THE ROLE OF INITIAL TEACHER TRAINING COURSES IN THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF EXPERIENCED NON-NATIVE SPEAKER ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS

Jason Anderson

Introduction

The vast majority of studies conducted to date on non-native-speaker (NNS) participants on English language teacher education programs have involved extensive (especially MA TESOL) courses, mainly conducted in North America (e.g. D. Liu 1999; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler 1999; Carrier 2003; J. Liu 2005; Llurda 2005). Most have focused on non-native English speaking teachers' (NNESTs) experiences on the program itself, especially their linguistic needs, challenges, and self-image (Moussu & Llurda 2008: 319), and often failing to situate their experiences in their own professional and personal development. Only one study to date (Anderson 2016) has focused on the experiences of the increasing number of NNSs enrolling on shorter initial teacher training courses (ITCs), such as the Cambridge CELTA and the Trinity CertTESOL. This mainly quantitative study indicated that the vast majority (89%) of NNS participants had prior teaching experience, and concluded that such courses, which were initially designed for native-speaker participants without prior teaching experience, "are not well suited to the needs, interests and future work contexts of NNS teachers" (2016: 271). It recommended further study on how course participants with prior teaching experience see ITCs fitting into their wider professional development, how useful they find different aspects of the course, and what areas of challenge they encounter. The current study seeks to shed light onto these issues by situating the participation of NNESTs on ITCs within their wider individual careers. The findings of semi-structured interviews with five respondents and email interviews with a further 14 respondents are reported and discussed. Recommendations, based partly on their feedback, are also provided.

Defining 'Non-native Speaker'

There is extensive discussion in the literature on the validity of the native speaker dichotomy (e.g. Rampton 1990; Medgyes 1992, 1994; Davies 2003). A number of authors argue that the distinction itself is losing relevance and appropriacy in a world where global Englishes are becoming the norm (e.g. Kirkpatrick 2007; Jenkins 2014). Given that there is a growing number of individuals who cannot easily be categorized as native-speaker (NS) or NNS (Medgyes 1992; Moussu & Llurda 2008), it may be more appropriate to view a continuum between two extremities upon which individual speakers can locate themselves (Rampton 1990; J. Liu 1999; Brutt-Griffler & Samimy 2001). Thus, in line with recommendations by Medgyes (1994) and J. Liu (1999), for this study I asked prospective participants to self-identify as either native-speaker, non-native-speaker or neither, and interviewed only respondents who self-identified as NNSs in the data. My personal experience tallies with Medgyes' assertion that native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) and NNESTs use different routes to become more proficient teachers (1992: 340), and thus, as a teacher educator, I believe that my ability to serve the needs of trainee teachers effectively depends on my understanding both the routes and the differences in question. Nonetheless, I heed Moussa and Llurda's (2008: 319) recommendation to use the two terms with "extreme caution" recognising that, aside from the validity of the dichotomy itself, the negative prefix 'non-' may implicitly disadvantage NNESTs within our profession (Richardson 2016).

Background to This Study

Initial teacher training courses, such as the Cambridge CELTA (Cambridge English Language Assessment 2015) and the Trinity CertTESOL (Trinity College London 2016) are popular modes of entry into English language teaching (TEFL, TESOL, TEAP, etc.), certifying over 10,000 teachers per year (Hobbs 2013). Often taken intensively (4-5 weeks), both are accredited at level 5 on the UK regulated qualifications framework, and require at least 120 contact hours of instruction and six hours of observed and assessed teaching practice. Initially originating in the UK and designed for native-speakers of English with little or no prior teaching experience (Ferguson &

Donno 2003), both courses are attracting increasing numbers of non-native-speaking participants (Anderson 2016), with CELTA courses listed as available in 74 countries, and CertTESOL courses in 21 countries, according to information available on their respective websites[1].

