IREELL
Indonesian Review of English Education, Linguistics, and Literature
P-ISSN:3025-2369 I E-ISSN:3021-8101
https://jurnalfaktarbiyah.iainkediri.ac.id/index.php/ireel/index

Instagram to the Classroom: A Narrative Inquiry of a Lecturer-Practitioner Collaboration

Muhammad Isa*
Politeknik Negeri Madiun
Muhammadisa@pnm.ac.id
**Corresponding Author*

ABSTRACT

The *MBKM* initiative has increased practitioners' involvement in Indonesian higher education, yet little is known about how lecturers experience and make meaning of such collaborations. This narrative inquiry addresses that gap by recounting one lecturer's personal experience of co-teaching a Public Speaking course with a professional Public Speaking practitioner at a state polytechnic in East Java, Indonesia. Data were generated through reflective journals, field notes, artifacts, and narrative conversations, and were analyzed through restorying within the three-dimensional space of temporality, sociality, and place, following Clandinin and Connelly (2000). The findings are presented as nine narrative vignettes and discussed through six themes: informal and digital space as a site of professional formation; authority negotiation in a shared instructional space; translanguaging as an inclusive Public Speaking pedagogy; practitioner embodied knowledge and student engagement; institutional structure as a source of collaborative friction; and collaborative teaching as a form of professional identity work. The study suggests that professional identity development depends on relational authenticity and honest negotiation as much as on formal institutional design, and that both shape the effectiveness of lecturer-practitioner collaboration. The findings offer practical recommendations for ESP lecturers, program coordinators, and policymakers who plan to bring practitioners into vocational higher education in Indonesia.

Keywords: lecturer-practitioner collaboration, narrative inquiry, public speaking, teacher identity, translanguaging

Copyright: © 2026 by Authors.
Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

Introduction

The disconnect between classroom study and the demands of the job market, together with the *Merdeka Belajar Kampus Merdeka* (*MBKM*) policy that calls on industry experts to teach communicative courses such as Public Speaking, is addressed by the D4 (Applied Bachelor) program in English for Communication, Business, and Professionals (*Kemdikbudristek*, 2021).

This policy places the lecturer in an unfamiliar position. No longer the sole authority in the room, the lecturer must share the instructional space with a professional whose expertise comes from practice rather than from theory. The central question of this study is how one English lecturer experiences, negotiates, and makes meaning of that shared authority. Even so, while *MBKM* has accelerated practitioner involvement in Indonesian vocational higher education, programmatic evaluations of the *Praktisi Mengajar* (Practitioner Teaching) program have focused on whether the collaboration was implemented, not on how instructors actually experienced it while it unfolded (Nurhaida et al., 2023).

This gap matters because of the particular demands of EFL teaching in vocational Public Speaking. Accounts of Indonesian vocational training report that the curriculum has generally favored passive reading of dense texts over active oral performance, leaving graduates ill-equipped for the communicative demands of the workplace (Marliana et al., 2025); ESP teaching in vocational institutes has also lagged behind workplace and digital demands (Rahmawati, 2026). Orally based training grounded in real workplace contexts has been shown to improve student motivation and communicative proficiency, and technology-assisted resources in Indonesian public speaking classrooms have been well received for supporting fluency and pronunciation (Alonto, 2024).

To a large degree, however, the literature frames the inhibitors of oral performance, such as nervousness and language anxiety, as psychological issues to be resolved at the level of the individual student. Research on Indonesian learners similarly attributes low willingness to speak to fear of errors and lack of confidence (Maulana et al., 2020) and proposes discrete classroom methods for building speaking confidence (Tifani et al., 2020). This body of work generally overlooks the relational authority of the teacher who models and legitimizes

communicative confidence (Chand, 2021). Traditional methods also remain overly intellectualized; scholars have called instead for an embodied pedagogy grounded not in textual or syntactic boundaries but in sensory presence, non-verbal posture, and career experience (Senior & Dixon, 2009), a claim reinforced by recent research showing that embodied engagement shapes how educators come to understand and enact theoretical concepts in practice (Ferreira & Ineson, 2026). This concern connects to a broader shift in English for Specific Purposes, which has been urged to open its horizons beyond the practice of professional communication narrowly conceived in textual and linguistic terms (Hyland, 2022).

Theoretically, this study draws on narrative inquiry as developed by Clandinin & Connelly (2000), grounded in Dewey's philosophy of experience. Narrative inquiry treats experience as both a phenomenon and a method of inquiry, assuming that human beings live storied lives and that professional experience can be understood as an unfolding narrative process. It works within a three-dimensional analytic space of temporality, sociality, and place, used not as a fixed category but as a topography for tracing how personal and institutional life intersect (Barkhuizen et al., 2013; Clandinin, 2016; Kim, 2016). Because this study aims to understand the inner, relational, and identity-saturated dimensions of a teaching partnership rather than to quantify its outcomes, narrative inquiry offers a more suitable epistemology than survey or quasi-experimental designs, which would reduce such experience to variables.

