead of being instructed how to learn, students were told what to learn. This is an indication of:
first, a traditional teacher-centred approach, which is discussed in more details in Chapter 5; second, the imbalanced power relations these teachers had with their students. When asked about their thoughts on the issue, the student revealed that they were more concerned about the mark than the learning, and so, they just followed their teachers’ instructions. The participant here described a ‘teach to the test’ approach where the purpose of learning becomes solely a scores-hunt. In such circumstances, learners do not challenge any of their teachers’ views since the aim of the teaching is “not actually about education it’s about marking”. This lack of criticality further contributes to establishing and normalising these discourses.

4.2.2.2 Teachers on Perceived ‘Native English’ as the Origin

The views of teacher participants were similar to those of their students claiming that ‘native English’ was the origin. Participants explicitly stated this in several instances in their interviews. Additionally, this section also further tracks the production of these views among teachers. For instance, one of the teacher participants who was relatively recently recruited – and yet to complete three years of teaching at the target university – stated:

In Algeria, the moment any teacher is enrolled or recruited in higher education especially in an English department, there is a kind of a strict note usually provided by teachers who are much more experienced than we used to be, which is to adopt the British way of speaking, not the American one. [] I noticed the major one instruction, which not only I but many other teachers have been asked to abide by, is to speak the British English not the American variety and of course ‘as standard as we can possibly make it’ [participant uses exaggerated British accent]. (TP3/Interview.5/07/2020)

In this extract, the participant reported what typically took place when someone new was hired. They stated that when they and reportedly other teachers were hired, more experienced teaching staff instructed them to adhere to British English norms; the “strict note” stated that they should not even
consider American English. These findings depict how certain discourses were transferred among teachers. The linguistic units that the participant used here also demonstrate the authoritative way that they were instructed to follow those norms. This further signifies the imbalanced power relations between teachers with different experience. As such, not even American English was tolerated in this context; and by extension, neither were ‘non-native’ varieties. When asked, the participant provided several ideas to justify the intolerance, their position, and the nature of their interaction with the older teachers:

I: What do you think is the reason they want you to go for British English?

TP3: To be honest, at first, I thought that it must surely have something to do with international relations, maybe it has something to do with the teaching programmes, or some mutual relations between England and Algeria (...) that they want to implement or to have this sort of variety spoken by the majority, and I also think that British variety looks more standard, looks more formal than the American variety. These are two main reasons, when we speak, we always have to go to the root, the origin and I think that must surely be another sound reason for these teachers to be instructing this kind of (...) it’s an advice, it has not been given in any formal way, but the majority agree upon it and I also happen to align with them.

(TP3/Interview.5/07/2020)

Here, the participant provided the assumptions they made for the reasons they were instructed to adhere to British English norms. They initially assumed it could be the result of some agreement between Algeria and Britain, then that the reason was because British English was more “standard” and “formal”, and finally by making the claim that British variety was the origin. Before looking into these individually, the fact that the participant made assumptions means that their more experienced colleagues did not justify the reasoning for their instruction; a similar pattern to how students were instructed to follow the same ‘native speaker’ variety. This is not only evidence for the naturalisation of these discourses, but also of how successful this process was. In other words, despite those being given informally and without
justifications, the teacher participant did not question their legitimacy. Instead, they attempted to justify them by themselves. In fact, the respondent added that they “align with” those since ‘native English’ was “standard”, “formal”, “the root” and “the origin”. Besides their own beliefs, teachers also noted that students held similar beliefs about ‘native speaker’ varieties:

I: What about other varieties [of English], do you think they are important or even relevant to ELT in Algeria?

**TP2:** What do you mean by other varieties?

I: Other than British and American.

**TP2:** Our students are very proud, it’s like the French proverb “if you want something, ask it directly from God”, that’s what they go by. If you want to speak English, it’s better to speak British or American rather than go and use another accent. *(TP2/Interview.3/07/2020)*

This extract presents another assertion by which teacher participants continue to normalise biases towards ‘native speaker’ varieties. The participant claimed that students were too “proud” to learn about ‘non-native’ varieties of English. This can be explained in reference to the previously pointed out intolerance to ‘non-native’ varieties this teacher experienced from their students (see Section 4.2.1.2). Here, the respondent justified their students’ attitude through the proverb “if you want something, ask it directly from God”. Here, the status of the ‘native speaker’ as “god” also affirms the participants’ view of English as the origin. Additionally, the teacher participant’s justification for their students’ bias indicates their lack of awareness of the role they played in the normalisation of these.

This section highlighted the bias of the two participant groups towards ‘native speaker’ varieties, how they used the assertion that those were the origin to justify this, and on tracing how these beliefs were normalised in this context. Findings showed that these biases were normalised among students through their interactions with their teachers who, in imbalanced power relations, rigorously instructed them to
strictly follow ‘native speaker’ English norms. At the same time, students did not challenge these instructions because of ‘the teach to the test’ approach followed in the context. Instead, they developed a scores-hunt strategy as an adaptation to that. Results in this section also demonstrated that newly recruited teachers received similarly strict instructions to abide by ‘native speaker’ norms from more experienced teaching staff. Often, those teachers already agreed with the instructions. Teachers’ interactions with students who did not tolerate the use of ‘non-native’ English varieties also served to normalise those beliefs. Overall, this section provided significant results in relation to how certain aspects of Academic Coloniality were manifested, transferred, and normalised among teachers and students at the target university.

4.2.3 Because ‘Native English’ Is More desirable

4.2.3.1 Students’ Perception of the Desirability of ‘Native English’

Student participants continued to justify their biases throughout this section by claiming that ‘native speaker’ varieties were more desirable. In their discussion of items 1 to 3 of the interviews, students repeatedly claimed that teachers and students were more inclined to learn and teach ‘native speaker’ English varieties and provided several explanations for that:

**SP1:** in Algeria, people are more likely to spread here in Algeria the American one, American English. Because the young generation and the following one are more interested in the first world and the developed world, songs, movies... etc, they are really attracted by that and they try to imitate them. And again, the American dream is a big idea in here. And this is why it is more likely to be used in here.

I: Do you think that’s relevant to English language teaching at university?

**SP1:** I think so, you know, when we are talking about the orientation, when we get our Baccalaureate degree and choose to study English, most of it is because we are attracted
to a certain culture and a certain variety like the British or American, like people their dream is to live in the UK or just you know. That’s why I think they choose English as a major.

(SP1/Interview.15/07/2020)

In this exchange, the participant started by explaining that students were “more likely” to be interested in American English because of their attraction to the ‘developed world’, their intrigue by media towards it, and because they tried to imitate the lifestyle. This explanation provides evidence for another origin of the production of some aspects of Academic Coloniality among participants: the effects of media. These are discussed below in Section 4.3.2, so the focus here is on the idealisation of the American English, its speakers, and their lifestyle. The participant’s linguistic units used to describe those “first world and the developed world” provides insights into how they viewed them. Their use of forms like “developed” to describe speakers of American English suggests a dichotomous view between those and themselves. That is to say, it appears that the student here viewed American norms and lifestyle as more developed than their own. This is a common discourse in post-colonial contexts (see Chapter 6, Section 6.3). This effect is further reinforced by the idealistic representations of ‘native speaker’ norms on the media. Essentially, the participant’s discursive strategy was that learners of English in Algeria were attracted to American English because of the idealised images they had about it, its speakers, and their lifestyle. In fact, they specifically stated “the American dream is a big idea in here” which reflects the extent to which they were affected by the stereotypical American cultural norms.

When asked about the relevance of that to ELT at university, the participant explained how it played a role in students choosing to do English as a major in the first place. They stated that their attraction to British and American cultures influenced them to do English at university. In fact, the participant specified that some students’ “dream is to live in the UK”. In their assertion that they chose to study English at university because of their attraction to “the British or American” cultures or varieties, there is clear indication of them learning English to communicate with the ‘native speaker’. In fact, the student
specifically exemplified that students “dream” to live in an English ‘native speaking’ country, and so choose to study English. This does not only emphasise the idea of learning English to communicate with the ‘native speaker’, but also the understanding that Britain and the USA were the only contexts where they would use the language. In this case, attraction to ‘native speaker’ English varieties among students started even before joining university.

Results from previous sections showed that teachers preferred British English; even the newly recruited teaching staff were strictly instructed to follow those norms (see Sections 4.2.1.2). Naturally, students reported several instances of their clashes of preferences for either variety. The following exchange illustrates one of the student participants’ view on the issue and their explanation to their teachers’ attitudes:

Exchange 2

I: Are any of them [varieties of English other than British and American] incorporated in your learning at university?

SP5: Of the other varieties? No. Even when you talk (...) There are some teachers when you talk to them and you use the American accent, they correct you, it’s annoying (...) When you talk in American, they correct you []

I: Have you experienced that yourself?

SP5: Yes, and it’s frustrating!

I: Why do you think they do that?

SP5: I don’t know because they have particular standards that you need to reach if you don’t then you’re not good enough, you need to reach that particular (...) the roof, they said.

(SP5/Interview.12/07/2020)
First, the disagreement between students and teachers seems to only involve American and British English excluding any ‘non-native’ varieties. This could indicate either a lack of awareness of those, or simply not considering them of high enough status to be targets for their learning and teaching. In fact, the student participant themselves stated that they were not aware of other varieties:

I, for example, did not know there is an Indian accent or (xxx). I just thought there are three: British and American and Australian. [] Students need to be aware of that (SP5/Interview.12/07/2020)

This provides clear evidence of the lack of awareness among students about ‘non-native’ varieties. This is likely due to the complete disregard of those in their studies. Going back to Exchange 2, the extract shows how the student participant felt about the disagreement they had with their teachers when using any variety of English other than the British one. They stated that ‘non-native’ varieties were not incorporated in their learning. Further, the participant explained that their teachers corrected them even for the use of American English. It is interesting here to note the participant’s use of language “even when” to make the point that their teachers did not even allow speaking American English, let alone “the other varieties”. This provides further evidence for the intolerance of some teachers to ‘non-native’ varieties, and even American English in this case. Evidence suggests that those teachers only accept British English as a learning target.

On top of supporting previous findings, Exchange 2 demonstrates a different reaction from students to their teachers’ intolerance to their use of English varieties that they did not approve of. SP5 stated that being corrected when they used American English was “annoying” and “frustrating”. In other words, despite their lack of awareness of ‘non-native’ varieties, students still objected to their teachers’ intolerance. When asked about reasons for the intolerance, they asserted that their teachers had “particular standards” that they expected students to adhere to; for them, those were “the roof, they said”. In other words, for those teachers, the British English ‘native speaker’ was the ultimate language
user and should be the learning target for their students. While some students accepted, normalised, and adopted these views; others found them discouraging. However, in both cases, the attitude that ‘native English’ varieties were of higher status was reinforced. This particular point explains the previous findings about student participants’ views on ‘native varieties’ as superior. Interestingly, the student here appeared to be aware of this effect on their classmates:

There are some students who think that British accent is hard, and the way British people live and the way they interact with the world; it’s so much of an elite way like they are superior [] for example, I was talking to my friend [] she prefers the British and when we talked about it she said that it’s more elegant, and it’s more “appropriate”, that’s the word; she said top-study English. *(SP5/Interview.12/07/2020)*

Here, the participant presented some of their classmates’ beliefs about British English and its speakers. They stated that those classmates consider British norms “superior” and that of an “elite” group. The participant then gave the example about their friend who “prefers the British” English because she believed it was “more elegant”, “more appropriate” and “top-study English”. Here, it appears that the friend normalised similar views to their teachers of a superior British English that should be the learning target. This is further confirmation to how such discourses were transferred and reproduced. When asked about the source of their teachers’ views, the participant provided a detailed explanation:

**I:** What do you think is the source of those standards?

**SP5:** Because most of our teachers who do that are more experienced in the British society, so you find that they have studied in Britain, and they interacted with their people and not so much with the American society. That’s why they believe that students who are learning English are supposed to learn the RP, as they said. So, they need to speak in adopting the way the BBC speak, you know. *(SP5/Interview.12/07/2020)*
In this extract, the participant explained their teachers’ attitudes towards ‘native speaker’ British English. They stated that the main reason was that those teachers were more familiar with British norms – as opposed to American ones –, that some teachers studied in the UK, and their interactions with people there contributed to that. The participant conveyed that those teachers who insisted on them using only British English had more knowledge about British English than American. They claimed that this was due to them studying in the UK and so being more familiar with British norms. That is to say, the participant based their discursive strategy here on their teachers’ familiarity with British English, and so they preferred it. However, as will be explained in the following section, that was not the case with all teachers. Apparently, the student was making assumptions about those reasons further indicating that teachers did not justify their instruction. The participant also added that those teachers believed that students should be learning RP and aim to imitate “the way the BBC speak”. The teacher’s use of BBC as a target for students indicated the involvement of media in their perception of the ‘native speaker’. Additionally, it provides further evidence for those teachers’ beliefs in the ‘native speaker’ as a learning target.

4.2.3.2 Teachers’ Perception of the Desirability of ‘Native English’

The interviewee teachers consistently expressed how desirable ‘native English’ varieties were to them, their students, or “around the world”. In line with the findings from students, most teachers favoured British English despite exhibiting awareness that students may have different preferences. Before presenting these, it is relevant to keep in mind this chapter’s results on newly recruited teachers being strictly instructed to follow British English norms in their teaching by their more established colleagues (see Section 4.2.2.2). The extracts below show evidence of these teachers’ preferences, their assumptions about students, and the arguments they used to explain these:

In higher education, I prefer British English, it is the source, the basis; it is the source of other varieties (...) Okay, this is a matter of preference, this is not objective: it sounds like (...) official, it has its status, it is a bit powerful and so on. But in our department, we give
the choice to students to choose which variety to use. Most of the time, they choose American English because they watch movies all the time. *(TP6/Interview.17/07/2020)*

Ideas in this excerpt could be presented in two parts. Part one is where the teacher justified why they “*prefer British English*” as it was of higher status and carried more power. They also noted that this was a subjective preference. This could have two explanations: on the one hand, if linked to previous findings, this could mean that the participant internalised those views and was justifying them. However, because the instructions received were informal, they still recognised the subjectivity in those. On the other hand, this could indicate that while some teachers prioritised British norms in their practice because of the instructions they received, others already favoured those even without the interference of their older colleagues. In this sense, even younger teachers held biased beliefs about ‘native speaker’ varieties even without the influence of their more established teaching staff. In either possibility, there is clear evidence of the teacher participants’ belief in the higher status of British English.

In the second part of the excerpt, the participant stated that students were allowed the choice, but they opted for American English because of their exposure to it on media. Superficially, this seems like the teacher was being tolerant to students’ choice of English varieties. However, this choice only included either American or British English. That is to say, while the teacher participant preferred British English, students tended to embrace the American one. This supports earlier findings about the difference in the ‘native variety’ of choice students reported *(see Section 4.2.3.1).* However, the teacher here appeared to tolerate the use of American English. Interestingly, throughout this section of the interviews, none of the teacher participants mentioned ‘non-native’ varieties of English. These varieties did not seem to have enough status to be referred to in their teaching. In fact, when asked, a teacher participant explained the following:

*I:* How about if you were to point out other varieties, other than British and American? How would you incorporate those?
TP1: Why would I? since most people all over the world they speak either British or American, so why would I go, let me say, WASTE MY TIME teaching for example Australian English. Everything is different, vocabulary is different, you know, especially pronunciation is different. (TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)

In this extract, the participant explained that they saw no reason to point out varieties of English other than American or British. In fact, for them, that was considered a waste of time. The participant’s discursive strategy here was that speakers of English “all over the world” speak either American or British English, and since other varieties had different vocabulary and pronunciation, incorporating them would be difficult. In fact, the teacher participant considered raising students’ awareness of varieties other than American and British English a ‘waste of time’ indicating how menial they viewed those. The participant did not only view ‘non-native’ English varieties of low status, but even Australian English was also not worth using in their classes. To support their view, the respondent claimed that speakers of English “all over the world” either used British or American English. The participant here seemed to assume that the global interactions in English abided by British or American English. In other words, because they lack awareness of the use of ‘non-native’ English, they assumed that all speakers of English either used American or British English. Taken together, these findings indicate that teachers view British and American English of much higher status than other varieties. Coupled with their lack of awareness of ‘non-native’ varieties, this led them to make the inaccurate assumption about the use of English outside Algeria. In turn, this assumption impelled them to view teaching students about any other variety than these two ‘a waste of time’.

The results of this section continued to show similar tendencies to previous findings in this chapter. Teachers’ and learners’ responses reflected several aspects of Academic Coloniality through their preferences of ‘native speaker’ varieties and how they justified those. Findings here showed that both participant groups normalised certain discourses that put the ‘native speaker’ in higher status. In the case
of teachers, this was either due to the instructions by their more established colleagues, or their own personal preferences. Those teachers transferred such biases to some of their students through imbalanced power relations. Media was also shown to have a role affecting students’ preferences who tended to prefer American English. Teachers, on the other hand, still preferred British English. Throughout this difference in preferences, the participants displayed a lack of awareness of ‘non-native’ English varieties. On top of their belief in the superiority of ‘native speaker’ varieties, this lack of awareness led some teachers to make inaccurate assumptions about speakers of English around the world, considering that referring to them ‘a waste of time’. Overall, this section provided more insights into how the participant groups normalised several characteristics of Academic Coloniality in their day-to-day experiences.

Under this theme, I explored the awareness and views of student participants and teachers in relation to English language varieties and how they related those to their learning and teaching. The results showed that participants thought of ‘native speaker’ English varieties as more formal, the origin, and more desirable to rationalise their biases. For teachers, the purpose for learning English was not communication, but nativeness. On this basis, participants had ‘native speaker’ varieties as learning targets and viewed them as superior. In fact, addressing ‘non-native’ varieties of English in their teaching was regarded as a waste of time, and they showed no tolerance to the use of ‘non-native’ varieties in their classrooms. Findings also showed imbalanced power relations between teachers and their students within these classrooms. As a result, certain problematic discourses were normalised through a mixture of day-to-day interactions and stern instructions from educators. Additionally, the teach to the test approach adopted in the context contributed to normalising those beliefs in the students’ minds who internalised intolerance towards ‘non-native’ varieties. This intolerance also contributed to pushing other teachers, who may not have held the same beliefs, to adhere to ‘native speaker’ norms making a full circle between the participant groups. The results also showed that newly recruited teachers were strictly instructed to
follow ‘native-speaker’ English norms in their teaching by their more experienced colleagues. These instructions, the students’ intolerance, and media effects led to the transfer and normalisation of biases towards ‘native speaker’ English norms within the context. In this manner, this section highlighted several ways Academic Coloniality is manifested among the participants and how these are transferred between them.

4.3 Which and Whose English to Learn?

In this section, I further explore the attitudes of students and teachers through interview items 1 to 6 to pursue more answers to RQ1 and RQ2. More evidence for Academic Coloniality was found in the views of those involved in ELT in higher education in Algeria. The opinions and the awareness of the participants in relation to English varieties and which of those should be taught in higher education in Algeria were observed in their expressions on matters of language ownership, the effects of media on attitude towards English, and on their expectations about the use of the language. Findings continue to indicate bias towards and glorifying ‘native speaker’ varieties.

4.3.1 Language Ownership

4.3.1.1 Students on Language Ownership

Language ownership was one of the recurrent discursive strategies the student participants used to legitimise several biased claims about their learning. The claim that English is owned by the ‘native speaker’ was expressed by the respondents both explicitly and implicitly throughout their discussion of interview items 1 to 6. While some participants associated the English language to ‘native speakers’ and argued for their superiority, others used the language-culture association to make the same point. On other occasions, participants associated the language to the country. Instances of all of these are presented and discussed below:
So, my first contact, listen to this, my first contact with the language was with a native, I was and still am exposed to the language from a native source. Walid, look, this allowed me, not only to have the best mark at the Baccalaureate exam, (...) it allowed me to learn the language the right way; it wasn’t an Arabic person like me, an Algerian person who learned it, so it wasn’t a second-hand language. *(SP1/Interview.15/07/2020)*

The participant here attributed their success in learning English to their first teacher being a ‘native speaker’ – this was before they joined the target university –. They explained that this allowed them to successfully pass their tests and learn the language ‘the right way’. More interestingly, the respondent contrasted the ‘native speaker’ teachers to themselves/ an ‘Arabic’ or ‘Algerian’ person like them who only ‘learned’ the language. This implies that they may not have had the same success had they been taught by a ‘non-native’ teacher. First, there is clear evidence for native-speakerist thinking through giving advantage to the ‘native speaker’ teacher since they were ‘a native source’ and could teach English ‘the right way’. The participant also seemed to assign a large part of their success to the contribution of the ‘native speaker’ teacher as opposed to their efforts. In fact, they put themselves and the local ‘non-native’ speaker of English down compared to the ‘native speaker’. As stated earlier, this type of downgrading local knowledge while glorifying the Western is common within post-colonial contexts, and so this could be taken as a sign of French coloniality. In relation to language ownership, the linguistic units the participant used demonstrate their belief that while the ‘native speaker’ owned the language, the ‘non-native’ only ‘learned it’, which made ‘non-native’ English varieties an undesirable ‘second-hand language’. Not only that, but these also indicate that the participant believed that ‘non-native’ speakers would never own the language since they could not become a ‘native source’. This belief could also explain why they thought of the local ‘non-native’ speaker as inferior.
Several other participants also afforded the ‘native speaker’ higher status because of the belief in their relation to the language. For example, in the extract below, the native-speakerist views were more explicit:

Because they are native, they know their… they’re related to that, it’s their culture, you cannot teach one’s culture better than them, so I believe that when you get a native speaker or a native teacher, they are going to provide you with more information.

(SP9/Interview.09/07/2020)

Here, the student provided reasons they thought a ‘native speaker’ teacher of English was better than an Algerian one. They claimed that the ‘native’ teacher’s relation to the language and belonging to the target culture gave them advantage over the ‘non-native’ teacher. Before addressing these claims, it is important to note the linguistic and argumentation strategies the participant used here. The way the student gave reasons in succession, then following those with strong explicit claims ‘you cannot teach one’s culture better than them’ indicate that these beliefs for them were obvious, taken for granted, and existed outside the realm of questioning, i.e., normalised. Going back to the claims made in the excerpt, the participant seemed to assume a link between a good English teacher, nativeness, and belonging to the culture. While the former could be taken as further evidence for native-speakerist views, the latter signifies the belief in the association between language and culture. That is, the participant’s discursive strategy here was: since English and ‘its culture’ were closely related, and since the ‘native speaker’ of English belonged to this culture, they qualified as better teachers of English as they had more ownership of it. This association is explored in more detail in this chapter under Section 4.4.2. Participants also seemed to associate English ownership to ‘native speaker’ countries:

I: Do you think the cultural background of the teacher himself/herself is relevant to their ELT and pedagogical practices? If so, how?
**SP6**: Yes, yes, and yes [...] when you have a lecture with someone who has never practiced the language in its mother country, you can see the difference. You can see that they don’t use the language appropriately. *(SP6/Interview.05/07/2020)*

This extract provides insights into how some students justified what they deemed incorrect use of English from their teachers. The participant here explained that their teachers were unable to use the language ‘appropriately’ because they did not communicate with the ‘native speaker’ in English’s ‘mother country’.

As previous results in this chapter already established, students did not tolerate the use of ‘non-native’ English varieties by their teachers and considered those, not just inappropriate, but also incorrect (see Section 4.2.1.1). This could explain why the participant perceived their teachers’ inability or refrain from the use of ‘native speaker’ English as inappropriate. Additionally, in the student’s division of teachers into those who ‘practiced the language in its mother country’ and those who did not, bias towards those who have been to an English-speaking country was clear. More interestingly, the participant’s use of ‘its mother country’ seems to indicate a sense of belonging to the country rather than the people, and so visiting the country allowed them to acquire appropriate use of English. This could be put down to the influence of teachers’ attitudes, those who have been to English-speaking countries, on their students. In some cases, teachers go back to their home countries with a feeling of superiority over their colleagues; if similar attitudes get transferred to students, they could hold such perspectives.

**4.3.1.2 Teachers on Language Ownership**

Similar to their students, teachers also seemed to view the English language as the property of the ‘native speaker’. This argumentation strategy was consistent in teachers’ interviews to justify their preference of the ‘native speaker’ English varieties, indicating more signs of Academic Coloniality in their perspectives. Interestingly, despite showing varied levels of awareness of ELF and WEs, attitudes on the issue seemed to be shared among most teacher participants. What follows are some extracts from the interviews to show instances of these perspectives:
I: Do you think culture is relevant to your ELT and pedagogical practices in Algeria?

**TP1:** Of course! Because we have to teach a language which is not ours.

*(TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)*

Here, there is a clear indication of the teacher participant’s view towards the ownership of the English language. They openly expressed the idea that English did not belong to them, implying that it belonged to the ‘native speaker’, and so it should be taught in relation to ‘its culture’. The teacher participant here seemed to connect language ownership to the ‘culture of the native’. The similarities in the discourses students and teachers represented their perspectives towards language ownership (“the language in its mother country”, “the culture of the language”, “their [native speakers] language”) signify three main ideas: first, an oversimplistic view of the English language, culture, and the speakers of English; second, the extent to which the participant groups affected each other’s perspectives, and third, to what extent biased discourses were normalised in this context. The oversimplification of these concepts was a common discursive strategy that most of the participants resorted to because, that way, they did not need to critically explain each individual case in isolation. Instead, they only needed to think one thing that, even somewhat superficially, explained the subjects they were asked about. Additionally, the participants also showed several instances of unrealistic assumptions about the ‘native speaker’ when arguing about the relevance of ‘native speaker culture’ to their ELT practices:

Let me give you an example, when they, two neighbours are talking, they say “The Jones”;
The Jones are the neighbours; “the Jones are absent” then one of them says “how did you know?”, they say “the milkman told me”. The explanation of this “the milkman told me” is that he saw that the milkman did not deliver milk, so he understood that his neighbours were absent. This is cultural, this is cultural! Because, for example, in Algeria, we don’t have this part of delivering milk every morning. So, students have to understand that culture is important, the way of eating the way of (...) yeah! *(TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)*
The participant made the case for, not only the relevance of, but the necessity to learn ‘native speaker culture’ in ELT by giving an example of a conversation involving glass milk bottles delivery; an occupation that almost completely disappeared since the 1990s after the introduction of the much cheaper plastic milk bottles to supermarkets. Evidently, and regardless of the relevance of these cultural aspects, there seems to be a lack of up-to-date insights into these. The participant insisted (‘have to’, ‘important’) that students should learn about a ceased business since the 1990s for them to be able to use the language in 2020. In addition, there were some instances of Othering in the extract above in the way the participant chose to represent the ‘native speaker’ Other as the opposite of, or at least very different than, the Self ‘in Algeria, we don’t have this part of delivering milk every morning’. The language the participant used also seemed to express negative associations to themselves ‘we don’t have this’ as there are always negative connotations to the use of the negative form. This is more evident in another example they provided:

For example, [In Britain/USA] it is allowed for a teacher to invite a student to the cafeteria; students are allowed to go to teacher’s cafeteria and vice versa. Whereas in Algeria, we don’t have this type of stuff, I mean I can talk with my students in the cafeteria, there is no problem because we have only one cafeteria for teachers and students, whereas in Britain or in America, they have a cafeteria for students and other ones for teachers.

(TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)

In this extract, besides the ‘Us vs Them’ division, there is a clearer expression of a what ‘they have’ Vs what ‘we don’t have’ notion. Firstly, the participant here seemed to assume that across all university campuses in ‘Britain and America’, there were separate cafeterias for students and teachers. This overgeneralisation seems to be the result of the participant’s construction of the Other, who has ‘a cafeteria for students and other ones for teachers’ as opposed to the Algerian Self, where only one shared cafeteria was available at the university campus. That is to say, whatever we did not have, they did, and
in a better state. Such predication strategies, which grants them ownership of the English language as argued by several participants, was often transferred to the students through their interactions with their teachers. This explains several of the previous findings of students adopting essentialist and native-speakerist attitudes towards ELT.

The focus in this section was on the views of the participant groups in relation to language ownership. Several aspects of Academic Coloniality were manifested in their perspectives. The findings here also supported previous ones on how certain discourses get transferred through teacher-student interactions. Both participant groups were found to believe that English was closely related to the ‘native speaker’ culture, belonged to their country, or to the ‘native speaker’ themselves. For teachers, this led them to argue that since they were teaching a language which did not belong to them, they should follow ‘native speaker’ norms. Consequently, they insisted on students learning cultural aspects that were either inaccurate or irrelevant. These results also showed that those teachers often constructed a superior ‘native speaker’ Other as opposed to the Self which often led to inaccurate, unrealistic, and oversimplified images about them. The similarity in the language students and teachers expressed their perspectives provided further evidence for how teachers’ attitudes affected their students’. In fact, students also held and normalised native-speakerist opinions, believed English belonged to the ‘native speaker’, and looked down on local knowledge.

4.3.2 Media Influence

Throughout their interviews, both participant groups justified their preference of ‘native English’ by linking it to the influence of the media. Several points of discussion regarding this issue are presented below. These include how Algerian university students of English had limited chances to practice the language outside the classroom, the discursive strategies both participant groups expressed their perspectives on the matter, and how these relate to the other aspects of Academic Coloniality discussed
in this chapter. Below is a discussion of some of the extracts from the interviews with student participants and teachers on the matter.

**4.3.2.1 Students on Media Influence**

A recurrent sub-theme students employed to explain their preferences for ‘native speaker’ varieties as a target for learning is the impact of media on their use of English. Several participants stated that because their favourite TV programmes and social media were in English, it played a role in their interest in the language and in the variety they would learn. SP2, who was a senior student coming back to university for a second degree after graduating years earlier, stated that they noticed a shift from French-leaning students to English-leaning ones:

**SP2:** I think things have changed drastically regarding English. My point of view is, I’m a little bit old, so I have been able to notice the change, and it’s not a change; it’s a shift from a French attitude to an English one, if I may say so. Algerian young people especially are leaning towards an English fellowship rather than a French one.

I: Why do you think that is?

**SP2:** I think most importantly, it’s the media [...] my generation was exposed to French media; the new generation is exposed more to English media, speaking about foreign language of course. Whatever foreign language that is surrounding the new generation, it is all in English, which is a benefit, I’d say. *(SP2/Interview.10/07/2020)*

The participant here referred to ‘the shift’ they noticed in their current classmates’ interest in English as their second language to replace French, which was more dominant in their previous experience at the same university. Of course, this could simply be because the participant’s first experience was not in a department of English but political sciences as they stated later in the interview. However, in the extract above, they argued that media was the ‘most important’ factor driving this shift of interest. This argument
seems especially valid when considering the sociolinguistic background of the country (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.1). That is, in Algeria, students of English did not have many opportunities outside the classroom to practice using the language. Access to social media, TV programmes, and films in English was their main way of contact with foreign languages in general, and English specifically; and since the takeover of English over research, science, trade, entertainment…etc, these platforms became an effective way to get people more interested in English as that would allow them access to more content. At the end of the extract, the participant expressed that, for them, this shift was a ‘beneficial’ one as it opened doors for more opportunities internationally for these students than French did for their previous colleagues. This indicates a certain level of awareness of the spread of English and its status in the world. However, they seemed to assume that this spread was neutral. In the next extract, SP5 explained the role media played in their preference of American English:

I: what is the reason behind that [preference of American English] in your opinion?

SP5: social media, movies, series, and the way the American culture is more influential in our society. Like our students interact more with the American society, not the British one. It’s like the British society are the elite and they find themselves at ease with the American society with the movies and you know Hollywood and songs and so on; so that’s why they adopt, and they are more familiar with the American accent. *(SP5/Interview.12/07/2020)*

There are two insights worth highlighting in the participant’s reply here. First, they emphasised the role that ‘social media, movies, series’ played in familiarising American English to students that they felt ‘at ease’ not only with the variety, but also with the ‘American society’. Consequently, it made sense that students were more likely to prefer American over British English. Second, the participant made no mention of any other English variety than American and British ones. This shows a lack of awareness that the participant themselves expressed which was pointed out earlier in this chapter (see Section 4.2.3.1). Interestingly, most participants here agreed on the same perspective that media was a main factor in their
preference of American English. This is likely due to the nature of the content these students were exposed to.

### 4.3.2.2 Teachers on Media Influence

Teacher participants held similar perspectives to those of their students on the influence of media on learners’ choice of English varieties. The similarities in how teacher participants expressed certain ideas and attitudes, as will be exemplified in this section, reinforced the interpretation about how participants’ transfer certain discourses among each other. In relation to the effects of media, responses revealed that teachers seemed to overlook their own preferences and focus more on the students’ choices and how they were influenced by TV and social media. Several teacher participants pointed out the increasing interest of students in English in Algeria more than other ‘foreign’ languages. This is a similar point to the shift SP2 describes earlier (see Section 4.3.2.1). In the following exchange, TP1 called attention to the increase in the interest of English that they noticed over the last few years:

I: Do you think that there has been any significant changes or developments concerning English over the last few years?

**TP1:** In Algeria? Yeah yeah; it seems there is more interest in English than in other languages.

I: Okay and why do you think that is?

**TP1:** Well, it’s (...) you see, it’s the influence of cinema and films and you know, this kind of stuff *(TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)*

When asked about reasons behind the increase in interest in the language, the participant specified ‘cinema and films’ and ‘this kind of stuff’ without mentioning any other possible explanations. This is perhaps because opportunity to speak English in Algeria is limited to the university/schools and media (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.2). In support of this, further in the interview, TP1 proceeded to cite ‘films and documentaries’ as their source for information about the issue:
According to what I see in films and documentaries, people are more inclined to speak English than speak any other foreign language. *(TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)*

Having ‘films and documentaries’ as the source of information about an issue that is vital to their teaching practices can be extremely misleading since the main purpose of those is not accuracy of information, but entertainment. In fact, this might explain several of the predication strategies about speakers of English the teacher participants employed. Likewise, TP2’s answer to the same question indicates similar emphasis on the role social media played in the increased interest in English without acknowledging other factors:

> Absolutely, yeah, big changes. In terms of the quality of language our students are now using, at the level of the speaking skills, I can say that today’s generations, we call them the Facebook Generation, they have better accents, and they are very good at the level of the speaking skills compared to the students that we had before, and this is due to the use of (...) the permanent use of different social media. *(TP2/Interview.3/07/2020)*

Taken together, these teachers’ predication strategies about the role social media, the internet, and TV played in students’ preferences could be because the use of those in English was not a choice for most of them considering that, as students, they either did not have access to them at all, or their use was not as prevailing as it was among their students. As a result, they seemed to overly perceive the impact these platforms had on the English variety choices of these students. In fact, teachers appeared to consider their students a completely different generation; not because of the age difference, but because of the students’ use of Facebook: ‘the Facebook Generation’, which indicates an emphasis on this difference (presence and lack of use of social media). Returning briefly to the teacher participants’ responses, there was a positive attitude towards this change. TP2 for example, highlighted the improvement they noticed in the student’s spoken English through time, which they also attributed to the use of social media. As
explained earlier (see Section 4.3.2.1), student participants expressed a similarly positive attitude towards this ‘shift’ of interest. This also shows that teachers too assumed a neutral spread of English in Algeria.

Another significant discursive strategy in TP2’s responses was what they considered an improvement from the older cohorts to the newer student cohorts. The participant explained:

I: When you say they have better accents, how would you describe that?

