
1-9-2017

Construct Shift of Pre-Service Language Teachers on Globalized English within a Turkish Context

Yonca Özkan

Cukurova University, yoncaca@cu.edu.tr

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended APA Citation

Özkan, Y. (2017). Construct Shift of Pre-Service Language Teachers on Globalized English within a Turkish Context. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(1), 105-122. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol22/iss1/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Qualitative Report at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Qualitative Report by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.



Qualitative Research Graduate Certificate
Indulge in Culture
Exclusively Online • 18 Credits
LEARN MORE

NSU
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN
UNIVERSITY

NOVA SOUTHEASTERN

Construct Shift of Pre-Service Language Teachers on Globalized English within a Turkish Context

Abstract

The leading position of English as a global language has indisputably continued for several decades. This pivotal role has inevitably been influencing English language teaching and teacher education. The number of nonnative English speaking teachers has by far surpassed that of native English speaking teachers. This reality has led us to conduct this particular descriptive study involving Turkish senior pre-service language teachers acting as participants in a training as part of a course (Globalization in ELT), in which we investigated the participants' perceptions towards globalized English regarding common themes in the journal and interview data. The findings revealed that although the majority of participants supported superiority of nativeness and inner circle culture prior to delivery of the course, following the training, their perceptions regarding pre- and post-training constructs displayed a rather different picture. The study has implications for teacher education involving material developers, curriculum designers, instructors, and students.

Keywords

Global English, Native/Nonnative English Language Teachers, Pre-service Language Teacher Education, Perception, Construct, and Mixed Methods Sequential Explanatory Study

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Acknowledgements

This study was funded by Çukurova University Research Fund under the Project Number SBA-2015-3317.

Construct Shift of Pre-Service Language Teachers on Globalized English within a Turkish Context

Yonca Özkan

Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey

The leading position of English as a global language has indisputably continued for several decades. This pivotal role has inevitably been influencing English language teaching and teacher education. The number of nonnative English speaking teachers has by far surpassed that of native English speaking teachers. This reality has led us to conduct this particular descriptive study involving Turkish senior pre-service language teachers acting as participants in a training as part of a course (Globalization in ELT), in which we investigated the participants' perceptions towards globalized English regarding common themes in the journal and interview data. The findings revealed that although the majority of participants supported superiority of nativeness and inner circle culture prior to delivery of the course, following the training, their perceptions regarding pre- and post-training constructs displayed a rather different picture. The study has implications for teacher education involving material developers, curriculum designers, instructors, and students. Keywords: Global English, Native/Nonnative English Language Teachers, Pre-service Language Teacher Education, Perception, Construct, and Mixed Methods Sequential Explanatory Study

The global spread of English throughout the world has had a major influence on business, education, and technology. English has become the lingua franca, or a universal language, and is now the language for most international communication (Bhatt, 2001). Today, it is either the official or the second language used in over fifty countries (Crystal, 1997). Although there are so many English speakers sharing this common language, English is becoming increasingly diversified in nature due to the influence it is exposed to concerning multiple linguistic and cultural variations, accents, idioms, and vernacular. This phenomenon has led to English gaining a status dubbed as “World Englishes” (WEs), for which Kachru (1996) offers three territories where language is used: The Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and the Expanding Circle. In the Inner Circle, English is used as the first language; in the Outer Circle, it is used by mostly colonized countries as a second or official language, and in the Expanding Circle, it is highly utilized as a foreign language in the rest of the world, albeit with a cross-nation status as a medium of communication regarding education, business, and technology. As for education, particularly English language education, we see a continuously increasing number of nonnative English speaking teachers (NNESTs) functioning in both the outer and expanding circles. This number has by far already surpassed that of native English speaking teachers (NESTs; Canagarajah, 1999; Crystal, 1997; Kachru, 2001; Matsuda & Matsuda, 2001). Despite the pioneering work of the Medgyes (1992, 1994), it took almost a decade for researchers to focus on NNESTs. These studies centred mostly on self-perceptions of NNESTs and student perceptions' of NNESTs.

According to several researchers (e.g., Amin, 2000; Braine, 1999), native English speakers (NES) are more likely to be hired to teach ESL/EFL even without any specific teaching qualifications compared to qualified nonnative English speakers (NNES). Some researchers have discussed this issue of nativeness as the native speaker fallacy and argue that merely being a native speaker of a language is not a guarantee that a person will be successful

in teaching his or her own native language (Canagarajah, 1999; Medgyes, 1994, 1999). Maum (2002) also argues that most of the intrinsic knowledge that a NES brings into the ESL/EFL classroom can also be learned by NNESTs through specific teacher training. However, it is generally believed that NESTs have more advantages teaching L2 learners than NNESTs (Liu, 1999). There is even a common belief that for NNESTs to become qualified they need to improve their language skills to compete with those of native speakers, yet they also need to embrace the teaching practices and methods adopted by NESTs (Mahboob, 2004). According to Beare (2013), some of the positive advantages that NES may have over NNESTs can be cited as: (a) providing accurate pronunciation models for learners, conversational opportunities, and insight that nonnative speakers may not have, (b) understanding native English speaking cultures with all intricacies of idiomatic English usage, and (c) having the ability to speak the language as it is spoken in English speaking countries. However, NNESTs, as was pointed out by Cook (2005), Kachru (2001), Medgyes (1994), Phillipson (2001), and Tang (1997), do have some strengths that NESTs do not have: (a) providing L2 learners with a positive role model for learning, (b) teaching language learning strategies more effectively, (c) being more empathetic to the needs and problems of L2 learners, and (d) incorporating L2 learners' first language as a method of effective teaching.

One major concept agreed upon by scholars is that "intelligibility" as a prerequisite for successful communication (Deterding & Kirkpatrick, 2006; Jenkins, 2000; Kirkpatrick, 2010; Seidlhofer, 2001). These studies support the notion that as long as NNESTs have the ability to use English effectively and are intelligible in their communication with others; this should be fair enough in our judgment of such speakers' competence in the language.