Two complementary constructs frame the study. The first is language teacher identity, understood not as fixed but as a dynamic, relational process continuously reconstructed through experience and professional relationships (Varghese et al., 2005). This aligns with views of identity as a shifting landscape re-examined through local interaction (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009) and as situated at the intersection of personal, situational, and professional dimensions (Pennington & Richards, 2016). Identity, in this sense, is something teachers enact through the ongoing practices and relationships of teaching rather than something they simply hold (Yazan & Lindahl, 2020). The second construct is the distinction between explicit and tacit knowledge (Polanyi, 1966): in Public Speaking, professional knowledge is embodied in the practitioner's posture, gesture, and intonation, developed through practice rather than

learned in a classroom. Recent work on the tacit dimension of teaching similarly argues that this non-observable, experience-based knowledge remains underexplored relative to its explicit counterpart (Enow, 2023). Together, these two constructs position the encounter between lecturer and practitioner as a space in which professional identity is disrupted and reconstructed through exposure to a different, embodied form of authority.

Prior work relevant to this study can be grouped into three strands, each with limitations that this study addresses. Research on collaborative and co-teaching practice has produced influential model taxonomies, such as one-teach-one-observe, station, parallel, and team teaching, but these were developed primarily in K-12 special education and applied to higher education with little attention to structural differences, particularly where practitioners and lecturers are not institutionally affiliated or contractually bound to one another (Friend & Cook, 2017; Villa & Thousand, 2013). Even well-structured collaborations require ongoing techno-pedagogical negotiation and the reconciliation of different institutional cultures, rather than the simple application of a checklist (Wider et al., 2026). Work on identity in co-teaching finds that when facilitating structures position co-teachers as equals rather than subordinates and allow them to combine complementary expertise, teachers can constructively reconstruct their identities as a shared or dyadic identity (Dikilitaş & Bahrami, 2023), and that entering a collaborative structure more generally prompts educators to renegotiate their identities locally with a content-area counterpart (Giles & Giles, 2023a).

The second strand concerns the language realities of classrooms with mixed English proficiency. Recent studies in the Indonesian vocational context reframe translanguaging, the flexible use of a learner's full linguistic repertoire, as a communicative strength rather than a source of anxiety, supporting students' efforts to express ideas in English (García & Wei, 2014; Kuncoroningtyas et al., 2025). The third strand concerns method: although narrative inquiry has become a widely used qualitative approach in language teacher education, it remains underapplied in Southeast Asia (Jannah et al., n.d.; Jasmine et al., 2026). Across all three strands, the practitioner collaboration is typically examined through its effects on student outcomes, program design, or pre-service training, while the lived experience of the in-service lecturer who negotiates the collaboration has rarely been the direct object of study.

Taken together, this evidence supports both the institutional rationale and the pedagogical promise of practitioner collaboration, but leaves its lived, day-to-day experience largely unexamined. Few studies have examined the structural and identity dimensions of *MBKM* practitioner programs together; little attention has been paid to how an established ESP lecturer experiences, negotiates, and is transformed by working alongside an industry practitioner; and no narrative inquiry, to this researcher's knowledge, has traced the lived experience of an in-service lecturer through such a collaboration in Indonesian vocational higher education. This study contributes a first-person, anticipatory account of an emergent, informally initiated practitioner collaboration, tracing how embodied practitioner knowledge, translanguaging, and institutional friction interact to reconstitute professional identity. The study recounts the experience of an English lecturer who co-taught a Public Speaking course alongside a professional practitioner with D4 students at a state polytechnic in East Java, Indonesia. It offers an insider Indonesian perspective often missing from literature written for a global readership of lecturers, program coordinators, and policymakers, together with practical policy recommendations. The research questions are:

1. How does the lecturer narrator make meaning of the experience of collaborating with a Public Speaking practitioner in teaching a Public Speaking course to D4 English for Communication, Business, and Professionals students?
2. What tensions and turning points shaped the collaboration, and how were they navigated?
3. How did the collaboration influence the lecturer's professional identity and teaching practice?

Methods

This section presents the research design, participant, setting, data collection procedures, and data analysis strategy, followed by the trustworthiness measures adopted in the study.

Research Design

This study uses narrative inquiry, an approach that treats experience as both its subject and its method (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Narrative inquiry suits research questions

concerned with the inner, relational, and identity-saturated character of an educational partnership, dimensions that survey or quasi-experimental designs would render as measurable variables rather than lived experience. The inquiry was organized within the three-dimensional narrative space of temporality, sociality, and place, used not as a fixed category but as a backdrop for tracing the interplay between personal experience and institutional life (Barkhuizen et al., 2013; Clandinin, 2016).

