"I Love the American Accent": An Inquiry into ELT Teachers' Perception of Teaching in Light of Global Flows[1]

Leila Tajik*[2]
Negin Mojtabaei[3]

Abstract

In the absence of ample practical studies which explore how ELT teachers perceive teaching with respect to various hypotheses associated with globalization, namely homogenization, polarization, and hybridization, and how their practice reflects the tenets of the global flows, this study was conducted to address these neglected issues. Three main aspects of language teaching, mostly affected by various orientations towards globalization and, in consequence, ELT- namely the primacy of native speaker variety, the appropriateness of Western-led methods, and the appropriateness of Western-led materials- were the focal points of our study. Twenty teachers, selected through criterion-referenced sampling technique, participated in this research. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and classroom observations accompanied with field notes. The thematic analysis of data revealed that the only area less affected by the tenets of the Global English is ELT teaching methods. Our

teachers seemed to be aware of the ideas promoted by critical scholars of World Englishes as to the need to adapt teaching methods to the peculiarities of distinct contexts. On the other hand, our teacher participants favored monocentric adherence to the English variety and Western-led English materials. Altogether, the data of the interviews and observations corroborate the lack of awareness of our teachers of the imperialistic features of Global English. These findings have implications for the design of teacher training courses.

Introduction

The term 'globalization' was first used in 1960s in the context of economy and business and later became widespread in political and cultural dimensions (Featherson, 2006). In terms of culture, globalization has been associated with three major hypotheses, namely *homogenization*, *polarization* or *heterogenization*, and *hybridization* (Holton, 2000; Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Singh & Doherty, 2004). Proponents of homogenization proclaim that globalization contributes to the emergence of a homogenized global culture which is standardized around Western norms. The polarization process warns about the gradual destruction of local cultures through homogenization and stresses that local cultures should be legitimized, presented, and strengthened. This said, heterogenization functions as a resistance movement to the hegemonic features of homogenization and contributes to increased diversity and cultural heterogenization (Holton, 2000; Kumaravadivelu, 2006). Hybridization is defined as "the simultaneity of both universalizing and particularizing tendencies" through which local areas benefit from global resources and, at the same time, they retain their own cultural identities (Robertson, 1995, p. 29). Different conceptualizations of globalization have led to the emergence of two main conceptualizations of the English language and, in consequence, English Language Teaching (ELT), namely Global Inner Circle English and World Englishes (WE). In the former, inner circle varieties of English, including British and American English, are considered as the most legitimate varieties; native speakers are the only authoritative owners of the language; and teaching methods and coursebooks propagated by inner circle countries are the most effective, efficient, and authoritative means and materials for ELT contexts (Canagarajah, 2002; Jenkins 2006). These imperialistic features of globalization considered as homogenization were resisted by WE (Cameron 2002, Canagarajah, 2007; Jenkins, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Phillipson, 1992). According to Canagarajah (2007), contrary to Inner Circle English orientation, promoting the ideology of monocentricity of English, the WE paradigm evolved on the basis of pluricentric English, advocating all varieties of English as legitimate and acceptable.

Notwithstanding changes introduced by the new conceptualizations of English for the realm of language teaching, it appears that, the beliefs such as the priority of British or American English over other varieties and native speaker

ownership, are still deeply ingrained in ELT teachers and teacher educators (Jenkins, 2006; Seidlhofer, 2005). Although much invaluable in their own terms, the existing studies seem to have failed to provide evidence for how globalization is perceived by ELT teachers in different parts of the world. More specifically, we do not know how teachers approach contrasting ELT paradigms; that is, if they favor conformity to native speaker norms or adopt an authoritative position. As is true for all English teaching contexts, English language teaching as a foreign language (EFL) in Iran needs to be scrutinized in terms of how teachers approach the contradictory ELT teaching paradigms. In order to address this issue, we conducted this study to document a sample of English teachers' perspectives about Global English and WE and to explore how their perspectives are reflected in their daily pedagogical practices. Three main aspects of language teaching affected by various orientations towards ELT guide our study, namely, *the primacy of native speaker variety*, *the appropriateness of Western-led methods*, and *the appropriateness of Western-led materials*. Specifically, the following question guided the present inquiry:

> How do ELT teachers perceive various aspects of ELT in light of globalization, and how is their perception reflected in their day-to-day pedagogical practices?

This study can elucidate how global flows have impacted Iranian ELT teachers' conceptualizations of English teaching. In other words, it clarifies if our teachers have chosen to be passive performers of globalized Western norms, methods, and materials, or active and authoritative decision-makers and norm-developers in their working context. If this study finds evidence for our teachers' lack of awareness of the Western hegemonic goals of Global English, it can have implications for making changes to current teacher training programs so that more attention would be devoted to elucidating the negative consequences of blind adherence to the Inner Circle English. Since ELT teachers' orientation towards English in light of globalization seems to be among the neglected areas in the literature of ELT, the present study can provide ideas for and raise the awareness of the ELT teacher preparation community in other parts of the world on the necessity of raising teachers' awareness of various orientations towards globalization and giving more priority to probing into teachers' perspectives about them. In other words, as the impact of globalization on English teaching is of global significance, findings of the present study are likely to be applicable for ELT and teacher training programs in other countries.

Review of the Literature

Globalization, which first appeared about six decades ago in the context of economy and business (Featherstone, 2006), had its heyday in 1990s by being transferred to the academic usage. Historically, globalization has been conceptualized in light of two ideological standpoints of modernism and postmodernism, each associated with a distinct hypothesis on globalization. The initial section of this review has as its defining characteristic an explicit focus on theoret-

ical underpinnings of the hypotheses associated with globalization. Specifically, it explains the consequences of various orientations towards globalization on culture and, in particular, on the English language and ELT. It elaborates on two main conceptualizations of ELT introduced into the literature through contradictory processes of globalization. Finally, this review reports the related practical studies.

Hypotheses Associated with Globalization

This part explicates the three major hypotheses associated with globalization in detail.

Homogenization. For some (e.g., Altan, 2017; Block, 2002; Giddens, 1990; Crystal, 2003), globalization is a process which homogenizes the world in favor of the Western standards and norms of behavior. As such, this perspective, which has been considered as "an aspect or outcome of the Western project of modernity" (Robertson, 1995), results in cultural convergence (Holton, 2000). Within this understanding, Global English evolved as an approach to teaching and learning English with its foundations in mainstream ELT which considers Inner Circle English as the only variety which is correct, pure, and authentic (Crystal, 2003). According to Jenkins (2006), the final goal of this approach is for nonnatives to achieve a near-native competence, and deviations from native-speaker norms are seen as errors which result from incomplete acquisition of English language. So as to legitimize the global dominance of Global English, its proponents (e.g., Crystal, 1997, 2003; Kaplan, 2001) attempted to describe it as a form which has grown to be independent of any social control (cited in Phillipson, 2001).

