Preparing Culturally and Linguistically Competent Teachers for English as an International Language Education

GUOFANG LI

University of British Columbia

Despite recent scholarly advancements in teaching English as an international language (EIL), its implementation in TESOL classrooms has been challenging and limited. Because English teachers play a significant role in EIL implementation in their daily lessons, preparing EIL-oriented teachers becomes critical. This article outlines major developments in EIL and their implications for teacher competence and discusses the ideological challenges in integrating EIL in teacher education. It concludes with a detailed description of a three-step EIL-oriented pedagogy for TESOL teacher education courses and programs that aims to foster teachers' linguistic self-respect, build their pedagogical competence for plurilingual teaching, and transform their classrooms.

doi: 10.1002/tesj.322

With its ever-increasing use and spread by people of different nations for communication in global migration and flow, English is widely accepted as an international language. As an international language, it enables speakers to share ideas and cultures with others across the globe, and its varieties become established alongside local languages and embedded in the culture (s) of the countries in which they are used. English as an international language (EIL), therefore, refers to a function that the English language performs in international, multilingual contexts in which users from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds

communicate through different varieties of English (Friedrich & Matsuda, 2011; Kumaravadivelu, 2012; McKay, 2002).

In the globalized contexts in which varieties of different Englishes and cultures are in constant contact, there are increasing tensions between the use of idealized "standard English" and other Englishes in English teaching, for example, between British English and Pakistani English in Pakistani schools (Mahboob & Talaat, 2008), Ghanaian English in Ghanaian schools (Wu & VanderBroek, 2008), and Singaporean English in Singaporean schools (Rubdy, 2007). The emergence of other varieties of English, such as China/Chinese English (Yun, 2013), Korea/Korean English (K. Park, 2009), and Japan/Japanese English (Takeshita, 2000), suggests growing user awareness and recognition of the existence and legitimacy of local English varieties and cultures that are increasingly being used for intercultural communications (Murata & Jenkins, 2009).

With expanding complexity and diversity in the varieties of different Englishes and cultures presented in global communication, the teaching of English, then, is more about gaining "the ability to shuttle between different varieties of English and different speech communities" (Canagarajah, 2014, p. 6). In these contexts, a successful language user needs to have the awareness of multiple English varieties, develop intercultural sensitivity to contexts and constraints, and possess interactive and collaborative skills (Canagarajah, 2014; Friedrich, 2012; Kubota, 2012). Thus, teaching from an EIL paradigm needs to focus on facilitating intercultural communicative competence in multilingual and multicultural contexts, rather than mastery of an idealized "standard English" and its associated cultural norms where English is the native language or mother tongue of most people (e.g., the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, Anglophone Canada and South Africa, and some of the Caribbean territories) (Kachru, 1992).

Although the field has made significant advances in theorizing methods, approaches, and materials in EIL teaching (Canagarajah, 2014; Matsuda, 2012; McKay, 2002; Zacharias & Manara, 2013), the question of how to prepare teachers for this epistemic shift

remains to be addressed. As Matsuda (2009, 2017) argues, changes in EIL cannot be successfully implemented without changing teachers. English teachers in the field of TESOL come from different backgrounds and include those considered *native-English-speaking* and those identified as *nonnative-English-speaking* teachers or multilingual users of English. The former group may lack knowledge and awareness of local English varieties and cultures while the latter group often are learners of standard English and are unfamiliar with its cultures and societies. With the global expansion of English and the increasing number of English learners and users across the globe, it is important to consider what English teachers need to know and how they should be prepared to teach in the new EIL paradigm.

For this purpose, in this article I first outline the major developments in EIL pedagogy and their implications for teacher education. I then describe the challenges of preparing teachers with EIL-oriented competencies in TESOL teacher education programs. Finally, drawing on my teaching experiences in TESOL programs in North America, I illustrate a three-step pedagogy that can help overcome these challenges and prepare teachers with much needed border-crossing EIL-oriented competence.

MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS IN EIL AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER COMPETENCE

In recent years, the field of TESOL has witnessed a steady growth in publications that discuss English teaching from an EIL perspective (e.g., Marlina & Giri, 2014; Matsuda, 2012; McKay, 2002; Sharifian, 2009; Zacharias & Manara, 2013). As a group, EIL scholars reject the use of a dominant "standard English" (such as British English or American English) as the only possible medium of international and intercultural communication. Instead, they propose to legitimize all English varieties and their users and promote teaching English as "a heterogeneous language with multiple grammars, vocabulary, accents, and pragmatic discourse conventions" (Marlina, 2014, p. 7).

EIL is thus seen as pluricentric, inclusive of both the so-called standard Englishes and those of less powerful varieties and

treating them as equally valuable for intercultural communication in multilingual contexts. Teaching English from an EIL paradigm, therefore, requires teachers to examine their attitudes toward those nonstandard English varieties and their knowledge and skills in how to include these variations in their classrooms. Kubota (2012) considers these EIL principles *anti-normative* as they require an epistemic break from the conventional monolingual model ("standard English") toward a plurilingual model (both "standard English" and local English varieties) and from monoculturalism (i.e., the target language culture) to multiculturalism (i.e., target culture and local cultures) in English language teaching.