Participant of the Research

The protagonist and narrator is the English lecturer who initiated, negotiated, and sustained the collaboration. This insider status is treated here not as a limitation of narrative inquiry but as an asset: the researcher is both a participant in and an interpreter of the experience. The second participant is the practitioner, a national television news reporter and certified trainer with a national Public Speaking training company, referred to here by the pseudonym Angga in keeping with the relational conventions of narrative inquiry. He was informed of the study's aim and agreed to participate. The study was conducted in a second-year Public Speaking course within the D4 English for Communication, Business, and Professionals program at a state polytechnic in East Java, Indonesia. The specific institution is not named here, in keeping with standard practice for protecting the identities of the practitioner and students associated with the course. This vocational program was selected because the gap between academic language teaching and professional communicative demands is especially pronounced there, and because the institution actively implements the *MBKM* requirement for practitioner involvement. The practitioner led four six-hour sessions during the even semester (March 2026).

Instruments

Data were generated from December 2025 to March 2026 through four overlapping instruments, each serving a distinct function in constructing the narrative (Barkhuizen et al., 2013). Instrument A, a reflective journal kept by the lecturer, was the primary source of the narrator's own storied data: it recorded key moments of the collaboration from its origins on social media in December 2025 through the final session in March 2026, with journal prompts organized around time, sociality, and place. Instrument B, field notes on classroom atmosphere, student engagement, and relational incidents, recorded at the end of each session, supplied observational data on the collaboration as it unfolded in the classroom. Instrument C, documentary evidence comprising the course syllabus, digital chat messages, and institutional records, supplied verification data used to confirm the material reality of events described in the narrative. Instrument D, informal narrative conversations with the practitioner, conducted especially in the period following each session, supplied the practitioner's own storied data and introduced a second narrative voice into the account. The lecturer's storied experience, drawn primarily from Instruments A and D, forms the core narrative data reconstructed into the nine vignettes; Instruments B and C function as corroborating and contextualizing data used in the restorying process described below.

Data Analysis

This study uses narrative restorying rather than thematic analysis as its analytic approach. Restorying is a narrative inquiry procedure distinct from thematic analysis: rather than coding data into themes independent of narrative sequence, restorying reads the raw data to identify key story elements (setting, characters, tensions, actions, and resolution) and reconstructs an interpretable narrative from them, interpreting meaning through the story's own temporal and relational structure(Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Creswell & Poth, 2018). This study drew on restorying, not thematic analysis, because the research questions concern how meaning unfolds through the collaboration's temporal and relational structure, which restorying is designed to preserve.

The restorying process was carried out recursively in three steps. First, the full data set was read and plotted along a timeline. Second, this reading surfaced six recurring narrative strands: the role of informal and digital space in relationship formation; authority negotiation in the shared instructional space; the role of protective concern and student advocacy; the practitioner's embodied authority; translanguaging as inclusive pedagogy; and institutional structure as a source of collaborative friction. Third, these six strands were rewoven into nine narrative vignettes, each of which is linked in the Result and Discussion section below to the specific research question it addresses.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness was addressed through credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability, following Lincoln & Guba (1985), whose criteria remain in active use in recent qualitative methodology (Enworo, 2023). Credibility was pursued through authenticity, achieved by including directly quoted exchanges rather than paraphrased summaries; plausibility, achieved by triangulating the reflective journal, field notes, documentary evidence, and narrative conversations as convergent sources; transferability, achieved through thick description of the institutional and classroom context so that readers can judge its relevance to their own settings; and reflexivity, achieved through sustained attention to how the researcher's dual role as lecturer and narrator shaped the interpretation offered here. Ethically, because the lecturer-narrator is also the author, the practitioner remained potentially identifiable despite the institution not being named. He was informed of this risk and agreed to participate on that basis. He was given a pseudonym, and his employer's name was withheld to protect his professional reputation. Throughout the narrative, his views are represented with care and fidelity.

Result and Discussion

The findings and discussion below are organized around the study's three research questions rather than presented as separate sections, in keeping with the narrative approach adopted in this study. For each research question, the relevant narrative vignettes are presented first, each reconstructed from the data and followed by an interpretive

commentary, and are then discussed in relation to prior research. Conversation extracts originally recorded in Indonesian or in a mix of Indonesian and English were translated into English for presentation here.

This narrative offers a window into an experience that is, on its surface, particular and individual, but that also speaks to broader questions about how professional partnerships form and endure, how practitioner knowledge meets academic pedagogy, and how teachers make sense of themselves through that encounter.

Result and Discussion for Research Question

Research Question 1 asks how the lecturer narrator makes meaning of the experience of collaborating with a Public Speaking practitioner. This section addresses that question through Vignettes 1, 2, and 9.

