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The global demand for English has broad implications for teacher preparation in lingua franca settings. Given that up to 80 percent of all English teachers globally are nonnative speakers of English, the quality of their professional preparation and their degree of language proficiency are key issues. This review surveys research on nonnative English-speaking teachers related to teacher preparation, including issues of pedagogy and language varieties. To illustrate actual training issues, two cases of teacher preparation experiences in Egypt and Uzbekistan are presented. The Egypt case describes the development of standards for English teachers and how they may provide a road map for professional preparation and improved English language skills. The Uzbek case provides examples of ways in which the teacher preparation program targeted needs perceived by both the trainers and the local teachers. This review also sets out goals for teacher preparation in lingua franca settings such as assisting participants to view themselves as intercultural speakers and integrating methodologies that are valued in the local context. Suggestions for future research include consideration of how teacher educators might address the issue of Inner Circle and Outer Circle varieties of English and how teachers’ cultural knowledge can be addressed within teacher preparation curricula.

The global spread of English has resulted in the use of English as a lingua franca (Burns, 2005; Seidlhofer, 2004). As explained by Seidlhofer (2004), in its purest form, “a lingua franca has no native speakers” (p. 211). However, the spread of the English language is such that it has resulted in its use by speakers of English from Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circles (Burns, 2005; Seidlhofer, 2004). Regardless of the term used to refer to English as a lingua franca (e.g., English as an international language, English as a world language, English as a global language, etc.), the reality is that, to put it in Burns’ (2005) words: English is “a language used locally and internationally, not only among so-called native speakers but by anyone wishing to activate his or her role as a member of an international communicative network” (p. 1).1
Additionally, around the world, there are more English speakers who come from Expanding Circles than those who come from Inner Circle contexts (Canagarajah, 2005; Kachru, 1992; Kachru & Nelson, 2001). Therefore, it should not come as a surprise that English is being taught by nonnative speakers of English to other nonnative English speakers (Kachru & Nelson, 2001; Medgyes, 1996; Pasternak & Bailey, 2004). Nonnative English-speaking (NNES) teachers constitute up to 80 percent of the English teachers around the world (Canagarajah, 1999). Pasternak and Bailey (2004) argue that given these numbers, “It is simply not logical to assume that there are enough native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) (qualified or otherwise) to meet the global demand for English teachers; nor is it logical to assume that hiring a native over a nonnative teacher is always the best administrative decision” (p. 156). This chapter reviews current research and scholarship in relation to issues in teacher preparation for English as a lingua franca. Through the presentation of two cases of teacher preparation in English as lingua franca settings, it addresses current issues in English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching and learning. It concludes with implications for teacher preparation in lingua franca settings and suggestions for future research.

**Issues of Professional Preparation and Language Proficiency**

Recently, there has been a significant growth in research focusing on NNES teachers (see Kamhi-Stein, 2005, for a comprehensive review of the research on the topic). However, as explained by Pasternak and Bailey (2004), the debate over the qualifications of native and nonnative speakers “is highly controversial” (p. 156) on two grounds. First, a satisfactory definition of the term native speaker is not available “and in the absence of such a definition, the negative term is quite impossible to define” (Kaplan, 1999, quoted in Pasternak & Bailey, 2004, p. 156). Second, nativeness in English cannot be equated with proficiency in English and, a teacher’s language proficiency “is only one element of professionalism” (p. 161). For Pasternak and Bailey, the second element of professionalism is professional preparation.

They further argue that teachers, regardless of whether they are native or nonnative speakers—must have both declarative knowledge—“knowledge about something”—and procedural knowledge—“ability to do things” in at least three key areas: “(1) knowing about and how to use the target language, (2) knowing about and how to teach in culturally appropriate ways, and (3) knowing about and how to behave appropriately in the target culture” (p. 158).

Bailey (2006) and Pasternak and Bailey (2004) present a framework that examines issues of language proficiency and professional preparation. Central to their framework are two notions. First, language proficiency and professional development need to be perceived as continua. Second, “there are different degrees of proficiency: being proficient is a continuum, rather than an either-or proposition” (Pasternak & Bailey, 2004, p. 163). Moreover, “whether or not a teacher is proficient depends on how we define this multifaceted construct” (p. 163). Figure 1 presents the framework.
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Figure 1: Continua of Target Language Proficiency and Professional Preparation (from Bailey, 2006)

According to this framework, teachers falling in Quadrant 1 would be those who are proficient in the target language and are professionally prepared. Teachers falling in Quadrant 4 would be those who are neither proficient nor have professional preparation. According to the framework, teachers falling in Quadrant 2 would be professionally prepared and not proficient in the target language and teachers falling in Quadrant 3 would be proficient in the target language but not professionally prepared.