TP2: When I say accent, I mean (...) It’s not only pronunciation, but I really mean accent because some students do speak British or American, and they make the difference because they prefer one accent to the other. In the past, our students were just using RP without any influence by the British or American accent, but nowadays, they do make the difference and they prefer one to the other. (TP2/Interview.3/07/2020)

There is a clear expression here of the participant’s bias towards ‘native speaker’ English varieties. For them, the ability to speak British or American English indicated improvement in students’ level through time. This also suggests a sense of dissatisfaction with students who spoke English without ‘influence by the British or American accent’. Based on that, for TP2, factors like fluency and communicative competence came second as indicators of improvement if learners were not able to speak ‘native speaker’ English varieties. This bias, as discussed above, appears to be the result of the influence of their previous teachers and their own beliefs of the superiority of the ‘native speaker’ varieties (see Section 4.2.2.1).

Tracking back to the teacher participant’s problematisation of the students’ use of ‘non-native’ English varieties, it is reasonable to suggest that they were inflicting the same views on their students; that is, the bias towards British and American English varieties. This becomes more evident when linked back to the attitudes expressed by the student participants towards these varieties. These students seemed to use very similar language to their teachers which suggests that they adopted the same perspectives.
In this section, I attempted to show the effects of media on the participants’ attitudes as a contributor in the production of some aspects of Academic Coloniality. The findings demonstrated that both participant groups recognised the role media played in recreating certain biased discourses, specifically towards ‘native speaker’ varieties. Participants found this interest to be positive. In fact, one of the teacher participants claimed that it improved the general level of English use because students could use ‘native’ English varieties. In line with previous findings, students’ attitudes also appeared to be affected by those of their teachers. At the same time, teachers seemed to highlight the role media played in affecting students’ perspectives and undermine those effects on themselves. In fact, some participants expressed that they relied on media as information sources which could explain inaccurate images about speakers of English. Overall, this section showed that exposure to English through media appeared to play a key role in the production of many biases among the participants.

4.3.3 Where/With Whom Are We Going to Speak English?

4.3.3.1 Students on Learning English to Communicate with the ‘Native Speaker’

One of the consistently recurring discursive strategies with student participants was the assumption that the main context in which they would use English was to interact with the ‘native speaker’. This assumption was implied in several situations in the discussion of the previous themes and sub-themes. In almost all examples provided by students for cases in which they would use English, they exclusively referred to either Britain or the United States:

as someone who is using the American English, as someone who is learning the language to deal with people from America or something like that. He or she should be interested more in the American culture and the social norms, and when and where to use certain things and certain words, same thing can be applied to the British culture. If I am going to be studying in a British University or I’m going to work in a British company.

(SP1/Interview.15/07/2020)
In this example, when the student was asked about the relevance of culture to ELT in Algeria, they started by arguing for the relevance of the American culture. They followed that with ‘same thing can be applied to the British culture’. The student participant seemed to be unaware or completely dismissive of the other contexts where they could use the language. This can be due to the previously highlighted point in this chapter that their teachers solely focused on British and American English in their teaching (see Section 4.2.1.2). When enquiring about the consistent use of such examples, the participant seemed to be aware that going to or working with the British or American ‘native speaker’ was not the only situation they were going to speak English:

I: twice, you put the condition: “If I'm going to the US or working in a British company”. Do you think that is the aim of English language teaching in Algeria? I mean, do you think you're learning English in Algeria for that?

SP1: Honestly, no. And it goes back to the whole educational system because they're not teaching us to cope with what is going on in the world right now and with the full economical development, etc. They're not teaching us to do that. Like in our department, for instance, we're just studying the language for the sake of knowing the language, and that's my point of view. But again, there are some teachers who emphasise the importance of knowing what you want from studying this language and kind of put in like a plan and go through it. So, if I am studying English to work in a British company, I'm going to be more interested in EST. ESP. (SP1/Interview.15/07/2020)

In this exchange, the participant confirms that their dismissal of varieties other than British and American ones was linked to their learning ‘they're not teaching us to cope with what is going on in the world right now’. Additionally, even though the participant acknowledged that the purpose of ELT in Algeria, or why they were learning English, was not only to go to the US or work in Britain, they proceeded to give another example about using English in Britain or the US. This was consistent through the rest of the interview:
you’re teaching me history, you’re teaching me past events, but you’re not teaching me, the actual culture, how it is going on there? What are the norms? what kind of society it is? What kind of people am I going to face when I go to Britain? [] if I am going to work in a British company. *(SP1/Interview.15/07/2020)*

Despite recognising that their use of English would not only be with the ‘native speaker’, the participant continued to exclusively provide examples about English use with British/American speakers. This indicates that the assumption about the use of the language was not conscious. The student participant appeared to be unaware of their own assumption that the only context they would use English was if they travelled to the US or Britain. According to them, this was because of the consistent normalisation of these exclusive discourses in their studies.

Other student participants also seemed to hold similar views. However, these were expressed more explicitly in response to item 3 of the interview:

> I think we should have another version at university. I think it should be the version of the natives themselves. I think the students should go deep into the language, speaking correctly, pronouncing correctly with a lot of aspects concerning academic native English. *(SP3/Interview.13/07/2020)*

The participant here plainly stated that, according to them, the ‘*academic native English*’ should be the reference in ELT at university in Algeria. Again, there seemed to be a complete disregard for the relevance of ‘non-native’ English varieties in this context. This is another indication of the outcomes of the exclusive discourses continuously reproduced in the classroom further emphasising the effects of teacher-student interactions.
4.3.3.2 Teachers on Learning English to Communicate with the ‘Native Speaker’

Teacher participants appeared to hold similar perspectives to their students about contexts of English use. In the discussion of their attitudes about items 1 to 6 of the interviews, teachers appeared to restrict cases in which English was used to interactions with the ‘native speaker’. Additionally, participants mostly focused on ‘native speaker’ varieties as learning targets:

I: What about other varieties [of English], do you think they are important or even relevant to ELT in Algeria?

TP2: What do you mean by other varieties?

I: Other than British and American.

TP2: If you want to speak English, it’s better to speak British or American rather than go and use another accent. Unless you really need to be understood or you are looking for friendship or something. I don’t think that either students or teachers would prefer other accents to American or British. (TP2/Interview.3/07/2020)

Here, the teacher participant expressed explicit bias towards American and British English. For them, it was not necessary to learn about other English varieties as cases for their use were negligible i.e., you did not need to learn about them ‘unless you really need to be understood or you are looking for friendship or something’. This implies that learning English was not about being understood or making friendships, but about communication with the ‘native speaker’. TP2 also explained the lengths to which they went to get in touch with the ‘native speaker’ implying the need for such contact in ELT:

We are in a global era where all people are talking about the world being a small village. Let me just tell you that 20 years ago this type of conversations could not have been successful between you and me, having an international call for free was not possible at the time, and this is to explain that now it is very easy to get in contact with the other and his culture.
which was not the case just 25 years ago, the only means for me to get in touch with the British was the BBC and the Americans through the Voice of America, so that I could have the chance to listen to native speakers knowing that we were through a period where foreigners never came to our country because of the situation we were living in at the time especially during the time of 80s and beginning of the 90s. it was very rare to find an English native speaker to talk to. Having now the opportunity of technology and satellites, different TV channels, all this have facilitated contact not only with people but also with language itself. All this helped a lot, and we now can say that learning about the other’s culture and language is easier than it was the case before. (TP2/Interview.3/07/2020)

The participant here argued that it was not only necessary to be in touch with the ‘native speaker’ to learn English, but also that the purpose of that learning was to communicate with them. They seemed to highly value the technology that allowed them to be more in touch with the ‘British’ and the ‘American’ as opposed to earlier where they had limited opportunities to contact them. The teacher also recognised that the same technology allowed much more than that, turning the world into ‘a small village’. Interestingly, the participant was aware that they had access to people from all over the world with whom they could speak English. However, their focus seemed to still be exclusively on communicating with the British or American ‘native speaker’. In a like manner to SP1, the teacher participant appeared to be operating with an underlying impression that the main context of English language use was to communicate with the ‘native speaker’.

More aspects of Academic Coloniality were also brought out in this section’s findings. The focus here was on situations the two participant groups thought they would use English. The findings continued to show clear bias towards ‘native speaker’ English varieties and indications of the view that the purpose of learning the language for them was to communicate with the ‘native speaker’. Although both groups showed signs of awareness that communicating with the British/American speakers was not the only
situation they could use English, they were still dismissive of the contexts where they would communicate with the ‘non-native’ English language users. Interestingly, despite this knowledge, both groups continued to reproduce a discourse that indicated an underlying assumption that their use of English would strictly be with the ‘native speaker’. Consistently with previous findings, similarities between the two participant groups’ results can also be taken as additional evidence for the effect of the teacher-student interaction on the production of biased discourses that contributed to the continuity of Academic Coloniality in the context.

Under this theme, I focused on the two participant groups’ attitudes in relation to language ownership, the effects of media, and contexts where they used English. Data here revealed significant findings about the production, manifestation, transfer, and normalisation of several aspects of Academic Coloniality among participants. More evidence for bias towards ‘native speaker’ varieties and neglect of ‘non-native’ ones was expressed by both participant groups. These discourses were induced by teachers who argued that since they were teaching ‘native speaker’ language, they should follow their norms insisting on often irrelevant cultural aspects. Media also played a role in this by raising the learners’ interest in ‘native speaker’ varieties. Interestingly, teachers and students assumed that this interest was neutral. The findings also confirmed that student participants were consistently affected by their teachers’ attitudes, who contributed to normalising their biases. Evidence for instances of Othering were also demonstrated under this theme as some of the teachers used media as their source of information about English use. In fact, teachers were aware of the effects of media on their students’ preferences. Both participant groups showed a similar sense of looking down on local knowledge and glorifying the Western, so they also demonstrated, often implicitly, the idea that they were learning English to communicate with the ‘native speaker’.
4.4 Attitudes towards Language-Culture Association

This section explores the third theme emerging from the discussion of items 4 to 6 of interviews with teacher participants and students. Consistent with previous findings, results of this section continue to show several aspects of Academic Coloniality in the views of the participants about cultures, their relevance to ELT, and their perception of the relationship between language and culture. The responses of the participants showed several unrealistic and often oversimplified views about their understanding of culture, the Other, and the implication of these opinions on how they saw the ‘native speaker’ of English. These are represented in the following sub-themes:

4.4.1 Cultural Awareness

4.4.1.1 Students on Cultural Awareness

In their responses to interview items, students did not show high levels of awareness about culture. Most participants held monolithic oversimplified views about culture that mostly gave advantage to the ‘native speaker’. Additionally, the linguistic forms used to express these nomination strategies give a strong impression of certainty about their opinions:

The English culture is different, and the Algerian culture is totally different. There’s a huge difference between the Algerian culture in particular and the English culture. Now the point is: it’s up to the individual to learn to take what they believe is enough from the foreign culture (SP2/Interview.10/07/2020)

This extract illustrates how the participant perceived ‘the Algerian culture’ as ‘totally different’ from that of English. Here, clear evidence for a monolithic view of culture was manifested. The student also showed traces of Othering in the construction of a ‘totally different’ Other culture (‘English culture’) than that of the Self (‘Algerian culture’). The intensification the participant used to highlight the ‘huge difference’ between the Self and the ‘totally different’ Other can be taken as proof for the normalisation of this belief.
The participant also referred to the ‘English culture’ as ‘foreign’ further detaching themselves from its monolith and placing themselves as mere passive users who borrowed aspects of it. In fact, they made similar separations within the ‘English culture’:

There are different English-speaking countries. Each country has its own culture, so when you adopt the language, you get the culture with it. (SP2/Interview.10/07/2020)

The participant here equated cultures to countries. Doing so implies the possibility of physically visiting the culture by visiting ‘its country’. This is evidence of an oversimplified essentialist belief in fixed and stable cultural norms that are similar within every country. Results continue to show that the participant held oversimplified views on the issue:

For example, if I read an American book, the background is American. If I read for example for James Joyce, a hardcore Irish; Ireland is here. I’m reading, for example, a book. Ireland is here, it’s there. Ireland is the backstage. Ireland is present [...] For example if I read about Yeats, the Irish poet, militant, he was fighting for things, so I have always this background, so I have acquired this culture. Same thing, if I go to Africa, if I read for example about Chinua Achebe, Africa is here, it’s all around me, the jungles, the cultures, the dances all are there, see? (SP2/Interview.10/07/2020)

The participant in this extract suggested that an American book, an Irish writer or a poet may represent the culture of the whole country they were from, or continent in the case of Chinua Achebe. This type of oversimplification is a direct result of the previously mentioned essentialist view of culture. SP2 also referred to culture as a quantifiable entity one could not only learn about, but even acquire: ‘so I have acquired this culture’. The nomination strategy through which the participant expressed their attitude suggests a level of certainty that springs from normalised positivist views towards these issues. Additionally, they also expressed some examples of stereotyping when discussing the African writer Chinua Achebe: ‘the jungles’ and ‘the dances’. Interestingly, while all other writers the participant
mentioned represented the countries they came from, Chinua Achebe represented the whole African continent. By doing this, the participant reduced Africa to one homogeneous group that shared ‘the jungles, the cultures, [and] the dances’. This is likely because, in their studies, the curriculum made the division American Literature, British Literature, but took African literature as one homogeneous group. In this sense, the favouring of ‘Western knowledge’ by looking into it in more details compared to the local African literature continues.

Another argumentation strategy students employed that benefited the ‘native speaker’ was the belief that knowledge of culture granted correctness of language use:

> I think as someone who has a master’s degree, I think that I am expected to perform it 100% correctly and 100% like native-like. But that only can happen if I am aware of the cultural aspect, and I am aware of how the natives would perform this specific speech act.

*(SP1/Interview.15/07/2020)*

In this extract, the participant put the condition that the only way they could speak English ‘100% correctly’ was to have awareness of the cultural aspect of the language, and this should be expected of someone with a master’s degree. These indicate the self-inflicted power imbalance students situated themselves in compared to the ‘native speaker’ justifying it through cultural knowledge. This is not only problematic because of the participant quantifying culture into something they could acquire/be aware of by the time they get a masters’ degree, but also because it implies that all ‘native speakers’ can speak English ‘100% correctly’ due to their cultural background. This can be evidence of the lack of cultural awareness, as well as the belief in a fixed link between ‘the native speaker’ and culture.

### 4.4.1.2 Teachers on Cultural Awareness

With regards to cultural awareness, responses from teacher participants showed similar results to those of the students. Many instances of oversimplification of ideas, unrealistic representations about the
‘native speaker culture’, or even out-of-date knowledge were introduced by the teacher participants often to argue for the importance of the British or American culture to their ELT practices in Algeria. In similar language to that of the student respondents, TP1 stated:

The Algerian culture is 100% different from any other Anglo-Saxon culture. In drinking, in travelling, in speaking, in everything. (TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)

This is the same monolithic view of culture and evidence for Othering as in the students’ responses (see Section 4.4.1.1). By completely separating the ‘Algerian culture’ monolith from any other Anglo-Saxon ones, the participant justified their claim of its irrelevance to their ELT practices:

I: Does this mean that the Algerian culture is not relevant to-

TP1: In learning English, it’s not; it’s absolutely not. (TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)

Teachers deeming the ‘Algerian culture’ as ‘100% different’ and irrelevant to ELT was a common discursive strategy to justify problematising the use of Algerian norms when speaking English. Additionally, the perspectivation strategies the participant employed indicate problematic perspectives about the ‘native speaker’:

For example, we have the expression in English “let’s go Dutch!”, it’s everyone pays for- you know, I pay for myself you pay for yourself. In England, in America, everywhere you go, you find it’s “let’s go Dutch”. So, in Algeria we have this tendency, for example, if we go together- in a café, there is a tendency that someone pay for everybody. This is in our culture, in the UK, in America, they don’t have it. In America or in Britain, it’s “let’s go Dutch”. (TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)

This example is consistent with the claim that the ‘Algerian culture’ is ‘100% different’ from the American and British ones. Apparently, the participant constructed these by thinking of the Americans and British
as the opposite of their perception of an Algerian person. Such predication strategies are clear evidence for the Othering of the ‘native speaker’. A good illustration of such strategies is another example TP1 provided:

For example, this business of giving tips to a taxi driver. In Britain, it’s not the same in Britain as in America; in America, it’s a kind of obligation, you have to give tips to the taxi driver. This is cultural. If he tells you the fare is 20$, you have to give him 25$ or 30$ and ask him to take it all as a tip, whereas in Britain there is not such stuff about tips. This is cultural.

Tipping in America is not the same as in Britain. (TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)

The participant here provided an unrealistic cultural practice, ‘the tipping business’, first, by assuming that all American taxi drivers obliged their customers to pay tips, and second, by claiming that British taxi drivers did not take them. These attributions might be the result of the stereotypical representations on media that participants’ views were affected by as previously discussed in this chapter (see Section 4.3.2). In this sense, the construction of the ‘native speaker’ Other was also affected by the unrealistic representations on media.

This section focussed on exploring the cultural awareness in the discourses of the teacher participants and students. Findings here showed that both participant groups held oversimplified, essentialist, and monolithic views of culture. At the same time, they expressed that the Algerian culture was completely different than that of the English. As a result, they argued that Algerian culture was irrelevant in ELT at best, and problematic at worst. Student participants also claimed that it was necessary for learners to acquire the target culture for them to be able to use English correctly. Consistent with previous findings, students and teachers expressed similar views indicating the effectiveness of their interactions in spreading problematic discourses. The participants also often constructed several stereotypical and inaccurate views about the ‘native speaker’ Other. Overall, this section provided further understanding of more aspects of Academic Coloniality and evidence for their transfer among the participants.
4.4.2 Language-Culture Association

4.4.2.1 Students on Language-Culture Association

Discussions of interview items 4 to 6 showed interesting results that continue to provide evidence for Academic Coloniality in the way student participants viewed the relationship between ‘Western culture’ and English language. Most participants seemed to believe that the relationship between language and ‘its culture’ was fixed, and they could not be separated. On that ground, participants problematised their own cultural background when speaking English. After arguing for the necessity to learn ‘the cultural aspects of English’ to be able to speak it correctly (see Section 4.4.1.1), the student argued:

[speaking English 100% correctly] only can happen if I am aware of the cultural aspect, and I am aware of how the natives would perform this specific speech act. But if I’m not aware, just like our case, I’m definitely going to use my norms, and definitely going to try to apologise to you the way I would do in my native language. (SP1/Interview.15/07/2020)

The participant here suggested that their lack of awareness of cultural norms of English forced them to speak it in association to Algerian ones. For them, speaking English in this manner was incorrect. In this sense, the ability to speak English correctly (‘native-like’) necessitated that learners should not only copy the ‘native speaker’ English, but also adopt their cultural norms. This argumentation strategy stems from a normalised belief that English and ‘native speaker’ culture cannot be separated. The following excerpt shows further insights on how the participants viewed this relationship:

look! We are trying to adopt a language, but it’s a package. You cannot choose one thing and leave the other. This package comes with its culture. English comes with its different cultures, okay? There are different English-speaking countries. Each country has its own culture. (SP2/Interview.10/07/2020)
The student here plainly asserted that the relationship between English and ‘its culture’ was unbreakable, and learning one required adopting the other, i.e., ‘it’s a package’. It appears that this view was normalised for the participant here as they claimed later in the interview:

you cannot detach them; you can never detach them (SP2/Interview.10/07/2020)

The idea that English is inseparable from ‘its culture’ is rooted in the colonial heritage of ELT within EFL paradigm (see Chapter 2, Section 2.2.1.3). The belief in the inseparability of English from ‘native speaker culture’ along with the idea that the ‘Algerian culture’ was completely different from that of English (see Section 4.4.1.1) can explain the participants’ assertion that Algerian cultural norms were problematic in ELT. In this sense, their argumentation strategy becomes: if English cannot be separated from ‘its culture’, and this culture was ‘totally different’ than ours, we should distance ourselves from ours and adopt theirs.

On follow-up questions, tracing the sources of these with most participants led back to teacher-student interactions. In the following excerpt, the participant detailed one of those instances:

we had a teacher that taught us idioms on the second year of university, and in those idioms, it appeared a lot of “teatime”. For example, “it’s not my cup of tea”, and the teacher explained the importance of teatime in the English culture. And even while she explained the meaning of the idioms and the situation in which the idiom can be used, she would always explain the cultural background so she could put us in the right context. So, this is why it is important to teach culture (SP4/Interview.06/07/2020)

This extract shows how easily the student participant adopted stereotypical statements about ‘the importance of teatime in the English culture’. The student explained how their teachers took the time to link these to specific cultural contexts that they deemed the ‘right’ ones. This kind of ease in adopting ideas as educators provided them is evidence for the students hindered critical thinking that the teaching
to the test approach contributed to. Additionally, another possible reason for students’ vulnerability to such unrealistic representations was caused by French coloniality:

**SP7**: I grew up not liking my own culture. I didn’t embrace it. I didn’t like it. I didn’t think much of it. I actually kind of hated it and made fun of people who made traditional Algerian things, which is very wrong of me. I should have embraced my culture first and then embrace the western one. I guess I grew up westernised, and that’s why.

I: Why did you hate your own culture?

**SP7**: I have no idea! Till now, I don’t know, because we’re not very traditional in my family, my small family not my big family. We’re not very traditional. My mom is not big on traditions, and I grew up in this umbrella of Francophonie, so basically, my own culture didn’t matter much. I didn’t think of it much. It kinda seemed uncool to me. The cool thing to me was Western culture. *(SP7/Interview.15/07/2020)*

This case provides a clear demonstration of how French coloniality contributed to Academic Coloniality in ELT in Algeria. The participant in this exchange expressed how the conditions they grew up in affected the way they viewed their culture compared to ‘Western culture’. For them, Algerian traditions and culture were so ‘uncool’, unlikeable, and to be made fun of that they ‘hated’ them. This is a perfect example of the role French coloniality played in Algerians’ perception of their identities and cultures. In fact, the participant specifically mentioned growing up in an ‘umbrella of Francophonie, so basically, my own culture didn’t matter much’. Having such low opinions of their culture left students vulnerable to teachers and media’s constructs of an unproblematic ‘Western native speaker’/culture.

### 4.4.2.2 Teachers on Language-Culture Association

In this section, teachers also manifested similar results to their students. Opinions about the relationship between language and culture were expressed consistently with previous findings. For educators,
teaching English meant they were teaching a language that is foreign to them; one that belonged to the ‘native speaker’:

because we have to teach a language which is not ours, they [students] have to know the culture. (TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)

The participant here argued that students must ‘know the culture’ because the language they were learning did not belong to them. In this sense, the teacher was also associating ‘native speaker culture’ to English. In fact, respondents affirmed this association and distanced themselves from the language:

It's not just a means of communication that you are acquiring in here. You have opted to major in English and along with that you have made this serious step towards letting yourself be influenced because you're going to read to their theoreticians, their critics, their literature, their history (TP3/Interview.5/07/2020)

The participant here argued that students of English should let themselves ‘be influenced' by the package English language brings, i.e., ‘its culture’. More interestingly, the teacher’s recurrent use of ‘their’ in this extract shows how they put themselves in a position where they had no linguistic authority over English and must learn about/abide by ‘their’ cultural norms. These findings are not dissimilar from the students’, which further indicates how such discourses were transferred among the participants.

While this is the common view among most participants, one of the respondent teachers appeared to look at these issues differently. That is to say, although they believed in language-culture association, and that they were teaching a language that did not belong to them; they did not seem to view cultures as separate monolithic blocks:

You have opted to study a foreign language. So, you do not just simply dismantle it from the cultural aspect. So, whatever culture you have abided by; whatever country you have been influenced by, you need to have your own culture in an open conversation with the
culture of the language you are attempting to acquire. So, it's more of a whole process in there. So that we can end up with students who manage to efficiently learn the language neither by dismissing their own culture nor by completely taking whatever culture they are being exposed to through the language. (TP3/Interview.5/07/2020)

The extract above shows the participant’s view towards the interaction of the language learner’s culture and that of the target language. The teacher here started by emphasising the idea that English was ‘foreign’ to their learners and that one could not ‘dismantle it from the cultural aspect’. However, unlike previous examples from other teachers and students, TP3 considered that cultures could interact and were not totally disconnected. They held that students were not passive receivers of information and could take an active role in their learning of cultural aspects. Interestingly, the participant here did not see the Algerian cultural norms as problematic for ELT. They argued that efficient language learning occurred when the student was flexible and understanding with their cultural beliefs and the target culture.

This section dealt with the two participant groups’ cultural awareness on ELT and their views on the relationship between culture and language. Results of this section were also consistent with the previous two themes demonstrating several aspects of Academic Coloniality in the participants’ responses. Findings showed that the participants believed that they were learning a language that did not belong to them, and so should learn ‘its culture’ to be able to speak it correctly. They also believed in a fixed association of English to a ‘Western culture’. The latter was constructed as the opposite of the Self. However, students needed to learn about it to be able to effectively use the language. Consistent with previous sections, these views were shown to be transferred through teacher-student interactions. Although most participants shared similar ideas on these issues, one of the teacher participants held different understandings of cultures. They argued for a more active role that students should assume for a more efficient English language learning.
4.5 Conclusion to the Chapter

In this chapter, I presented the findings from data collected through the interview items 1 to 6 in the first phase of the study. The focus in this chapter was on highlighting manifestations of Academic Coloniality in the participants' perceptions and tracing these to find out how they were produced. I tried to find out whether the participants’ opinions reflected knowledge about English as an international language including varieties of it around the world. The findings showed clear evidence of Academic Coloniality in the responses of the two participant groups that were manifested in the three emerging themes presented. For most participants, the line of argument started at language ownership. They saw themselves as mere borrowers of English that belonged to the ‘native speaker’, as a result, they must learn their culture. Here, cultural Othering played a role in distorting both participant groups’ cultural awareness. First, the participants constructed an Other who was the opposite of the Self, who was often oversimplified into a set of stereotypes that the media affected. Second, findings also showed that both media exposure and teachers, who were themselves affected by media or more established teaching staff, contributed to the unrealistic images about ‘native speaker’ English. Among the participants, the latter was considered the origin, more formal and more desirable than ‘non-native’ English varieties. Third, both participant groups were found to hold an unconscious attitude that they were learning English to communicate with the ‘native speaker’ or to travel to an English-speaking country. In Chapter 6, I provide a diagram that summarises the findings from this chapter that are relevant to the production of Academic Coloniality (see Chapter 6, Section 6.4, Figure 7).

To continue the line of argument, participants also held a strong belief that English could not be separated from ‘its culture’. At the same time, this culture was believed to be completely different than that of Algeria which renders the latter irrelevant at best, and problematic to ELT at mid-range, and inferior to the Western culture at worst. Tracing Academic Coloniality in the attitudes of teachers and students, the findings showed that more established teaching staff influenced the newer generation of teachers’
choices of English who themselves transferred their views to the students through teacher-student classroom interactions. Student participants indicated that they often did not challenge their teacher’s views because their main concern was about their mark, which was common in a teach to the test approach. However, their role was not completely passive as they were shown to put pressure on their teachers by not tolerating their use of ‘non-native’ varieties. A snapshot of the findings from this chapter that address the production of Academic Coloniality can be found in Chapter 6, Section 6.3, Figure 5.
Chapter 5: Findings: Maintenance and Continuity

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I present the findings of the data collected from interview Items 7 to 10 and the documents analysed. I highlight the views and reported practices that contribute to the reproduction of aspects of Academic Coloniality presented in Chapter 4. The findings are presented under two main themes that play a role in the continuity of Academic Coloniality at the target university. The first theme is “Actively Gatekeeping Academic Coloniality” where I present findings from the participants about the actions and decisions that actively contribute to maintaining Academic Coloniality including them actively resisting changing content and practices to a more up-to-date state. The second theme is “Passively Gatekeeping Academic Coloniality” in which I present findings about factors that passively contribute to the continuity of Academic Coloniality. These include overlooked feedback and mismatched views between educators and students resulting from lack of effective communication and awareness of issues in ELT in the context. Findings from document analysis had the role of supporting claims made by the interviewees. It is worth noting here that the factors that contribute to the reproduction of Academic Coloniality are not primarily related to ELT, despite the effects they have on it.

5.2 Actively Gatekeeping Academic Coloniality

In this section, I present findings from student participants and teachers in relation to their reported practices and experiences that actively maintained aspects of Academic Coloniality. These findings were observed from the participants’ responses to interview items 7 to 10 that focused on their expectations, experiences, and practices as English language students and teachers at the target university. The analysis of these indicated that some members of staff at the target university were actively resistant to change which hindered the student participants’ and other teachers’ experience partaking in the continuity of Academic Coloniality.
5.2.1 Resisting Change

5.2.1.1 Students on Resisting Change

In their responses, the student participants described the nature of resistance to their suggestions of change. Most respondents expressed that they were made to feel inferior by some of their teachers. They stated that most of their requests for change of topics or teaching methods were not accommodated by educators. This was a recurrent theme in most of the student interviews. Several points can be discussed from the way SP9 described their experience with different teachers in Exchange 3 below, so I will be referring to it more than once:

Exchange 3:

**SP9**: Some teachers are very open-minded to what we're going to say or what you’re going to suggest [] But some others, because they are very strict, you cannot even dare to suggest, so you just let it be in their hands.

I: And what's the reason for that in your opinion?

**SP9**: Some teachers are used to (...) again back to the teacher-centred kind of teaching. Some others lost control over the class. Whether concerning the atmosphere or even concerning the ways they teach or how they teach. So again, it depends on how the teacher views teaching itself. Some teachers really are there to make teaching a very interesting process, but others just make you hate it.

I: Okay. Do you think there is a specific reason for that difference at the same department?

**SP9**: Well, I'm not saying that this is actually the only reason, but I think that age plays a role. So, when you have like those old, and it depends again, because we had some old teacher who are actually very open to anything you want to say, but the majority. They had that one thing. They gave much importance to writing. So, I don't know. They don't even speak English much. So, they learnt English with the way of writing instead of speaking. But younger teachers tend to be the opposite. So, they allow you to be free in the classroom.

*(SP9/Interview.09/07/2020)*
In Exchange 3, the participant started by stating that they had two completely different experiences making suggestions to their teachers. To indicate this, in their nomination strategy, the participant went from one extreme describing the first group as ‘very open-minded’ towards their contributions and propositions, indicating the extent to which they were successful making changes with those teachers, to the other extreme describing the second group of educators: ‘you cannot even dare to suggest’. With the latter group, the participant tried to convey the level of hesitation they felt when making suggestions. In fact, they were more likely to ‘just let it be in their hands’. The linguistic forms the participant used here indicate that they were concerned about the teacher’s reaction: ‘they are very strict’. Other participants also reported similar experiences with some of their teachers when they made comments in their classes:

   during my experience, I had some bad comments. I had a teacher once try to humiliate me actually because I said: “it would be better if you looked for a video to explain”.

   (SP5/Interview.12/07/2020)

Here, the student asserted that their teacher attempted ‘to humiliate’ them for suggesting the use of a video. This reaction could be taken as evidence for the extent to which some teachers were resistant to any suggestion from their students. This is likely because those teachers held traditional classroom power relations (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.1.2). This also seems to be a recurrent incident as other participants reported:

   when students make mistakes, some correct them, and some do not, and when they do, they correct them in a very rude way. It's very rare to find a teacher that is very willing to correct you in a polite way. (SP9/Interview.09/07/2020)

In this extract, the participant stated that it was not in fact one but ‘some’ of their teachers who had similar attitude when students made mistakes. They specified that finding a teacher who corrected them politely was ‘very rare’. As a result, they were less likely to make comments or suggestions to them during classes. In fact, these two examples render the participant’s nomination strategy in Exchange 3 “you
cannot even dare to suggest” more reasonable. In fact, SP4 added that it was ‘most’ of their teachers who had similar attitudes towards the students:

SP4: Usually, teachers in Algeria, they have, not all of them, but most of them, have un complexe. I don't know how to say it in English here.

I: It's literally “a complex.”

SP4: Okay, the complex. So, they take the students suggestions as if the teacher is not competent enough and the student is trying to show off and is trying to make fun of the teacher, so the teacher immediately reacts or have a bad reaction or, you know, negative reinforcement, but punishment. (SP4/Interview.06/07/2020)

In this extract, the participant claimed that ‘most’ of their teachers did not take suggestions from students well. They described it as “un complexe” in French, which is closer in meaning to “they have a condition” in English. Here, the student appeared to notice that there was something wrong in their teachers’ reactions. However, they were unable to put it in words. The respondent explained that those teachers tended to misinterpret the intentions of the students making the comments, which triggered the “bad reaction”. Based on this extract, it appears that most of the teachers did not like to be challenged by their students. In this context, these teachers appeared to hold on strongly to the traditional imbalanced power relations with their students in classrooms where teachers stand, talk, give instructions, and hand assessments; and students sit, listen, take notes, and sit for tests. In such a classroom arrangement, students are in inferior positions to their teachers, which means: 1) they are often anxious about speaking out or challenging their teachers’ approaches; and 2) teachers are likely to respond negatively to comments from an inferior authority. While it is unrealistic to expect teachers to be open to all suggestions made, the evidence here indicate that students were being completely discouraged from giving feedback.

Going back to Exchange 3, when the respondent was asked about the reasons for the contrast in their teachers’ reaction to students’ suggestions, their first response was to highlight teacher’s ‘age’. The participant, after making exceptions, stated that the majority of the ‘older teachers’ were ‘very strict’ and
reacted negatively to suggestions. Similarly to SP4 above, the participant in Exchange 3 also noticed that their teachers ‘had that one thing’, referring to their reactions to students’ comments. In Chapter 4, Section 4.2.2.2, the findings showed that older teaching staff held stronger views towards manifestations of Academic Coloniality. Here, the results so far indicate that they also believed in traditional classroom power dynamics, which in turn could contribute to the maintenance of Academic Coloniality. Other participants also reported that these teachers were attached to their traditional teaching approaches:

[name of the teacher omitted], for example, doesn't allow us to use internet in order to make a small research, which happened in 2020, recently. Isn’t this weird?

(SP2/Interview.10/07/2020)

This extract is clear evidence of how far some of the teachers were committed to the traditional ways in which they were educated. In the example the participant provided, students were not even ‘allowed’ to use the internet for their assignment, instead the teacher (who held the power in this case) expected them to physically go to the library and hand-write their assignments. The teacher here was not only holding on to their traditional approaches, but was also actively resistant to any change of these. Confronted with such resistance, the student was puzzled ‘which happened in 2020, recently. Isn’t this weird?’. This kind of active resistance to change ensures the continuity of traditional, and often counterproductive, methods, teaching approaches, and views that constitute Academic Coloniality.