Vignette 1: The Stranger on the Screen

He was a profile picture long before Angga became my co-worker. A few weeks before December 2025, he appeared in my Instagram feed, one of many faces in a digital stream that was rarely memorable. At that point he was simply another individual, not yet a professional contact. We were both people who attended fitness centers, wrote about fitness and health, and talked about healthy living. Our online contact was infrequent, but never entirely forgettable.

Over time, the platform revealed more about him. The rhythm of his posts, the professional photographs, the polished captions, and the occasional glimpse of a life he led before the camera gradually gave me a clearer picture of who he was. He was a news reporter for one of the national television channels. But another detail caught me by surprise: he was also a trainer at a respected national Public Speaking training company. This was someone who did not merely study communication; he practiced it professionally, day after day, before national audiences.

The vignette shows that informal, digitally mediated space is emerging as a meaningful site of professional opportunity, challenging the assumption that productive practitioner-

educator partnerships must be institutionally brokered. The personal foundation of the encounter was what made the later professional collaboration possible and comfortable.

Vignette 2:

In mid-December 2025, Angga posted an Instagram story showing him leading a Public Speaking training session for university graduates. I watched it and, without much deliberation, left a comment on the post:

> "*Wow, it turns out you're not only a TV reporter, but also an amazing public speaking trainer! Would you be interested in collaborating to teach my students' Public Speaking course? If you agree, we can discuss the details, like your available schedule, the syllabus, and so on*." (Instagram comment, December 2025)
>
> "*Of course, I don't mind. I love teaching and sharing my real experience.*" (Angga, Instagram reply, December 2025)

He responded quickly, and rather unexpectedly, saying yes. I felt the particular excitement of a door opening that I had not fully believed would open. I told my Chief of Study Program almost as soon as I received the reply, and he was as enthusiastic as I was. Angga later mentioned that he had worked as a practitioner-lecturer at several well-known universities for three years. For him, this was familiar territory; for me, it was an entirely new foundation to build on. The informality of this invitation illustrates the organic character of professional collaboration: substantial cooperation can grow from genuine personal initiative rather than institutional need. The request also involved a willingness to step outside the disciplinary boundaries of one's own work and to recognize that another person's expertise could add value to it, itself a form of professional identity work (Varghese et al., 2005).

Vignette 9: The End That Was Also a Beginning

The fourth and final session passed quickly, leaving a lasting warmth. Everyone felt fulfilled. Angga was happy, and the students had visibly grown. I felt a satisfaction I had not experienced before. Without discussing it directly, we both understood that the unlikely friendship that had started on gym posts and Instagram stories had become something more lasting.

Neither of us had fully processed the ending before we were already looking ahead. We agreed, without hesitation, to continue the following semester. It did not feel like new planning so much as a natural extension of something already in motion. On my way home, I found myself tracing how it had all begun: a comment typed on a phone screen in December, a yes that came sooner than I had expected, a motorbike ride through the streets of Madiun, a cup of hot tea with a little sugar. It had never felt like an ordinary teaching partnership. And now, here we were.

> Researcher: "*Angga, thank you so much for being willing to come in as a practitioner for my class. The students really liked you. How about we teach together again next semester? And while we're at it, let's write a book on public speaking together, what do you think?*"
>
> Angga: "*Oh, I'd absolutely love to.*" *(Narrative conversation, March 2026; translated from the original)*

The decision to continue reflects the relational sustainability of the partnership: why some collaborations do not simply end, but continue to develop. This continuity was not formalized through any contract; it emerged from shared pedagogical intent and a fidelity to one another that had built up over time.

Informal and Digital Spaces as Sites of Professional Formation

The most striking feature of this partnership's origin is that it bypassed conventional institutional channels in favor of social media, which challenges established assumptions about where meaningful partnerships form. Existing literature tends to frame practitioner alliances as institutionally brokered, arranged through committees or formal memoranda of

understanding. This case suggests instead that the relational groundwork for genuine cooperation can develop in a digitally mediated, informal context, provided that two people with complementary knowledge find one another. It was, specifically, the personal history of the interaction that made the subsequent professional cooperation both possible and comfortable. This is consistent with emerging evidence that online spaces expand opportunities for informal professional networking, allowing teachers to work around institutional barriers on their own initiative (Wider et al., 2026). It also resonates with the concept of collaborative professionalism, in which much of the most productive cooperation is driven by genuine, trust-based professional connections rather than by formal, imposed structures (Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2018). For institutional policy, this suggests that while formal recruitment channels remain necessary, requiring collaboration to originate solely through official channels risks excluding some of the most authentic partnerships.