A complementary view of the relationship between professional preparation and language proficiency, this time in direct relationship to the EFL English as a foreign language setting, is provided by Lee (2004). She argues that teacher preparation programs need to sensitize teachers to issues that are of professional interest to them. To do this, the teacher preparation curriculum should promote reflection, capitalize on the teachers’ strengths by promoting awareness of the advantages they bring to the classroom as nonnative English-speaking professionals, and reinforce the need for ongoing language improvement.

An issue that has only recently been addressed is the relationship between proficiency in English and teachers’ instructional practices. A study by Butler (2004) investigated EFL teachers in Korea, Taiwan, and Japan, their perceptions about their level of proficiency, and their perceptions about the minimum level of proficiency they perceived to be necessary to teach elementary school children. The results of the study showed that there were gaps in the teachers’ perceptions about their proficiency, their desired level of proficiency, and what they perceived to be the minimum level of proficiency necessary to teach at the elementary school level. Butler explains that the teachers’ negative self-perceptions are problematic because
they may ultimately affect their instructional practices and, in turn, negatively affect student learning and motivation.

In another related study, Kamhi-Stein and Mahboob (2005) investigated the relationship among teachers’ English language proficiency, teachers’ beliefs about second language (L2) teaching and learning, and language used in classrooms in Argentina, South Korea, and Pakistan. They found that a complex interplay of factors affect the teachers’ use of English in the classroom. Specifically, the results of their investigation showed that in implementing instruction, the extent to which teachers used their home language or English was affected by their actual proficiency in English (as measured by a battery of tests) and their beliefs about L2 teaching and learning. The study also showed that the teachers’ instructional practices were, to a large extent, contextualized in the beliefs and practices of the educational system in which they functioned.

Issues of Pedagogy

Over the last few years, researchers have emphasized the importance of implementing language teaching methodologies that are sensitive to local sociocultural and institutional beliefs (Canagarajah, 1999; Kumaravadivelu, 2001; Lin, Wang, Akamatsu, & Riazi, 2005; Luk, 2005; McKay, 2002). Communicative language teaching (CLT), the most popular approach to the teaching of English around the world over the past two decades (Burns, 2005), has been questioned on the basis that it relies on Western beliefs and values, and as such, is problematic because of the mismatch in expectations about teachers’ and students’ roles (Luk, 2005; McKay, 2002).

In a study of the implementation of CLT in Hong Kong classrooms, Luk (2005) found that “verbalizing voices does not necessarily equal communication” (p. 264). Instead, she concluded that language development for global communication is facilitated when instruction allows students to express their “localized self” (p. 265) in the target language, that is, when classroom activities are centered around topics that are relevant to the students’ local settings and allow students to express their thoughts, feelings, and intentions. The same conclusion was reached by Lin, Wang, Akamatsu, and Riazi (2005) in their study of their own English language learning experiences in foreign language settings. At issue were instructional materials, which, though ostensibly authentic (in the sense that they were written by and about native English speakers), did not allow students to express their “localized selves” (Luk, 2005, p. 265). Instead, when teachers focused on topics centered around social and political issues that were relevant to the students’ lives, the students gained confidence and fluency in using English for meaningful communication.

In relation to pedagogical practices, Lin, Wang, Akamatsu, and Riazi (2005) argue that rather than asking “what counts as ‘good pedagogy”, the question that needs to be asked is: “What counts as good pedagogy in specific sociocultural contexts?” (p. 210). To answer this question, they report on the instrumentality of the teachers of English they had studied, who, in spite of implementing
methodologies that would be devalued in the context of current Anglo-based pedagogies (e.g., code-mixing, code-switching, translation, etc.), facilitated their process of English language appropriation.

Although teachers’ pedagogical practices are crucial to the language learning process, the role that teachers play in the classroom is equally important. Luk’s (2005) study of the implementation of CLT in Hong Kong showed that successful communication is promoted when teachers act as “linguistic mediators” (Luk, 2005 p. 264) and “cultural mediators” (Kramsch & Sullivan, as quoted in Luk, 2005, p. 264). Much like Luk, Velasco-Martin (2004) argues that the figure of the teacher as an intercultural speaker “leaves no place for the issue of the native versus the nonnative speaker” (p. 280) (a point also made by Kramsch, 1998 and Seidlhofer, 1999). Moreover, in this view, central to the language learning process is student training for critical awareness about the target language and culture and their own language and culture. Rather than training students for native speaker competence, emphasis is placed on helping students develop an intercultural personality (McKay, 2002; Velasco-Martin, 2004).