Several studies (Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Benke & Medgyes, 2005) have demonstrated that NESTs and NNESTs have very different teaching approaches and attitudes in language classrooms. These studies indicate that NESTs approach teaching English in a more relaxed and flexible style with a rather student-centered approach, whereas NNESTs tend to use a more traditional teacher-centered or curriculum-centered approach, and mainly rely on the use of textbooks following highly structured way of teaching. Medgye (1994), in Table 1, highlights some of the most significant differences found between NESTs and NNESTs regarding teaching behavior.

Table 1. General Perceptions of NESTs and NNEST, (Medgye, 1994)

| NESTs | NNESTs |
|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| Adopt a more flexible approach | Adopt a more guided approach |
| Are more innovative | Are more cautious |
| Are less empathetic | Are more empathetic |
| Focus on: fluency, meaning, language in us, oral skills | Focus on: accuracy, form, grammar rules, printed words |
| Attend to perceived needs | Attend to real needs |
| Are more casual | Are more strict |
| Prefer free activities | Prefer controlled activities |
| Use a variety of materials | Use a single textbook |
| Tolerate errors | Correct/punish for errors |
| Supply more cultural information | Supply less cultural information |

One major supremacy NNESTs may have over NESTs is probably intercultural awareness which makes learners feel more at ease in classes. Absence of this awareness will probably lead to strained classroom situations to emerge for in which case instructors would not be able to empathize with learners. Regarding this issue, Alptekin (2002), Byram (1997),

Finocchiaro (1982), Sifakis (2004), Yassine (2006), Yılmaz and Özkan (2016) propose that intercultural communicative competence should be emphasized in both ESL/EFL context and teacher education programs. For these scholars, cultural awareness which describes the ability to use perspectives, practices, and products in one's own culture and in making evaluations should be raised for more empathetic learning situations. And this can only be achieved by someone with a multicultural background, who in our case is the NNEST. Despite the existence of "the native speaker fallacy" which is the belief that the ideal teacher is a native speaker of English (Phillipson, 1992, p. 185), Phillipson refuted the NS fallacy and believed that "teachers are made rather than born whether teachers are native or non native" (1992, p. 194) and other researchers investigating NESTs and NNESTs, and have all reached the conclusion that both categories of teachers have strengths and weaknesses... In order to reconstruct this misconception, dedicated and methodical training is required for our pre-service language teachers. A training program of this fashion necessitates reflection, inquiry, discussion, and observations in and outside classroom situations. Already acquired constructs have got to be reformulated in order to promote competence and self-esteem of NNEST in their practices. Here, there is a need to apply a constructivist approach which paves the way for more confident, efficient, and proficient NNESTs.

A constructivist theoretical framework underlies this study, in which I investigated how the pre-service language teachers construct meaning in their interactions with the world, and looked for shared visions (Crotty, 1998). Since this study focuses on training based on Globalized English issues, I chose a constructivist approach to examine how the participants here in our study create meaning through their participation in the training which is embedded into this particular course-*Globalization in English*- they were enrolled in.

Here in the training based on the constructivist principles, learning activities involve active engagement, inquiry, problem solving, and collaboration with other individuals. The instructor (also researcher), here, is a guide or facilitator who encourages learners to critically question, challenge, and come up with their own conclusions. It challenges an empiricist/reductionist approach to teaching/learning where the teacher fills students with information considered to be true knowledge, and the students store this information (Cannella & Reiff, 1994; Richardson, 1997). Constructivist teacher education usually reflects two main traditions: (a) the developmental, and (b) social reconstructionist traditions (Cannella & Reiff, 1994). While the former attempts to teach students in mostly Piagetian manner, the latter emphasizes deconstruction of prior knowledge. The developmental tradition is typically characterized by direct instruction in theory and practice, mostly without opportunities for self-examination. This approach tends to appear rather prescriptive emphasizing teacher control or manipulation (Oldfather, Bonds, & Bray, 1994). Social reconstructionist tradition, however, enables students to deconstruct their prior knowledge through critical analysis and structured reflection.

This study tries to shed light on globalized English within the framework of social constructivism concerning pre-service language teachers by exploring their pre- and post-constructs in a training provided during a course titled *Globalization in ELT*. In this respect, I as a researcher based on my observations and experiences at the ELT Department in one of the state universities in Turkey, I have been observing our pre-service teachers need to raise their awareness concerning NEST and NNESTs and their characteristics in teaching and other Globalized English issues that are quite essential in their actual teaching practices. I have been giving lectures on *Globalization in English* for the last three years which was initiated due to my doctoral student's project based on English as a lingua franca and teacher education. This study is also based on such a training so that our pre-service language teachers could become aware of ELF related issues mainly intelligibility and ownership of English. Based on end-year reflections regarding this elective course, all of the course participants expressed their

satisfaction out of this specific course and its materials. Since this is the case, I never had a doubt in pursuing this elective course titled *Globalization in English* at my department with the aim of enabling the student teachers at my department to become fully aware and competent on these cross-cultural and international issues with the support of materials based on empirical research, books, and audio/video materials. In this study, I tried to share my course experience from *Globalization in ELT* focusing on the pre-service language teachers' views and I sought responses to the following questions:

1. How do Turkish pre-service English language teachers perceive globalized English prior to a training program in reformulating their already acquired constructs about Global English (GE) related issues?
2. How do Turkish pre-service English language teachers perceive globalized English following a training program in reformulating their already acquired constructs about GE-related issues?
3. If there are any construct shifts, what are the factors leading to such alterations?