Collaborative Teaching as Professional Identity Work

A deeper thread runs through all six themes: this collaboration functioned as an experiment in professional selfhood. The lecturer who left a comment on Instagram in December was not the same teacher who walked out of the final session in March. He did not become submissive or defensive; instead, he recognized the value of his own expertise while learning to share authority without losing his footing, and even came to speak of his students with a kind of pride he had not previously voiced. This aligns with the view that language teacher identity is dynamic, relational, and continuously constructed through experience and professional relationships (Varghese et al., 2005), a view echoed in frameworks that treat identity as a shifting landscape re-examined through local interaction (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009). Entering a collaborative structure of this kind reconstructs identity at the local level as an educator negotiates with a counterpart from another field (Giles & Giles, 2023b), consistent with the broader view of teaching as a practice sustained through ongoing identity work (Pennington & Richards, 2016; Yazan & Lindahl, 2020). This narrative offers a richly textured account of that reconstruction, built not through detached professional development but through the lived experience of working alongside another person in a shared classroom.

Result and Discussion for Research Question 2

Research Question 2 asks what tensions and turning points shaped the collaboration and how they were navigated. This section addresses that question through Vignettes 3, 5, and 8.

Vignette 3: Building across Distance

We built this collaboration at a distance, he in Yogyakarta and I in Madiun, almost 200 kilometers apart, and we had never met in person. All negotiations took place online. We agreed on four sessions, which Angga would lead using his own pedagogical approach. I explained to him the reality of my students: roughly half were proficient in English, while the rest were still working on the basics of spoken English. I told him this because I wanted him to understand what he was taking on. I also explained that my students were highly motivated, and that once I described his career and experience to them, their interest was immediate. I believed the sessions would go well. Alongside that confidence was a quieter worry that Angga, more used to university students who already had a strong linguistic foundation, might be caught off guard by the range of proficiency in my class.

> "*Angga, just so you know, out of 20 students, 8 of them lack basic general English. The rest are pretty good; six are even getting ready for the IPEC (Indonesian Polytechnics English Competition). So, don't be shocked, okay? Don't compare them with the students at the other campuses where you're also a practitioner, like that top one in Yogyakarta, lol. Their motivation varies quite a bit. Help me keep them motivated, yeah?*" (Researcher to Angga, WhatsApp message prior to the first session; translated from the original)

This level of preparation illustrates a precondition for successful collaboration: the willingness to be honest about constraints rather than presenting an idealized picture. Naming this constraint reflects the emotional labor involved in practitioner teaching, an investment in students' well-being and dignity that is central to instructional planning.

Vignette 5: The Motorcycle, the Lunch, and What Was Said Between

Toward the end of the first session, Angga and I rode to a local restaurant for lunch, with me navigating on my motorbike through streets I knew well. The most significant exchange of that first chapter of the collaboration happened during that ride. He said:

> "*You're right. Some of them really don't have good basic speaking skills*." (Angga, narrative conversation, March 2026)

I accepted this quietly. I already knew it, and I had told him as much beforehand. Still, hearing it confirmed from someone outside the classroom landed differently. For a moment I felt something like the protectiveness of a teacher whose students were now being assessed by someone whose own professional standards had been shaped elsewhere. My honest response was that it did not matter whether these students spoke perfect English; what mattered was whether they could speak from the heart, in Indonesian if necessary, when they needed to. I told him I was not talking about grammar, but about presence and will, about the courage to speak in public. He nodded. And with that exchange, the partnership found its footing.

This informal exchange took the form of a narrative dialogue, an improvised conversation through which experiential knowledge was produced and exchanged (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). It also reveals a tension between industry norms of performance and educational norms of development: the lecturer's confidence-first approach rests on the premise that linguistic development follows from, rather than precedes, the reduction of anxiety and the building of communicative courage (Krashen, 1982).

Vignette 8: The Form That Nobody Expected

Some friction emerged amid otherwise peaceful cooperation, not between Angga and me, nor between Angga and the students, but between Angga and the institution. As required under *MBKM* (*Kemdikbudristek*, 2021), my institution asked Angga to document his sessions in photos and video. This was unfamiliar territory for him. In more than three years as a practitioner-lecturer across several universities, he had never been asked to do this before, and he told me so, visibly puzzled.

I asked Angga to prepare the PowerPoint materials and to provide documentation of the sessions in the form of photos or video. He responded with evident surprise, asking whether this was really required, and noted that no other campus where he taught had ever asked for anything similar. He agreed nonetheless, and said he would send the materials afterward by WhatsApp (exchange recorded in field notes, March 2026; translated from the original).

I was caught between two things I understood equally well. The institution's need for documentation was legitimate. But I also sensed the weight of asking someone who had come to teach, not to complete paperwork, and who had already given up four Saturdays commuting between Yogyakarta and Madiun in response to an Instagram message, simply because he wanted to. The documentation was eventually produced. But the episode left a lesson behind: even well-intentioned institutions do not always account for the full human experience of the people who carry out their requirements.

This episode points to a structural friction likely to recur in similar collaborations: a mismatch between an institution's administrative requirements and the professional expectations practitioners bring from their usual working contexts. Even small frictions of this kind may affect a practitioner's willingness to pursue future collaborations if institutional demands do not align with practitioners' norms.