Heterogenization or polarization. Notwithstanding the attempts made by leaders of the Global English towards detaching its role from its historical determinants, i.e. modernism, and, in consequence, to help it survive, modern globalization was criticized in the mid-20th century by postmodern modes of thought for its potential to dehumanize and devaluate local cultures. Postmodern or neo-Marxist sociologists (e.g., Foucault, 1980; Kellner, 2001; Lyotard, 1979) consider modern globalization as Americanization or Westernization which "operates not so much through the conquest, but through the imposition of Western norms and standards" (cited in Escobar, 2004, p. 8). As to the language, critical scholars (e.g., Block, 2002; Canagarajah, 2007; Jenkins, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Phillipson, 1992) question the neutrality of the global spread of English advocated by modernists.

Among the prominent and pervasive criticisms to the neutrality of English language we can refer to those advanced by Phillipson (1992), Pennycook (1994), Cameron (2002), and Kumaravadivelu (2006). Phillipson (1992) describes English as a medium through which new mental structures are imposed from Inner Circle countries to other countries. He raises our awareness of the

hidden goals of countries like the United Kingdom and the United States by promoting English language around the world as a so-called standard language which, in deep layers, imposes their culture, values, and worldviews, and contributes to the gradual destruction of local languages and cultures. Pennycook (1994) points outs how English media from developed countries have penetrated into the media of developing nations, eroding the national sovereignty, cultural identity, and political independence of developing nations by its one-way flow of information. Going one step further, Cameron (2002) discusses how dominant cultures impose their modes of thought and, in consequence, their definition of acceptable or desirable communicational skills on subaltern cultures. Cameron considers this kind of imposition as a new form of imperialism through which Western countries not only try to destruct indigenous languages by promoting Inner Circle English but also to propagate their own patterns for an effective communication. Kumaravadivelu (2006) looks at English from four angles which altogether result in the colonial coloration of the language. From the scholastic dimension, he points to the way in which "Western scholars have furthered their own vested interests by disseminating Western knowledge and by denigrating local knowledge" (p. 12). From the linguistic dimension, he mentions that local languages and cultures are considered irrelevant for learning and teaching English as an additional language. From the cultural dimension, he discusses English language as a carrier and also promoter of Western culture and values; and from the economic dimension, he considers English language as a commodity which provides wealth to the economy of Inner Circle countries. Overall, postmodern scholars raise the awareness of the public about the hegemonic attributes of modern globalization represented through the use of language in various aspects of life. Equipped with this awareness, in the postmodern understanding of globalization, also called polarization hypothesis, Western versions of modernity are resisted and challenged by various social movements around the world (Singh & Doherty, 2004). This resistance opens up new spaces for periphery countries and cultures to act no longer as merely numb receivers of Western culture but to act as critical agents who are able to question the legitimacy of hegemonic Western values (Kumaravadivelu, 2008). In fact, polarization, which appears to be a consequence of the awareness of the hegemonic attributes of globalization, contributes to increased diversity (Holton, 2000).

The ideas advanced by postmodernists as to the resistance of outer circle cultures to the hegemonic orientation of modern globalization have penetrated into language education as well. The rise of critical SLA, which introduced notions like WE into the literature, provides valid evidence for this claim. The WE paradigm refers to institutionalized, nativized, or indigenized varieties of English, the emergence of which dates back to the early 1980s when discussions of Kachru (1986, 1992), Smith (1987), Rampton (1987), and Sriher (1994), among others, about Asian English, Nigerian English, and Singaporean English as legitimate varieties of English led to the reconceptualization of English from a one-variety language possessed by its native speakers to a language with multiple legitimate varieties used mostly by nonnative people. According to Jenkins

(2006), with the emergence of the WE paradigm, earlier concepts and forms in mainstream SLA such as code-switching, negative transfer (interference), and fossilization that indirectly implied learners' deviation and deficiency from Western norms changed to less-pejorative ones.

Main Contradictions in ELT

Based on this evidence from the literature, the WE paradigm was introduced as a response to the hegemonic ideas advanced by the Global English orientation. These contrasting ELT paradigms have been marked by large areas of controversy, mainly about the ownership of the English language, the primacy of native speaker variety, the appropriateness of Western-led methods, and the appropriateness of Western-led materials, which will be detailed below.

The ownership of the English language: As stated above, the modernist understanding of globalization advances the idea that English primarily belongs to the British and American people; in consequence, they are the only competent speakers of English allowed to set the correct forms of language (Jenkins, 2006). Native speaker's ownership, however, has been problematized by postmodern critical scholars. According to Jenkins (2006), the outer circle and expanding circle have their own right to develop their own norms rather than continuing to defer to those of the so-called educated native speaker. This is also affirmed by Rajadurai (2007) who condemns regarding native speakers of English as the custodians of the language with the right to prescribe norms.

The primacy of native speaker variety*:* As stated previously, the Global English imposes the pre-assumption that native varieties of English are the only acceptable varieties in ELT classes. Consequently, it perceives variation in the language produced by learners as deviations from English norms and describe them in terms of errors or fossilization (Seidlhofer, 2004), disregarding the fact that learner varieties might be reflective of their ability to appropriate English language in a way that suits their social practices (Canagarajah, 2006). Contrary to Inner Circle English, WE recognizes that "learners may be producing forms characteristic of their own variety of English which reflect the sociolinguistic reality of their English use, whatever their circle, far better than either British or American norms are able to do." (Jenkins, 2006)

The appropriateness of Western-led methods: Another result of the global spread of English is the taken-for-granted correctness and effectiveness of Western-led methods. According to Canagarajah (2002), teachers in periphery countries perceive the methods propagated by inner circle countries as "the most effective, efficient and authoritative" (p. 135) to be applied in their teaching without considering what their local contexts necessitates. In addition to noting the inappropriateness of labeling Western-led methods as the best methods due to their not fitting well with the local contexts, Canagarajah alludes to the increasing awareness of the fact that the methods constructed in inner circle countries are not value-free, but reflective of social relations, ways of thinking, and strategies of learning preferred by native countries.

The appropriateness of Western-led materials: Another consequence of favoring the global spread of English has, most probably, been turning ELT into a highly competitive industry. Increasingly, English textbooks are published in and imported from inner circle countries to the outer and expanding circle world. This phenomenon has been attacked by critical intellectuals (e.g., Gray, 2002) who problematized global coursebooks as being culturally loaded. To them, native materials, inherently, represent native world views, visions, and cultures and, accordingly, are products of "the interplay between commercial, pedagogical and ethical interests" (Gray, 2002, p. 157).

Resistance in Practice

The above section elaborated on the way the rise of a new conceptualization of English has challenged the Global English, endorsing indubitable obedience to native-speaker norms. Although the theoretical understanding of the need to resist against the dominant Western modes of thought might seem appealing to the intellectuals in developing countries, it seems that this conception has, predominantly, been represented merely on the paper with little, if any, practical attempts on the part of critical scholars to bring them into ELT classroom life. Among many others, Seidlhofer (2004) claims that there is a conceptual gap between the meta-level, i.e. what researchers of WE assert, and grassroots practice which promotes the unquestioning submission to native-speaker norms. Additionally, Jenkins (2006) resents that despite critical discussions in the field of theory and research, the traditional beliefs such as native speaker ownership and the priority of British or American English over other varieties is still deeply ingrained in teachers and teacher educators.