Additionally, SP9 also added in Exchange 3 that those older teachers ‘don’t even speak English much’, and they focus more on writing. The majority of these teachers went to a post-independence Algerian university that adopted the French colonial approach with traditional student-teacher power dynamics and where French was the language of instruction (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.1). In other words, these teachers were instructed in French when learning English at university which explains SP9’s claim that their writing in English was more developed than their speaking. This provides more evidence for the role French coloniality played in the maintenance of Academic Coloniality in Algeria.
5.2.1.2 Teachers on Resistance to Change

The results in this section showed that even teachers who wanted to make changes to their content faced resistance from others who held on to familiar practices. These findings suggest that there was a division between teachers, some who were critical of the current situation, and others were satisfied. Those who argued for the necessity of change were critical of the Canevas. Participants claimed that these documents were out-of-date, unrealistic, and irrelevant to the students’ needs:

I honestly thought that there are many issues with these Canevas. First of all, they are outdated. Some of these Canevas have been made probably 20 years earlier; I’m not really sure about that. But I can tell you that they have been made a very long time ago and that they did not undergo any changes. And that some of them tend to look like they are very Utopian. It is a developing country, you cannot just come up with any sort of curriculum, or with any sort of Canevas, this Canevas needs to be coming from the university. [] they first need to go to university to look at what kind of level we have, [] they need to look for the learner’s needs. (TP3/Interview.5/07/2020)

The teacher in this extract expressed their dissatisfaction with the contents of the Canevas currently in use. They stated that the document did not change for a long time rendering them out-of-date. The participant’s response also showed how unrealistic the content of the curriculum was. They used the linguistic unit “Utopian” to express the complete mismatch with the reality of the learning was taking place at the target university. The teacher added that the Canevas did not meet the students’ needs. The evidence provided here supports the claim that there was clear unsatisfaction among some teachers with the contents of the curriculum and the documents governing it. Naturally, those teachers demanded change and wanted more power to make adjustments:

I’m not going to disagree [with the Canevas]; I’m not going to teach them popular culture or best sellers or any kind of text that I can get from the library, but I still want to have the possibility for the freedom to change [] I would say that the Canevas need to undergo serious revisions [] we are young in age, we can understand students’ needs. (TP3/Interview.5/07/2020)
This extract demonstrates the desire of some teachers who wanted to change and contribute to the curriculum. Interestingly, despite the direct criticism of the Canevas, the participant stated that they would not ‘disagree’ with them. That is to say, even while noticing the necessity to make changes, they still felt they were not in a position to make them. Essentially, the teacher here showed confidence in their awareness of their students’ needs, but not courage to opt for adjustments to the curriculum guidelines or Canevas. In fact, these teachers had a certain level of freedom to make changes on a minor scale:

Speaking of the freedom, we do have the freedom. There are almost no strict guidelines which is both good and bad. The teachers still have the capacity and flexibility and malleability to change, or to introduce certain things. We have room for agency. At the expense of this freedom, other issues will arise. For example, on the national level, if each university is going to allow its teachers the freedom to construct their curriculum, then we are going to end up with no unification whatsoever. (TP3/Interview.5/07/2020)

The participant here disclosed that they had freedom to make changes within the boundaries of the Canevas. However, they refrained from making those changes because of the possible issues of coordination with other Algerian universities that could arise from that. The respondent here appears to be too concerned about conformity to the same content as other universities to make the changes they think were necessary. They might have been affected by the fact that coordination between lower-level institutions in a centralised model of education is very important. The participant argued that if each university went about designing their own curriculum, each one would have a completely different content that would make it difficult to mobilise students or have national unified tests:

the problem is going to arise for students who are going to pass, for example, contests on a national level. (TP3/Interview.5/07/2020)

In this extract, the participant was referring to national PhD contests the Algerian MHE organises with state universities. In Algeria, admissions to PhD placements are not granted through applications, but
through sitting for national exams at universities that have open seats. Every year, universities open a number of seats for new PhD students and choose applicants based on their performance in those tests, and students from different parts of the country can sit for the exam at any of them. For TP3, coordination with other universities across the country was vital because it made it easier for students who wanted to sit for those tests to pass. This concern with coordination with other universities was one of the reasons younger teachers held off making changes to their content. At this point, they tried to make changes to the Canevas. This way, they would make sure to meet the students’ needs and ensure coordination with other universities since the same document was circulated to all institutions. Ideally, these teachers would communicate the desire to change through one of the first meetings in a series of meetings that end at the MHE where the Canevas is issued (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.1.1). These teachers would have the opportunity to suggest their changes in the meetings with the ‘responsable du module’ (equivalent of Unit convenor) who was responsible for voicing those suggestions in their meetings with other senior staff members. However, in those meetings, teachers who want to make changes did not seem to be offered much power to do so:

especially young teachers, they need to have a voice in there. We are marginalised from any decision making. (TP3/Interview.5/07/2020)

This is clear evidence for how younger teachers felt in their dealings with the more established teaching staff. Despite the freedom they had in making minor changes within the boundaries of the Canevas, younger teachers found themselves ‘marginalised’ and voiceless when trying to make changes to the document. In this respect, there seems to be a specific order that largely depended on age and title:

I: do you feel you’re able to influence the Canevas?

TP3: Oh, I wish. Like in a formal manner? no. because my grade [Translation from Algerian Arabic – my work position is not high enough], so until then, three years after I am done with my PhD, only then can I be allowed to efficiently and formally be able to take part in decision making or to influence. (TP3/Interview.5/07/2020)
In this extract, the participant explained the role the work position played in how much power they had in the decision-making process about the Canevas. More experienced teaching staff had more control over the policy documents. The participant explained that before they were ‘allowed’ to take part in making changes, they would need to have worked for three years after finishing their PhD. And since the teacher participant here still had not finished those three years yet, decision making was afforded to older teachers who were not only satisfied with the current curriculum content/Canevas, but were also so attached to their practices that they act as gatekeepers against any changes:

I: What would you change within your practice in relation to what we’ve been talking about: English varieties, culture and curriculum design?

TP1: What I want to change? Nothing, I’d keep it just like this, it’s perfect, I mean it works well. (TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)

The teacher participant’s response in this exchange indicates that they were satisfied with their teaching and the views they held in relation to English varieties, culture, and the curriculum they taught. This is evidence for the lack of awareness of feedback from their students that were, according to the students, caused by two main reasons: the students not making suggestions or the teachers dismissing those if made. In other words, this lack of awareness of the curriculum’s irrelevance to the learner’s needs was the result of the traditional classroom power relations. Additionally, such complaints may not be reflected in the students results as they became accustomed and efficient with the teach to the test approach to education; this will also be discussed more under the next theme (see Section 5.3.1). This lack of awareness seemed to lead the teachers to an uninformed sense of satisfaction with their methods, enough to call it “perfect”, and content enough to state:

I’m very confident about what I am teaching. (TP2/Interview.3/07/2020)

So far, the reasons older teachers were resistant to change were: first, they already believed the Canevas and curriculum contents were ‘perfect’; and second, because of the imbalanced power relations they had
with both groups of the younger teachers and students. As far as Academic Coloniality is concerned, being resistant to change and preserving the current content and approaches equally preserved its previously highlighted aspects. In Chapter 4, Section 4.2.3.2, findings showed that while younger teachers might be slightly more tolerant towards students’ learning and use of English, their views were not too different from those of the older teachers. The younger ones were found to be affected by their older colleagues’ opinions on these issues (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.2.2). That is to say, even if they were given the equal chances to make changes, it is not clear that they would move towards a less colonialist ELT approach. The reason for this is also based on findings from the previous chapter; those teachers did not show high levels of awareness of English as an international language, as a lingua franca, or world Englishes. Simultaneously, openness to change, open communication with students, and the detachment from overly traditional teaching approaches can be an important factor in increasing chances for signs of Academic Coloniality within the context to be addressed.

Findings in this section provided data about the attitudes of student participants and teachers towards the current curriculum and their willingness to make changes to it. Students reported that the older teachers showed strong resistance to their suggestions for change and that they often expressed that extremely. As a result, students were discouraged from making comments or giving feedback decreasing chances for change even further. Additionally, younger teachers, who were more responsive to the students, had limited freedom to introduce change to contents. However, they refrained from that because of their concerns about unification across universities. Their ability to make changes was also limited by the Canevas that their older colleagues were satisfied with. Younger teachers complained that they were left out of decision-making. The findings indicated a power imbalance between members of teaching staff that was largely based on age and level of experience granting older teachers more power. Those teachers were also found to be strongly attached to their traditional teaching approaches (such as the imbalanced teacher-student classroom) and satisfied with the current content being taught. This led
them to actively resist all proposals for change to practices and content making them gatekeepers to Academic Coloniality in this context.

5.2.2 Failure/Refusal to Implement Updates

5.2.2.1 Students on Failure to Implement Updates

Another contributor to the maintenance of Academic Coloniality at the target university is the failure to stay up-to-date. The results showed that students found a lot of their lessons out-of-date. They stated that it caused them to feel bored during those classes as they could not relate to their content. As already explained above (see Section 5.2.1.1), there were several confrontations between students and teachers about these, but no updates to the contents were introduced. Students were not only dissatisfied with the topics of their lectures for being out-of-date, but also the techniques by which they were delivered:

I'm not happy with what they taught us during the first three years. Personally, I am not, and I am really disappointed. And because it's not only boring, but because they use the technique of storytelling as the only teaching technique, which is really boring. (SP4/Interview.06/07/2020)

The participant, who was a Master 1 student, expressed their discontent with their studies during their undergraduate years. This comment specifically addressed the Culture Unit (Culture de la Langue). Additionally, the student also found that the way the content was presented ‘storytelling teaching method’ only made their experience worse. This provides evidence for students’ dissatisfaction with their studies. The student then followed this with an interesting comment about this unit:

So again, Walid, the first three years were a bit (...) for me, at least, I think that they should change module “Culture” with “History of English” and not culture. Yes, because again, I know I said it earlier, but you are expecting to know about the culture, we’re in 2020, and I do not think that culture is synonym of history. Yes, History is important to culture, of course, but is history culture? It's not. You see modern culture is all about, as I said, habits, lifestyle, food, traditions, and ethics. We have only dealt with that in our Master 1 here, and it was “Culture de Langue”. (SP4/Interview.06/07/2020)
The student in this extract explained reasons for their frustration with the content of the unit ‘Culture’ in their undergraduate years through suggesting it should have been called ‘History of English’. Here, they implied that the content was more historical than cultural. Looking at the Objectifs de l’enseignement (learning targets) section in the Canevas, the document included that the purpose of the unit was to “Identify the relationship between culture and language and explain how cultural aspects (religious, social, political...)” (Canvas.2019/20). However, evidence provided showed that the practice was not as stated in the document. Texts that teacher participants provided, which they used for the unit in the undergraduate years, indicated that the approach was more historical. For example, the outline of one of the texts used included:

The Romantic Period

1785-1830

1789—1815: Revolutionary and Napoleonic period in France.
1789: The Revolution begins with the assembly of the States-General in May and the storming of the Bastille on July 14.
1793: King Louis XVI executed; England joins the alliance against France. —1793—94: The Reign of Terror under Robespierre.
1804: Napoleon crowned emperor.
1815: Napoleon defeated at Waterloo
1807: British slave trade outlawed (slavery abolished throughout the empire, including the West Indies, twenty-six years later)
1811—20: The Regency—George, Prince of Wales, acts as regent for George III, who has been declared incurably insane?
1819: Peterloo Massacre
1820: Accession of George IV

In this outline, the text would introduce the historical events chronologically. They would investigate the development of past events with a focus on when they took place. This is also consistent with the claims
of SP4 above. So far, the evidence provided demonstrated the gap between policy and practice, which is also a common feature of the centralised educational system. In addition to this, student participants also insisted that the content they were being taught was out-of-date:

**SP7:** they teach us things that are very old, theories that are very old. They don’t even matter anymore. *(SP7/Interview.15/07/2020)*

The linguistic units the participant used here do not only indicate their awareness that the content they were taught was out-of-date, but also shows their frustration with it. In fact, the student showed even more awareness stating that what they were learning has already been discredited:

**SP7:** They teach a lot of theories, but a lot of them were refuted. *(SP7/Interview.15/07/2020)*

This is evidence of teachers’ dependence on outdated sources. That is to say, on the references section of the Canevas for the majority of the units, the list of references dated between 1940s and mid 2000s regardless of whether they were authoritative sources. Table 9 below highlights a few examples of the References sections for a few units copied from the Canevas:
### Table 9: Examples of reference lists from the Canevas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Objectifs de l’enseignement (learning targets)</th>
<th>References (copied from the Canevas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Linguistics and Literature** | • Show students the intimate relationship between linguistics and literature.  
• Show that literature can be approached from a linguistic point of view. | Barthes, R. (1967) *Le degré zero de l’écriture*. (Trans. Writing Degree Zero)  
Eco, U. (1). *La Strutura Assente*.  
Table 9 shows example reference lists of three units: Literature and Civilisation, Research Methodology, and Linguistics and Literature to show that the issue extended across different units. It also includes the learning targets for each of these units in order to provide an idea about the unit and to compare them to the participants’ responses. The reference lists in this table provide further evidence for the SP7’s argument that they were taught out-of-date information. As shown in Table 9, the most recent reference on the list was published more than 15 years ago. This is clear evidence for the failure of the teachers and the MHE to provide up-to-date content in their teaching. Additionally, students reported evidence of lack of coordination between teachers of different units:

for example, he did a lesson about registers and styles when we already had that lesson in linguistics [ ] we have a lesson in civilisation and then we have the same one in literature. They’re not coordinated. That's a big problem. *(SP7/Interview.15/07/2020)*

In addition to indicating the lack of coordination between teachers, this extract highlights more the failure of the MHE to organise the contents properly. That is to say, because the different suggestions for content in the Canevas come from three different sources after several meetings across various departments and regions (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.1.1), it is likely for such interferences to occur. It is therefore the responsibility of the MHE to look at all the suggestions together and make the suitable decisions.

While the out-of-date and disorganised content of the sessions frustrated some of the student participants, others felt that most of their lectures were not beneficial since they already knew the content. Unable to relate or understand the reasons, participants reported feeling ‘bored’ when the repeated sessions took place:

The lectures, some are really boring, and some are unnecessary, it’s like they love to repeat the lectures every time. *(SP9/Interview.09/07/2020)*

This extract shows the results of this lack of coordination and being out-of-date on the students. For other participants, they experienced a sense of boredom and complacency due to feeling excessively knowledgeable and lacking in challenges:
Nothing Shocked me anymore. Nothing was new to me anymore, except for example, some techniques or some methods. *(SP2/Interview.10/07/2020)*

Here, the participant expressed how they viewed their lectures. They reported that they had nothing more to learn. This is probably the result of having the same content repeated which gave the impression that all there was to learn has already been presented. This could result in further disengagement from their studies particularly when added to some teachers’ aggressive attitudes when students tried communicating their concerns.

So far, these results showed that students were unsatisfied with the content for being out-of-date and for having repeated sessions due to the lack of coordination. Their claims were confirmed through the Canevas. Under these conditions, some students felt that they knew everything about their studies. While these findings referred to general practice, circumstances that surround these would also apply to aspects of Academic Coloniality. That is to say, the failure to introduce updates to the teaching material plays a key role in the maintenance of Academic Coloniality within this context.

### 5.2.2.2 Teachers on Failure to Implement Updates

Responses from teacher participants confirmed several findings reported by the students and provided more details for others. These also highlighted a similar age and experience related division between teachers. The data from the participants provided evidence for the mindset some of the teachers had that could explain the use of out-of-date references. A good example of this mindset was the statement a teacher participant made:

> I have not changed my practices. Nowadays, I’m focusing on performance and procedure. What I am teaching my students now is that we have reached a point in language teaching where everything has been said at the level of the approach and the method. All people around the world agree that we have to go through communicative language teaching. *(TP2/Interview.3/07/2020)*
There are three main points about the respondent’s views on language education to explore from this extract. First, the participants’ conclusion that scientific research has figured out everything about language learning. Second, the false belief that communicative language teaching was agreed upon internationally to be the ultimate language teaching approach. Third, what these two ideas combined mean in relation to the out-of-date content.

In the first point, the participant’s argumentation strategy starts from the mindset that educational research was constant and finite that everything about it has already been established indicates a positivist view of social reality. However, it appears that the participant took this further by oversimplifying research in language teaching and overgeneralising findings about it. This unrealistic view of research could only lead to the conclusion that there would no longer be a need to: one, do any more research about the area; and two, read any more about it since ‘everything has been said’, and any further reading would just be repeating the same ideas. This explains the outdated reference lists on the Canevas (see Table 9 above).

The second argumentation strategy the participant made was that communicative language teaching was universally agreed upon as the best approach to language teaching. Similarly to the first point, making that overgeneralised claim about a process that involved teachers and learners with different backgrounds, complicated learning styles, habits, and cultures indicates oversimplified positivist views. In fact, not only the claim that “All people around the world agree that we have to go through communicative language teaching” was untrue, but also the teaching approach was criticised as early as 1985. This is further evidence for the teachers’ continued lack of exposure to research in the field. Additionally, the use of “all people” in that claim could imply an ‘echo chamber’ effect where participants’ were only exposed to views that confirmed their bias. What is more, despite the participant’s claims that they followed a communicative language teaching approach, students reported a lack of interaction in classroom. Within communicative language teaching, language learning happens through students’
interaction with each other and their teachers. However, students complained about their sessions being the opposite. For example, SP9 complained:

They just ask a couple of questions and that's it. They don't open the discussion. They don't make debates. (SP9/Interview.09/07/2020)

This provides further evidence for two of the previously raised issues: the gap between policy and practice, and the lack of effective communication from students to these teachers.

The third point referred to above was the conclusion that can be made bringing these two argumentation strategies together. Teachers appeared to have their minds set about many aspects of their practices. The views they set their minds on were often no longer accurate, oversimplified, or overgeneralised. In fact, Table 9 above illustrates that several of the references used were not only outdated but were also in French. This emphasises the extent to which these teachers still cling to the norms and views they learned during their French post-colonial university experience. In addition to this, teachers appeared to refrain from exposure to newer research as they already had their minds set about their normalised practices and content isolating them from any opposing ideas. Consequently, the problematic discourses they held do not get challenged. Instead, these were just repeated since they did not seek updated knowledge creating an echo chamber where their opinions only were further normalised. The more these views were repeated, the more they were naturalised to the teachers, and the more defensive they were about them. This way, regardless of the inaccuracy of these perceptions, they were guaranteed to continue within this context. This also applied to several manifestations of Academic Coloniality.

On the other hand, younger teachers also pointed out that the Canevas were ‘outdated’ (see Section 5.2.1.2). Interestingly, the participant specifically stated that their older colleagues were in charge of that:

Some of these professors are quite aged they are not up-to-date with these, for example, platforms and e-learning methods, and our students are quite a nerd to these changes. Look at this COVID crisis across the world has urged universities across the globe to look for
alternate ways of teaching; that is online courses and students are going to enrol in platforms and all. And funnily enough, there are many teachers who were not going to be able to push through that, and these are the same teachers who are said to contribute to making these Canevas better. (TP3/Interview.5/07/2020)

In this extract, the participant specifically targeted the older teachers for their inability to keep up with the current generation of students. They highlighted the inability of these teachers to adjust to the use of technology after courses went online due to COVID-19 indicating that they were attached to and depended on their traditional approaches. The respondent also specified that these teachers were the ones who had the highest voices to introduce changes to the Canevas. These predication strategies were clear evidence that the participant extended their earlier criticism about the Canevas being out-of-date to those able to make changes to it. Their argument here was that if these teachers, who were supposed to update these documents, were unable to keep up with their students or the use of technology, they should not be the key holders of such influential documents. In fact, the participant indicated on several occasions during their interview that younger teachers should also have an equal say in updating the content of the Canevas. However, as already shown previously (see Section 5.2.1.2), they were denied any chances to make such changes by older teachers who were actively gatekeeping these documents.

At the same time, it should also be noted that the younger teachers did not specifically protest any manifestations of Academic Coloniality in their issues with the Canevas. As shown throughout this chapter, their main criticism was either about the Canevas in general or the texts used in their classrooms being outdated. In other words, even though those teachers were willing to implement changes to the texts, content, and policy documents; there was not clear evidence to make the claim that these changes would be addressing Academic Coloniality. In fact, they may even be using the same references themselves, since as shown in the previous chapter, they held views that were similar to those of the older teachers.
This section focused on the teacher participants’ and students’ attitudes towards the content they were respectively teaching and learning. Findings highlighted several views that some of the teachers held about their practice that were problematic in nature. Those teachers believed that language education as a field of study was limited and that researchers already figured out everything there was to know about it. Consequently, they were no longer introducing updates to the content or reference lists on the Canevas. Data from these documents showed completely out-of-date reference lists for most, if not all, units. In fact, some of these references were also in French as older teachers imported them directly from their French university experience. Consequences of these teachers’ choices also divided students into two groups. Some of them recognised the out-of-date nature of the content and were unsatisfied with it. The lack of coordination leading to constant reproduction of the same discourses added more to the frustration of these students. On the other hand, because of the teachers’ oversimplification of the field of study, namely as finite, other students also showed similar attitudes by thinking that they already knew everything about their studies. The gap between teacher’s thinking of policy and practice also played a role to this effect, since interactions were limited, and students were more dictated to than discussed with.

Additionally, the results also illustrated that younger teachers complained that many changes needed to be introduced to the Canevas since they have not been changed for years. In fact, they went beyond that and criticised their older colleagues for not being able to relate to the current generation of students, because of their failure to stay up-to-date, and for their inability to keep up with the use of technology when forced to due to COVID-19. The younger teachers argued that their colleagues should not be the only ones with the ability to introduce changes to the Canevas, they wanted as much power since those colleagues did not intend to implement any. The older teachers appear to have been isolating themselves from newer research that would challenge their views about their practice. They did not see the need to do further research since they already knew everything about the field. Ultimately, this mindset created
a metaphorical wall around these teachers’ views and ensured their continuation in this context. As shown in Chapter 4, Academic Coloniality was manifested in many of these perspectives, as a result, ensuring the continuation of these actively ensures the continuation of Academic Coloniality.

Under this theme, I explored how Academic Coloniality was being actively maintained at the target university. The findings illustrated that this mainly took place through two ways: resistance to change, and refusal to update teaching content. For the first, it was found that the older educators opposed implementing any modifications to their methods or content. They were strongly attached and defensive of their traditional approaches, most of which they adopted during their university experience in a post-colonial university as Algeria carried the same French colonial model after its independence. The results also showed that those teachers influenced the Canevas the most creating a power imbalance that left younger teaching staff out of all decision-making positions. Similar power imbalance between the older teachers and their students in classes were also demonstrated which resulted in putting these students off making suggestions for change. These imbalances in terms of their influence on policy document and power over them allowed those teachers to actively resist change.

This section’s findings also indicated that some teachers held oversimplified versions of positivist views about language education. Those teachers were found to believe that research had already established everything about their field, and so there was no need to implement any updates in their content. As a result, reference lists for units on policy documents that were out-of-date did not appear to be an issue for them. Younger teachers noticed that the Canevas were outdated and needed revisions. However, only their older colleagues could make changes to those. These newer teachers also criticised their veteran colleagues for their inability to keep up with the use of technology as well as their students’ interests. Older teachers’ belief that they already knew everything about their practice revoked the need for exposure to more recent research. This led them to continuously reproduce the same discourses, naturalise them, and become protective of them. Altogether, the results of this section showed that the
active resistance for change and the intentional refusal to update content and methods of ELT in the context of this study were the two key factors in actively maintaining Academic Coloniality.

5.3 Passively Gatekeeping Academic Coloniality

I present in this section the findings collected from the teacher participants, students, and policy documents about the views, practices, or information that passively ensured the continuity of Academic Coloniality in the context of this study. The data presented here were collected from the participants’ responses to interview items 7 to 10 that focused on their experiences as students and teachers of English in Algeria. The analysis of these responses, in addition to data from the policy documents, demonstrated lack of communication between teachers and their students that was leading to them constructing different views about the practice. Accordingly, findings are presented below under two sections: mismatched views on practice, and unheard calls for change.

5.3.1 Mismatched Views on Practice

5.3.1.1 Students’ Views on Practice

The aim of this section is to highlight the discrepancy between what students reported about their learning experience and what their teachers perspectives of the pedagogy. This is different from the gap between policy and practice as the focus here is more on the perspectives of the participants rather than policy documents. In this part, I present the findings from the students’ responses to the interviews. These students reported on several occasions in the interviews that their classes were teacher-centred:

The class itself is teacher-centred, so it is always the teacher who does everything and even when you are asked to do a presentation, it’s always related to the teacher that choses the topic and you just gather the information and go and present, that’s it, really teacher-centred. I don’t know if it’s Algeria as a whole, but in our department, this is how it goes. (SP9/Interview.09/07/2020)
The participant in this extract indicated that their classes were teacher-centred and followed that with an example to express their feeling of restriction. This example provided evidence for the power imbalance between teachers and students within these classrooms. The intensification strategy in the participant’s statement ‘it is always the teacher who does everything’ show the extent to which these teachers dominated the classrooms. Through the example in the extract, the respondent illustrated their feeling of restriction by this dominance, which left no space for autonomy for them. In fact, some participants expressed that they were more concerned about their marks than learning:

There are certain modules that we have to learn about, and then we have to take tests about, so I don't think we have much choice in them. Well, if you want to pass, you have to study them, you have to learn them, I guess. And if you want to pass with a good grade, you have to learn everything. You have to care about every module. So, you don't really have a choice. There isn’t freedom. *(SP7/Interview.15/07/2020)*

Here, the participant explained why they did not see or mind the lack of freedom in their classes. They broke down their argumentation strategy by stating that the reason they did not have choices was because they were only learning those units to pass tests about them, and not to retain information. The respondent followed this with the idea that those who wanted to get better marks should learn everything emphasising their belief that the only reason for learning was to pass/get better grades. By doing this, the participant spelled out what “teaching to the test” was. These justifications indicated that the adaptation to the teach to the test approach for them was the norm, i.e., naturalised. Other participants also showed awareness of this issue:

They literally get inside the classroom, repeat whatever the lecture is about, or say the exact same thing that they have been saying for the past 10 years, five years, three years, or whatever. And then go outside the classroom. And then ask you to memorise it or learn it by heart. So that you can “تَقْعِيْنَة” [Translation from Algerian Arabic – vomit] or puke what they’ve been feeding you in exams. And I really don’t like that because I personally notice that learners or students in general don’t use their critical thinking. For example, if the exam question if it is ever, let’s say twisted like you need to think it through before you actually
answer it. It would be a disaster. Trust me! We are so used to direct questions, like give me or write exactly what I gave you in the “polyçopié” [Translation from French – Handouts] or whatever. And I don’t like this to be honest. (SP4/Interview.06/07/2020)

The participant in this extract summarised their experience as students at the target university. For them, a typical class was where the teachers were in control of the classroom, they spoke, gave instructions, sent handouts, and left with the expectation that students would memorise what they were lectured. The participant mentioned that these teachers were still repeating the same outdated content they have been teaching for a long time, which is consistent with previous findings. They also emphasised that they needed to ‘memorise [the content] or learn it by heart’ because they would need to produce it again for their exams the same way they learned it in the lectures. The student also showed awareness that this method hindered the learner’s autonomy and criticised it for that. Furthermore, they recognised the effects this teaching method already had on their classmates through the example they provided at the end of the extract above.

The implications of the findings from this extract can be presented in four main interrelated points. Initially, the way the participant described how their classrooms run provided further evidence for the nature of the imbalanced power relations between teachers and their students. In line with previous findings, those teachers took over the classroom, and dictated to students what to think about the subjects they were learning. That is to say, since students’ output in their tests should be what they were lectured in their classes, they did not need to actively think about any of it as their teachers have already done the thinking for them and were asking them to respond that way. All they had to do was to “learn by heart” and restate everything as it was. Clearly, this had a big impact on the students’ critical thinking abilities. As the participant suggested, students got so efficient in this method (learning exactly what they were taught the way they were taught it to reproduce it on exam papers that asked direct questions) that they would find it extremely difficult to deal with any other type of tests. Despite the participant’s awareness of this and its effect, they still did not have a choice since their teachers, who had the upper
hand in an imbalanced power relation, choose to employ a teach to the test method. The findings also demonstrated that teachers seem to have a routine approach to their classes, where they dictated the content instead of discussing it, failing to engage the students. So far, the students described a teacher-centred approach in teacher-dominated classrooms where the same discourses were constantly reproduced.

5.3.1.2 Teachers’ Views on Practice

As previously stated, with the aim of highlighting the differences between the views of students and teachers about their experiences at the target university, this section presents the attitudes of the teachers on the matter. Responses from teachers showed that the ideas they had about their practice differed from those of their students. Despite the previously reported issues and complaints from students and some teachers, others appear to see their practices and content as completely unproblematic:

I: What would you change within your practice in relation to what we’ve been talking about: English varieties, culture and curriculum design?

TP1: What I want to change? Nothing, I’d keep it just like this, it’s perfect, I mean it works well.

(TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)

In addition to the previous findings deduced from this extract, it also shows the participant’s view of their practice. They viewed that as “perfect”. It is worth noting here how the linguistic forms the teacher participant used contrast those of the students in the previous section (see Section 5.3.1.1). That is to say, while the linguistic means of the students employed intensification to describe the issues and convey urgency, the teachers’ indicate reassurance and confidence in their practices. TP6 in response to the same interview item stated:

If it’s not broken, don’t fix it. (TP6/Interview.17/07/2020)
This is clear evidence for the discrepancy in the views of the two participant groups about their experiences. Bringing the findings in this chapter together could explain the reasons for how extreme this difference in these perceptions was: 1) students not voicing their feedback in fear of their teachers’ reaction, 2) teachers’ false idea that they already knew everything about their practice which led to their refusal to make updates to their content and practices, and 3) their attachment to their traditional approaches.

In addition to these findings, this discrepancy in the perceptions of the experiences of the participants indicates a lack of communication in the direction from students to teachers. In other words, the lack of awareness of the issues the student participants complained about suggests that teachers were unaware of these students’ feedback. In fact, the university did not have any system in place to collect feedback, or any evaluation measures, from the students about their learning, this is also addressed in the following sub-theme.

Concerning the teaching approach, while students reported a teacher-centred one, educators seemed to believe that they employed a learner-centred communicative language teaching approach. Not only that, but as previously discussed, these teachers also had unrealistic views about this approach:

I'm very confident about what I am teaching. And let me tell you that since I started being a teacher, I was influenced by communicative language teaching. And in all the different levels, I've been through primary, middle, secondly, up to higher education. I have not changed my practices. *(TP2/Interview.3/07/2020)*

In this extract, the participant expressed their view of their teaching in a similar manner to their other colleagues; reassured and confident. Here, they revealed that they had teaching experience in primary education, middle school, high school, and university; and that in all of those different contexts, they used communicative language teaching. This approach to language teaching largely depends on students practicing the target language through interacting with each other mimicking real life interactions. With this in mind, it would be extremely challenging to use this approach in a context like an Algerian primary
or middle school as the level of students in English did not develop enough for them to be able to use the language in interaction. In those contexts, English is a second ‘foreign language’ after French with minimal teaching hours (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.1), and so, students do not learn more than the basic grammar rules and vocabulary in the one hour per week they get. On one hand, a possible implication of this argumentation strategy is that the teacher participant failed to accommodate their students’ actual needs by insisting on an approach that was too advanced for their level. On the other hand, a more likely explanation is that, while the teacher believed they were using a communicative language teaching approach, their practice was closer to a grammar translation method. This would explain the discrepancy in the responses of the two participant groups. In fact, looking at the Canevas, the spreadsheets appeared to be focused more on the four language skills (writing, reading, speaking, and listening) than on interaction:
Figure 3: Scanned copy of semester 3 undergraduate spreadsheet (as on Canevas)
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The Figure 3 above contains information on the units undergraduate students were expected to learn about in their third semester; but in this section, the focus is on the “VHS (15 semaines)” column (hourly volume per 15 weeks – how many hours will the classes be during the whole semester –). The spreadsheet indicates that Written Expression (67h 30), Oral Expression (45h), Grammar (45h) and Translation (45h) were given twice as much time as the rest of the units. It is worth noting that a focus on the four language skills instead of real-life interactions is a main feature of grammar translation method. Additionally, this approach is more teacher-centred, it gives plenty of attention to grammar rules, and relies on translation of text and vocabulary from/to the mother tongue to/from the target language. Taking this into account with the students’ testimony that their classes were teacher-centred, it appears that, despite the teacher participant’s belief, evidence indicates that they still mostly used grammar translation method.

In this section, I presented the perceptions of students and teachers on their English language learning and teaching experiences at the target university in order to highlight the discrepancy in how they viewed their experiences. The results showed that the two participant groups had completely different attitudes towards those. On one hand, the students reported that they experienced a teacher-centred approach where their classrooms were dominated by their educators. They also stated that the approach was a teach to the test one where, if they wanted to get good grades, students were expected to learn what the teachers taught them by heart to later reproduce those in tests. This was found to hinder students’ critical thinking and their performance outside the test/exam closed environment. On the other hand, teacher participants did not seem to be aware of any of the issues the students reported in their practice. It was found that there was a complete lack of effective communication/feedback from students to their teachers or to the university in general. Additionally, teachers appeared to hold inaccurate views on their practice. In other words, while they claimed they were employing a student-centred communicative language teaching approach, they were much closer to a grammar translation method one. This was backed up by the students’ responses as well as the policy documents. Overall, the most obvious finding
to emerge from this section was the mismatch between the views of the two participant groups about their English language learning and teaching experiences.

As far as Academic Coloniality is concerned, these mismatched views played an important role by passively contributing to the continuation of problematic practices, and thus maintenance of Academic Coloniality. That is to say, the “if it’s not broken, don’t fix it” (TP6/Interview.17/07/2020) attitude of the teacher participants despite all the issues reported by the students (be it due to the lack of awareness or communication) means that any changes to practice were unlikely to take place. This way, even though the participants were not actively trying to maintain the status quo, they were indirectly contributing to the continuation of the previously highlighted manifestations of Academic Coloniality at the target university.

5.3.2 Overlooked Feedback

5.3.2.1 Students on Overlooked Feedback

In this section, I present more evidence from students’ responses on their learning experience. The focus here is on the reactions of these students to the content, performance, and responses that were overlooked by the target university. Previous results already showed that the student participants were unsatisfied with several aspects of their studies. In their responses to item 10, these students made several suggestions relevant to the manifestations of Academic Coloniality in their studies showing awareness beyond what results from previous items demonstrated:

I: What would you change within your learning in, in relation to English varieties, culture or curriculum design?

**SP7:** I would open up more to Western culture in general, other than just the American and British English one, I would like that very much (xxx) Yes, I would also very much like to add the African culture if possible []

I: Is there a specific reason for you to want to learn about that?
SP7: Just because I think that it’s been on the British too much. Especially the Algerian [culture]. As Algerians, we don’t know much about it. We’re not very much connected to it, we’re not connected to our roots that much although we have “النف” [Translation from Algerian Arabic – pride] as they say, but we’re not connected to our roots at all. We’re westernised. Very westernised.

I: What is the reason for that in your opinion?

SP7: The first thought that comes to mind to mind is colonialism, of course. And how it, not smashed, kind of put its boot down on our own culture and tried to erase it. And I don’t really know much about our own history. Well, I know, but not really the techniques or the tactics of the French colonial system and how they really erased our culture, but for sure, that’s a problem. Also, a big problem that happened “بكري تع الحزب الواحد” [Translated from Algerian Arabic – in earlier years, the one-party state policies] I don’t know how you call it English.

I: You can continue the Arabic if you want

SP7: That erased our culture as well. Sure, Unity is fine and nice, but we need diversity.

(SP7/Interview.15/07/2020)

The exchange above includes several suggestions that the participant made about their studies. They expressed their eagerness to learn more than just about ‘American and British culture’ and specifically Western, African, and Algerian. They also felt that their studies focused too much on British and American ones and pointed out the necessity to include more content about ‘Algerian culture’. What was even more interesting is the participant’s argumentation strategy for that. They appeared to recognise the colonial legacy in how detached they were from their culture linking that to the French colonial practices and the policies early post-colonial Algeria adopted.