Negotiating Authority in the Shared Instructional Space

This partnership was never fully symmetrical. The lecturer held formal curricular authority; Angga held professional authority earned through practice rather than academic training. Their arrangement involved ongoing, largely quiet negotiation. The lecturer's decision to leave the classroom was itself a meaningful act of authority, one that can be understood through the spatial dimension of collaborative instruction: teaching space is never neutral but is shaped by who occupies it (Rytivaara & Kershner, 2012). The lunch conversation was a further verbal negotiation, in which Angga observed that not all students had strong basic speaking skills. Rather than conceding the point, the lecturer engaged with it, challenged its framing, and redirected the conversation toward a shared commitment to developmental confidence. This was one of the few moments in which two professionals addressed one

another as equals. This pattern echoes research showing that co-teachers can productively reconstruct their identities when enabling structures position them as equals rather than subordinates, allowing them to combine complementary expertise into a shared, dyadic identity (Dikilitaş & Bahrami, 2023).

Institutional Structure as Collaborative Friction and Opportunity

The documentation requirement that unsettled Angga points to a friction likely to recur across similar institutional collaborations. Practitioners enter institutions built around administrative structures designed to hold instructors accountable, particularly under *MBKM* requirements (*Kemdikbudristek*, 2021). Yet practitioners are not employees; they operate in a professional culture that assumes their expertise rather than subjecting it to procedural scrutiny, including photographic documentation. The implication is straightforward: institutions that rely on practitioner collaboration need clear, proactive, and institutionally supported documentation protocols that reduce the burden on practitioners while still giving their contribution the institutional recognition it merits.

Result and Discussion for Research Question

Research Question 3 asks how the collaboration influenced the lecturer's professional identity and teaching practice. This section addresses that question through Vignettes 4, 6, and 7.

Vignette 4: The First Morning

March arrived, and so did Angga. It was the first of the four sessions, carrying the particular energy of genuine novelty. Students who had heard a great deal about him were visibly shy, and, to my surprise, Angga seemed to share some of that shyness too. I introduced him warmly, and once the initial tension eased, I made a deliberate decision: I left the room. I arranged the classroom so that Angga and my students could work together without my presence looming over them. I followed the session remotely from my phone and exchanged occasional informal messages from my office. At one point I asked whether he wanted something to drink. His reply was quick and disarmingly ordinary:

"A hot tea with little sugar would be nice." (Angga, text message, March 2026)

I brought him his tea. That small, ordinary gesture stays with me as one of the textures of this collaboration that no syllabus could have anticipated.

Even the act of leaving the classroom was a negotiated act of authority, one that can be understood through the spatial dimension of collaborative instruction: the teaching space is never neutral but is shaped by its occupants (Rytivaara & Kershner, 2012). Deliberately vacating that space carries as much pedagogical weight as entering it; the tea request, small as it is, carries a disproportionate amount of relational meaning within this collaboration (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

Vignette 6: What He Brought That I Could Not

Angga described the morning session to me over lunch. He had begun with the basic principles of oratory: posture, pose, eye contact, body language, and intonation. He commanded the room with the kind of natural authority that comes not from having studied public speaking, but from having practiced it before audiences for years.

Listening to him, I recognized the content immediately. I had taught the same topics in previous semesters, and I understood body language conceptually well enough to teach it. But Angga taught it differently: as something inhabited in the body, mastered through years of professional practice rather than studied from the outside. My students noticed the difference. So did I.

> "*Oh, by the way, in class just now, I was still going over the basics of public speaking, things like intonation and gestures. After that, I had them put together a short speech about their most memorable experience. They came up one by one to practice, and I corrected them on the spot whenever something was off.*" (Angga, narrative conversation over lunch, March 2026; translated from the original)

This moment illustrates the distinction between explicit knowledge, what can be articulated, and tacit knowledge, what is carried in practice and reflex (Enow, 2023; Polanyi & Sen, 2009). In public speaking, this embodied knowledge is essential: a practitioner-teacher's authority is inseparable from the professional body that has already performed before an audience. This is also a candid pedagogical gesture on the lecturer's part, one that does not obscure what each partner contributed.

Vignette 7: A Classroom Finding Its Voice

The initial discomfort dissolved; students took their places, expectant and a little nervous. Those who were more fluent in English delivered increasingly confident presentations. Students with lower English proficiency did not fall behind. Many found their own way forward, speaking in a natural mixture of Indonesian and English. They stood up. They made themselves heard.

> "*Just like you said earlier, a few of the students used Indonesian, but most of them actually spoke in English*." (Angga, narrative conversation, March 2026; translated from the original)

Hearing this, I felt something settle. The collaboration had not produced a perfectly bilingual classroom. It had created a learning space in which every student, regardless of where they started, found a way to contribute, work, and grow.