Language Varieties and Pronunciation

A question that has received attention over the last few years is which variety of English to teach. Matsuda (2003a) notes that the applied linguistics field views multiple varieties of English as “legitimate” (p. 719). With this backdrop in mind, one would expect that in English as a lingua franca classrooms, instructional practices would favor the integration of multiple varieties of World Englishes. However, in practice, language classrooms favor the implementation of Inner Circle varieties of English, with British and American English being the preeminent varieties since they are perceived to represent the owners of the English language (Matsuda, 2003a, 2005). Matsuda (2003a) argues that this practice, which she has observed in Japan, is problematic on several grounds. First, it goes contrary to—in the case of Japan—the objective that English “be offered as the required foreign language because it is an international language” (p. 721). It is also problematic because it undermines language learners and fails to help them take ownership of the English language. It further fails to show that, much like native speakers of English, speakers of English as a lingua franca speak different varieties of English.

To challenge the Inner Circle orientation to English language instruction, Matsuda (2003a, 2005) proposes a curriculum in which students are exposed to English speakers from various backgrounds. In this curriculum, instruction focuses on communicative effectiveness—rather than grammatical accuracy based on Inner Circle expectations. The curriculum would also integrate instructional materials that represent different varieties of World Englishes and such materials would be used as a means to raise awareness about the role and place of English in different geographical regions. Furthermore, in this curriculum the EFL teacher would attempt to cross-reference key themes from subject matter courses to increase student awareness about the world and the role of English. Finally, schools would offer courses in languages other than English “to better equip them [students] linguistically
for intercultural communication” (2005, p. 71). Like Matsuda, Evans (2005) proposes relying on a curriculum that challenges the notion that Inner Circle varieties of English are the only valid varieties of English. To meet this goal, Evans implemented an approach to instruction modeled after Kachru’s (1992) Outer and Expanding Circle Englishes. In this approach, instruction was designed to make students aware of the spread of English and its different varieties, to raise students’ awareness of their own and others’ discourse styles, and to help students to understand how discourse style affects interactions.

Several studies, focusing both on language learners and teachers, have focused on perceptions about the ownership of English in relation to English as a lingua franca. Specifically, Matsuda’s (2003b) investigation of secondary school students in Japan showed that while students were aware that English was being used internationally, they also thought that speakers of English in Inner Circle countries were the owners of the English language. She also found that Japanese students perceived Inner Circle English as standard varieties of English and preferred these varieties over Outer Circle varieties of English. Much like Matsuda’s study, in an investigation focusing on teachers of English in Greece, Sifakis and Sougari (2005) found that most respondents believed that English belongs to native speakers or to people with native speaker competence. Sifakis and Sougari recommend that teacher training in Greece and other Expanding Circle settings promote awareness of issues related to English as an international language, persuade teachers to study the varieties of English used, and encourage reflection on issues of identity and ownership of English as a lingua franca. They also recommend that testing instruments in EFL settings deemphasize traditional native-speaker norms (see Elder & Davies, this volume).

Several recent studies have investigated the issue of teacher identity, ownership of the English language, and accentedness in English. For example, the relationship between teacher identity and accentedness in English was investigated by Jenkins (2005). Specifically, in a study of NNES teachers of English in lingua franca contexts, Jenkins found that native speaker accent was associated with positive characteristics whereas a nonnative speaker accent was associated with negative characteristics. She also found that factors such as past experiences and perceptions about their future as professionals may contribute to their identification with native speakers or to the teachers’ desire to be identified as a native speaker as expressed by native-like accentedness. Jenkins concludes that “it can’t be taken for granted that teachers (let alone all speakers) from the expanding circle wish unequivocally to use their accent English to express their L1 identity or membership in an international (ELF) community” (p. 541).

In a study of immigrant women teaching in adult ESL programs in Canada, Amin (2004) concluded that “native speakers are imagined as having Inner Circle accents, and that accents, like race, are socially organized, are a linguistic manifestation of nativism, and constitute a new and effective form of racism” (p. 77). However, the teachers in Amin’s study implemented pedagogical practices that resisted the notion that native speakers have an Inner Circle accent. Rather than
using commercial audiotapes that relied on “White accents,” the teachers in her study made use of tapes with a variety of accents, including their own. In a related investigation, Golombek and Jordan (2005) found that the pre-service teachers were influenced by the native speaker myth and by the notion that the native speaker is White. However, they further observed that the teacher preparation program in which pre-service teachers were enrolled helped them to challenge the notions by providing them “opportunities for PSTs [pre-service teachers] to develop alternative instructional practices that are compatible with an imagined identity, especially because those practices may run counter to institutional norms” (p. 530).