The methodology promoted on such courses is heavily influenced by early communicative language teaching in the UK in the 1970s and 1980s, which maintained an ostensibly monolingual approach suited to the (often monolingual) native speakers it trained (Howatt 1984). At that time, it was generally presumed that the native speaker was the *de facto* authority on how to use English, and the pedagogy disseminated from the Anglophone centre was assumed to be the most progressive, and most appropriate regardless of context (Phillipson 1992). Since the 1990s, both these assumptions have been critiqued extensively (e.g. Phillipson 1992; Holliday 2005; Houghton & Rivers 2013), and more multilingual approaches to language teaching have been proposed (e.g. Butzkamm & Caldwell 2009; G. Cook 2010; Canagarajah 2013). However, ITC syllabi have changed little with regard to issues of *native-speakerism*[2] (Holliday 2005; Kiczkowiak et al. 2016) and multi/monolingualism since the 1990s (Hobbs 2013; Anderson 2016). ITCs are often seen as prestigious qualifications among NNESTs due to their association with native-speaker-like proficiency (Anderson 2016) and the debatable assumption that they promote the most effective methodology for language teaching (Holliday 2005). While increasing numbers of NNESTs enrol on ITCs each year, prior to the study by Anderson (2016), no research was conducted into their effectiveness or appropriacy for NNESTs. Prior literature on the challenges faced by NNESTs in our profession indicates strongly that "NNES professionals in and outside Inner Circle countries still face rampant discrimination when they apply for teaching positions" (Kamhi-Stein 2016: 188; see also Mahboob and Golden 2013), but that ITCs have, to date, done very little to raise awareness of this discrimination or support course participants that are disadvantaged by the 'non-native speaker' label (Kiczkowiak et al. 2016).

Research into Non-native Speakers on Teacher Preparation Programs

There exists a fairly extensive literature on NNSs on longer teacher preparation programs, especially MA TESOL courses in the US, where they often constitute over 30% of program participants (Llurda 2005). The majority of these studies have focused primarily, or singularly, on the challenges and concerns of the participants within the course itself (e.g. D. Liu 1999; Kamhi-Stein 2000; Carrier 2003; Barratt 2010; Nemtchinova et al. 2010), with several comparing their abilities and performance on practicums to NS participants in the N. American ESOL context (e.g. J. Liu 2005; Llurda 2005). Despite the fact that Llurda (2005) found that the majority will return to their home country after completing their programs, these studies pay little attention to the relevance of the course content for their future careers and teaching practice, my primary area of interest. Nonetheless, they have identified a number of characteristics of NNSs on such courses, including higher language awareness, but lower linguistic proficiency than NS peers (e.g. Llurda 2005), reports of low esteem in relation to NS peers (e.g. Kamhi-Stein 2000), and the recognition that they have different, often context-specific skills to NNESTs (e.g. Samimy & Brutt-Griffler 1999). NNS participants have often expressed a strong interest in improving language proficiency and a desire to know more about English language culture (D. Liu 1999). A number of studies have provided useful recommendations to improve the program experience for NNSs (e.g. Kamhi-Stein 2000; Carrier 2003; Brady & Gulikers 2004; Barratt 2010; Nemtchinova et al. 2010). These include enhancing their self-perception and self-confidence (Kamhi-Stein 2000; Carrier 2003), highlighting their expertise (Kamhi-Stein 2000), developing awareness, equity and collaboration between NSs and NNSs (Kamhi-Stein 2000; Barratt 2010), modifying practicums (Brady & Gulikers 2004), and developing various aspects of their language proficiency (Carrier 2003; Nemtchinova et al. 2010). Carrier (2003) also suggests raising questions of appropriacy of methodology.

While a number of studies have highlighted issues of native-speakerism on ITCs (Ferguson & Donno 2003; Hobbs 2013; Kiczkowiak et al. 2016), none have compared the experiences of NNS and NS participants on ITCs until the primarily quantitative study by Anderson (2016) contrasting the background, needs, and future teaching contexts of 41 NS and 38 NNS participants on ITCs. It found that:

---

[1] http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/find-a-centre/find-ateaching-centre/
http://www.trinitycollege.com/site/?id=2093 (both consulted: 06/22/2016)

[2] "…an established belief that 'native-speaker' teachers represent a 'Western culture' from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology." (Holliday 2005: 6).

NNSs are much more likely than NSs to have prior teaching experience and qualifications, they have very different reasons for taking such courses, they are more likely to teach in their home countries after completion, and they prioritize different components of the course. (2016: 261)

Anderson's study shed some light onto NNSs' reasons for taking ITCs. While both NNSs and NSs shared the expectation that the course would improve their job prospects, NNSs indicated much greater interest in the methodology and greater interest in professional development. However, due to its primarily quantitative nature, the study revealed little about the relationship between these different elements, and it uncovered very little regarding the challenges that NNS participants were facing regarding discrimination in the industry. It also noted that, in contrast to NNSs on MA TESOLs in North America, improving English language proficiency was only considered a priority by one of the 38 NNS respondents. Also, issues of self-confidence, inferiority or identity were rarely mentioned by NNSs, and most (60%) expected to teach adults, not younger learners, after their course. While acknowledging that high average levels of satisfaction with courses were reported by both NS and NNS respondents, Anderson strongly recommended further qualitative study to develop a greater understanding of the significance of ITCs for NNS participants, which this study intends to do.