Methodology

Participants

The participants in this study (n=49; 10 males and 39 females; age range: 21-23) were all teacher candidates of the English Language Teaching (ELT) department of a state University in Southern Turkey, being educated and trained to become ELT teachers. All participants were in their 4th year of education and were following a curriculum composed of English teaching methodology, linguistics, research, and literature courses. Participants' level of English was fairly similar with upper intermediate level on a scale of 5. For this study, purposeful sampling was used, which is regarded as an appropriate approach when conducting a study to provide a fair picture of the participants' experiences (Frankel & Devers, 2000).

A total of forty-nine pre-service language teachers attended the theoretical training of the study. They all volunteered to participate in the study by choosing the elective course titled *Globalization in ELT* to take the Globalized English training program in the fall term of the 2015-2016 Academic Year. Before being exposed to the training program, they were all interviewed and given a questionnaire to understand their perceptions regarding the issues of Global English. This pre-data revealed that a great majority of them were unaware of certain globalized English-related issues and debates and they were all strong favorers of a native speaker-based model of language teaching.

Method

In this study, in order to answer the research questions, a qualitative case study design was adopted. Both interviews and weekly journals which enabled me to explore the pre-service language teachers' perceptions and experiences in *Globalization in ELT* (one of the four elective courses chosen by the participants of this study with 2 credits) were used so as to collect and analyze the data to reveal the perceptions of pre-service language teachers on the concepts of GE-related issues (intelligibility, culture, nativeness, ownership of English, and NEST/NNEST), and self-esteem (Please see course syllabus-assessment section in Appendix-1). These issues were guided by studies in the literature review focusing on English as an international language, English as a lingua franca and globalized English context. The qualitative aspect of the study gives a way to provide insights into the case of educational training of such issues, how the pre-service teachers construct these issues /concepts, how they

interpret their course-specific experiences and the meaning they associate with these experiences (Merriam, 2009). Also, this aspect allowed me to explore the phenomenon within a real-world context (Creswell, 2003, 2007). This university was chosen for the case study as it was where the researcher/the author was employed.

Content analysis can help researchers make inferences by identifying the characteristics in the targeted text (Stone, Dunphy, Smith, & Ogilvie, 1966). Researchers transform the content into numerical terms by counting the frequency of the terms occurring in the text. Inferences are developed through frequency count, with which themes are developed. Statistical techniques can be applied to help researchers count the frequency of the terms which occur in the text (Moodie, 1971). Similarly, I used content analysis to examine the themes before and after the training. Counting the frequencies of the terms which occurred in student teachers' journals helped me to identify what really mattered during this training. Content analysis can only provide the general patterns of the recurring terms. However, it was not able to sufficiently help me understand why certain groups of terms occurred more frequently than other terms in the journals and in order to deeply comprehend interviews conducted as well with each of the course participant. Content analysis was carried out for determining common themes from both sets of data sources: journals and interviews. The results were presented in descriptive statistics and the themes emerged within elicited journal and interview data were discussed with verbatim.

Instruments

I collected the data via two techniques: weekly student journals and semi-structured face-to-face pre- and post-training interviews. Each participant in the study created a weekly journal based on each week's (for 13 weeks) session content as part of the training in total 637. I did not take 99 journals into account since they were missing in content. I gave a hint for each week to make participants start their writing journals, the participants posted their essays on Class Blog (See Appendix-2 for samples) created just for the very specific purpose of the course I have been conducting. As for the interviews, the first lasted approximately 400 minutes; 6 to 8 minutes per participant, and the second approximately 500 minutes; 8 to 10 minutes per participant. The researcher's interpretations of the participants' statements strictly conformed to the rules of research by concealing identity of the participants. The study was undertaken in line with Çukurova University ethics procedures and guidelines as stated in the Official Paper dated on 16.06.2013 and numbered 28679. I conducted the two interviews in a one-to-one fashion, and audio recorded in order to gain better insights of participants' comments and enhance validity. As a researcher and instructor during this course, I and one of my doctoral students studying corresponding issues in her study worked together during interview sessions especially in recording and transcribing the data. The interview performance referring to whether the participants uttered long or short scripts of language were not the matter in grading of the course. Also, we listened to the recorded interviews twice in order to make sure that no points were missed. Then we transcribed all the interview data before figuring out the themes. I posed the following items to the participants in the interviews:

Pre-training Interview:

- What are your views regarding native/nonnative speaking teachers? Is nativeness an important feature in language teaching? Who owns English? Does native mean ideal teacher to you? Is there a relationship between language and culture? What should cultural information consist of in English language

classrooms? How do you feel as a nonnative speaking teacher in your practicum context?

Post-training Interview:

- How did this course affect your perceptions in the issues of GE? Is nativeness an important feature in language teaching? Who owns English? Does native mean ideal teacher to you? Is there a relationship between language and culture? What should cultural information consist of in English language classrooms? How do you feel as a nonnative speaking teacher in your practicum context? Do you feel any change in your views after your exposure to the training? If there is any, can you explain in detail? Out of this training, what aspects would you specifically carry to your actual teaching practice?

Procedure

The training part of the *Globalization in ELT* Course consisted of 14 weeks in total (2 hours of meeting per week: face-to-face involving course lectures, video presentation, discussion, and reflection), reading and discussing articles/chapters, reflecting upon GE-related issues (prior to face-to-face meeting), and writing journals (following face-to-face meetings). During the training, most up-to-date global literature (scholarly published articles, textbook chapters, books, reviews, videos, etc.) regarding English language teaching was utilized for attaining our very aim of raising awareness concerning GE-related issues (See samples from pre-service teachers in Appendix-2). Each week as an incentive to keep weekly journals, and the course instructor gave two or three questions to trigger their thoughts and writing in this process (See samples in Appendix-2).