Here, the participant showed high levels of awareness of several features of Academic Coloniality that were highlighted in Chapter 4. The participant’s objection to the sole focus on American and British norms in their studies and their recommendation to include several other contexts provides evidence for their awareness of the use of English as an international language as well as of the fact that their content was
too limited to ‘native speaker’ varieties. The student here proposed that their studies should include a much broader scope. This shows that they recognised that they were not learning English only to communicate with the ‘native speaker’. Additionally, the student also pointed out that more attention should be afforded to African and specifically Algerian cultural norms which were neglected in their courses. The respondent appears to be conscious of the post-colonial effects reflected in their learning where local knowledge was often viewed as either inferior to the Western or totally neglected. Further, they continued to acknowledge the practices of French colonialism “put its boot down on our own culture and tried to erase it” to explain that their current detachment from the ‘Algerian culture’ was the result of those practices. These findings together indicate that the participant was aware that, through the continuous neglect of local norms and focus on the ‘native speaker’ ones, their studies were reinforcing the effects of French colonialism. This is significant because Academic Coloniality was not directly mentioned or defined to them prior to or during the interview. This means that the participant arrived at these conclusions on their own. Unfortunately, as the previous findings in this chapter showed, it was likely that feedback from this participant may either not be expressed or end up dismissed by the ones who had the authority to make changes. In fact, another participant specifically addressed this point in their response to interview item 10:

Regarding the department, I would really love for the ancients, for the dinosaurs to be more open, to try to update with the new generation. Walid, there’s so much potential with new generation of students. They are amazing. The ground is fertile, their English is germinated. They just need to pour some water on it, and we would have beautiful English trees, if you get my metaphor. (SP2/Interview.10/07/2020)

In this extract, the participant addressed the issue that their older teachers, who had the power to make changes, were not paying attention to the potentials their classmates showed. It is worth noting the linguistic means the respondent chose to use at this point; “ancients” and “dinosaurs”. Besides the obvious reference to their age, the participant could also be referring to the teaching methods and
content they were being taught. This is supported by the use of “to try to update with the new generation”, where the participant was referring to what they hoped would change. This is consistent with previous findings about the out-of-date content and teaching methods. On top of that, the participant continued in a metaphor to explain the linguistic abilities and awareness their classmates had and indicating that all teachers needed to do was to encourage those. Taking this metaphor with the criticism of the older teachers suggest that the participant here referred to how these learners were restricted by their teachers who continued to disregard their feedback.

5.3.2.2 Teachers on Overlooked Feedback

I focus in this section on the teachers’ responses to interview item 10 in relation to the points raised by their students about the issues they had and their awareness of those. The results show that when asked the same question as their students, they seemed to either express satisfaction with the current situation or make no comments about the issues presented in the above section. Previous findings in this chapter already showed that there was a lack of awareness on these issues (see Section 5.2.1.2). The same findings also supported the fact that those teachers were satisfied with their content and practices regardless of how out-of-date they were. As a result, some of these teachers, specifically the older ones, appeared to oppose any suggestions for change. Those were the same teachers who seemed to disregard feedback not only from students, but from their less experienced colleagues as well:

at the same time, they need to comply with the needs of the students. They need to look out there. They [the Ministry of Higher Education] shouldn't just impose.

(TP3/Interview.5/07/2020)

This extract shows that the teacher participant here emphasised the importance of going back to the students to find out their needs. They then referred to their objection to the MHE having the final say in the content to be taught. This shows that some of the teachers recognised the lack of compatibility of the current content with the student’s needs and were suggesting changes based on that. In other words,
those teachers were aware of how valuable the feedback they could get from students was. However, as shown previously, these teachers were left out of the decision making when it comes to changing policy documents. Responses from those teachers who can make changes were different, they were satisfied with their current practices and did not express any need for change. In fact, most of the teacher participants did not refer to their interactions with students or getting any form of feedback from them at any point of their interviews, and when asked about the process, one of the teachers completely skipped over the initial meeting at the university:

TP1: I am in a team, but we’ll meet in October. My team is about deciding the programme of first year. We’re going to meet in October. Of course, here in the East and then the team of east with the team of the west and the team of the centre, they meet in Algiers; and they decide for a curriculum for every university, the same I mean, the same stuff for all the universities. (TP1/Interview.08/07/2020)

The participant here explained the steps the Canavas goes through from regional meetings to the national one at the level of Ministry of Higher Education (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.1.1). Interestingly, the participant detailed the steps and meetings they held to issue the Canavas but completely neglected to mention the initial meetings with all teachers of every specific unit and taking feedback from them for any changes. This is interesting because that is the stage some of the younger teachers stated they felt left out from (see Section 5.2.1.2). It is also important to mention that suggestions for the Canavas content come from those meetings, not the MHE. That is to say, when TP3 in the previous extract objected that the MHE imposed content, their comments should be directed to those teachers in these meetings and not the MHE. What these findings mean is that, by neglecting the first stage of meetings at the local university, the participant left out feedback and recommendations about the teaching from other members of teaching staff. Indirectly, this ensured the continuation of the status quo including any aspects of Academic Coloniality.
The second theme of this chapter dealt with attitudes and practices that passively contributed to the continuation of Academic Coloniality at the target university. Unlike the previous theme, findings here were about participants’ lack of awareness, communication, or overlooking feedback instead of actively taking action that contributed to maintaining Academic Coloniality. The results showed that students and teachers had completely different views about their learning and teaching. Students reported a teach to the test teacher-centred approach where they were obliged to memorise information to reproduce it in tests if they wanted to pass. On the other hand, teachers were found to hold inaccurate views about their practice. While students and policy documents showed an outdated grammar translation method, teachers claimed to be employing a communicative language teaching approach. In addition to that, through their suggestions, some of the students showed awareness of certain aspects of Academic Coloniality in their studies. They also appeared to be conscious of the effects of French coloniality in Algeria and on their classes. At the same time, their teachers did not indicate any awareness of the issues reported by the students; in fact, evidence revealed that they neglected the feedback from them as well as their younger colleagues. All in all, it was found here that this lack of awareness, broken communication from students to their teachers, and neglect of feedback played an important role in the maintenance of Academic Coloniality in this context.

5.4 Conclusion to the Chapter

In this chapter, I presented findings from the two participant groups’ responses to interview items 7 to 10 and backed them with evidence from the policy documents collected. After highlighting the production and manifestation of Academic Coloniality in the previous chapter, the aim of this one was to point out the factors that contributed to its maintenance in this context of the study. Those factors were presented under two main sections. In the first section, “Actively Gatekeeping Academic Coloniality”, I introduced the actions and decisions participants took that actively played a role in maintaining the manifestations of Academic Coloniality presented in the previous chapter; these included resisting change in general or
refusing to update content despite it being manifested. In the second section, “Passively Gatekeeping Academic Coloniality”, I demonstrated the elements that passively contributed to the continuation of Academic Coloniality at the target university. Those included the lack of awareness and broken communication between the participant groups that resulted in mismatched views about their experiences, in addition to the teachers able to make changes overlooking feedback that could draw attention to some aspects of Academic Coloniality. For easier conceptualisation of these, a synopsis of these findings is presented in in the next chapter through Figure 8 (see Chapter 6, Section 6.5).

Outside the classroom, results of this chapter highlighted imbalanced power relations between older teaching staff and their younger colleagues where the former group held control over the policy documents governing content and duration of the teaching material. It was shown here that older teachers held unrealistic oversimplified views about their ELT practices; they believed that they already knew everything about their field and there was no reason for them to try to stay up-to-date with current research. These teachers also appeared to be strongly attached to their traditional methods, most of which were heavily affected by their French colonial university experience that Algeria carried on with post-independence. Consequently, it was found from analysis of the Canevas that the references these teachers used were out-of-date, and from the responses that they actively opposed change to their contents and methods. At the same time, younger teachers pointed out that several issues with the policy documents needed to be addressed as these have not been changed for a long time. Additionally, they complained about their lack of influence on these as they always felt left out by the older teachers from any decision-making role. In fact, they went further to criticise their older colleagues for not being able to adapt with their newer generations of students or the technology use required. They argued that they, too, should have equal influence on the Canevas instead of the older teaching staff having the sole control over them.
In the classroom, this chapter’s findings indicated significant discrepancies in the views of the two participant groups. Students reported traditional power relations between them and their educators that put them off contributing to their classes. These students also stated that they were unsatisfied with a teacher-centred approach where they were learning mainly to pass tests. In fact, results showed that students did not have a choice as expectations were for them to memorise information so they can reproduce them in their exams in order to pass. Naturally, this hindered their criticality and performance in the field outside an exam environment. Signs of this traditional teaching approach were also confirmed by the findings from the document analysis. Meanwhile, teachers’ views were the opposite, as they reported a communicative language teaching student-centred approach. This discrepancy was likely the result of the unchanged Canevas. In addition to this, some of the student participants showed through their suggestions that they had awareness of some of the issues relevant to Academic Coloniality in their studies as well as others caused by French coloniality. However, due to the power imbalance between them and their teachers, their feedback was overlooked as teachers did not show any signs of awareness of many of these and other issues reported by the students. Overall, this chapter’s findings show strong evidence of several practices, decisions, and lack of formal channels of communication that both, actively and passively, contributed to the continuation of Academic Coloniality within the context of this study.
Chapter 6: Discussion: A Self-Sustaining Impediment

6.1 Introduction
In this chapter I discuss the findings presented in chapters 4 and 5 from phase one’s semi-structured interviews and document analysis. I entitled this chapter ‘A Self-Sustaining Impediment’ referring to Academic Coloniality within the context of this phase to represent two main ideas. First, it is ‘self-sustaining’ in the sense that the larger part of its aspects is being (re)produced away from any interference of anyone outside the context. Here, I want to emphasise how interactions among and between teachers and their students contribute to Academic Coloniality. Second, it is an ‘impediment’ in that it hinders the learning process. As I discuss below, several aspects of Academic Coloniality do not only affect learners, but also put unnecessary pressure on teachers. I start discussing the findings by presenting Academic Coloniality, providing its definition, and how it relates to existing literature. I then follow that with its production, manifestations, and reproduction (maintenance and continuity). I discuss each of these linking the findings across Chapters 4 and 5 together and comparing them to relevant literature. Finally, I provide a conclusion where I summarise and link all of these together.

6.2 Academic Coloniality
The global spread of English and demand for its speakers in the global market pushed many countries to afford the language and its teaching special attention. As a result, speakers of English increased and are still increasing exponentially (Sargeant 2016). In many contexts, several issues surrounding the spread of the language and how it is being taught were addressed (Phillipson 1992; Pennycook 1994, 1998, 2001; Canagarajah 1999, 2005; Holliday 2005, 2006, Jenkins 2014, 2015). In other contexts, Algeria in this study, research into ELT did not cover the ideological dimensions of several practices and attitudes of people involved in it. This phase of the study addresses this through exploring features of Academic Coloniality in an English Department at one university in Algeria. By doing this, the study addresses the gap in the
literature on coloniality in ELT in the country (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.2). Academic Coloniality in ELT can be defined as the practices and attitudes of people involved in ELT that contribute to the production, manifestation, and reproduction of certain power patterns between learners of English as a second language and its ‘native speakers’. Chapters 4 and 5 demonstrated ample evidence for the existence of these practices and attitudes among teachers and students of English at the target university in Algeria. Below is a visual representation of these findings:
Figure 4: Visual representation of Academic Coloniality within phase one’s target university
Figure 4 represents a summary of the findings of this phase of the study. From left to right, the results showed that both media and French coloniality affected teachers’ and students’ views, who also interacted with each other to contribute to the production of Academic Coloniality in their context. Manifestations of Academic Coloniality included the interplay of the belief in the English language ownership by the ‘native speaker’, the fixed association of English language to the English ‘native speaker and their culture’, and Othering of the ‘native speaker’ which led to the construction of several biases, inaccurate views, and unproductive practices. As for the reproduction and maintenance of Academic Coloniality in this context, a combination of some teacher participants’ practices and lack of constructive communication ensured its continuation at the target university. In what remains of this chapter, I discuss these findings in detail, how they relate to current research, and what implications they provide.

6.3 Production and Transfer of Academic Coloniality

The results in the first phase of the study revealed that the production of Academic Coloniality took place on several levels and interactions. On the first level, both French coloniality and media influenced the views of older teachers, younger ones, and their students in different ways. The impact of French coloniality was observed in the findings in two main ways: how older teachers were found to hold on to the beliefs and practices they adopted from their experience in a post-colonial Algerian university that adopted the French colonial model (Benrabah 1999, Rezig 2011), and how ‘Western culture’ was advocated on the account of the local one (Kumaravadivelu 2006) through the views of the participants. At the same time, the influence media was also recorded in two main manners: it exposed the participants to unrealistic attractive images of the ‘native speaker’ of English that raised their interest in inner circle varieties (Kachru 1985); it also introduced several stereotypical representations that idealised the ‘native speakers’, which participants used to justify their biases. The following chart visually represents these relationships:
Figure 5: Visual representation of the production of Academic Coloniality

In order to understand the production of Academic Coloniality within the target university in phase one of this study, we can look at Figure 5 above from the bottom to the top. As already explained, the results of this study showed that French coloniality’s contribution to the production of Academic Coloniality materialised through older teachers’ university experience at institutions that adopted the French model and through views of inferior local knowledge and superior Western. Taking the French model university first, the findings presented in Chapter 5, Section 5.2.1 showed that several teacher participants addressed their students in French instead of English; students also reported that those teachers’ written English was better than their spoken. This was put down to the fact that they were instructed in French when learning English. In fact, the analysis of the Canevas showed that teachers also carried several French references from their university experience to use in their teaching (see Chapter 5, Section 5.2.2.1, Table 9). These findings are supported by several studies that looked into the Algerian linguistic context. Benrabah (1999, 2014), Rezig (2011), Belmihoub (2018) report that Algeria implemented the same French colonial university system after its independence in 1962 where diplomas held in those Algerian
universities were acknowledged by both Algeria and France and a degree equivalence process for these was not required for transfers, multiple exchange programmes were organised between the two countries, and several PhD studies were co-supervised by French and Algerian academics. In addition, several books and references that were used in teaching were gifted to Algerian universities by the French Embassy in Algeria (Abid-Houcine 2007, Belmihoub 2018).

Going back to the second way in which French coloniality contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality, the results across Chapters 4 and 5 showed that participants held the views of a superior ‘native speaker’ of English due to their background of a superior ‘Western culture’, and an inferior image of the ‘Self’ and the local Algerian culture. Such findings are familiar within post-colonial contexts; Kumaravadivelu (2006) states that: “Western scholars have unscrupulously furthered their own vested interests by disseminating Western knowledge and by denigrating local knowledge” (p.14). As far as Academic Coloniality is concerned, holding low views of the local speakers of English and their culture leaves participants defenceless to the stereotypical, unrealistic, and idealised images they encountered in their everyday interactions or through media (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4.2.1). Interestingly, the results from a student participant showed high levels of awareness of these practices by colonial France and their effects in their society and within their learning that seemed to be normalised for their colleagues and teachers. The student even suggested to broaden the scope of their studies to include more than just ‘native speaker’ varieties and culture (see Chapter 5, Section 5.3.2.1). They proposed more attention to and education of local norms and culture. The respondent’s awareness of the issues surrounding French coloniality and how they effected their social and educational context allowed them to propose ways to mitigate those effects. This is consistent with Fairclough’s (2010) argument that raising awareness about the normalised social wrongs that are the product of the dominant groups’ practices, colonial France in this case, could “contribute to righting or mitigating” (p.8) these social wrongs. Additionally, Blommaert & Bulcaen (2000) state that this awareness also helps empower and announce the dominated groups to
resist them. It is in this sense that this participant’s awareness did not only include that about the problem, but also how to resist this form of coloniality. In this regard, Hoff & Hickling-Hudson (2011) and Mbah (2018) argue for promoting and co-creating relatable local knowledge as a way of resisting these and moving towards self-sustainability. I believe that the case of this participant is a suitable opportunity for me to point out that, despite my own biases, I am not giving my participants voices and implying that they had none. Instead, my aim is to amplify their already existing voices through this study.

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, media also played a role in the production of Academic Coloniality among the participants in two related, but different, ways. First, it is important to consider how the exclusive exposure to ‘native speaker’ varieties raised the participants’ interest and familiarity with those. As highlighted in Chapter 4, Section 4.3.2, the findings showed how participants pointed out a shift of interest in a second language from French to English. This is consistent with the bulk of the literature that address the global spread of English stating that media often promote ‘native’ varieties (Dragojevic, Mastro, Giles, & Sink, 2016), and especially Ushioda (2017) who points out the decrease in motivation to learn other languages that accompanied the interest in and spread of English. The reason these students’ English resembled more that of the ‘native speaker’ was attributed to those varieties being omnipresent across the media they were exposed to. In this regard, Lippi-Green (2012) reports that these media outlets supply stereotypical representations, linguistic ideologies, and unrealistic characters. Sonnesyn (2011) also states that most of the varieties of English used in Disney’s films released between 1995 and 2009 were either American or British. In fact, 61% of those were American English (ibid.), which also supports the findings in the current study about students being more interested in American English (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.3.1).

The second way in which media contributed to Academic Coloniality is the stereotypical and ideal representations of the ‘native speaker’ in the media; these propelled the biases and unrealistic images the participants held. The results throughout Chapter 4 showed how attractive participants found the
idealised representations of ‘native speakers’ of English and their lifestyle. Several studies (Dobrow & Gidney, 1998; Mastro, Behm & Morawitz, 2005; Gluszek & Hansen 2013) already established how it is standard in the media to represent ‘native speaker’ English and its speakers in a positive frame making them more appealing to those who are watching. Exposed to these images, learners were drawn to imitate not only the lifestyle, but also the language used. Gluszek & Hansen (2013) explain that these portrayals of varieties can considerably affect learners’ reaction to them. In fact, Belmihoub (2018) states that Algerian youth imitating ‘native speakers’ “serves as a way for the people to convey linguistic sophistication, membership in an elite group of intellectuals and celebrities, and a modern and open lifestyle consistent with that portrayed in American movies and television shows.” (p. 217). Beyond the attraction to these, the findings also demonstrated that the inaccurate representations in the media led some participants to hold false assumptions about the ‘native speaker’ and their lives (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4.1). In this regard, Soares (2017) argues that the “constant exposure to media’s propaganda may shape individuals’ beliefs, attitudes, and behavior” (p. 5). In this sense, the contribution of media to the production of Academic Coloniality in higher education in Algeria extended beyond the learners’ and teachers’ university experience to their everyday life and to what extent they were exposed to the biased content in the media they subject themselves to.

So far, the discussion of the findings highlighted how student and teacher participants were affected by French coloniality and media, and how those contributed to the production of certain beliefs that fall within aspects of Academic coloniality. In this sense, this study goes beyond the concept of self-marginalisation (Kumaravadivelu 2012) to address French Coloniality and media as external factors that play an active role in the production of power asymmetries in ELT in Algeria (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.2). In the following section, I discuss the internal factors that contribute to Academic Coloniality. That is to say, while the previous section focused on factors that are outside the institutional boundaries of the university and the individuals involved, the following one seeks to provide a deeper understanding of the
problematic interactions and practices within the university itself on an individual level. By doing that, this study also addresses the need for a deeper understanding of the conditions that contribute to the persistence of colonial practices within ELT (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.1). In reference to Figure 5, I moved one level up to discuss the nature of the relationship among teachers and students, and how their interactions contribute to the production of Academic Coloniality. Figure 6 below represents those in more details:
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**Figure 6: Production and transfer of Academic Coloniality among teachers and students**

Figure 6 illustrates how Academic Coloniality is internally produced and transferred among people involved in ELT at the target university. As shown in Chapter 4, the nature of how aspects of Academic Coloniality were carried and transmitted is complicated, which was reflected in the nature of the relationships among and between teachers and their students. In order to break this down, I start at the top of Figure 6 following the blue arrows from older teachers towards younger teachers and towards students. The results in Chapter 4 showed that older teachers held biased views about English, the ‘native speaker’ of English, and their practice. These are discussed in more details later in this Chapter under Manifestations of Academic Coloniality (see Section 6.4). For the sake of clarity, I use this as a starting point for the cycle represented in Figure 6, however, this is not to say that older teachers were the only
source of Academic Coloniality. The division between teachers into ‘older’ and ‘younger’ ones emerged from the data collected, mostly in how participants referred to each other; older teachers had more experience, better positions, were more resistant to change, and held more power. Similar age-based divisions among educators were also reported in previous literature as early as 2004 (Angelides 2004, Hargreaves 2005); and most recently, Hamlaoui (2021) notes a similar separation among higher education teachers in Tunisia. With regards to the relationship of older teachers to their newly recruited colleagues in this study, the results demonstrated the power imbalance between them and how that directly affected the issue under investigation. Younger teachers reported that they were strictly instructed to abide by British English norms, often without justifying the reasoning behind these instructions (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.2.2). The results also exposed that those older teachers held control over policy documents that govern the content of the curriculum and did not allow the new staff to introduce any changes (see Chapter 5, Section 5.2.1.2). In this sense, they were not only acting as gatekeepers of those biased beliefs, ideologies, and practices; but they also had the power to do so. In this regard, Canagarajah (2005) states that within the majority of such institutions, gatekeepers (older teachers in this case) still favour ‘native speaker’ Standard English. The fact that the more experienced teachers did not offer justifications for the strict instructions to follow ‘native speaker’ norms is also an indication of both the power imbalance they had with their colleagues, and how they normalised these biased views. Many scholars point out the imbalance in power between older and younger teachers in different educational contexts (Nias 2002, Angelides 2004, Hamlaouï 2021); however, the latter point is where we can see what Holliday (2020) refers to as the process of “building of ‘normal’ thinking through social construction” (p. 45). By not justifying these instructions, or not seeing the need to, those teachers introduced arguably controversial views as if they were taken for facts. This is where we can see how these aspects of Academic Coloniality were produced. This can be significant to the ongoing discussion on the persistence of coloniality (R’boul 2022b), native-speakerism (Holiday 2005, 2006; Tupas 2022), and ‘Standard English’ Ideology (Jenkins 2014) as it addresses exactly how certain beliefs are transferred among educators. Those problematic
aspects were moved outside the circle of discussion through reification (Berger and Luckmann 1979; Gergen 2001; Holliday 2005, 2020) and normalisation (Fairclough 1995, 2010). This process was so successful that the other teachers (for example, TP3 in Chapter 4 Section 4.2.2) did not only adopt these biases as they were, but they even tried to justify them as if they were their own.

The relationship between older teachers and their students was not different from the one they had with their younger colleagues. The data collected indicated that this falls largely to the ‘teach to the test’ method that teachers employed in this context. This is when teachers shift their classes’ content and focus to skills that help students perform better in tests rather than exploring content (Benmoussat & Benmoussat 2018, Isma-ard 2021). They are often encouraged to do that because of the view that higher test scores are evidence of better education (Hayes & Read 2004). Accordingly, the findings demonstrated how student participants developed a score-hunt strategy to accommodate that practice. They were found to be more interested in achieving the required marks to pass rather than trying to understand the reasoning behind the information their teachers presented. In fact, SP4 (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.2.1) reported that they followed their teachers’ instructions as they were because of that. Since their instructions were indisputable, and similarly to their interactions with their younger colleagues, older teachers did not see the need justify their decisions of following ‘native speaker’ norms. This adds another layer to the normalisation – or the building of the ‘normal’ (Holliday 2020) – pointed out above in the case of younger teachers. This provides deeper understanding for how coloniality in ELT takes place between learners and educators. In this sense, Academic Coloniality is produced in everyday classroom interactions between those teachers and their students who unquestionably adopt their teachers’ biased views. This is backed up in Benmoussat & Benmoussat (2018) who recognise that the ‘teach to the test’ method is detrimental for students’ critical thinking. On top of that, this approach also emphasises the imbalance in the relation giving these teachers even more control over their classrooms. In fact, student participants themselves reported that most of their older teachers were more strict and less tolerant to their use of
‘non-native varieties’. As already stated in this section, this is a common bias within similar institutions (Canagarajah 2005), where Angelides (2004) also notes that older teachers are more “curriculum oriented” (p. 73) and less likely to oppose the tradition.

Moving one step clockwise on Figure 6 to younger teachers, the findings throughout Chapter 4 showed that they also held similarly biased views to those of their older colleagues. Be it because of media, French coloniality, or their veteran colleagues’ opinions; these teachers seemed to normalise, justify, and teach those views to their students. This is also another way Academic Coloniality is produced within these ELT classrooms. In fact, even if younger teachers did not completely align with the problematic instructions, the changes to the curriculum they could introduce were limited (see Chapter 5, Section 5.2.1.2). Angelides (2004) reports similar findings when looking into the relationship between younger and older teachers. He notes that while older teachers held most control over the workplace, younger ones merely “try to ‘survive’ in the schools and to influence the decision-making as much as possible” (ibid. p. 67). As the findings also indicated, those suggestions for change faced strong resistance from the more experienced teachers (see Chapter 5, Section 5.2.1.2). In this matter, Hamlaoui (2021) also notes a reluctance to make changes that is “related to teachers’ age and/or years of experience.” (p. 177). As a result of these circumstances, younger teachers continuously feed their students more biased ideas, who, as explained above, are often too concerned about their scores to oppose them. This is also supported in several previous studies (Burgess & Etherington 2002; Nishino 2012, Xu 2012, Bagheri & East 2021) that establish the effect of teachers’ expectations on their students’ views.

The contribution of students to Academic Coloniality in this phase of the study was not a simple passive one; rather, they had an active role in establishing it within their classrooms. The results throughout Chapter 4 showed evidence for students’ intolerance of the use of ‘non-native’ English in their classes, not only by their classmates, but also their teachers – older and younger ones. In fact, teachers reported that their students did not tolerate their use of ‘non-native’ English forms, regardless of communication (see
Chapter 4, Section 4.2.1.2). In this regard, several studies (Kuo 2006, Jenkins 2007, 2014; Soruç 2015) note that it is the general tendency for EFL students to have a bias towards ‘native speaker’ English varieties. This is again backed up by the findings in this study. Griffiths and Soruç (2019), who investigated the issue of intolerance among EFL and non-EFL students, established that EFL students were less tolerant of ‘non-native’ English use. They explained that this could be the result of these students’ being “removed from the day-to-day struggle to communicate” (ibid. p.62), and so develop unrealistic expectations. This study’s findings add to that the possibility that the intolerance towards ‘non-native’ varieties is transferred to them in their daily interaction with their teachers. In this sense, in a similar process to the one explained earlier in this section between older and younger teachers, these students accepted and adopted these aspects of Academic Coloniality, and then moved to defend them as if they were their own. To back up the influence of teachers on these students, the findings across Chapter 4 highlighted several instances where student participants and teachers used comparable language to express similar ideas (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.1; Section 4.2.3, Section 4.3.1 and Section 4.4.1). As already stated in this section, the influence of teachers’ preferences on their students’ views was established by several studies. Equally, as findings in this study demonstrated, teachers can recognise students’ expectations (or intolerance in this case) and accordingly adapt their classroom practices to meet those (Schulz 2001, Nishino 2012, Bagheri & East 2021).

Taking into account: a) the way in which older teachers construct and normalise the biased views to their younger colleagues as well as students; b) how younger teachers adopt those views, defend them as their own, then teach and reify them to students; and C) how students accept those and become intolerant of the use of ‘non-native’ English forms by their teachers; it seems that the ELT environment in this context goes beyond an eco-chamber effect as teachers and students alike actively participate in the process. There appears to be a full ‘circle of intolerance’ between the people involved in ELT at the target university on a daily basis that guarantees the continuous production and transfer of Academic Coloniality among
them. That is to say, older teachers, younger ones, and students actively encourage the use of ‘native speaker’ English varieties and do not tolerate the use of ‘non-native’ ones leading to a consistent dismissal of alternative ideas.

In this section, I discussed the factors that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality in ELT within the context of the first phase of the study. As clear from the discussion above, French coloniality and media had an important role to play in that. At the same time, the discussion also showed that the people involved in ELT on a daily basis contribute even more to its production – or at least more than I initially expected. That is to say, at the beginning of this study, I defined Academic Coloniality as “the formation of those asymmetrical power patterns between the learner of English and the ‘native speaker’ that are the result of the colonial and linguistic background of the country, globalisation, the effects of the EFL paradigm, the ideology of Self and Other, and other reasons.” This definition emphasised the role external factors play in Academic Coloniality. However, after the data collection and analysis, the definition I provided in Section 6.2 of this chapter is: “Academic Coloniality in ELT can be defined as the practices and attitudes of people involved in ELT that contribute to the production, manifestation, and reproduction of certain power patterns between learners of English as a second language and its ‘native speakers.” Here, I place more emphasis on the role ‘the practices and attitudes of people involved in ELT’ play in the production of the power asymmetries. In other words, I initially thought that Academic Coloniality was more caused by external factors ‘colonial and linguistic background of the country, globalisation, the effects of the EFL paradigm’; however, the discussion of the findings about its production helped me realise that much of its aspects were self-inflicted – internally produced and reproduced (see also Chapter 6, Section 6.5).

6.4 Manifestations of Academic Coloniality

The results in this phase of the study showed that Academic Coloniality was manifested within the target university in different interwoven manners. These were mostly evident in the opinions and reported
practices of the student and teacher participants. Across this section, I make no distinction between the views of teachers and their students since – as the results showed – both participant groups held very similar beliefs about English, the ‘native speaker’, and ELT. As discussed above, this is due to how each of them affected the others’ opinions and practices. The following figure (Figure 7) summarises the findings about how Academic Coloniality was manifested in the views and practices in the context of this phase:

**Figure 7**: Visual representation of the manifestation of Academic Coloniality

To explain how the different aspects of Academic Coloniality were carried in the views of the participants and how they related to each other, we can look at Figure 7 above from top to bottom. The organisation of English language ownership, language-culture association, and Othering at the top as key elements in
this respect is based on the discursive strategies that participants used to justify their biases and beliefs about themselves and the ‘native speaker’ of the language. These three then come into play to create two lines of arguments that teachers and students made; in turn, those resulted in the other biases as shown at the bottom dark-grey box in Figure 7. As far as language ownership is concerned, the results indicated that participants believed that English was associated with the ‘native speaker’, their culture, and their country. As a result, some teachers argued that they should follow ‘native speaker’ norms in their practice since they were teaching a language that did not belong to them (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.1.2). Additionally, participants also held strong beliefs about the association of language to ‘native speaker’ culture (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4.2). Consequently, they maintained that they should teach/learn these cultural aspects. However, the cultural aspects teacher participants insisted on teaching tended to be inaccurate/unrealistic since they were often constructed as the opposite of the Self (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.1, and Section 4.4.2). In fact, participants even argued that the Algerian culture was completely different than that of the ‘native speaker’ of English (see Chapter 4, Section 4.4.1). It is only by bringing these findings together that we can see the justification for the bias in the participants’ attitudes and reported practices, i.e., since we are teaching a language that does not belong to us, since this language cannot be separated from its culture, and since this culture is entirely different than ours; therefore, we have to follow its ‘native speakers’ norms, learn their culture, and distance ourselves from our own cultural norms as they can hinder the learning process.

In this sense, it is clear how language ownership, language-culture association, and Othering contribute to manifestations of Academic Coloniality within this context. Several studies across different contexts report similar findings in relation to language ownership. For instance, Matsuda (2003) reports that despite learners’ awareness of the international status of English (which was the case for some participants in the current study – see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.1), they still did not hold a sense of ownership over it. In fact, similar results are also found even within contexts where English is nationally established
– Malaysia (Pillai 2008, Saraceni 2010, Akkakoson 2019). As for the association of English language to ‘Western culture’, R’boul (2020) states: “English learners may be (explicitly or not) encouraged or even pressured to distance themselves from their local culture and assimilate to a modern, Western culture” (p. 183) as their educators held the belief of English’s link to ‘native speaker and Western culture’ (Holliday 2005, Kumaravadivelu 2006). As already stated, this study’s findings support this since both participant groups reported similar ideas. This association requires extra effort from learners since they do not only need to speak English, but to also abide by the expected culture-specific norms stereotypically associated to the context (R’boul 2020). A possible explanation from this study for why students of English were pressed to let go of their local norms when learning English (Jenkins 2014, R’boul 2020) is the belief that ‘the culture of English’ was completely different from that of Algeria. As explained in Chapter 4, Section 4.4.1, this was mostly due to the construction of a superior ‘native speaker’ Other as opposite of the Self. Holliday (2005) defines the Other “as something which is constructed as opposite to the familiar, with often falsely attributed negative or exotic characteristics which are opposite to the positive characteristics of the Self.” (p. 22). However, in the case of the current study, the Other was assigned exotic but also positive, and not necessarily accurate, attributes that were often the opposite of a problematic inferior Self. Additionally, as demonstrated in the previous section in this chapter, the construction of the ‘native speaker’ Other was often distorted by unrealistic images in the media.

As shown in Figure 7, the chains of thoughts explained above led to several of the manifestations of Academic Coloniality reported in Chapter 4’s findings. First, there was clear bias towards ‘native speaker’ varieties expressed by both participant groups. In this regard, Jenkins (2014) explains that despite the body of knowledge arguing for ‘non-native varieties’ to be considered as equally prestigious, speakers in such contexts still hold strong preference for American and British varieties, and even consider any others just wrong. In fact, very recently, Matsuda (2021) adds that those ‘native speaker’ varieties have a “sacred place” (p. 127) among speakers of English as a second language. They, as shown in Chapter 4, Sections
4.2.1, 4.2.2 and 4.2.3, believed those varieties to be more formal, academic, the origin, and more desirable. In this regard, many studies (Sifakis & Sougari 2005; Ranta 2010; Ke & Cahyani 2014, Jenkins 2014; Chen and Lin 2016, León, 2018; Norton & Pavlenko, 2019) that investigate the preferences and perceptions of students and teachers of English in several contexts across the world report similar findings on this, and on how learners and teachers alike held ‘native speaker’ English as a learning target despite their awareness of the international use of the language. In fact, Galloway (2013, P. 801) states that ‘non-native’ English varieties were seen as “imperfect”, “wrong”, or “untrustful”; this perhaps explains why the findings in this study indicated that some participants considered addressing those in their practice as a waste of time (see Chapter 4, Section 4.2.3). In addition to these, the results also showed that both participant groups held an underlying belief that they were learning/teaching the language to communicate with the ‘native speaker’ (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3.3). This is arguably due to the teaching practices, Seidlhofer (2010) states: “The focus has so far remained very much […] on the goal of successful communication with native speakers.” (P. 366). This itself can be associated with the belief within language teaching that learning outcomes can be better when learners have the chance to communicate with the ‘native speakers’ of the target language (Spolsky 1989).