Methodology
Research Questions
This study focuses on understanding the role of ITCs in the professional development of experienced NNESTs from different backgrounds. The following four research questions were chosen:

1. What factors contribute to NNESTs with prior teaching experience taking the decision to enrol on ITCs?
2. How useful and productive do experienced NNESTs find ITCs?
3. What impact do ITCs have on the teaching practices, professional development and career path of experienced NNESTs?

4. What suggestions/feedback do respondents have to ensure that ITCs are as useful for NNESTs as for native-speaker participants?

Data Collection
Two data collection strategies were chosen, both qualitative, in line with the open-ended nature of the research questions. Extensive (c.60 minute) face-to-face or Skype semi-structured interviews (Kvale 1997) were planned to collect in-depth data from a small number of respondents, supplemented by a larger number of email interviews (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2011) to include respondents from a wider variety of locations worldwide who were not able to participate in face-to-face interviews (James 2007). Two research instruments were developed; a semi-structured interview schedule and an email interview form, both based on, but simplifying, the four research questions as recommended by Kvale (1997). Initial questions were open, with more specific follow-up prompts also prepared if required (Kvale 1997). In the case of email interviews, these were asked in subsequent emails (James 2007).

Participants
In order to recruit a wide range of respondents, I contacted 22 course providing organisations (CPOs) via email, selected from online databases[3] to include a balance of CPOs from the UK (6 CELTA and 6 CertTESOL) and other countries worldwide (5 CELTA and 5 CertTESOL), including Europe, Asia and South America. My information sheet outlined the aims of the study, eligible participants (NNESTs with teaching experience before their course), and requested volunteers to contact me directly via email.

19 interviews were arranged and completed (five face-to-face and 14 via email) representing 13 nationalities (Algerian, Argentinian, Chinese, French, Greek, Indonesian, Italian, Moroccan, Romanian, Russian, Spanish, Ukrainian and Uzbek). All respondents self-identified as non-native speakers of English and provided written, informed consent to participate. Respondent profiles are summarized in Table 1. Names have been changed to preserve anonymity.

---

3   http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/find-a-centre/find-a-teaching-centre/
http://www.trinitycollege.com/site/?id=2093

Name	Course type	Interview type	Year of course	Prior teaching experience (years)	Prior teaching contexts (YL=younger learners)
Sharon	CELTA	Face-to-face	2013	8	Private adult
Monica			2006	5	Secondary; private YL
Andrew			2015	6	Private adult
Lucia	CertTESOL		2012	1	Private adult
Farah			2014	2	Private YL/adult
Nadia	CELTA	Email	2011	8	Secondary; private adult
Habib			2013	16	Private adult
Nina			2015	6	HE
Carla			2015	8	Private adult
Patricia			2014	2	Private YL
Deniza			2013	6	HE
Isabel	CertTESOL		2015	24	Secondary
Olga			2012	5	Private adult
Camille			2012	4	Secondary
Ofelia			2013	30	Private adult/YL
Angela			2012	8	Secondary
Manuela			2012	16	Secondary
Sofia			2013	3.5	Private adult
Sabina			2014	4	Private YL

Table 1: Summary of respondents

Data Analysis

Transcribed data from semi-structured interviews and written data from email responses were analysed in four stages, following recommendations by Cohen et al. (2011: 555). First, natural units of meaning were generated by identifying and codifying key themes in the data. These units of meaning were then classified and categorized according to my research questions, under which thematic subcategories emerged. Narratives to describe the findings were identified and linked to appropriate extracts from the interviews. Finally, I interpreted the data, comparing my findings to the literature. 'Saturation' (Dörnyei 2007) began to occur with regard to answering my research questions approximately two thirds of the way through data analysis, after which insights tended to corroborate previous findings. The exception to this was the diversity of narratives with regard to impact of ITCs on career paths, which continued to remain insightful throughout data collection.

Findings and Discussion

To improve readability, standard orthography has been used in spoken interview extracts below, with false starts and repetitions removed. 'SD' after extracts indicates spoken data. All other data is taken directly from email interview responses. Additional information has been added in square brackets where required.