Data Analysis

I analyzed the data from the two instruments, weekly journals and interviews in the form of verbatim transcripts in terms of common emerging themes, which were categorized as pre- and post-training constructs. A qualitative thematic methodology was used in order to seek evidence for the research questions. First, I read and then reread the journals and transcripts of each pre-service language teacher. Merriam's (2009) guidelines were followed in the analysis of the journal and interview data. I moved from the single words to the generation of themes and categories. Then I caught ideas, reflections and thoughts throughout the data. Underlining the common words and ideas to form the codes and categories, I started to figure out the common themes emerged to tabulate occurrences of reflections. After I wrote down categories, I reread the notes again until no additional idea was to be found and be sure that I reflected all the thoughts and views of the participants in the study. And these categories were divided into some general themes. I analyzed the themes in terms of frequency of occurrence, and I conducted a chi-square test in order to identify any observable significant differences in the dispersion of overall themes for each item. After the interviews, I transcribed the recorded sessions and put it into a document form so that I can share these with each of the participants in the study. This allowed the participants to change or modify their responses and served as a means of member checking of the interview data, which was employed in order to construct internal validity and credibility in data analysis process (Merriam, 2009).

Findings

The results of our analyses are presented in both tabular form for the journal data, and verbatim of participants regarding GE-issues are presented with elaboration concerning each raised theme in the interview data.

Journal Data

When pre- and post-training data is compared, we can see a considerable shift in participants' constructs, in that while the main focus was on NEST superiority in the pre-training period, in the post, priority shifted in favor of NNEST competence and skills in teaching (Research Questions #1 and 2). In Table 2, related percentages of both constructs are clearly illustrated.

Table 2. Common Themes in Pre- and Post-Training Periods

| Themes # | Themes | Pre-training (%) | Post-training (%) |
|----------|----------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | NEST superiority | 26.9 | 1.0 |
| 2 | Communicative competence | 21.1 | 1.8 |
| 3 | Ownership of English | 15.7 | 3.0 |
| 4 | Inner circle culture/target culture | 11.3 | 2.5 |
| 5 | Self-esteem and self-confidence | 6.9 | 11.5 |
| 6 | Professionalism | 3.9 | 9.7 |
| 7 | Intercultural communicative competence | 3.5 | 17.8 |
| 8 | Global status of English | 3.2 | 9.6 |
| 9 | World Englishes and their cultures | 2.8 | 12.0 |
| 10 | Intelligibility | 2.3 | 15.6 |
| 11 | Intercultural awareness | 2.3 | 15.4 |
| | Chi-square | p=0.000 | p=0.000 |

Overall, 11 common themes emerged from the pre- and post-training periods. In Table 2, we can see that while some themes expanded from rather limited percentage of occurrence to considerable percentage of emergence, some others were shifted in exactly the opposite direction. As can be seen from Table 2, most constructs in the pre-training period were related to NEST superiority-being communicatively competent in English, claiming NESTs own English and NESTs do know target culture better than NNESTs. However, in the post-training period, we face a considerable shift towards constructs concerning intercultural awareness, intercultural communicative competence, and intelligibility. For instance, NEST superiority (Theme 1) was observed to have the highest gap between pre- and post-training periods, for while this theme emerged by 26.9 percent in the pre-training period, in the post-training, we can observe a rather significant decrease in its occurrence (1.0%). As for expanded themes, Theme 7 (Intercultural communicative competence), with 3.5 percent in pre-training considerably increased to 17.8% in post-training. Similarly, Themes 5 (Self-esteem), 6 (Professionalism), 8 (Global status of English), 9 (World Englishes and their cultures), 10 (Intelligibility), and 11 (Intercultural awareness) displayed considerable expansion comparing their pre and post percentages of occurrence: Theme 5 (Self-esteem and self-confidence): 6.9-

11.5; Theme 6 (Professionalism): 3.9-9.7; Theme 8 (Global status of English): 3.2-9.6; Theme 9 (World Englishes and their cultures): 2.8-12.0; Theme 10 (Intelligibility): 2.3-15.6; Theme 11 (Intercultural awareness): 2.3-15.4). As for the themes, which shifted in the opposite direction, we see a rather significant shrinkage of percentage in occurrence comparing the pre and post-training periods: Theme 2 (Communicative competence): 21.1-1.8; Theme 3 (Ownership of English): 15.7-3.0; Theme 4 (Inner circle culture/target culture): 11.3-2.5).

As can be seen from Table 2, superiority of NEST in the pre-training period has dramatically dropped to 1.0 % of emergence in the post-training period. On the other hand, communicative competence in the use of English which attracted preference by rather high percentage (21.1%) in the pre-training period was remarkably illustrated with a rather low percentage (1.8%) in the post-training period. Expectedly, similar behavior in the tendency of participants was also voiced in the interview data. What pre-service teachers voiced before and after the training regarding intelligibility, NEST/NNEST, and self-esteem are presented below:

In the lecture, with the articles, chapters, and videos I observed the misconceptions of English, the stereotypes, the importance of intelligibility etc. From some scholars' perspectives, I got the language again and developed myself new approaches especially in teaching English. From now on, as I know the importance of intelligibility, I will pay more attention on fluency and being understandable rather than being like native speakers. The lecture generally underlines the fact that you should focus on communication rather than the fallacies based on native speakers. Before this lecture, I had some fallacies too but now, as I understood from this experience, I will try my best to teach effective, communicative strategies in my classes. (Intelligibility; Excerpt 1)

Thanks to the papers, chapters, videos in lectures, I have learned that to be flawless English teacher, it is not necessary to be NEST. According to my knowledge about lecture which is Globalization in ELT, there are many NNEST who are more successful than NEST in teaching English. As a teacher, fluency will be more important than accuracy in my own teaching in the future. (NEST Superiority; Excerpt 2)

I did not choose the course on purpose, I just was wondering what is going to be studied. Honestly, I had some prejudice. I didn't like reading articles because they couldn't take my attention. When I watched the videos of David Crystal about Global English and Standard English etc., I started to have curiosity about the course. In terms of teaching English, I have some new beneficial techniques thanks to him and other scholars such as Jennifer Jenkins. She really encouraged me very much. Because I believe now (thanks to the course) every non-native teacher or student have their own accent, their own English. They don't have to imitate British accent or American accent. The point must be the fluent use of English. So, I have so many new ideas, language strategies and motivation (the most important one for me). (Self-esteem; Excerpt 3)

Interview Data

In support to the journal data, interviews conducted with the participants yielded sound ground for our interpretation of the shifts observed in pre- and post-training constructs: (a) intelligibility, (b) culture, (c) nativeness, (d) ownership of English, and (e) self-esteem.