The issue of teacher accentedness has also been investigated from the students’ perspective. In one study, focusing on ESL learners’ attitudes toward teacher accentedness in an Inner Circle setting, Kelch and Santana-Williamson (2002) had students listen to passages read by native and nonnative speakers and complete attitudinal surveys. The findings of their investigation showed that language learners were not capable of distinguishing between native English-speaking (NES) and a nonnative English-speaking (NNES) teacher accent “with a high degree of accuracy” (p. 62). The results also showed that students attributed positive characteristics to teachers who were perceived to be native speakers. Finally, the study revealed that degree of familiarity with the different varieties of English spoken by the teachers affected the students’ perceptions about the teachers. In another study, also looking at ESL learners’ attitudes toward teachers, Liang (2002) had students complete a variety of tasks designed to untap the students’ attitudes toward Inner Circle and Expanding Circle teachers. She also had students listen to recordings of five NNES teachers and one NES teacher and complete attitudinal surveys. The results of the study showed that students did not perceive the native speaker to be the ideal teacher of English. At the same time, degree of teacher accentedness correlated positively with students’ attitudes toward the teacher.

**Teacher Preparation: Examples from Egypt and Uzbekistan**

In this section, we apply the issues raised above to two lingua franca settings for in-service teacher preparation. Our aim is to show how these issues play out in the actual, on the ground preparation of teachers in two very different lingua franca contexts where resources are scarce, yet needs are great.

**Egypt: The Development of Standards**

English is the primary foreign language offered in Egyptian public schools, and competent users of English are in great demand in tourism and commerce. Many Egyptian universities require English-medium instruction in the final two years of university study in majors such as science, engineering, and technology. Despite the demands, there is dissatisfaction with students’ ability to use English for a variety of communicative purposes.

The growing emphasis on English is underscored by dramatic changes in the onset of English instruction in Egyptian government schools. Within the last decade,
the introduction of English instruction has been moved from the sixth year of primary school, to the fourth year, and, more recently, to the first year of primary school. As in many EFL settings, the pool of qualified instructors has not kept pace with government mandates. El Naggar et al. (2001) point out that many English teachers lack training in the effective instruction of young learners and experience in communicative teaching methods, and many teachers themselves feel that their own English skills are inadequate.

Pharos, a project focused on improving the quality of English teaching in Egyptian schools, illustrates several key issues in in-service teacher training in a lingua franca setting. The project was a precursor to a larger educational reform program that is currently taking place in Egypt around the vehicle of national standards (National Standards of Education, 2004). The Pharos project sought to:
1. improve English classroom instruction and in-service teacher education systems;
2. provide a framework to support training and technical assistance;
3. offer a set of consistent criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of training; and
4. ultimately serve as a model for the development of standards in other content areas such as mathematics, science, Arabic, and other foreign languages.

The vehicle used to meet these goals was standards. Standards are statements that describe what learning should look like and how learning should be provided in order to increase achievement or effectiveness. Applied to teachers, standards describe what teachers need to know and be able to do as they design and deliver instruction and assess student achievement. The Pharos project took place over a four-year period with a team of American specialists with expertise in standards development and implementation. These American specialists collaborated with Egyptian faculty of education members with extensive knowledge of teacher preparation in Egypt and the Egyptian instructional setting. By the end of the project, the team had developed four sets of standards—for English teachers, teacher trainers, educational leaders, and in-service training programs.


Standards can serve as a lens through which to improve teacher professionalism and language proficiency. They necessarily create a certain tension between teachers’ current comfort zones and a more forward directed target for improved professionalism and language proficiency. To be meaningful, they must,
as Lin, Wang, Akamatsu, and Riazi (2005) note, be sufficiently grounded in the specific sociocultural contexts. The following examples illustrate how some of the key issues raised previously were realized through the application of standards in the in-service preparation of English teachers in Egypt. They seek to demonstrate how improved professionalism and proficiency were conceptualized within the Egyptian sociocultural context.

Example 1: Variety of English. Standards designed for the EFL setting must address the issue of language proficiency. However, where should the bar be set? Our review of literature shows that language learners assess the “ideal English teacher” on a number of different criteria. For example, they gave more favorable ratings to teachers who spoke a variety of English with which they were familiar. In addition, they did not necessarily perceive pronunciation to be a key criterion. At the same time, standards that aim to improve student achievement through teacher effectiveness must set out certain benchmarks. This is illustrated in the domain “language proficiency” which states: “Language proficiency is defined as the level of English language competence that enables educators to perform their tasks and duties.” Applied to the English teacher:

Standard 1: The English teacher uses oral and written English language appropriately and fluently.