The shift from a monocentric model to a pluricentric perspective necessitates a reconceptualization of which English varieties and culture(s) to include in English teaching. The field of TESOL has been dominated by *native-speakerism*, the belief that the ideal teacher of English is a native speaker (Holliday, 2006; Phillipson, 1992). This belief is still very much alive in many parts of the world. For example, in a recent analysis of the nonnative-speaking teacher movement and its implications for Asia, Braine (2013, p. 12) reveals that the "native English-speaker fallacy" is still dominant in many parts of Asia, especially in countries such as Japan, Korea, and China, where teachers' proficiency in standard English is still being used as the most important criteria to judge teachers' competence. A similar preference for native-speakerism is also reported in many European countries (Modiano, 2009). Under this native-speakerism ideology, teaching English is seen as teaching standardized English and providing cultural information about native English speakers and users in *inner circle* countries (Kachru, 1992), which is primarily based on Anglo-White, middle-class values.

In contrast, the EIL perspective recognizes the significance of teaching local English varieties, the role of learners' local cultures (rather than the target language cultures), and cross-cultural comprehensibility among these learners (Canagarajah, 2014; Sifakis, 2004). In the EIL context, culture learning is seen as a social process through which the learners understand their own culture in relation to that of others (McKay, 2002). For EIL users, English is "a means to communicate to the rest of the world *their*

identity, culture, politics, religion, and 'way of life'" (Smith, 1983, p. 9, italics added). This perspective gives local English varieties, cultures, and learners' cultural identities a prominent role in English learning, alongside the study of standard English, and it necessitates a move from monolingualism and monoculturalism to multilingualism and multiculturalism in instruction.

This shifting perspective to include local English varieties and affirm local cultural identities in EIL teaching requires teachers to have a meta-understanding of EIL and its pluricentric nature as a heterogeneous language. Past and recent research has revealed very consistent findings on learners' perceptions of English varieties both in countries where English is the native language or first language (L1) such as the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia (or the inner Kachruvian circle countries) and those where English is not a native tongue but plays an important part in the nation's institutions either as an official second language or foreign language (or the outer and expanding Kachruvian circle countries). In these studies (e.g., Atay, 2008; Braine, 2013; Mahboob & Talaat, 2008; Wu & VanderBroek, 2008), students and teachers across different global contexts consistently show a preference for standardized English over their own English varieties, as well as their local languages and cultures. One key objective in EIL teaching is then to challenge this native-speakerism mindset. As Marlina (2014) describes it, EIL teaching is

> an act of professionally guiding students from all Kachruvian circles to (1) gain knowledge and awareness of pluricentricity of English and the plurilingual nature of today's communication; (2) inspire students to give equal and legitimate recognition of all varieties of English; and (3) develop the ability to negotiate and communicate respectfully across all cultures and Englishes in today's communicative settings that are international, inter-cultural and multilingual in nature. (p. 7)

Dogancay-Aktuna and Hardman (2012) further argue that, because today's communication is always situated within infinitely variable cross-cultural contexts, understanding the general nature of cultural differences is more important to communication than mastering the cultural norms of any given country or the cultural

specifics of any particular interlocutor. That is, in order to prepare students for diverse and hybrid zones of intercultural contact, EIL teachers should become "agents of transculturation" who understand the emergent and negotiated nature of the language–culture connection (Dogancay-Aktuna & Hardman, 2012, p. 111). Since language is closely linked to cultural identity, EIL teachers also need to understand how to bring learner languages and identities in to the classroom by creating spaces where students can feel comfortable with any struggles and conflicts that may emerge from EIL learning (Li, 2013).

Realizing the ideals of EIL education in a particular country or context in the current native-speakerism TESOL education culture, however, still faces many challenges and obstacles. Such effort will require multiple levels of educational reform, including national policy support, curriculum provision, and receptivity of stakeholders, and it will depend on many critical factors such as assessment and testing policies and practices, availability of texts and materials, and teacher development. While full-fledged implementations of EIL may take time, a crucial step toward preparing teachers to move away from the native-speakerism model is to focus on developing knowledge and raising awareness of their personal attitudes toward English dialects and cultures; this can be done by introducing other varieties into teacher education. By opening up some spaces in the curriculum for other varieties and cultures, teachers can experiment with and experience new EIL-oriented instructional roles as promoters of intercultural competence, multiculturalism, and other varieties of English (Renandya, 2012).

CHALLENGES IN PREPARING EIL TEACHERS IN TESOL TEACHER EDUCATION

The implementation of EIL in the classroom and teacher education has encountered tremendous difficulties and resistance. English teacher educators in general still have "minimal understanding" of EIL (Marlina, 2014, p. 7); their attitudes toward EIL are "far from enthusiastic" (Llurda, 2009, p. 81); and many believe that including other varieties is "desirable but not necessary" (Matsuda, 2009, p. 196). It is, therefore, not surprising that

systematic implementation of EIL in undergraduate or graduate EIL-oriented teacher education courses or programs in universities is reported to be challenging and limited (Marlina, 2013; Matsuda, 2012; Zacharias, 2014).