Intelligibility

Prior to training, 39 participants believed the ideal teacher to be a native speaker due to his/her phonological, grammatical, and pragmatic competence. Following the training, nearly all participants (n=46) agreed that intelligibility gained priority over native-like linguistic characteristics. Here are presented the participants' verbatim statements highlighting this:

Native speaker teacher should be preferred in any teaching context since they use perfect English. (Pre-training; Excerpt 4)

Now I see that we do not have to speak native-like in order to be a good model for our students. Intelligibility must be taken into account and westerns norms should not be the model. (Post-training; Excerpt 5)

I should try to raise my students' awareness towards lingua franca core in order to highlight intelligibility in class but not perfect pronunciation. (Post-training; Excerpt 6)

Culture

In the pre-training period, 41 participants believed language teachers should refer to inner-circle culture in a language teaching context. However, following the training, most of the participants (n=45) believed that integrating outer and expanding cultural elements should also be incorporated into an ELT context with specific emphasis on their own indigenous culture (i.e., Turkish). The shift can be well exemplified in the verbatim statements:

I would cover British or American culture in my classes and I was exposed to British culture while I was learning English at school. (Pre-training; Excerpt 7)

We should give cultural aspects of the language. So, our students encounter different cultures and they will be more tolerant and respectful toward other cultures. (Post-training; Excerpt 8)

I provide intercultural base, not just target culture. Language is not linked to one culture and I will not ignore nonnative culture and norms. I will embed both native and nonnative culture. (Post-training; Excerpt 9)

Nativeness

Nativeness was regarded as an important factor prior to the training by 37 participants. However, following the training, the elicited data show that only 7 still believed that nativeness is of paramount significance in teaching English. The excerpts here best illustrate the shrinkage in the participants' constructs following the training.

Being native brings success in applying for a job and teaching itself in Turkey. (Pre-training; Excerpt 10)

I would fight against misconceptions such as only nonnative speech is accented, nonnative speech lacks intelligibility, and the nonnative speaker is responsible for communication problems. (Post-training; Excerpt 11)

As a student, I gave up feeling sorry about speaking like native speakers. Secondly, I recognize that I also have an accent which is described as foreign accent. I have much more courage since I understand that I can be better than a native speaker teacher regarding some pedagogical issues. (Post-training; Excerpt 12)

Ownership of English

Of the participants, a great majority (n=44) believed that only native speakers of English owned the English language in the pre-training period. Following the raising awareness sessions, however, only 16 held the belief that the language belonged to the very people who used it as their native language. These statements are representative of the shift in this construct:

Language and culture are united to me and we cannot separate culture from the language. (Pre-training; Excerpt 13)

I would make sure my students to be aware of paradigms. The way they see world, how language and globalization is connected, I would want them to dig into their mental maps. The maps that will help lead them to universal challenges while building up their own identity. (Post-training; Excerpt 14)

I would definitely inform my students about the ownership of English. Since English belongs to anyone who speaks it, it gives them reins and makes them the master of the language no matter what their levels are. (Post-training; Excerpt 15)

Self-esteem

In this study, prior to training, due to differences in linguistic and cultural characteristics between themselves and native speakers of English, most of the participants (n=42) voiced decrease in their self-esteem during their classroom practices. Following sessions of the training in Globalization in ELT Course, a significantly great majority (n=40) began to voice a heightened level of self-confidence and self-esteem in their encounters with native speakers and their classroom practices. This significant construct shift is well illustrated in the extracts in the following:

I feel less competent in using English when compared to native speakers of English. But I think my grammar is good enough to teach English. Still I cannot speak like a native speaker. (Pre-training; Excerpt 16)

I was thinking that I wouldn't be able to be a good speaker like a native speaker. Here, I gained self-esteem about this subject. I know that I can be a good speaker as well as native speakers from now on. Intelligibility is more important instead of being perfect speaker. As a student, I gave up feeling sorry about speaking like native speakers. Secondly, I recognize that I also have an accent which is described as foreign accent. I have much more courage since I understand that I can be better than a native speaker teachers. They don't have so many advantages of teaching English well. (Post-training; Excerpt 17)

As a nonnative teacher candidate, I now feel more confident thanks to this course. Usually, most of the nonnatives (that includes me as well) think that they are inferior compared to natives. Now I know that both NEST and NNEST have different advantages in teaching and neither is inferior or superior in comparison. (Post-training; Excerpt 18)

In this study, the participants also expressed in their weekly journals the reasons for the shift in their constructs (Research Question #3). As a major cause for such a shift, they stated that they were mostly affected by course-related videos (46.2%) and course lectures (25.6 %). As for medium factor, participants did also cite journal writing (13.6 %), and course-related articles (10.5 %), and for minor impact, in-class presentation (1.9 %), self-study (1.2 %), and peer interaction (1.0 %) emerged as potential reasons for the shift. The factors for such shift and pertaining percentages can be observed in Table 3.

Table 3. Factors Affecting Emergence of Themes

| Factors affecting emergence of themes in post-training period | % |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Course-related Videos | 46.2 |
| Course Lectures | 25.6 |
| Journal Writing | 13.6 |
| Course Articles and Chapters | 10.5 |
| In-class presentation | 1.9 |
| Self-study | 1.2 |
| Peer interaction | 1.0 |
| Chi-square result | p=0.000 |

From Table 3, we can clearly observe the outstanding reasons affecting construct shift of the participants. No doubt visuals have played the most significant part in impacting their views about English and themselves as potential English language teachers.