In this conceptualization of language proficiency, the native speaker is not the model; rather the focus is how teachers use the language in the course of their duties. Evaluation might contain levels of achievement such as “does not meet standard,” “meets standard,” or “exceeds standard” so that teachers may move further along the language proficiency continuum.

Example 2: Methodology. In the area of methodology, standards should build on a foundation that validates what teachers already know, but also give explicit direction to their design of lessons. This is illustrated in the domain “Planning and Management of Learning” for the educational leader (i.e., headmaster, school director, or principal) where the standard and indicator are:

Standard 1: The educational leader manages the organizational unit and resources to ensure a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Indicator A: The leader sets SMART objectives to guide performance in the work unit. (S = Specific M = Measurable A = Attainable R = Results-oriented T = Time bound)

Egyptian teachers learn the acronym SMART in their pre-service training. The Egyptian educational system is a very top-down and hierarchical workplace where teachers generally have very little say in decisionmaking. This indicator aimed to validate teachers’ approach to lesson planning while attempting to link teacher thinking and administrator thinking through a shared discourse. In other words, it gave administrators an entrée to talk the same language as the teacher in the course of their work as educational professionals in the school.
Example 3: Professionalism. The seventh domain of the Pharos standards deals with Professionalism—defined as the modeling of ethical professional conduct, engaging in reflective practice, and pursuing life-long professional growth and career opportunities. The standard and indicator that follow further delineate this domain:

Standard 1: The English teacher continually evaluates his/her choices and action, is a reflective practitioner, and actively seeks opportunities to grow professionally.

Indicator F: The English teacher solicits feedback and advice from peer teachers whenever possible to evaluate his/her own professional practice.

This standard reflects ways in which teachers in a lingua franca setting can promote their own professional growth. It reinforces Lee’s (2004) call for teachers to engage actively in a process of reflection that aids them in making professional decisions.

Many other examples exist within the Pharos standards, but these three dealing with varieties of English, methodology, and professionalism should suffice to provide a picture of how standards can create a road map to promote professionalism and improve language skills. To truly instantiate the key issues we have identified as constituting a contemporary approach to teacher preparation in lingua franca settings, local teachers, teacher trainers, and education officials must be involved from the earliest stages of development. This was true of the Pharos project; American consultants and Egyptian faculty of education members collaborated, and all drafts of the standards were put out to field discussions with “partners,” consisting of classroom teachers, directors of in-service training centers, professors from faculties of education, ministry officials, and so on. Although the writing team tried at all times to be mindful of local conditions, the partners time and again underscored it. In the end, the team could say with confidence that the standards succeeded in being “Egyptianized” while still providing a pathway for professional development, both for individual teachers seeking to improve their teaching skills and their English language proficiency, and, on a wider scale, for larger scale pre-service and in-service teacher preparation.

Uzbekistan: Target Language Proficiency and Professional Development

The Uzbek State University of World Languages (USUWL) is the largest teacher education institute in Uzbekistan. Begun in 2000 as a joint project between USUWL and the Regional English Language Office of the U.S. Department of State in Tashkent, USUWL’s Institute of English Language Teacher Education (IELTE) operates a unique English-medium pilot program for future teachers of English. It is the only four-year pre-service English teacher preparation program in Central Asia, qualifying its graduates to teach English at Uzbek secondary schools, lyceums, institutes, and universities.
From October 2003–May 2005, ten members of the IELTE teacher training faculty participated in a two-year professional development program funded by the U.S. Department of State.\textsuperscript{5} This program consisted of six site visits by two English Language Specialists (ELSpecs) and a three-week summer intensive program in 2004 conducted at the University of California, Los Angeles. For the majority of participants, the summer program represented their first time outside Central Asia as well as their first visit to an English-speaking country.

The primary goals of the ELSpecs’ site visits included providing feedback on pedagogy, promoting reflective teaching,\textsuperscript{6} assessing the IELTE’s curriculum, and collaborating with faculty on curriculum/materials development. For the summer intensive, the primary goals included continued revision of the IELTE curriculum, creation of a program website, improving teacher pronunciation, professionalizing skills, and broadening understanding of U.S. culture. The ultimate project goals were to provide the IELTE faculty with the necessary skills to develop and implement a successful undergraduate curriculum and to autonomously administer the IELTE program.

Uzbekistan, as one of the former Republics of the Soviet Union, is located in a region of the world where English was previously relegated to school subject status. Today, although Russian continues to be the dominant nonnational language in this Muslim majority country and to play a critical role in education, government and commerce, English is widely spoken and taught. As an English-medium program within an otherwise Russian-medium institution, IELTE represents a unique English as a lingua franca environment. Using a curriculum modeled after U.S. English teacher preparation programs, the faculty strictly adhere to the practice of conducting classes and all other interactions (e.g., office hours, meetings, casual conversations) in English. This practice carries over to Uzbek and Russian-speaking teacher candidates, who use English not only in the classroom setting (i.e., to ask and answer questions, to conduct group work) but also in out-of-class interactions with their peers.