This limited EIL integration, in turn, leads to English teachers' narrow understanding of EIL and apprehensive receptivity toward including other varieties in their classrooms. In-depth analyses of TESOL teacher education programs in several Asian countries such as China, Korea, and Vietnam confirmed the prevalence of native-speakerism with the majority of teacher education courses focusing on improving teacher candidates' proficiency in "standard English" without introducing any other English varieties (Kim, 2008; Nguyen, 2013; Zacharias, 2014; Zhang, 2007). This type of professional preparation affects teachers' attitudes toward other varieties of English and their associated cultures.

A body of research on teacher attitudes toward EIL (e.g., Jenkins, 2005; Koskun, 2011; Selvi, 2013; Zacharias, 2014) reached consistent findings that language teachers across English teaching contexts prefer standard English such as American or British English and hold deficit views toward accents of other English varieties, considering them as not good, wrong, incorrect, and deficient. Similarly, cultural awareness for many English teachers still means knowing and teaching cultures from those of inner circle Western countries; many do not see themselves as cultural mediators (see Atay, 2008). In fact, many teachers engage in "auto-colonization" or unconscious acceptance/imposition of Western norms without critical reflection (McKay, 2004, p. 14). For example, in Atay's (2008) study of Turkish prospective teachers' integration of culture in the classroom, the teachers focused "only on the target culture specified in the textbook when teaching cultural issues and did not discuss the [local] culture or any other culture" (p. 96). Moreover, all the teachers believed that "focusing on learners' culture is not necessary" (Atay, 2008, p. 96).

Consequently, teachers' knowledge of local cultures and varieties of English is often regarded as a deficit. Canagarajah (2012), a bilingual academic researcher and a fluent Sri Lankan English speaker, shared his experience as an in-service teacher receiving training in Sri Lanka from the United States Information

Agency. For this training, he taught a lesson using Sri Lankan English and a widely used but "nameless and untheorized" local method (p. 259). To his surprise, the U.S. experts questioned his English and laughed at his teaching method. He remembered,

> [T]hough the textbook features standard American English, I had spoken Sri Lankan English during my lesson. Furthermore, the students and I had code-switched between English and Tamil in our interactions. ... This experience devastated me. I was left with a poor image of myself as a teacher. ... I had never thought my teaching practice or English proficiency was questionable. (p. 259)

As Canagarajah's (2012) experiences illustrate, teacher educators' failure to capitalize on local cultures and languages can have a detrimental impact on teachers' professional development and self-confidence as teachers. In some studies, English teachers are found to have experienced low self-esteem and high language anxiety. For example, Tum (2013) studied four nonnative English L2 student teachers in northern Cyprus and found that the language anxiety experienced by these teachers adversely affected their performance in the target language and their views of how they intended to teach the target language in their future classrooms. Similar results have also been found in studies of non-L1 English-speaking teachers in other countries (e.g., Hammad & Ghali, 2015; G. Park, 2012; Takahashi, 2014). In an extreme case, one multilingual, non-L1 English-speaking teacher in Japan reported being forced to take on a "fake American" identity in order to teach English in Japan (Galloway, 2014, p. 1).

Given this deep-seated ideological barrier, the most important first step in EIL-oriented teacher education is to challenge the worldview of teachers and expand their knowledge base in the pluricentricity of English. As a first step, teacher educators can equip teachers with a positive perspective of local languages and cultures as *funds of knowledge* (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005). A funds of knowledge approach regards the historically and culturally developed bodies of linguistic knowledge and skills from the teachers' (and their students') local cultures and communities as rich cultural, linguistic, and cognitive resources and bases for culturally responsive and meaningful lessons in the

English language classroom (González et al., 2005). Seeing their prior knowledge in local varieties and cultures as funds of knowledge can help foster cultural and linguistic continuity among learners, promote intrinsic motivation, and therefore increase their academic achievements.

One body of work has examined the positive impact of using students' home languages and emerging localized varieties in English language instruction (for a comprehensive review, see Tollefson, 2007). In another extensive review of 22 different research studies around the world, Siegel (1999) examined the effects of the instructional use of stigmatized varieties, such as working-class English, regional dialects (e.g., Appalachian in the United States and others in Sweden and Norway), pidgins and creoles (e.g., Melanesian Pidgin and Hawai'i Creole), and African American vernacular, on student achievement. Siegel examined stigmatized varieties used in three contexts: by teachers as a medium of instruction, by students for classroom activities, and by the class as the focus of discussion in the classroom. She found overwhelming evidence that the use of stigmatized varieties in all three types of programs had positive effects, including higher reading and writing scores in standard English; increased overall academic achievement in mathematics, science, and other subjects; and higher participation rates and student self-esteem. As Siegel (1999) pointed out, the results of these studies "clearly contradict claims that using a stigmatized variety in the classroom exacerbates interference or is detrimental to the acquisition of the standard" (p. 710). On the contrary, these findings indicate that "appropriate teaching methodology incorporating the students' vernacular may actually help them acquire the standard" (Siegel, 1999, p. 721).