Discussion

With this study, we endeavored to identify and examine if there were any significant shifts in pre-service language teachers' perceptions of the current status of English before and after the training. The study looked into the five specific areas noted in the Method: (a) intelligibility, (b) culture, (c) nativeness, (d) ownership of English, and (e) self-esteem.

In examining the first theme, *intelligibility* scored a higher value in post-training period. This was probably due to exposure of NNEST training material. In line with this, Jenkins (2000) regards intelligibility as a prerequisite of successful communication. In support to Jenkins, Seidlhofer (2001) states that nonnative speakers should not be regarded as defective communicators just because they are not native speakers and do not belong to Inner Circle Countries. Similarly, Kirkpatrick (2010) argued that phonological proficiency in Asia should not be measured by NES standards. Instead, it should only be measured in the learners' ability to use English effectively and intelligibly to communicate with other English speakers (Deterding & Kirkpatrick, 2006).

Regarding *culture*, the findings in this study seem to support Sifakis (2004) who believes that intercultural interaction is understood as communication among speakers of English for whom their L1 is not only an inescapable, but a very welcoming situation to preserve their cultural identity. Here, we see intercultural prominence asserting itself as a

dominant factor in a language teaching curriculum. One would think it would be extremely difficult for a language teacher to develop a positive relationship with other cultures if his/her students were not aware of the existence of other cultures. Similarly, Alptekin (2002) proposed a model where intercultural communicative competence should be developed among language learners by providing linguistic and cultural behavior which will ease their communication and provide them with cultural awareness and communication strategies in dealing with such different cultures. In this vein, Bayyurt (2006), Finocchiaro (1982), Yılmaz and Özkan (2016) claim it is the teachers' duty to prepare their students to cope with universal problems within ethnic and cultural systems.

As for *nativeness*, the participants' pre-constructs highlighted superiority of NEST in teaching English due to native speakers' linguistic and cultural knowledge. However, following the training, they began to question the assets of NESTs in teaching context and became more aware of the capabilities and potentials of NNESTs. What is important for participants here is professionalism and teaching experience rather than being a native speaker. This behavior of participants is well illustrated by scholars in literature (e.g., Cook, 2005; Medgyes, 1994; Tang, 1997) who believe NNESTs have an advantage in the classroom due to their empathy with the language learner, and awareness of potential problems arising in classroom situations.

Regarding *ownership of English*, both data sets reveal that the participants before training believed that native speakers or inner circle nations "owned" English. However, following the consciousness-raising sessions, they started to challenge what they already had held to be true (i.e., now English belonged not only to a specific nation, person, or people, but to anyone who is competent in using it for his/her own purposes). Widdowson (1994) also expresses views in this line.

Concerning *self-esteem*, prior to training, the participants expressed views that they had rather low self-esteem in their teaching at practicum sessions. Following the training, their views have dramatically shifted towards rather raised built self-esteem and confidence in dealing with students in real class context at practicum. Sifakis (2009) believes that teacher education programmes should focus on developing student teachers' confidence as autonomous practitioners which may be an extension to questioning competences of NEST and NNEST within an English global setting.

The pre-service language teachers' reflections support the conclusions of many other researchers, providing additional support for the ability to generalize these findings to the general populations in language teacher education program.

Conclusion and Implications

This study revealed that participants' constructs during pre-training period were significantly different in terms of type as well as frequency of emergence. In the post-training period, while some constructs significantly expanded, some others shrank. The shift from NEST superiority and communicative competence in English teaching context in the pre-training period to the teachers' professionalism/teaching experience, intercultural awareness and competence in the post-training period is notably significant here. Now that they were introduced to contentious issues such as GE, NEST/NNEST debate, ownership of English, nativeness, etc., the emphasis was laid on the immediate teaching context rather than nativeness. The participants prioritized NEST superiority, ownership of English by native speakers, native-like performance, accent, and target culture, and while in the post-training period, they focused on World Englishes, other cultures, self-esteem, intercultural awareness, intelligibility, and intercultural communicative competence. The exposure to videos, articles, chapters, classroom discussions, all had a major role in the overall shift of constructs, be it in the form of expansion or reduction. Observing different ELT contexts around the world via

videos and printed reading materials, the pre-service language teachers may have become aware of the current status of English and its implications to ELT.

What participants were exposed to during the training as part of the *Globalization in ELT* course may have acted as a very strong incentive for participants' resetting constructs in the English language teaching field. Additionally, promoted notion of native speaker supremacy has continued for decades in most EFL settings. Turkey was certainly not immune from this trend, which has exerted its influence in almost any language education institution. Quite naturally, individuals trained and educated in this line, could not have been expected to free themselves from this preconceived construct of native supremacy. Expectedly, during the pre-training period, participants in this study expressed views in line with this perception. In addition, in other courses some basic elements in the Common European of Framework for References (CEFR) were highlighted. Combination of what has been perceived primarily and what has been introduced via the CEFR may have led to promotion of communicative competence within the framework of native speaker in the target culture.

This current study yields findings that may have a number of implications for English language teaching and teacher education, and may be interpreted as that teacher candidates should be well educated in meeting the requirements of this globalized and changing world by becoming aware of concepts such as *Global English*, *native/nonnative English speaking teachers*, *intelligibility*, *intercultural awareness*, and *intercultural communicative competence*. For this, curriculum designers, as well as material developers should generously embody outer and expanding circle characteristics within their works. This way, we can expect interculturally competent English *language teacher* to take roots such that he/she is contented with himself/herself in terms of competence, self-esteem, and confidence. Only a teacher trained in this fashion can possibly be of some use to himself/herself as well as to his/her students.

