

## Chapter V

### Conclusion, Implications, and Suggestions

#### 1. Conclusion

Indonesian university students majoring in English seem to always value Indonesian accent of English speech higher – either in competence, attractiveness, and overall traits, even when being compared to varieties from the Inner Circle which are considered “native.” On one side, it reflects a very high level of solidarity among Indonesians who also speak with Indonesian accent. On the other side, this attitude suggests that Indonesian university students majoring in English see English as an international language. Rather than looking at nativity, they value varieties of English speech more from their familiarity to them. Meanwhile, in terms of competence and attractiveness, the pattern of ‘the more competent a variety the less it is attractive and vice versa’ still appears.

However, Indonesian university students majoring in English seemed to have difficulties in identifying varieties of English speech despite their status as students, whom should be knowledgeable enough in English as their major. The recognition rate of the overall speakers is moderate to low. The most recognizable variety is Indonesian, while the most un-recognizable is Sri Lanka.

In terms of social variables related to attitudes, Indonesian university students seem to be highly affected by their gender, self-valued English proficiency level, and experiences of living in any English speaking countries. In terms of the recognition ability, Indonesian university students majoring in English seems to be highly affected only by their experiences of living in any English speaking countries and their length of time studying English.

## **2. Implications and Suggestions**

This study shows that Indonesian university students are not biased towards nativity but are less aware of the varieties of English. These attitudes imply some wider and larger issues regarding educational and political situations in Indonesia. It suggests national regulations to be adjusted to EIL view (English as an International Language), which means that the status of English should be maintained as a means of international communication only and that Indonesian learners would not have more difficulties being taught by only local teachers compared to “native” teachers. The more important thing to be put into consideration is the students’ failure to recognize varieties of English despite them majoring in English. It suggests materials in universities to be adjusted to focus on raising Indonesian learners’ awareness of varieties of English including the “non-native” ones – and not only on the speech but

also the written, the grammar, the vocabularies, and others – in order that they can command EIL (English as an International Language) without difficulty.

This study has also found several intriguing findings opposing previous findings on language attitude study towards varieties of English in Indonesia, one of them being the strong solidarity among Indonesian listeners towards Indonesian accent of English. On one side, it enriches previous findings on language attitude study towards varieties of English in Indonesia since this study involved aspects excluded by the previous study by Fenty L. Siregar (2010); which are the Indonesian variety itself, dialect recognition, and influences by social variables. On the other side, it suggests other researchers interested in sociolinguistics to conduct more thorough studies involving various other varieties of English to gain wider and deeper understanding on Indonesians' overall attitudes towards English in general, or to cross-check those intriguing findings this study has found in particular.

Lastly, in spite of important findings, this study has limitations. First, average number of respondents coming from only one level of Indonesian society (i.e. university students) might be problematic to be generalized as representative of language attitudes of Indonesians. Studies involving more various types of participant are recommended in this case. Secondly, it is unavoidable that an individual's voice characteristics have their own uniqueness regardless of efforts done to meet the requirements of the verbal guise test. Additional qualitative questionnaires might be of a great help for further studies. Thirdly, the self-valued nature of the social

variables might become disturbances. Further studies need to control the social variables in order to maximize the reliability level of the findings.