These benefits of using students' home languages and local English varieties suggest that instead of monolingual views of TESOL methodologies, developing plurilingual competence and cultivating identities and subjectivities among teachers (and hence their students) needs to become a critical component of teacher education (Li, 2013, 2015). Attending to teachers' funds of knowledge in local cultures and language varieties as a first step

can help them become culturally and linguistically competent teachers.

EIL TEACHER EDUCATION PEDAGOGY AND PRACTICE

According to Matsuda (2012), one of the key features of English used in international settings is its heterogeneity, and consequently one of the primary goals in the EIL classroom is to "develop awareness of and sensitivity toward differences—in forms, uses, and users—and learn to respect (at least tolerate) those differences" (p. 170). Teacher education courses and programs can help teachers develop such awareness of, sensitivity to, and respect for differences by integrating other English varieties and cultures in the curriculum. In the following, I propose a three-step cultural approach that involves the cultural reconciliation stage, the cultural translation stage, and finally the cultural transformation stage (Li, 2008, 2011, 2013). I illustrate this approach using examples from my own TESOL teacher education classes at major teacher education institutions at different public state universities in the United States. The teachers in these classes included both preservice and in-service teachers who aimed to teach or were already teaching English. Course assignments for the three steps were designed in ways that allowed preservice and in-service teachers to learn about themselves and their students as cultural beings through a series of inquiries. Through these inquiries, teachers' and teacher candidates' authentic cultural and linguistic knowledge was often used as a scaffold for powerful learning, which enabled them to achieve critical consciousness about language and cultural diversity while supporting their successful content learning.

I have used this approach in one institution in the United States where the majority of the TESOL teachers in my courses came from countries such as Korea, Japan, Russia, Ukraine, India, and China, with only a few from inner circle countries. In another university in the United States where I taught, the composition of my courses was the opposite: the majority of TESOL teachers in my classes were from English L1 countries such as the United States and Canada, with only a few international educators from

countries where English is a second or foreign language. Therefore, teacher educators who wish to adopt this approach need to gauge their own particular teaching contexts and modify the steps to make it relevant to their own students and circumstances.

Step 1: Building Cultural and Linguistic Self-Respect Through Cultural Reconciliation

In the cultural reconciliation stage, the focus is on how to support preservice and in-service teachers as they come to know themselves and others as cultural beings and reconcile with their own (as well as their students') linguistic diversity. This process focuses on building cultural and "linguistic self-respect" (Siegel, 1999, p. 721) and helping teachers rediscover the importance of their preexisting linguistic repertoire. In this stage, the goal is to help teachers gain a renewed sense of their own cultural and linguistic resources and "notice" their cultures and languages from an asset perspective. This renewed cultural and linguistic self-respect is the essential starting point for building plurilingual competence for teaching from an EIL paradigm.

This stage took the form of an *"autobiographic sketch* or *linguistic self study* exercise in my classes, in which teachers were asked to reflect on their own language and cultural experiences in their homes, schools, and communities. They were invited to write (through traditional essays or using new technologies such as PowerPoints, web pages, or iMovie) about their family cultural histories, language and literacy practices in their lives, and their identities as language educators. Teachers were encouraged to use artifacts such as photos and documents. This assignment capitalized on teachers' prior knowledge, beliefs, and experiences to help them become culturally and linguistically reflective practitioners (Richards & Farrell, 2011). For many teachers (even teachers from a "standard English" background), who either took their own language and cultural experiences for granted or thought their own experiences as irrelevant to their becoming a language teacher, this exercise proved to be a powerful tool to engage them to have a new lens on their cultural and linguistic repertoire. As one teacher wrote, "My upbringing was basically

middle-class American, and I didn't really think about the influence my ancestors may have on my family culture until I sat down to write this paper." Many other teachers shared similar experiences. Another wrote, "When I started thinking about culture, I had a difficult time figuring out what my 'culture' was." Through this self-reflection exercise, many saw that their culture was valuable and that they could use it in their teaching with diverse students. According to an in-service teacher,

> I plan to bring my students into the culture through conversation, experience, and relationships. ... I share my stories of the Jeep shop, my move to NC [North Carolina], my time in FL [Florida], the bus ride into work. ... Communication and reflection of their ideas are critical to their cultural development and necessary for every classroom.

A preservice teacher wrote, "It is ... my belief that teachers bring their own personal backgrounds into the classroom. It is essential that educators understand their own culture so that relating to students from different cultures becomes second nature."

Step 2: Gaining Pedagogical Competence for Plurilingual Teaching Through Cultural Translation

Building on preservice and in-service teachers' renewed sense of cultural and linguistic self-respect, the cultural translation stage takes it further by engaging them in comparing "standard English" and an English variety (which can be their own or one that is relevant in their teaching context) or two different English varieties in order to gain skills and techniques for plurilingual education. Teacher educators can adapt this assignment to suit their teachers' linguistic realities. Teachers from a "standard English" background can be asked to study a less dominant English variety or varieties that their current or future students speak or use. Teachers who speak a dialect can compare "standard English" and their dialect or compare two nonstandard varieties that they might encounter in their current or future teaching. Teachers' awareness of the differences between "standard English" and an English variety or between varieties can enhance their ability to help their students make positive transfers (Ellis, 1994;

Siegel, 1999). Therefore, it is vital for teachers to learn "techniques that help learners notice the differences between their own vernacular and the standard" (Siegel, 1999, p. 718).