Limitations

As with any research, there were limitations with the current study. Limitations included the length of the study and the setting of the research conducted. The study lasted for 14 weeks. It would be desirable to see the research time extended over the course of a full academic year to examine the long-term effects of training on Globalized English issues upon pre-service teachers' actual teaching environments. Another limitation was the setting of the research which included a single higher education setting. This study may be conducted in different settings as well state and private colleges to explore the experiences and perspectives of pre-service language teachers.

References

- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 56(1), 57-64.
- Amin, N. (2000). *Negotiating nativism: Minority immigrant women ESL teachers and the native speaker construct*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Arva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System*, 28(3), 355-372.
- Bayyurt, Y. (2006). Non-native English language teachers' perspective on culture in English as a foreign language classrooms. *Teacher Development*, 10(2), 233-247.

- Beare, K. (2013). Non-native English teachers: Native English teachers only?! *About Education*. Retrieved July 29, 2015, from <http://esl.about.com/od/teachingenglish/a/Non-Native-English-Teachers.htm>
- Benke, E., & Medgyes, P. (2005). Differences in teaching behavior between native and non-native speaker teachers: As seen by the learners. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Nonnative language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 195-216). New York, NY: Springer.
- Bhatt, R. (2001). World Englishes. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 527-550.
- Braine, G. (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the “native speaker fallacy”: Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77–92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cannella, G. S., & Reiff, J. C. (1994). Individual constructivist teacher education: Teachers as empowered learners. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 21(3), 27-38.
- Cook, V. (2005). Basing teaching on the L2 user. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 47-62). New York, NY: Springer.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Crystal, D. (Ed.). (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Deterding, D., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2006). Emerging South-East Asian Englishes and intelligibility. *World Englishes*, 25, 391–409.
- Finocchiaro, M. (1982). Reflections on the past, the present and the future. *Forum*, July, 1982.
- Frankel, R. M., & Devers, K. J. (2000). Study design in qualitative research--1: Developing questions and assessing resource needs. *Education for Health: Change in Learning & Practice* (Taylor & Francis Ltd), 13(2), 251-261.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1996). The paradigms of marginality. *World Englishes*, 15(2), 241-255.
- Kachru, B. B. (2001, October 25). Why the time is right for India to exploit its most valuable export commodity: English. Learning English. *Supplement to The Guardian Weekly*.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Liu, J. (1999). Nonnative-English-speaking professionals in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 85–102.
- Mahboob, A. (2004). Native or nonnative: What do students enrolled in an intensive English program think? In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 121-147). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Matsuda, A., & Matsuda, P. K. (2001). Autonomy and collaboration in teacher education: Journal sharing among native and nonnative English-speaking teachers. *CATESOL Journal*, 13(1), 109-121.

- Maum, R. (2002). *Nonnative-English-Speaking teachers in the English teaching profession*. Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from <http://teachingpronunciation.pbworks.com/f/NNESTs+in+the+English+teaching+profession.pdf>
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, 46(4), 340-349.
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. London, UK: Macmillan Publishers.
- Medgyes, P. (1999). Language training: A neglected area in teacher education. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 177-196). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Moodie, D. W. (1971). Content analysis: A method for historical geography. *Area*, 3(3), 146-149.
- Oldfather, P., Bonds, S., & Bray, T. (1994). Drawing the circle: Collaborative mind mapping as a process for developing a constructivist teacher education program. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 21(3), 5-13.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (2001). English for globalization or for the world's people. *International Review of Education*, 47(3/4), 185-200.
- Richardson, V. (1997). Constructivist teaching and teacher education: Theory and practice. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Constructivist teacher education: Building new understandings* (pp. 3-14). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Habeas corpus and divide et impera: "Global English" and applied linguistics. In K. Miller & P. Thompson (Eds.), *Unity and diversity in language use: Proceedings of the 34th Annual BAAL Conference*. London, UK: Continuum Press.
- Sifakis, N. C. (2004). Teaching EIL – Teaching international or intercultural English: What teachers should know. *System*, 32(2), 237-250.
- Sifakis, N. (2009). Challenges in teaching ELF in the periphery: The Greek context. *ELT Journal*, 63(3), 230-237.
- Stone, P. J., Dunphy, D. C., Smith, M. S., & Ogilvie, D. M. (1996). *The general inquirer: A computer approach to content analysis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tang, C. (1997). The identity of the nonnative ESL teacher: On the power and status of nonnative ESL teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 577-580.
- Widdowson, H. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377-389.
- Yassine, S. (2006). Culture issues in FL teaching: Towards the fostering of intercultural awareness. *Annales du Patrimoine*, 5.
- Yılmaz, B., & Özkan, Y. (2016). An Investigation into English Language Instructors' and Students' Intercultural Awareness. The Qualitative Report, 21(10), 1932-1959. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol21/iss10/12>

Appendix A

Course Syllabus

YIS 415 Globalization in ELT

2015-2016 Academic Year/Fall Term

Course Description:

This course aims at educating student teachers of English as a foreign language on issues regarding aspects of English as an international lingua franca and implications for teaching and learning. The purpose is to help student teachers be informed about ELF and what ELF represents for communication and teaching. The course takes up

a transformative perspective which will be used to help student teachers become aware of their deeper convictions about ELF-related issues.

Course Schedule:

| Week | Topic |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Introduction to the course, Scope of the course |
| 2 | Understanding the global character of English |
| 3 | ELF paradigm, EFL, World Englishes, Standard English |
| 4 | The primary issues of ELF |
| 5 | Standard English as a model of teaching |
| 6 | Teaching English as an international lingua franca |
| 7 | Intercultural communication and competence |
| 8 | Multilingualism |
| 9 | Cross-cultural factors in teaching |
| 10 | Native speaker / non-native speaker |
| 11 | The dichotomy of native speaker teachers and non-native speaker teachers |
| 12 | ELF and pedagogy |
| 13 | Ownership of English |
| 14 | Critiques, additions and alternatives to ELF paradigm |
| 15 | Final discussion |

Learning Outcomes:

Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:

- become aware of their deeper convictions about Globalized English issues and positions,
- be informed about English and its global position,
- identify the primary issues of Global English,
- examine the implications of Global English for teaching and learning,
- evaluate the alternatives in teaching and learning English.