In the realm of practice, few scholars have explored how ELT teachers and students react to the dichotomy of Global English versus WE. Some found the persistent inclination of practitioners towards the inner circle type of English. Matsuda (2003), for instance, found the strong preference of Japanese students to speak British and American English and their belief that these varieties are pure and authentic. He resented that the inner circle English taught in Japan has failed to give a sense of autonomy to students as independent and powerful users of their own variety. As another example, Jenkins (2005) found her nonnative teachers' desire to identify themselves, through their accents, as members of an international community and to be mistaken for a native speaker. Her teachers reasoned that native-like accents will "enhance rather than damage their social and economic prospects internationally" (p. 542). Though the inclination towards native speaker norms seems to dominate among ELT practitioners, the literature provides instances of teachers who question the imported norms and standards of inner circle countries and try to appropriate them to suit their socio-cultural contexts. An example comes from Singh and Doherty (2004) who analyzed ELT teachers' accounts of pedagogic choices in designing and enacting educational programs for international students in the contact zone of the global university. They examined the ways teachers navigate and manage the dilemmas created between their professional ethic of the

cultural respect and the curricula of linguistic-cultural orientation to Western higher education. Data analyses revealed three strategies used by teachers which represented teachers not as sacrificed recipients of global flows but as active and reflective agents who have a necessary role in the global machinery. Yildrim and Okan (2007) elicited ELT teacher trainers' perspectives about global English and its cultural consequences. Their teacher trainers called for a foreign language pedagogy which promotes critical language awareness, i.e. an understanding of how language shapes and is shaped by society. They suggested that teachers adopt a critical stance and be aware of the cultural and linguistic threats of English to their students' mother tongue. To document the complexity of ELT in new global economic and cultural conditions, Neilsen et al. (2007) analyzed narratives from data collected from in-depth interviews with nine native speaker ELT teachers who taught English in a range of non-English speaking countries. They found that their teachers may no longer be the norm-bearers; rather, they have tried to negotiate the cultural, technical, and economic flows of globalization and may have gained inner strength to develop their own philosophies and new methodologies of teaching.

The above literature documented that few empirical studies have explored how recent conceptualizations of English have found their way into the practical realm of teaching. To address this gap, we attempted to find out how Iranian ELT teachers perceive English in light of globalization and how their understanding is represented in their classes.

Method

As stated previously, this study aimed to explore ELT teachers' orientation towards Global English and WE; in particular, we checked our teachers' orientation towards the primacy of native speaker variety, the appropriateness of Western-led methods, and the appropriateness of Western-led materials. In this section, we elaborate on the characteristics of the participants, data collection techniques and procedures, and method of data analysis.

Participants

Twenty ELT teachers teaching general English courses in four private English institutes - named as institute A, B, C and D in this study -- in Bandar Abbas city participated in this research. They were selected through criterion-referenced, or purposive, sampling technique (Mertens, 2014). The main criteria for selecting practitioners were teachers' years of pedagogical experience and the proficiency level of their students. We selected teachers with more than two years of teaching experience since, through a piloting, we found that more experienced teachers are likely to have richer and more relevant responses to the interview questions. Another criterion for selecting teachers was the proficiency level of their students. We decided to observe classes with upper-intermediate- and advanced-level learners due to the higher degree of interpersonal interactions

in their classrooms which we thought might result in extracting richer data from class observations. Twelve teachers were male and were female. As to their university degree, 10 had a BA degree in English Teaching, five had completed their BA program in English Translation, and others had completed their MA program in Teaching English.

Data Collection Techniques

We used two main qualitative data collection techniques, namely semi-structured interviews and classroom observations accompanied with field notes to collect data. Semi-structured interview is a verbal process consisting of predetermined semiformal questions which allow for additional clarification and/or exploration of the questions or answers when needed (Dörnyei, 2007; Mason, 2004; Patten, 1990). Observation is defined as "the systematic description of events, behaviors, and artifacts in the social setting chosen for study" (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). According to Thorpe (2008, p. 97), "Field notes are contemporaneous notes of observations or conversation taken during the conduct of qualitative research".

Procedure

In the initial stage of data collection, we decided on the themes to explore in ELT teachers' conduct. More specifically, we identified the main aspects of ELT documented in the literature as being influenced by the global flows so as to explore in our study. Three main aspects were selected, namely, the primacy of native speaker variety, the appropriateness of Western-led methods, and the appropriateness of Western-led materials. Next, we decided on data collection techniques. We selected semi-structured interviews to explore teachers' perspective about various orientations towards English; additionally, we decided to utilize classroom observation as a supportive data collection tool to realize how teachers' perception towards globalization, explored through interviews, were reflected in their daily pedagogical practices. We also thought about taking field notes during classroom observations not to miss minutes of significance. Later, based on the aspects introduced above, we prepared the interview guide of the study. Interview questions aimed to guide classroom observations as well.

In the next step, we decided on the criteria for selecting teacher participants. As we sought to attain a rich data set, we thought that more experienced teachers teaching intermediate- and advanced-level students might contribute more relevant data to the study. To check this, we first piloted the study on four experienced and novice EFL teachers in Bandar Abbas English institutes, teaching students at beginner, intermediate, and advanced levels of language proficiency. We informally interviewed them and observed one session of their classes, which provided us with the realization that more experienced teachers are likely to have richer and more relevant answers to interview questions, possi-

bly due to their more years of teaching experience. Also, we found that the classes with upper-intermediate- and advanced-level students yield higher levels of interaction among class members which results in extracting richer data from class observations. In addition to confirming our hunch as to the benefits teaching experience and students' level can bring about, the pilot study familiarized us with the research environment as well and helped us to make revisions to the vague or ambiguous interview questions. As to the number of teacher participants, we were cognizant that we had to meet data saturation, namely to collect data to the point at which the newly collected no longer provided additional insights.

After we planned the details, we gained the permission of managers of four language institutes to collect data of their teachers. We explained the purposes of the study as well as the type of data we needed. We promised not to reveal the names of their participants nor their language institutes. Although we had intended to continue data collection to the time when no new information emerged from the data, the managers of institutes imposed limits on the number of practitioners we could contact with. Accordingly, we felt compelled to predetermine the sample size.

Once we worked out the details of the study, data collection began. Data collection was performed by one of the authors of this article who had been teaching in one of the four institutes and had easier access to the context of the language institutes. So as to make sure she was on the right path, she checked all the steps she took with the other author. Initially, she selected the participants through criterion-referenced sampling. She endeavored to identify teachers who were enthusiastic to cooperate and were able to manage their time for the data collection techniques of the study besides meeting the essential criteria. Prior to data collection, she explained the aims of the study to the participants, elaborated on various types of data she aimed to collect, asked participants' permission for the audio recording of the interview sessions and their classes, and informed them that their data will be used in writing an academic paper. The interview time was decided by teachers and lasted for 20 to 35 minutes depending on different individuals' schedule. At the beginning of the interview sessions, the interviewer tried to establish rapport with the teachers by asking informal questions about their degree and their years of experience. Also, she asked them to select English or Persian language for their interviews. At times when they were indecisive, Persian language was suggested by the researcher, because teachers' lack of English proficiency might inhibit them to reveal their perception. All the interviews were audio-recorded to be transcribed later.