These techniques can include traditional contrast-based methods such as contrastive analysis, which entails consciously using areas of overlap to facilitate learners' recognition of differences and similarities between the two languages and hence positive transfers (e.g., Ellis, 1994; Johansson, 2008). Other techniques can incorporate the "new" translanguaging approaches that draw systematic attention to cognate relationships across languages and capitalize on learners' flexible and simultaneous access to their multilingual repertoire (Canagarajah, 2013; Cummins, 2007; García & Wei, 2014). During this stage, the focus is to help teachers translate the differences by "contrastive consciousness raising" (James, 1992, p. 195) and competence building. Teachers not only need to understand differences but also need to learn skills for how to teach students to recognize these differences and facilitate positive transfers.

In one of my classes in the U.S. context, this stage involved native-English-speaking preservice and in-service teachers studying a minority student's language learning and cultural experiences and comparing their language and learning experiences with those of the student. For this assignment, preservice and in-service teachers selected a student (who could be from their classes or other settings) from a cultural background different from their own and collected information about the student through home visits and interviews with parents or caregivers, teachers, and other relevant community members. Once data gathering was completed, the teacher education students compiled a biography of the student, compared and contrasted their own experiences with those of their student, and offered suggestions for addressing the differences.

Although the focus of my courses was to understand the whole student and his/her language learning experiences, educators who wish to have more linguistic emphasis can adapt the assignment to engage teachers in analyzing aspects of language differences and uses in different settings. This assignment, through various data collection methods, not only allowed closer relationship

building between teachers, students, and families but also provided teachers with an opportunity to examine their own students' culturally different experiences of and beliefs about language learning. In addition, the process of comparing their own language, culture, and learning experiences with those of their students and applying teaching techniques they learned in class to understand the differences proved to be a very worthwhile learning process. As one teacher wrote in her paper,

> This assignment has taught me that getting to know the backgrounds, families, and cultural influences of my students can have a dramatic impact on my ability to help them be successful. Making it a point to get to know more about my students and their families early on . . . may prevent future students from failure and retention.

In sum, this step, by building on teachers' appreciation and recognition of their own linguistic capital, allows them to see that "English varieties are not just a matter of different pronunciation features and vocabulary, but rather a much more encompassing manifestation of cultural, linguistic and other values" (Matsuda, 2012, p. 174).

Step 3: Transforming Everyday Teaching Practice
The cultural transformation stage focuses on gaining skills to integrate local cultures and language varieties into the course or curriculum as an everyday practice. Preservice and in-service teachers engage in an application project trying out the plans they outlined during Step 2. The application requires teachers to incorporate some of the linguistic and cultural diversities they identified in the previous two assignments by using some of the translanguaging or contrastive strategies they acquired in the class or the program. They can choose to focus on one language or English variety or language skill area (e.g., reading, writing, listening, or oral language development) or a particular language skill (pre-reading, during reading, post-reading, vocabulary, grammar, and others), but they are to teach these skills from an EIL perspective that embraces heterogeneity and respects differences. Therefore, instead of teaching the skill from a traditional monolingual, monocultural perspective, teachers would

teach it by bringing in students' language varieties in instruction and allowing them to use their language varieties in learning.

By affirming language varieties that students bring to a diverse classroom, and exposing students to other dialects through carefully selected materials and designed activities (see Matsuda, 2012, for materials and activities for EIL), teachers can instill not only linguistic self-respect but also an appreciation of differences across language varieties. Teachers can also engage in self-reflection by carefully documenting their work and analyzing their practices—how they plan the lessons, what materials and activities to use, what the classroom implementation process is, and what works and what does not. If time allows, teachers can practice first by microteaching in class and get peer feedback and then apply the lesson with real students. Teachers can also engage in lesson planning and collaborate with peers. Moreover, teachers can present their pedagogical practices to their teacher education class after completion through formal class presentations, an informal show and tell, a gallery walk, or poster presentations.

Through the application, reflection, and peer feedback, teachers learn how to transform the monolingual English classroom into multilingual and multicultural teaching practice zones. Because teaching from an EIL perspective requires teachers to work against the monolingual instructional strategies in English language classrooms that emphasize the separation of students' and teachers' own language varieties, and make full use of students' translanguaging resources and repertoire as part of the everyday pedagogical practices (Cummins, 2007), an application practice provides an opportunity to try out a new exercise in small steps and to address possible challenges that may arise from such innovative work.

This stage in my courses often included an application to a practice portfolio or case study in which teachers built on the previous assignment to apply one or two techniques they proposed to an individual student or a small group of students to facilitate active transfers between some of the differences and address any challenges they identified. Teachers were required to document their sessions, analyze what worked and what did not, and reflect on how to improve them if they taught them again in

the future. Teachers could collaborate in pairs or groups. In some classes, teachers also presented their work to their teacher education class as posters. As one teacher wrote, "having the opportunity to reflect on my teaching and a single student's growth and success has provided me with a different outlook and a bit of a boost in my confidence." Such confidence lies in the teachers' opportunity to affirm students' cultural identities and see progress in students' learning and motivation. As another in-service teacher wrote, this assignment made him "realize that it is possible to make an educational difference even if it is just one student at a time."