Despite the growing popularity of English in Uzbekistan, there are still very few opportunities to interact with native speakers of English. Notable exceptions to this situation for the IELTE faculty include U.S. State Department ELSpec visits or other professional development opportunities afforded by Peace Corps, Soros Foundation, the British Council, and so on. In particular, IELTE has benefited from having both a U.S. State Department Senior English Language Specialist and a Fulbright Fellow funded to teach in the program.

An additional factor figuring into the equation of faculty target language proficiency and professional preparation is the resource poor environment in which the IELTE operates. A modest teacher professional library has been provided through outside funding. However, the program still lacks many essential resources, including Internet connectivity. In terms of teacher professional preparation, faculty members are educated in the field of English Philology, possessing either a B.A., Diploma, or M.A. degree in this field; they are all self taught in the field of Applied
Linguistics and teaching English as a second language since neither of these degrees is currently offered in Uzbekistan.

As noted earlier, when conducting teacher professional development, it is important to build in tolerance for teacher accentedness, accept regional varieties of English, and recognize nonnative speaker ownership of English. It is also critical to keep in mind the strengths that NNES teachers bring to the classroom and to recognize the complex sociocultural context in which a given program is situated. In Uzbekistan, however, there is no localized English variant and Inner Circle variants of English (i.e., British and increasingly American) are the target linguistic norms for the EFL classroom as well as for teacher preparation programs such as IELTE. Given IELTE’s goal of creating a U.S. style TESOL preparation program in Central Asia, the program setting was one in which the faculty are attempting to emulate and recreate the linguistic and cultural practices of similar programs in the United States.

Applying the Bailey (2006) and Pasternak and Bailey (2004) framework, it was determined that the IELTE faculty fell into quadrant 4—neither possessing target-like second language proficiency nor having adequate professional preparation as second language teacher educators. Goals for the professional development program were thus defined collaboratively with the IELTE faculty to address each of these competencies. IELE faculty-identified needs included: fine-tuning the existing teacher preparation curriculum and designing new courses for the 4th year curriculum; preparing for the upcoming accreditation of IELTE by the USUWL administration; revising the entrance exam and other assessment instruments; increasing teachers’ facility with computers; addressing teacher pronunciation and grammar skills; and structuring the supervision of the student teaching and senior project courses. ELSpec-identified needs included: fine-tuning teachers’ lesson delivery; addressing language issues in content classes; improving teachers’ pronunciation and academic writing skills; identifying the optimal scope and sequence of courses for the 4-year TESOL curriculum; and helping IELTE faculty acquire professional leadership skills.

**Target language proficiency.** Multiple components of the program targeted linguistic development. A key component of all six site visits involved IELTE faculty observations by the ELSpecs. These observations proved critical in assessing the classroom linguistic performance of individual faculty members and providing individualized feedback in the areas of grammar, pronunciation, word choice, and nonnative use of expressions. A few verbatim comments from the written observation protocols follow:

- **Grammar:** “There are still occasional question and embedded question formation issues (e.g., “First you will explain what was your aim,” “What you liked?” “What the teacher should change?”)

- **Pronunciation:** *Teacher pronunciation remains an issue, particularly with the mid and low front vowel contrasts and with the diphthongs. We noted, for example, that “scattered” sounded like “skittered,” “radar” sounded like “raedar,” “hatter” sounded like “hetter,” “feather” sounded like*
“fither,” “lead” sounded like “liyd,” and “blind” sounded like “blonde.” Lack of postvocalic /r/ is also an issue: “hard” sounded like “hot” and “or” sounded like “oh.”

- Word choice: “Avoid the use of the expression “home task”. Instead, use homework or out of class assignment.”
- Nonnative use of expressions: “Yes? with rising intonation at the end is not a tag question in English. Instead, try “Right?” “Okay?”

Because participants had self-identified their need for advanced work in pronunciation and grammar, during the 3-week summer intensive program components were added to address these. Additionally, during visit six, an experiential content-based academic writing module was added to provide participants with practice in high-level academic writing and exposure to a process approach to writing.