In the next phase, the researcher observed two sessions of all teachers' classes as a non-participant observer. The observation was done in two sessions so as to reduce the Hawthorne effect and to increase data consistency. The Hawthorne effect refers to the fact that people will modify their behavior simply because they are being observed. The classes observed lasted for about an hour and a half and occurred in the middle of the term. During class observations, field notes were taken to help the researcher to remember and record details of

teachers' conduct relevant to the purpose of the study. Field notes taken during observations included various types of information. First, the general information of each class, including teachers' names and the date and place of observation were documented. In addition, three other main types of information, directly linked to the purpose of the study, were noted. Field notes were complemented with documenting any other detail of the classes which sounded relevant to the purpose of the study.

Data analysis

We used thematic analysis to analyze all data, including interview transcripts and field notes of observations*.* Braun and Clarke (2006) define this method as "a method for identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns (themes) within data" which "minimally organizes and describes data set in rich detail" (p. 6). To analyze data, we first translated all interviews into English and transcribed them. As mentioned above, we attempted to explore our teachers' perspective about three main aspects of ELT influenced by the global trend - namely the primacy of the native speaker variety, the appropriateness of Western-led methods, and the appropriateness of Western-led materials - as well as their realization in teachers' practice. In addition to the three main themes, within each theme, a number of sub-themes were addressed through interview questions. For instance, within the main theme *the primacy of native speaker variety,* we addressed the English accent teachers have, teachers' dis/satisfaction with their accent, teachers' feelings towards being recognized with a non/native accent, etc. Keeping the main themes or categories as well as subthemes in mind, we searched through all data to find instances relevant to them. To extract themes and subthemes, we scrutinized all data to find their similar thematic cores and to group them under their relevant categories or subcategories. Hence, incidents with a common focus were classed under the same categories - this was done with the aim of condensing data into a more meaningful and more manageable form in the research paper.

To make sure the participants concurred with the categorization of the data, some instances of segmentation, categorization, and labeling of all responses were checked with them. Since the teachers had busy schedules, they could only check around a third of the analysis of their own interviews. In 98% of the cases, consensus was obtained between the researchers and teachers over the categorizations. At the same time, to check the interrater reliability of the analysis phase (i.e. segmentation and labeling), the two researchers carried out the processes of data analysis. Initially, one of the researchers performed the analysis of the data which was later re-examined by the second researcher, a procedure believed to increase the reliability of the findings (Mackey & Gass, 2000). The results of the second round of the analysis yielded high consistency between the first and the second round. The cross-checking of the analysis procedure with the participants and the second researcher also enhanced the internal validity or credibility of the study, as highlighted by various scholars including Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Shenton (2004), which had already been ad-

dressed through one of the researchers' full engagement with the field and being immersed into the study during the time to complete data collection (Maxwell, 1996). A further attempt to ensure the credibility of the research was to employ multiple sources, or triangulation, of data collection (Shenton, 2004; Yin, 2009). Additionally, the use of well-established methods of data collection and analysis, a point emphasized by Yin (2009) and Shenton (2004), added to the trustworthiness of the study. Also, in the observation phase, the researcher observed each class for two sessions to increase the consistency of this phase.

Results and Discussion

This section reports the outcome of the analysis of participants' responses to the interview questions as well as the observation field notes. It presents the data in three main sections, each representing one theme, i.e. the primacy of native speaker variety, the appropriateness of Western-led methods, and the appropriateness of Western-led materials. Each theme is detailed through sub-themes which touch upon various aspects of the main theme and is illustrated with extracts from the data. Note that the findings extracted from different sources of data collection will not be presented under separate headings as, throughout the findings, various sources of data corroborated one another. In consequence, to illustrate the themes, we make references to extracts taken from transcripts obtained through different sources. For the subthemes like teachers' dis/satisfaction with their accent, teachers' feelings towards being recognized with a non/native accent, teachers' choice of a second accent, and teachers' feelings towards their students' accents, which did not yield themselves to observation, no observational evidence is provided.

Theme one: The primacy of native speaker variety

This theme was addressed through nine subthemes inherent in interview questions, namely the English accent teachers have, teachers' dis/satisfaction with their accent, teachers' feelings towards being recognized with a non/native accent, teachers' choice of a second accent, teachers' feelings towards their students' accents, teachers' reaction to the students' nonnative accents, teachers' perspectives about native idiomatic items, and the appropriateness of code-switching.

Subtheme one: The English accent teachers have. The analysis of teachers' responses to the first question and the classroom observations revealed that all teachers identify themselves with their American accent. When inquired about their reasons for their choice of the American accent, they referred to their own interest or their students' interest; the American accent being more smooth and fluent compared with the British accent; dominance of the American accent in pedagogy and in the world; their being exposed to the American accent when

they began learning English; and not having a choice to choose other accents. The excerpts below elucidate these points:

> *I love the American accent and I try to speak like an American as much as possible. So, I have practiced it a lot.* (Reza, Institute B)

> *I got familiar with British accent at university and I felt that I couldn't connect with this accent. I felt that although it is pure, it is too tough. I found American accent more fluent and sweet. That's why I prefer the American accent.* (Amir, Institute D)

> *I think the American accent is a dominant accent and most of the English textbooks have been designed based on this accent.* (Mohammad, Institute A)

> *It was not a decision by me. I think it was enforced by the educational system including the junior high-school, high-school, and university.* (Nazanin, Institute C)

As the above examples show, our teachers revealed that they identified themselves with having an American accent. Four main reasons were extracted from their responses. One reason relates to their and their students' interest in the American accent. This can be interpreted as our teachers' tendency to be known as near-native speakers, advocating the Western manifestation of English, not as Persian speakers, ensigns of their own country. This might also be taken as an indication of being affected by the homogenizing features of globalization which promotes native accents, among others. Teachers' another reason to speak with an American accent was that it is more smooth and fluent than the British accent. It appears that American and British accents were the only acceptable varieties to our teachers. This understanding seems to be consistent with the mainstream conceptualization of English which, according to Jenkins (2006), promotes native-like competence or conformity to a native speaker. Teachers' third reason to speak with an American accent was that this accent is dominant in pedagogy and in the world. Interestingly, they did not question why the American accent should be dominant and other accents might be considered as unacceptable and marginal. Again, this might be indicative of the fact that our teachers consider Western English as the only legitimized variety for teaching and, in consequence, tend to identify themselves with the dominant orientation in the world. This can also be taken as a result of globalization as an imperialistic phenomenon through which, according to Cameron (2002), Western countries try to impose their definitions of what is legitimized and acceptable. Our teachers also reported that the American accent was imposed on them by their teachers. If we take this imposition as an indication of the prevalence of the American accent in the educational system of the country, we can infer that this variety is ingrained in teachers' and students' minds as an acceptable and legitimate variety, that is indicative of the domination of a mainstream orientation towards English in the educational system, as maintained by Jenkins (2006). This finding corroborates the assertion made by Pishghadam and Sabouri (2011) that having a native-like mastery of British and American varieties has even turned into a criterion for the recruitment of Iranian English teachers.