IMPLEMENTATION

The three steps illustrated above were based on 16-week courses on teaching diverse learners, but teacher educators in different contexts can implement them within one single course or as three bigger stages in a TESOL teacher education curriculum, depending on needs and availability of time and resources. Each step can be adapted to specific course content. For example, the assignment can be integrated into a language teaching methods course or in a reading, writing, listening, or conversation course. When it is incorporated in a particular course for a skill area, the assignments (see the Appendix for samples) can be adapted to focus on the relevant skill area. Teacher educators can also modify it to address specific language points, such as grammar analysis or vocabulary teaching. For teacher educators who are pressed for time, a condensed version of all three steps can be integrated into one larger assignment.

The three steps may be most effectively utilized when they are implemented in a sequential order. As illustrated above, Steps 1 and 2 build foundations for Step 3. In fact, Step 1 is crucial to transforming teachers' perceptions of local language varieties and the value of including them in the formal, traditional English classroom. Skipping this step can lead to very superficial understandings of the changing relationships among language, culture, and identity. This step can be implemented in many courses but the best time would be when teachers are beginning their journey of learning to teach.

Step 2 is also a significant phase in the transformation of teachers' thinking and practice. Many in-service teachers have large class sizes, sometimes with over 60 students or more, while many preservice teachers may not have had any interactions with language learners before they step into the real classroom. For either group of teachers, having some in-depth understanding of one student's language and literacy lives, their experiences, and struggles in relation to their own experiences can deepen their understanding of the relationships between local languages and cultures and "standard English" and its associated cultural norms. This knowledge will better prepare them for a small-scale implementation in Step 3. In Step 3, the important point is to start with concrete and small steps of instruction and focus on reflection on these instructional practices. Teacher educators can prepare teachers for the assignment by explicit modeling and teaching of the EIL strategies that they are required to use for the task. Small-group guided exercise before teachers' independent practice is essential. Creative, reflective activities, such as a poster or multimedia presentation of their work to peers, and peer and instructor feedback on these activities, can also facilitate the transformation.

In sum, the three-step approach can make a transformative change in teachers' confidence and competence. One in-service teacher who completed a course including these three steps illustrated the potential impact of this approach on her teaching:

> I anticipated that this course would be good for me but had no idea how applicable and transforming it would be. The course was very thoughtfully designed in terms of readings and writing experiences. ... I gained some major perspective that will impact my teaching gradually over time but in a very meaningful way. I wish I could jump ahead in my progress to demonstrate now the value that will be gained over time, but I would like Dr. Li to know that I am on an important path because of her work. (Thank you!)

CONCLUSION

Becoming a competent user in the increasing complexity of inter- and intra-cultural communications is about gaining border-

crossing communicative competence rather than mastery of one "standard" English and its particular cultural norms. EIL users' intercultural competence, their ability to understand and communicate their own culture in relation to that of others, becomes essential. To help users acquire such intercultural communicative competence, "the role of English educators becomes, more so than ever, a multifaceted affair" (Friedrich, 2012, p. 45). As Friedrich (2012) notes, such a role includes the task of facilitating communication "not only as far as linguistic forms are concerned, but also in terms of intercultural awareness-building and communicative strategy development" (p. 45).

Since teacher competence is highly affected by one's beliefs and communities of practice such as teacher education (Canagarajah, 2012), it is important that TESOL teacher education programs provide programs and pedagogy to embrace the paradigm shift in English language classrooms around the globe. Thus, it is imperative that TESOL teacher education fosters teachers' positive outlook on local and other language varieties, whether standardized or nonstandardized, equips them with useful translanguaging strategies, and prepares them to become agents of transculturation through everyday multilingual and multicultural teaching.

THE AUTHOR
Guofang Li is a professor and a Tier 1 Canada Research Chair in Transnational/Global Perspectives of Language and Literacy Education of Children and Youth in the Department of Language and Literacy Education, University of British Columbia. Her recent research interests include English language learners' biliteracy development, technology-enhanced language teaching in schools, TESOL teacher education, and language education policy.

REFERENCES

Atay, D. (2008). The beliefs and dilemmas of Turkish prospective teachers of English. In S. Dogancay-Aktuna & J. Hardman (Eds.), *Global English teaching and teacher education: Praxis and possibility* (pp. 83–99). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Braine, G. (2013). The nonnative speakers (NNS) movement and its implications for ELT in Asia. In N. T. Zacharias & C. Manara (Eds.), *Contextualizing the pedagogy of English as an international language: Issues and tensions* (pp. 12–39). Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2012). Teacher development in a global profession: An autoethnography. *TESOL Quarterly*, *46*, 258–279. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.18

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London, England: Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2014). In search of a new paradigm for teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Journal*, *5*, 767–785. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.166

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(2), 221–240.