Overall, this section discussed aspects of Academic Coloniality within the context of this study in relation to relevant literature in the field. Most of these reported similar findings within outer circle (Kachru 1985) countries which further emphasises the coloniality in Academic Coloniality in ELT in Algeria, a country with no Anglo-American colonial history (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.2). On top of that, thanks to the analytical approach adopted, this study also provided a better understanding of the discursive strategies underpinning the perceptions, practices, and beliefs of the participants (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.3). In the following section, I discuss the factors that contributed to the maintenance of Academic Coloniality in the context of this phase.
6.5 Maintenance and Continuity of Academic Coloniality

Factors that contribute to maintaining Academic Coloniality within the target university in this phase of the study are presented in Chapter 5’s findings. Unlike the previous two sections about the production and manifestations of Academic Coloniality, factors that lead to its continuity are not primarily relevant to ELT only. Consequently, several studies I discuss and compare the findings to are not directly related to ELT; however, they are still relevant to the practices and views that contribute to the constant reproduction of Academic Coloniality. Findings here are significant because they connect certain concepts to coloniality that were not previously connected to it. This broadens existing knowledge on issues of coloniality to include several new aspects that were not traditionally linked to it (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.1). As presented in Chapter 5, based on the nature of their contribution to the maintenance of Academic Coloniality, these findings were divided into two main categories: Actively Gatekeeping Academic Coloniality, and Passively Gatekeeping Academic Coloniality. These are summarised in Figure 8 below with further details:
Figure 8: Visual representation of the maintenance and continuity of Academic Coloniality

- Older teachers control policy documents
- Older teachers attachment to old methods
- Confidence in current practices

- Teachers belief that everything about their field is known
- So, no need for updates
- Isolation from up-to-date research

- Teach to the test teacher-centred approach
- Students: teacher-centred approach
- Teachers: student-centred approach

- Teachers’ lack of awareness about issues their students face
- Lack of systematic/formal way of collecting feedback
As clear from Figure 8 above, reproducing Academic Coloniality within the context of this phase of the study took place in two different manners, actively and passively. The former encompasses actual practices (resistance to change and refusing to implement updates) of those involved in ELT that contributed to the continuity of Academic Coloniality; and the latter includes circumstances, opinions, or simply lack of action (mismatched views on practice, overlooked feedback) that had a role in that. Here, I first discuss the active practices to then follow that with the passive gatekeeping of Academic Coloniality.

Under Section 5.2.1 in Chapter 5, the findings showed how resistant older teachers were to making changes to their practices and content. Those teachers functioned as gatekeepers for Academic Coloniality through their clinging to traditional beliefs and approaches to language teaching. Their belief in a teacher-dominated classroom prevented any possibility for their students to challenge those. In fact, even younger teachers faced several hurdles to make changes or even communicate the need for them.

The findings in the same section showed that, unlike their more experienced colleagues, younger teachers did not have any authority to implement changes to the policy document even when they wanted to. Nonetheless, they were allowed to make changes in a limited manner within the boundaries of the Canevas. At the same time, because of concerns about coordination with other state universities across the country, these teachers made minimal changes since they did not want to disadvantage their students in national exams. As a result, for them to make any significant changes, they needed to have access to the policy document, and, as explained earlier in Section 6.3 of this chapter, this was not the case within the target university. In this sense, it seems that older teachers’ resistance to change ensured that the aspects of Academic Coloniality discussed above persisted within this context. As stated earlier in this chapter (see Section 6.3), Hamlaoui (2021) notes that it is often older teachers that resist prospects for change. Similar to this study’s findings, Angelides (2004) also explains that those teachers “had the upper hand in decision-making” (p. 67) as well as holding better positions at their departments. As a result, younger teachers, who were comparatively more open to change, felt marginalised and had no power to
make changes (Hargreaves 2005). In terms of their relationship with their students, similar power-relations to the ones in the current findings were also reported by Angelides (2004): “Older teachers appeared to be stricter than the younger ones” (p. 68).

One of the more interesting findings in Chapter 5 that contributed to older teachers’ resistance to change as well as their refusal to introduce updates was the sense of confidence and satisfaction they had in their practices. For example, in Section 5.2.1 of the same chapter, TP1 reported that they did not need to change their practices since they were working perfectly. In this respect, Hamlaoui (2021), who investigated teachers’ resistance to educational change at Tunisian universities — an arguably similar context to that of Algeria — asserts: “the longer a teacher has been teaching, the more confident and satisfied he or she tends to be with the methodology he or she has been using” (p. 178). Several other studies also reported that teachers who taught the longest are the most resistant to change (Snyder 2017; Tariq, Dilawar & Muhammad 2019). In this study, teacher participants went further to claim that this was not only their perception, but research in language teaching itself reached a point where new approaches were no longer introduced (see Chapter 5, Section 5.2.2.2). This argument lead to the second manner through which Academic Coloniality was being maintained: refusal to implement updates. Here, the findings demonstrated that these teachers did not see the necessity to introduce any updates, and, due to the aforementioned nature of the unequal power relations they had with their younger colleagues and students, their views did not get challenged. In this sense, older teachers who held authority over the content being taught were isolated from any possible views that would question theirs; their detachment from recent research, their younger colleagues, and students ensured an unchallenged continuation of Academic Coloniality. Teachers’ attachment to their traditional methods is by no means unique to this study, Hargreaves (2005), Zimmerman (2006), Ibrahim & Zaatari, (2013), and Ungar & Nagar (2014) report similar findings that late career teachers are much more likely to be committed to the familiar. The main issue in the case of this study is that the familiar was adopted from a post-independence Algerian French
university as reflected in the documents analysed (see Chapter 5, Section 5.2.2.2). In this sense, this study does not only point out these teachers’ attachment to traditional approaches, but it also links them to colonial ideologies.

Looking back at Figure 8, I move now to the right of the chart to discuss the circumstances that passively contributed to the continuity of Academic Coloniality within this context. As explained earlier in this section, these were mostly due to the lack of effective channels of communication between the people involved in ELT at the target university. First, I discuss the discrepancies in the views of teachers and students about their experiences in teaching and learning respectively, see how these compare to existing literature, and how that contributed to the maintenance of Academic Coloniality.

In Chapter 5, Section 5.3.1, the findings showed that, while students described experiencing a teacher-centred approach, teacher participants claimed the opposite. Students were expected to absorb whatever their teachers (who dominated the classrooms) introduced to later reproduce it during their exams. In fact, the results indicated that students already adapted to this approach which arguably obstructed their critical thinking. At the same time, teachers seemed to be completely unaware of this issue; as stated above, they were satisfied with their practice (Chapter 6, Section 6.5). Besides, students adapting to this approach by becoming effective in their score-hunt further reassured those teachers. These findings were taken as an indication of a lack of effective communication and close attention about the issues in hand. These results support much of the literature in this regard. Benmoussat & Benmoussat (2018), for example, assert that Middle East and North Africa (MENA) countries still rigorously abide by traditional teacher-centred approaches that are “based on repetition and rote memorization” (p. 35). Despite teacher participants claiming otherwise, in this study, the findings from students and policy documents analysis indicated teacher-centred classrooms. Within these contexts, as students adapt to the ‘teach to the test’ approach, their learning became no longer fairly represented by their scores (Campbell 1985); instead, these were a representation of their skills in learning specific information to later reproduce it
again (Schweisfurth 2011). Such adaptation, Benmoussat & Benmoussat (2018) argue, inhibits students' critical thinking. In addition to this, this study established that this adaptation that allowed students to achieve the desirable scores, which do not necessarily reflect successful learning (Levin 2017), also gave teachers further confidence in their practices. Consequently, as discussed earlier in this section, it also contributed to their rejection to possible changes, preventing the possibility of bridging the gap between teachers’ and learners’ perceptions, and passively assisting the maintenance of Academic Coloniality within the context.

Another issue that also passively contributed to the continuation of the gap between the perception of teachers and students, and so to maintaining Academic Coloniality, was the lack of formal ways of collecting feedback from students. ‘Feedback’ in this case is used to refer to students’ assessment of their learning experience, not teachers’ evaluation of learners’ performance. This type of assessment from students to teachers is particularly important as it enables “feedback dialogue” (Vattøy & Smith 2019, p. 261), which is proven to improve learning (Lerang, Ertesvåg, & Havik, 2018). This is the case where students do not only passively receive feedback from their teachers, but also contribute by providing their own insights and experiences. However, the findings in this study showed a lack of attention to any of these insights by members of staff who had power to amend contents and practices (see Chapter 5, Section 5.3.2.2). This is often the case when feedback only goes in the direction from teachers to students (Bailey & Garner 2010, Ajjawi & Boud 2018). This was especially relevant since some student participants showed significant levels of awareness of several aspects and circumstances that contributed to Academic Coloniality in their studies (see Chapter 5, Section 5.3.2.1). In fact, they even managed to notice how their learning was continuing the French colonial legacy of trampling local norms and cultures (see Chapter 6, Section 6.3). As already discussed in this section, teachers, especially older ones, did not seem to be aware of this or the many other issues that student participants reported. In this regard, balancing responsibilities (Li and De Luca 2014), larger number of students (Vattøy & Smith 2019), routine, and
tiredness (Hargreaves 2005) were all presented as possible explanations in previous literature. In this context, however, there was no formal way or instructions by the department for teachers to collect feedback from their students; in such conditions, expecting them to constantly be motivated to do so seems unrealistic. As a result, this further served to increase the isolation of decision makers from any views that would challenge theirs, adding to their self-assuredness of their practices and content, and so contributing to the continuity of Academic Coloniality within the context.

6.6 Conclusion to the Chapter

In this chapter, I discussed the findings from the data analysis of the interviews and document analysis of the first phase of this study. I started with a reminder of the definition of Academic Coloniality and how it related to and addressed the gap in the literature in the context of Algeria. I followed that with a detailed discussion of how it was produced, how it manifested itself within the target university, and how participants contributed to its reproduction. With regards to its production, I argued that while both French coloniality and the media left teachers and students more susceptible to aspects of Academic Coloniality, the daily interactions between them, the imbalanced power relations, and the creation of a biased normal had a more direct role in that. That is to say, both French coloniality and media contributed to students and teachers holding biased views about their use of English and their cultural norms, but it was the interactions between and among teachers and students that served to create and normalise those biases specifically within this context (Daffri & Taibi 2023). As for the manifestation of Academic Coloniality within the context of this study, I presented the two main arguments through which participants justified their biases. In that section, I asserted and explained how the belief in the ownership of English by the ‘native speaker’, its association to ‘Western culture’, and Othering led learners and educators to argue for the necessity to learn about ‘native speaker’ norms and neglect local ones. Additionally, I discussed how these in turn led to several other ways through which Academic Coloniality manifested itself in this study. Finally, I addressed how it was maintained and reproduced among students.
and teachers at the target university. I divided these into two main parts: how it was actively maintained, and how it was passively maintained. In the former, I demonstrated how older teachers’ resistance to change, their attachment to their out-of-date approaches, and confidence in traditional practices (in addition to the nature of their relationships with their younger colleagues and students which led to their isolation from any opposing views) contributed to the constant reproduction and continuity of Academic Coloniality within the context. On the other hand, its passive maintenance was in large due to the lack of any formal and effective chains of communication among educators and learners. That is to say, teachers did not seem to be aware of the several issues students experienced with their learning, especially considering the lack of any student-to-teacher feedback collection. I argued that this led to even more isolation for decision makers that resulted in the constant reproduction of Academic Coloniality within the context. In this sense, while older teachers may not have been the sole contributors to the creation of Academic Coloniality here, they still played a major role in its continuity.

So far, through this phase of the study, I provided plenty of evidence for the existence of Academic Coloniality within the target university. I presented in depth detailed understanding of how it was produced, manifested, and reproduced through the beliefs and reported practices of the people involved in ELT on a daily basis. I also indicated how it was self-sustaining in the sense that, without any external interference – through raising awareness –, it is difficult to see how the current situation at this university could change. After establishing this, in the following two chapters, I present then discuss the findings from the questionnaire surveys that were administered to 479 student and teacher participants across the country in order to support this phase’s findings as well as generalise them.
Chapter 7: Results: Academic Coloniality: Omnipresence

7.1 Introduction

This chapter marks the start of the second phase of this study. Here, I present the findings from the data collected using the survey questionnaires constructed then administered to 376 students and 103 teachers of English at 10 universities across Algeria (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.2.2). The aim of this phase of the study is to seek to validate the findings from the first phase quantitatively among a larger population. Accordingly, the presentation of the quantitative findings here mirrors the ones discussed in Chapter 6 about the production, manifestation, and maintenance of Academic Coloniality. By doing this, this phase also attempts to provide answers for RQ1 and RQ2 among a bigger number of participants across the 10 sampled universities. On the whole, responses from the student participants and teachers were largely similar to phase one’s results. In what follows, I present the quantitative findings, and briefly compare them to the findings of the previous phase.

7.2 Attitudes towards Factors Influencing the Production of Academic Coloniality

As stated in the chapter introduction, this section deals with the questionnaire respondents’ points of view and reported practices that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality within the contexts of this phase. In the previous phase, it was established that French coloniality, the effects of media, and the nature of interactions between the participant groups all contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality (see Chapter 6, Section 6.3). Here, I present the statistical evidence for these starting with students then teacher participants.
7.2.1 Students’ Attitudes towards Factors influencing the Production of Academic Coloniality

Among students, the effects of French Coloniality were manifested through their belief in a superior “Western culture” generally, or ‘native speaker’ culture specifically. Table 10 presents the results students provided through their responses to the four relevant items. The statistics below show a general bias towards ‘native speaker’ contexts, ‘native speaker’ teacher model, and educational system. This bias is noticeable in the average mean (Mean= 3.8) of the items, as well as the percentages. In fact, the average of individual “agreement” and “strong agreement” by participants reached 68% indicating their alignment with the superiority of ‘native speaker’ ELT experience compared to the local one. In terms of individual items, while item 41, item 51, and item 01 show a similar response pattern with more than half the respondents (strongly) agreeing with them; item 46 shows a more equal distribution of responses (mean = 2.9). Compared to the other three, the wording for the latter item is more general: referring to ‘Western culture’ rather than the British or American ‘native speaker’ culture, which could explain this difference in the response spread. By contrast, the average percentages for the “disagreement” and “strong disagreement” to the items is as low as 17.5%. Notably, an average of 14.5% of the students selected “not sure” as a response to these items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 46: Compared to Algerian Culture, Western culture is cooler</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 41: In my opinion, learning English in Britain or America is better than learning it in Algeria</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 51: I think that learning English from the native speaker is the ideal situation.</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 01: I believe that British and/or American universities are better than Algerian ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.4%</th>
<th>7.5%</th>
<th>8.7%</th>
<th>29.4%</th>
<th>52.9%</th>
<th>4.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Average: 5.4% 12.1% 14.5% 30.9% 37.1% 3.8

Valid N= 349

Besides French coloniality, the findings of the qualitative phase also showed that media contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality in two main ways: raising the student participants’ exposure and interest in the ‘native speaker’, as well as spreading stereotypes and idealising the ‘native speaker’. Table 11 and Table 12 below demonstrate the quantitative findings relevant to these two factors:

**Table 11: Students’ attitudes on the effects of media on exposure/interest in the ‘native speaker’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 02: I became interested in English because my favourite TV shows/ Series/ films/ Social Media platforms/ Video Games / Podcasts… etc are in English</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 07: I think students are interested in English more than French because of media.</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 03: American culture is more influential in our society because of TV shows/ Series/ films Social Media platforms/ Video Games / Podcasts… etc.</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14: Students interact more with the American society, not the British one, because of media</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21: I am affected more by American English because of movies and TV series I watch.</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 3.8% 10.2% 12.9% 41.5% 31.5% 3.8

Valid N= 354
Table 11 above presents the data collected from student participants in relation to the effects of media on their interest and exposure to the ‘native speaker’. The statistical results show clear evidence for the effects media had on the participants. The average mean for the five relevant items reached 3.8 indicating an overall affirmative response to these effects. In fact, even the lowest mean was as high as 3.6 (item 21). This is also evident through the percentages of the items. For starters, more than 65% (item 21) and over 78% (item 02) of participants self-declared as interested in and/or affected by ‘native speaker’ English because of their exposure to those on media. These students also seemed to recognise the same pattern around them as over 77%, 78%, and 64% either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with item 07, item 03, and item 14 respectively. By contrast, the average of participants who “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the five items did not exceed 14%. The average percentage of those who answered “not sure” was 12.9%.

As stated in the previous phase, the second way media affected students contributing to the production of Academic Coloniality was through the often inaccurate stereotypes that contributed to the idealisation of the ‘native speaker’. According to the data Table 12 below presents, students seemed to acknowledge the role media played in the images they had of the ‘native speaker’. The average mean of the four relevant items reached 3.9, which indicates large affirmative attitude towards them. This is also reflected in the average percentage for student participants who “agreed” and “strongly agreed” reaching over 68%. With regards to individual items, most participants responded positively to item 08 (81.1%), item 23 (69.6%), and item 29 (90.5%); and less than 18% chose “disagree” and “strongly disagree” in either of these cases. However, in the case of item 10, negative responses reached almost a third of participants (32.7%). This could be explained by the fact that some participants also worked part time as English teachers. In fact, one of the student interviewees in phase one of this study explained that they worked as entry-level English teacher at a private language school. Equally, these could also be students who were interested in reading for pleasure in English, which also came up in the first phase’s interviews. On the
whole, the average negative percentage was as low as 16.6%. Only the average percentage of 7.7% of the respondents elected to respond “not sure” to the four items.

Table 12: Students’ attitudes on the effects of media on stereotypes/idealising the ‘native speaker’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 08: Most of what I know about the native speaker of English</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comes from films, TV, series, podcasts, social media platforms… etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10: Films, TV shows, series, podcasts, social media platforms…</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc are the only contact I have with English outside the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 23: I think that British and/or American lifestyles are</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29: I learned a lot about the American and British lifestyles</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N= 352

At the beginning of this section, I explained that the third aspect that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality among student participants was their daily interactions with their teachers. Under teacher-student interaction, four factors were introduced in this phase of the study to illustrate: the unequal classroom power relations, intolerance to the use of ‘non-native’ English varieties in the classroom, the teach to the test approach, and the way teachers imposed their views on students. In what follows I present the quantitative findings from the student participants on these four factors starting with the unequal classroom power relations:
Table 13: Student participants’ responses in relation to classroom power relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 25: Some of my teachers do not accept any suggestions from students.</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22: Some teachers correct students in a rude way.</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 53: I avoid making suggestions in the classroom because of my teachers’ reactions</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N= 342

According to the data presented in Table 13 above, the average mean for the three concerned items reached 3.2 providing evidence for the overall unequal classroom power relations between the student participants and their teachers. This is also reflected in the average percentages of the responses with 49% of the participants either “agreeing” or “strongly agreeing” with the statements compared to 35.2% of them showing disagreement (disagree + strongly disagree). Only an average of 15% of the participants chose “not sure”. Individually, item 25 and item 22 had a mean of 3.2 and 3.5 respectively; the two items referred more to their teachers’ attitudes during classroom interactions. This is evidence for the imbalanced nature of the classroom relationship. Additionally, the percentages of disagreement for the two items can mean that not all their teachers had the same attitudes, which brings up the previous phases’ older Vs younger teachers division (see Chapter 6, Section 6.3). On the other hand, item 53, which was more about the students’ response to these relationships, had a mean of 2.9 only. The 41% responses’ agreement percentage (agree + strongly agree) for the item is not a low one, and so this still can be taken as evidence for the nature of the classroom relationship. At the same time, this specific item can also be affected by other factors like the participants’ confidence levels and which of their teachers they were
considering at the time of responding. Overall, the data presented in the table above provides evidence for the imbalanced relationship between the student participants and their teachers.

The second factor under student-teacher interactions that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality is students’ intolerance of the use of “non-native” English varieties in the classroom. Table 14 below presents the statistical findings from the student participants’ responses to the three relevant items:

**Table 14: Students responses on intolerance to the use of ‘non-native’ varieties in the classroom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 47: It upsets me when my teachers do not speak native speaker English in class</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 54: I would prefer it if my teachers spoke either British or American English in class</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 60: In my opinion, teachers should not waste time talking about non-native varieties of English (other than American and British English)</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N= 342

In this table, it can be observed that there was a general tendency for student participants not to tolerate using or addressing ‘non-native’ varieties of English by their teachers in the classroom. This is evident from the average mean of the three items (mean = 3.3). The average percentages also back this up with an average agreement percentage of 52.8%. On the other hand, the average percentage for disagreement reaches 28.6%. Evidently, an average of 18.6% of the respondents selected “not sure” as their response.
The following factor within the teacher-student interactions that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality is the teach to the test approach. This factor is represented in Table 15 below through the students’ responses to the five items that stand for their attitudes towards their teachers’ practices as well as how they reacted to those:

**Table 15: Student participants’ attitudes on the teach to the test approach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 73</td>
<td>I think my teachers focus more on preparing us for tests and exams and less on exploring new concepts.</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 65</td>
<td>I follow my teachers' instruction because I have to get the required mark to pass.</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 59</td>
<td>I feel that my learning is not about education, but about getting the mark.</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 48</td>
<td>I feel that if I wanted to get good grades, I should learn everything my teachers tell me.</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 35</td>
<td>I only work hard during exams</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N: 340

The statistics in Table 15 show evidence for the teach to the test approach and how students adapted to it. The average mean for the five items of 3.6 supports the presence of this teaching approach, which is also backed up by the average agreement percentages of 64.4%. Individually, item 73, item 65, and item 48 with agreement percentages of 67.7%, 76.8%, and 65.2% respectively can be taken as evidence for the students’ attitudes on the teaching approach itself. This indicates that students were aware of this approach as adopted by their teachers. Meanwhile, item 59 (54.8%) and item 35 (57.7%) demonstrate how these student participants already adapted to that. By contrast, an average percentage of 26.9% of
the student participants took an opposite stance to the statements above. Only the average of 8.6% of the students chose ‘not sure’ as their response.

The fourth factor under teachers-students interactions that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality is how teachers introduced their bias towards ‘native speaker’ English to their students. In Table 16 below, the statistics for the three relevant items are presented. The findings show that despite the average mean of 3.2 and the average agreement percentage of 42.7% (Vs 34.1% disagreement), it cannot be decisively stated that the students feel pushed by their teachers towards ‘native speaker’ varieties as the responses to the individual items differ. That is to say, 52% of respondents to item 43 “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the statement indicating that they were aware of their teachers’ preference to British English. At the same time, a smaller percentage of 39.1% (item 32) and 36.6% (item 43) expressed agreement with the other two statements. This is especially relevant considering the percentage of participants who expressed disagreement to these statements: 42.7% (item 32) and 34.1% (item 43). The almost equal mixture of responses could be taken as an indication that while some teachers encouraged or expressed expectations for students to abide by British English norms, others did not. As a result, not all student participants experienced similar practices from their teachers. This can also explain why an average of 22.9% of the respondents selected “not sure”.

**Table 16: Student participants’ attitudes to their teacher’s bias**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 32: My teachers encourage me to speak British English</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 43: My teachers prefer British English over American English</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 45: My teachers expect me to speak British English</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 344
So far, this section presented the statistical results about the factors that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality among the student participants. These results demonstrated the respondents’ bias towards ‘native speaker’ English and their norms. The responses also indicated that students recognised the role media played in exposing them as well as raising their interest in ‘native speaker’ varieties. Additionally, the results also demonstrated the role media played in the spread of inaccuracies among these students. In classrooms, the statistics provided evidence for the unequal power relations these students had with their teachers. There was also evidence that student participants were not tolerant to the use of ‘non-native’ English varieties. Furthermore, it was demonstrated through this section’s findings the presence of a teach to the test approach as well as the bias of some teachers who encouraged students towards ‘native speaker’ English varieties. In the following section, I present the findings on equivalent factors from the teacher participants’ point of view.

7.2.2 Teachers’ Attitudes towards Factors Influencing the Production of Academic Coloniality

The factors that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality among teacher participants are similar to those among the respondent students. In chapter 6, Section 6.3, I explained that French coloniality affected the teachers’ attitudes with regards to how they viewed their own norms compared to Western ones (‘native speaker’ norms). In Table 17 below, the statistics also show similar results. With an average mean of 3.5, the statistical data provide evidence for a positive attitude towards ‘native speaker’ norms. This is also supported by the average of the agreement percentage that reached 58.1%. Interestingly, when looking at individual items, it can be noted that, similar to students’ results, while there is strong agreement on item 53 (68.7%), item 43 (76.4%), and item 81 (70.6%), which specifically mention the British and/or American ‘native speaker’; 54.9% of the teacher participants seemed to disagree with item 48. This pattern is similar to student participants’ responses to the same items set (see
Section 7.2.1, Table 10), which was justified by the wording of the items referring to ‘Western’ culture instead of that of the ‘native speaker’ of English.

**Table 17:** Teacher participants’ attitudes on local Vs ‘Western’ norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Compared to Algerian culture, Western culture is cooler</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I think that learning English from the native speaker is the ideal situation.</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>In my opinion, learning English in Britain or America is better than learning it in Algeria.</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>I believe that British and/ or American universities are better than Algerian ones.</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 100

Moving on from French Coloniality, the next two factors to consider in this study are in reference to the effects of media on teacher participants. Similar to the findings with students, the two factors include “exposure to/interest in ‘native speaker’ varieties” and “stereotyping/idealising the ‘native speaker’". In Table 18 below, the statistical evidence for the former is presented:

**Table 18:** Teachers attitudes on the effects of Media on exposure/interest in ‘native speaker’ varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>I became interested in English because my favourite TV shows/ Series/ films/ Social Media platforms/ Video Games / Podcasts… etc are in English</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>I think students are interested in English more than French because of media.</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statistics in Table 18 above illustrate the findings from the four items aimed to inquire about the effects of media on the exposure and interest of the teacher participants in the ‘native speaker’ varieties and their attitudes toward that. The average mean of 3.6 shows that, generally, these teachers’ interest and attitudes to the ‘native speaker’ English were affected by the media. This is also backed up by the average of the agreement percentage of 65.2%. Individually, item 07 and item 03, which are concerned more with the participants perception of this effect on people around them, had the highest agreement percentages with 85.5% (Mean = 4.1) and 81.2% (Mean = 4.0) respectively. However, item 02 and item 23, which look more into the effects of media on the participants themselves, show a different response pattern with agreement percentages of 48% and 46.1% respectively. It appears that teacher participants here recognised the exposure and influence of media on their students, but their perception of that on themselves was different since some of them may not use media as much as these students. These results indicate that the exposure and interest of students in ‘native speaker’ English that is caused by media was largely noticed, but a smaller number of teachers were reportedly affected by that. In addition to these, an average of 23.3% of the teacher participants expressed disagreement with the above statements, while only 11.5% chose ‘not sure’.

In terms of the effects of media on stereotyping/idealising the ‘native speaker’, the statistical results from the teacher participants show a similar pattern to those of the students (see Table 19). The findings from
the responses to the four relevant items indicate that teachers’ attitudes towards the ‘native speaker’ (English) were largely affected by media. Evidence for this is the average mean of 3.7, and the average agreement percentage with the statements of 74.3%. Individually, while item 8, item 25, and item 31 show a similar response pattern with agreement percentages of 71.6%, 84.4%, and 82.4% respectively and low disagreement percentages < 23%. Item 10 shows a higher disagreement percentage of 37.3%. This is also similar to the case with student participants which was explained in them doing other activities outside university in English. It is also worth noting that the average percentage of participants who selected “not sure” was 7.1%.

**Table 19: Teachers’ attitudes on the effects of media on stereotypes/idealising the ‘native speaker’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 8: Most of what I know about the native speaker of English comes from films, TV, series, podcasts, social media platforms… etc.</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10: Films, TV shows, series, podcasts, social media platforms… etc are the only contact I have with English outside the classroom.</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 25: I think that students find British and/or American lifestyles attractive.</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 31: I learned a lot about the American and British lifestyles from media.</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 101

Moving away from the effects of media, phase one results indicated that the interactions between older and younger teachers also played a role in the production of Academic Coloniality. In phase one of this study, results showed that the unequal power relations between more experienced teaching staff and comparatively younger ones played a role in preserving certain biased views about ‘native speaker’
English. However, the statistical evidence of this phase does not provide clearly cut results. Table 20 below shows that while a considerable percentage of participants reported being instructed to follow British and American ‘native speaker’ norms in their teaching (30.4%), the majority of them (57.1%) expressed disagreements with the three relevant items. A low average percentage of 12.5% of the respondents selected “not sure” as their response.

Table 20: Teachers’ responses on older teachers – younger teacher interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 40: I was informally told to follow British and/or American English-speaking norms in my teaching.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 55: I was told by other teachers to encourage students to use British and/or American English.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 64: I was formally instructed to teach according to British and/or American English norms.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 102

While the statistics in Table 20 above provide an idea on the spread of participants’ responses to these items, demographic information in Figure 9 below clarifies that this spread does not correspond to that of the participants years of university teaching experience. Figure 9 below indicates that only 17 respondents (16.7%) had more than 15 years of university teaching experience, 18 (17.6 %) had between 10 and 15 years, and 67 participants (65.7%) had less than 10 years. In phase one, findings indicated that younger teachers were instructed to follow ‘native speaker’ norms in their teaching. However, this does not seem to be the case according to the statistics presented in Table 20 and Figure 9. That is to say, while 57.1% of the participants disagreed that they were told to abide by ‘native speaker’ norms in their teaching, and 30.4% greed to that, the spread of the participants based on their university teaching experience...
experienced does not correspond to that of the responses to the three relevant items in Table 20. Although sampling a larger number of teacher participants may yield different results, the current statistics do not entirely support the relevant findings in phase one of this study.

Figure 9: Demographic information on the number of teachers and their university teaching experience

The following factor that played a role in the production of Academic Coloniality according to the previous phase’s findings is the intolerance of the use of ‘non-native’ English varieties within the classroom. Table 21 below presents teacher participants’ attitudes towards that through their responses to items relevant to their own intolerance of these varieties (items 49, 56, 58 and 62) as well as how they perceived their students’ preferences (items 65 and 63). The statistics below show that while most respondent teachers expressed preference for their students to use ‘native speaker’ English during classes (68.3% agreement percentage to item 56), not as many of them believed that students should not be allowed to use ‘non-native’ English varieties (with 57.3% and 50% disagreement percentages to item 49 and item 58 respectively). This indicates that despite their preferences, teachers reported that they were not intolerant of the use of ‘non-native speaker’ norms. At the same time, the agreement percentage of 48% to item 62 (mean= 3.2) indicates that a significant number of respondents indeed saw that addressing ‘non-native’ varieties in their classes was a ‘waste of time’. In addition to this, the high agreement percentages to item 65 (80.6%) and item 63 (71%) can be taken as evidence that teachers’ perception was
that students did not only prefer learning about ‘native speaker’ norms, but also expected teachers to adhere to those during their classroom interactions. This is evidence for the intolerance to the use of ‘non-native’ forms teachers perceive from their students.

**Table 21:** Teachers’ responses on intolerance to the use of ‘non-native’ varieties in the classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 49: It upsets me when my students do not speak native speaker English in class.</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 58: We cannot allow students to speak non-native English varieties (other than American and British English).</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 56: I would prefer it if my students used either British or American English in class.</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 62: In my opinion, teachers should not waste time talking about non-native varieties of English (other than American and British English).</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 65: I think students prefer to learn about native speaker English.</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 63: My students expect me to speak British or American English in the classroom.</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 98

Another factor within classroom interactions that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality is the implications of the ‘teach to the test’ approach. In Table 22 below, I present the statistical data of teacher participants’ responses to the items that investigated their impression of students’ attitudes towards their learning. With an average agreement percentage of 69.3% (average mean = 3.8), these results show evidence of teachers’ belief in a ‘teach to the test’ model. Interestingly, item 61 and item 37 had the highest mean of 4.4 and 4 respectively indicating that teachers were aware of their students’ adaptation to this teaching approach. That is to say, teacher participants seemed to notice how their
students developed a score hunt strategy rather than the focus on learning. At the same time, respondent teachers also indicated through their responses to item 77 (Table 22, below) that they did not only focus on concepts that were likely to be on tests:

Table 22: Teachers’ attitudes on their teach to the test practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 77: I focus more on preparing students for tests and exams and less on exploring new concepts.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N: 103

These results reveal a gap between teachers’ reported practices and their impressions of students’ ways of engaging with their learning. One possible explanation for this is that despite teachers’ educational approach, students developed an instrumental score-focused attitude. However, a more likely explanation is that respondent teachers may have been unconsciously employing a teach to the test approach. This is more likely because students themselves reported earlier in this chapter (see Section 7.2.1) through their responses to item 73 and item 65 (Table 15) that their teachers’ focus was more on preparing them for tests. In either of these cases, there seems to be a lack of effective communication between student and teacher participants on this aspect of the practice. With regards to the disagreement percentages, Table 23 below shows that an average of 18.8% of participants disagreed with the relevant items. It is also worth mentioning that only the average of 11.9% selected ‘not sure’ as their response.
The following factor within teacher-students interactions that contributed to the production of Academic Colonality is teachers’ bias to ‘native speaker’ English varieties. Results for the relevant items are presented in Table 24 below. The statistics below show an interesting divide between the results of item 42 with a mean = 2.3 and items 34, 45 and 47 with mean = 3.2, 3.2 and 3 respectively. These results appear to show that the majority of the teacher participants were biased towards the use of British English in their teaching. This is evident in the statistics: while item 42 had an agreement percentage of 12.3% and a disagreement of 69.3%; items 34, 45, and 47 together average an agreement percentage of 45.9% and a disagreement one of 37.1%. Although the difference of the average percentages for British English was not significant, there was much higher agreement on not encouraging learners towards American English. This bias towards British English was also indicated earlier in this chapter through students’ responses to item 43 in Table 16 (see section 7.2.1). On average, 17.1% of the participant selected not sure as their response.
Table 24: Teacher participants’ bias towards ‘native speaker’ English varieties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 42: I encourage my students to speak American English</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 34: I encourage my students to speak British English</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 45: I prefer British English over American English as a learning target for my students</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 47: I expect my students to learn British English.</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 101

So far, through sections 7.2.1 and 7.2.2, I presented the statistical results about the attitudes of student and teacher participants that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality. Most of these results supported the findings of the previous phase providing quantitative evidence for the previously qualitatively established concepts. In terms of the belief in a superior ‘native speaker/Western culture’, both participant groups expressed bias towards ‘native speaker’ contexts, teacher models, and educational systems. Additionally, statistical results also showed that there was clear evidence for how media exposed student respondents to idealised ‘native speaker’ images that raised their interests in them. Results from teacher participants indicated that they recognised this effect among their students but not among themselves, which could be put down to their lesser time exposed to media. Despite this, both participant groups acknowledged the role media played in shaping the images they had of the ‘native speaker’. When it comes to power relations, results provided evidence for imbalanced power relations in the classroom between the student participants and their teachers. However, for the relationship between older and younger teachers, the statistical data did not provide as clear evidence for similarly imbalanced power relations as more than half the respondents did not report being instructed to follow certain ‘native speaker’ English norms. In relation to participants’ intolerance to the use of ‘non-native’
forms in the classroom, results here illustrated that students were intolerant of the use of those by their teachers. The teacher participants also seemed to be aware of this intolerance. For themselves, however, evidence showed that although teachers expressed preference for British ‘native speaker’ English, they were still reportedly tolerant of the use of ‘non-native’ varieties in their classrooms. Results also showed that while students were aware of their teachers’ preference of ‘native speaker’ English, it did not seem that all their teachers encouraged them towards those. In addition to this, results from both participant groups indicated the adoption of a teach to the test approach, and that students already developed a score hunt strategy as an adaptation to that. Overall, this section provided ample statistical evidence for the majority of the previously qualitatively established factors that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality.