Subtheme two: Teachers' dis/satisfaction with their accent. When asked if they were satisfied with their accents, fifteen teachers maintained that they were not much satisfied with their accents since they thought they could never speak like a native speaker. One teacher noted:

> *I feel if I had worked on my English from childhood, I would have had a better accent. Now, I try to pronounce the words well. I try my best to have a standard pronunciation, but it is clear I cannot speak like a native speaker. I have practiced English during my adulthood. Obviously, the one who has been exposed to English from childhood has a better accent.* (Zahra, Institute A)

This excerpt and many others vividly manifest our teachers' negative feelings about their nonnative accent. Regrettably, they did not perceive themselves as native Persian speakers who are able to produce their own versions of English and, accordingly, wished to imitate a native-like accent. This inclination towards native accents might result from the Westernization process which considers English language as a property of Western countries and perceives English teachers and students as passive recipients of the language with no right to speak their own variety of English. This trend in our teachers provides a new support for the claims made by Jenkins (2006) that the beliefs such as native speaker ownership and the priority of British or American English over other varieties of English are still deeply ingrained in teachers.

Subtheme three: Teachers' feelings towards being recognized with a nonnative accent. The next question inquired about how teachers would feel if someone thought that they spoke with a local accent. Eleven teachers expressed that they did not feel degraded to be perceived as nonnative speakers, as they thought having nonnative accents is inevitable in an EFL context. Others, however, revealed that they felt inferior if they were known as a nonnative speaker. The quotes below illustrate their concerns:

> *I can't say I would be happy with my local accent. But I won't be sad either because, in our country, English is learned as a foreign language. We should try our best to speak like a native, but it's obvious that we can't be a native. So, I can't say that I feel upset to have a local accent because I'm sure I have the right to have my local accent. I think you should get upset just whenever a nonnative person questions your ability. But if a native person tells me that I don't have a native accent, I won't be upset.* (Maryam, Institute B)

> *Of course, it is not tolerable for me, I can't stand it because I've tried a lot to speak with an American accent and I've tried a lot to hide my Iranian accent. So it bothers me when someone thinks that I have a local accent.* (Shayan, Institute C)

In contrast to the first teacher who seemed to cope with her identity as a nonnative speaker of English, the second one seemed displeased to be regarded as a foreign speaker. Through his further elaborations in the interview session, it sounded that he hid his local accent since, to him, Persian is a non-standard, downgraded accent and American is the only legitimized variety. In consequence, he tended to identify himself as a near-native speaker with a near-

native accent. Overall, although at first sight our teachers seemed to take contradictory positions towards being labeled as nonnative speakers, they all shared a feeling that they would be more content to be identified as a so-called pure American speaker than as a speaker with a nonnative accent. The next subtheme provides further evidence to this claim.

Subtheme four: Teachers' feelings towards being recognized with a native accent. When we probed into our teachers' reflection over being regarded with a native accent, almost all of them revealed their tendency to be identified as a native speaker. An example:

> *You know, once it happened to me, I was talking to a native person in a hotel, almost four years ago; he asked me if I were Iranian. I said "Yes, how did you understand?" He said because you tried to drag some words, I realized you are Iranian. At that time, I got really disappointed. Three months ago, when I talked to a native person, he could not understand that I'm Iranian and it means I have made progress during these years.* (Amir, Institute D)

In his further elaborations, this teacher confessed how much pleased he was to have shifted from being regarded as a nonstandard speaker with a Persian accent to a native speaker with a perfect American accent. This excerpt vividly shows this teacher's tendency to identify himself with a Western accent. Additionally, it highlights the primacy of native speaker judgments as to the teachers' accents. This example, along with many others in which our teachers disclosed their tendency to have a near-native identity, might be indicative of the attitude of the community of ELT teachers in Iran who consider inner circle accents as the only reliable varieties. Iranian ELT professionals' positive attitudes towards the American accent has already been highlighted by Pishghadam and Zabibi (2012).

Subtheme five: Teachers' choice of a second accent. We also asked teachers what other accent of English they favor in addition to their own American accent. Not surprisingly, all teachers selected another native variety, i.e. the British one. Clearly, native accents were conceptualized as the only acceptable and legitimate ones by our teachers. As we stated above, it is highly probable that this tendency is a consequence of the homogenization process which highlights the Western manifestation of English as the only standard and acceptable one.

Subtheme six: Teachers' feelings about their students' nonnative accents. Our participants were also upset with their students' nonnative, or as the majority of them called it, nonstandard Persian accent. A teacher called the students' nonnative accent as artificial and the American accent as the natural one. The majority resented the negative transfer of Persian accent to the English one. Some practitioners found themselves incapable of correcting the

nonnative-like accent of their adult students whom they called as inflexible. The following excerpts from the interview transcripts elucidate these points:

> *Almost all of my students try to speak with an American accent. I'm not satisfied with their accents because, in my opinion, their accent is artificial and bogus. So, I work on their accents to make them natural.* (Ameneh, institute D)

> *I repeatedly remind my students that they have to practice more. I always ask them to watch movies and work on their accents. It is somehow related to their feelings. You know, sometimes they speak with a good accent, but as soon as they want to reveal their feelings, I see that their accent changes to an Iranian accent. As we have different dialects in Iran, they speak with their local dialects. It is not proper. The more they practice, the more they can talk with an American accent or British accent. One of my students drags the ending of the words. It's obvious that he speaks English like Persian.* (Nima, Institute B)

> *Most of my students speak with a Persian accent, and there are few students who speak well enough. Also, some of the students who are old and not flexible enough speak with a Persian accent and correcting them is a difficult task.* (Nazanin, Institute C)

As the first example reveals, this teacher attempted to make her students' accent *natural* by removing traces of the *artificial* Persian accent from their language. In the second example, as the teacher recalls, the negative transfer or local accent becomes more evident when the students discuss their own emotional status. This teacher's resentment of his students' nonnative variety might indicate that there is little awareness among our ELT practitioners that "learners may be producing forms characteristic of their own variety of English, which reflect the sociolinguistic reality of their English use. . . far better than either British or American norms are able to do", as maintained by Jenkins (2006, p. 168). The same teacher exemplified dragging the ending of the words by pronouncing the long vowel /iː/ as a deviation from British or American standard accents. In fact, dragging the ending of the words is a feature of the Persian phonological system which lacks the short vowel /ɪ/. In the last quote above, the teacher thinks that older students are not capable of producing the English words with the proper standard accent. Altogether, the above extracts elucidate our teachers' displeasure over their learners' nonnative-like accent. What added to their resentment was that they thought that accent is not teachable. A teacher noted:

> *In my early years of experience, I used to zoom in on my students' accent a lot. For example, I told them that they have to pronounce 'theater' with the correct initial sound of /θ/ which is absent in Persian. But, after years, I found that accent is not something teachable and it is more related to the students' talent and enthusiasm.* (Fatemeh, Institute A)

As is evident, our teachers not only believed that their student's local accents were incorrect, but also thought that correcting their accents was beyond their ability as teachers.