Dogancay-Aktuna, S., & Hardman, J. (2012). Teacher education for EIL: Working toward a situated meta-praxis. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language* (pp. 103–118). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Friedrich, P. (2012). EFL, intercultural communication, and the strategic aspect of communicative competence. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Teaching English as an international language: Principles and practices*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Friedrich, P., & Matsuda, A. (2011). English as an international language: A curriculum blueprint. *World Englishes*, *30*, 332–344. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01717.x

Galloway, N. (2014). "I get paid for my American accent": The story of one multilingual English teacher (MET) in Japan.

Englishes in Practice, *1*(1), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.2478/eip-2014-0001

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

González, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hammad, E. A., & Ghali, E. M. A. (2015). Speaking anxiety level of Gaza EFL pre-service teachers: Reasons and sources. *World Journal of English Language*, *5*(3), 53–64. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v5n3p52

Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, *60*, 385–387. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl030

James, C. (1992). Awareness, consciousness and language contrast. In C. Mair & M. Markus (Eds.), *New departures in contrastive linguistics* (pp. 183–198). Innsbruck, Austria: University of Innsbruck Press.

Jenkins, J. (2005). Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: The role of teacher attitude and identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, *39*, 535–546. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588493

Johansson, S. (2008). *Contrastive analysis and learner language: A corpus-based approach*. Oslo, Norway: University of Oslo Press.

Kachru, B. (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kim, E. J. (2008). An exploratory study of curricula in English teacher (pre-service and in-service) training programs for primary and secondary schools in Korea. *English Teaching*, *63*, 261–281. https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.63.2.200806.261

Koskun, A. (2011). Future English teachers' attitudes toward EIL pronunciation. *Journal of English as an International Language*, *6*(2), 46–68.

Kubota, R. (2012). The politics of EIL: Toward border-crossing communication in and beyond English. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language* (pp. 55–69). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). *Language teacher education for a global society*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Li, G. (2008). *Culturally contested literacies: America's "rainbow underclass" and urban schools*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Li, G. (2011). The role of culture in literacy learning and teaching. In M. L. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. B. Moje, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 4, pp. 515–538). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Li, G. (2013). Promoting teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students as change agents: A cultural approach to professional learning. *Theory Into Practice*, *52*(2), 136–143. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.770331

Li, G. (2015). Subject matters of language, culture, identity, and power. In M. F. He, B. Schultz, & W. H. Schubert (Eds.), *The guide to curriculum in education* (pp. 61–67). New York, NY: Sage.

Llurda, E. (2009). Attitudes towards English as an international language: The pervasiveness of native models among L2 users and teachers. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 81–118). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Mahboob, A., & Talaat, M. (2008). English language teachers and teacher education in Pakistan. In S. Dogancay-Aktuna & J. Hardman (Eds.), *Global English teaching and teacher education: Praxis and possibility* (pp. 3–25). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Marlina, R. (2013). Globalisation, internationalisation, and language education: An academic program for global citizens. *Multilingual Education*, *3*(5). Available at http://www multilingual-education.com/content/3/1/5. doi: 10.1186/2191-5059-3-5

Marlina, R. (2014). The pedagogy of English as an international language (EIL): More reflections and dialogues. In R. Marlina & R. A. Giri (Eds.), *Pedagogy of English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers and students* (pp. 1–19). New York, NY: Springer.

Marlina, R., & Giri, R. A. (Eds.). (2014). *Pedagogy of English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers and students*. New York, NY: Springer.

Matsuda, A. (2009). Desirable but not necessary? The place of World Englishes and English as an international language in English teacher preparation programs in Japan. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 169–189). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Matsuda, A. (Ed.). (2017). *Preparing teachers to English as an international language*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

McKay, S. (2004). Teaching English as an international language: The role of culture in Asian contexts. *Journal of Asian TEFL*, *1*(1), 1–22.

Modiano, M. (2009). EIL, native-speakersim and the failure of European ELT. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 58–77). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Murata, K., & Jenkins, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Global Englishes in Asian contexts: Current and future debates*. London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nguyen, M. H. (2013). The curriculum for English language teacher education in Australian and Vietnamese universities. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*(11), 33–53.

Park, G. (2012). "I am never afraid of being recognized as an NNES": One teacher's journey in claiming and embracing her nonnative speaker identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, *46*, 127–151. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.4

Park, K. (2009). Characteristics of Korea English as a glocalized variety. In K. Murata & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Global Englishes in Asian contexts: Current and future debates* (pp. 94–107). London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Renandya, W. A. (2012). Teacher roles in EIL. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL, 1*(2), 65–80. https://doi.org/10.1002/ 9781405198431

Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2011). *Practice teaching: A reflective approach*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Rubdy, R. (2007). Singlish in the school: An impediment or a resource? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 28*, 308–324. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630008666407

Selvi, A. F. (2013). Toward EIL teacher education: Exploring challenges and potentials of MATESOL programmes in the United States. In N. T. Zacharias & C. Manara (Eds.), *Contextualizing the pedagogy of English as an international language: Issues and tensions* (pp. 43–58). Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Sharifian, F. (Ed.). (2009). *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Siegel, J. (1999). Stigmatized and standardized varieties in the classroom: Interference or separation? *TESOL Quarterly, 33*, 701–728. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587883

Sifakis, N. C. (2004). Teaching "EIL"—Teaching "international" or "intercultural" English? What teachers should know. *System, 32*, 237–250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2003.09.010

Smith, L. E. (1983). *Readings in English as an international language*. Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Takahashi, H. (2014). Non-native English-speaking teachers' self-perceived language proficiency levels, anxieties, and learning strategies. *International Journal of Christianity and English Language Teaching, 1*, 24–44.