7.3 Attitudes towards Factors Influencing the Manifestation of Academic Coloniality

In section 7.2 of this chapter, I presented the online questionnaires’ statistical results relevant to the factors that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality in Algeria. Those factors were qualitatively established in the previous phase of the study throughout chapters 4, 5 and 6. In this section, I similarly present the factors of manifestation of Academic Coloniality among the questionnaires’ respondents. In the qualitative phase of the current study, I explained how participants’ belief in language ownership, the association of language and culture, and Othering contributed to other aspects of Academic Coloniality, namely, having the ‘native speaker’ of English as the learning target, and the belief in learning English to communicate with the ‘native speaker’. These will be the five factors presented in this section.
7.3.1 Students Attitudes towards Factors Influencing the Manifestation of Academic Coloniality

The first factor of manifestation of Academic Coloniality among the student participants is language ownership. Table 25 below presents the statistical findings on those students’ attitudes about the items relevant to the belief in the ownership of the English language. These results indicate that, on average, respondent students believed in the ownership of English by the ‘native speaker’. This is evidenced by the agreement percentage average of 48.1% (average mean = 3.2). However, individually, while item 58 and item 63 show similar relatively high agreement stats, responses to item 49 had higher disagreement percentage (48.4%). That is to say, while more participants agreed with English belonging to the ‘English culture’, and that they only borrow it from the ‘native speaker’ themselves when speaking; more of them disagreed with the idea that English belongs to the ‘native speaker’. A possible explanation for these results is how the three items are worded. More participants disagreed with item 49 because it was comparatively more direct which may have caused participant bias (or response bias). This becomes more likely considering that this item is not different from item 63, which is not as directly expressed. It is worth noting that the items were worded as closely as possible to the wording of the participants in the previous phase’s interviews. Overall, an average percentage of 19.5% of respondents chose “not sure” as their response.

**Table 25: Student participants’ attitudes toward language ownership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 58: The English language belongs to the English culture</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 49: English language belongs to the native speaker</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 63: When speaking English, I am borrowing the native speaker’s language.</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 349
The next factor under manifestation of Academic Coloniality in this context is the attitudes of the student participants towards the association of the English language to ‘its culture’. Table 26 below presents the statistics of the items that represent this factor:

**Table 26: Student participants’ attitudes on language-culture association**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 66: English cannot be separated from its culture.</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 26: I can only speak English 100% correctly if I am aware of its cultural aspects.</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 33: Every country has its own culture, so when you adopt the language, you get the culture with it.</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4: It is necessary to learn the culture of English to be able to speak it correctly</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 372

These results show clear evidence that the student participants believed in the association of English language to ‘its culture’. This is evident in the average agreement percentage of 65% and the average mean of 3.7. This is also reflected in the individual items with the lowest mean of 3.3 for item 26. Only a low percentage average of 17.6% of participants disagreed with the statements above. A similar average percentage of them (17.4%) also chose “not sure” as their response.

The third factor of manifestations of Academic Coloniality concerns the attitudes of the participants on the issue of the ‘Self and Other’ ideology. In the previous phase, qualitative findings indicated that this ideology manifested itself through participants Othering of the ‘native speaker’. Table 27 below presents this phase’s findings on this issue. These results show that there was an overall tendency among the student participants to perceive the ‘native speaker’ Other as completely different to the Self. This Other also possessed a more interesting culture than the perceived local one. This is backed up by the significant
average (80.8%) and individual agreement percentages (≥ 72.6%). The average mean for these is also 4.1 further supporting that. Only a low average percentage of 7.6% of the respondents disagreed with the below statements. It should also be mentioned that an average of 11.5% of the participants selected “not sure” as their response.

Table 27: Student participants’ attitudes on the Self and Other ideology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 5: The culture of the native speaker of English is completely different than that of the Algerian speaker of English.</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12: Native speakers of English are completely different than Algerian speakers of English</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18: In Britain and America, they have many interesting cultural aspects that we do not have.</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 372

Moving to the participants’ belief in the ‘native speaker’ as the learning target, Table 27 below presents the findings on the relevant items. The results below show that the majority of students agreed that the British and/or American ‘native speaker’ and ‘their’ variety of English should be the target for their learning. Evidence for this could be taken from the average agreement percentage of 61.9% (average Mean = 3.6). When examining the items individually, it can be said that more students did not only agree that it was better to speak British or American English varieties (item 16), but also that these should be targets for speech and learning (item 67, 57, 19). More than half the student participants also agreed that teachers should correct students with reference to these varieties (item 64). On the other hand, an average of 22.8% of the participants disagreed to the below statements while 15.3% of them were “not sure”.
Table 28: Student participants’ attitudes on the ‘native speaker’ as the learning target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 67: I think students should try to speak as near native speaker accent as possible.</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 57: Native speaker English should be the target variety for learning English</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19: In my opinion, learners of English should choose to speak either British English or American English.</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16: If you want to speak English, it’s better to speak British or American rather than go and use another accent</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 64: I think teachers should correct students based on either British or American English.</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 350

The last factor under manifestations of Academic Coloniality for students is the idea of learning English to communicate with the ‘native speaker’. In the last phase, this factor was not explicitly expressed by the participants, it was rather implied from them limiting their examples to only those in Britain or America. When developing the items in Table 29 below, I stayed faithful to the expressions used by the interviewees. Therefore, regardless of the agreement percentages, because of the nature of Likert scale questions (that limit participants only to the limited pre-set items), I could not draw conclusions with the same certainty as those of the first phase. The relevant statistical results are presented in Table 29 below.

These results show that the majority of the participants agreed to the statements below indicating that they were learning English to communicate with the ‘native speaker’. This is evidenced by the agreement percentage of 58.3% (Mean = 3.6). These reflect the student participants’ motivation from learning English of getting closer to (item 72), learning about (item 11), and wanting to travel/work with the ‘native speaker’. Interestingly, the percentage of respondents who chose “not sure” was over 20% in the three items individually. This could be put down to these students’ willingness but lack of certainty that they
would eventually travel to or work in *Britain or America*, or that their motivation to learn English may not necessarily be *only* to communicate with the ‘native speaker’.

**Table 29: Student participants’ attitudes on learning English to communicate with the ‘native speaker’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 72: Learning English brings me closer to my dream of living in America or Britain</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 50: I am learning English because I want to travel/work in America or Britain</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11: Learning English teaches me about the people I am going to face when I go to Britain or America</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 364

Through Section 7.3.1, I presented the statistical findings about the factors of manifestation of Academic Coloniality from the point of view of the student participants. The results here generally confirmed the previous phases’ findings by providing more evidence for the students’ bias towards ‘native speaker’ English norms. Initially, the statistics above illustrated how the students believed in the ownership of the English language by the ‘native speaker’. There was also clearer evidence in the respondents’ assumption that English was associated to ‘its culture’, which also happened to be the ‘native speaker’s culture’. Additionally, there was evidence that these participants also held an image of the ‘native speaker’ as the complete opposite of that of the Self showing traces of the ideology of the ‘Self and Other’. Finally, results from the last two factors provided evidence that the majority of students held the ‘native speaker’ as the learning target; this can be explained by results confirming that the purpose for them to learn the language was to communicate with the ‘native speaker’. Having presented these, in the following section I present the findings on the equivalent factors from the respondent teachers’ points of view.
7.3.2 Teachers’ Attitudes towards Factors Influencing the Manifestation of Academic Coloniality

As stated in the introduction of Section 7.3 above, the first factor under manifestation of Academic Coloniality among the participants is their belief in the ownership of the English language by the ‘native speaker’. Statistical results for teacher participants in this phase elicited similar findings. Table 30 below provides evidence that over half of the teacher participants believed that English belonged to the ‘native speaker’. This is backed up by the agreement percentage average of 54.8% (average Mean= 3.3). Individually, 87.4% of the respondents agreed to Item 13, indicating that they did not believe that English belonged to them. Participants also showed more agreement to item 60 (48%) and item 67 (52.6%) displaying a belief that the English language belonged to ‘its culture’ and/or the ‘native speaker’. However, responses to item 51 had a higher disagreement percentage of 57%. A similar pattern of responses to the same item was also noticed among student participants (see Section 7.3.1, Table 25, item 49). The contradiction for how participants responded to this item, compared to item 67 that expressed the same idea in a less direct manner, was explained by the more direct wording of the former which may have caused a case of participant bias (response bias). The wording for this phase’s items was based on the statements of the interview participants in order to ensure meeting the purpose of this phase of the study (see Chapter 3, Section 3.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 13: When teaching English in Algeria, we are teaching a language that is not ours.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 60: The English language belongs to the English culture.</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 51: English language belongs to its native speaker.</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 30: Teacher participants’ attitudes toward language ownership**
Item 67: When speaking English, I am borrowing the native speaker’s language.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 100

Besides language ownership, the association of the English language to what participants believed is ‘its culture’ (or the ‘native speaker’ culture) is the next factor under the manifestations of Academic Coloniality in Algeria. The results for the relevant items to this are presented in Table 31 below. The statistics here show that the majority of the teacher participants believed in the association of English to ‘its culture’. On average, up to 77.6% of the participants agreed to the statements below (Mean = 4) which indicates their belief. Individually, 83.3% (item 70) of the respondents signified that they believed English could not be separated from ‘its culture’. Around 62.1% (item 28), 82.3 (item 35) and 81.95% (item 4) agreed with the necessity of learning the ‘culture of English’ in order to be able to speak the language correctly. Overall, this is evidence that most teacher participants believed in the language-culture association. Only 9.7% of them on average disagreed with these items while 10.4% chose “not sure”.

Table 31: Teacher participants’ attitudes on language-culture association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 70: English cannot be separated from its culture.</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 28: Learners can only speak English 100% correctly if they are aware of its cultural aspects.</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 35: Every country has its own culture, so when you adopt the language, you get the culture with it.</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4: It is necessary to learn the culture of English to be able to speak it correctly.</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 103

The next factor under manifestations of Academic coloniality in the case of respondent teachers is their belief in a constructed ‘native speaker’ Other who was the opposite of the Self. The statistics in Table 32
below provide evidence for this. The high agreement percentage average of 77.6% (Mean = 4.1) provides clear indication that the respondents here did not only hold that the ‘native speaker’ (item 5) Other and their lifestyle (item 15) were completely different than the Algerian Self and their lifestyle, but also that they had more interesting cultural aspects (item 20). Very similar results were also recorded from the student participants above (see Section 7.3.1, Table 27). Only a low average percentage of 9.4% disagreed with the statements below, while 13% on average opted for “not sure” as their response.

Table 32: Teacher participants’ attitudes on the Self and Other ideology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 5: The culture of the native speaker of English is completely different than that of the Algerian speaker of English.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15: The Algerian lifestyle is totally different than the lifestyle of the native speaker of English.</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20: In Britain and America, they have many interesting cultural aspects that we do not have.</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 103

After establishing the three key factors (see Chapter 6, Section 6.4, Figure 7) of manifestation of Academic Coloniality in Algeria, I present below the statistical findings of the following two factors resulting from them. The first of which is how the teacher participants held the British and/or American ‘native speaker’ and their varieties as the learning target. This is clear in the statistical results in Table 33 below. These show an agreement percentage average of 62% (Average Mean = 3.5) indicating that the respondents held the ‘native speaker’ as the learning target. Similarly to their students above (see Section 7.3.1, Table 28), the majority of these teachers did not only believe that it was better to stick to ‘native speaker’ English varieties (item 18), but also that they should aim to imitate it (items 71 and 18). This was because, according to their response to item 68, teachers should take these varieties as a reference in their
instructions (item 68). On the other hand, an average percentage of 23.9% expressed disagreement with the statements below, and 14.1% were “not sure”.

Table 33: Teacher participants’ attitudes on the ‘native speaker’ as the learning target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>I think students should try to speak as near native speaker accent as possible.</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>In my opinion, learners of English should choose to speak either British English or American English.</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>If you want to speak English, it's better to speak British or American rather than go and use another accent</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>I think teachers should correct students based on either British or American English norms</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 102

Throughout this chapter, one of the recurrent subjects was the similarity in teacher participants’ responses to their students’. This can either be taken as evidence for the effect these participant groups have on each other, and/or that these were the most widespread manifestations of Academic Coloniality in the context. The former explanation is more likely especially taking into account the findings of the first phase of the study. In fact, the similarity of responses in this phase was most evident in both participant groups’ responses to the multiple-choice – multiple answer – items (see Appendix 12 - item 74 and item 77, and Appendix 13 - item 78 and item 79). Figure 10, Figure 11, Figure 12 and Figure 13 below show the results from these:
The terms under each bar in Figure 10 and Figure 11 above were taken from expressions interview participants used to describe British or American English and turned into choices in the relevant items in this phase’s questionnaires. Teacher participants and students had the choice to select more than one option in these items. Interestingly, the percentages of participants from both groups who selected each element were close to each other. That is to say, the majority of both participant groups (78.6% of...
teachers, and 62% of students) believed that British English is ‘academic’; 49.5% of teachers and 45.5% of students thought of it as ‘the original one’; only 9.7% of teachers and 19.9% of students chose ‘more desirable’; 48.5% of teachers and 55.1% of students selected ‘more elegant’... etc. The comparable results from teachers and students are evidence for the spread of these beliefs among them. In fact, this can even be taken as further evidence for the effects both participant groups had on each other and to what extent these concepts are normalised among them. This is even more clear in Figure 12 and Figure 13 below:

![Participant teachers' view of American English](image)

**Figure 12**: Teachers’ responses to the multiple-choice (multiple answer) question (item 79)
The results in Figure 12 and Figure 13 above support the previous claims for how the participant groups may have affected each other’s attitudes towards ‘native speaker’ varieties. Looking at these individually, response percentages for most of the choices are very comparable. The obvious exception here is the option describing American English as ‘more desirable’; where a much higher percentage (60.2%) of respondent teachers, compared to only 37.8% of students, selected it. This is highly likely due to teacher participants’ perception of their students’ preference for American English. That is to say, since the students’ expression of preference for American English was directed more towards teachers who had to face it on a daily basis, they tended to perceive and so express it more than their students. This latter point can also be taken as evidence for the pressure students put on their teachers to conform to specific ‘native speaker’ varieties.

In section 7.3 of this chapter, I presented the statistical results of the factors relevant to the manifestations of Academic Coloniality in Algeria. These results continued to provide more statistical evidence for the previously qualitatively presented manifestations of Academic Coloniality. First, results showed that both participant groups held the belief that English belonged to the ‘native speaker’. Not only that, but they
also displayed acceptance for the idea that they had no ownership over the English language as it belonged to the ‘native speaker’ and ‘their culture’. There was also evidence in their responses that they believed in a constructed ‘native speaker’ Other who was not only the complete opposite of their perception of the Self, but also had a more interesting cultural background. Both student and teacher participants also provided similar responses to the next factor expressing that ‘native speaker’ English should be the learning target for learners, as well as the reference for teachers to correct their students. In this section, I also brought attention to the similarity in the participant groups’ responses explaining it through the effects each participant group had on the other. Afterall, while teachers may have had more power in the classroom, students could also create pressure on them to abide by ‘native speaker’ norms. Overall, this section continued to provide more statistical evidence for the concepts explored in the previous phase.

### 7.4 Attitudes towards Factors Influencing the Reproduction of Academic Coloniality

After presenting the quantitative findings about the factors that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality and its manifestations among the participants in the second phase of this study, I now move to present those that contributed to its maintenance and continuity. As explained in Chapter 6, Section 6.5, factors that contributed to the reproduction of Academic Coloniality in this context were not necessarily directly related to ELT per se. Those were the practices, conditions, and views under which ELT was taking place that contributed to reproducing aspects of Academic Coloniality. Similarly to the previous two sections, here, I present the findings from students about 1) their call for change to the content, 2) the mismatched views on practice, and 3) the overlooked feedback. I then follow that with the matching factors from teacher participants.
7.4.1 Students’ Attitudes towards Factors Influencing the Reproduction of Academic Coloniality

The first factor that contributed to the constant reproduction of Academic Coloniality was the lack of attention to the students’ calls for change to the curriculum. Those were often met with either opposing views or disregard from teachers (see Chapter 7, Section 7.4.2). Table 34 below presents the attitudes of students on the content of their lessons and their awareness of how out-of-date some of it was. With an agreement average of 60.1%, the statistics below can be taken as evidence for the student participants’ desire to implement updates to the current content they were being taught. A closer look at individual items shows that more students were aware of the out-of-date nature of what they were studying (items 31, 24 and 34), and believed that changes should be introduced (item 15). Interestingly, their responses to item 20 ‘I am happy with the content of my lessons’ reveals a less contrasting distribution between those who agreed (37.5%), were not sure (29.4%), and disagreed (33.1%). This could indicate that while most of these respondents realised the need to introduce changes to the content, not all of them knew how/agreed to the necessity and/or urgency to bring those.

Table 34: Student participants’ attitudes on the content of the curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 15: The content of the curriculum currently being taught should be changed</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20: I am happy with the content of my lessons.</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 31: I think that we are being taught very old theories that do not matter anymore.</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 24: I think we are studying too much past events, not actual culture.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 34: I think the content of the courses I am learning is out-of-date</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 357
As stated in this section’s introduction, the following factor that contributed to the maintenance and continuity of Academic Coloniality among the participants was the mismatched views on practice between students and their teachers. Here, I only present the statistical findings from students on the relevant items. Those of teachers are presented in Section 7.4.2 below. In Table 35, the findings show that, on average, students agreed with the statements below. This is backed up by the average agreement percentage of 50.7% compared to only 20.9% of disagreement. However, taking the items individually, the statistics reveal more than that. While the majority of participants agreed with item 62 (66.5%) that they feel that the role of students was too passive in the classroom, their responses to the other two items differed. When directly asked about the teaching approach their educators followed, 47% of the students expressed agreement that it was a teacher-centred one. However, 41.3% of them selected “not sure”. This is possibly due to the mixture of approaches teachers used. In fact, this is similar to the qualitative phase’s findings; students testified that their older teachers leaned more towards a teacher-centred approach while younger ones were more open to discussions with their students (see chapter 5, Section 5.3.1.2). In fact, this could also explain the less contrasting spread of responses to item 27, where 34.3 % disagreed, 26.9% were not sure, and 38.8% agreed. Overall, while these findings do not decisively make a divide in the participants’ attitude, they can still be taken as a representation of the uncertainty students had of their teachers approaches.

**Table 35: Student participants’ attitudes on the teaching approach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 62: In our classes, I think that teachers present information and students just passively receive knowledge.</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27: Our teachers allow us to be leaders and decision-makers in our own learning.</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 69: My teachers follow a teacher-centred approach</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last factor that contributed to the reproduction of Academic Coloniality among the student participants was the overlooked feedback. Here, I asked specific questions to understand whether and how often (if at all) the teachers and/or the institutions these students went to collected feedback from them. The statistical findings about those are presented in Table 36 below. First, these findings indicate a lack of institutional form to collect feedback from students on their learning. The agreement percentage of 66.6% to item 71 and disagreement one of 71.8% to item 37 are clear indications that the majority of the sampled universities did not have a systematic way to collect feedback from their students. Second, there is indication that some of the teacher participants tried to collect feedback from students. Responses to item 70 show that, while more participants (49.4%) testified that their teachers did not regularly collect feedback from them, over a quarter of them (26.5%) stated otherwise. However, responses to item 28 show that this rarely took place as 65.8% of them signified, despite the majority of students’ willingness to provide feedback with 56.5% of them agreeing to item 36. In general, these findings provide solid evidence for the lack of systematic feedback collection from students at the target institutions.
Table 36: Student participants’ attitudes on feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 70: My teachers regularly collect feedback from us about our learning</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 71: My university/department systematically collect feedback from students about our learning experience.</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 36: I often provide feedback to my teachers about my learning whenever they ask me</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 28: My teachers rarely asked me to provide written feedback about my studies</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 37: Nobody from my university ever asked me to provide formal feedback about my experiences as a student</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 353

In Section 7.4.1, I presented the quantitative findings about the factors that contributed to the maintenance and continuity of Academic Coloniality in Algeria. Overall, the statistical findings shown here back up the findings of the qualitative phase on students’ views of the out-of-date content, their attitudes towards their teachers’ classroom practices, as well as whether their universities neglect to collect feedback from them. The results here illustrate that the students were aware of the out-of-date nature of the content they were being taught, and they expressed strong desire for changes to be introduced. However, these students did not seem as certain about the teaching approach their educators adopted. While more of them indicated that their teachers followed a teacher-centred approach, others were not as certain since not all of their teachers adopted the same methods. Finally, the findings in this section also provided solid evidence that their institutions did not collect feedback from them despite their teachers’ irregular efforts. In the following section, I present the findings from teachers on the equivalent factors.
7.4.2 Teachers’ Attitudes towards Factors Influencing the Reproduction of Academic Coloniality

As far as teachers are concerned, three factors of reproduction of Academic Coloniality are presented in this section. The first of which is the attitudes towards the content of the curriculum. Table 37 below provides the statistical results from the respondent teachers on the relevant items. Interestingly, it appears that these teachers were aware of the need to introduce changes (item 16) as well as the out-of-date nature of the content they were teaching (item 33 and item 26). However, 60% of them agreed that they were happy with the content of their lessons (item 22), and 45.1% of them disagreed that the contents of their courses were out-of-date (item 9). These findings in isolation may seem contradictory. However, the findings of the first phase of this study indicated that older teachers held more power over policy documents that dictated the content of the curriculum (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.1), but younger teachers only had limited freedom under the boundaries set by these documents (see Chapter 6, Section 6.5). Considering that the majority of respondents to the online survey were of the second category (see Figure 9 above; also see Chapter 9, Section 9.5 for limitations), it seems that the results here reflect similar findings. That is to say, most of the respondent teachers here expressed the need to implement changes to the out-of-date contents that were governed by the policy documents, but they were satisfied with the contents they were teaching within the limits of those. This is particularly evident as the teachers responded to items referring to more general practice at their institution (‘content being taught’, ‘we are teaching’) differently than the ones that referred to more personal practices (‘my lessons’, ‘courses I am teaching’). In this sense, similarly to the findings of the previous phase, these results can be taken as evidence for older teachers resisting change despite their younger colleagues’ willingness to introduce those.
### Table 37: Teacher participants’ attitudes on the content of the curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 16: The content of the curriculum currently being taught should be changed.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22: I am happy with the content of my lessons.</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 33: I think that we are teaching very old theories that do not matter anymore.</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 26: I think we are teaching too much past events, not actual culture.</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9: I think some of the content of the courses I am teaching is out-of-date.</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 103

The next factor that contributed to the reproduction of Academic Coloniality in the context of this study was the mismatched views students and teachers held about the practice. In Section 7.4.1, I presented the findings from students about their attitudes on their teachers’ views. In Table 38 below, I introduce the teacher participants’ responses to these. Overall, results show that the majority of the respondents here reported that they were following a student-centred approach. This is especially evident in the responses to item 74 and item 29. For item 66, even though the majority (54.6%) disagreed with the statement ‘In my classes, I mostly present information and students just passively receive knowledge’, a considerable section of them (36.4%) agreed. This shows that despite the majority insisting to report a student-centred approach, some teachers appeared to perceive the situation differently. Comparing the participant groups’ responses, it can be noticed that while students expressed the feeling of being too passive in their classrooms and uncertainty about their teachers’ approach, respondent teachers seemed to be confident that their approach was student-centred. This mismatch in views between the participant groups was one of the factors that contributed to the reproduction of Academic Coloniality in Algeria.
**Table 38:** Teacher participants’ attitudes on the teaching approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 74: I follow a student-centred approach</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 66: In my classes, I mostly present information and students just passively receive knowledge</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29: I allow students to be leaders and decision-makers in their own learning.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N = 102

The final factor for the reproduction of Academic Coloniality among teachers was the lack of any systematic way to collect feedback from students which could bring some of the aspects of Academic Coloniality into question. Similar to the items directed to the student participants, with the items in Table 39 below, I sought to find out whether and how often do teacher participants (and their institutions) collected feedback from their students. The disagreement percentage of 53.9% to item 76 (with 35.3% ‘not sure’ respondents), and agreement one of 48.1% (with 26.5% ‘not sure’ respondents) indicate that most sampled universities did not have a system in place to collect students’ feedback. The contrast in responses to item 75 and item 30 can be taken as an indication that although teachers did not collect written feedback, they reportedly regularly collected it in other forms. Similarly to students’ results, teacher participants’ responses here also indicate students’ willingness to provide feedback (item 38). Overall, these findings can be taken as evidence for the lack of institutional feedback collection system from learners.
In this section, I presented the quantitative findings on the factors that contributed to the constant maintenance and continuity of Academic Coloniality in Algeria. The results here continued to be consistent with the previous phase’s findings. Initially, they showed that students and younger teachers both indicated willingness to implement changes to the out-of-date contents but did not have the power to introduce them. Additionally, the results also demonstrated mismatched views on the teaching approach followed; while students were uncertain and felt like passive receivers of information in the classrooms, teachers were more certain and mostly reported a student-centred approach. As far as feedback is concerned, both participant groups indicated that their institutions did not have any systematic way through which they collected students’ feedback. However, while students indicated a lack of feedback collection from their teachers, the respondent teachers reported regular feedback collection despite it not being necessarily written. On the whole, similarly to the previous two sections, this section also provides more quantitative evidence for the ideas presented and discussed in the previous phase of the study.


7.5 Conclusion to the Chapter

In this chapter, I presented the findings from the data collected through the online questionnaire survey to the 376 students and 103 teachers of English at 10 universities across the three regions of Algeria. Overall, most of the quantitative results presented in this chapter fall in line with the previously qualitatively discussed results of phase one. I started this chapter by presenting the attitudes of the two participant groups on the factors that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality. In this section, I demonstrated how both participant groups showed bias towards ‘Western Culture’ generally and the ‘native speaker’ specifically. Here, I also highlighted to what extent media played a role in the production of Academic Coloniality through exposure to unrealistic idealised images of the ‘native speaker’ and their ‘Western culture’. In terms of the power relations, I presented the relevant findings which showed evidence for unequal power relations between teachers and their students, but those between older and younger teachers were not as conclusive. In turn, teachers also reported awareness of their students’ intolerance of the use of ‘non-native’ speaker English varieties. Those teachers also expressed preference for ‘British English’, yet they did not report any intolerance toward their students’ English use. In terms of the style of teaching, results in this section indicated a teach to the test approach to which students already adapted.

In this chapter, I also introduced the participants’ attitudes towards manifestations of Academic Coloniality in Algeria. Both respondent groups held the belief that the English language belonged to the ‘native speaker’ and ‘their culture’ and they just borrowed it during speech. For them, this ‘native speaker’ was a more interesting Other that was constructed as the opposite of the Self, and whose variety of English should be the learning target. Finally, I presented the findings on participants attitudes towards the factors of reproduction of Academic Coloniality. Here, I noted the resistance to change of older teachers despite the willingness from younger ones and the respondent students. Additionally, mismatched views on practice were also evidenced in this section. And finally, results showed that most
institutions across the country did not collect feedback from their students further burying several aspects of Academic Coloniality.
Chapter 8: Discussion: Academic Coloniality in Algeria

8.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I discuss the quantitative results presented in Chapter 7 from the second phase of the current study’s online questionnaires. This chapter is entitled ‘Academic Coloniality in Algeria’ because in addition to discussing the second phase’s results, I also compare them to those of the previous phase in order to verify them and provide grounds for generalisation of the previous qualitative findings. In what follows, I demonstrate how Academic Coloniality manifested itself and was (re)produced among the 479 teacher and student participants across the 10 universities from the East, Centre, and West of Algeria. I initiate by discussing the statistical results from Chapter 7 and how these relate to the existing literature, and then compare them to the previous phase’s findings to validate those and seek generalisations. To meet this purpose, I again follow the structure Production, Manifestations, and Reproduction of Academic Coloniality to mirror Chapter 6 and facilitate the comparisons.

8.2 Production of Academic Coloniality in Algeria

The quantitative results in the second phase of the study demonstrated that the same factors that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality in the qualitative phase of the study were also identified here. These can be categorised into three sections: French coloniality, effects of media, and teacher-student interactions. In Chapter 7, Sections 7.2.1 and 7.2.2, I reported results from students and teachers respectively about the factors that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality within their contexts. In their responses to the relevant items, the participants’ attitudes towards their cultural norms in relation to those of the ‘native speaker’ showed evidence for the effects of French coloniality. The results indicated a largely more positive attitude towards a superior ‘Western culture’ generally and a British/American ‘native speaker’ specifically as compared to their own culture and themselves. Given that Algeria is a post-colonial country (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.1), research in similar contexts is
expected to yield similar findings since it served Western nations to promote their own knowledge and cultures and demote the local ones in their colonies (Kumaravadivelu 2006). This was one of the elements that was shown to contribute to the production of Academic Coloniality in the previous phase as it left participants susceptible to other factors that presented them with unrealistic, and often idealised images of the ‘native speaker’ (see Chapter 6, Section 6.3). Interestingly, participants’ responses to items that only mentioned ‘Western culture’ were not as clear cut as those that specified British or American ‘native speaker’ (see Table 10 and Table 17, Chapter 7). Participants here may have not been as decisive about those since they were students and teachers of English, while ‘Western’ includes more than only speakers of English, and as demonstrated in the following sections of the chapter, their bias was geared towards the British and Americans who they considered speakers of ‘Standard English’ varieties. This link between what is British and/or American and ‘Standard English’ (Jenkins 2019) is rooted in the colonial history of the language (Tupas 2022).

As already stated above, the second category of the factors of production of Academic Coloniality is the effects of media. This took place through exposing and raising the interest of the already vulnerable participants (because of the effects of French Colonisation) to stereotypical and idealising representations of the ‘native speaker’. The results for this were divided into two factors: “exposure and interest in ‘native speaker’ varieties” and “stereotyping/idealising the ‘native speaker’”. The results for the first revealed that both participant groups recognised the role media played in exposing and raising the students’ interest in English. To a lesser extent, but still with more agreement than disagreement, teachers’ responses also reflected that their own interest in English was the result of media. Such exposure to media that often exclusively promoted ‘native speaker’ varieties is considered in this study one of the components that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality. In this respect, Dragojevic et al., (2016) state that ‘native speaker’ varieties were predominantly present on media. In fact, unlike their ‘non-native’ speakers of English counterpart, characters speaking British or American English were often portrayed in more
positive stereotypical roles (Lippi-Green 2012, Gluszek & Hansen 2013). In this sense, it is important to note how the participants could have been affected by the constant exposure to positive images of the ‘native speaker’. It is also worth mentioning that these findings are similar to those of the previous phase.

The second factor within the effects of media that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality among the participants of this phase was how the stereotypical and idealised images of the ‘native speaker’ through the media shaped the respondents’ attitudes towards them. Similarly to the previous phase’s findings, the quantitative results in Chapter 7 demonstrated that the images both participant groups held of the ‘native speaker’ were largely affected by media’s attractive representations. In this matter, Dobrow & Gidney (1998) and Mastro et al., (2005) report that the representations of the ‘native speaker’ on media is often displayed as positively and as attractively as possible for the watchers. In fact, Gluszek & Hansen (2013) explains that these positive images have an impact on the learners watching those. Arguably, this impact has already taken place as Belmihoub (2018) demonstrates the effect of media’s representation on Algerian youth and how imitating the lifestyle of the ‘native speaker’ can be taken as a sign of modernity and development. In addition to the attraction of these representations, the danger of such exposure to media was the spread of often inaccurate representations about the contexts the participants are interested in (Britain and America), the people who live there (‘native speakers’) and the languages spoken (‘Standard English’). Here, Soares (2017) affirms that constant exposure to such inaccuracies do not only affect the individual’s attitudes but can also “shape” their perspectives (p.5). As such, it can be argued that Academic Coloniality among the participants in this case was produced by factors from outside the educational institutions as much as from inside of them.

After presenting the findings about French coloniality and the effects of media, I now move to examine how the interactions between the participants contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality. Here, I explore the power relations between them, the teach to the test approach, how teachers imposed biased views on students, and the intolerance of the use of ‘non-native’ English varieties in classrooms. In
the previous phase, I explained how these factors operated through the everyday interaction between participants to contribute to producing Academic Coloniality. Beginning with the relationship between students and their teachers, student participants reported imbalanced power relations favouring the teachers (see Chapter 7, Section 7.2.1, Table 13). In fact, this can be evidence for teachers’ belief in a traditional teacher-dominated classroom. Some of the results from students were explained in terms of different teachers (older and younger, having different attitudes in the classroom). In this respect, Angelides (2004) reports that senior educators are more likely to continue the traditional approaches. In addition to this, these relationships were further reinforced through the teach to the test teaching approach. In Chapter 7, Section 7.2.1, the majority of students reported that their teachers focussed more on preparing them for tests and exams. Equally, both participant groups revealed that students already developed a score hunt strategy to adapt to this teaching approach. Such approach to teaching is often the result of the belief that better scores in tests and exams are an indication of a better-quality education (Hayes & Read 2004). Within this system, the primary interest for teachers’ is to equip their learners with the skills they need to achieve better scores, and exploring content becomes secondary (Benmoussat & Benmoussat 2018). This would contribute to the production of Academic Coloniality by granting teachers even more power over their classrooms and inhibits students’ critical thinking as their hunt for test scores did not require them to use it making the normalisation of certain concepts less and less difficult.

The interactions between teachers and their students also included how the two participant groups expressed their biases towards ‘native speaker’ English varieties and their intolerance towards the ‘non-native’ ones. While the traditional teacher-dominated classroom power relations and the teach to the test approach mostly served teachers, the students’ biases and intolerance in fact put those teachers at a disadvantage. The statistical results showed that despite their preference for British English, not all teachers reportedly expressed that or encouraged their students towards it. On the other hand, both groups of respondents indicated that the student participants were intolerant of the use of ‘non-native’
English forms in the classroom exerting pressure on their teachers to abide by ‘native speaker’ norms. This is significant as it highlights the active role students play in the protection and normalisation of these practices and by extension the production of Academic Coloniality. This is because, although not clearly demonstrated in this phases’ findings, several other studies already demonstrated how teachers can not only recognise but also adapt to their students’ expectations (Schulz 2001, Nishino 2012, Bagheri & East 2021). In terms of the students’ intolerance, Jenkins (2007, 2014), Soruç (2015), Griffiths & Soruç (2019) who investigated EFL students’ biases also report similar findings. In fact, Griffiths & Soruç (ibid.) report that EFL students were more intolerant of the use of ‘non-native’ variety than non EFL students.

Findings from the first phase of the study on the production of Academic Coloniality qualitatively revealed a detailed understanding of how French coloniality, the influence of media, and interactions between teachers and students contribute to the normalisation and transfer of several problematic ideas. In Chapter 6, Section 6.3, I explained that French coloniality’s contribution took place in two ways: first, through older teacher’s experience in an Algerian university that followed the French system post-independence. Those teachers had more power over the policy documents that governed the curriculum, held on to more traditional approaches to teaching, and led teacher-dominated classrooms. Second, the underlying belief in a superior West, especially compared to their local norms, left the participants vulnerable to attractive and often stereotypical images of an ideal ‘native speaker’ that were presented to them all over the media. Results of the previous phase also illustrated how the power relations among and between more powerful older teachers, biased younger ones, and intolerant students within a teach to the test system contributed to the transfer and normalisation of otherwise problematic concepts that contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality.

For the second phase of the study, I broke these aspects down and represented each with one or more factors that I quantitatively investigated through the questionnaire surveys. Because of the nature of quantitative research, I could not draw as in-depth conclusions about Academic Coloniality as I did in the
previous phase. Instead, by quantitatively validating each of these factors, I find myself in a better position to conclude that the production of Academic Coloniality among the participants of this phase operated in a similar manner to that of the previous one since the findings in Chapter 7, Sections 7.2.1 and 7.2.2, which are discussed above, provided evidence for the presence of French coloniality, the effects of media, as well as imbalanced power relations. As explained in Chapter 3, Section 3.4.2.2, participants for this phase come from 10 different universities across the East, Centre, and West of Algeria. In this sense, I would argue that the findings here can be generalised.