Overall, the examples above show how the globalized varieties of English have been conceptualized in our teachers' mind as the only correct and ac-

ceptable varieties and how teachers insist on teaching them. This finding corroborates the assertion made by Seidhofer (2004) about ELT teachers' perceiving variation as a deviation from native norms and describing them in terms of errors or fossilization.

Subtheme seven: Teachers' reaction to the students' nonnative accents. Finally, the analysis of teachers' responses to the question which explored how teachers react to their students' nonnative accents showed paradoxical results compared with their responses to the previous question. Here, our teachers revealed positive reactions to their students' local accents. Comparing this to their answers to the previous question evinces that although teachers considered their students' accents as nonstandard, they did not react to them negatively and preferred to correct their learners' wrong pronunciations instead. A teacher noted:

> *I think pronunciation is more important than accent and I don't mind if a student has a good pronunciation but not a good accent. In my idea, accent just makes your speaking more beautiful.* (Nasim, Institute A)

One explanation for this seemingly conflicting finding might relate to the fact that our teachers were disappointed of correcting their students' accents, so they refused to waste time on this and, as an alternative, corrected their pronunciation.

The primacy of pronunciation over accent correction was also recorded in 17 class observations. In most of their class time, teachers did not react unfavorably to their pupils' Persian accent. An example of field notes from one class can elucidate this point:

> *The student starts talking about the topic of 'students at school'. He has a Persian accent and pronounces /θ/ sound like /d/. But the teacher does not correct him and lets him go on.* (Note taken in Ahmad's class, Institute B)

Subtheme eight: Teachers' perspectives about native idiomatic items. In addition to the differences mentioned above between mainstream and critical ELT, other differences exist. For instance, the two perspectives have different orientations towards employing native idiomatic expressions. The global conceptualization of English which is the result of globalization as a homogenization phenomenon emphasizes the importance of using British or American expressions, idioms and proverbs (Jenkins, 2006). In contrast, in critical SLA, scholars like Seidhofer (2004) believe that using idiomatic language while speaking is considered as an obstacle in communication with other nonnative speakers in a way that they might not understand it and it might contribute to communication problems. When inquired about reasons for teaching British and American idioms and proverbs, teachers mentioned two reasons: students' needs and interests, and producing real English. The majority of teachers said that they allocate time to teaching idioms since they find their students eager to

master them. Interestingly, to the most of teachers, English expressions turn the students' language into more real language. Two teachers noted:

> *Whenever students hear and learn an idiom or proverb, they will go into ecstasies. When a student learns a grammar point, he/she feels that he has not learned something real. But when he learns an idiom or proverb, he gets really excited and this increases his self-confidence* (Fatemeh, Institute A)
>
> *I teach these items in upper levels because they are a part of everyday language and they are used in speaking a lot. So, if students want to communicate with someone they have to learn these items.* (Nima, Institute B)

Our teachers also used more glamorous terms to describe English idioms; to them, English expressions are *the spirit of language* and *essential items for everyday language use*. This emphasis on acquiring English idiomatic expressions might represent our teachers' adherence to 'unilateral idiomaticity' (Seidhofer, 2004) which, as Seidhofer (2004) maintains, might inhibit comprehensibility in communication with nonnative speakers. Our teachers' tendency towards unilateral idiomaticity is probably raised from their attachment to the dominant and globalized conceptualizations of mainstream ELT in which British and American versions of English are the only correct and standard forms and learning their native expressions are crucial for students.

Subtheme nine: The appropriateness of code-switching. The last sub-theme explored within the first theme concerns the appropriateness of code-switching. Jenkins (2006) states that in mainstream SLA, code-switching, indirectly, implies learners' deviation and deficiency from Western norms and is forbidden in the class. However, in critical SLA, code-switching has been changed to a less-pejorative concept and is considered as revealing learners' sociolinguistic identities. To elucidate how our teachers approach code-switching, we explored it through interviews and observations. Eighteen teachers believed that using code-switching should be kept at a minimum. To them, code-switching was permitted only when there is no other choice. A teacher noted:

> *Both teacher and learners must use English in the class. But, sometimes, it is not possible to explain something to your students in English and it is unavoidable to have the Persian equivalent for it. In my idea, code-switching should be limited to these situations.* (Pedram, Institute A)

The above quote, as well as many others, illuminate that our practitioners regard code-switching as a tool for students to fill their language knowledge gaps, not as representatives of their sociolinguistic identities. This perspective appears to be in line with the monolithic view of mainstream English in which code-switching is used to "compensate for gaps in knowledge" (Jenkins & College, 2006). As Jenkins (2006) states, in mainstream ELT, English users should obey the rules of native speakers and are not allowed to create their own versions of English accompanied by code-switching and code-mixing which can be representative of their own local identities.

Teachers' orientation towards mere use of the English language in teaching was also reflected in their pedagogical practice. In 15 classes, students were not allowed to speak Persian and the negative imperative *do not speak Persian in the class* was repeatedly heard. Overall, all data indicated that our teachers' dominant pedagogical assumptions stem from the imperialistic features of globalization. As Seidhofer (2005) states, this monocentric view is certainly accepted as a reality in the expanding circles and is defined based on the un-questioning submission of native-speaker norms.

Overall, through analyzing participants' answers to the questions related to the first theme, we can note that our participant teachers had a monocentric perspective about English. In fact, their conceptualization of English was based upon indubitable obedience to native-speaker norms. This perspective had al-ready been captured by Pishghadam and Sabouri (2011) who maintained that for Iranian teachers only the American and British varieties of English repre-sent standard English.

Theme two: The appropriateness of Western-led methods

According to Canagarajah (2002), in mainstream ELT, teachers in periphery countries have the assumption that methods imported from inner circle coun-tries are the most effective, efficient, and authoritative. He continues that these teachers spend lots of time and energy on applying pre-defined top-down methods in their classes, whereas, in critical ELT, teachers appropriate their teaching methods with their students' needs and the atmosphere of the class and do not insist on the application of globally-accepted methods. In this sec-tion, we present how our teachers deal with global teaching methods. Two sub-themes were explored: teachers' appropriating global teaching methods, and teachers' familiarity with global teaching methods.