Teacher professional development. Prior development initiatives at the IELTE had focused on the theory and practice of CLT. During visit one, it became quickly apparent that the IELTE faculty was successfully implementing CLT. However, initial ELSpec observations of classroom teaching revealed that (1) the curriculum was overloaded with tasks and (2) little attention was being paid to “essentials” of lesson delivery such as warm-up, comprehension checking, effective transitions, and language feedback. Sample comments from the written observation protocols follow:

- Lesson warmup: “Although your use of language is quite natural, I found the typical lesson “chit chat” somewhat lacking. Don’t be afraid to ask students more personal questions and begin the lesson with a more extended warm-up.”
- Comprehension checking: “There needs to be more variety in ways that student comprehension is checked. Almost without exception, students were asked “Is it clear?” As we’ve discussed previously, this is not the most effective way to ensure student comprehension.”
- Transitions: “Transitions are very brief or absent. For example, when introducing the second activity, the transition you used was “Okay, same happens when you read something.” The connection between the first and second activity wasn’t really clear. Your transition should serve to provide this important missing information.”
- Language feedback: “I’d like to see more “recasting” of students’ language. They sometimes have the right idea but lack the appropriate language to explain this. This is where the teacher can help assist students’ own language acquisition.”

To supplement the feedback from course observations and to promote reflective teaching, participants were asked to videotape themselves teaching, select a short self-contained segment to transcribe, and then write a critical incident analysis of the segment. Issues identified by the participants included excess teacher talk,
failure to elicit information from students, inadequate or unclear instruction, ineffective transitions between lesson segments, and so on.

Because the IELTE faculty lacked a professional background in applied linguistics, many were teaching courses in the 3rd and 4th years (e.g., second language acquisition, assessment) that they themselves had never taken. Thus attempts were made to provide resources and expertise in these areas. Finally, a high priority was assigned to teacher professional development, including writing curriculum vitae and conference abstracts and developing teacher portfolios.7

Goals for Teacher Preparation in a Lingua Franca Setting

The two examples of Egypt and Uzbekistan reveal that teacher preparation in lingua franca settings must be guided by carefully-defined goals. They further reveal the importance of setting in determining these goals since, as Markee (2001) reminds us, the immediate context of language teaching and the sociocultural factors present ultimately account for “Who adopts what, where, when, why, and how?” (p. 125). Our experiences suggest that teacher preparation programs in lingua franca settings should:

• Expose teachers and, ultimately, learners to varieties of English beyond the Inner Circle;
• Help to deconstruct the myth of the native speaker and offer participants opportunities to recognize and value themselves as intercultural speakers;
• Integrate methodologies that are valued in the local context and reflect students’ actual needs and interests;
• Align teacher preparation with the needs of learners in schools;
• Be guided by local conceptualizations of what constitutes professionalism;
• Foster language development through increased target language exposure, consciousness-raising activities, and overt feedback;
• Provide teachers opportunities to progress along the continuum of professionalism through exposure to standards and a variety of professional development opportunities;
• Encourage collaboration between local and outside experts; and
• Instill in participants the value of on-going reflective practice and life long learning endeavors.

Future Directions

Based on our collective experiences, we have identified the following issues as critical for those involved in international teacher education. The questions below are meant to both provoke discussion and guide future research in teacher preparation in lingua franca settings.
What does it mean to aim for a global perspective while maintaining local sensibilities?

For example, which criteria should be applied to determine the appropriateness of teaching methods and curricular models in local contexts? Investigations should be undertaken to understand the value of different methodologies in relation to local beliefs and to determine how best to blend local teaching approaches with those promoted by Inner Circle methodologies. This work should include investigation of which content/topics are appropriate and relevant for given populations; it should further consider how teacher education programs can modify their existing language curricula to become more sensitized to these issues.

How should teacher educators address the issue of Inner Circle versus Outer Circle varieties of English?

The literature on NNES teachers makes the important point that target language norms (i.e., Inner Circle vs. Outer Circle variants of English) differ widely depending on the context in which the teacher preparation program is conducted. Thus which variety of World Englishes to teach should be determined based on local norms and curricular guidelines. However, a continuing controversy is the degree of target language proficiency that NNES teachers must attain in order to serve as good target language models for their students. Sensitively addressing the proficiency issue and building language development opportunities into teacher preparation programs is a priority, especially in contexts where there is no localized variety of English and where teachers lack fluency and/or accuracy in their command of English. Answers to this question will assist in developing objectives for teacher preparation curricula and in setting aims for acceptable levels of language proficiency in local contexts.

How should teachers’ cultural knowledge be addressed within teacher preparation curricula?

This issue closely parallels that of which variety of English to select as the target norm. In this respect, it is critical to infuse the notion of the teacher, regardless of language background, as the intercultural speaker, acknowledging his or her knowledge of both local and target cultures. But how to achieve this and how to ensure that teachers are able to display an intercultural personality, that is, that teachers develop the ability to critically reflect on the target culture and language in relation to their own language and culture remain issues to be addressed.