8.3 Manifestations of Academic Coloniality in Algeria

The relevant quantitative results of this phase of the study continued to demonstrate similar evidence to the previous qualitative ones. The responses from the student and teacher participants provided evidence that Academic Coloniality was manifested among the respondents in similar ways to phase one’s context. In Chapter 7, Sections 7.3.1 and 7.3.2, I presented the descriptive statistics from the students and teachers about these manifestations. I referred to language ownership, language-cultural association, and Othering in the previous phase as key elements of the manifestations of Academic Coloniality since their interactions led to other discursive strategies: ‘native speaker’ English as the learning target and learning English to communicate with the ‘native speaker’ (see Chapter 6, Section 6.4). In this phase’s results, evidence illustrated that teacher participants and their students did not perceive themselves as owners of English, instead, they held the belief that the language belonged to the ‘native speaker’. These findings align with existing literature. While Matsuda (2003) states that learners, despite their awareness of its use internationally, did not feel they have ownership of English; Pillai (2008), Saraceni (2010), Akkakoson (2019) who looked into that in different settings, also report similar findings. Similarly, the statistical results of this phase also clearly demonstrated the extent to which the participants associated the English language to ‘its culture’ or that of the ‘native speaker’. The belief in the association of English to ‘its culture’ would put extra burden on learners since they did not only have to learn the language, but also the cultural
norms stereotypically associated to it (R’boul 2020). Kumaravadivelu (2006), who also addresses this, reports that English is often associated to ‘Western culture’ within similar ELT contexts. In addition to this association, results from both participant groups illustrated how they held an image of a constructed ‘native speaker’ Other who was the opposite of their perception of themselves (the Self). The Other, in this case, also had several ‘more interesting’ cultural aspects the participants did not have. The construction of an exotic Other based on reversing the features of the familiar Self was at the core of Holliday’s (2005) “Generalised Other” (p. 5).

The normalisation of these three factors among the participants often resulted in them justifying several other biases and manifestations of Academic Coloniality. That is to say, if a participant held that English belonged to the ‘native speaker’, that the language could not be separated from ‘its culture’, as well as the existence of a ‘native speaker’ Other who was the inverse of the Self; they were likely to conclude that ‘native speaker’ English, lifestyle, and culture should be the target for their learning. This was what the results in Chapter 7, Section 7.3.1 and 7.3.2 (Table 28 and Table 20, but not as conclusively in Table 28) indicated. Both participant groups seemed to have bias towards ‘native speaker’ English varieties (specifically, British and American) as learning targets. In this respect, Matsuda (2021) establishes that learners of English often cherish these two varieties. Jenkins (2014) also explains that despite the efforts to move away from a ‘native speaker’ varieties-centred ELT, the bias of most of those in the field still leans towards them. In addition to this, the similarity in responses between the two participant groups was one of the interesting results to pay attention to in this phase. The findings to responses on participants’ views of British and American English showed comparable results between those of teachers and students (see Chapter 7, Section 7.3.2, Figures Figure 10 to Figure 13). The larger section of the participants held that British English was ‘Academic, the original one, correct, more elegant, and of Higher Status’ while American English was ‘more desirable, and more flexible’. This view towards ‘native speaker’ varieties and associating them with more positive attributes and as higher status than their ‘non-native’ counterparts
is a common theme in the relevant literature (e.g., Sifakis & Sougari 2005; Ranta 2010; Galloway 2013; Ke & Cahyani 2014, Jenkins 2014; Chen and Lin 2016, León 2018; Norton & Pavlenko 2019, Matsuda 2021). Besides confirming the previous findings in this section, the similarity in choices the participants made here was a clear indication of how these biases, or manifestations of Academic Coloniality, were transferred, accepted, and adopted (normalised) by teachers and students alike. The spread of such problematic concepts about ‘native speaker’ varieties may be evidence for their normalisation of these within such contexts. And, as explained at the end of Section 8.2 above, this ‘Building of normal thinking’ (Holliday 2020) took place through the everyday interaction between those involved in ELT.

Manifestations of Academic Coloniality in the first phase of this study was expressed through the views of the participants on issues relevant to their teaching and learning and ELT in general, and through the discursive strategies they expressed in defence of the opinions they held. The way in which the participants represented the ‘native speaker’ of English, ‘Standard English’, and ‘its culture’ displayed several aspects of Academic Coloniality. To explore these, I presented language ownership, language-culture association, and Othering as key elements from which sprang other arguments the participants used to justify their biases. I explained that by holding the belief that English belonged to the ‘native speaker’ and that the language cannot be separated from ‘native speaker’ culture, participants argued for the necessity to follow their varieties and cultural norms. Additionally, by holding that English could not be separated from ‘native speaker’ culture and at the same time constructing a ‘native speaker’ Other who was entirely different than the Self, participants justified the assertion that ‘native speaker culture’, and not local norms, were more relevant to their learning/teaching. Through these, they also rationalised other aspects of Academic Coloniality including biases, holding ‘native speaker’ English as the learning target, and learning English to communicate with the ‘native speaker’ (see chapter 6, Section 6.4, Figure 7).
As far as manifestations of Academic Coloniality are concerned in the quantitative phase of the study, I followed a similar approach to its production. I converted several elements from the first phase into factors that I investigated through the responses to the survey questionnaires. In this sense, by showing that the teacher and student participants in the second phase held similarly biased beliefs towards the ‘native speaker’, ‘their culture’, and English language varieties; I could maintain that Academic Coloniality is manifested among these participants in a comparable way to that of the first phase. In other words, since the findings discussed above from Chapter 7, Sections 7.3.1 and 7.3.2 provided evidence for participants’ belief that English belonged to the ‘native speaker’, that it could not be separated from native ‘speaker culture’, that the ‘native speaker’ Other was a stereotypical exotic image generated based on the Self, as well as other justifications and biases; it could be said that Academic Coloniality was manifested through the attitudes of these participants similarly to how it did in the previous phase. In this sense, by providing enough evidence for the manifestations of Academic Coloniality in Algeria across the 10 sampled universities, it was also possible to generalise those findings.

The generalisations made by bringing the findings of the two phases together are significant to the literature on coloniality because they indicate the presence of attitudes, reported practices, and ideologies that are linked to coloniality. That is to say, while discussing evidence for the manifestations of Academic Coloniality in Algeria across both phases of the study, most of the findings supported the relevant existing literature. Although many of these studies were undertaken in contexts with previous Anglo-American colonial history, which Algeria is not, they yielded similar results. As such, this is evidence for the globality of Academic Coloniality, i.e., its effects extend to the countries that were not directly affected by Anglo-American colonialism.
8.4 The Reproduction of Academic Coloniality in Algeria

In a similar way to the production and manifestations of Academic Coloniality, the statistical findings relevant to its maintenance and continuity among the participants of this study also supported the previous phase’s findings. Across Section 7.4 of Chapter 7, I presented the descriptive statistics from the responses of the student and teacher participants to investigate their attitudes towards introducing change to the content of the curriculum, the teaching approach, and students’ feedback collection. Those results showed similar evidence for the conditions under which the teaching and learning of English took place in the previous phase. Before discussing these, it is important to remember that the factors of reproduction of Academic Coloniality are not primarily related to ELT. They are, however, the sum of the opinions, conditions, and actions of teachers and students that actively or otherwise contribute to the continuity of the previously discussed manifestations. Concerning the participants attitudes towards implementing changes to the teaching content, it appears that while students showed awareness of the out-of-date nature of their learning and expressed the need to introduce changes, not all teachers shared the same opinions. The results from teacher participants on the matter revealed that while the majority of teachers recognised the need to introduce revisions, they did not seem to be able to make any significant ones. This was explained by referring to the relationship between the older and younger teachers in the results of the previous phase’s findings. In this respect, Hamlaoui (2021) states that, in similar contexts, it is often older teachers who resist changes as it intervenes with their comfort in the familiar. Not only that, but because they often had more experience, those teachers held higher positions and more power over policy documents (Angelides 2004). On the other hand, and similarly to this study’s findings, Hargreaves (2005) also explains that younger teachers were often more open to change.

With regards to the second factor that contributes to the reproduction of Academic Coloniality in this phase of the study: the attitudes towards the teaching approach, the results in Chapter 7 showed interesting differences in the responses of the two participant groups. On the one hand, respondent
students generally indicated that they only had a passive role in a teacher-centred classroom. However, a large percentage of them expressed uncertainty responding to the relevant items. This uncertainty was put down as a sign that not all teachers within these universities had the same attitudes in the classroom. In fact, Angelides (2004) explains that compared to their younger colleagues, older teachers held on to more traditional approaches and tended to be “stricter” (p.68). On the other hand, the teacher participants did not seem to be as uncertain about the teaching approach they followed. The statistical results showed that the majority of them were confident that their teaching approach was student-centred completely contradicting the students’ assertion. This discrepancy in the views of the people directly involved in the everyday learning and teaching of English at the target universities was one of the factors that contribute to the maintenance of Academic Coloniality. This is because such mismatched views are evidence for further lack of communication. Nevertheless, despite teachers’ confidence that they follow a student-centred approach, they were more likely to be following a teacher-centred one. I make this argument based on the previous phase’s analysis of the policy documents that all the universities involved in this study refer to, as well as the fact that existing literature assert that MENA countries still strictly follow a teacher-centred approach (Benmoussat & Benmoussat 2018).

Moving now to a different but relevant factor to the lack of communication between teachers and students, I discuss how the lack of a systematic way to collect feedback from students contributed to the constant reproduction of Academic Coloniality in Algeria. Findings from students indicated that universities did not have any formal arrangement to collect feedback from the participants about their learning experience. Additionally, students also indicated that teachers only rarely collected feedback from them despite these students indicating their willingness to do so. Similarly, teachers also indicated that their universities did not have any organised way to collect feedback from students on their learning. They also expressed that they were less likely to collect written feedback from their students. The contribution of the lack of a “feedback dialogue” (Vattøy & Smith 2019, p. 261) in this phase of the study
is that the assessment that goes from students to their teachers about their learning often gets overlooked. Some of the comments students made may point out one or several aspects of Academic Coloniality. Instead, as the statistical results in this case illustrated, the feedback only goes from teachers to students, but not in the other direction (Bailey & Garner 2010, Ajjawi & Boud 2018). Managing responsibilities (Li and De Luca 2014), large classroom sizes (Vattøy & Smith 2019), habits, and overwhelming workloads (Hargreaves 2005) were all given as possible justifications for the lack of feedback collection from students. The findings here add to those that teachers themselves might become less motivated to keep the feedback dialogue going in both directions if the institutions themselves do not set up a formal arrangement for that.

In the previous phase of the study, I explained that the maintenance and continuity of Academic Coloniality took place in two ways: active and passive. In the former, I highlighted the actual practices that played an active role in the maintenance of the biases (resistance to change and refusal to introduce updates). In the latter, I emphasised the conditions, attitudes, and the failure to act addressing certain relevant issues (mismatched views on practice and overlooked feedback). The findings in that phase showed how the veteran teaching staff had the power to be and acted as gatekeepers for several aspects of Academic Coloniality by resisting any revisions to the policy documents that govern the curriculum. This ensured the persistence of several aspects of Academic Coloniality. The first phase’s findings also indicated that students and teachers held different views of their practice; while students reported teacher-centred classrooms that their teachers dominated, teachers claimed the opposite. Additionally, there did not seem to be any systematic way through which the target institutions and teachers collected feedback from students further emphasising the lack of communication issues, and so allowing Academic Coloniality in the context to continue.

In the quantitative phase of the present study, I followed a similar approach to the production and manifestations in order to explore the reproduction of Academic Coloniality among the participants in the
sampled 10 universities. I transformed the findings of the first phase into the three factors I discussed in this section. This way, through presenting the evidence from the responses of teachers and students about the resistance to change, mismatched views on practice, and the overlooked feedback; I could argue that the maintenance (actively) and continuity (passively) of Academic Coloniality in these contexts took place in a comparable way to that of the previous phase. That is to say, because the discussed above results from Chapter 7, Section 7.4 signified that older teachers seemed to be resistant to change despite younger ones’ and students’ demands for it, that teachers and students seemed to hold different views on whether the teaching approach was student or teacher-centred, and that there did not seem to be any formal arrangement from institutions to sustain a feedback dialogue; I could assert that Academic Coloniality was being reproduced within the 10 sampled universities in similar processes to those of the previous phase. By making this claim, I am also linking the factors discussed in this section to coloniality; this link was not previously made by existing literature. Additionally, it is also possible to generalise those results since the findings from participants of those contexts seem to show similar attitudes.

8.5 Conclusion to the Chapter

In this chapter, I discussed the findings from the analysis of the second phase’s survey questionnaires’ data. I followed that with a comparison between these and the findings of the previous phase of this research. I discussed above the statistical findings on how Academic Coloniality was (re)produced and manifested in Algeria by reporting the responses of student and teacher participants to the questionnaire items, relating the results from those to the existing literature, then comparing them to the previous phase’s findings. On the whole, most of the results of this phase validated those of the previous one. Regarding the production of Academic Coloniality, I explained that French coloniality left students and teachers vulnerable as they regard their culture and norms inferior to the ‘Western ones’. At the same time, the attractive representations of the ‘native speaker’ in the media those students and teachers were constantly exposed to reinforced such beliefs. Not only that, but those representations on media often
turned out to be inaccurate and stereotypical, but they were still adopted by both the learners and educators as, most of the time, these were the only contact they had with the ‘native speaker’ and English.

While both French coloniality and media played an important role in the production of Academic Coloniality, the daily interactions between the students and teachers equally contributed to it. The imbalanced power relations between the teachers and their students meant that they could dominate the classrooms, introduce students to biased views, and suppress any opposing views form them. On top of that, the teach to the test approach many of these teachers followed ensured that students adopted and repeated those views regardless of their belief in them. This way, these beliefs were normalised and then talked about in daily interactions as if they existed beyond any opposition. At this point, students, to whom the biases were reified, did not only normalise them with others, but also did not tolerate the use of ‘non-native’ English varieties, directing pressure towards their teachers to abide by those. In this sense, both teachers and students actively contributed to the production of Academic Coloniality.

With regards to the manifestations of Academic Coloniality, I argued that the two main arguments learners and educators made to justify most of their biases sprang from the interactions of three key elements: language ownership, language-culture association, and Othering. Those who held that the English language belonged to the ‘native speaker’ and that the language could not be separated from ‘its culture’ (or the culture of the ‘native speaker’ in some instances), often argued for the necessity to follow the ‘native speaker’ variety and culture. Equally, those who maintained that English was inseparable from ‘its culture’, while constructing a stereotypical image of the ‘native speaker’ Other as the complete opposite of the Self (which also seemed to be affected by the media), accordingly contended for the irrelevance of ‘non-native’ cultural norms (including Algerian ones) since they were ‘completely different’ than those of the ‘native speaker’, who should be held as the learning target. For those educators and their students, these two justified most of the other findings such as the bias towards ‘native speaker’ varieties, holding them as learning targets, and learning English to communicate with them.
Finally, as far as the reproduction of Academic Coloniality is concerned, I made the distinction between two ways: actively gatekeeping Academic Coloniality and Passively gatekeeping it. As already explained in this chapter (see Section 8.4), actively gatekeeping Academic Coloniality refers to the actions that learners and/or educators took that contributed to its maintenance, while passively gatekeeping it included the attitudes, lack of action, as well as the circumstances under which ELT took place that contributed to the continuity of Academic Coloniality in Algeria. I also reminded that these did not necessarily strictly relate to ELT per se, but they still affected it. The findings showed how older teachers’ comfort in the familiar and resistance to change the out-of-date content and teaching approaches actively protected the ways in which ELT has been taking place in Algeria, which demonstrably reflected several aspects of Academic Coloniality. On the other hand, the lack of an effective and productive chain of communication between the learners and their teachers was at the heart of the passive continuity of Academic Coloniality here. Evidence here showed how educators and students held mismatched views of their roles in the classroom and the teaching approach, but more significantly, there did not seem to be any formal systematic procedure to consider students-to-teachers feedback, which could be vital to bring to the surface several aspects of Academic Coloniality.
Chapter 9: Conclusion: Beyond Academic Coloniality

9.1 Introduction

I entitled the last chapter of this thesis “Beyond Academic Coloniality” because, after establishing how it is (re)produced and manifested across Algerian universities throughout this thesis, the discussions I provide in this chapter might potentially set the stage for a post Academic Coloniality future. I start by addressing the research questions through summarising its findings and discussing how the present study meets its aims. I then move to exploring the study’s theoretical, methodological, and contextual contribution to knowledge and how it enriches previous research in the field. Section 9.4 further presents the implications of the findings on the broader academic, social, and pedagogical domains. In the last part of this chapter, I turn to the study’s limitations which can prompt for directions for future research. Finally, I conclude the chapter with some final remarks, reflecting on the lessons I learnt from carrying out this PhD project.

9.2 Summary of the Findings

As interest in English and ELT in Algeria is growing, calls and concerns about the global spread of English and its links to colonial ideologies in ELT scholarship have also been resonating (e.g., Liu 2018, Schreiber, 2019, Rice 2021, R’boul 2022, Tupas 2022). Consequently, the study at hand, which aims at investigating Academic Coloniality in ELT in higher education in Algeria, comes as a timely one. Between efforts to dismantle language hierarchies and break free from the colonial linguistic dependency of French through transitioning to English and opening up to the Anglophone countries and to the world, English is often talked about as the engine for such transition in Algeria (Jacob 2019). However, one of the main arguments in this research is that, if not implemented carefully, this transition from French to English might do more harm than good (Daffri & Taibi 2023). Through conducting semi-structured in-depth interviews, analysing documents, and collecting surveys from teachers and students across 10 Algerian universities, findings
support that ELT in higher education in Algeria is entrenched in colonial ideologies and practices. In what follows, I draw on these findings to answer this research’s questions.

9.2.1 **What, if any, evidence is there of Academic Coloniality within English language teaching in higher education in Algeria?**

The manifestations of Academic Coloniality in Algeria were evident in the attitudes, justifications, and practices of the teachers and students of English at university. Throughout this thesis, I explained how the beliefs held by students and teachers towards English language ownership, connecting it to ‘*its culture*’, and Othering combined lead to two lines of discursive strategies through which they rationalised their biases as well as their practices. By believing that (a) they were learning/teaching a language that did not belong to them, (b) since they could not separate this language from the culture of its ‘native speakers’, and (c) because this culture was completely different than their own; learners and educators contended that they should hold these ‘native speakers’ and their cultural norms as learning targets and abide by them. At the same time, they also claimed that teachers should instruct students to distance themselves from their own cultures as these could interfere with the learning process since they were entirely different than those of the target language. This way, learners and educators of English at Algerian universities justified their bias towards ‘native speaker’ English varieties, why they held these as *formal* and more desirable, why they did not tolerate ‘non-native’ ones, and how they held the underlying belief that they were learning English to communicate with the ‘native speaker’.

In this sense, evidence for Academic Coloniality in ELT in higher education in Algeria lie in these practices and biased attitudes which educators and learners believe in that continuously hold the Algerian speakers of English at a disadvantage and favour the ‘native speaker’ of the language.
9.2.2 How is Academic Coloniality (re)produced in this context?

Here, I divide the answer to RQ2 into two parts: Part one for the ways in which Academic Coloniality is produced, and part two for the ways that ensure its reproduction. As far as the production of Academic Coloniality is concerned, three main factors come into play: French coloniality, effects of media, and the interactions among and between teachers and students. French coloniality’s contribution to the production of Academic Coloniality took place through older teachers’ faithfulness to the traditional practices and beliefs they experienced at the French model university that Algeria adopted post-independence, as well as the belief in inferior local norms compared to Western ones that both educators and students held. This left them defenceless to the effects of Media that raised their interest in ‘native speaker’ English varieties and exposed them to stereotypical and idealistic representations about its speakers. Moreover, the classroom interactions between more established teaching staff, their younger counterparts and students also played a role in the production of Academic Coloniality at the Algerian university. Older educators who held more powerful positions and control over policy documents that dictated the teaching content assisted in the normalisation of biased views among their younger colleagues and students. In turn, students, through their intolerance of the use of ‘non-native’ varieties of English in the classroom also put additional pressure on their teachers to abide by ‘native speaker’ norms further advancing the normalisation of those in their classes.

In this fashion, the production of Academic Coloniality in higher education in Algeria takes place as a result of how students and their teachers are affected by French Coloniality, media, and the daily interactions between them that lead to the normalisation of otherwise problematic beliefs about the ‘native speaker’ of English and their varieties.

For the reproduction of Academic Coloniality, I divided them into two main categories: Academic Coloniality’s active maintenance, and its passive continuity. For the former, because older teachers had
better positions at departments of English and had control over policy documents, their resistance to change, attachment to out-of-date content and teaching approaches, isolation from opposing views, as well as comfort in the familiar played a role in the continuous maintenance of several aspects of Academic Coloniality in the teaching material and classrooms. On the other hand, the lack of productive lines of communication between educators and their students at the Algerian departments of English – not only from teachers to student but also in the other direction – allowed several other aspects of Academic Coloniality to passively continue in the context. As a result of this, teachers did not seem to be aware of several issues their students experienced in their learning. In fact, teachers and students seemed to have different views on classroom practices. Here, I argue that in the same way in which these issues and mismatched views were unnoticced by those who could address them, aspects of Academic Coloniality, too, continue within such contexts.

This way, the reproduction of Academic Coloniality in higher education in Algeria is the result of active practices that resist change and ensure the maintenance of the familiar, including aspects of Academic Coloniality; and the lack of formal chains of communication that lead these aspects to continuously be unrecognised.

**9.3 Contribution to Knowledge**

This study’s contribution to knowledge is three-fold: theoretical, methodological, and contextual. Theoretically, the study offers the concept of Academic Coloniality as a theoretical lens through which the legacies of colonialism within ELT can be studied. Over the years, a large body of literature attempted to investigate the long-lasting effects of colonialism on English language education and to address issues of Western knowledge’, methods’, and approaches’ domination in ELT (Kumaravadivelu 2016, p.82). These studies demonstrate how traces of Western Colonialism continue in ELT today through certain ideologies and practices within it. Ideologies such as native-speakerism (Holliday 2005, 2006, 2013, 2015), ‘Self’ and
‘Other’ Ideology (Pennycook 1998, Holliday 2005), ‘Standard English’ ideology (Tupas 2022), the belief in Western Culture superiority (Kumaravadivelu 2006, R’boul 2022a), and others were extensively studied and linked to colonialism. Despite this, these ideologies still prevail within ELT theory and praxis as illustrated in this study.

The findings of this study show how Algerian students and teachers in several Algerian universities reproduced colonial discourses and ideologies in their ELT practices. This research also expands the knowledge on the previous body of literature through taking it a step further by exploring aspects of coloniality within ELT contexts that were not traditionally directly linked to previous British or American colonialism. Through taking the concept of Academic Coloniality as a holistic lens to closely examine lingering systems of power within ELT, the study unravelled how certain aspects such as the lack of direct communication (e.g., the absence of institutionalised feedback on classroom practices) between the different parties involved in ELT and the marginalisation of certain voices (e.g., excluding input from students and younger teachers on decision making regarding policy and practice) may continue the power patterns in ELT which privilege certain (Western) ways of knowing, methodologies, and practices over (local) others. The premise of Academic Coloniality therefore is that understanding how colonial legacies are manifested and (re)produced within ELT requires context-specific and in-depth exploration of the complex and interconnected practices and ideologies of those involved in it that may not traditionally be linked to colonialism and its legacies.

Findings of this research do not only confirm some of the previous studies presented in the literature review chapter of this thesis, but they expand and go beyond them by providing an in-depth investigation of aspects of Academic Coloniality and how they operate in ELT in Algeria. Through the qualitative phase, concepts that are embedded within Academic Coloniality such as native-speakerism, the ‘Standard English’ ideology, the ‘Self’ and ‘Other’ ideology and others were thoroughly addressed and explored in a context where such research is particularly scarce (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.2). This enabled a holistic
conceptualisation of these concepts and revealed how certain factors that were not previously linked to the coloniality framework (e.g., overlooked feedback and mismatched views on practice) can contribute to the (re)production and manifestation of Academic Coloniality. As such, these findings can be transformed and operationalised within the local context, i.e., higher education in Algeria, through addressing and finding solutions to these factors as will be explored in the following section. When combined with a CDA approach, the concept proved particularly useful as is further explored below.

In order to understand how the practices and beliefs of people involved in ELT contribute to the production, manifestation, and reproduction of power patterns between the ‘native speakers’ of English and its learners, I combined the coloniality framework with CDA framework. Such combination provided a bird’s eye view by which data was interpreted and contextualised. CDA, as an analytical approach, is multidisciplinary as it goes beyond the analysis of texts and combines the analysis of the broader social and historical structures while dealing with issues of social inequalities and power imbalances (Van Dijk 1993, p. 253). Such multidisciplinary approach makes CDA a promising area for linkages between different theoretical and methodological approaches (Scollon 2002, p.1). In this research, the methodological collaboration between CDA and the (de)coloniality framework was a useful one. Drawing on CDA insights, the study highlights the ideological stances that are meant to preserve the status quo of the dominant group and continue a state of power imbalances and injustices in ELT, which can be traced back to the field’s colonial history. Furthermore, findings of this study align with CDA’s claim about hegemony in that often, dominated groups are unaware of the injustices they are subject to and do not possess the necessary knowledge to identify and resist them (Liu 2018, p.192). For instance, participants in this study embraced colonial ideologies of the ‘Self’ and ‘Other’ and native-speakerism. These findings can therefore be used to inform decolonial knowledges and approaches in ELT. This is because the essence of CDA is rooted in its quest to transform desk research findings into practices and measures for empowering the marginalised and amplifying their voices. As such, using CDA as a methodological tool in combination with
the (de)coloniality framework is a relatively innovative methodological attempt (see Heinrichs 2020) that can significantly contribute to the field of ELT.

The context where this study took place constitutes one of its major contributions. Given the socio-historical background of Algeria (a previous French colony where many languages for long have been existing in power struggle) and the rapid spread of English in the country, the context provided interesting insights into the uneven structures of power within ELT. Through the lens of Academic Coloniality, it was obvious that ELT in the country is fuelled by colonial discourses and power inequalities despite it never being affected by a previous Anglo-American colonialism. This was manifested in the belief in the supremacy of “Western Cultures” and their languages. This means that the legacies of colonialism in ELT are not confined in former Anglo-American colonies, but they extend to the global sphere (e.g., Liu 2018).

Such findings can be significant not only to the Algerian context but also other contexts with similar historical, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds. It is crucial, however, to investigate aspects of Academic Coloniality in ELT in reference to those historical, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds. This is because Academic Coloniality may be reproduced and may manifest differently in different contexts depending on these aspects. As such, understanding Academic Coloniality as context-specific allows for an in-depth exploration of its aspects. Furthermore, it helps generating context-sensitive remedies for pedagogical and by extension social problems.

### 9.4 Implications of the Study

Drawing on the above-mentioned contributions, this research has significant pedagogical and social implications. Given the status of English in today’s world, resisting the language and its spread is no longer an option nor should it be the aim. What should be resisted, however, is the colonial ideologies and practices embodied in ELT. One option to do so is the “decolonial option” (Mingolo & Escobar 2013) which is defined by Escobar (2010) as “a gradual epistemic decolonization, as a long-term process of re-
signification and re/construction towards words and knowledges otherwise” (p. 397). It happens first by identifying colonial discourses and ideologies then working towards delinking from Western epistemologies followed by the creation of a grammar of decoloniality (Mingolo 2010). The latter is defined as “a framework for strategic plans drawn by subalterns deriving from their own lived experiences and hence will vary from context to context” (Kumaravadivelu 2016, p.79). In other words, resistance should be context-specific and decolonising ELT can happen through recentring local and indigenous knowledges and developing methodologies and materials that recognise its specificities. Research is one way to do so because it enables “paying attention to the local exigencies of learning and teaching, identifying researchable questions, producing original knowledge, and subjecting it to further verification” (Kumaravadivelu 2016, p. 82), which is the aim of the current study.

First, through recentring Algerian students’ and teachers' ELT beliefs and reported practices, this study might have pedagogical implications and could be beneficial to all people involved in ELT in higher education in Algeria and other contexts. The study sheds light on the importance of listening to the voices of all parties involved in ELT, including less experienced teachers and students. It calls for moving away from the mindset that places power in the hands of senior staff and dismisses the voices of younger teachers and students. The miscommunication between students and teachers (manifested in the mismatched views on the role of learners and teachers) and between teachers among themselves (manifested in the mismatched view on the courses’ contents) might be a contributing factor to the continuation of colonial practices within the ELT classroom. Therefore, raising awareness towards such issues, through research like this one, and opening channels of communication between the different parties where the previously normalised matters are openly discussed and reflected on is one step towards addressing the different aspects of Academic Coloniality. One way of opening such channels is through different forms (written and spoken) of institutionalised feedback from students. Feedback on classroom interactions, courses’ content, and teachers’ practices does not only give voice to students,
actively involve them in the learning process, and put them at the centre of pedagogy, but would also help teachers identify their ‘blind spots’ (Zierer & Wisniewski 2019, p) and clarify some of the mismatched views.

Second, learning to collect and be receptive to feedback can have further significant implications on ELT pedagogy in Algeria as it might encourage both teachers and students to develop open and inclusive mindsets that will embrace change. Such change can bring about a shift from the current dominant colonial approach towards an alternative decolonial one. Raising teachers’ and students’ awareness about Academic Coloniality, empowering them to make their voices heard, and encouraging them to make changes can all contribute to the production of pedagogical knowledges and methodologies that are rooted in local epistemologies. These local knowledges and methodologies would enable teachers and students to critically engage with power structures and resist them. Encouraging people involved in ELT in higher education in Algeria to “develop the knowledge, skill and disposition necessary to become producers, not just consumers, of the pedagogical knowledge” (Kumaravadivelu, 2016, p. 81) can also be achieved through updating the current policy documents, i.e., Canevas. For instance, through the incorporation of courses and lectures about the different English varieties beyond British and American English. Teachers and students should also be made aware that these varieties are equal, and that ‘native speaker’ English is a mere social construct. Furthermore, courses and materials should also reflect the diversity and inclusivity of English and ELT through incorporating a range of inner, outer, and expanding circles, including the local culture (e.g., Matsuda & Friedrich 2011). Through such content, the dynamicity and flexibility of culture can be reflected, and learners can develop an understanding that using English does not necessarily contradict embracing their local culture.

Third, such pedagogical implications would have an impact on the wider social domain. Through taking steps towards decolonising ELT knowledge and methodologies, which are “necessary steps for imagining and building democratic, just, and non-imperial/colonial societies” (Mignolo 2009, p. 160), ELT classrooms
can become equitable, and socially just educational environments. This in turn will prepare citizens who are capable of active participation in a transforming society and world (Osman & Hornsby 2018). When English is taught to reflect its plurality and inclusivity, when learners are encouraged to go beyond pro-‘native’ ideals, and are taught that English is not the property of an idealised ‘native speaker’ and that mimicking them is not the only path of success (Schreiber 2019, Rice 2021), and when idealised monolingualism is replaced by an acknowledgment of plurilingualism and diversity (Phillipson 2017), learners will be provided with the necessary means to resist colonial normative practices in their social lives. In this case, such an approach to pedagogy, or critical pedagogy which is a learning and teaching approach that aims at challenging unequal power structures and deconstructing existing hierarchies to empower students to transform their individual and collective realities (Stommel 2014, Gray 2019, Rice 2021), might serve in both decolonising ELT and changing social realities. ELT, in this sense, will be transformed from a means to maintain coloniality to a means to disrupt it.

9.5 Limitations and Recommendations for Further Research

Despite the significant contributions that this research offers and the useful findings it yielded; it still has some limitations which opens doors for future research. One of its limitations is the lack of systematic observation due to COVID-19 interruptions. Observation would have provided interesting insights and various perspectives into teachers’ and learners’ classroom practices and interactions in action rather than reported ones. While interviews allowed me to collect rich and detailed information about ELT practices, it needs to be acknowledged that they still only captured reconstructions of these practices and not the actual ones. As such, observations could have provided first-hand data about classroom interactions and practices that are otherwise unattainable. For instance, it might have offered useful data on the teaching approach inside the classroom (e.g., teacher-centred or learner-centred approaches). Furthermore, observation could have resulted in the emergence of new aspects of Academic Coloniality that were not reported through the interviews. Nevertheless, in my research, I was committed to
capturing and centring participants’ voices (Strauss & Corbin 1998) through the interviews. In addition to that, given the scarcity of research about the colonial and unequal power structure within ELT in Algeria, interviews allowed me to deeply explore what people involved in it believe English is, how it should be taught, and what students should learn, to form an understanding of the manifestations and (re)production of Academic Coloniality in this context.

Another limitation of this research is related to the online survey. First, the use of closed-ended questions in the survey limited participants’ freedom to choose only from ready-made options, which at times might have been reflected in the high percentages of the “not sure” option. This option, which can also be considered a limitation of using the Likert scale questions, made it difficult to interpret some data. This in turn restricted the analysis from tapping into a deeper level to understand participants’ responses. Given the large number of participants, however, it was necessary to develop surveys that take less time to answer, hence, the closed-ended questions. Furthermore, due to the nature of this research, which is sequential exploratory research, the aim of the survey was to verify the qualitative data, it was therefore necessary to stay consistent with the findings of the former phase. This also explains the wordings of the questions in the survey. In translating the findings from the qualitative themes into the quantitative variables, my main objective was creating variables that are not only consistent with the qualitative findings, but also that reflect the original themes (Morgan 2015). I did this through staying faithful to the words and expressions my participants used during the interviews. I am aware, however, that this, in some instances, resulted in inconclusive results. These inconclusive results could have potentially also been remedied through increasing the number of survey participants and universities. In increasing the scope of sampling, more older teachers could have been included. This was another limitation for using online surveys, as more younger teachers responded. This can be put down to the fact that older teachers in this context often did not prefer to use ICT. All of this can prompt directions for further research.
The limitations presented above can give room to the original contribution of this research, i.e., Academic Coloniality to develop. As the concept of Academic Coloniality proved useful in identifying and highlighting aspects of coloniality within ELT in a context without previous Anglo-American colonial history, it can be taken up and further explored in other similar contexts. One way to do so is using observation, which can unravel aspects of Academic Coloniality that were not explored in this research. Another way would also be through expanding the scope of the surveys to include larger participant numbers and to diversify the type of questions included in the survey (e.g., including open-ended questions). Other aspects of Academic Coloniality that can be further explored in the context of Algeria is the effects of the lack of institutionalised feedback on the (re)production of Academic Coloniality. Although, this research was useful in identifying this aspect as potentially contributing to the maintenance of some problematic practices within ELT in higher education in Algeria, it was not possible to explore the reasons behind the lack of it. Another recommendation is related to resistance to change among older teachers. As this emerged as a factor for Academic Coloniality’s reproduction, reasons for why older teachers were more resistant to change than their younger counterparts in Algeria remain unclear. The exploration of such reasons was beyond the scope of this project; however, this gives an interesting area for development for future research. This can be explored through in-depth interviews and the use of a format of survey that is accessible to older teachers. Finally, further research can also target the power imbalances between younger and older teachers when it comes to making changes to the policy documents and the extent to which this affect courses’ content. Considering that participants in the surveys were mostly younger teachers, it might be useful to further explore the issue while enabling the voices of both teacher groups to be heard.