Subtheme one: Teachers' appropriating global teaching methods. Fourteen teachers considered themselves not to be the followers of a pre-determined method but as authoritative users of different methods which they electively choose for different situations. Their responses implied that they set their own criteria for choosing a particular teaching method. A teacher declared:

> *I do not use one method. You know, in the post-method era, the teaching experts say that there is no one method for teaching, because each method has its own merits and demerits. So, you have to use positive points from different methods. In accordance to teaching experts, I use an eclectic method in the class. I try to take the ultimate advantage of all of the approaches in the class.* (Mohammad, Institute A)

Through the above excerpt, the teacher showed that he was not a passive user of predetermined well-known methods; on the contrary, he had an active and authoritative role in his class, creatively using an eclectic mixture of differ-ent methods with the spice of his own experience. Overall, analyzing the data of

this subtheme showed that our teachers did not consider globally-accepted methods as the most applicable ones in their classes; rather, they selectively utilized a mixture of methods they found beneficial for their trainees. The inefficiency of global teaching methods for the Asian contexts - including Vietnam, China, and Malaysia - had already been announced by Ellis (1996), Pennycook (1994), and Hiep (2007). This perspective is consistent with the ideas advanced by critical ELT in which teachers identify themselves not as followers of a pre-defined method but as active decision-makers of different methods which suit their class conditions. According to Canagarajah (2007), in critical ELT, nonnative speakers resist the hegemony of globalization via appropriating it for their own use. This finding, however, does not support the assertion made by Canagarajah (2002) that inner circle methods are the most effective in the eye of teachers in periphery countries.

Subtheme two: Teachers' familiarity with global teaching methods. When inquired if they were familiar with CLT, 16 teachers replied positively. They were, however, willing not to implement this method in its entirety, but to selectively use those features they find promising. The following recollection provides evidence for this claim:

> *I try to apply those features of CLT which are appropriate for my students. As far as I know, the most important feature of CLT is that the class shouldn't be teacher-centered. So, I try to reduce teacher time in my classes and let students speak and correct one another's mistakes.* (Amir, Institute D)

The above extract and others with similar focus show that our teachers were not persistent users of CLT who apply global methods unconditionally; rather, they acted as independent decision-makers applying only those features of the method they recognized as effective for their students. As a matter of fact, what they practiced in their classroom did not contain all the features of the method prescribed in theory. This perspective seems to be consistent with the post-method pedagogy which labels no method as the best one.

The observation of the classes provided further proof to this finding. Through classroom observations, we found that our teachers followed an eclectic method for their pedagogical practices, acting like autonomous users rather than followers of a specific method. The following examples taken from the field notes of a single class reveal this point:

> *He uses a method that is similar to direct method. Students should not speak with their mother tongue and there are not any translations in the class. The teacher mainly emphasizes on fluency and pronunciation.* (Note taken in Reza's class, Institute B)

> *The teacher uses Grammar-translation method for teaching grammar. The teacher explains the grammar in Persian. Then, he explains the rules in English and he starts practicing with students.* (Note taken in Reza's class, Institute B)

Overall, based on the interview transcripts and observation field notes, we realized that in contrast to the homogenization trend advanced in modern era,

our participants utilized what they thought was effective for their context, not what was globally introduced to the ELT community. This characteristic of our teachers, i.e. their authoritative use of globalized methods, is indicative of teachers' resistance towards these methods (Canagarajah 2002; Pennington, 1995). According to Canagarajah (2002), critical teachers are critically conscious of the strategies they find useful. Pennington (1995) maintains that critical teachers significantly resist global methods via applying their own methods in the class.

Theme three: The appropriateness of Western-led materials

As stated above, the global spread of English has changed ELT to a competitive industry and, consequently, Western-led materials have become more widespread than before. In the present study, we explored how teachers identify themselves in relation to the British or American cultural items in global textbooks and their ideas about local textbooks.

Subtheme one: Dealing with culturally inappropriate texts. When we asked teachers about their reaction to the global textbooks which might promote some culturally inappropriate messages, we found that the majority of our teachers were at ease with the cultural discrepancies between their mother tongue and English; they even appreciated global textbooks for their presenting culturally imbued materials which familiarized students with the native culture. They, further, pointed to their students' interest in knowing about the foreign culture. One teacher declared:

> I don't have problems with L2 culture, because most of the books in Iran are censored and they have somehow been adapted to our culture and traditions. But, you know, the students need to get familiar with the native culture. For example, I had a lesson about dating last week. But the students needed to understand what dating was. You cannot censor dating and its related vocabulary. (Saleh, Institute D)

Another teacher put it:

> Experience shows that students not only do not have problems with these cultural differences, but also like to learn these differences. For example, I had to teach a part of a book which was about dating. There were two religious students in my class. I explained that dating might not be accepted in our culture. But this topic is a topic in your book and should be taught. I taught that lesson and the students liked it. I think a person who wants to learn English should stop being dogmatic about his/her own culture. (Amir, Institute D)

The above recollections provide further evidence on our teachers' tendency towards mainstream conceptualizations of ELT which requires nonnative speakers to absorb British or American culture in order to learn the language. Put it differently, our teacher participants seemed to lack critical perspectives towards global books; alternatively, they were unaware of the hegemonic cul-

tural items hidden in these textbooks and their impact on the local culture. As to the consequences of unilateral teaching of L2 culture, Ziaei (2012) states that by teaching global books, some unacceptable topics might become common ones and gradually become a part of our culture regardless of their positive or negative effects.

Subtheme two: Local materials. We also explored teachers' attitudes towards localizing textbooks. The majority of teachers were against utilizing local textbooks for two main reasons: inappropriateness of local books and the priority of teaching international books. As to the inappropriateness of local books, they reasoned that the books do not promote students' active participation and that they are not attractive. One teacher stated:

> *Most students like to participate in class actively. For example, they like to sing songs, play roles, and do their exercises in pair work. You know, international books are more practical for students and have opportunities for students' active participation in class. But, unfortunately, most local books are grammar-based and students do not have a chance to use grammar rules practically.* (Reza, Institute B)

Another teacher declared:

> *You know, local books are not attractive enough. If you take a look at international books, you realize that they are full of attractive items. They have colorful and beautiful pictures which attract students. Also, all of international books have CDs which are very beneficial for students*. (Mahsa, Institute C)

Teachers, further, highlighted the primacy of international books for their representing the native language and the native culture, and their being more reliable. For instance, a teacher noted:

> *I do not believe in teaching local books. Nowadays, teachers and students trust international books more than local books as they like Western clothes, Western food, and Western way of life represented in them*. (Razieh, Institute A)

Another example:

> *I don't think that localizing English language is a good thing. How can we localize a language that does not belong to us? This is totally irrational*. (Samira, Institute C)

Another teacher mentioned:

> *I prefer to teach international books because, as these books are originally American or British, they are safer and more reliable for teaching.* (Ahmad, Institute B)

The above examples show that our teachers favor international textbooks since they contain Western culture and enjoy Western origins. As a matter of fact, these teachers considered English as a language which is "tied to its native speakers"(Seidlhofer, 2004). It appears that our teachers are unaware of the ideological hegemony of the west which makes "colonized people worship the languages, cultures, music, art, knowledge, pedagogies or most aspects of West-

ern life as more advanced, progressive and superior" (Phillipson, 2008). Only two of our teachers highlighted the need for developing local materials for their potential to promote local culture and values.