In the case of NNES teachers, access to knowledge of the target culture remains an issue for the vast majority who are teaching in EFL contexts because many have little access to native speakers and have not had the opportunity to experience the target culture firsthand. Teacher educators must therefore critically examine how to engage teachers in activities designed to prepare them to explicate culture, both in planned (i.e., culture-based lessons) and unplanned contexts (i.e., in response to student questions).
To what extent, if any, are standards applicable to lingua franca contexts? If they are, kinds of standards should be developed to meet local needs? And which kinds of collaborative projects might local and outside experts be engaged in to develop such standards? In other words, whose standards are to be used and for which purposes?

The development of standards has the potential for many avenues of reform. Among possible impacts, for instance, are discussions (for the first time) across educational sectors, the setting of benchmarks for student achievement, changes in student assessment procedures, the design of blueprints for meeting the needs of teachers through professional development programs, and the development of criteria for teacher promotion and career advancement apart from seniority or patronage.

Other issues that we have not touched on directly in this chapter will undoubtedly also come into play and need to be addressed. One rather obvious one is that the pre-service education of teachers in lingua franca settings is often not in alignment with the in-service programs delivered by “specialists” from abroad. This, coupled with the fact that many in-service programs involve collaboration of both local teacher educators and foreign specialists mandates that the current knowledge base and philosophies of both sets of teacher educators be in alignment as well. Often, this is not the case as local authorities who are designated to participate in joint teacher education programs often have received their own teacher education many years in the past and may not have updated their knowledge base. This can, in some cases, lead to the lack of a shared philosophy between the two sets of educators and even, in extreme cases, to resistance to or obstruction of program goals.

In conclusion, if pre-service and in-service are seen as steps on the same pathway to teacher professionalism, then government ministries must develop articulated plans that require the collaboration of the institutions delivering pre-service education and those systems in which in-service education is delivered. The results of ongoing needs assessment can be fed back into both sets of institutions and priorities for teacher preparation can be assigned. This is especially important in the case of low resource settings. Ensuring quality should be a chief aim of any teacher preparation system and the study of mechanisms for quality control should guide policy and planning.

Notes

1. For a comprehensive review of research perspectives on English as a lingua franca, see Seidlhofer (2004).


3. A domain is defined as a general, overarching area that is broad enough to account for the various audiences and settings to which it is applied. Progress indicators were also developed to go along with domains and standards. These are defined as assessable, observable behaviors or activities that show progress toward

4. The program graduated its first cohort of 65 students in the spring of 2005.

5. Donna Brinton and Barry Griner of UCLA’s Department of Applied Linguistics & TESL conducted the six site visits to Tashkent, where they were assisted by Regional English Language Officer Lisa Harshbarger, Assistant Regional English Language Officer Rifat Gafurov, and Senior English Language Fellow Joëlle Uzarski. During the three-week summer Uzbek Teachers of English Program at UCLA they were assisted by Priyanvada Abeywickrama, Claire Chik, Janet Goodwin, Christine Holten, Linda Jensen, and Joëlle Uzarski.

6. Seminal sources on reflective teaching include: Bailey, Curtis, and Nunan (2001a); Richards and Lockhart (1994); Stanley (1998); and Zeichner and Liston (1996).

7. For excellent sources on teaching portfolios, see Bailey, Curtis, and Nunan (2001b) and Wolfe-Quintero and Brown (1998).

8. Lazaraton (2003) presents interesting research on this issue. See also the response to this research (Jeannot & Lazaraton, 2004).

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY


This volume, from the Case Studies in TESOL Practice series, is written by practitioners for practitioners. The volume summarizes current thinking and scholarship in relation to issues of English as a global language and applies them to the language classroom. The 12 chapters in the volume provide practitioners with practical ideas of how the notion of English as a global language can be integrated in actual classrooms around the world.


This thought-provoking volume presents a collection of 12 papers dealing with the spread of and effects of English on local communities. The papers in the volume argue that the spread of English is often associated with “the imported notions of ‘progress’ and ‘innovation’” (p. x) at the
expense of local practices and beliefs. The authors make the case for revaluing local practices in language teaching and learning.


Along with its companion volumes in the three-part series *Teaching English Language Worldwide*, *Analysing English in a Global Context* is a valuable compilation of essays that address the changing nature of English today. Issues addressed in the 15 articles that comprise the volume include the internationalization of English, the development of local varieties and the surrounding debate regarding which of these constitute “standard” varieties, and the need to recognize and value NNESTs.


This volume focuses on issues related to NNES professionals as teachers of English. The volume consists of 16 chapters in which the authors present theory and research related to NNES professionals; it examines a wide range of issues in relation to teacher preparation and discusses implications for classroom practice.
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