This finding reflects what researchers of multilingual teaching describe as translanguaging, the flexible and intentional use of a learner's full linguistic repertoire, treated as a legitimate communicative practice rather than a deficit (Garcia & Wei, 2014). The students' multilingual speech was not a compromise but an adaptive response to communicating across a range of proficiency levels.

Translanguaging as Inclusive Public Speaking Pedagogy

The most pedagogically significant finding is the emergence of translanguaging, the spontaneous and purposeful mixing of Indonesian and English, as a student strategy. Less proficient students did not withdraw or feel ashamed of the linguistic resources available to them. This supports the view that translanguaging is not a deficit practice but a marker of genuine communicative competence (García & Wei, 2014). The result echoes recent research in Indonesian vocational institutions, where translanguaging functions as a purposive pedagogical tool that reduces anxiety and allows students to draw on their native language repertoire to generate ideas they then express in English (Kuncoroningtyas et al., 2025). The lecturer's decision to set aside the goal of flawless English can be read as an intuitively

practiced translanguaging pedagogy; his conviction that speaking grows from presence and will, rather than grammatical precision, resonates with the idea that reduced anxiety and communicative courage are preconditions for linguistic development, not its byproducts (Krashen, 1982).

Practitioner Embodied Knowledge and Student Engagement

Students responded to Angga differently than they did to the lecturer, evidence of the distinct role a practitioner can play in ESP teaching. Polanyi & Sen's (2009) distinction between explicit and tacit knowledge, between what can be stated and what is carried in practice and reflex, helps explain this difference, and more recent work confirms how underexamined this tacit dimension of teaching remains (Enow, 2023). In public speaking specifically, embodied knowledge matters: a practitioner-teacher's authority cannot be separated from a professional body that has already performed publicly. Vocational students are especially attuned to the gap between knowing a professional skill in theory and seeing it demonstrated in practice. This finding suggests that ESP program design should treat the practitioner's role not as an incidental addition but as a core pedagogical resource offering something that well-organized academic teaching alone cannot fully replicate.

Conclusion

This study set out to provide a narrative account of an English lecturer's collaboration with a Public Speaking practitioner in a D4 vocational program. In response to the research questions, the collaboration was construed by the lecturer as an unexpected process of relationship- and identity-building. Its tensions and turning points, including the candid acknowledgment of student proficiency, the deliberate relinquishing of teaching space, and the friction over documentation, were negotiated through open, respectful dialogue rather than formal procedure. The collaboration reshaped the lecturer's professional identity by revealing the complementary value of embodied practitioner knowledge and by reinforcing a confidence-first, inclusive approach to pedagogy. The study contributes to the literature by centering the educator's own experience and by showing that translanguaging can function as an inclusive pedagogy in a vocational Public Speaking course, and that collaborative

teaching can serve as a productive site of identity work. Practically, the findings suggest that planning practitioner collaboration should be approached as a relational rather than a purely administrative task; that course design should leave enough room for genuine relationships to form; and that institutions should communicate documentation expectations clearly and early, in ways that support rather than discourage practitioners from becoming ongoing collaborators.

This study has limitations characteristic of a single-narrator account: the narrative is inevitably shaped by the researcher's own perspective and memory, and does not claim to represent students' or the institution's views. Its findings are transferable but not statistically generalizable, since they are drawn from a single case over a single semester (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Future research could examine collaboration across further semesters, compare practitioner collaboration in ESP with practices in other disciplines and institutions, or examine translanguaging specifically as a pedagogical practice in teaching Public Speaking to Indonesian EFL learners.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to express his sincere gratitude to the research participant (Angga) for his contribution to this study. Special appreciation is extended to the coordinator of the D4 English for Communication, Business, and Professionals program for supporting this collaborative teaching arrangement. The author also thanks colleagues who offered advice and feedback during the preparation of this manuscript.

References

Alonto, A. (2024). Prospects of the Use of Mobile-Assisted Language Learning (MALL) Applications in Public Speaking Courses. *Journal of English Education Program*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.26418/jeep.v5i1.72334

Barkhuizen, G., Benson, P., & Chik, A. (2013). *Narrative Inquiry in Language Teaching and Learning Research* (0 ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203124994

Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2009). Understanding teacher identity: An overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *39*(2), 175–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057640902902252

Chand, G. B. (2021). Challenges Faced by Bachelor Level Students While Speaking English. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, *6*(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v6i1.853

Clandinin, D. J. (2016). *Engaging in Narrative Inquiry* (0 ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315429618

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research* (1. ed., 1. PB print). Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (Fourth edition). SAGE.