Why Did They Take the Course?

All but two of the respondents indicated that they enrolled primarily on their own initiative (the other two were asked to enrol by employers), with two separate, yet closely related envisaged outcomes dominating: to improve career prospects (15)[4] and to improve classroom practice (15):

"There was one main reason for taking the course: become a world-wide recognised ESOL teacher and be able to be hired as one abroad … I also felt I needed an honest opinion from native

4 Numerals in brackets indicate the number of respondents providing a response.

English teachers with recognised expertise in teacher training, and benefit from their advice and guidance for further improvements." (Angela)

The belief that such ITCs promote the most progressive methodology, often through association with assumptions regarding native speaker authority was also evident in other comments, supporting arguments that native-speakerism lives on in ELT through the close link between methodology and employability that ITCs provide. For example, after explaining that his manager "imposed" the qualification on him, and noting "Either I take the CELTA or look for a new job", Habib reflected "What I hoped to learn from CELTA as a teacher is the art of teaching English by being trained by professional and native or near-native trainers." Habib's comment could be interpreted as either an implicit association between native speakers and effective methodology (i.e. native-speakerism), or, when considered in the context of the interview (with myself, a native speaker), as the manifestation of a coping strategy within a community of practice where native-speakerism continues to dominate (Kiczkowiak et al. 2016).

While many respondents expressed a hope to work in other countries after the course (11), few seemed confident of this outcome. For two, this desire was described as a 'dream' (Monica, Sabina), and for others (4), uncertainty was evident in their responses:

> "[The CELTA] is like a passport for teaching in London, I heard. I'm not sure whether it's right or wrong." (Andrew, SD)

Consistent with Anderson (2016), improving language proficiency was not discussed as a major reason for taking the course, mentioned by only 4 respondents (language proficiency is further discussed below).

How Useful Did They Find the Course?
The majority of respondents reported finding the course 'very' (8) or 'extremely useful' (3), yet there were also both shortcomings and challenges reported. There was significant consistency among responses regarding the most useful course element: teaching practice, with the practical nature of the course receiving most praise. It was often discussed in close conjunction with post-lesson self-evaluation and feedback discussion:

> "All parts were useful and interesting to me, especially the teaching practice sessions and the feedback sessions we had afterwards. I also appreciated very much all the aspects we were forced to consider when building our lesson plans." (Carla)

The planning element was reported as the second most useful element, indicating that the action research cycle of planning, teaching, observing and reflecting was helping many of these experienced teachers to develop their classroom practice. It is likely that such teachers benefit more from development, which focuses on "individual… reflection, examination and change" than training, aimed more at "building specific teaching skills" (Freeman 1982: 21). While reflective practice and developmental procedures were reported on very positively, it is notable that the most commonly discussed challenges related to adding new teaching skills and procedures to their practice (i.e. training), especially for more experienced teachers. This included changing how they give instructions, reducing teacher-talk time (TTT), eliciting more and using concept check questions (CCQs), and sometimes led to conflict between course expectations and the practices that they had internalized over years of teaching. The language used to describe this conflict was revealing, with five respondents blaming themselves for these difficulties, or presuming that their prior practice was at fault:

> "Changes in teaching practice are really difficult to internalise. You need to fight with yourself constantly." (Manuela)

> "The biggest challenge was to overcome the old wrong habits I had in my teaching which I had to eradicate from my teaching practice." (Nadia)

Because the course was oriented towards providing a new body of knowledge, participants often felt that they were expected to forget their prior experience:

> "I thought it could have been easier to learn how to teach successfully if I had not had any prior experience." (Nadia)

These extracts highlight an important contradiction between the initial, preservice nature of ITCs and the needs of experienced teachers, for whom aspects of identity, context and experience become necessarily integrated into their Personal Practical Knowledge (Golombek 2009). While the inevitably assessment-oriented nature of lesson observation on ITCs means that they are most likely to fall under what Freeman (1982) has called the *Supervisory Approach* where the observer is an authority, and one to whom many pre-service trainees may be willing to submit, it is also possible for trainers, when working with NNESTs, to draw more on Freeman's *Alternatives Approach*, more appropriate to teacher development, where the observer is a provider of alternative perspectives who "stimulate[s] the

teacher to think critically and, thereby, to broaden the scope of what s/he will consider doing in that classroom situation" (1982: 23). This was even suggested by one respondent, who used Gebhard's (1984) terms:

> "...maybe it would be better if the trainers or the tutors could have combined a more collaborative approach because [our course] was a more directive approach." (Sharon, SD)

As predicted by the literature (e.g. Medgyes 1994; Llurda 2005; Anderson 2016), many (but not all) reported learning little if anything in the language awareness inputs – not only are these respondents successful English language learners/users, they are also experienced English teachers, and in several cases, linguists too:

> "Regarding language awareness, I did not learn any new things compared to native speakers of English as I'm a linguist and I'm familiar with grammar, phonetics and so forth." (Isabel)

Linked to this and consistent with Anderson (2016) several respondents expressed concern that the initial nature of the course prevented inclusion of more advanced aspects of pedagogy:

> "Me and my other non-native English-speaking trainees feel [the pedagogic theory] was a bit too basic, but they can't really teach advanced for the others, otherwise it's really difficult." (Farah, SD)

Likewise, there was only limited discussion of challenges relating to respondents' own language proficiency, contrasting with other studies (e.g. Carrier 2003; Brady & Gulikers 2004) where it was more prominent. Given the prior teaching experience of the respondents (averaging 8.6 years), it is likely that many felt they had already developed the language proficiency that they need to teach, at least in their own classrooms, and may need less focus on this than NNSs on MA TESOLs (D. Liu 1999; Kamhi-Stein 2000).

With regard to suitability of the course to their future teaching contexts (asked only to the five face-to-face interviewees), uncertainty about finding work made it difficult for two of them (Farah and Sharon) to answer, although two that subsequently taught in their home countries were critical regarding aspects of methodology, particularly use of L1. Lucia indicated feeling guilt whenever she drew on her L1 to teach Spanish-speaking learners:

> "You feel like you're being a kind of fraud if you are teaching in English and you have to speak in Spanish." (SD)

Andrew commented on issues both of methodological incompatibility and language choice:

> "At first I thought much of the methodology, if I learnt it here I could use it elsewhere. However now I know it's not for all contexts ... If I'm using CLT in the Chinese context, sometimes the students, they do not talk in the target language." (SD)

As noted by Anderson (2016) and Kiczkowiak et al. (2016), ITCs tend to promote a monolingual methodology, leaving little opportunity for exploration of use of L1. This is reflected in course syllabi where it is rarely mentioned and echoed in the comments of some respondents including Carla, who took the course in Spain:

> "...6 people in the course couldn't speak Spanish and that was definitely a big point in favour. All in English. We talked about different teaching methodologies and about the possibility of using L1 in class but they told us it wasn't the Cambridge style."

Only one, who also took the course in Spain, describes a more L1-inclusive environment:

> "I was lucky in this aspect. Our students were Spanish so many times when they were lost in any part of the lesson we could explain something in L1 and they felt really comfortable." (Sabina)

What Impact Did the Course Have?
Impact on teaching practice

Just as most respondents reported finding the course very useful, most reported changes in their own teaching practice, with a significant number of strategies and principles that respondents described implementing (15) indicative of learner-centred teaching (Nunan 1988). This included collaborative learning (groupwork, pairwork and mingle activities) (6), more interactive teaching (2), the reduction of TTT (2) and more peer-teaching opportunities (1):

> "I have considerably reduced my TTT in class. I have a clear idea of the importance of teacher-independent students in a class and having them participating as much as possible... I try to make the lesson more dynamic, regrouping students differently and for different purposes." (Carla)

It is interesting that two of the respondents who indicated among the highest levels of implementation had both obtained teaching posts in the UK soon after (Farah and Sofia), where such methodology is likely to be both contextually appropriate and expected of teachers:

> "If you see me teaching you can see that I'm... a TESOL-trained teacher because I just implement all methodology I've learned from the course, from A to Z." (Farah, SD)

Difficulties implementing the methodology were reported both from adult (e.g. Andrew, Lucia; see above) and secondary (e.g. Angela)

bilingual contexts[5], while others (e.g. Sharon, Isabel, Monica and Nina) indicated that they appropriated selectively from what they had learnt upon returning to bilingual contexts, aware of the context-dependent nature of methodology:

> "…our methodology in Russia is a compilation of different methods and techniques depending on the aspect of the language you teach and the age range of the students in the groups." (Nina)

Impact on careers

With regard to the career paths of NNESTs, this study has uncovered evidence both of "life-changing" opportunities and insurmountable barriers to finding international employment. Of the nine who have either gained employment or received some kind of promotion since the course, five considered that the qualification was either important or instrumental in this change:

> "It was a life-changing course for me, you know. Because of this I found my way back to teaching and I feel qualified now… I feel like my teaching skills have been recognised." (Farah, SD)

In the cases of Angela, Olga and Isabel, despite repeated attempts, they have failed to find work internationally and met with discrimination and prejudice. Despite evidence indicating that many learners in varied contexts do not prefer NS teachers over NNS teachers (see: Lipovsky & Mahboob 2010), evidence of discrimination towards NNESTs has been provided by 12 of the 19 participants in this study, even though none of the questions addressed this issue directly. Isabel provides the following story:

> "One of my course partners was told they couldn´t hire her as she was Spanish, only when she was in the interview and just said her surname. She did not have this problem when she was on the phone and the employers did not even notice her accent, they took her as a "native" speaker."

Camille, an MA-qualified science teacher with five years' teaching experience, including in the UK, recounts the following episode, indicating that the prejudice extends beyond English language teaching itself:

> "Last year I applied for a job in a top International School in Bangkok and they openly told me they would only consider English native speakers for the position, even for the teaching of Science."

Nonetheless, this study also indicates that ITCs can help experienced NNESTs get new jobs and promotions, both in their home country and overseas, in competition with NESTs. While it was

encouraging to note that four respondents had successfully found work in the UK since their course, this may reflect a bias in the data set, given that four of the five face-to-face interviews were conducted with respondents in the UK. At least two of these four were aware that their achievements were atypical:

> "…people think 'Oh my God, you're non-native, but you're teaching in England!" (Monica, SD)

If nothing else, the limited evidence provided by this study indicates that at least some employers in the UK are willing to employ non-native speaker teachers, but that discrimination is still largely endemic in the industry, in agreement with Mahboob & Golden (2013) and Kamhi-Stein (2016).

Suggestions and Recommendations of Respondents

14 of the 19 respondents would recommend the course to non-native speaking colleagues. Of these, four included no provisos:

> "I would say that it is really worth to take this course no matter whether you are new to teaching or an experienced teacher, but without teaching qualification." (Nadia)

10 other respondents recommended the course, but did so with cautions or provisos, four mentioning probable discrimination in competition for work with NESTs, and three warning about the intensity of the course. Five respondents did not specifically recommend it, either discussing advantages and disadvantages, or providing warnings:

> "I would tell them that such a course is more appropriate for less experienced teachers who need to benefit from teacher training in an English-speaking environment. I would also advise them to think twice before taking this course because there is no job guarantee for a non-native teacher of English." (Angela)

Recommendations offered for improving courses included suggesting that more help was needed with finding work (4), with two linking this to issues of discrimination towards non-native speaker teachers. One solution was proposed:

> "Create a network of companies hiring ESOL teachers and connect the newly qualified teachers to that network so that it becomes faster for them to get hired. " (Sofia)

Four respondents suggested that Trinity and Cambridge might investigate the possibility of developing more context-specific and/or culturally sensitive courses. However, the strongest shared recommendation, mentioned by six respondents

---

[5] Here I prefer to use 'bilingual' to 'monolingual' to recognise the prior linguistic resources of the learners.

was that the course should not make special allowances for non-native speaker participants:

> "I think it wouldn't be fair because with this qualification you are supposed to be the same, teach internationally. You shouldn't require any extra assistance or help because you are in the same classroom, you are the same trainees, you are assessed with the same criteria." (Sharon, SD)

Several respondents providing this recommendation noted that it was precisely these criteria that made it useful as a means of demonstrating pedagogic equality with qualified NESTs, and their superiority over unqualified NESTs:

> "I feel like this certificate helped me to be in the same position as a native speaker." (Farah, SD)

> "[Unqualified NESTs] are valued as better than you, and I really feel uncomfortable because I think it's not fair. I think [the qualification] is a good way to say: 'Well you're native, but I'm a teacher. You're not a teacher." (Lucia, SD)

All respondents were asked whether they had heard of the Cambridge In-service Certificate for English Language Teachers (ICELT), designed specifically to meet the needs of in-service teachers in a wide variety of contexts. None had heard of it. Upon investigating the qualification, only four indicated that they might have been interested as an alternative to the CELTA/CertTESOL. Most perceived that the CELTA and CertTESOL were the internationally accepted benchmarks in the industry:

> "I chose the CertTESOL because this would help me to get the certificate to work more easily abroad." (Isabel)

Limitations and Recommendations

The following limitations should be acknowledged: Only two of the 19 respondents were male, and 63% of respondents took their courses in the UK. As well as experienced NNESTs (the focus of this study), ITCs also include a minority of NNSs who lack prior teaching experience (11%; Anderson 2016) and are likely to have different needs.