Takeshita, Y. (2000). Japanese English as a variety of Asian Englishes and Japanese students of English. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 10*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1.1.582. 5572

Tollefson, J. W. (2007). Ideology, language varieties, and ELT. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 25–36). New York, NY: Springer.

Tum, D. O. (2013). A study of non-native student teachers' feelings of foreign language teacher anxiety (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Institute of Education, University of London, London, England.

Wu, S., & VanderBroek, L. (2008). The role of English and indigenous languages in teacher education in the Ghanaian context. In S. Dogancay-Aktuna & J. Hardman (Eds.), *Global English language teacher education: Praxis and possibility* (pp. 41–57). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Yun, H. (2013). China English, a developing variety of English. *English Language and Literature Studies*, *3*(1), 117–121. https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v3n1p117

Zacharias, N. T. (2014). Integrating EIL pedagogy in a pre-service teacher program. *TEFLIN Journal*, *25*(2), 217–231.

Zacharias, N. T., & Manara, C. (Eds.). (2013). *Contextualising the pedagogy of English as an international language: Issues and tensions*. Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Zhang, L. (2007). An investigation of the current curriculum features of EFL teacher education program. *Jiangxi Education and Research*, *12*, 60–61.

APPENDIX

EXAMPLE ASSIGNMENTS

Autobiographical sketch/linguistic self-study
In an autobiographical sketch (if written 4–5 pages), introduce yourself to your classmates. Please make sure to address the following three aspects of your cultural and language and literacy lives:

1. *Thinking about your cultural experience*
Think about the cultural history of your family.

— What culture(s) do you most identify with?

— Identify the people or experiences that you feel have shaped your cultural outlook.
— How are your values shaped? Which values do you wish to pass on to your own children and your students? How?
— How does your school experience, books you read, and media you are exposed to shape your cultural outlook?
— How has the culture you live in changed?

2. *Language, literacy, and culture in your life*

— What's your perception of your language proficiency in your local English variety?
— What was your experience trying to learn the standard variety of English? What were the struggles?
— Who do you interact with most in your daily life: L1 English speakers or non-L1 English speakers?
— Think about your experience of communicating with people who are not L1 speakers of English or who are culturally different or who share different values. Have you had misunderstandings in your communication (such as food, gestures, idioms, ritual and courtesy, touch and personal space)? What do you do when you do not understand each other?

3. *Who are you as a language educator?*
Think about your experience as a language educator for students from nonnative-English-speaking backgrounds.

— What is the role of their local language varieties in their English learning? What challenges you are facing in teaching these learners?
— What can a language teacher do to help all the students feel confident about their own languages and cultures?

A language learner study
For this assignment, select a nonnative-English-speaking learner and collect information about the student following the instructions below. Once you have completed data gathering, write a biography of the student in 8–10 pages. You will also compare and contrast your own language learning experiences with those of the student and offer suggestions for accommodating the differences or your common struggles.

Possible sources for information (choose as many sources as you can to collect useful information about the learner): parent

interview, teacher interview, student interview, classroom observation, assignment analysis, analysis of assessment data, other sources (e.g., social media).

In this learner study, you will:

— Describe the student's family background, community s/he lives in, key life events in his/her previous experiences, and his/her attitude toward local language and standard English learning;
— Compare and contrast similarities and differences between you and the student in terms of culture and language learning.
— Identify the possible school and home cultural and language conflicts based on your analysis.
— Summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the student's language learning based on the information you have.
— Provide a modification plan for classroom language teachers and recommendations to parents (if applicable).

Application to practice portfolio

For this assignment, you will identify one or a small group of nonnative-English-speaking learners (or work with the same one identified in the language learner study) and teach three lessons to help with their English literacy learning from an EIL perspective by including learners' local language variety in the instruction. You will need to spend some time with the students and teach at least three lessons using at least three suggestions/strategies of translanguaging or contrastive methods. Each lesson should focus on a separate skill or strategy.

You will need to first assess or pretest the students to identify their needs, plan your lessons to address the needs, evaluate the progress of your lessons, and assess (or posttest) student outcomes and mastery using appropriate assessment measures. While you plan and conduct your lessons, make sure to consider how you would make the lessons more accessible to learners of different proficiency levels in English variety and standard English. After each lesson, evaluate students for mastery of the content. Reflect on the effectiveness of the lesson in a 2–3 page paper in which you evaluate the effectiveness of the process you just went through. Be sure to comment on aspects of the process were most valuable to you and why.

Your portfolio will consist of three short reflection papers (or a big one combining all three reflections) and artifacts for each lesson. This reflection paper should total approximately 15 pages. The artifacts should include the following: (1) the lesson plan, (2) related assessments, and (3) student permanent products (e.g., work samples, scored record sheet, videotape, or audiotape).

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the supporting information tab for this article.