Required Readings:

(Required readings will be compiled by the course instructor and will be available at the copy center of our Department.)

Assessment:

- Active participation: 20%
- Weekly journals and tasks: 40%
- Final Paper: 20%
- Formulating an action plan based on course content: 20% (Details of this specific task will be discussed in the course lectures).

Appendix B

Samples of Triggering Questions and Journals

Journal 4: Triggering questions to start writing for Journal 4

1. We begin to understand the critical role that **intelligibility** plays in Globalized English context. How is it defined in the paper we covered in our lecture?
2. Discussing misconceptions regarding **intelligibility**, native speaker norms etc, what is your **stance**? Have you thought about the role of intelligibility in your own teaching context or at

practicum? Please consider whether you have tried to help your learners develop those strategies that will help them become intelligible (i.e., successful) communicators.

3. Based on the video (MA study) we watched, what are the elements that the **teaching of pronunciation** should focus on? Make a note in your journal of anything you find interesting or surprising.

Related sample journal posted on class blog

The screenshot shows a Blogger post editor interface. The title is "Globalization in ELT" and the content is a journal entry. The text in the journal entry discusses intelligibility, mentioning that it is influenced by judgmental attitude or bias, and that non-native speakers are often stigmatized for their accents. It also notes that communication problems are not necessarily due to pronunciation but can be due to other factors like accent and intonation.

1-Intelligibility is referred as sender's message is understood by a receiver or word and utterance recognition. Intelligibility is influenced by judgemental attitude or bias. There are some misconceptions that only the non-native speaker is responsible for communication problems, non-native speech lacks intelligibility and only non-native speech is accented. But these are not true. Non-native speakers are stigmatized as speaking with foreign accent but some native speakers have accent too. Not all non-native speakers are the reason of communication problems. Even inner circle speakers are found to be among the least intelligible.

2-I think that as a teacher native speaker norms should not be accepted. Dialects in the classroom is inevitable. The important thing is intelligibility and comprehensibility. As long as there is a clear communication the accent, dialect and pronunciation do not matter. In order to create a relaxed and convenient atmosphere the judgments must be put aside and the fact that a non-native speaker can be intelligible and successful should be remembered.

3-Different accents from different L1 backgrounds have some problem with pronouncing some sounds and it is very natural. Consonant sounds, placement of nuclear stress and some core sounds should be recognized. But as long as they are intelligible the pronunciation differences are not that important.

Sample of a final task: Reflection of the course

The screenshot shows a Blogger post editor interface. The title is "Globalization in ELT" and the content is a reflection on the course. The text discusses how the course helped in reviewing every course, video, and other stuff in class, and how it raised awareness about the global status of English. It also mentions that the course helped in understanding the importance of pronunciation and how it can be taught effectively.

1) - I helped a lot in terms of reviewing every course, videos and all the other stuff in class. Because we all were summarizing the articles for each post, it raised our awareness about the Global status of English. The other thing that I can say that with the help of the jargon books I improved my terminology related to Global English. It caused a distraction in an affirmative way in terms of pedagogical improvement that I slightly changed my ideas about how to teach English.

- In terms of technology I did not encounter with any problems, in fact I think it is a brilliant idea to make the students who are teacher candidates learn more about how to cover a lesson and make their knowledge refresh.

For contents I can say that sometimes they were the same to some extent and it felt a lot of repetition. Except for that each topic was very useful for our professional experience.

- Jus: a tiny negative aspect that I can tell you is the topics were so much relaxed that it caused repetition.

- The suggestion that I would recommend that I think it would have been better not to post that much question to each task so that the repetition would be decreased and make the students to write reflections about the articles and videos that we covered.

- First of all I can say that I gained a lot of new insights on the Global status of English. I also had the chance to analyse my classmates opinions so that I could find out the missing points.

2) The course definely filled my expectations. All the stuff that we covered raised my awareness about the status and a lot of precious people that contributed to this field which was a missing crucial for us. Through the videos, articles and the topics now I have an agenda about the status of English in the world.

After taking this course my teaching english strategies have positively changed. From now on I know the vital point of teaching a foreign language. I gained very useful information about not to stick in accent in language teaching process and mostly care about the students intelligibility. The most positive outcome is that as non-native teacher I have a lot more self-confidence since I agree with all the misconceptions about non-natives and pedagogical information about foreign language teaching. As I am really sad about being too late to realize all this points, I will make my students benefit from these aspects from the beginning.

Author Note

Yonca Özkan is an associate professor in the Department of English Language Teaching at Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey. She teaches undergraduate and graduate course in teacher education and second/foreign language teaching methodology. Her research focuses on pre-service language teacher education, language teaching methodology, and technology integration into language teaching and language teacher education. She is currently conducting a research study on ELF and teacher education. Correspondence regarding this article can be addressed directly to: yoncaca@cu.edu.tr.

This study was funded by Çukurova University Research Fund under the Project Number SBA-2015-3317. Thankfulness should also be expressed to those anonymous reviewers for their enlightening comments and helpful advice.

Open data: The data in this study is open to access with no copyright restrictions.

Ethics statement: The study was undertaken in line with Çukurova University ethics procedures and guidelines as stated in the Official Paper dated on 16.06.2013 and numbered 28679.

Conflicts of interest statement: The author has no involvement whatsoever in any organization with any financial/non-financial interest in the subject discussed in this work.

Copyright 2017: Yonca Özkan and Nova Southeastern University.

Article Citation

Özkan, Y. (2017). Construct shift of pre-service language teachers on globalized English within a Turkish context. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(1), 105-122. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol22/iss1/6>