Nonetheless, this study has revealed a number of areas in which CPOs could make changes to ensure that courses are as productive for NNESTs as they are for other participants. The following recommendations are based partly on direct suggestions from respondents and partly on observations made above:

1. Teaching practice tutors should be encouraged to use developmental approaches to lesson observation when working with experienced teachers, possibly incorporating aspects of Freeman's (1982) Alternatives Approach, rather than the Supervisory Approach more commonly used when training novice teachers.

2. Opportunities to engage trainees in discussion on critical evaluation and appropriation of methodology (rather than wholesale adoption) should be explored, employing the expertise of NNESTs to help raise awareness of potential challenges of implementing communicative methodology in different contexts (Carrier 2003; Brady & Gulikers 2004). This would also help to prepare NS participants for diverse future teaching contexts.

3. Given that NNESTs may be learning little from language awareness inputs/seminars (especially grammar), CPOs could be encouraged to experiment, firstly with how they can usefully draw on the knowledge of participating NNESTs (e.g. by encouraging them to give mini-presentations or lead group projects on aspects of language; Barratt 2010) and secondly by adapting syllabi (if required) to allow for an increase in focus on areas of lexis, which NNSs tend to find more challenging (Medgyes 1994), especially idiomatic and culturally-situated language, and less grammar which often dominates ITC language awareness syllabi.

4. CPOs may usefully include discussion of issues of norms, models and Englishes (including global and lingua franca), to raise awareness of all course participants that native-speaker models should not be presumed to be the default norms (V. Cook 1999), and to reflect emerging global realities of language use (Kirkpatrick 2007). This would also help to reduce the likelihood of NNESTs feeling pressurised to conform to native-speaker-like norms, as several of the respondents above seemed to do.

5. ITC syllabi could be made more L1-inclusive, for example by including appropriate reading and discussion activities on issues relating to L1 use. On courses run in contexts where learners in teaching practice classes share L1, CPOs could help trainee teachers make effective use of L1 in planning, materials preparation and teaching as appropriate (see: Butzkamm & Caldwell 2009). Monolingual NS course participants may also learn from observing such lessons, and recognizing the value of multilingualism to language teaching.

6. Finally, given the above-documented discriminatory practices towards non-native speakers that are evidently still widespread in the industry, awareness raising activities on this issue could be included on courses, as suggested by Kiczkowiak et al. (2016). Also, as suggested by one respondent above, it may be possible for Cambridge and/or Trinity to develop a publicly accessible database of organisations that employ recent ITC graduates, offer equal opportunities to all job applicants, and welcome applications from non-native speaker teachers, possibly with the opportunity for such organisations to also make public their hiring policy.

Conclusion

As Mahboob (2010: 15) notes, "far from being deficient, NNESTs enrich the field by adding multilingual, multinational, and multicultural perspectives to issues that have traditionally been seen through a monolingual lens". The recommendations provided here have the potential to foster more fruitful environments for learning and thereby to help all participants develop their understanding of the necessarily context-specific strengths and weaknesses of all teachers, whether NESTs, NNESTs, or neither, and the importance of equity and diversity among all English language teachers as colleagues.

Acknowledgements

References

Anderson, J. (2016). Initial teacher training courses and non-native speaker teachers. *ELT Journal* 70/3: 261-274.

Barratt, L. (2010). Strategies to prepare teachers equally for equity. In Mahboob, A. (Ed.). *The NNEST lens: Non-native English Speakers in TESOL* (pp. 180–201). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Brady, B. & Gulikers, G. (2004). Enhancing the MA in TESOL practicum course for nonnative English-speaking student teachers. In Kamhi-Stein, L. (Ed.). *Learning and Teaching from Experience: Perspectives on Nonnative English-speaking Professionals* (pp. 206–229). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Brutt-Griffler, J. & Samimy, K. (2001). Transcending the nativeness paradigm. *World Englishes* 20/1: 99-106.

Butzkamm, W. & Caldwell, J. (2009). *The Bilingual Reform: A Paradigm Shift in Foreign Language Teaching*. Tübingen, Germany: Narr Studienbücher.