Teachers' adherence to the global textbooks was also observed in their class practice. During class observations, it was found that teachers were followers of global textbooks and not critical of them. Examples from field notes elucidate this point:

> *The teacher exactly follows the book. The topic of reading is boring for students. But the teacher does not pay attention to them and continues teaching the lesson.* (Note taken in Maryam's class, Institute A)

> *The topic of the lesson is dating. The students are teenagers and it seems that they are embarrassed when the teacher talks about this topic. But the teacher does not pay attention to their feeling and makes the class funny to reduce students' embarrassment.* (Note taken in Sima's class, Institute B)

Analyzing data from field notes showed that participant teachers did not act critically towards global textbooks; rather, they acted as unconditional followers of the books and made students adapt to the books even when their lesson topics were boring or culturally inappropriate for the pupils. Briefly, teacher reflections collected through interviews and their class practice revealed that they did not have a critical vision towards global textbooks and, entirely, succumbed to them. Having said that, we can describe these teachers as norm-dependent affected by Western-led norms and standards and ignorant of the fact that native norms carry a one-way flow of ideas or beliefs from Western countries.

Conclusion

This study helped elucidate how ELT teachers define themselves and their practice with respect to various hypotheses of globalization. To be more specific, it documented in what ways English teachers approach the hegemonic preoccupations of the Inner Circle English and the empowering mission of WE. Three main aspects of ELT teachers' conduct more susceptible to the ideologies advanced by mainstream ELT were explored - namely the primacy of native speaker variety, the appropriateness of Western-led materials, and the appropriateness of Western-led methods. We found that the only area less affected by the tenets of the Global English is ELT teaching methods. Our teachers seemed to be aware of the ideas promoted by critical scholars of WE as to the need to adapt teaching methods to the peculiarities of distinct contexts. On the other hand, our teacher participants favored monocentric adherence to the English variety and Western-led English materials. Altogether, data of the interviews and observations corroborates the lack of awareness of our teachers of the imperialistic features of Global English. Since it is common practice that Iranian language instructors are not allowed to teach in a language institute unless they complete the institute's teacher training courses and their practice is constantly supervised to assure they stick to the institute's agenda, studies of this kind can

reveal policies favored by language institutes as to the language variety teach-ers teach, their teaching methods, and teaching materials. Having this in mind, we can claim that we have provided evidence as to the language institutes' standpoint regarding the dichotomy of Global English versus WE.

Whether to interpret this as lack of awareness of the language institutes and, in consequence, their teachers of the hegemonic intentions of Global Eng-lish or their intentional acceptance of the domination of the inner circle coun-tries, we can conclude that radical changes need be made in the purpose and content of the country's teacher education courses. The Ministry of Education which governs and supervises the programs directed by language institutes can make its own policies as to how to resist the imposition of native countries through advancing the ideas promoted by WE. It can, then, supervise the train-ing programs offered in the site of various language institutes to assure they are loyal to the policies of the ministry. It is only then that ELT teachers will be-come aware of the hidden ideologies of unilateral teaching of native varieties of English to foreign students. Other outer circle countries in the world who re-sent the domination of Global English in their pedagogy can, as well, benefit from this suggestion.

Further research can build upon the present study by exploring ELT teach-ers' orientation towards global flows in a larger number of language institutes. Additionally, other contexts of teaching English, including schools and universi-ties, can be explored in terms of how they promote or inhibit Westernization in their contexts. Future studies can also scrutinize if teachers' personal variables like gender and teaching experience can influence their thought patterns as to teaching English. Moreover, students' perspective about native-speakerism can be explored as well.

References

Block, D. (2008). Language education and globalization. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 31-43). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Re-search in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Cameron, D. (2001). Zones of contact: Globalization and the teaching of communication skills. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 67-83). London, England: Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2002). Globalization, methods and practice in periphery classrooms. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 134-150). London, England: Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization con-tinued. *College Composition and Communication*, *57*(4), 586-619.

Canagarajah, S. (2006). Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 26*, 197-218.

Canagarajah, S. (2007). The ecology of global English. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *1*(2), 89-100.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. England: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. England: Oxford University Press.

Escobar, A. (2004). Beyond the third world: Imperial globality, global coloniality and anti-globalization social movements. *Third World Quarterly*, *25*(1), 207-230.

Featherstone, M. (2006). Genealogies of the global. *Journal of Theory, Culture and Society*, *23*(2-3), 387-392.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of modernity*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Gray, J. (2002). The global course book in English language teaching. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 151-168). London, England: Routledge.

Hiep, H. P. (2007). Communicative language teaching: Unity within diversity. *ELT Journal*, *61*(3), 193-201.

Holton, R. (2000). Globalization's cultural consequences. *The Annuals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *570*(1), 140-152.

Jenkins, J. (2005). Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: The role of attitudes and identity, *TESOL Quarterly*, *39*(3), 535-543.

Jenkins, J., & College, K. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 157-174.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *16*(2), 137-162.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language teaching*, *25*(01), 1-14.

Kellner, D. (2002). Theorizing globalization*. Journal of Sociological Theory*, *20*(3), 285-305.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). Dangerous liaison: Globalization, empire and TESOL. In J. Edge (Ed.), *(Re-)Locating TESOL in an age of empire* (pp. 1-26). London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research (Second language acquisition research series).* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, B. (1989). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating world Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(4), 719-729.

Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mertens, D. M. (2014). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Neilsen, R., Gitsaki, C., & Honan, E. (2007). Traveler's tales: ELT teachers in a globalizing world. In C. Gitsaki (Ed.), *Language and languages: Global and local tensions* (pp. 1-14). Newcastle, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pennington, M.C. (1995). The teacher change cycle. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(4), 705-731.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language.* London, England: Longman.

Pishghadam, R., & Sabouri, F. (2011). World English or world Englishes: A quantitative survey on Iranian English learners' attitudes toward varieties of English. *English Language and Literature Studies*, *1*(1), 86-95.

Pishghadam, R., & Zabihi, R. (2012). Life syllabus: A new research agenda in English language teaching. *Perspectives* (TESOL Arabia), *19*, 23-27.

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

Philipson, R. (2008). The linguistic imperialism of neoliberal empire. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *5*(1), 1-43.

Rajadurai, J. (2007). Intelligibility studies: A consideration of empirical and ideological issues. *Journal of World Englishes*, *26*(1), 87-98.

Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25-44). London, England: Sage.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *24*, 209-239.

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, *59*(4), 339-341.

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, *22*(2), 63-75.

Singh, P., & Doherty, C. (2012). Global cultural flows and pedagogic dilemmas: Teaching in the global university contact zone. *TESOL Quarterly*, *38*(1), 9-42.

Sridhar, S. N. (1994). A reality check for SLA theories. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(4), 800-805.

Thorpe, R. (2008). Field notes. In R. Thorpe & R. Holt, *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative management research.* London, England: Sage Publications.

Yildrim, R., & Okan, Z. (2007). The question of global language teaching: A Turkish perspective. *Asian EFL Journal*, *9*(4), 54-66.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ziaei, S. (2012). Examining cross-cultural clues as to globalization and Iran's culture in an international ELT book series: American English file. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *3*(1), 141-148.