Dikilitaş, K., & Bahrami, V. (2023). Teacher Identity (re) Construction in Collaborative Bilingual Education: The Emergence of *DYADIC* Identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, *57*(4), 987–1012. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3168

Enow, L. O. (2023). How efficiently are we using our understanding of the tacit dimension of teaching? *Review of Education*, *11*(2), e3411. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3411

Enworo, O. C. (2023). Application of Guba and Lincoln's parallel criteria to assess trustworthiness of qualitative research on indigenous social protection systems. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *23*(4), 372–384. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-08-2022-0116

Ferreira, J. M., & Ineson, G. (2026). Embodied learning in teacher education: Investigating student-teachers' experiences in engaging with embodied cognition theories. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *171*, 105335. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2025.105335

Friend, M. P., & Cook, L. (with Pearson (Firm)). (2017). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals* (Eighth Edition). Pearson.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Giles, A., & Giles, A. (2023a). Constructing teacher identity in teacher collaboration: What does it mean to be a teacher of culturally and linguistically diverse English learners? *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, *16*(1), 36–45. https://doi.org/10.7160/eriesj.2023.160104

Giles, A., & Giles, A. (2023b). Constructing teacher identity in teacher collaboration: What does it mean to be a teacher of culturally and linguistically diverse English learners? *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, *16*(1), 36–45. https://doi.org/10.7160/eriesj.2023.160104

Hyland, K. (2022). English for Specific Purposes: What Is It and Where Is It Taking Us? *ESP Today*, *10*(2), 202–220. https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2022.10.2.1

Jannah, K., Setiyawan, A., & Hidayah, L. W. (n.d.). *Teacher Challenges and Strategies in Implementing the Deep Learning Approach to Improve Speaking Skills in Narrative Inquiry*.

Jasmine, A., Kurniawati, D., & Indrasari, N. (2026). A Narrative Inquiry into Indonesian Pre-service Teachers' Cross-Cultural Teaching Experiences in Malaysia. *Edunesia : Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, *7*(1), 752–774. https://doi.org/10.51276/edu.v7i1.1597

Kemdikbudristek. (2021). Panduan pelaksanaan Merdeka Belajar Kampus Merdeka. Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi.

Kim, J.-H. (2016). *Understanding narrative inquiry: The crafting and analysis of stories as research*. SAGE.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition* (1st ed). Pergamon.

Kuncoroningtyas, F. S. A., Sumardi, S., & Putra, K. A. (2025). EFL Students' Attitudes Towards Translanguaging Practice: Its Implications for Willingness to Communicate in Indonesian Vocational Classrooms. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, *13*(1), 255. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i1.12711

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.

Marliana, R., Ali H, A. H., Warqiah R, W. R., & Syamsul, C. P. (2025). Practical English Communication: Role plays training for SMKN 1 Majene students. *Room of Civil Society Development*, *4*(3), 460–474. https://doi.org/10.59110/rcsd.639

Maulana, F., Ikhsanudin, I., & Suhartono, L. (2020). Students' Motivation to Speak in a Group Discussion. *Journal of English Education Program*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.26418/jeep.v1i1.40025

Nurhaida, I., Windah*, A., & Nina Yudha, A. (2023). Transformasi Paradigma Pembelajaran: Kolaborasi dan Partisipasi Aktif Melalui Sosialisasi Program Praktisi Mengajar. *Dinamisia : Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, *7*(5), 1315–1325. https://doi.org/10.31849/dinamisia.v7i5.15686

Pennington, M. C., & Richards, J. C. (2016). Teacher Identity in Language Teaching: Integrating Personal, Contextual, and Professional Factors. *RELC Journal*, *47*(1), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216631219

Polanyi, M., & Sen, A. (2009). *The tacit dimension*. University of Chicago Press.

Rahmawati, Y. (2026). Digital Readiness in Esp Learning: Evidence from Vocational Maritime Education. *Journal of English Education Program*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.26418/jeep.v7i1.99836

Rytivaara, A., & Kershner, R. (2012). Co-teaching as a context for teachers' professional learning and joint knowledge construction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*(7), 999–1008. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.05.006

Tifani, T., Regina, R., & Wardah, W. (2020). Improving Students' Confidence in Speaking by Storytelling Technique through Webtoon. *Journal of English Education Program*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.26418/jeep.v1i1.40017

Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. A. (2005). Theorizing Language Teacher Identity: Three Perspectives and Beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *4*(1), 21–44. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327701jlie0401_2

Villa, R. A., & Thousand, J. S. (2013). *A guide to co-teaching: New lessons and strategies to facilitate student learning* (3 edition). Corwin.

Wider, W., Saad, A., Mahmood, N. A., Ishak, S., Aziz, M. R. A., Wu, C., Wu, H., & Tanucan, J. C. M. (2026). Digital Literacy in Enhancing Collaborative Teaching: A Systematic Review. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *27*(1), 210–234. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v27i1.8717

Yazan, B., & Lindahl, K. (Eds.). (2020). *Language teacher identity in TESOL: Teacher education and practice as identity work*. Routledge.