Cambridge English Language Assessment. (2015). *CELTA Syllabus and Assessment Guidelines* (4th ed). Cambridge: University of Cambridge English Language Assessment.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Carrier, K.A. (2003). NNS teacher trainees in Western-based TESOL programs. *ELT Journal* 57/3: 242–250.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education* (7th ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.

Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 33/2: 185-209.

Davies, A. (2003). *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ferguson, G. & Donno, S. (2003). One-month teacher training courses: Time for a change? *ELT Journal* 57/1: 26–33.

Freeman, D. (1982). Observing teachers: Three approaches to in-service training and development. *TESOL Quarterly* 16/1: 21–28.

Gebhard, J. (1984). Models of supervision: Choices. *TESOL Quarterly* 18/3: 501-514.

Golombek, P. (2009). Personal practical knowledge in L2 teacher education. In Burns, A. & Richards, J. C. (Eds.). *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education* (pp. 155–162). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hobbs, V. (2013). "A basic starter pack": The TESOL certificate as a course in survival. *ELT Journal* 67/2: 163–174.

Holliday, A. (2005). *The Struggle to Teach English As an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Houghton, S. & Rivers, D. (2013). *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup Dynamics in Foreign Language Education*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Howatt, A. (1984). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

James, N. (2007). The use of email interviewing as a qualitative method of enquiry in educational research. *British Educational Research Journal* 33/6: 963–976.

Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University: The Politics of Academic English Language Policy*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Kamhi-Stein, L. (2000). Adapting US-based TESOL education to meet the needs of nonnative English speakers. *TESOL Journal* 9/3: 10–14.

Kamhi-Stein, L. (2016). The non-native English speaker teachers in TESOL movement. *ELT Journal* 70/2: 180-189.

Kiczkowiak, M., Baines, D. & Krummenacher, K. (2016). Using awareness raising activities on initial teacher training courses to tackle 'native-speakerism'. *ELTED* 19: 45-53.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kvale, S. (1997). *Interviews: an Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lipovsky, C. & Mahboob, A. (2010). Appraisal of native and non-native English-speaking teachers. In Mahboob, A. (Ed.). *The NNEST Lens: Non-native English Speakers in TESOL* (pp. 154–179). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Liu, D. (1999). Training non-native TESOL students: Challenges for teacher education in the west. In Braine, G. (Ed.). *Non-native Educators in English Language Teaching* (pp. 197–210). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Liu, J. (1999). From their own perspectives: the impact of non-native ESL professionals on their students. In Braine, G. (Ed.). *Non-native Educators in English Language Teaching* (pp. 159–176). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Liu, J. (2005). Chinese graduate teaching assistants teaching freshman composition to native English-speaking students. In Llurda, E. (Ed.). *Non-native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges, and Contributions to the Profession* (pp. 155–177). New York: Springer.

Llurda, E. (2005). Non-native TESOL students as seen by practicum supervisors. In Llurda, E. (Ed.). *Non-native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges, and Contributions to the Profession* (pp. 131–154). New York: Springer.

Mahboob, A. & Golden, R. (2013). Looking for native speakers of English: Discrimination in English language teaching job advertisements. *Voices in Asia Journal* 1/1: 72–81.

Mahboob, A. (2010). The NNEST lens. In Mahboob, A. (Ed.). *The NNEST Lens: Non-Native English Speakers in TESOL* (pp. 1–17). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or nonnative: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal* 46/4: 340–349.

Medgyes, P. (1994). *The Non-native Teacher.* London: Macmillan.

Moussu, L. & Llurda, E. (2008). Non-native speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching* 41/3, 315–348.

Nemtchinova, E., Mahboob, A., Eslami, Z. & Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (2010). Training non-native English-speaking TESOL professionals. In Mahboob, A. (Ed.). *The NNEST Lens: Non-Native English Speakers in TESOL* (pp. 222–238). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The Learner-centred Curriculum.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rampton, B. (1990). Displacing the "native speaker": Expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal* 44/2: 97–101.

Richardson, S. (2016). *The 'native factor', the haves and the have-nots… and why we still need to talk about this in 2016.* Paper presented at the 50th IATEFL Annual Conference, Birmingham, UK.

Samimy, K. & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To be a native or a non-native speaker: Perceptions of "non-native" students in a graduate TESOL program. In Braine, G. (Ed.). *Non-native Educators in English Language Teaching* (pp. 127–144). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Trinity College London. (2016). *Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (CertTESOL Syllabus)*: – from January 2016. London: Trinity College London.