9.6 Final Remarks

The spread of the English language that accompanied globalisation attracted the attention of several studies that sought to address issues of ideology, coloniality, discourse, language, and power in the latter
few decades. However, many of these issues persist as this study and many others across similar and different contexts discovered. Biases towards the ‘native speaker’ and inner circle English varieties persevere across comparable and distant educational contexts. The research I did throughout this thesis allowed me the opportunity to learn and raised my awareness to many of the questionable practices and beliefs about ELT. I came all the way from a contributor to Academic Coloniality in Algeria, to writing my PhD thesis about it, to publishing a paper that addresses its (re)production and manifestations.

My PhD journey was as rewarding as it was challenging. I researched a plethora of scholarly works and learned a great deal about my research area, but I also felt lost at times and only managed thanks to guidance and support from my supervisors. I taught with brilliant lecturers across many subjects and watched my students succeed and graduate, but I also struggled to adapt with the uncertainties brought by the unprecedented circumstances of COVID-19. I encountered many new perspectives about things I thought I understood about my participants and tried to represent their voices the best I could, but I also struggled to find motivation and missed deadlines at times. Through this journey, I did not just learn how to write a thesis, or how to teach effectively, or how to publish; I learned how to think.

Finally, I hope that, through this thesis and published work, I could raise awareness of Algerian and international speakers of English to the underlying issues of Academic Coloniality, and contribute to a future beyond it.
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Appendix 1: Sample from the Canevas

Intitulé du Master : Linguistique et langues appliquées
Semestre : 1 et 2
Intitulé de l'UE : UEF1 English Language
Intitulé de la matière : English Phonetics and Phonology
Crédits : 2
Coefficient : 1

Objectifs de l'enseignement (Décrire ce que l'étudiant est censé avoir acquis comme compétences après le succès à cette matière – maximum 3 lignes).
Achieving native-like proficiency, i.e. listening to and understanding authentic English and speaking with a pronunciation that reflects the phonetic and phonological characteristics of English.

Connaissances préalables recommandées (descriptif succinct des connaissances requises pour pouvoir suivre cet enseignement – Maximum 2 lignes).
Course in oral expression + phonetics and phonology at the undergraduate level.

Contenu de la matière :
- Speech production and speech perception (the short and long vowel system, the diphthong system, consonant and consonant clusters, assimilation, elision, stress, rhythm, weak forms, intonation)
- Distinctive feature theory
- Phonological rules
- Spoken language production

Mode d'évaluation : ...
Examen

Références (Livres et polycopiés, sites internet, etc).
Additional references will be given during the course.
Intitulé du Master : Didactique des Langues Étrangères
Semestre : 1 et 2
Intitulé de l’UE : Unité de Découverte
Intitulé de la matière : Language and Culture
Crédits : 1
Coefficient : 1

Objectifs de l’enseignement (Décrire ce que l’étudiant est censé avoir acquis comme compétences après le succès à cette matière – maximum 3 lignes).

Identify the relationship between culture and language and explain how cultural aspects (religious, social, political...) should be taught through different types of texts.

Connaissances préalables recommandées (descriptif succinct des connaissances requises pour pouvoir suivre cet enseignement – Maximum 2 lignes).

Course in Linguistics (Licence)

Contenu de la matière (indiquer obligatoirement le contenu détaillé du programme en présentiel et du travail personnel)

— Culture in foreign language teaching
— Intercultural communication
— Texts and corpus analysis

Mode d’évaluation : Contrôle continu, examen, etc...(La pondération est laissée à l’appréciation de l’équipe de formation)

Contrôle continu.

Références   (Livres et polycopiés, sites internet, etc).
Appendix 2: Sample from the Curriculum Programme

1 - Semestre 1 :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unité d’Enseignement</th>
<th>V.H. hebdomadaire</th>
<th>Autres</th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>Crédits</th>
<th>Mode d'évaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V.H.S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE Fondamentales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEF1 Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Literature</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>5h5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Literature</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>5h5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Literature</td>
<td>22h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>27h30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEF2 Civilisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Civilisation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>5h5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Civilisation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>5h5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE Méthodologie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methodology</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>5h5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT and Research</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>5h5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1h</td>
<td></td>
<td>10h</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE Découverte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>22h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2h30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Anthropology and Ethnology</td>
<td>22h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2h30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unité Transversale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Législation</td>
<td>22h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2h30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Semestre 1</td>
<td>375h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 - Semestre 2 :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unité d’Enseignement</th>
<th>V.H. hebdomadaire</th>
<th>Autres</th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>Crédits</th>
<th>Mode d’évaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V.H.S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE Fondamentales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEF1 Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Literature</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>5h5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Literature</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>5h5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Literature</td>
<td>22h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>27h30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEF2 Civilisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Civilisation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>5h5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Civilisation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>5h5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE Méthodologie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methodology</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>5h5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT and Research</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td>5h5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Analysis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1h</td>
<td></td>
<td>15h</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE Découverte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>22h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2h30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopedagogy</td>
<td>22h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2h30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unité Transversale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship (Career Management)</td>
<td>22h30</td>
<td>1h30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2h30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Semestre 2</td>
<td>375h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Sample from the Teaching Materials

Department of Letters and English Language

British Literature

Third Year

The twentieth Century

Period Introduction Overview

1914-18: World War I
1922: James Joyce's *Ulysses*; T. S. Eliot's *The Waste Land*
1929: Stock market crash; Great Depression begins
1939-45: World War II
1947: India and Pakistan become independent nations
1953: Premiere of Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*
1957—62: Ghana, Nigeria, Uganda, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago become independent nations
1958: Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*

- The Modern period, beginning around the turn of the twentieth century, has its roots in the late Victorian transition from widespread belief in art as a vehicle for pleasure and instruction towards a belief (at least on the part of artists) in "art for art's sake."
- The sense of alienation—i.e., the distance between the serious artist and a general public—that marked the early twentieth century grew out of this sense of art for art's sake; or, put another way, a sense of art was no longer beholden to some general, public purpose.
- Mass literacy became a reality towards the end of 1800s, in large part owing to passage of the Education Act of 1870 that mandated compulsory elementary schooling.
- Universal education, even if just in basic reading and writing, produced a general reading public that in turn generated demand for popular fiction.
- Segmentation of the reading public: A widening gulf emerged between so-called serious (or highbrow) art and popular (or lowbrow) art.
- Already by the last decades of the Victorian period (the 1880s and 1890s) authors were turning away from the optimism and triumphalism that had marked the early- and mid-Victorian periods.
- Many authors were satirizing, even attacking, middle-class Victorian values and were reflecting a greater degree of skepticism in their work, especially of the long-held Victorian belief in national exceptionalism—i.e., that England was special in history and thus had a duty to spread its version of civilization across the globe.
- At the dawn of the twentieth century, many people (artists included) had lost their faith in institutional, cultural, or social foundations that could provide stability in the world. W. B. Yeats would express this sense of dissolution and instability most definitively in his 1919 poem, "The Second Coming": "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold"
Appendix 4: Sample from the List of Teachers and their Information

Université
Faculté des lettres et des langues
Département des lettres et langue anglaise

L1 / 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Expression/4h30</th>
<th>Oral Expression/3h00</th>
<th>Grammar/3h00</th>
<th>Linguistics/1h30</th>
<th>Phonetics/1h30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>Mrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Culture/1h30</td>
<td>Literary Texts/1h30</td>
<td>Methodology/3h00</td>
<td>Human &amp; Social Sciences/1h30</td>
<td>Foreign Language/1h30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>PART-TIME TEACHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L2 / 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Expression/4h30</th>
<th>Oral Expression/3h00</th>
<th>Grammar/3h00</th>
<th>Linguistics/1h30</th>
<th>Phonetics/1h30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Pr.</td>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>???</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Culture/1h30</td>
<td>Literary Texts/1h30</td>
<td>Methodology/3h00</td>
<td>Foreign Language/1h30</td>
<td>Inf. &amp; Com. Tech./1h30/S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>PART-TIME TEACHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
<td>TECH. FRIENDLY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dernière MAJ faite le 09/10/2022
Appendix 5: Participants’ Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

Academic Coloniality in English Language Teaching in Algeria

Researcher: Walid Daffri

Email: wd400@bath.ac.uk

Supervisor: Dr Trevor Grimshaw

Email: T.Grimshaw@bath.ac.uk

Phone: +44 1225 385876

Please initial box if you agree with the statement

1. I have been provided with information explaining what participation in this project involves. ☐
2. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss this project. ☐
3. I have received satisfactory answers to all questions I have asked. ☐
4. I have received enough information about the project to make a decision about my participation. ☐
5. I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent to participate in the project at any time without having to give a reason for withdrawing. ☐
6. I understand that I am free to withdraw my data within two weeks of my participation. ☐
7. I understand the nature and purpose of the procedures involved in this project. These have been communicated to me on the information sheet accompanying this form. ☐

303
8. I understand and acknowledge that the investigation is designed to promote scientific knowledge and that the University of Bath will use the data I provide only for the purpose(s) set out in the information sheet.

9. I understand the data I provide will be treated as confidential, and that on completion of the project my name or other identifying information will not be disclosed in any presentation or publication of the research.

10. I understand that my consent to use the data I provide is conditional upon the University complying with its duties and obligations under the Data Protection Act.

11. I hereby fully and freely consent to my participation in this project.

Participant’s signature: ________________________________ Date: ________________

Participant name in BLOCK Letters: ________________________________

Researcher’s signature: ________________________________ Date: ________________

Researcher name in BLOCK Letters: ________________________________

If you have any concerns or complaints related to your participation in this project please direct them to the Department Research Ethics Officer, Dr Lizzie Milligan on:

Email: E.M.A.Milligan@bath.ac.uk

Phone: +44 1225 385525
Appendix 6: Gatekeeper’s Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

Academic Coloniality in English Language Teaching in Algeria

Researcher: Walid Daffri

Email: wd400@bath.ac.uk

Supervisor: Dr Trevor Grimshaw

Email: T.Grimshaw@bath.ac.uk

Phone: +44 1225 385876

Please initial box if you agree with the statement

12. I have been provided with information explaining what participation in this project involves. ☐

13. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss this project. ☐

14. I have received satisfactory answers to all questions I have asked. ☐

15. I have received enough information about the project to make a decision about my participation. ☐

16. I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent to participate in the project at any time without having to give a reason for withdrawing. ☐

17. I understand that I am free to withdraw my data within two weeks of my participation. ☐

18. I understand the nature and purpose of the procedures involved in this project. These have been communicated to me on the information sheet accompanying this form. ☐
19. I understand and acknowledge that the investigation is designed to promote scientific knowledge and that the University of Bath will use the data I provide only for the purpose(s) set out in the information sheet.

20. I understand the data I provide will be treated as confidential, and that on completion of the project my name or other identifying information will not be disclosed in any presentation or publication of the research.

21. I understand that my consent to use the data I provide is conditional upon the University complying with its duties and obligations under the Data Protection Act.

22. I hereby fully and freely consent to my participation in this project.

Gatekeeper’s signature: ____________________________ Date: __________________

Gatekeeper name in BLOCK Letters: ____________________________

Researcher’s signature: ____________________________ Date: __________________

Researcher name in BLOCK Letters: ____________________________

If you have any concerns or complaints related to your participation in this project please direct them to the Department Research Ethics Officer, Dr Lizzie Milligan on:

Email: E.M.A.Milligan@bath.ac.uk

Phone: +44 1225 385525
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Academic Coloniality in English Language Teaching in Algeria

Name of Researcher: Walid Daffri

Contact details of Researcher:

Email: wd400@bath.ac.uk

Name of Supervisor: Dr Trevor Grimshaw

Contact details of Supervisor:

Email: edstg@bath.ac.uk
Phone: +44 1225 385876

This information sheet forms part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. Please read this information sheet carefully and ask one of the researchers named above if you are not clear about any details of the project.

1. **What is the purpose of the project?**
In my research, I focus on English language teaching (ELT) in higher education in Algeria. In this research I seek to investigate issues around ELT from the point of view of students and teachers of English themselves. Findings of my study are expected to help understand more and potentially improve the field of English language learning in the country. The data and information that you provide will lay a foundation for the successful operation of this research. Thus, I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study.

2. Why have you been selected to take part? [or Who can be a participant?]

As the focus of the study is English Language Teaching in Algeria, you, as an Algerian student/teacher of English at this university could be of great help if you choose to participate in the study.

3. Do you have to take part?

It is completely up to you to decide if you would like to participate. Before you decide to take part, I will describe the project and go through this information sheet with you. If you agree to take part, I will then ask you to sign a consent form. However, if at any time you decide you no longer wish to take part in the project, you are free to withdraw without giving a reason.

4. What will you be asked to do?

Participants in this study will have interviews with the researcher in order to get deep understanding of their attitudes towards how English is being taught in their departments and their awareness to issues surrounding that.

Participants are free to choose not to be part of this study without providing any justification, and there are no side effects, penalties or disadvantages for not participating.

Participants in the interviews will be asked about their attitudes towards English language teaching in general, about it in their department and about any suggestions to improve that.

To ensure accuracy and faithfulness in the representation of your responses, interviews will be audio recorded with your permission.

The interviews will last less than 1 hour and will be audio-recorded with the consent of the participants. The data collected will not include any names or personal details of the participants or the university where data is collected. I will strictly abide by the international practice in relation to data collection and management, particularly the ethics on research conduct and management of University of Bath, take strict security measures to protect the data you supply,
and guarantee that your participation in this study will not bring about any side effect on any participant.

6. What are the possible benefits of taking part?

There are no obvious direct benefits of taking part in the project. However, the information that will be collected from you will be significant for a more equitable English Language Teaching practice in higher education in Algeria. They will help achieve an understanding of ELT and issues surrounding it within these settings. Results are also expected to help curriculum designers, teachers and learners develop awareness towards these issues.

7. What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?

There are no obvious disadvantages to you taking part in this study. If you are asked a question that you do not want to answer for any reason you can chose not to answer.

8. Will your participation involve any discomfort or embarrassment?

You are not expected that you feel any discomfort or embarrassment if you take part in this study. If, however, you do feel uncomfortable or appear upset at any time, the researcher will stop the interview straight away and may direct you to approach an appropriate support service.

9. Who will have access to the information that I provide?

Only the researcher and his supervisors will have access to the information that you provide. All records will be treated as confidential.

10. What will happen to the data collected and results of the project?

All data collected during the project including personal, identifiable data will be treated as confidential and kept on a password protected file on the University of Bath’s secure server (X drive). This storage of data will be done in accordance with GDPR. Recorded data will not be kept
for any longer than 5 years. Your name or other identifying information will not be disclosed in any presentation or publication of the research.

After the project has finished, I will also provide you with a summary of the project results if you would like that. This summary will not include any identifiable information and will show the overall findings of the project.

11. Who has reviewed the project?
This project has been given a favourable opinion by the University of Bath, Social Science Research Ethics Committee (SSREC).

12. How can you withdraw from the project?
If you wish to stop participating before completing all parts of the project, you can inform the researcher in person, by mail or telephone. You can withdraw from the project without providing reasons for doing so and without consequences.

After two weeks of participation, it may not be possible for participants to withdraw their individual participation as the data will be anonymised by then and will not be identifiable individually.

13. What happens if there is a problem?
If you have a concern about any aspect of the project, you should ask to speak to the researchers who will do their best to answer any questions. If they are unable to resolve your concern, or you wish to make a complaint regarding the project, please contact the Chair of SSREC at ssrec@bath.ac.uk

14. If you require further information who should you contact and how?
Thank you for expressing an interest in participating in this project. Please do not hesitate to get in touch with us if you would like some more information.

15. Privacy statement
I will strictly abide by the international practice in relation to data collection and management, particularly the Privacy notice for Research Participants and the ethics on research conduct and management of University of Bath, take strict security measures to protect the data you supply, and guarantee that your participation in this study will not bring about any side effect on any participant.
Name of Researcher: Walid Daffri

Email: wd400@bath.ac.uk

Name of Supervisor: Dr Trevor Grimshaw

Contact details of Supervisor:

Email: edstg@bath.ac.uk

Phone: +44 1225 385876
Appendix 8: Gatekeeper Information Sheet

GATEKEEPER INFORMATION SHEET

Academic Coloniality in English Language Teaching in Algeria

Name of Researcher: Walid Daffri

Contact details of Researcher:

Email: wd400@bath.ac.uk

Name of Supervisor: Dr Trevor Grimshaw

Contact details of Supervisor:

This information sheet forms part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. Please read this information sheet carefully and ask one of the researchers named above if you are not clear about any details of the project.

5. What is the purpose of the project?

In my research, I focus on English language teaching in higher education in Algeria and ideologies surrounding ELT in this context. Findings of my study are expected to help understand more and potentially improve the field of language learning in the country. The data and information I want to collect from your faculty/department will lay a foundation for the successful operation of this research. As cleared below, this will be through undertaking interviews with willing participants
in the department. Thus, I will be very thankful if you grant me access for data collection at your faculty/department.

6. **What will you be asked to do?**

By signing this consent form, you will grant the researcher access to undertake data collection in your faculty/department. That is, you are giving permission to the researcher to undertake audio-recorded interviews with willing students and teachers of English at the faculty of Arts and Foreign Languages, Department of English.

For confidentiality reasons, neither your name nor the institutions’ will be mentioned in any part of this study.

If you have any questions about this information sheet, please, contact the researcher on the details below.

If you change your mind, you have the right to withdraw your consent with or without any justification.

By the end of the analysis, you will receive a brief summary of the results of the study if you wish to receive it. In case you have any queries or complains, please, don’t hesitate to contact the researcher on the details below.

8. **What are the possible benefits of taking part?**

There are no obvious direct benefits of taking part in the project. However, the information that will be collected from the participants will be significant for a more equitable English Language Teaching practice in higher education in Algeria. They will help achieve an understanding of ELT and issues surrounding it within these settings. Results are also expected to help curriculum designers, teachers and learners develop awareness towards these issues.

9. **What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?**

There are no obvious disadvantages to taking part in this project, and participants are free to choose not to answer questions they think may cause them issues.

10. **Will your participation involve any discomfort or embarrassment?**
Participants in this study are not expected to feel any discomfort or embarrassment if they take part in the project, and they are free to stop the interview straight away and will be directed to the appropriate support service if they feel uncomfortable or upset.

11. Who will have access to the information that you provide?

Only the researcher and his supervisors will have access to the information provided. All records will be treated as confidential.

12. What will happen to the data collected and results of the project?

To protect the participants’ identities, neither students nor teachers will be required to mention their names during the interviews. Their names will only be kept (separately from the keycode) for two weeks after the interviews in case any of them wants to withdraw their individual contribution. During this period, raw data will be stored on my password-protected computer and backed up to the University of Bath X drive as soon as possible; nobody but the researcher and supervisors will have access to the raw data. After that, data will be anonymized, and it will no longer be possible for them to withdraw their participation individually. The name of the institution will also not be mentioned for the same reason. The anonymised data collected will be saved in encrypted files on my password-protected computer and backed up to University of Bath X drive as soon as possible.

11. Who has reviewed the project?

This project has been given a favourable opinion by the University of Bath, Social Science Research Ethics Committee (SSREC).

12. How can you withdraw from the project?

If participants wish to stop participating before completing all parts of the project, they can inform the researcher in person, by mail or telephone. They can withdraw from the project without providing reasons for doing so and without consequences.

After two weeks of their participation, it may not be possible for participants to withdraw their individual participation as the data will be anonymised by then and will not be identifiable individually.

13. What happens if there is a problem?
If you have a concern about any aspect of the project, you should ask to speak to the researchers who will do their best to answer any questions. If they are unable to resolve your concern, or you wish to make a complaint regarding the project, please contact the Chair of SSREC at ssrec@bath.ac.uk

14. If I require further information who should I contact and how?

Thank you for expressing an interest in participating in this project. Please do not hesitate to get in touch with us if you would like some more information.

15. Privacy statement

I will strictly abide by the international practice in relation to data collection and management, particularly the Privacy notice for Research Participants and the ethics on research conduct and management of University of Bath, take strict security measures to protect the data you supply, and guarantee that your participation in this study will not bring about any side effect on any participant.

Name of Researcher: Walid Daffri
Contact details of Researcher:

Email: wd400@bath.ac.uk

Name of Supervisor: Dr Trevor Grimshaw
Contact details of Supervisor:

Email: edstg@bath.ac.uk
Phone: +44 1225 385876
Appendix 9: Email for Questionnaire’s Participants
Recruitment

Dear..., 

I hope you are keeping well.

My name is Walid Daffri, a PhD student at University of Bath, I got your email from []. He told me you might be able to help me out recruit respondent teachers and students for my questionnaires. I hope it is okay emailing you because what worked best so far was when I email a laureate who is back at home to forward the links to their students/colleagues.

My target population includes university teachers of English and students of English at university of all levels and majors, so any teachers or students that you know can be included (as long as they are current teachers/students).

I am sending you two links, one for teachers' questionnaire, and another for students' one. I would be ever so grateful if you could forward the teachers questionnaire to your colleagues and would really appreciate it if you could forward the link to the students' questionnaires to any of your students and ask them to do the same. I am also emailing other teachers at your university, so I apologise for any potential cross-emailing.

I would really appreciate it if you were able to help.

The questionnaires take less than 15 minutes each, so hopefully, they do not feel like a burden.

Teachers Questionnaire: https://bathreg.onlinesurveys.ac.uk/questionnaire-for-teachers
Students Questionnaire: https://bathreg.onlinesurveys.ac.uk/questionnaire-for-students

Please, do not hesitate to get in touch with me if you have any queries about the project, the questionnaires or anything else.

I really appreciate your time. Thank you!
Best wishes,
Walid
Appendix 10: Students’ Interview Guide

1- Do you think there has been any significant changes/developments concerning English over the last few years?

2- Do you think the number of varieties of English spoken around the world will grow? Why/Why not?

3- Is there a particular variety or varieties that you think should be the point of reference in ELT in Algeria? Please explain?
   - What about the other varieties? Do you think they are important and relevant to ELT and pedagogical practices in Algeria?
   - Yes- Are they incorporated in your Learning?
   - No- what’s your justification?

4- Do you think culture is relevant to ELT and pedagogical practices Algeria?
   - Yes – in what way?
   - No – why?

5- Do you expect to learn about culture in your language courses? which one(s)?

6- Do you think the cultural background of the teacher himself/herself is relevant to their ELT and pedagogical practices? How?

7- Do you feel that you have freedom/ independence in your studies to adopt and learn about a variety or culture of English? Why/Why not?

8- Do you have any views about the content of your lectures in relation to what we talked about?

9- Do you feel you are able to influence the content of your lecture or your teachers when making suggestions to them? What do you think is the reason?

10- What would you change within your learning in relation to English varieties, culture and curriculum design?
Appendix 11: Teachers’ Interview Guide

1. Do you think there has been any significant changes/developments in English over the last few years?

2. Do you think the number of varieties of English spoken around the world will grow? Why/Why not?

3. Is there a particular variety or varieties that you think should be the point of reference in ELT in Algeria? Please explain?
   - What about the other varieties? Do you think they are important/relevant to your ELT and pedagogical practices in Algeria?
   - Yes- how do you incorporate those varieties in your practice?
   - No- what’s your justification?

4. Do you think culture is relevant to your ELT and pedagogical practices Algeria?
   - Yes – in what way?
   - No – why?

5. Do you expect your students to learn about culture in your language courses? which one(s)?

6. Do you think the cultural background of the teacher himself/herself is relevant to their ELT and pedagogical practices? How?

7. Do you feel that you have freedom/ independence when planning the content of the curriculum? Why/Why not?

8. Do you have any views about the CANEVAS sent to you from the MHE?

9. Do you feel you are able to influence the CANEVAS?

10. What would you change within your practice in relation to English varieties, culture and curriculum designing in your ELT practices?
Appendix 12: Students’ Questionnaire

Name of Researcher: Walid Daffri
Contact details of Researcher:
Email: wd400@bath.ac.uk
Phone:
Name of Supervisor: Dr Trevor Grimshaw
Contact details of Supervisor:
Email: edstg@bath.ac.uk
Phone:

I am conducting this study to investigate issues around English language teaching from the point of view of students and teachers of English in Algeria. Findings of my study are expected to help understand more and potentially improve the field of English language teaching and learning in the country. The data and information that you provide will lay a foundation for the successful operation of this research. Thus, I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study. These forms are completely anonymous, you will not be asked to provide any personal information that could identify you. This project has been given a favourable opinion by the University of Bath, Social Science Research Ethics Committee (SSREC).

If you have any questions about the study, please, do not hesitate to get in touch with me or my supervisor on the contact details above.

I really appreciate your input!

1) I fully and freely consent to my participation in this project

Item 01: I believe that British and/or American universities are better than Algerian ones.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 02: I became interested in English because my favourite TV shows/ Series/ films/ Social Media platforms/ Video Games / Podcasts... etc are in English.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 03:** American culture is more influential in our society because of TV shows/ Series/ films Social Media platforms/ Video Games / Podcasts... etc.
  Strongly disagree
  Disagree
  Not sure
  Agree
  Strongly Agree

**Item 04:** It is necessary to learn the culture of English to be able to speak it correctly.
  Strongly disagree
  Disagree
  Not sure
  Agree
  Strongly Agree

**Item 05:** The culture of the native speaker of English is completely different than that of the Algerian speaker of English.
  Strongly disagree
  Disagree
  Not sure
  Agree
  Strongly Agree

**Item 07:** I think students are interested in English more than French because of media.
  Strongly disagree
  Disagree
  Not sure
  Agree
  Strongly Agree
Item 08: Most of what I know about the native speaker of English comes from films, TV, series, podcasts, social media platforms... etc.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 10: Films, TV shows, series, podcasts, social media platforms... etc are the only contact I have with English outside the classroom.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 11: Learning English teaches me about the people I am going to face when I go to Britain or America.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 12: Native speakers of English are completely different than Algerian speakers of English.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 14: Students interact more with the American society, not the British one, because of media.

Strongly disagree
Item 15: The content of the curriculum currently being taught should be changed.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 16: If you want to speak English, it’s better to speak British or American rather than go and use another accent.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 18: In Britain and America, they have many interesting cultural aspects that we do not have.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 19: In my opinion, learners of English should choose to speak either British English or American English.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Item 20: I am happy with the content of my lessons.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 21: I am affected more by American English because of movies and TV series I watch.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 22: Some teachers correct students in a rude way.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 23: I think that British and/or American lifestyles are attractive.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 24: I think we are studying too much past events, not actual culture.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 25: Some of my teachers do not accept any suggestions from students.
Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 26: I can only speak English 100% correctly if I am aware of its cultural aspects.
Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 27: Our teachers allow us to be leaders and decision-makers in our own learning.
Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 28: My teachers rarely asked me to provide written feedback about my studies.
Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 29: I learned a lot about the American and British lifestyles from media.
Strongly disagree
Disagree
Item 31: I think that we are being taught very old theories that do not matter anymore.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 32: My teachers encourage me to speak British English.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 33: Every country has its own culture, so when you adopt the language, you get the culture with it.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 34: I think the content of the courses I am learning is out-of-date.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 35: I only work hard during exams.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 36:** I often provide feedback to my teachers about my learning whenever they ask me.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 37:** Nobody from my university ever asked me to provide formal feedback about my experiences as a student.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 41:** In my opinion, learning English in Britain or America is better than learning it in Algeria.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 43:** My teachers prefer British English over American English.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree
Item 45: My teachers expect me to speak British English.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Item 46: Compared to Algerian Culture, Western culture is cooler.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Item 47: It upsets me when my teachers do not speak native speaker English in class.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Item 48: I feel that if I wanted to get good grades, I should learn everything my teachers tell me.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Item 49: English language belongs to the native speaker.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
**Item 50:** I am learning English because I want to travel/work in America or Britain.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 51:** I think that learning English from the native speaker is the ideal situation.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 53:** I avoid making suggestions in the classroom because of my teachers’ reactions.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 54:** I would prefer it if my teachers spoke either British or American English in class.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 57:** Native speaker English should be the target variety for learning English.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 58:** The English language belongs to the English culture.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 59:** I feel that my learning is not about education, but about getting the mark.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 60:** In my opinion, teachers should not waste time talking about non-native varieties of English (other than American and British English).

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 62:** In our classes, I think that teachers present information and students just passively receive knowledge.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 63:** When speaking English, I am borrowing the native speaker’s language.
Item 64: I think teachers should correct students based on either British or American English.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 65: I follow my teachers’ instruction because I have to get the required mark to pass.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 66: English cannot be separated from its culture.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 67: I think students should try to speak as near native speaker accent as possible.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree
**Item 69:** My teachers follow a teacher-centred approach.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Item 70:** My teachers regularly collect feedback from us about our learning.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Item 71:** My university/department systematically collect feedback from students about our learning experience.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Item 72:** Learning English brings me closer to my dream of living in America or Britain.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Item 73:** I think my teachers focus more on preparing us for tests and exams and less on exploring new concepts.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 74:** British English is
- Academic
- The original one
- More desirable
- Correct
- More elegant
- More flexible
- Of higher status

**Item 75:** What year of study are you in
- 1\textsuperscript{st} year (undergraduate)
- 2\textsuperscript{nd} year (undergraduate)
- 3\textsuperscript{rd} year (undergraduate)
- 1\textsuperscript{st} year (postgraduate)
- 2\textsuperscript{nd} year (postgraduate)

**Item 76:** Where do you go to university? (Name of university or Wilaya)

**Item 77:** American English is
- Academic
- The original one
- More desirable
- Correct
- More elegant
- More flexible
- Of higher status

**Item 78:** What is your gender?
- Male
- Female

**Item 79:** How old are you? (age)
Appendix 13: Teachers’ Questionnaire

Name of Researcher: Walid Daffri
Contact details of Researcher:
Email: wd400@bath.ac.uk
Phone: [redacted]

Name of Supervisor: Dr Trevor Grimshaw
Contact details of Supervisor:
Email: edstg@bath.ac.uk
Phone: [redacted]

I am conducting this study to investigate issues around English language teaching from the point of view of students and teachers of English in Algeria. Findings of my study are expected to help understand more and potentially improve the field of English language teaching and learning in the country. The data and information that you provide will lay a foundation for the successful operation of this research. Thus, I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study. These forms are completely anonymous, you will not be asked to provide any personal information that could identify you. This project has been given a favourable opinion by the University of Bath, Social Science Research Ethics Committee (SSREC).

If you have any questions about the study, please, do not hesitate to get in touch with me or my supervisor on the contact details above.

I really appreciate your input!

1) I fully and freely consent to my participation in this project

☐

Item 02: I became interested in English because my favourite TV shows/ Series/ films/ Social Media platforms/ Video Games / Podcasts... etc are in English.

   Strongly disagree
   Disagree
   Not sure
   Agree
   Strongly Agree

Item 03: American culture is more influential in our society because of TV shows/ Series/ films Social Media platforms/ Video Games / Podcasts... etc.
Item 04: It is necessary to learn the culture of English to be able to speak it correctly.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 05: The culture of the native speaker of English is completely different than that of the Algerian speaker of English.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 07: I think students are interested in English more than French because of media.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 08: Most of what I know about the native speaker of English comes from films, TV, series, podcasts, social media platforms... etc.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Item 09: I think some of the content of the courses I am teaching is out-of-date.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 10: Films, TV shows, series, podcasts, social media platforms... etc are the only contact I have with English outside the classroom.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 13: When teaching English in Algeria, we are teaching a language that is not ours.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 15: The Algerian lifestyle is totally different than the lifestyle of the native speaker of English.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 16: The content of the curriculum currently being taught should be changed.

Strongly disagree
Item 18: If you want to speak English, it’s better to speak British or American rather than go and use another accent.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 20: In Britain and America, they have many interesting cultural aspects that we do not have.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 21: In my opinion, learners of English should choose to speak either British English or American English.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 22: I am happy with the content of my lessons.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 23:** I am affected more by American English because of movies and TV series I watch.

  Strongly disagree
  Disagree
  Not sure
  Agree
  Strongly Agree

**Item 25:** I think that students find British and/or American lifestyles attractive.

  Strongly disagree
  Disagree
  Not sure
  Agree
  Strongly Agree

**Item 26:** I think we are teaching too much past events, not actual culture.

  Strongly disagree
  Disagree
  Not sure
  Agree
  Strongly Agree

**Item 28:** Learners can only speak English 100% correctly if they are aware of its cultural aspects.

  Strongly disagree
  Disagree
  Not sure
  Agree
  Strongly Agree

**Item 29:** I allow students to be leaders and decision-makers in their own learning.

  Strongly disagree
  Disagree
  Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 30:** I rarely ask students to provide written feedback about their studies.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 31:** I learned a lot about the American and British lifestyles from media.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 33:** I think that we are teaching very old theories that do not matter anymore.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 34:** I encourage my students to speak British English.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 35:** Every country has its own culture, so when you adopt the language, you get the culture with it.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Item 37: I feel that my students only work hard during exams.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 38: Students often provide feedback to teachers about their learning whenever we ask them.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 39: Nobody from the university ever asks students to provide formal feedback about their experiences.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 40: I was informally told to follow British and/or American English-speaking norms in my teaching.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 42: I encourage my students to speak American English.
Item 43: In my opinion, learning English in Britain or America is better than learning it in Algeria.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 45: I prefer British English over American English as a learning target for my students.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 47: I expect my students to learn British English.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 48: Compared to Algerian culture, Western culture is cooler.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree
Item 49: It upsets me when my students do not speak native speaker English in class.

   Strongly disagree
   Disagree
   Not sure
   Agree
   Strongly Agree

Item 50: If students want to get good grades, they should learn everything teachers tell them.

   Strongly disagree
   Disagree
   Not sure
   Agree
   Strongly Agree

Item 51: English language belongs to its native speaker.

   Strongly disagree
   Disagree
   Not sure
   Agree
   Strongly Agree

Item 53: I think that learning English from the native speaker is the ideal situation.

   Strongly disagree
   Disagree
   Not sure
   Agree
   Strongly Agree

Item 55: I was told by other teachers to encourage students to use British and/or American English.

   Strongly disagree
   Disagree
   Not sure
   Agree
Item 56: I would prefer it if my students used either British or American English in class.

- Strongly agree
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Item 58: We cannot allow students to speak non-native English varieties (other than American and British English).

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Item 60: The English language belongs to the English culture.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Item 61: I feel that students do not focus on education but on getting the mark.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Item 62: In my opinion, teachers should not waste time talking about non-native varieties of English (other than American and British English).

- Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 63:** My students expect me to speak British or American English in the classroom.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 64:** I was formally instructed to teach according to British and/or American English norms.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 65:** I think students prefer to learn about native speaker English.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 66:** In my classes, I mostly present information and students just passively receive knowledge.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

**Item 67:** When speaking English, I am borrowing the native speaker’s language.
Item 68: I think teachers should correct students based on either British or American English norms.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 69: Students follow my instructions because they have to get the required marks to pass.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 70: English cannot be separated from its culture.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 71: I think students should try to speak as near native speaker accent as possible.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree
**Item 74:** I follow a student-centred approach.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Item 75:** I regularly collect feedback from my students about their learning.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Item 76:** My university/department systematically collect feedback from students about their learning experience.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Item 77:** I focus more on preparing students for tests and exams and less on exploring new concepts.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Not sure
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

**Item 78:** British English is

- Academic
- The original one
- More desirable
Correct
More elegant
More flexible
Of higher status

Item 79: American English is

Academic
The original one
More desirable
Correct
More elegant
More flexible
Of higher status

Item 80: How long have you been teaching at university?

Item 81: I believe that British and/or American universities are better than Algerian ones.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Not sure
Agree
Strongly Agree

Item 82: What is your gender?

Male
Female

Item 83: What is your place of work? (University or Wilaya name)